SOME FACTORS AFFECTING JAMAICAN STUDENTS' DECISION TO REMAIN IN NORTH AMERICA OR RETURN HOME

Dissertation for the Degree of Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

TREVOR GEORGE GARDNER

1976

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

Some Factors Affecting Jamaican Students' Decision To Remain in North America or Return Home

presented by

Trevor George Gardner

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph. D degree in Education

Walter F Johnson
Major professor

Date 2/12/76

O-7639

145

ABSTRACT

SOME FACTORS AFFECTING JAMAICAN STUDENTS' DECISION TO REMAIN IN NORTH AMERICA OR RETURN HOME

By

Trevor George Gardner

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify factors that influenced the decision of Jamaican students to remain in North America or return to Jamaica after their course of study.

Population and Sample

The population used in this study was graduates of North American universities and colleges who were originally from Jamaica. This sample consisted of 120 subjects drawn from the population.

Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study was developed by the researcher solely for this study. The study contains ten dependent variables as factors affecting the decision made by respondents.

Data Analysis

The multivariate analysis of variance was the statistical technique used to analyze the data in this study. The only exception was the response to question one, in which case the ranked-difference correlation was used.

Testing of Research Questions

The .10 level of significance was employed to test the research questions in this study.

Research Question 1:

The result of the Ranked-Difference Correlation cited Professional and Economic motives as the primary factors affecting the decision to emigrate.

Research Question 2:

There was no significant difference between Rural and Nonrural respondents.

Research Question 3:

There was no difference in the levels of education among the North American group; there was a significant difference among the Jamaican group.

Research Question 4:

There was no significant difference in these groups when they were separated on the basis of profession.

Research Question 5:

When respondents were grouped according to income brackets no significant difference was found in either group.

Research Question 6:

There was a significant difference in both groups when respondents were grouped on the basis of age. The younger group showed a more favorable tendency to return home.

SOME FACTORS AFFECTING JAMAICAN STUDENTS' DECISION TO REMAIN IN NORTH AMERICA OR RETURN HOME

By

Trevor George Gardner

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1976

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated, with love, to Pat, a loving and understanding wife, to my father and mother who have been a constant inspiration, and to Mrs. Miller, my elementary school teacher, who demonstrated that teaching was an art of love and giving.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A brief acknowledgment can never suffice to express gratitude to all who have given generously of their time and have provided continuous encouragement and leadership. The acquisition of this degree has been made possible only through the efforts and consideration of many people, of whom I am mentioning only a few.

My sincere appreciation goes to Dr. Walter Johnson, chairman of my doctoral program. He was more than an educator doing his job, he was a caring and helpful friend. To the other members of my doctoral committee, Dr. Eudora Pettigrew, Dr. Vandel Johnson and Dr. George Myers, I express my thanks for being there to help and encourage.

I appreciate the help of Mrs. Aubrey Phillips, of the Jamaican Embassy in Washington, for the time and energy she expended to arrange interviews with the educational attache of other embassies. Thanks are also extended to Miss Norma Niles for her help and support.

To my parents who gave all to help me realize this goal, I give myself for the harmonious development

of every disadvantaged child in the world. Through them I have learned that nestled in every little haunt of depravity is a vibrant mind yearning for the light of day. I pledge myself to bring the day to such as I can.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

CHAPTER I

PROBLEM

Introduction

The question of foreign student immigration from developing countries has attracted global attention. In 1965 Maner asked whether foreign student exchange had reached a point where "more immigration than exchange was taking place."[1] Barbara Walton, in 1967, cites the same issue as "one of the most hotly debated in student exchange circles today, having replaced the issue of whether foreign students are favourably inclined towards the United States."[2] In the early 70's Margaret Cormack expressed similar concern in her deposition on "Visa for What?"[3] Numerous research projects in Africa, Asia, Europe and the Caribbean have also paid scholarly attention to the same question and its associated problems.

More precisely, the question of immigration, particularly from developing countries, has never ceased to warrant singular attention. A United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

study on "Five Developing Countries" in Latin America gave special attention to student immigration.[4] Reverend William Gibbons reporting to the United States Committee on Scientific Manpower Survey, in 1967, emphasized the importance of a look at student immigration as a significant contributor to the "brain drain" syndrome.[5] Dr. Walter Adams devoted a complete chapter of his book Brain Drain to relating the drain to student attrition.[6] Tai K. Oh, writing on Asian students, states that among developing countries 42.6 percent of the immigration is due to student drain--a contrast to 3.8 percent from the "luxury clubs"[7] of the world. A published document from the Immigration and Naturalization Service states that during the fiscal years 1963-67, the United States received 41,652 skilled immigrants of whom 12,260 were students from foreign nations, especially developing nations.[8] In 1964-65, 25 percent of the medical interns and 70 percent of foreign residents in the United States hospitals were from developing countries.[9] In 1973-74 foreign student enrollment in the United States exceeded 151,000--the highest number ever reported in the history of foreign students.[10] This increase was 3 percent over the previous year. Such an increase has occurred despite the hazards of inflation and stiffened immigration. This suggests heightened search for education on the part of foreign youth. The increase in foreign student enrollment came

entirely from the developing world. While the number of students from some Far Eastern and East Asian countries has slightly declined and has remained stable in others, the number from Latin America and Africa, in particular, the Near and Middle East has risen significantly. It is important to note that the 11 percent annual increase that characterized the 60's has fallen between 4-3 percent over the past years and is concentrated in the developing countries. Consequently if the percentage of student loss remains constant or rises, the developing countries face the greater loss.

Statement of the Problem

Consideration of the student drain is a problem which admits two separate issues--migration and education. Consideration of migration usually focuses upon the phenomena which would lead an individual to change his geographical location.

Generally the causes are wide-ranging including psychological, sociological, as well as economic phenomena. C. W. Roberts points out that education enters the analysis in that professional and technical manpower is almost axiomatically, highly educated manpower. The human capital theory presents those personnel as embodying a disproportionate amount of educational expenditure relative to the population. The national character of educational investment costs as well as the expected

returns from social investment lead naturally to the political concern with the consequences of high level migration.[11]

This problem is embarrassing to the host countries and destructive to the development of the native countries. When the quality and quantity are lost it intensifies the problem. The elusive nature of student drain makes its study difficult. It is difficult to determine exactly when a student should be recorded as a "drainee." It is even more difficult to determine how great the loss is until he has matured on a measurable skill. By that time it is very uncertain whether it was his new country that led to his success.

