



**AgEcon** SEARCH

RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

*No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.*

EVALUATION OF OPPORTUNITIES AND PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED  
BY YOUNG U.S. PROFESSIONALS SEEKING CAREER INVOLVEMENT  
IN THE ECONOMICS OF AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

by

Larry Senger

A Plan B Research Paper  
in partial fulfillment of requirements for an M.S.  
in Agricultural Economics

Michigan State University

August 1979

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to acknowledge the support of Dr. D. F. Fienup who provided advice and assistance for this paper. He is also primarily responsible for the organization and preparation of the survey upon which this paper is based.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
I. RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS . . . . .	4
II. EVALUATION OF TRAINING . . . . .	7
III. EMPLOYMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES . . . . .	11
IV. PROBLEMS WITH DEVELOPMENT CAREERS . . . . .	16
V. ROLE OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS IN DEVELOPMENT . . . . .	22
SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	25

## INTRODUCTION

In 1978 the American Agricultural Economics Association sponsored a study entitled "Needs and Strategies for Improving Training of Agricultural Economists for Work in International Agricultural Development." Major emphasis was placed on exploring two related topics. First, what can U.S. universities do to improve the training of future agricultural economists from LDCs for work in the agricultural development of their countries; and second, what can be done to increase the participation and contribution of young U.S. professionals trained to work in the economics of agricultural development in LDCs.

The United States is generally recognized as the major center in the world for training agricultural economists. As a consequence, many students from LDCs have received training in agricultural economics in American universities. In recent years these students have accounted for approximately one-third of all the students enrolled in U.S. graduate agricultural economics programs.<sup>1</sup> As the proportion of LDC students studying in U.S. departments of agricultural economics has grown so has concern over the adequacy of their training to deal with problems unique to their countries and cultures. Programs for training foreign students as well as U.S. students need to be examined periodically to determine whether they are meeting the needs of their clients. The type of program suitable for foreign students is likely to differ substantially from the type of program suitable for a student from the U.S. Thus, the U.S. agricultural economics profession has a special responsibility to study the adequacy of U.S. training specifically for LDC students. The AAEA study was undertaken in response to this concern and feeling of responsibility.

It is generally recognized that it is desirable for LDC professionals to staff and direct their own programs to develop their agricultural sectors. This is an ideal towards which most LDCs are moving, but an ideal which has not yet been attained. It is reasonable to expect that in many developing countries much of the technical expertise required for development work will continue to come from the developed countries for at least the next two decades. The need to teach and advise LDC students in U.S. universities will also continue to exist.

This demand for expertise from abroad has a history of roughly three decades. Agricultural economists have been involved in the work of development through direct participation in development projects, programs and research in LDCs since the end of World War II. Today, the prospect of involvement in this type of work continues to attract many American doctoral students of agricultural economics who attempt to tailor their programs for careers in this field. Thus, considerable human resources within the profession have been and continue to be committed to development work.

The International Committee of the AAEA is concerned about the effective use of these human resources. This has led to a consideration of the two issues explored in this paper: 1) what is the nature and extent of work opportunities available to young professionals who are interested in development and 2) what are the problems they encounter in pursuing career interests along these lines.

The basis for this discussion will be information collected from a mail survey conducted in the spring of 1979. In connection with this survey 214 holders of U.S. Ph.D.s interested in the economics of agricultural development were mailed questionnaires which they were asked to complete and return. These questionnaires were sent mainly to U.S. professionals but a few from Australia, Canada and Western European countries were also included.

The Sample Group. Forty-three U.S. universities which train agricultural economists at the Ph.D. level were contacted by mail. The departments of economics and agricultural economics in these universities were asked to supply a list of all Ph.D. recipients since 1968 who were from the United States and who had a major interest in the economics of agricultural development at the time of their graduation. Twenty-six of the 43 departments returned a total of 200 names and addresses; 13 returned letters stating that no U.S. students with an interest in development had received Ph.D.s in their departments in the last ten years. Only four departments failed to return any response to the request for names of students.

Fourteen more names were obtained from lists of Ph.D. dissertation titles on development topics published in the AJAE over the past ten years. (An additional 15 universities which train agricultural economists to the master's level were also contacted in connection with the survey of LDC students. In all, 58 U.S. universities were requested to participate in this study. See Table 1.)

A total of 115 persons returned questionnaires. Eighty-eight of these were returned within a month and another 27 were received after a follow-up was sent to nonrespondents. Of these 115 returned questionnaires a total of 108 were included in the study. Of the 108 respondents, 101 are of U.S. origin. The seven remaining respondents include three Canadians, two Australians, and one each from Austria and Finland; all of whom received master's and doctoral degrees from U.S. universities.

The seven questionnaires returned but not used were excluded from the study because either 1) the respondent stated that he had never been seriously interested in development (four cases), or 2) the respondent turned out to be from an LDC (two cases), or 3) the survey was returned too late for inclusion (one case).

An additional 14 questionnaires proved to be undeliverable and were returned unopened by the post office. Excluding these two groups of questionnaires (the seven unused and the 14 undeliverables) there was a total of 193 questionnaires mailed, 108 were returned for a response rate of 56 percent.

The Problem of Nonrespondents. The group of nonrespondents seems to closely resemble the group of respondents in terms of 1) proportions of people in different categories of employment as revealed by addresses, and 2) present location, i.e. U.S. vs. overseas. (See Table 2.) Also, as stated earlier, 27 additional survey responses were returned after a follow-up letter was sent to nonrespondents. This group does not differ in any consistent way from those returned after the initial contact.

Using the information contained in Table 2 certain statements can be made to the effect that the proportions of respondents and nonrespondents employed by various types of institutions are statistically equivalent. This falls short, however, of being able to state that the respondent and nonrespondent groups are both random samplings of the same population. Thus, the possibility that the sample is biased does exist. This is the case with all mail surveys.

Concern over possible bias exists, but this should not preclude serious consideration of the information gathered in this survey. This survey's results should be judged in their own merits not because they pretend to be 100 percent unbiased, but because they reflect the valid opinions of 108 professionals who are interested in the topic explored in this study.

The Questionnaire. The questionnaire contains five general categories of questions: 1) those designed to provide background information with regard to the respondents' academic and employment history, 2) those related to the adequacy of U.S. graduate training for work in development, 3) those concerning the status of the current and future job market for agricultural economics development specialists from the U.S. and other developed countries, 4) those concerning problems which arise in the course of pursuing a career in the field of agricultural economic development, and finally, 5) those touching on the issue of how institutions involved in development can be more effective in the work of economic development in LDCs. (See appendix for a copy of the questionnaire.)

The rest of this paper will discuss the results of the survey as they pertain to these five categories of questions.

## I. RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Age and Sex. All 108 respondents were men. The name of only one woman appeared on any of the lists supplied to the study and she did not return the questionnaire. The ages of the respondents range from 28 to 54, with the average age being 39.5 years. (See Table 3.)

Ph.D. Education. Although those returning questionnaires received their doctorates from a total of 24 universities, 56 percent of all respondents earned their degrees in just six of these universities (Cornell, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, Ohio State University, Purdue and the University of Wisconsin). (See Table 4.)

Of the 108 respondents, 82 listed agricultural economics as the major area of study for their doctorate, while 11 stated that it was economics and nine responded by listing development. Each of the six remaining respondents indicated a different major area of study. (See Table 5.)

In contrast, the list of the areas of specialization of the respondents is much more extensive. The most often repeated specialty was development (38 percent gave this answer). After development the two most frequent areas of specialization mentioned were combinations of development and marketing, and development and production (each was mentioned 7.4 percent of the time, i.e., eight times each). Ten other combinations of two fields into one specialty field were cited, accounting for an additional 17.5 percent of the responses. The remaining responses fall into 15 additional categories ranging from farm management to econometrics.

Overall, development was mentioned either singly or in combination with another area a total of 74 times (68.5 percent) while production, the next most popular field, was mentioned alone or in combination 14 times (13.0 percent). (See Table 6.) It is clear that development is the most common area of specialization. This is to be expected given the fact that the sample was drawn from a universe of agricultural economists interested in development. More will be said about this subject in the portion of this paper that deals with training.

Employment Positions. Nearly one-half (51 in all) of all respondents are presently employed by U.S. universities as either assistant (21), associate (19) or full professors (11). One is a full professor in a university of another developed country, and another is an assistant professor in an LDC university. If it can be assumed that associate professors have been granted tenure this gives us a total of 32, or 29.6 percent of the respondents who have tenured university positions.



Another large group of respondents, again almost half (50), are working as economists, researchers, or development project administrators. These respondents are working for a variety of employers which include universities; state, federal, and international agencies; and private consulting firms. Finally, three are working in extension and two are working as managers for private firms.

Employers. The largest single employer, as already stated, is the U.S. university system. A little in excess of one-half of all respondents (58 to be exact) are employed by U.S. universities in tenure and non-tenure track positions. In addition, three respondents are employed by universities overseas (two by developed country institutions and one by an LDC university).

Of the 50 remaining respondents 27 are employed by international agencies (USAID, the World Bank, IDB, A/D/C, the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations and various other international research centers and institutes); and 14 are employed by government (eight federal, one state, two DC and one LDC).

Of the remaining respondents five are employed by private business or consulting firms and one is employed by a local chamber of commerce as a senior agricultural economist. (See Table 7.)

Location of Employment. About three-quarters of the respondents are presently living in the United States. Nine are living in South and Central America, nine in Africa and 11 in Asia. (See Table 8.)

Employment Activities. The most common activity in which the surveyed group spends its work days is research. Slightly more than 51 percent of the respondents spend 50 percent or more of their time on their present job doing research-related work. This by far represents the major on-the-job responsibility of this group of agricultural economists.

The second most common activity is administrative work: 18.5 percent of the respondents indicated that they are involved in this type of work 50 percent or more of time. This is followed by teaching which is the primary activity of 14.8 percent of the respondents. Consulting and extension consume more than 50 percent of a respondent's work time in only 6.5 percent and 5.5 percent of the time respectively.

As to what percentage of time is spent on international as opposed to domestic issues, it was determined that 53.7 percent of those surveyed spent one-half or more of their time working on international issues. Of these 36, or exactly one-third of the sampled group spent all of their time on international issues. Only 18, or one-sixth of those surveyed are presently spending 100 percent of their time on domestic matters. (See Tables 9a, b.)

It might also be of interest to breakdown activities and international content of work by type of employment to see if the responsibility profile of jobs varies across employers. Tables 10a and b list average amounts of time devoted to each category of activity for each employer type.

Language Capability. All but eight of those returning questionnaires noted some competency in at least one foreign language. Of those with knowledge of foreign languages 36 have minimum competency in just one language, 31 listed two, and 25 respondents listed three languages. A small group made up of only eight respondents claimed some knowledge of four languages.

The most common foreign languages mentioned were Spanish, Portuguese and French. In general, fluency was claimed most often in connection with the ability to read foreign languages and least often in connection with the ability to write them. (See Table 11.)

Most foreign language skills were developed before finishing graduate school. This was the case 73 percent of the time. This would seem to indicate that once an individual has begun his career there is less time available for acquiring language skills or that the area in which one does development work often depends upon involvement in that region during or prior to graduate school.

Source of Initial Interest in Development. When asked to comment on the source of their initial interest in development 62 percent of all respondents indicated that the important and interesting nature of the work was one of the attractions of such a career. Following this, three most often cited influences were Peace Corps experience (27.8 percent), professors (26.9 percent) and university courses (22.2 percent). Only 9.3 percent of the respondents replied that they were attracted to the field because of good job prospects. (See Table 12.)

Location of Overseas Experience. As one might expect from the frequency with which Spanish and Portuguese were mentioned as foreign languages, the most commonly named region of overseas involvement was South America. A total of 55.5 percent of all respondents have had some experience in that part of the world.

The second most frequently worked-in part of the globe was Central America and the Caribbean in which 51.9 percent of the respondents have had at least some experience. South and Southeast Asia was listed by 42.6 percent of those returning the questionnaire; West Africa by 27.9 percent and East Africa by 26.9 percent. (See Table 13.)

Personal Preferences for Location of Expanded Overseas Activities. When asking where respondents would most like to expand their international activities if they could, we are faced with the same general outcome. South America is the

most popular. It was cited as the region most preferred for expansion of international activities by 23.1 percent of the respondents. Central America and the Caribbean, and South and Southeast Asia were both indicated as being most preferred by 9.3 percent of those surveyed. Finally, a total of 6.5 percent chose West Africa. (See Table 14.)

## II. EVALUATION OF TRAINING

Course Work. Respondents were asked to rank course work in 15 areas in terms of their usefulness in preparing them for work in international agricultural development. A scale of from 1 to 5 was used with 1 being "extremely useful" and 5 as a "waste of time."