From the introduction to this problem it is apparent that this phenomenon--student drain--has many factors that are associated with the problem. These factors affect the decisions students make at the point of immigrating or at the point of returning home. This study seeks to ascertain some factors that have most influence on the students' decision and to present a recommendation for improvement.

Background for the Study

It is estimated that between 10-90 percent of the foreign students do not return to their home country.[12] This range is phenomenally wide, reflecting the variability of loss to the countries from which students have come.

The overall loss has been an average of 10 percent.[13] Korea, however, is estimated to have lost as high as 90 percent.[14] Colombia has lost between 10-30 percent depending on whether bonded or unbonded[a] students are considered.[15] The Caribbean operates at a loss of an average of 10-25 percent. Jamaica's loss fluctuates within that figure.

Between 1970-73 general immigration began to decline but student immigration increased.[16] For example, United States' statistics show that between 1956-66 the percentage of exchange visitors not returning to their home countries at the end of their training amounted to 2.7 percent. Within that same time period (1956-66) the amount was 8.3 percent for 1961-66. The significant rise was reflected shortly after the United States granted special immigration privilege status to the professionals.

As high as 85 percent do not return to Iran; the Dominican Republic, Chile and Israel have also been identified as heavy losers. Indian student immigration is about 17.2 percent; this contrasted with an Indian enrollment of 13.0 percent in the United States and a graduate population of 17.9 percent of all graduates

---

[a]Bonded: the official term used for Jamaicans who are sponsored by government and have to give a specified number of years' service.

working on doctorates in 1964[17] helps to put the picture in bold relief. In looking at the "Brain Drain" through student drain from developed countries we are looking at about 151,066 foreign students representing 177 countries and territories, enrolled in 1,359 United States institutions.[18] A 10 percent loss of potentially high manpower skill from any country would be traumatic. In developing countries it is twice as devastating. C. W. Roberts in reviewing factors associated with immigration as it affects Guiana says: "While by world standards Caribbean migrations remain almost negligible in size, their significance for population growth within the region is considerable; this is most fully demonstrated in the case of Guiana."[19]

Ten percent of the Caribbean's 12,705 students would be 1,271 and 10 percent of Jamaica's 1,423 would be 142.[20] Comparatively speaking this may be a small figure but when compared to its potential in a small territory it is a significant loss. As this figure accumulates over the years, the loss becomes more severe. Another consideration is that in using 10 percent one is calculating at the lowest end of the scale. That figure could as easily be between 10-90 percent for any developing country. Such losses become significant manpower problems.

Understanding the seriousness to Jamaica of the student drain demands some knowledge of the country as

it now is. After over 300 years (1655-1975) of British rule Jamaica became independent in 1962, but still possesses a highly neo-colonial aura in education, socio-economic and cultural practices. The country of 4,411 square miles is populated by 2 million people.[21] Its best educational record to date is its provision of free secondary education to 10 percent of its students.[22] Illiteracy is regularly documented as between 35-45 percent; the variation depends mostly on the definition used for illiteracy.

Traditionally an agrarian society, the country has made prodigious steps towards industrialization.

> Manufacturers and light industry have shown tremendous gains in Jamaica during the past twenty-five years, due in part to the efforts of the Jamaica Industrial Development Corporation, created in 1952. The JIDC, which has branch offices in New York, London and Toronto prepares feasibility and market studies. . . . In 1973 the value of the output of the manufacturing and processing sector was J$ 207.6 million, 14 percent of the gross national domestic product . . . (this sector employs) some eighty thousand persons or 12.6% of the work force.[23]

Jamaica's largest industry, bauxite--alumina, has increased its national receipts six times what it was four years ago. The significant industrial spurt has not yet fully harmonized with the agricultural development. A similar situation exists between the neo-colonial education practices of British traditional forms and functions and the more aggressive and innovative North American influence. The two have not yet found a

harmonious existence. A search for an identifiable culture is the third area of fervent. A final fact that may help in understanding the problem of student drain from Jamaica is the socio-economic disparity that exists in the nation. This last point is foremost in the minds of most Jamaicans, and particularly so in the minds of public figures, both the "haves" and "have nots."[24] When a student leaves Jamaica to study abroad he has a mental image of these four factors of ferment and depending on how the "push" and "pull" factors affect his life in the "U" curve[b] experience he decides to drain or to return.[25]

On leaving, a student is aware of the phenomenal immigration of technical and professional workers to the United States and Canada. In 1967 and 1968, 4,140 immigrated to these countries. When it is considered that in 1968 only 3.7 percent of the labor force were technical and professional workers, it leads to the conclusion that 1 out of every 25 members of the labor force is a technical or professional worker while 1 out of every 6 emigrants is. The cost of producing 1 of these people in J$ is 4,481. Thus the total value of the annual "gift" of human capital to the metropolitan "luxury clubs" by Jamaica is almost J$ 9 million--this accounts for only

---

[b]The "U" curve is a term used in reference to the acculturation process the exchange student undergoes.

the highly skilled. This is the unenchanting picture with which the student emigrates.

Despite significant economic, educational and cultural changes since 1962, student drain continues and has even increased proportionate to general migration. Although historically Jamaica, like most developing nations, ignored this loss, the change in trends and needs of small nations, has forced them to begin programming to offset this loss.[26] Jamaica has begun to nationalize, or gain significant partnerships, in areas of natural resources. At this point she needs her educators, engineers and scientists back home. She also needs to find out what factors have perpetuated this attrition despite seeming need for professional manpower skills.

The implications of large-scale movement of trained people from developing countries is a question which has been of perennial interest. However, Barbara Walton says that this discussion has taken a new trend. It now questions the "brain drain" through potential, not functional, manpower skills. From the professional fields of education, science, medicine and engineering, developing countries similar to Jamaica have had more than a normal exodus of students.[27] The problem is made even more complex because of the multiplicity of different nations with varying needs for special types of brains.

Between 1963-67, from Asia alone 8.638 students adjusted their status to U.S. immigrants. In the Caribbean the number was about 2,000.

There are two types of foreign students--the exchange student who is supported by government and the exchange student who supports himself. Statistics as late as 1974 show that U.S. government sponsored programs are helping only a fragment of the total foreign student population, namely 1.2 percent or about 5 students out of 390.[28] From this category the immigration rate is lowest, 10-20 percent annually.

The second group has a significantly higher range of immigration. This is the group that finances their own education. Among them the rate varies between 10-90 percent depending on the country. In Jamaica it is this group that has the highest student immigration records. In 1970 76.2 percent immigrating in this group changed status. This becomes more meaningful when compared with the fact that only 10 percent of the total foreign student population in the United States changed status.[29] Of 11,372 students who changed from student to immigrant status 87.6 percent were individuals who came at their own expense. Only 8.6 percent of these immigrants came with government sponsored (J) visa status. Two assumptions may be drawn from the preceding information: one is that the majority of students who study

in foreign countries do so on their own, and two, the change of status by such a sizable percentage must have an adverse effect on developing countries whose stock of human skills is already at a low margin. The question then is not whether foreign students are on government exchange or personal exchange study programs. Instead the question to be asked is how developing countries can get their potential skills back home without students opting for third and sixth regulation immigration privileges. In this particular study the last question is most pertinent to Jamaica.

Another point to consider is that some student residency is purposely protracted. This protraction makes it more difficult to decide at what point these people should be classified as drainees. Their potential value, in light of this protraction, may best be viewed on a continuum of possible service to their country while still in the host country. Because of this variation in student behavior it must be realized that the preceding figures are deflated, that is, they do not include these protracted sojourners.

Due to the complexity of the brain drain and the added speculation on potential student worth, reliable data on them are scarce and difficult to find. In general causes vary with the national situation. Yet there are some nations that face nearly identical socio-economic,

educational, and certain demographic features relevant to immigration of student to developing countries. For example, Trinidad, Barbados and Jamaica have vast commonality, Argentina, Equador, Peru, Egypt and Iran have substantial common denominators to bring to bear on the problem of student drain.

While some developing countries need all their skilled people, there are some that would be negatively affected by such returns--unemployment levels may rise and large governmental expenditures for state services may be incurred.[30]

A most valuable need in deciding how to prevent potential skill from attriting is to identify the causes. Admittedly this is a very difficult task. Basically the causes for both functional and potential talent have been identified by various scholars as falling into two groups: the "push and pull" factors. The former is laden with negative inducements to return home and the latter with positive inducements to stay in the host country.[31] The problem is not quite that simple.

It should be realized that the same factor which is a push in one country could as easily be a pull in another country. In the same vein, management of these factors can cause them to generate "push" features under one individual and "pull" features under another. In keeping with this consideration Walton and Awasthi both

blame developing nations for their ambivalent response to the problem of student drain in past years. At the same time Reverend William Gibbon chides United States industries and Higher Education for enticing student drain.[32]

Responding to the caprice of the push and pull forces are factors like predeparture sets, adaptation to host country, communication with native country, economic inducements, professional development, the psyche for adventure, sense of responsibility to home country, fear of failure, government policies and politics, demographic data and curriculum skills. The students' perceptions and expectations of these factors ultimately affects his response to the desire to return home.

Documentation on most of these factors is common in the literature on the brain drain. There are some, however, that are new to the study. These new factors have been acquired through interviews and determined by the investigator to be of enough significance to be included in the study. Among these factors are fear of failure, psyche for adventure, predeparture sets and life style. Although Cora Du Bois mentions predeparture sets of foreign students it is not in the light of immigration but of adoptation to the host environment.[33]

A positive look at this problem will reveal two pragmatic facts to the developing countries. The first

is that they are both the immediate and eventual losers. In the immediate sense, the skill is not readily available to meet the countries' needs. In the long run developing countries perpetuate a state of underdevelopment. This underdevelopment breeds low educational and economic responsibility and an unending cycle of low progress becomes the image of the countries.

The second obvious fact is that it is the developing countries which must most urgently and painstakingly find solutions to the problem. In some cases these solutions may be distasteful but they are nonetheless necessary. Unless solutions are found, the "luxury clubs" of the world will continue to draw the skills of students. Since the fully human behavior is free and therefore unpredictable, solutions will have to be found that do not enslave the conscience of students.

There are implications of this problem too for the developed nations (luxury clubs). Student immigration invariably provides a channel of immigration on immigration third regulation privileges, so that relatives who are often untrained find a route of exodus to developed countries. The resultant problems in educational provision, economic, social and political adaptation become the host country's problems. Often these are not as easily regulated as limiting the type and volume of immigrants. Recent legislations by United

States and Canada highlight the problems that these nations are having because of immigration. Many of these problems have been affected by original student immigration.

Purpose of the Study

In keeping with the problem as stated previously the primary purpose of this study is to identify factors that are associated with the decisions of students in North America on whether or not to return to Jamaica. An additional purpose is to examine the relationships or lack of them, between factors which separate people who have returned to Jamaica and those who have not. A third dimension to this study is to observe whether people with different demographic experiences are significantly different on their responses.

General Research Questions

Because of the exploratory nature of the study and purposive character of the sample, it will not be possible to test the following research questions in a scientifically valid manner. Rather, they set the direction for more exploration and also for a more meaningful discussion and examination of the problem.

Research Question 1:

(a) Was there a difference in the response to Ranked Factors and Item Factors between returnees and non-returnees (b) By ordering Ranked Factors and Item Factors, what factors are considered most, less, least influential in a three-three-four order?

Research Question 2:

Was there a difference between the response of subjects from Rural and Nonrural background?

Research Question 3:

Was there a difference between the responses among the different levels of education achieved with regards to (a) Bachelors and (b) Masters and (c) Doctors of Philosophy and Medical Doctors?

Research Question 4:

Was there a difference among the responses of (a) Education and (b) Medical/Engineer and (c) The Other Professional groups?

Research Question 5:

Was there a difference in response on Factors by respondents who perceive themselves as coming from (a) Upper and Middle (b) Lower and (c) Lower Middle Income brackets?

Research Question 6:

Was there a difference between the responses of subjects between 1-31 years and 32-upwards?

Scope

The following areas of student immigration have been included in the questionnaire:

(a) Student Demographic Data: This factor explores the background of the subjects--parental experiences, family influence, socio-economic stature, and interest in family immigration patterns.

(b) Pre-Departure Sets: This area seeks to cover perceptions of the United States or Canada by the subject before he left home. It is hoped it will also establish what his perceptions of his future would be in light of his studies abroad.