In order to rank course work areas in terms of usefulness an average evaluation of each course work area was determined. The average was derived by simply dividing the sum of all evaluations given by respondents to courses in a given area by the number of respondents who did course work in that area. Using this method the following ranking of courses, beginning with the most useful was determined: 1) Agricultural and Economic Development, 2) Production Economics and Farm Management, 3) Micro Economics, 4) Sector and Project Analysis, 5) Econometrics and Statistics, 6) Land and Resource Economics, 7) Trade and Trade Policy, 8) Agricultural Policy, 9) Linear Programming and Operations Research, 10) Agricultural Marketing, 11) Agribusiness, 12) Math, 13) Comparative Economic Systems, 14) Macro Economics, 15) History of Economic Thought. (See Table 15.)

On the whole this ranking does not produce many surprises. The two areas of study ranked first and second were also the two most common areas of specialization. However, it will no doubt disturb some people to see Comparative Economic Systems and the History of Economic Thought at the bottom of the list.

Areas of study in which over 100 respondents took at least one course were, 1) Micro, 2) Macro, 3) Statistics and Econometrics, and 4) Agricultural and Economic Development. The first three of these areas are core elements of most programs in Agricultural Economics and the fourth is an area in which people interested in technical assistance work would have particular interest. Therefore it is not surprising that these four areas were included in the programs of almost all respondents.

Other areas of study in which one-half or more of all respondents did course work are, 1) Production Economics, 2) Agricultural Policy, 3) Mathematics, 4) Trade and Trade Policy, 5) Linear Programming and Operations Research, 6) Agricultural Marketing, 7) Land and Resource Economics, 8) History of Economic Thought.

Finally, only a quarter or fewer of the respondents took courses in the following areas, 1) Comparative Economic Systems, 2) Sector and Project Analysis, 3) Agribusiness Studies. (See Table 16.)

There does not seem to be a correlation between the proportion of students who took courses and the usefulness of course work. For instance, although 106 respondents took courses in Macroeconomics (and 46 of these took three or more courses in the area) it was still rated second to last in terms of usefulness in a development career. At the other extreme is Sector and Project Analysis. Only 21 respondents did course work in this area, and most of these took only one course of this type (17 of the 21). However, those who did do course work in the area were generally of the opinion that the effort had been worthwhile, and the area received the fourth highest average ranking of all course areas.

The relative usefulness of Sector and Project Analysis courses probably reflects the fact of the project orientation of most development work being done overseas today. For this reason, the proportion of graduate students taking courses of this nature is no doubt higher now than when most of the respondents were doing their course work.

Finally, exactly one quarter of the respondents reported having done course work in areas other than the 15 listed on the questionnaire. Most of these were courses in economics (consumption econ., international econ., human resource econ., etc.), in other social sciences (rural sociology, anthropology, political science), or in research methodology. Finally, surprisingly few respondents (only three) did any course work in any of the physical sciences during their graduate studies. (See Table 17.)

Overall Training. When asked to check from a list, those aspects of their training and work experience which have been most useful in developing current capabilities to work in development, course work as a whole came in third. The two most useful experiences were 1) overseas assignment (72.2 percent of the respondents checked this), and 2) thesis research (with 66.6 percent). Courses taken was checked by 48.1 percent. (See Table 18 for a complete list of experiences and the frequency with which they were checked.)

The relative importance respondents attached to thesis work and overseas experience in preparing international agricultural economists for development work underscores the need for agricultural economics departments and agencies to provide doctoral students with the opportunity to do development oriented thesis work including, when possible, field experience overseas.

Training, Further Comments. In their final remarks respondents made some additional comments on the topic of training needs. In these comments respondents identify three basic training needs: 1) the need for a broad background and a specialty, 2) the need for overseas experience, 3) the need for language skills. (Several respondents mentioned that currently language skills in French are especially desirable.)

The Need for a Broad Background and a Specialty. In terms of the first need doctoral students were encouraged to obtain as a foundation the best possible general training as an agricultural economist, and, if possible, to expose themselves to such topics as plant breeding, agronomy and animal science in order to become more effective members of interdisciplinary teams. However, as we saw earlier, only three of the 108 respondents actually did any course work in these areas while in graduate school. Since graduate programs in agricultural economics may not accommodate additional work in physical sciences, it may be necessary to acquire a background in these subjects while doing undergraduate studies. The problem here of course, is that career interests are not always well defined during most students' college years, and therefore the agricultural development economist with this ideal background may be quite rare. Others suggested a need for agricultural economists to take some courses which would give them a broader view of the social problems and needs of LDCs, so that they would be more adept at identifying local institutions which may be hindering development. Judging from the number of students who took sociology-related courses, it would appear that this type of course is easier to fit into an agricultural economics program than a physical science course.

Then, to complement this broad base it was suggested that students take several courses in a specific area to develop a special skill. It seemed to be the consensus of the respondents that this special skill should not be development; that development should be part of a student's general background, and that the special skill should be in an area such as marketing, production, finance, etc.

This prompts the following observation. Agricultural economists interested in development are not essentially specialists of development. They are prepared to work as economists in several areas, and bring their backgrounds in different areas of specialization to bear upon their work in development. This is reflected in the demand for agricultural development economists which basically consists of a demand for agricultural economics generalists who have developed at least one area of expertise and often one in addition to the more general one of development.

This need for technical assistance specialists to have a broad, even interdisciplinary background was also discussed in a 1968 article in the American Journal of Agricultural Economics (AJAE):

With the exception of economics, most of the disciplines in technical assistance work have a physical science parentage. Nevertheless, the recommendations of each independent viewer are generally microscopic and unintegrated. They are not integrated with the recommendations of other specialists, nor with the interdependent ramifications for the total and interrelated physical and social process of change. This difficulty of disciplinary integration is a major source of ineffectiveness.<sup>2</sup>

Some knowledge of the disciplines of other project team members, even if it is only rudimentary, will help unify and direct team efforts.

The Need for Overseas Experience. The second category of needs mentioned basically reiterates what has already been stated, i.e., that overseas experience is an important training need of international agricultural specialists. Several ways in which this could be accomplished were suggested: 1) provide more overseas experiences for graduate research assistants, 2) develop intern programs with international research centers to provide doctoral candidates with overseas thesis research experience, 3) provide opportunities to do post doctoral work overseas with senior professionals, 4) increase the professional content of the Peace Corps so that young professionals would be attracted to the program.

The Need for Language Skills. Finally, respondents encouraged students to obtain fluency in one or more languages and to study the cultures of the areas in which they hope to work. It was stated that research done in LDCs by people who do not know the language and who are not familiar with native customs results in tenuous recommendations.

Training and Career Flexibility. Respondents to whom it applied were asked to answer yes or no to the following question: "If you are no longer working in development, do you feel that the development oriented training has hindered your career?" Forty-three respondents answered this question, indicating that 39.8% of the respondents no longer classify themselves as working in development.

Of the 43 respondents who are no longer working in development only four felt that the development orientation of their training had hindered their careers. In general, these four respondents commented that after being involved in development work they had found it difficult to break into the U.S. job market (especially into the university system). They also indicated that if they had it to do over again they would do different course work to develop skills more in demand domestically. It was mentioned that in terms of later domestic employability, development training is sometimes deficient on the quantitative and agribusiness side.

Over 88 percent (i.e. 39 of the 43 respondents) who are no longer working in development, felt that the development orientation of their training had not hindered their careers. However, some of the respondents who stated that development training did not hinder their careers (six in total) qualified their "no" response. Some of their remarks were that: 1) their university careers had probably been slowed if not hindered, 2) they felt out of touch with U.S. employers and 3) they would probably take different courses if they had it to do over again.

The remaining 32 of the 43 respondents, by far the majority of those no longer working in development, did not qualify their no responses to this question. It seemed to be their experience that it had not been difficult to find work, and that their development training turned out to be appropriate for a broad range of domestic employment possibilities, as well. Some stated that this was the case because most of their training had not been in the area of development to begin with, but in some other specialty area within agricultural economics. (See Tables 19a, b, c.)

The majority of those no longer working in development are presently employed by universities. Thirty individuals are in this category. The remaining 13 work for the federal government, private enterprise, local and state institutions and domestic research centers.

### III. EMPLOYMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Original Job Preferences. The occupation which attracted the greatest proportion of respondents during the time they were doing their Ph.D. studies was university teaching and research. This was the number one choice of 52.8 percent. The second most often expressed first choice career was one involving international agency work; 34.3 percent listed this as their first preference. These two also happened to be the most popular second choice careers, receiving second choice preference indications 15.7 percent and 21.3 percent of the time respectively.

Two employment goals which were almost no one's first choice but were very common second and third choices were careers as researchers for government and project analysts and planners in government agencies. Both of these were listed as first choice less than 3 percent of the time, but were cited as second or third choices approximately 30 percent or more of the time.

The most often ignored career possibilities were those involving work with private business and consulting firms, agricultural extension, university administration, and government administration. More than 80 percent of those surveyed indicated that they would rank careers in these areas as coming in fourth place or later. (See Table 20.)

This initial job preference profile is in line with what could be expected given the surveyed group's interest in development work and the type of employer with which one must be affiliated in order to become involved in such work.

Preferred and Actual Employment. About half of the respondents have either shifted job preferences since completing their Ph.D.s or have had to settle for careers which have often not coincided with their initial aspirations. This conclusion is based on the fact that only 59 of the 108 respondents are now employed in the fashion in which they most wanted to be employed while doing graduate studies.

However, 79.6 percent of the respondents are presently involved in jobs which they listed as being among the three most preferred possibilities. As to the 20.4 percent remaining, no inferences can be drawn concerning how unsatisfied they are in their current occupations. Although it seems likely that some of them may feel that they have been mismatched, there is no information available as to how much these people's preferences have changed since beginning their careers.

Those who were most successful in obtaining jobs in the category of their first preference were those who wanted most to teach and do research in universities. Of the 57 who stated that this was their first choice, 43 or 75.4 percent are presently working in the university system. Of the 37 who listed international agency work as the initial most attractive career option, 13 or 35.1 percent are currently employed in such institutions. The majority of people who originally wanted to work for international agencies are actually working for universities (37.8 percent) or for state or federal government (16.2 percent). This suggests that there are fewer opportunities for employment with international agencies than with the universities.

Current Job Involvement in Development Work. As mentioned earlier in the section of this paper entitled, "Training and Career Flexibility," 43 respondents stated that they are no longer working in development. This leaves 65, or 60.2 percent of the respondents who are presently involved in development work to some degree.

Desired Increase in Development Activities. When the respondents were asked whether they would like to increase their current involvement in development activities, 65, or 60.2 percent stated that they would; 21, or 19.4 percent stated that they would not; and the rest (22 or 20.4 percent) said that they could not increase their involvement in development since they were already involved in that kind of work 100 percent of the time.<sup>3</sup> This indicates that some of the 43 respondents who are not involved in development work would like to be if it could be arranged.



Those who want increased opportunities in development would like involvement in a number of activities. This list of activities, in the order of preference indicated by the respondents is as follows: 1) joint research with LDC colleagues overseas, 2) one to three month technical assistance assignments overseas, 3) one to three year overseas assignments, and 4) short term consulting work overseas. Each of these was cited as being first or second choice activities in more than 25 percent of the cases.

The two activities which were first or second choice least frequently were teaching development courses to graduate and undergraduate students. Activities which were cited an intermediate number of times were 1) advising LDC students on research, 2) preparing and monitoring development projects, and 3) organizing and participating in international conferences and seminars. (See Tables 21a, b.)

These results indicate a desire to have increased direct involvement in overseas development work as opposed to increased involvement in activities which can be undertaken domestically.

Percent of Trained Specialists Currently Working in Development. There is no clear consensus among those surveyed as to what proportion of U.S. Ph.D.s prepared to work in development is actually working in that field today. Twenty-nine and six-tenths percent of the respondents put the figure between 25 percent and 50 percent, and 24.1 percent estimated it to be less than 25 percent. Only 12 percent calculated it to be between 50 and 75 percent, while even fewer, only 7.4 percent, were so optimistic as to hazard a guess in excess of 75 percent. The remaining 26.9 percent of the respondents said they had no idea how to answer the question. Since the responses to this question were so scattered, it is difficult to draw any conclusions other than that it is anybody's guess as to what proportion of trained agricultural development specialists are actually involved in that field of endeavor today. Our own sample puts the figure at 60.2 percent which lies in a range estimated to be correct by only 12 percent of the respondents. (See Table 22.)

It does not appear that the respondents' opinion in this matter was colored in any way by their current employment, or by the proportion of time the individual is currently spending on international issues. When a regression was run correlating the two figures (estimated percent of those trained working in development was the dependent, and percent of time currently spent on international issues the independent variable) an  $R^2$  of only .054 was obtained.

Future Development Opportunities for the Agricultural Economics Profession.