(c) National Responsibility: This area measures the expectations that students have in the relationship of the nation to themselves. Insight should be gained as to whether the student viewed himself as a potential meaningful contributor to the system of development of his country; whether he feels like he belongs or sees himself as disinfranchised.

(d) Economic Influences: In this area a sense of how seriously the student considered this a major factor in his decision should be realized. The significance of salaries here as opposed to salaries in Jamaica should shed some light on economic considerations. This factor should probe into the individual's survival or life style as it hinges on economic benefits.

(e) Adaptation: Information on this area will reveal how difficult it was to adapt to North American society. Also highlighted will be the factors that facilitate or inhibited adaptation. Influence on foreign student's office, American citizens and fellow students in becoming adopted to the American culture will be explored in this factor.

(f) Desire for Adventure: This factor aims at divulging whether or not there is a significant influence on Jamaicans to immigrate merely for the adventure travelling entails.

(g) Communication: This factor helps the subject to categorize the channel of communication that influenced him most in his decision to return home or stay abroad. It may reveal the presence or absence of official government contact with the subjects while they were in school and the subsequent relationships that have existed since their settling in a foreign country.

(h) Professional Development: In considering whether to return home, the subject will supply some information as to his opportunities for scholarly development as he perceived them. It may reveal his knowledge of how much the government expends on projects with research orientation and what

chances for promotion he saw as viable considerations in going home. It may also reveal how the subject saw himself relative to those who would be placed above him. This factor should help to determine if foreseeable personnel conflicts influenced decisions.

(i) Attitude Towards the Future: The security, quality and possibilities for personal and family success. The factor seeks to determine whether or not these individuals see the system as perpetuating failure, or whether they and other members of their family had a reasonable opportunity for success in the system.

(j) Government Policies and Politics: This factor is to determine if the decisions made were influenced by the political party in power or by particular politics of the government that was then in power. National politics, its atmosphere, functions and impact on decision not to return will be considered.

(k) Relevance of Professional Skills: This factor will determine if the skills acquired under the curriculum or program were considered relevant to the needs. They will give responses that generate

how important to Jamaica they considered their skill at that time and what possibilities for success they considered reasonable.

(l) Alternative Life Style: The variety of life experiences possible within the social and professional milieu.

Limitations in the Study

There are certain limitations in the study that need consideration. The mode of selecting the subjects makes it difficult to generalize beyond Jamaicans who have studied in the United States and Canada. Even at this rate, the fact that most of the subjects were obtained from social, scientific, cultural and government organizations makes the sample a biased cluster sample. Additional names were acquired from solicitation through individuals acquainted with people. Therefore inferences derived from these results are applicable only to similar populations.

The data for this study were obtained through an instrument developed solely for this project, using however, the Likert method of evaluating responses. As in the case with similar surveys, subject responses may not reflect the true intensity of depth of attitudes, perceptions and expectations. In addition, subject participation in this study was purely voluntary, solely

dependent upon one's willingness to participate and one's interest in participating by taking time to answer the survey instrument.

Overview of the Study

In Chapter II, literature relevant to the topic will be reviewed. Included will be pertinent material on the general problem of "brain drain" through student immigration. Review will cover all the aforementioned factors that are associated with student drain. For example, communication, demography, life style, professional development, etc. Attempts will be made to focus student drain primarily from developing countries.

The design of the study will be examined in Chapter III. Among the categories will be methodology, design, and approach to the analysis of the data.

An analysis of the results of the survey will be presented in Chapter IV. Differences that separate respondents as evidenced in their response to the instrument will be given special attention. Differences in response to particular factors will be examined also.

Chapter V presents a summary of interview data. Chapter VI will include a summary and conclusions with recommendations for a model that may be more useful than the system in operation in Jamaica. Significant implications for further research will also be cited in this chapter.

NOTES--CHAPTER I

[1]Barbara Walton, Foreign Student Exchange in Perspective Research on Foreign Students in the United States, Office of External Research (Washington, D.C.: Department of State, September, 1967), p. 3.

[2]Robert Maner in Barbara Walton's Foreign Student Exchange, p. 7.

[3]Margaret L. Cormack, "International Educational Exchange: Visa to What?" International Educational & Cultural Exchange 5 (Fall 1959): 50.

[4]United Nation Institute for Training and Research, Research Report No. 5, The Brain Drain from Five Developing Countries (New York, 1971), p. 7.

[5]Rev. William Gibbons, "Scientific Migration," United States Committee on Scientific Manpower Survey (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967).

[6]Walter Adams, ed., Brain Drain (New York: The Macmillian Company, 1968).

[7]Tai K. Oh, "A New Estimate of the Student Brain Drain from Asia," International Migration Review 7 (Winter 1973): 449-56.

[8]Joseph Cha Tharampil, The Brain Drain: A Case Study, Asian Forum 3 (1970): 236-44.

[9]Ibid., p. 239.

[10]Open Doors, 1973-74, Institute International of Education 1973-74.

[11]Stephen Dedijer, "Why Did Daedalus Leave," Science 13 (June 30, 1961): 249.

U.S.
Bran

p. 17.

Rosic

Rosic

Indes
Ass, 1

Rosic

Ibaiba,

Ibaiba,

Rosbo
, b

[12]Hubert G. Grubel and Anthony Scott, "The Cost of U.S. College Student Exchange Programs," The Journal of Human Resources 13 (Fall 1966): 81-98.

[13]Oh, "A New Estimate," p. 451.

[14]Grubel and Scott, "Student Exchange Programs," p. 87.

[15]UNITAR, The Brain Drain, p. 13.

[16]Open Doors 1969, Institute for International Education.

[17]Chathaparampil, The Brain Drain, p. 242.

[18]Open Doors 1973-74, Institute for International Education 1973-74.

[19]C. W. Roberts and R. Johnson, Social and Economic Studies (Kingston, Jamaica: University of West Indies Press, 1974).

[20]Open Doors 1970, Institute for International Education, Education, 1970, p. 5.

[21]Arnold Bertram, The Daily Cleaner, Kingston, Jamaica, 1975, col. 3, p. 6.

[22]Image of Jamaica, Industrial Cooperation Service, Jamaica, Kingston, 1974, p. 15.

[23]Ibid., p. 10.

[24]Edward Seaga, The Daily Cleaner, Kingston, 1960.

[25]Roberts and Johnson, Economic Studies, p. 142.