The respondents give a rather optimistic prognosis concerning opportunities to

work in development in the near future. Only 16.7 percent felt that opportunities for agricultural economists would diminish, 31.5 percent were of the opinion that they would remain about the same while 47.2 percent responded that they felt opportunities were growing. The remaining 4.6 percent had no opinion.

Reasons given in support of the opinion that opportunities are growing were for the most part closely related. Basically, it was felt by these respondents that the socio-economic problems in the LDCs are growing and becoming increasingly more visible. At the same time they perceive that governments are becoming increasingly more convinced of the importance of developing strong agricultural sectors as a way to solve some of these problems. These factors, in turn, work together to create a strong demand for the services of agricultural development experts.

Another theme which emerged on a smaller scale was that opportunities would grow because the supply of assistance monies from developed countries was on the rise. Title XII was mentioned in this connection. However, almost three times as many respondents felt that despite Title XII provisions, just the opposite was taking place. (One respondent commented that he believed Title XII would principally affect the agricultural sciences and exclude economics.)

This perceived decrease in federal and international financial support for development was the main bit of evidence used in support of the opinion that opportunities were on the decline. However, these respondents indicate that they believe shrinking funds are only symptomatic and not the root cause of the narrow future they see for development work. According to them it mainly has to do with the sharp decline in commitment of U.S. government and universities in general. The observation was made that: "the 60's are over." Vietnam and Watergate have made American people and institutions more cynical and more apt to question the motives behind development work. In addition, at present energy issues are of greater concern to developed economies than is the development of LDCs.

Other reasons given to explain a possible reduction in development opportunities were 1) the number of trained agricultural economists from LDCs is growing, displacing demand for expatriate specialists, and 2) the LDCs have become disenchanted with the overly quantitative approach to development of the agricultural economics profession and are beginning to look to other quarters for solutions to their problems. (See Tables 23a, b, c, d for a complete list of all supporting arguments, pro and con, and the frequency with which they were used.)

Perceptions of Future Personal Opportunities in Development, Positive.

As a whole, respondents were more sanguine about their individual futures in development than they were about those for agricultural development economists in general. More than half of all respondents (54.6 percent) felt that their own opportunities were growing, or that they could be as involved in development work as much as they wanted to be; while the figure they gave for the profession in general was only 47.7 percent. And, of the 18 who stated that opportunities for international agricultural specialists in general were diminishing fully 62 percent (11 of them) believe that their own opportunities are growing. This is puzzling. It could only mean that they believe that the general decline in opportunities they see coming will not affect them. Perhaps they feel that their prior experience will give them an edge.

Perceptions of Personal Opportunities in Development, Negative. One respondent who has left the development field and who perceived that both his development opportunities and those of most agricultural economists were on the wane, was not entirely disheartened by the trend. His feeling was that as the domestic market for agricultural economists became saturated, universities looked to foreign countries to reduce the over-supply of Ph.D.s. He suggests that the answer lies more in reducing the number of Ph.D.s than in solving the world's problems.

Although his views may or may not be widely shared among the remaining respondents who did not feel optimistic about their individual futures in development, he does have one thing in common with the majority of them in that he is not currently working in development. Of the 38 who failed to comment about their own futures in development, replied in a negative fashion, or said they did not know what to reply, 23 or 61 percent are not presently involved in development work. This suggests that one's viability in the development field is in large degree a function of the level of current involvement.

Individuals' Success in Pursuing Development Careers. Most people responding to the questionnaire were satisfied with their success in pursuing development careers. This accounts for 79 or 73.1 percent of those surveyed. Earlier in this paper it was stated that only 65 respondents were presently involved in development work in some capacity. The fact that the number of respondents who are satisfied with their success in pursuing development careers is greater than the number of respondents currently working in development suggests that some respondents not presently involved in development work are not dissatisfied with this turn of events. This indicates that a shift of interests away from development has occurred in the case of at least 14 of the respondents. (See Tables 24a, b.)

Twenty-nine respondents said that they did not feel that they had been successful in pursuing career interests in development since completing their Ph.D. work. The most often cited reason for lack of success was the unavailability of a development related position when beginning one's career. This reason was given by seven respondents. A somewhat similar reason was given by six respondents who replied that they had accepted positions with universities that do not have any development orientation.

Another group of five respondents put their lack of success in establishing development careers down to conflicts between family concerns and priorities and development work. Others lost interest, became tired of doing development work "on the side," or felt compelled to withdraw from development work due to philosophical problems with the approach to development taken by most agencies. (See Table 25.)

#### IV. PROBLEMS WITH DEVELOPMENT CAREERS

The Problem of Desertion. When asked whether young U.S. professionals in agricultural economics are deserting their interests in development 62 percent of those questioned said yes, 20.4 percent responded no, and 17.6 percent said that they did not know. The frequency with which respondents returned a yes answer indicates that some problems exist.

This is especially disturbing since, as mentioned earlier, 47.2 percent of the respondents believe that opportunities to do development work are growing. This may suggest that young professionals who are capable of doing good work in this field are foregoing development work opportunities because of the drawbacks and professional disadvantages associated with involvement in such work.

When asked to designate reasons for this suspected desertion the most frequently checked problem area had to do with the lack of development related jobs in the tenure stream. Over 76 percent of those who felt that the field is being deserted considered this a problem. The other problems listed in their order of importance as indicated by the results of the survey are: 1) no support from agricultural economics departments (50.7 percent), 2) little if any research money is being made available (44.8 percent), 3) family reasons (43.3 percent), 4) poor promotion or advancement opportunities (40.3 percent), 5) too much traveling and moving around (29.9 percent), 6) growing unpopularity of the USA in LDCs (26.9 percent), and 7) frustrating nature of development work (25.4 percent). These percentages were calculated over the number who responded

yes to the question and not over the entire sample. (See Tables 26a, b). This list gives some indication of the problem areas and their relative importance in the minds of the group that was surveyed. What follows is a discussion of these problems.

University and Tenure Related Problems. Many of the most often cited problems are peculiar to development work carried on by people employed by universities. These problems were often mentioned again by the respondents in the final question of the survey in which they were asked to make any additional pertinent comments they liked. Here it was frequently mentioned that agricultural economics departments do not generally recognize the value of overseas, development activities. Thus, those with an interest in development must often pursue this interest on their own time and as a consequence find themselves in the unenviable position of having to juggle two almost separate careers simultaneously. They must work on one set of activities for the sake of securing tenure and on another set of unrelated activities in order to remain in the field of development. What complicates the problem even more is that development work requires frequent travel overseas; and faculty members very seldom have the freedom to move at will between overseas and U.S. university positions. In addition, work in development also often entails the time consuming task of securing research or project funds which once again cuts into the time which needs to be devoted to other professorial work.

Lack of Publishing Opportunities. Another problem related to that of getting tenure is that the results of much development work are not natural candidates for publication. This is because the current trend in development work is away from research activities and toward activities connected with project planning, appraisal and management. Due to the scarcity of hard research and clean data connected with this type of work there is often no appropriate material to offer professional journals for publication once the project is completed. It goes without saying that devoting a large proportion of one's time to activities that do not yield professional publications can work at cross-purposes with the goal of securing tenure.

These problems are not recent developments. Already in 1959 Lawrence Witt discussed such problems as the lack of recognition for overseas work in an article in the AJAE [19]. In subsequent articles in the same journal [3], [8] additional comments were made concerning the "isolation effect" of overseas work and the need to ensure appropriate "promotions and salary adjustments" for faculty involved in overseas activities.

University and Administrative Problems. So far the discussion of problems has been from the point of view of an individual interested in a career in development work. Another perspective on these problems is gained when looking at them from the point of view of university administrators. A discussion of this nature can be found in several articles in the AJAE, [7], [8], [9], [19]. The following two quotes from these articles serve to present the administrator's side of the issue.

But domestic educational institutions are discouraged from enthusiastically participating in this human capital formation process. If the prospect is one of losing the mature scholar after holding his position open for two or three years, to release a man is to disrupt and weaken domestic programs. Ideologically, universities support the objectives of U.S. AID programs. Operationally, the problems of practical involvement are enormous.<sup>4</sup>

In too many instances the department head's primary role has been that of solving, as best he could, the problems of personnel and domestic programs created by the departure of one or more of his staff members for an overseas assignment. A part of this responsibility was protecting a position for the staff member upon his return at some indefinite time. . . . As a result of staff members' being involved in AID contract projects, universities incur substantial costs in terms of less satisfactory performance of domestic work. Present funding of contract work on a year-to-year basis does not permit the department to add long-term personnel to strengthen its international competence without seriously impairing the work oriented primarily toward domestic needs.<sup>5</sup>

Now that the problems have been presented from the point of view of the faculty member interested in doing development work and from the point of view of the university administrator, we will begin to look at solutions proposed by respondents.

Towards a Broader Strategy for Staffing and Graduate Training. In order to solve these problems respondents suggested that it would be necessary to legitimize development activities as an ongoing responsibility of the agricultural economics profession. One way of doing this which was suggested was to create professorships in development. A solution like this was proposed in the literature on this topic in 1963 by Lowell S. Hardin [9]. Instead of development professorships he spoke of establishing "international service career opportunities" in more U.S. universities. In another article Guither and Thompson suggest creating a corps of career development specialists within the university system which they say "would attract more qualified people, for they would not have to pay the professional price now associated with 'leaves of absence'."<sup>6</sup>

If enough positions of this nature were made available within the university system the problems of the individual interested in a development career, and those of the university administrator, would be reduced. Development faculty would no longer have to nurture two careers simultaneously and administrators would no longer have to find ways to fill the gaps in domestic programs and research while members of their faculties are involved in technical assistance work overseas.

By establishing this sort of career opportunity within the university system departments could begin to encourage participation in development work and would be in a better position to reward international experience with promotion and tenure. It was pointed out that such an arrangement would also enhance the ability of a department of agricultural economics to train its foreign students as well as U.S. students interested in development work and would also generate valuable organizational skills which could be used to strengthen the department in general.

These are benefits which can accrue to the department itself. In addition, of course, are the benefits which must be considered from a humanitarian point of view. A careful use of this resource for development can have an impact on the important work of raising the standard of living of the rural poor in LDCs.

Finally, it was suggested that federal and international agencies could be more active in encouraging the formal publication of development results. This would entail making funds available for the collection and preparation of the type of data needed for publication, and also scheduling in the necessary time and personnel to allow for the completion of such work. One respondent reported that project administrators often discourage work on publications by project team members because they feel that this activity siphons off resources that should be spent directly in project implementation.

Agency Related Problems: Short Term Nature of Projects. So far we have concentrated on problems as they relate to the university system. Now we will turn to problems which originate with the government and international agencies which fund development work.

Those Ph.D.s which decide to bypass the university system and attempt to establish development careers by working exclusively with development agencies have a set of problems of their own. For this class of individual the major problem is a lack of career opportunities. Since long term, career positions are relatively scarce in such agencies as the World Bank, USAID, and the foundations, many young professionals accept short term assignments with these employers, hoping

to receive more secure positions later on. However, this solution is not ideal since a career slot may or may not be available two years down the line when a temporary assignment has been completed. Thus, it is not unexpected that when asked what agencies could do to increase the involvement of young professionals in international development work, the most frequent response from respondents not in the university system was that they should provide more career opportunities as opposed to short term technical assistance assignments.

This propensity of agencies to be concerned mainly with short-term projects also contributes to the problem of professors interested in the field. Such a system offers no continuity of research efforts, a thing which has little scholarly appeal. The importance of research done carefully and over a longer period of time is described by Sherwood O. Berg in a 1961 article entitled, "International Opportunities for American Land-Grant Universities."

What research can do is to enlarge the scope and nature of tools available to perform a given task and to clarify and interpret the alternatives among which judgment is exercised and human values brought to bear. Thus, research increases the range of options open to policy-makers and increases the probability that any given decision will have the result intended.<sup>7</sup>

The lack of this type of research was noted in 1965 by Kenneth L. Bachman who wrote in an AJAE article that "Agricultural economists and administrators have neglected research on the problems of both international trade and foreign economic development."<sup>8</sup>

Because of the tendency of short term projects to preclude serious research opportunities some respondents went so far as to suggest that universities should no longer provide short-term technical consulting services altogether. In addition, long term commitments would encourage the development of long-standing relationships between a university and a given developing area, thus increasing the credibility of researchers with foreign governments.

Need for Long Term Funding. We see then that problems encountered by those who would like to make careers of development work are caused by a lack of long term funding for development work. Until funds are available on a long term basis and are flexible there will be little incentive for departments to give program emphasis to international agriculture, and those interested in the field will have to continue managing two careers simultaneously. An ongoing funding base which would permit staffing of tenured positions in development is essential.

The need for long term funding has been recognized and discussed in articles for quite some time (as long ago as 1961, see [2], [3], [7], [9]), but the problem persists.



Making such funding available to universities would entail closer links between universities and international agencies than now exist. At present the highest degree of interaction between these two consists of a one way exchange of personnel, mostly on a short term basis. Much room exists for experimentation with different types of more formal and long term associations between these two types of institutions.

Long Term Funding and USAID. In terms of being in a position to offer long term funding USAID has a unique problem not common to most international agencies: its budget must be reviewed and approved on a yearly basis. One respondent pointed out that professionals cannot be asked to stake their careers on such weak and vacillating governance, nor can contracting universities be expected to commit resources to international work under such legislation. The proposed solution calls for universities to forcefully promote the establishment of permanent governmental bodies dedicated and funded to provide international education and technical assistance. This would necessarily involve a lobbying effort on the part of international agricultural specialists. Such action would demand a unified effort and could only succeed if departments supported the ambitions of its faculty interested in development.

The Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation. A new government agency, the Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation (ISTC) has recently been formed to help implement Title XII provisions. The institute will . . .

work directly with U.S. institutions and with developing country institutions and agencies in order to improve scientific and technological capabilities in developing countries and to address cooperatively critical problems of development and those of longer range global concern (taken from an unpublished ISTC status report).

The ISTC could well give development research projects and concerns the type of continuity that USAID has not been able to do with its project orientation. It is important for departments of agricultural economics to become as closely linked to the ISTC as possible while the institute is still young and such links are more easily established.

Additional Means Agencies Could Use to Increase Involvement in Development Work. Aside from calls for long term funding and more career opportunities respondents mentioned several other steps they felt agencies could take to encourage greater participation by young professionals. Some of these included: 1) providing more on-the-job training opportunities for young professionals

without extensive experience, 2) providing more research and project experience for graduate students, 3) developing more international research centers in LDCs.

Some respondents felt that philosophical and bureaucratic changes will be necessary to encourage the flexibility and innovation that they believe agencies have lost as they have become larger, and as management and budget procedures have become more rigid and centralized. Some suggested decentralization of control over monies and a serious attempt to cut red tape. Finally, some concern was voiced that agencies do not adequately consider the needs of families of development professionals. Such things as cultural orientation and language courses for family members were mentioned as steps that should be taken to cushion the culture shock family members may suffer once overseas. (See Table 27.)

Problems: Conclusions. A total of 78.7 percent of the respondents indicated that they felt opportunities in the field of development would grow or at least remain the same in the near future. At the same time 67.0 percent of those surveyed felt that young professionals are deserting the field of international agricultural development. This would indicate that it is possible that in the future some development opportunities available to agricultural economists may go begging unless the problems discussed in this section of the paper are dealt with. This would mean the underuse of a productive resource for rural development in poor countries. In an age of growing interdependence of nations and national destinies such as misuse of a scarce resource could represent a serious mistake.

## V. ROLE OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS IN DEVELOPMENT

LDC Development Needs. Respondents most often identified more local governmental support for agricultural development as the greatest agricultural development need in LDCs today (18.5 percent). After this, the needs most often cited as the primary need were the development of appropriate technology (16.7 percent), domestic political stability (14.8 percent), and more internal management capabilities (13.9 percent). Thus, it seems that the agricultural development economists surveyed tend to agree that the critical bottlenecks to development in LDCs are locally determined. (See Table 28.)

The Role of the Profession. When asked in what kind of activities U.S. professional agricultural economists can be most productive in international development work a third of the respondents replied research and technical

assistance work overseas in a local government institution. Another important activity cited by 22.2 percent of the respondents, was research and technical assistance work overseas in a technical assistance agency. Teaching and advising foreign students in U.S. universities was chosen as an agricultural economist's most productive development activity 20.4 percent of the time. (See Table 29.)

Areas of Skill. The specific area in which the respondents most often felt qualified to work was in the area of agricultural and rural development policy; 68.5 indicated a feeling of at least some competence in this category of development activity. Next in line was the activity classified as farm management, production economics and farming systems. This was specified as an area in which 60.2 percent of the respondents felt some qualifications to work. Following these two activities are agricultural planning and sectoral analysis (with 52.8 percent), rural and/or community development (with 45.4 percent), and administration of development (40.7 percent). Following these is a diverse list of activity areas ranging from international trade to human resource development. (See Table 30.)

This list also gives an idea of the broad range of areas in which agricultural development economists have competency and hence the broad range of problems they can deal with, as a profession, when involved in the work of development.

Towards a More Effective Role for Universities. When asked what a university could do to strengthen its contribution to international agricultural development, each of the following three courses of action were suggested by over 50 percent of the respondents: 1) provide more research opportunities in development fields (69.4 percent), 2) encourage more exchange of students and faculty between the U.S. and LDCs (69.4 percent), and 3) create professorships in international agriculture. (See Table 31.)

A discussion of the first and third of these suggestions has already appeared in this paper. They were discussed in connection with the problems that young professionals are experiencing in getting established in this career and were proposed as possible solutions to these problems. The second suggestion has not yet been discussed and should be looked at more closely. Formal graduate student exchange programs are almost nonexistent. American graduate students of international agriculture have a few opportunities to do part of their studies overseas. In general the only opportunities available to them consist of 1) infrequent opportunities to do research overseas

in connection with a university contracted USAID project or 2) even less frequent opportunities to work as team members on a development project sponsored by some other agency or foundation. These opportunities are rare and those that exist are usually only available to students who have entered the thesis stage of their doctoral studies. It is much easier for a student from an LDC to have the chance to do studies in the U.S. than is the reverse. In terms of students, the exchange has been largely one-sided.

On the professional level a similar problem has existed. Professors from LDCs sometimes come to the U.S. for additional training but very seldom do they teach development or other courses while they are here.

Towards a More Effective Role for Private Enterprise. Two of the respondents felt that private enterprise could play an effective role in development overseas if given an opportunity to do so. It was their feeling that the skills in resource allocation within the private sector have hardly been tapped for promoting agricultural production and small holder incomes in LDCs. An obvious problem is one of the present unpopularity and distrust of foreign business concerns in LDCs. (See [1].)

One of the respondents who brought up the subject had this comment to make: "If there were such an animal as a moral multinational (where foreign national interests allow them to operate), it would have a much greater impact on development than most existing foreign aid programs. They are more pragmatic and less encumbered with inefficient bureaucracy."

Towards a More Effective Role for Agencies. Some discussion of how government and international agencies can increase the involvement of young professionals has already been presented in this paper. (See Table 27 for a complete list and frequencies of different suggestions.) The following discussion of agencies' role in development is based on final comments of the respondents and deals mostly with problems concerning the orientation or philosophical underpinnings of most projects funded by the large development agencies. This discussion, however, will be brief. A large literature on the topic already exists and nothing original will be attempted here. Also, since no specific question on this topic was asked of the respondents, these comments are not necessarily representative of the entire group, but they do raise important issues for consideration.

An issue that was raised in various forms by several people was one dealing with the perceived hazard of the profit maximization mentality of Western institutions and its inevitable effects on the process of project

selection even with international agencies. In the same vein, the comment was made that the technical backgrounds of agency development teams tend to mitigate against attention to social issues and to favor large scale, capital intensive projects. It was felt that to counteract this bias agencies would need to become more sensitive to the needs and goals of the indigenous population and to encourage more interaction at the community level.

Such a perspective would require agencies to undertake a greater number of small scale projects designed to benefit a relatively small group of poor rural inhabitants in a given area. In order for such projects to be effective it would be necessary to concentrate on solving the common problems of a small group of poor farmers as opposed to solving the economic problems of an entire region at once. Perhaps it has been falsely assumed that economies of scale exist in development work in the same way they exist in some industries. Some respondents suggested that this assumption needed to be questioned.

Other respondents were concerned that agencies be more conscious of local political realities. They, in effect, suggested that agencies prepare a "psychological profile" of the governmental agencies with which they will be dealing so as to identify any internal politics which may offset any good a proposed project could do.

Finally, it was suggested that international agencies should integrate more local LDC staff into their project teams and encourage university trained nationals to increase their contact with the rural inhabitants and areas of their own countries.

#### SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The agricultural economics profession has skills and expertise that have application to the problems of development in LDCs. Institutions which fund and organize development projects and research as well as the LDCs themselves continue to show a strong demand for these skills. However, the agencies and universities which employ the agricultural development professional have not made work in development an attractive and practical career option. As a result many young professionals with training and interest in development are discouraged from participating in this work. When asked if young professionals in agricultural economics are deserting their interests in development only 20.4 percent of the respondents answered no, while 62.0 percent said yes. (The rest said that they did not know.) The reasons given for deserting the development area were as follows:

Lack of Career Opportunities. Agencies which hire agricultural development specialists offer more opportunities for short term involvement, than for long term, career involvement in development work. Most universities do not have professorships in development.

Tenure. Young faculty interested in development work have been at a disadvantage within their departments. It is more difficult for them to get promotions and tenure.

Lack of Research Opportunities. The trend is towards placing personnel with research degrees in administrative positions. Agencies are offering fewer and fewer opportunities for young Ph.D.s to do research overseas. Thus, their training in this area is not being used effectively. This feeds back into the tenure problem, because few research opportunities necessarily result in fewer research articles and publications, which in turn affects ones chances of being awarded tenure.

The suggested solutions for these problems include the following.

Long Term Funding. International agencies should make long term funds available to universities for development research. Federal funding of U.S. foreign assistance programs should be on a longer term basis so that a more stable source of funds would be available to universities for development research.

Career Opportunities International. Agencies involved in development work need to offer more career opportunities for young professionals. Universities should establish more professorships in international agriculture and development.

As things stand today the United States dominates the agricultural economics profession in both its ability to train young professionals and in the sophistication of its research techniques. As long as this is the case it is reasonable to expect that a demand from other parts of the world (mainly from LDCs) will continue to exist for this training and expertise. An important part of this demand can be met by training LDC students in U.S. universities. Young LDC professionals upon returning home will continue to need opportunities to interact with professionals from the U.S. and the rest of the world. In other words, the established profession's responsibility towards the LDC recipient of a Ph.D. or an M.S. does not end when a degree is placed in the student's hands.

One interest that young LDC professionals and many members of the profession from DCs have in common, and one which can serve as a basis for interaction, is the agricultural development of LDCs. Opportunities should be available for

young professionals from the U.S. to act upon this interest without it entailing the instability and the detrimental effects on their university careers that it often does presently.

Also, demand for the services of agricultural economists exists in areas of the world in which there are virtually no local people in the profession. Once again, young professionals should be encouraged to undertake development research and project work in these areas. This contact is helpful because local talent can be recruited for the profession and because the profession can be strengthened as its techniques and methodologies are broadened to deal with an expanded range of problems and research topics.

Participation of U.S. professionals in development work in LDCs represents more than an attempt to man the boats until LDC personnel can fill all the positions. Even when agricultural economists from developed countries are no longer needed for technical assistance work overseas, it will still, no doubt, be a goal of the profession to strengthen its international connection among professionals in the developed and developing world. Present opportunities to establish, strengthen, and operationalize the profession in LDCs need to be more fully utilized if this long term goal is to be met.