[26]Nathal Awashi, Social and Economic Studies (Kingston, Jamaica: University of West Indies Press, 1970), p. 81.

[27]Ibid., p. 86.

[28]Walton, Foreign Student Exchange.

[29]Open Doors 1974, Institute for International Education, 1974.

[30]Chathaparampil, The Brain Drain, p. 240.

[31]Herbert G. Grubel and Anthony Scott, "International Flow of Human Capital," American Economic Review 56 (May 1966): 270.

[32]Adams, Brain Drain.

[33]Cora Dubois, Foreign Students in Higher Education in the United States (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1956).

[34]Roberts and Johnson, Economic Studies, p. 142.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

A review of the research and literature pertinent to this study is presented in this chapter. Such a review is necessary since it illustrates the background and content which have served as the catalyst for this research. This review also contributes to a better understanding of the many concepts which influence any discussion of the immigration of professional manpower to developed countries. The categorization of the effects of emigration on the countries involved, and the causes for manpower movement will next be discussed. Thirdly, some of the peculiarities of the "drain" through student attrition will be presented. Finally, those implications which are most significant to this study will be summarized.

Throughout this chapter three main purposes guide the presentation and discussion. The first is to present material and statements specifically related to the problem of brain drain in general, and student drain in particular. The second is to provide as is best possible a rationale

In the

n to us

nds tow

as inte

Invit

Original

f this

ills th

ndi,[1]

Poli
poli
oper
dic
capi
huma
ghai
to a

the fus

Rational

Methode

as ever

However

Indus

Phrase

Phrase

for the points of view reported. The third main purpose is to use this review as a lead to a more objective attitude toward the international migration of students.

Background Perspective

Initially, and until quite recently, immigration was intellectually welcomed, since it added to world productivity by transferring skills from countries of low marginal productivity to those where it was higher. Out of this outflow of human capital comes what Walter Adams calls the international or cosmopolitan and the national model.[1]

> Following the logic of the international or cosmopolitan model the brain drain simply reflects the operation of an international market for a particular factor of production--specialized human capital. . . . The nationalists model regards human capital, or more precisely . . . certain minimum levels of human capital, as indispensable to a country's economic development.[2]

While immigration and emigration, in general, have just recently begun to attract national and international attention because of their inherently negative overtones for developed countries, student immigration has even more recently begun to draw attention.

In all recent studies of the outflow of trained manpower from developing countries there are some common conclusions, two of which are emphasized: the effect of emigration on developing countries and the causes of immigration. The former concludes that the outflow of

talent perpetuates a state of underdevelopment.[3] The latter includes salary differentials (Grubel, Adams and Dollot); professional opportunity (Useem, Adams and Scott); lack of receptivity to change at home (Adams and Useem); relevance of foreign training (Walton and Wharton); lack of realistic manpower policies (Adams and Awasthi); political balkanization (Dallot and Adams); discrimination on noneconomic grounds (Adams and UNITAR); monopolistic restrictions in advanced countries (Adams); lack of communication (Useem and Scott); desire for adventure (Dollot); search for cultural development (Scott). The latter element generates the cause and the former reflects the effect of student migration.

Economic Benefits

The literature is replete with the idea that the primary motive for brain drain "seems" to be to gain better economic benefits.[4] This can be true depending on whether the definition given to "economic" is salary differential[5] or cultural development amidst affluence.[6]

Studies done with students from India (Useem); Asia (Wharton); Jamaica (Girling); Caribbean (Eckardt); along with Grubel's foreign student cost analysis and Myers questions on foreign student exchange, show that there is little evidence from student responses to indicate that strong economic benefits have been the primary mover in the decision to drain.

Myers implicitly suggests that the personal economic motive is a decisive propellant to emigrate. He supports his claim on the belief that nonreturning students are often those who are marginal to the society from which they came. He does not, however, limit his concept of marginality to economic benefits. He also includes differences in dominant society because of race, ethnic origin or religion; he also introduces the idea of a social class bias with lower class professionals having a greater tendency to emigrate.[7]

Myers concludes that "class background may influence students migratory propensities through self-discrimination and through differential attitudes."[8]

The basic need for a job and the fact that the home country cannot provide that job is often the primary motivator in the economic sense. Canadians, with a rapidly increasing gross national product stimulated by modern technology, are not able to meet their own manpower needs. This need is often supplemented by established professionals and students from developing countries.[9]

Simply put, there are little or no attractions back home for the alert student, in most developing countries.

Studies by UNITAR and a United States subcommittee on foreign affairs all point to the limitations of job

attractions in developing countries. In cataloguing causes for emigration they include general lack of development, shortage of opportunities for professional and skilled workers, low salaries, discrimination in salaries between categories of professionals, unpleasant working conditions, limited chance for professional advancement, demoralization, frustration, discontent and rejection.[10] In this same study the UNITAR source ascribes to the economic factor the title of most "powerful pull factor."

> By far the most powerful "pull" factor is the economic strength of the advanced receiving countries, particularly the United States. America's scientific-technological civilization, the main source of its economic prowess, attracts the talented of less affluent professionals from abroad.[11]

Dollot observes that the attraction of professionals to the more advanced nations rest in high wages, varied resources, easy life, and the chance of making good. However he concludes that immigration appeared to be the great remedy for individual difficulties of living; and unemployment and underemployment have had very definite effects on the decision by students to emigrate.[12]

Lacking the facilities to realize personal, professional and economic development the professional moves in search of, or remains in, a resourceful place.[13] Lane Kirkland describes the feeling in these brusque

terms: "The job is still the secret of a guy's general happiness and attitude. If you like your work, you're happy. If you don't you are miserable." Albert Camus puts it more philosophically "without work all life goes rotten. But when work is soulless, life stifles and dies."[14]

In some less developed countries salaries could be as attractive as in the United States or Canada.[15] Despite that fact people emigrate in search of jobs. "The chief reason for emigration in the Arab world, is the inability to find an adequate job."[16] The job motivation factor is further supported by Lafi Ibrahim Jacfari's study of Palestinian and Jordanian students.[17]

Indeed the evidence would seem to indicate that professional and survival needs are more apparent than the extent of economic gain. Myers states that when relative purchasing power is considered, the decision is not as irrationally economical as one is prone to believe. He concludes that nonmonetary factors appear to be more important than monetary values in the decision.[18] The strength of the decision varies across occupations and periods of immigration.[19]

Dr. Shearer in reporting to the Manpower Research Committee substantially supports the argument that economic factors are not necessarily primary in emigration. He pointed out that one-seventh of all recent

United States doctorates were awarded to foreign students of whom two-thirds were citizens from under-developed countries. Both Shearer and Rev. Gibbons pointed to lack of national programs to attract and hold professional proficiency as a cause for emigration. They pointed out that between 90 percent (Nationalist China) and 14 percent (Pakistan) are apt to remain in the United States.[20]

Despite the limitations of these studies, the over-riding implication is that Myers seems to be right when he stated that nonmonetary factors appear to be more important than monetary values in the student's decision to emigrate.

Professional Development

> In 1952, the Walter McCarron Act introduced a preference within quotas of applicants of high education and exceptional ability. The Immigration Act of 1965 removed the national quotas but it maintained a similar preferential basis in determining eligibility within a world wide total of permissible immigration.[21]

According to a 1960 census, scientists, engineers and physicians comprised about 2 percent of all the United States professionals, technical and kindred workers. At the same time immigrant scientific professionals have a consistently higher proportion of all immigrating, professional, technical and kindred workers than the United States 20 percent ratio. Immigrant scientists, engineers, and physicians have ranged from

25 percent to about 32 percent of immigrant professionals.[22] Not all professionals are included in this 25 to 32 percent.[23]

If, as these data suggest, scientific professionals are a relatively large and growing proportion of total professional immigration, the general "pull factor" of American prosperity and occupational opportunities may not be sufficient explanation for the student drain. "Instead, scientific professionals may be entering the United States in greater numbers because of 'pulls' specific to them."[24] The fact that the current Immigration Act facilitates this movement does make it easier to move but does not in itself seem enough incentive for the decision of a student not to return home.

The figures in Tables 1 and 2 show that a rising share of the immigration into the United States is from developing countries. These figures probably substantially understate the actual share from developing countries since Canada, counted as a developed country is a "way station" for many who ultimately take up permanent residence in the United States.[25]

With increasing demand for professional output, an enlarged domestic entourage becomes a voluntary gift of valuable resources to other countries. This entourage is affected by a host of pull and push factors. Highly trained people are "pulled" to the developed countries

TABLE 1.--Immigration into the United States of scientists, engineers, and physicians, fiscal years 1956-66

Fiscal Year	Total All Countries		Developed Countries		Developing Countries	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
1956	5,373	100.0	3,604	67.1	1,769	32.9
1962	5,956	100.0	3,573	60.0	2,383	40.0
1963	7,896	100.0	4,534	57.4	3,362	42.6
1964	7,810	100.0	4,607	59.0	3,203	41.0
1965	7,198	100.0	4,548	63.2	2,650	36.8
1966	9,534	100.0	5,144	54.0	4,390	46.0

TABLE 2.--Percentage share of developing countries in immigration into the United States of scientists, engineers, and physicians, fiscal years 1962 and 1963-66

Fiscal Year	Total, 3 Groups	Scientists	Engineers	Physicians
1962	40.0	26.9	33.5	57.6
1963	42.6	34.9	40.9	51.0
1964	41.0	32.6	36.8	53.3
1965	36.8	27.0	30.4	53.8
1966	46.0	41.2	40.9	58.5

by strong diversified research and development programs.[26] The revolution in science and technology is a positive force contributing to the mobility of modern man. Indeed the expansion of scientific knowledge has created a new expansion which has created a new world of learning.[27] When some students finish their studies they find that their countries have not yet developed and planned sufficiently to accommodate them so they emigrate. Burma is an example of the point in question; 40 percent of the engineers in 1961 had not found employment in engineering 18 months later. According to another report, a 1961 census in India revealed that 10.4 percent of all scientific and technical personnel were unemployed, 18.6 percent were employed outside their fields, not to mention the number that were under-employed.[28] John and Ruth Useem give a similar report in a 1955 study.[29] Situations like these immediately raise serious questions in a student's mind as to the value of returning.

It is axiomatic that economic resources for developmental purposes and trained manpower are necessary ingredients to creating the essential cadres of talent that in turn can construct a viable scientific-technological infrastructure. In considering the student drain problem in Lebanon a UNITAR study expressed the previous thought in this way: "A major use for loss of the best talents in the country is the lack of facilities for

research in the institutions."[30] The same generalizations are applicable to their study on Arab natural scientists, where the conclusion was, . . . the conditions in Arab national universities, such as lack of research facilities.[31]

Another dimension of professional disenchantment is evidenced in the negative characteristics of the academic institutions in developing countries. The structure of intellectual and educational institutions is rigid, tradition-oriented, and compartmentalized, having the effect, as Dr. Frankel puts it, of "frustrating the innovator."[32]

In a 1957 UNESCO study Naeem Rathore reported that Pakistanian students complained that their professional life was subjected to an unreasonable amount of patience and struggle to achieve a position for which they were trained. It was even more difficult to get some of their ideas accepted and put in practice.[33] While Barbara Walton holds that those who study at the graduate level are more prone to be able to put their training into immediate use,[34] others like Grubel point out that the advance training puts the graduate out of the professional home market because he is too advanced.[35] Walton may well be correct if she is speaking of students who left specific jobs to which they will return.

Sengrie Gutevrez-Olivos study in Chile (1966) gave "professional progress" the highest rating as reason for emigration--29 percent; better renumberation, 24 percent; greater recognition of technical and scientific work, 16 percent; and more opportunity to carry out research, 13 percent.[36]

In addition to the "pull" factors which foster immigration there are the commensurate "push" factors which foster emigration. In 1961 a veteran foreign student advisor declared that he believed the reasons for student drain were "based primarily on factors in the home situation," and not on United States standard of living or American proselytizing.[37] Senator Mondale, who has played an active role in seeking legislative solutions to the brain drain problem, declares that, "until the fundamental and neglected problem of manpower utilization is met in the developing countries, there will continue to be a severe brain drain no matter what else we do."[38] In the same vein Paul Pre-bisch reporting to the 1966 conference of Society for International Development, pointed out that the rate of growth in developing countries is insufficient to integrate dynamic elements into the productive processes. Consequently those elements (students or other professionals) become frustrated and this is accentuated by education.[39]

Chilean nurses and Greek scientists returning home provide good examples.[40]

Another humiliating push factor is the case of the student who anticipates the possibility of having to seek "connections" to obtain a position rather than basing his claim to opportunities for hiring and promotion on professional criteria and past achievements.[41] Professionals, on returning home, find they have to "bow and scrape," a demeaning approach through which to re-enter one's own country.