TABLE 1

UNIVERSITIES WHICH PROVIDED NAMES  
AND ADDRESSES FOR MAIL SURVEY

- |                         |                        |
|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 1) California, Berkeley | 14) Missouri           |
| 2) California, Davis    | 15) MIT                |
| 3) Colorado State       | 16) North Carolina     |
| 4) Cornell              | 17) Ohio State         |
| 5) Florida              | 18) Oregon State       |
| 6) Hawaii               | 19) Pennsylvania State |
| 7) Illinois             | 20) Purdue             |
| 8) Iowa State           | 21) Stanford           |
| 9) Kansas State         | 22) Tennessee          |
| 10) Kentucky            | 23) Texas A & M        |
| 11) Maryland            | 24) Vanderbilt         |
| 12) Michigan State      | 25) Washington State   |
| 13) Minnesota           | 26) Wisconsin          |



TABLE 2  
RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS

Type of Address	Total	Percent in Category	Total Respondents	Percent Respondents	Total Non- Respondents	Percent Non- Respondents
<b>(2a)</b>						
1. U.S. University	80	41.5	48	44.4	32	37.6
2. U.S. Government	32	16.6	18	16.7	14	16.5
3. Internatl. Agency	19	9.8	11	10.2	8	9.4
4. Foundation	4	2.1	2	1.9	2	2.4
5. Foreign Government	4	2.1	3	2.8	1	1.2
6. Foreign University	3	1.6	1	.9	2	2.4
7. Private/Consulting Firm	4	2.1	1	.9	3	3.5
8. Home Address	47	24.4	24	22.2	23	27.1
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>(2b)</b>						
1. Domestic	152	78.8	83	76.9	69	81.2
2. Foreign	41	21.2	25	23.1	16	18.8
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>(2c)</b>						
1. Degree Received Before 1974	124	64.2	64	59.3	60	70.6
2. Degree Received 1974-1978	69	35.8	44	40.7	25	29.4
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100</b>

TABLE 3  
AGES OF RESPONDENTS

Age*	Total in Category	Percent in Category
25 - 29	1	.9
30 - 34	20	18.5
35 - 39	48	44.4
40 - 44	28	25.9
45 - 49	9	8.3
50 - 54	2	1.9
TOTAL	108	100

\*Average Age = 39.5

TABLE 4

UNIVERSITIES FROM WHICH RESPONDENTS  
RECEIVED DOCTORAL DEGREES

University	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
1. California, Davis	1	.9
2. Colorado State	3	2.8
3. Cornell	14	13.0
4. Florida	3	2.8
5. Hawaii	1	.9
6. Illinois	2	1.9
7. Iowa State	4	3.7
8. Kansas State	1	.9
9. Kentucky	4	3.7
10. Maryland	2	1.9
11. Michigan State	16	14.8
12. Minnesota	9	8.3
13. Missouri	1	.9
14. MIT	6	5.6
15. North Carolina	2	1.9
16. Ohio State	8	7.4
17. Oregon State	2	1.9
18. Penn State	1	.9
19. Purdue	9	8.3
20. Stanford	4	3.7
21. Tennessee	3	2.8
22. Texas A&M	2	1.9
23. Washington State	3	2.8
24. Wisconsin	7	6.5
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>100</b>

TABLE 5  
MAJOR AREAS OF STUDY FOR PH.D.s

Major Area of Study for Ph.D.	Total Respondents	Percent Respondents
1. Agric Econ	82	75.9
2. Economics	11	10.2
3. Development	9	8.3
4. Food & Ag Econ	1	.9
5. Production Econ	1	.9
6. Nat Resource Econ	1	.9
7. Comparative Econ	1	.9
8. Marketing	1	.9
9. Price Analysis	1	.9
TOTALS	108	100

TABLE 6  
AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION FOR PH.D.s

Area of Specialization	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
1. Development	41	38.0
2. Development & Production	8	7.4
3. Development & Marketing	8	7.4
4. Development & Trade	6	5.6
5. Development & Nat. Resource Ec.	3	2.8
6. Development & Policy	2	1.9
7. Development & Farm Mngmnt.	1	.9
8. Development & Econometrics	1	.9
9. Development & Nutrition	1	.9
10. Development and SE Asia	1	.9
11. Development & Transportation	1	.9
12. Development & Quantitative Analysis	1	.9
13. Production Econ	4	3.7
14. Prod & Trade	1	.9
15. Prod & Marketing	1	.9
16. Natural Res Econ	7	6.5
17. Marketing	4	3.7
18. Trade	3	2.8
19. Land Econ	3	2.8
20. Price Analysis	3	2.8
21. Farm Mngmnt	2	1.9
22. Quantitative Analysis, Math	2	1.9
23. Econometrics	1	.9
24. Ag Policy	1	.9
25. Ag Finance	1	.9
26. Russian Ec History	1	.9
TOTAL	108	100

TABLE 7  
EMPLOYERS

Type of Employer	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
<b>University</b>		
U.S. University	58	53.6
D.C. University	2	1.9
LDC University	1	.9
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>56.4</b>
<b>Government</b>		
USDA	7	6.5
Miscellaneous Federal	2	1.9
State Gov't	1	.9
LDC Gov't	2	1.9
DC Gov't	2	1.9
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13.0</b>
<b>International Agency</b>		
USAID	7	6.5
World Bank	2	1.9
IDB	1	.9
A/D/C	1	.9
Ford Foundation	5	4.6
International Research Centers	11	10.2
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>25.0</b>
<b>Private Sector</b>		
Private Business	3	2.8
Consulting Firm	2	1.9
Chamber of Commerce	1	.9
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5.6</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>100</b>

TABLE 8  
LOCATION OF CURRENT EMPLOYER

Location of Current Employment	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
1. USA	72	66.7
2. Puerto Rico	1	.9
3. Other DC	6	5.6
4. Central America & Caribbean	5	4.6
5. South America	4	3.7
6. North Africa	1	.9
7. East Africa	3	2.8
8. West Africa	4	3.7
9. South Africa	1	.9
10. South & SE Asia	7	6.5
11. East Asia	3	2.8
12. Oceania	1	.9
TOTAL	108	100

TABLE 9  
ACTIVITY PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS IN CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

Type of Activity	Percent of Time Spent in Given Activity										Total No. %			
	0%		1% to 24%		25% to 49%		50% to 74%		75% to 99%			100%		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%	
(9a)														
1. Research	14	13.0	18	16.7	20	18.5	31	28.7	20	18.5	5	4.6	108	100
2. Teaching	38	35.2	26	24.1	28	25.9	10	9.3	3	2.8	3	2.8	108	100
3. Administration	51	47.2	23	21.3	14	13.0	9	8.3	6	5.6	5	4.6	108	100
4. Extension	86	79.6	12	11.1	4	3.7	4	3.7	1	.9	1	.9	108	100
5. Consulting	74	68.5	22	20.4	5	4.6	5	4.6	2	1.8	0	0	108	100
(9b)														
<u>Domestic Vs. Intnatl</u>														
1. Domestic	36	33.3	9	8.3	10	9.3	10	9.3	25	23.1	18	16.7	108	100
2. International	18	16.7	23	21.3	9	8.3	10	9.3	12	11.1	36	33.3	108	100



TABLE 10a  
ACTIVITY PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS IN CURRENT EMPLOYMENT  
(AVERAGED BY EMPLOYER)

Type of Employer	No. in Category	Avg. Proportion of Time Spent in					Total
		Research	Teaching	Admin.	Exten.	Consulting	
University	61	44.1	33.7	8.5	10.2	4.5	100
International Agency	27	37.4	6.3	43.1	1.1	12.2	100
Government	14	67.8	3.2	20.6	2.1	6.3	100
Private Sector	6	36.7	2.5	43.3	3.3	15.8	100
Overall Average	108	45.0	20.9	20.6	6.3	7.3	100

TABLE 10b  
DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL CONTENT OF CURRENT  
EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES (AVERAGED BY EMPLOYER)

	No. in Category	International Issues	Domestic Issues	Total
University	61	40.9	59.1	100
International Agency	27	82.0	18.0	100
Government	14	47.5	52.5	100
Private Sector	6	61.7	38.3	100
Total	108	53.2	46.8	100

TABLE 11

## LANGUAGES, LANGUAGE FLUENCY AND WHEN LEARNED

Languages	Total of Respondents						Speak						Read						Write						When Learned							
	Poor, Not At All		Fair		Fluent		Poor, Not At All		Fair		Fluent		Poor, Not At All		Fair		Fluent		Poor, Not At All		Fair		Fluent		Before Career		During Career					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%				
South America	68	53.0	20	29.4	20	29.4	28	41.8	12	17.6	21	30.9	35	51.5	27	39.7	30	44.1	11	16.2	50	73.5	18	26.5								
Spanish	31	28.7	7	22.6	11	35.5	13	41.9	3	9.7	11	35.5	17	54.8	14	45.2	14	45.2	3	9.6	21	67.7	10	32.3								
Africa	1	.9	1	100					1	100					1	100																
Anahric	1	.9	1	100					1	100					1	100																
Krio	39	36.1	24	61.5	10	25.6	5	12.8	8	20.5	24	61.5	7	18.0	26	66.7	12	30.8	1	2.5	31	79.5	8	20.5								
French	2	1.9	2	100					2	100					2	100																
Hausa	1	.9	1	100					1	100					1	100																
Lesotho	1	.9	1	100					1	100					1	100																
Gepende	1	.9	1	100					1	100					1	100																
Swahili	6	5.6	3	50	3	50	1	100	4	66.7	2	33.3	1	100	5	83.3	1	16.7			4	66.7	2	33.3								
Asia	1	.9	1	100					1	100					1	100																
Bengali	2	1.9	1	50	1	100			1	50					1	50																
Chinese	1	.9	1	100					1	100					1	100																
Japanese	2	1.9	2	100					2	100					2	100																
Hindi	6	5.6	1	16.7	3	50	2	33.3	1	16.7	3	50	2	33.3	3	50	2	33.3	1	16.7	3	50	3	50								
Indonesian	2	1.9	1	50	1	50	1	50	2	100					2	100																
Lao	1	.9	1	100					1	100					1	100																
Marathi	4	3.7	3	75	1	25	1	25	3	75	1	25	1	25	3	75	1	25			3	75	1	25								
Malay	1	.9	1	100					1	100					1	100																
Nepali	1	.9	1	100					1	100					1	100																
Tagalog	1	.9	1	100					1	100					1	100																
Thai	8	7.4	4	50	1	12.5	3	37.5	5	62.5	3	37.5			8	100					2	25	6	75								
Urdu	3	2.8	3	100					3	100					3	100																
Vietnamese	1	.9	1	100					1	100					1	100																
Middle East	2	1.9	2	100					2	100					2	100																
Arabic	1	.9	1	100					1	100					1	100																
European*	11	10.2	5	45.5	4	36.4	2	18.2	3	27.3	5	45.5	3	27.3	5	45.5	5	45.5	1	9.1	10	90.9	1	9.1								
Danish	1	.9	1	100					1	100					1	100																
Finnish	1	.9	1	100					1	100					1	100																
German	2	1.9	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	3	15.0	1	5.0	5	25.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	10	50.0	1	5.0								
Greek	2	1.9	2	100					2	100					2	100																
Italian	2	1.9	2	100					2	100					2	100																
Russian	2	1.9	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	2	100			2	100																
Swedish	1	.9	1	100					1	100					1	100																

\*French listed under Africa. Spanish and Portuguese listed under South America.

TABLE 12  
SOURCES OF INITIAL INTEREST IN DEVELOPMENT

Source	No.	%	Rank
1. Interesting & important work	73	67.6	1
2. Peace Corps experience	30	27.8	2
3. Influence of professors	29	26.9	3
4. University courses	24	22.2	4
5. Availability of fellowship or assistantship	18	16.7	5
6. Good job prospects	10	9.3	6
7. Influence of peers	10	9.3	6
8. Lived abroad with parents	10	9.3	6
9. Studied or did thesis work abroad	9	8.3	7
10. Military service abroad	7	6.5	8
11. Voluntary work abroad other than Peace Corps	4	3.7	9
12. LDC wife, parents, friends	3	2.8	10
13. Contact with development professionals	2	1.9	11
14. Extensive travel	2	1.9	11
15. Employed abroad	2	1.9	11
16. Missionary background	2	1.9	11

TABLE 13  
OVERSEAS EXPERIENCE

Location	1st Most Experience		2nd Most Experience		3rd Most Experience		Sum of 1st, 2nd & 3rd		Rank	Some Experience	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%
1. Central America & Caribbean	15	13.9	22	20.4	5	4.6	42	38.9	2	56	51.9
2. South America	30	27.8	11	10.2	2	1.9	43	39.8	1	60	55.6
3. Middle East	2	1.9	1	.9	2	1.9	5	4.6	7	11	10.2
4. North Africa	2	1.9	1	.9	1	.9	4	3.7	8	10	9.3
5. East Africa	8	7.4	5	4.6	5	4.6	18	16.7	5	29	26.9
6. West Africa	8	7.4	8	7.4	7	6.5	23	21.3	4	30	27.8
7. South Africa	0	0	2	1.9	0	0	2	1.9	9	4	3.7
8. South & SE Asia	22	20.4	7	6.5	5	4.6	34	31.5	3	46	42.6
9. East Asia	0	0	5	4.6	2	1.9	7	6.5	6	13	12.0
10. Oceania	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.9	10	1	.9
11. Russia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	.9

TABLE 14  
PERSONAL PREFERENCES FOR LOCATION OF EXPANDED OVERSEAS ACTIVITIES

Location	1st Most Wanted		2nd Most Wanted		3rd Most Wanted		Sum of 1st, 2nd & 3rd		Rank	Some Experience in This Area Desired	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%
1. Central America & Caribbean	10	9.3	15	13.9	0	0	25	23.1	2	34	31.5
2. South America	25	23.1	5	4.6	2	1.9	32	29.6	1	44	40.7
3. Middle East	3	2.8	0	0	3	2.8	6	5.5	6	10	9.3
4. North Africa	1	.9	1	.9	3	2.8	5	4.6	7	9	8.3
5. East Africa	3	2.8	9	8.3	8	7.4	20	18.5	3	31	28.7
6. West Africa	7	6.5	5	4.6	2	1.9	14	13.0	4	26	24.1
7. South Africa	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.9	8	2	1.9
8. South & SE Asia	10	9.3	9	8.3	6	5.6	25	23.1	2	35	32.4
9. East Asia	5	4.6	3	2.8	4	3.7	12	11.1	5	17	15.7
10. Oceania	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	.9
11. Southern Europe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	1.9

TABLE 15  
AVERAGE EVALUATION OF COURSES

Course Category	Avg. Evaluation* of Courses	Rank
1. Microeconomic Theory	2.019	3
2. Macroeconomic Theory	2.788	14
3. Statistics & Econometrics	2.200	5
4. Linear Programming & Operations Research	2.507	8
5. Mathematics	2.724	12
6. Agricultural Dev. & Dev. Econ	1.910	1
7. Agricultural Policy	2.537	9
8. Trade & Trade Policy	2.425	7
9. Agricultural Marketing	2.600	10
10. Production Economics	1.989	2
11. Land & Resource Econ	2.234	6
12. Agribusiness Studies	2.625	11
13. History of Economic Thought	3.148	15
14. Comparative Economic Systems	2.760	13
15. Sector & Project Analysis	2.143	4

\*Evaluated on a scale of 1 to 5

- 1 - Extremely useful
- 2 - Very useful
- 3 - Moderately useful
- 4 - Slightly useful
- 5 - Waste of time

TABLE 16

NUMBER OF CLASSES TAKEN BY RESPONDENTS IN THE  
15 COURSE AREAS LISTED IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Course Areas	Respondents Taking											
	1 Class		2 Classes		3 Classes		4 Classes		5 or More Classes		At Least 1 Class	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Microeconomic Theory	5	4.6	36	33.3	31	28.7	20	18.5	16	14.8	108	100
2. Macroeconomic Theory	12	11.1	48	44.4	27	25.0	10	9.3	9	8.3	106	98.1
3. Stat & Econometrics	3	2.8	21	19.4	34	31.5	24	22.2	25	23.1	107	99.1
4. LP & DP Research	42	38.9	19	17.6	8	7.4	4	3.7	1	.9	74	68.5
5. Mathematics	22	20.4	28	25.9	15	13.9	6	5.6	6	5.6	77	71.3
6. Ag Dev & Dev Econ	10	9.3	31	28.7	20	18.5	25	23.1	16	14.8	102	94.4
7. Ag Policy	53	49.1	24	22.2	5	4.6	0	0	1	.9	83	76.9
8. Trade & Trade Policy	42	38.9	22	20.4	4	3.7	5	4.6	2	1.9	75	69.4
9. Ag Marketing	38	35.2	22	20.4	7	6.5	1	.9	3	2.8	71	65.7
10. Prod. Econ	33	30.6	40	37.0	14	13.0	1	.9	0	0	88	81.5
11. Land & Resource Econ	40	37.0	18	16.7	5	4.6	1	.9	0	0	64	59.3
12. Agribusiness Studies	6	5.6	1	.9	0	0	1	.9	0	0	8	7.4
13. History of Econ Thought	48	44.4	5	4.6	3	2.8	0	0	0	0	56	51.9
14. Comp Econ Systems	22	20.4	4	3.7	0	0	1	.9	0	0	27	25.0
15. Sector & Project Analysis	17	15.7	2	1.9	2	1.9	0	0	0	0	21	19.4

TABLE 17

## OTHER COURSES TAKEN BY RESPONDENTS IN GRADUATE SCHOOL

Courses	No. of Respondents Taking Courses in This Area	Avg. Evaluation of Courses
<b>Economics</b>		
Consumption Econ	2	1.500
Human Resource Econ	1	1.000
Institutional Econ	1	1.000
International Econ	3	1.750
Labor Econ	1	1.000
Price Analysis	3	1.500
Industrial Organization	1	1.000
Econ History of Different Regions	2	2.500
TOTAL	14 (13.0%)	
<b>Other Social Sciences</b>		
Anthropology	2	1.800
Communications	2	1.830
Political Science	3	1.800
Psychology	1	1.000
Rural Sociology	3	2.560
TOTAL	10 (9.3%)	
<b>Physical Sciences</b>		
Agronomy	1	2.000
Plant Breeding	1	3.000
Tropical Ag	1	1.000
TOTAL	3 (2.8%)	
<b>Quantitative</b>		
Research Methods	5	1.250
Systems Engineering	1	2.000
TOTAL	6 (5.6%)	
<b>Miscellaneous</b>		
Education	1	4.000
Ethics	1	3.000
Graduate Writing	1	1.000
Languages	1	3.000
Philosophy	1	2.000
Public Finance	2	2.330
South Asian Studies	1	2.000
Transportation	1	1.000
TOTAL	9 (8.3%)	



TABLE 18

ASPECTS OF TRAINING WHICH HAVE BEEN MOST USEFUL  
IN DEVELOPING CURRENT ABILITY TO WORK IN DEVELOPMENT

Experience	No.	%
1. Formal courses taken	53	49.1
2. Thesis research	72	66.7
3. Courses taught	29	26.9
4. Research projects after Ph.D.	51	47.2
5. Overseas assignment	80	74.1
6. Domestic work experience applicable to development work	32	29.6
7. Peace Corps experience	2	1.9
8. Growing up in LDC	1	.9
9. Work experience abroad	4	3.7
10. Interaction with other development professionals	1	.9
11. Broad range of interest & readings	1	.9

TABLE 19a

IF NO LONGER WORKING IN DEVELOPMENT  
HAS DEVELOPMENT ORIENTED TRAINING HINDERED CAREER?

	No.	%
Yes	4	3.7
No	39	36.1
Total of respondents no longer working in development	43	39.8
Total of respondents working in development	65	60.2
TOTAL	108	100

TABLE 19b

COMMENTS OF RESPONDENTS WHO SAID  
DEVELOPMENT ORIENTATION HINDERED CAREER

	No.	%
1. Yes, transition back into academic work difficult	2	50.0
2. Yes, would take different courses this time	2	50.0
TOTAL NOT IN DEV. WHOSE DEV. TRAINING DID HINDER CAREER	4	100

TABLE 19c

COMMENTS OF RESPONDENTS WHO SAID  
DEVELOPMENT ORIENTATION DID NOT HINDER CAREER

Comment	No.	% of Subgroup	% of All Respondents
1. No, but progress in establishing domestic career slowed	3	7.7	2.8
2. No, but I would take different courses this time	3	7.7	2.8
3. No, dev. training appropriate for broad range of domestic work	10	25.6	9.3
4. No, most of my training was not in dev. anyway	3	7.7	2.8
5. No, can still use training to teach development	1	2.5	.9
6. No, can use if I should decide to go back into dev.	1	2.5	.9
7. No comment	18	46.2	16.7
TOTAL NOT IN DEV. WHOSE DEV. TRAINING DID NOT HINDER CAREER	39	100	36.2

TABLE 20  
PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT GOALS WHEN STUDYING

Employment Goal	First Choice		Second Choice		Third Choice		Sum of First Three Choices		Rank	Indicated as Goal
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
1. University teaching & research	57	52.8	17	15.7	9	8.3	83	76.9	1	88 81.5
2. Researcher in govt.	3	2.8	16	14.8	19	17.6	38	35.2	3	52 48.1
3. Consultant/business	2	1.9	7	6.5	7	6.5	15	13.9	5	35 32.4
4. Ag planning/projects	2	1.9	15	13.9	15	13.9	32	29.6	4	46 42.6
5. Ag extention	1	.9	1	.9	6	5.6	8	7.4	6	22 20.4
6. University admin	0	0	3	2.8	1	.9	4	3.7	7	17 15.7
7. Government admin	0	0	1	.9	1	.9	2	1.9	8	14 13.0
8. Internat'l dev agency	37	34.3	23	21.3	11	10.2	71	65.7	2	79 73.1

TABLE 21a

WOULD YOU LIKE TO INCREASE CURRENT INVOLVEMENT IN DEVELOPMENT?

	No.	%
Yes	65	60.2
No	21	19.4
Already 100% involved	22	20.4
TOTAL	108	100

TABLE 21b

## ACTIVITIES OF INTEREST FOR EXPANDED INVOLVEMENT IN DEVELOPMENT

Activities	First Choice		Second Choice		Third Choice		Sum of 1st 2nd & 3rd Choices		Indicated as Area of Expansion		
	No.	%*	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. Joint research with LDC colleagues overseas	15	23.1	8	12.3	5	7.7	28	43.1	1	45	69.2
2. Advising LDC students on their research	6	7.1	6	7.1	8	12.3	20	30.8	5	36	55.4
3. Preparation and monitoring of dev projects	4	6.2	6	7.1	8	12.3	18	2.8	9	30	46.2
4. Teaching graduate courses in dev	6	7.1	1	1.5	3	4.6	10	15.4	7	28	43.1
5. Teaching undergraduate courses in dev	2	3.1	2	3.1	1	1.5	5	7.7	8	19	29.2
6. Overseas technical assis- tance (1-3 mos. assign- ments)	11	16.9	8	12.3	4	6.2	23	35.4	3	35	53.8
7. Overseas technical assis- tance (1-2 yrs.)	11	16.9	7	10.8	4	6.2	22	33.8	4	33	50.8
8. Short term consulting	8	12.3	10	15.4	6	7.1	24	36.9	2	36	55.4
9. Organization & participa- tion int. conferences & seminars	4	6.2	5	7.7	7	10.8	16	24.6	6	34	52.3

\*Percents are calculated over a base of 65, the number of respondents who gave yes answers to question: "Would you like to increase your current involvement in development activities?"

TABLE 22  
PERCENT OF QUALIFIED PH.D.'S ESTIMATED  
TO BE WORKING IN DEVELOPMENT

"Guestimate" of Respondents	No.	%
1% to 25%	26	24.1
26% to 50%	32	29.6
51% to 75%	13	12.0
76% to 100%	8	7.4
Don't Know	29	26.9
TOTAL	108	100

TABLE 23a  
 OPPORTUNITIES IN NEAR FUTURE FOR AGRICULTURAL  
 ECONOMISTS WORKING IN DEVELOPMENT

	No.	%
Growing	51	47.2
Remaining Same	34	31.5
Diminishing	18	16.7
Blank, Don't Know	5	4.6
TOTAL	108	100

TABLE 23b  
 REASONS WHY OPPORTUNITIES BELIEVED GROWING

Reason	No.	%*
1. Growing supply of assistance from DCs	5	9.8
2. Increased interest of LDCs in development	4	7.8
3. Increased interest worldwide in agriculture	9	17.6
4. Perceived growth in demand for ag dev economists	15	29.4
5. Problems in LDCs becoming larger and more visible	7	13.7
6. Title XII	4	7.8
7. Growing demand for interaction between DC & LDC economists	1	2.0
8. No reason given	6	11.8

\*Some respondents gave two supporting reasons. Some gave none, thus %'s do not necessarily add to 100%. Percentages calculated over base of 51 (see table 23a).



TABLE 23c

## REASONS WHY OPPORTUNITIES BELIEVED REMAINING SAME

Reason	No.	%*
1. Same perceived demand for ag dev economists	1	2.9
2. Static agency budgets	9	26.5
3. Static personnel levels in dev agencies	1	2.9
4. Federal support down	8	23.5
5. University support down	1	2.9
6. Number of LDC professionals growing	6	17.6
7. Energy problems becoming more important	1	2.9
8. Growing unpopularity of U.S. in LDCs	1	2.9
9. Less need for researchers more need for proj. admin.	1	2.9
10. Growing demand for interaction between DC & LDC economists	1	2.9
11. Food problem is not as critical	1	2.9
12. No reason given	4	11.8

\*Some respondents gave two supporting reasons, some gave none, thus %s do not necessarily add to 100%. Percentages calculated over base of 34 (see table 23a).

TABLE 23d  
 REASONS WHY OPPORTUNITIES BELIEVED DIMINISHING

Reason	No.	%*
1. Federal support down	6	33.3
2. University support down	3	16.7
3. Number of LDC professionals growing	4	22.2
4. Demand for quantitative analysis decreasing	2	11.1
5. Unpopularity of U.S. in LDCs	2	11.1
6. Demand for ag scientists up Demand for ag economists down	1	5.6
7. Demand for ag economists down because neoclassical models irrelevant	1	5.6
8. No reason given	2	11.1

\*Some respondents gave two supporting reasons, some gave none, thus %s do not necessarily add to 100%. Percentages calculated over base of 18 (see table 23a).