Faced with this hard reality, the superfluous educated man in Lower Developed Countries (LDC) has two options. He can stay home, living and working beneath his potentialities and possibilities at a subprofessional level. Or he can immigrate to an advanced country: notably the United States, and to a new world of opportunity and professional fulfillment. For the discontented educated elite, emigration is an escape hatch to a new and successful life; his discontent provides the necessary "PUSH."

Adaptation

Environmental, cultural and professional satisfaction along with the other ingredients that contribute to the social and professional man play a vital role in his adaptation to new situations or surroundings. Marjorie Klein and A. Alexander conclude that the more

one uncovers the painful facets of the adaptation process most foreign students make in the United States, the more difficult it is to take any position that would lead to the glossing over of foreign students' problems. Perhaps the best progress can be made by shifting the focus from the foreign aspect of the foreign student progress of gaining an education to the human aspect.[42]

Consistent with the results of a series of studies sponsored by the Social Science Research Council, different styles and adaptations were found both among groups with different cultural backgrounds and traditions, and within cultural groups as a function of situational and individual factors.[43] Despite these national, group or individual differences, however, they all seem to conform to the basic adjustment U-curve or W-curve. There is dispute regarding the exact shape of the adjustment curve but there is agreement that students are vulnerable to different stresses at different stages and show phases of attitude change. For example, problems typically shift from homesickness, making social connections, or using language early in the stay, to conflicts about future plans, reconciling changes in one's identity, or resolving intimate relationships established during the stay.[44] Coelho's study traced the development of attitudes in Indian students from an initial attitude of blanket acceptance and enchantment with the United

States through a period of sensitivity and criticism to a more differentiated and informed acceptance after years of exposure.[45] Any assessment of adaptation must consider three phases of adjustment and the shifting pattern of vulnerability.

During the last two decades many researchers have recorded the adjustment process of foreign students in the host cultures (Lysgaard, 1953; Dubois, 1956; Gullahorn and Gullahorn, 1956; Sewell and Davidson, 1961). They all agree on the U-curve experience of the initial feelings of elation and optimism associated with positive expectations regarding interaction with their host country. This thrill gives way to eventual frustration and negative attitudes as role relationships and channels towards their goals become unclear and increasingly difficult. If they are able to resolve these difficulties during the crucial phase of the acculturation process they then achieve a "modus viviendi" enabling them to work effectively and to interact positively with their host. This experience of relation, followed by frustration and eventual understanding with satisfaction forms the U-curve.[46]

The W-curve concept is more complex than the U-curve only as far as it takes the model one dimension beyond adaptation to the host country and back to a reacculturation to his own country.[47]

A student in the involvement phases of adjustment to a foreign culture or of readjustment at home frequently encounters situations of structural imbalance (Heider, 1958)[48] or cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957).[49] He may find the people he had expected to like or to feel at home with actually hold strongly divergent values. Or, he may contemplate the burden he will experience in responding to the expectations of "significant others" in his environment and their manipulation of standards. He may engage in role behavior that is at variance with his values.

No one is necessarily at fault when the W-curve phenomenon is functioning. Yet, in order to reduce his dissonance, while remaining in the cultural context, the student might maximize the negative component in his ambivalent feelings towards others in his environment and withdraw as much as possible from interaction with them. To bolster this decision he may join the "radical liberals."[50]

The United States spends much on exchange programs. Appropriation to the state department budget for educational and cultural programs for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 was $75.1 million.[51] Such an investment seems to be a humane political act by the United States. The United States government is necessarily concerned that the student it sponsors acquires not only a deeper but

also a more appreciative understanding of this country. This is a view most American citizens share. Although Congressional legislation stresses education rather than propaganda as the instrument for achieving this goal, the intent is clear (Dubois, 1950). Education is not equated with propaganda, but it is nevertheless envisaged as, an instrument of foreign policy and national interest.[52]

The counterpoint is governments of nations intent upon social and economic development are not necessarily concerned that the fellowship students they send to the United States acquire any deep appreciation of American life. In fact such appreciation may only serve to create in students disturbing critical attitudes towards their own countries. Foreign governments participating in exchange programs are intent only upon skills that will be relevant to the welfare of their nations.

The programs have been successful in creating mutual understanding in demonstrating American character and achievement, setting up a channel of communication and serving as an important aspect of American foreign policy.[53]

The purpose of this Act (Fulbright-Hays Act) is to enable the government of the United States to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries by means of educational and cultural interests, developments, and

achievements of the people of the United States and other nations, and the contributions being made towards a peaceful and more fruitful life for people throughout the world; to promote international cooperation for educational and cultural advancement; thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic and peaceful relations between the United States and other countries of the world.[54]

A vital part of adaptation is one's personal involvement in the process. The self-esteem that one brings to bear upon this process has unavoidable reflections of his decision of whether or not to emigrate (Dubois Gullihorn, 1963; Klein, 1971). Self-esteem is enhanced where the institution gives the student more control in his academic destiny. Several studies report students who affirm that they developed more self-confidence by studying in American universities. In a student's own words,

> At the University of Oregon I learned to question the professor and to think for myself. In Thailand students are taught to believe whatever the professor says. They do not seek knowledge on their own. They accept whatever is presented.[55]

In Johnson's studies with several Asian students "self-reliance in the search for knowledge is a trait they felt they had acquired at the University of Oregon." It was mentioned frequently as the most useful skill they had learned. John and Ruth Useem's study of returning

Indian students found a typical statement among the people they interviewed: "I feel much more certain of myself. It [studying abroad] made me an independent person about my own activities and judgment. . . . It took away my inferiority complex--being afraid of persons above . . . my whole outlook has changed; I know what I could do and could not do."[56]

The review on adaptations leads to the following conclusions:

1. Adaptation of the foreign student cannot be predicted or adequately evaluated without considering the frame of reference provided by his specific culture and his response to that culture in relationship to the demands of adjustment in the host country.

2. The situations with which a student has to contend have a powerful influence on the student's adaptation in any host country. The rate at which this affects the student drain for example is closely related to the type of classroom experiences they had, their interaction with citizens of the host country and how they relate to the U-curve experiences.