TABLE 24a

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF SUCCESS IN  
PURSUING CAREER INTERESTS IN DEVELOPMENT

	No.	%
Successful	79	73.1
Unsuccessful	29	26.9
TOTAL	108	100

TABLE 24b

RESPONSES TO THREE INTERRELATED QUESTIONS

Questions	Responses	
	No.	%
Currently involved in development work	65	60.2
Currently <u>Not</u> involved in development work	43	39.8
TOTAL	108	100
Would like to increase involvement in development work	65	60.2
Would <u>not</u> like to increase involvement in development work	21	19.4
Already working full-time in development work	22	20.4
TOTAL	108	100
Have been successful in pursuing career interests in development	79	73.1
Have <u>not</u> been successful in pursuing career interests in development	29	26.9
TOTAL	108	100

TABLE 25  
 REASONS FOR LACK OF SUCCESS  
 IN PURSUING DEVELOPMENT CAREER

Reasons for Lack of Success	No.	% of This Subgroup	% of All Respondents
No development work available when beginning career	7	24.1	6.5
Employed by a university which has no development orientation	6	20.7	5.6
Family considerations	5	17.2	4.6
A job which offers less dev. opportunities than expected	3	10.3	2.8
Left dev. work because too difficult to juggle two careers	2	6.9	1.9
Lost interest	2	6.9	1.9
Philosophical problems	1	3.4	.9
No comment	3	10.3	2.8
TOTAL	29	100	26.9

TABLE 26a  
ARE YOUNG PROFESSIONALS DESERTING  
DEVELOPMENT FIELD

	No.	%
Yes	67	62.0
No	22	20.4
Don't know	19	17.6
TOTAL	108	100

TABLE 26b

## WHY YOUNG PROFESSIONALS ARE DESERTING INTERESTS IN DEVELOPMENT

Reason	No.	%*	Rank
1. Few jobs available in tenure stream	51	76.1	1
2. No support from agricultural economics departments	34	50.7	2
3. Little if any research money is being made available	31	46.3	3
4. Poor promotion or advancement opportunities	27	40.3	5
5. Low salaries	5	7.5	8
6. Frustrating nature of development work	18	26.9	7
7. Too much travel & moving around	21	31.3	6
8. Growing unpopularity of USA in LDCs	18	26.9	7
9. Family reasons	29	43.3	4
10. Difficulty of juggling two careers at once	1	1.4	11
11. Job insecurity	2	3.0	10
12. Lack of national commitment to development	3	4.5	9
13. Ag econ background too specialized to be of any use	3	4.5	9
14. Ag econ background not specialized enough to be of any use	1	1.4	11

\*Percentages do not necessarily add to 100%. Respondents often cited more than one reason. Percentages calculated over a base of 67 (see table 26a).

TABLE 27

## WHAT INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES CAN DO TO INCREASE PARTICIPATION OF YOUNG PROFESSIONALS IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORK

What Agencies Can Do	No.	%
<b>I. PROVIDE MORE JOBS</b>		
More long-term career opportunities	21	19.4
More short-term technical assistance work	8	7.4
More entry level positions	9	8.3
More jobs for young professionals from LDCs	4	3.7
More short term research jobs for graduate students	11	10.2
Provide more information on job openings	4	3.7
<b>TOTAL FOR CATEGORY</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>52.7</b>
<b>II. PROVIDE MORE FINANCIAL SUPPORT</b>		
More funds for projects in LDCs	7	6.5
More long-term funding of projects in LDCs	2	1.9
More funding of small scale projects	2	1.9
More funding implementing Title XII	1	.9
More funding of development research in LDCs	10	9.3
More funding for universities to encourage greater participation by universities in assistance programs	21	19.4
More funds for private enterprises interested in development work	2	1.9
More funds to found more international research centers	1	.9
<b>TOTAL FOR CATEGORY</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>42.6</b>
<b>III. CHANGES IN POLICY AND PERSONNEL RELATIONS</b>		
Train more local professionals	4	3.7
Provide more interaction between U.S. and LDC professionals	1	.9
Provide more opportunities to publish	2	1.9
Pay higher salaries	4	3.7
Demonstrate more concern for families of personnel	4	3.7
Assist personnel returning from overseas assignments in locating domestic employment	3	2.8
Cut red tape & encourage flexibility	11	10.2
Reduce political strings attached to funds	1	.9
Keep monies from power hungry development entrepreneurs	1	.9
More seminars	3	2.8
<b>TOTAL FOR CATEGORY</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>31.5</b>
<b>IV. NOTHING</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.8</b>
<b>TOTAL FOR CATEGORY</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.8</b>

TABLE 28  
GREATEST AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS OF LDC's

Development Need	First Need		Second Need		Third Need		Sum of 1st, 2nd & 3rd		Need Indicated		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. More technical assistance overseas by U.S. professionals	0	0	0	0	1	.9	1	.9	12	5	4.6
2. More indigenous capabilities in agricultural economics	10	9.3	8	7.4	8	7.4	26	24.1	5	39	36.1
3. Development of appropriate technology	18	16.7	12	11.1	13	12.0	43	39.8	1	51	47.2
4. Better extension programs	6	5.6	8	7.4	12	11.1	26	24.1	5	33	30.6
5. More governmental support for agricultural development	20	18.5	8	7.4	9	8.3	37	34.3	4	47	43.5
6. Domestic political stability	16	14.8	5	4.6	4	3.7	25	23.1	6	29	26.9
7. Better research facilities	1	.9	1	.9	1	.9	3	2.8	11	11	10.2
8. Development of physical infrastructure	6	5.6	10	9.3	10	9.3	26	24.1	5	31	28.7
9. More trained nationals in agricultural sciences	3	2.8	22	20.4	13	12.0	38	35.2	3	51	47.2
10. Improvements in foreign trade markets	2	1.9	1	.9	2	1.9	5	4.6	10	9	8.3
11. Better marketing institutions and cooperatives	0	0	8	7.4	8	7.4	16	14.8	8	26	24.1
12. More internal management capabilities	15	13.9	13	12.0	13	12.0	41	38.0	2	50	46.3
13. Planning and policy analysis	5	4.6	8	7.4	9	8.3	22	20.4	7	33	30.6
14. Better ag policy	0	0	1	.9	0	0	1	.9	12	1	.9
15. Land tenure reform	5	4.6	1	.9	0	0	6	5.6	9	6	5.6
16. Greater small farmer determination of development projects	0	0	1	.9	0	0	1	.9	12	1	.9
17. Free private sector	0	0	0	0	1	.9	1	.9	12	1	.9
18. Increased interest in welfare of small farmer	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.9	12	1	.9
19. More practical non-ideological approach to problems	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.9	12	1	.9



TABLE 29

ACTIVITIES IN WHICH U.S. PROFESSIONAL AG. ECONOMISTS CAN BE MOST PRODUCTIVE  
IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORK

Activity	First Most Important		Second Most Important		Third Most Important		Sum of 1st, 2nd & 3rd		Rank	Indicated as Important	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%
1. Teaching and advising foreign students in LDC univs.	18	16.7	20	18.5	23	21.3	61	56.5	3	85	78.7
2. Teaching and advising foreign students in U.S. universities	22	20.4	16	14.8	13	12.0	51	47.2	4	84	77.8
3. Research on LDC problems from a U.S. base	4	3.7	8	7.4	14	13.0	26	24.1	5	71	65.7
4. Research & technical assistance with LDC government institutions	36	33.3	22	20.4	13	12.0	71	65.7	1	89	82.4
5. Research & technical assistance with technical assistance agency	24	22.2	27	25.0	19	17.6	70	64.8	2	89	82.4

TABLE 30

## AREAS OF DEVELOPMENT IN WHICH RESPONDENTS FEEL QUALIFIED TO WORK

Area of Qualification	First Most Qualified		Second Most Qualified		Third Most Qualified		Sum of 1st, 2nd & 3rd		Some Qualification Indicated		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. Farm management, production econ farming systems	21	19.4	2	1.9	9	8.3	32	29.6	2	65	60.2
2. Marketing in development	3	2.8	4	3.7	6	5.6	13	12.0	7	39	36.1
3. Land tenure & farm organization	2	1.9	8	7.4	3	2.8	13	12.0	7	35	32.4
4. Rural and/or community development	7	6.5	8	7.4	7	6.5	22	20.1	4	49	45.4
5. Ag planning & sector analysis	9	8.3	9	8.3	6	5.6	24	22.2	3	57	52.8
6. Credit & input problems	5	4.6	4	3.7	7	6.5	16	14.8	6	37	34.3
7. International trade & monetary policy	5	4.6	6	5.6	2	1.9	13	12.0	7	25	23.1
8. Agricultural & rural development policy	11	10.2	15	13.9	13	12.0	39	36.1	1	74	68.5
9. Admin. of development (design, implementation, evaluation)	6	5.6	5	4.6	6	5.6	17	15.7	5	44	40.7
10. Comparative econ systems	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	.9
11. Employment creation	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.9	10	1	.9
12. Extension experimentation	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.9	10	1	.9
13. Human resource development	1	.9	1	.9	0	0	2	1.9	9	2	1.9
14. Technical change, dissemination	1	.9	0	0	1	.9	2	1.9	9	3	2.8
15. Nutrition economics	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.9	10	2	1.9
16. Project & Experimental design	0	0	1	.9	2	1.9	3	2.8	8	3	2.8
17. Resource development	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.9	10	2	1.9
18. Labor migration	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.9	10	1	.9
19. Small scale industry	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.9	10	1	.9
20. Transportation	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.9	10	1	.9
21. None, have been away from it too long	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.9	10	3	2.8

TABLE 31

WHAT U.S. UNIVERSITIES CAN DO TO STRENGTHEN ITS CONTRIBUTION  
TO INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

What Universities Can Do	Indicated as Useful		Rank
	No.	%	
1. Encourage more exchange of students & faculty between U.S. & LDCs	75	69.4	1
2. Offer more courses on topic of development	28	25.9	4
3. Provide more research opportunities in development fields	75	69.4	1
4. Integrate topic of dev. into already existing courses	41	38.0	3
5. Informal seminars with guest lectures	23	21.3	5
6. Create professorships in international agriculture	57	52.8	2
7. Encourage faculty to take part in development work	11	10.2	6
8. Encourage more inter-disciplinary studies	1	.9	9
9. Encourage students to take farm management, marketing, & policy	1	.9	9
10. Make greater attempt to see things from the LDC perspective	2	1.9	8
11. Maintain same set of academic standards for LDC & U.S. students	1	.9	9
12. Make more funds available for ag dev. research	1	.9	9
13. Provide more overseas experience for grad students	3	2.8	7
14. Encourage publication of development research results	1	.9	9
15. Universities should charge less overhead on research contracts	1	.9	9

APPENDIX: ITEM 1  
THE QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY OF U.S. PROFESSIONALS INTERESTED  
IN THE ECONOMICS OF AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT\*

American Agricultural Economics Association

1) Name \_\_\_\_\_

2) Current Address \_\_\_\_\_

3) Year of Birth \_\_\_\_\_ Married, Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

4a) University Education

Institution	Dates Attended		Major Areas of Study	Degree Received	Year
	Mo/Yr --	Mo/Yr			

4b) What was your area of specialization for the Ph.D.? (farm management, marketing, development, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

5a) Foreign Language Capability (current)

Language	Speak			Read			Write		
	poor	fair	fluent	poor	fair	fluent	poor	fair	fluent
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

5b) Was your language capability acquired mainly:  
\_\_\_\_\_ before, or  
\_\_\_\_\_ after completion of your Ph.D. studies?

6) Please indicate your professional employment goals in order of preference at the time you were studying for your Ph.D.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> university teaching and research                           | <input type="checkbox"/> agricultural extension                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> researcher in government agency                            | <input type="checkbox"/> university administration                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> private business and/or consultant                         | <input type="checkbox"/> government administration                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> agricultural planning/project analyst in government agency | <input type="checkbox"/> professional in international development agency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other ( please indicate) _____                             |   |

\* Individual responses to this questionnaire will be kept confidential. All data collected will be aggregated and used to evaluate U.S. graduate training in agricultural economics and ways to improve it in terms of training needs of LDC students and U.S. citizens interested in development work.

7) Employment history since completing your doctorate. List in chronological order. If you hold, or have held, more than one job at the same time, please list each separately.

For each position indicate approximate percent of time spent on issues in these two areas.

For each position indicate approximate percent of time spent in these activities.

Mo/yr--mo/yr _____ Employer _____	Location of work _____ Title or Position _____	Research + Teaching + Administration + Extension + Consulting =	Inter'l issues + Domestic issues =	(total) % = 100
Mo/yr--Mo/yr _____ Employer _____	Location of work _____ Title or Position _____	Research + Teaching + Administration + Extension + Consulting =	Inter'l issues + Domestic issues =	(total) % = 100
Mo/yr--Mo/yr _____ Employer _____	Location of work _____ Title or Position _____	Research + Teaching + Administration + Extension + Consulting =	Inter'l issues + Domestic issues =	(total) % = 100
Mo/yr--Mo/yr _____ Employer _____	Location of work _____ Title or Position _____	Research + Teaching + Administration + Extension + Consulting =	Inter'l issues + Domestic issues =	(total) % = 100
Mo/yr--Mo/yr _____ Employer _____	Location of work _____ Title or Position _____	Research + Teaching + Administration + Extension + Consulting =	Inter'l issues + Domestic issues =	(total) % = 100
Mo/yr--Mo/yr _____ Employer _____	Location of work _____ Title or Position _____	Research + Teaching + Administration + Extension + Consulting =	Inter'l issues + Domestic issues =	(total) % = 100

- 8a) The following is a list of graduate course areas in which many agricultural economists study. In your case, please complete columns 2 through 7 in the following rating schedule by placing a check mark in the place that most clearly reflects your opinion today about how useful the courses listed were in terms of preparing you for work in international agricultural development. Also, please provide the information requested in column (1).

Graduate Courses	(1) Approx. No. of courses taken	(2) Extremely Useful	(3) Very useful	(4) Moder- ately useful	(5) Slightly Useful	(6) Waste of Time	(7) Cannot Tell
Microeconomic Theory							
Macroeconomic Theory							
Statistics and Econometrics							
Linear programming and operations research							
Mathematics							
Agricultural development and development economics							
Agricultural policy							
Trade and trade policy							
Agricultural marketing							
Production economics							
Land and resource Economics							
Agribusiness studies							
History of economic thought							
Comparative economics systems							
Sector and project analysis							
Others:							

- 8b) For each of the above areas of study in which you check "slightly useful" or "waste of time," please put a circle around the check mark if you think the problem was mainly because of poor teaching.

9) What was the source of your initial interest in the field of development?  
(Check as many as appropriate)

- Peace Corps experience
- University courses
- Good job prospects
- Interesting and important work
- Availability of fellowship or assistantship
- Influence of professors
- Influence of peers
- Lived abroad with parents
- Missionary background
- Other influence, explain \_\_\_\_\_

10) Which aspects of your training and/or work experience do you feel have been most useful in developing your current capabilities to work in development? (Check as many as appropriate)

- Formal courses taken
- Thesis research
- Courses taught
- Research projects after Ph.D.
- Overseas assignment
- Domestic work experience that is applicable to development work
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

11) In what areas of development do you feel most qualified to work? (List all in order of importance)

- Farm management, production economics and farming systems
- Marketing in development
- Land tenure and farm organization
- Rural and/or community development
- Agricultural planning and sector analysis
- Credit and input problems
- International trade and monetary policy
- Agricultural and rural development policy
- Administration of development (design, implementation, evaluation)
- None, have been away from it too long
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

12) Do you feel you have been able to pursue your career interests successfully in development since completing your Ph.D.? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

Explain \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

13) If you are no longer working in development, do you feel that the development oriented training has hindered your career? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

Explain \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



14) Would you like to increase your current involvement in development activities?  
 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please indicate those activities that most interest you in order of importance

- \_\_\_\_\_ Joint research with LDC colleagues overseas
- \_\_\_\_\_ Advising LDC students on their research
- \_\_\_\_\_ Preparation and monitoring of development projects
- \_\_\_\_\_ Teaching graduate courses in development
- \_\_\_\_\_ Teaching undergraduate courses in development
- \_\_\_\_\_ Overseas technical assistance (one to three months assignment)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Overseas technical assistance (one to two years)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Short term consulting
- \_\_\_\_\_ Organization and participation in international conferences and seminars

15) In order of importance, please indicate in which areas of the developing world

	(a) you have most experience and knowledge	(b) you would like to expand your inter- national activities'
Central America and Caribbean	_____	_____
South America	_____	_____
Middle East	_____	_____
North Africa	_____	_____
East Africa	_____	_____
West Africa	_____	_____
South and SE Asia	_____	_____
East Asia	_____	_____
Other	_____	_____

16) In terms of the near future, do you see opportunities for agricultural economists working in development

- \_\_\_\_\_ Growing?
- \_\_\_\_\_ Remaining about the same?
- \_\_\_\_\_ Diminishing?

Why? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

What about your own opportunities? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

17) What percentage of U.S. Ph.D.'s who prepared to do work in development would you say are actually working in that field today?

\_\_\_\_\_ %

- 18) Do you feel that young U.S. professionals in agricultural economics are deserting their interests in development? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

If yes, why?

- Few jobs available in tenure stream
- No support from Agricultural Economics Departments
- Little if any research money is being made available
- Poor promotion or advancement opportunities
- Low salaries
- Frustrating nature of development work
- Too much traveling and moving around
- Growing unpopularity of the U.S.A. in LDC's
- Family reasons
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

- 19) In what kinds of activities can U.S. professional agricultural economists be most productive in international development work? (Rank in order of importance.)

- Teaching and advising foreign students in foreign universities
- Teaching and advising foreign students in U.S. universities
- Research on LDC problems from a U.S. base
- Research and technical assistance work overseas in a local government institution
- Research and technical assistance work overseas in a technical assistance agency

- 20) In your opinion, what are LDC's greatest needs in terms of the development of their agriculture? (Rank top four in order of priority.)

- More technical assistance overseas by U.S. professionals
- More indigeneous capabilities in agricultural economics
- Development of appropriate technology
- Better extension programs
- More governmental support for agricultural development
- Domestic political stability
- Better research facilities
- Development of physical infrastructure
- More trained nationals in agricultural sciences
- Improvements in foreign trade markets
- Better marketing institutions including more effective cooperatives
- More internal management capabilities
- Planning and policy analysis
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

- 21) What can international development agencies (AID, World Bank, Foundations, etc.) do to increase the participation and involvement of young professionals like yourself in international development work? \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

22) What are the most important things a U.S. university can do to strengthen its contribution to international agricultural development, including a better accommodation of students who are interested in development?

- Encourage more exchange of students and faculty between the U.S. and LDC's
- Offer more courses on topics of development
- Provide more research opportunities in development fields
- Integrate the topic of development into already existing courses
- Offer informal seminars and invite guest lecturers to speak on the topic of development
- Create professorships in international agriculture
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

23) If you have further comments or suggestions regarding the role, problems, and/or opportunities for U.S. professionals working in development, please indicate below.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

24) Please check if you would like a copy of the final report.

---

APPENDIX: ITEM 2  
THE COVER LETTER WHICH ACCOMPANIED  
THE QUESTIONNAIRE

71  
AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION

OFFICERS

BERNARD F. STANTON, *President*  
Department of Agricultural Economics  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, NY 14853

RICHARD A. KING, *President-Elect*  
Department of Economics and Business  
North Carolina State University  
Raleigh, NC 27607

JOHN C. REDMAN, *Secretary-Treasurer*  
Department of Agricultural Economics  
University of Kentucky  
Lexington, KY 40506

R. J. HILDRETH, *Past President*  
Farm Foundation  
1211 West 22nd Street  
Oak Brook, IL 60521

V. JAMES RHODES, *Editor*  
American Journal of Agricultural  
Economics  
Department of Agricultural Economics  
University of Missouri  
Columbia, MO 65211

February 6, 1979

Dear Colleague:

I am requesting your help in conducting a major study on "Needs and Strategies for Improving Training of Agricultural Economists for Work in International Agricultural Development." This study is being carried out under the direction of the International Committee of the American Agricultural Economics Association.

One of our objectives is to determine the nature and extent of teaching and research opportunities available to young U.S. professionals prepared to work in the economics of international agriculture. The principal focus of this study is the evaluation of U.S. training and assessment of needs by LDC alumni of U.S. graduate programs in agricultural economics--but we want to relate U.S. capabilities to fulfill those needs to our own professional resource base. Another concern is to explore ways the U.S. agricultural economics profession can better relate to newly trained professionals in the developing countries.

The attached questionnaire is intended to provide information on these issues. It is being sent to U.S. agricultural economists who received their Ph.D.'s in the past 10 years and had a major interest in development at the time of graduation. Your name was provided by the U.S. university department where you obtained your Ph.D.

We will appreciate very much your contributions to the study by completing and returning the enclosed questionnaire within one week after you receive it. An envelope addressed to Dr. Darrell Fienup, Director of the study, is enclosed for your convenience.

Again, thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

*Harold M. Riley*  
Harold M. Riley, Chairman  
International Committee

Enclosures

HMR/lw

DIRECTORS

RICHARD T. CROWDER  
The Pillsbury Co.  
608 2nd Avenue, South  
Minneapolis, MN 55402

SYLVIA LANE  
Dept. of Agr. Econ.  
Univ. of California  
Davis, CA 95616

JOSEPH D. COFFEY  
Dept. of Agr. Econ.  
V.P.I. and State Univ.  
Blacksburg, VA 24061

G. EDWARD SCHUH  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture  
Washington, D.C. 20250

THOMAS G. BROWN  
Dept. of Agr. Econ.  
Univ. of Missouri  
Columbia, MO 65211

JOHN A. HOPKIN  
Dept. of Agr. Econ.  
Texas A. & M. Univ.  
College Station, TX 77843

NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Russel Stevenson, "Graduate Students from Less Developed Countries: The Continuing Demand for U.S. Training," American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 61, No. 1 (Feb., 1969), 104.

<sup>2</sup>Harold D. Guither and W. N. Thomson, "Agricultural Economists in Overseas Development Assistance and the Impact Upon U.S. Universities," American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 50, No. 5 (Dec., 1968), 1336.

<sup>3</sup>It was stated earlier in this paper that 36 or 33.3 percent of the respondents were involved full-time in international affairs. Here we read that 22, or 20.4% of the respondents are involved full time in development issues. This suggests, although this can not be proven from the survey for lack of information, that not all international issues are necessarily development issues. Some respondents working full time on international issues are no doubt involved in issues having to do with trade with other developed countries, U.S. trade policy, etc. By the same token, some development work is not international work. Some respondents are involved in regional development work within the U.S.

<sup>4</sup>Lowell S. Hardin, "Potential Growth Areas in Agricultural Economics," American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 45, No. 5 (Dec., 1963), 949.

<sup>5</sup>Guither and Thompson, op. cit., 1317, 19.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., 1337.

<sup>7</sup>Sherwood O. Berg, "International Opportunities for American Land-Grant Universities," American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 43, No. 5 (Dec., 1961), 1062.

<sup>8</sup>Kenneth L. Bachman, "Agricultural Economics and Technical Aid in Foreign Development," American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 47, No. 5 (Dec., 1965), 1086.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Aines, Ronald O. "Economic Development Through Agribusiness Consortia." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 50, No. 5 (Dec., 1968), 1345-50.
- [2] Bachman, Kenneth L. "Agricultural Economics and Technical Aid in Foreign Development." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 47, No. 5 (Dec., 1965), 1078-90.
- [3] Berg, Sherwood O. "International Opportunities for American Land-Grant Universities." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 43, No. 5 (Dec., 1961), 1056-63.
- [4] Billingsley, Ray. "Discussion: Agricultural Economists in Overseas Development Assistance and the Impact upon U.S. Universities." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 50, No. 5 (Dec., 1968), 1326-28.
- [5] Blase, Melvin G. "Discussion: Why Overseas Technical Assistance Is Ineffective." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 50, No. 5 (Dec., 1968), 1341-44.
- [6] Dorner, Peter. "Needed Redirections in Economic Analysis for Agricultural Development Policy." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 53, No. 1 (Feb., 1971), 8-16.
- [7] Eicher, Carl K. "Discussion: Training Needs for American Technical-Assistance Specialists Abroad." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 43, No. 5 (Dec., 1961), 1052-55.
- [8] Guither, Harold D. and Thompson, W. N. "Agricultural Economists in Overseas Development Assistance and the Impact Upon U.S. Universities." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 50, No. 5 (Dec., 1968), 1313-25.
- [9] Hardin, Lowell S. "Potential Growth Areas in Agricultural Economics." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 45, No. 5 (Dec., 1963), 939-51.
- [10] Lard, Curtis F. and Martin, J. Rod. "At a Crossroad: Graduate Teaching in Agricultural Economics." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 51, No. 5 (Dec., 1969) 1569-73.
- [11] Loomis, Ralph A. "Why Overseas Technical Assistance Is Ineffective." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 50, No. 5 (Dec., 1968), 1329-41.
- [12] Middaugh, W. S. "Training Needs for American Technical-Assistance Specialists Abroad." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 43, No. 5 (Dec., 1961), 1046-52.

- [13] Mosher, Arthur T. "Discussion: International Opportunities for American Land-Grant Universities." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 43, No. 5 (Dec., 1961), 1064-67.
- [14] Mosher, A. T. "Implications of the Green Revolution for Technical and Economics Assistance." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 52, No. 5 (Dec., 1970), 713.
- [15] Peck, Anne E. and Babb, Emerson M. "The AAEA Membership: Employment and Mobility Patterns." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 58; No. 3 (Aug., 1976), 600-05.
- [16] Schutjer, Wayne and Weigel, Dale. "The Contribution of Foreign Assistance to Agricultural Development." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 51, No. 4 (Nov., 1969), 788-97.
- [17] Storey, David A. and Christensen, Robert L. "Graduate Programs in Agricultural Economics: Results of a Survey." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 55, No. 1 (Feb., 1973), 61-64.
- [18] Warley, Thorald K. "Agriculture in International Economic Relations." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 58, No. 5 (Dec., 1976), 820-30.
- [19] Witt, Lawrence. "Towards an International Dimension in Agricultural Economics." American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 41, No. 2 (May, 1959), 211-20.