3. The concept of self-esteem is especially crucial in understanding the essential determinants of

adaptation. Self-esteem often depends on the type of recognition given by the significant members of the community.

4. Understanding the U-curve and the W-curve demands longitudinal studies of a systematic nature if their relevance to adaptation is going to be understood. Changes and shifts in attitude that affect the process of adaptation are well documented.[57]

5. The final schema that lends itself to adaptation is the pre-departure sets that have been developed through demographic experiences in the home country. Students from rigid caste societies or significantly culturally different societies will not adapt as easily to the American society under normal conditions. The converse is true, people from countries with similar political, social and cultural systems will integrate much more easily.

Relevance of Professional Skills

Labelling the foreign student who drains as a "loss" to the native country may savor only parochial nationalism.[58] Here the appropriate premise seems to be more in whether the countries from which these students originated can utilize their training. A returning

student may prove a great "loss" if he does not utilize his training on returning home. He may contribute less to the country than the nonreturnee who sends regular remittances home or provides a link of communication between home and larger professional communities with which his country has little practical acquaintance. Admittedly there may be difficulty in defining "utilization." To the extent that the skill is appropriate for home, the student becomes a loss if he does not somehow communicate as a channel between two otherwise elusive societies.

If this first thought is considered in relation to Bozeman's view of the purpose of American homage to exchange education then the possibility of a national loss to the developing country looms greater. Persuaded of the superior worth of their model of society[59] and convinced that what has happened here could, and if at all possible should, be made to happen in every other country of the world, Americans are today naturally proponents of global and regional unifying schemes.[60] Behind the proposition for unification is a denial of inherent cultural differences and allegiance to the history of the past. What matters most, they would argue from their perspective, is certainly the future. And the future, as most would propose, can be shaped into desired forms through social and economic norms.[61]

Expressing a thought along the same line, though for different reasons, the Prime Minister of Jamaica, Honorable Michael Manley in a New York television interview, postulates Bozeman's change:

> I think that as long as you live in a world that is at least partially dominated by concepts of acquisitiveness, permissiveness, that sees society as some big sort of thing that is supposed to happen by accident . . . more and more you have got to see the world in terms of deliberate social engineering, of security for babies, the day-care centers, the management of economy that guarantees employment to everybody . . . guarantees reasonable distribution of wealth so that you don't have provocative extremities of wealth and poverty. And I think you have just got to engineer the world.[62]

The plague of this American assumption is that the United States, or Canada for that matter, becomes the "moda saparende" of what is social and economic development to developing nations within reach of their influences. This very factor could act as a "push factor" since the student may see himself as only a robot expected to reproduce the American society. The very reason for which he was sent away is defeated and his creative genius redirected.

While the inapplicability of skills learned in the foreign institutions is emphasized, it is also true that another aspect of the problem could go unnoticed. As Barbara Walton points out so admirably--adaptability and re-adjustment in job performance may not be so much due to limitations in the actual programs, of students, as to the complex nature of the development process.

While trained personnel are essential to economic growth at a certain stage of national development, many other factors are equally essential and too often absent in the situation which faces the foreign student who returns.[63]

As a consequence of parochial changes both in the home and host country and of unpredictable situations encountered by the returning student, the current theme in the training of foreign students is that of changing the curriculum.[64] John and Ruth Useem report the tragedy in India where less than 10 percent of the foreign educated students work in jobs for which they were trained as specialists.[65] Susskind and Shell undertaking a study in 1967 reported that 31 percent of the students from developing countries who held an American M.A. degree considered American education too theoretical.[66]

Some suggest that what is needed is a two-track system of education, one for Americans and another for foreign students. Equally regrettable, however, is the attitude of those who overlook needed changes and innovations in the curriculum which would be beneficial simultaneously to American and foreign students alike. One seems to feel an assertion against American parochialism to which Clifton Wharton made reference in his study of Asian agriculture students who returned home.[67]

Perhaps the classic study of professional training of foreign students is that made by Clifton R. Wharton Jr.

(1959) notable for its careful focus and marshalling of information.[68] It concentrated on a single disciplinary specialty, agricultural economics, while limiting itself to the professional problems experienced by foreign students, omitting their general adjustment problems. The study, based on surveys in the United States and Asia, of students, alumni, professors and American economists working abroad represents the most intensive analysis available of important substantive problems in the education of foreign students.

Wharton emphasizes applicability of what students learn in their host country to their home country and the need for special courses. He also pointed out a major short-coming of American professional education for foreign students which has been taken up by many other educators and professionals, "American agriculture is not world agriculture."[69] In fact, he concluded that it is quite parochial in some respects, and techniques used in the United States may not be at all appropriate in Asia.

Harari puts it more eloquently by stating that we should perhaps substitute the word "quality" for "relevant" in discussing the curriculum. If by "quality curriculum" offerings and methodology representing a universal approach to knowledge and experience is meant, then it is regretfully clear that the United States

curriculum can stand a great deal of attention--perhaps the word, overhauling, would serve the intent more appropriately.

> The internationalization of the curriculum is a mission to which we need to dedicate ourselves more genuinely, not on the flimsy basis that we are training foreign students but rather because such a quality curriculum is absolutely essential to students of all nationalities who have to cope with the realities of an independent world.[70]

Quality and irrelevance may often wear the same "curriculum garb." As the Susskind and Shell study pointed out, the more specialized the student's field, the more likely he was to remain in the United States. In their study of Berkeley engineering graduates they discovered 20 percent with Masters degrees and 62 percent with doctoral degrees were still in the United States. In response to inquiries on this trend, a dean at Stanford commented that in fields such as aeronautics, and chemical, civil and mechanical engineering, all those who earned Ph.D.'s in any given year were likely to remain in the United States.

Clearly this is a case of the overtrained. The individual's skill is developed beyond the technical development of his nation and beyond the point where he can even be accommodated professionally. In such cases the problem is not in the United States or its institutions.[71]

Nurses in the medical profession felt that United States study had little professional value. Broadhurst's five years research project discovered that re-adjustment for these nurses, on returning home, was difficult. One-third re-emigrated. In a team study undertaken jointly by New York University and the Institute of International Education, it was discovered that 15-25 percent of the foreign students were described as poor by their supervisors; 40 percent expressed the intent to secure American citizenship. Reports by Halberstam and Dacso[72] 1962, 1964, 1965 and by Marsh and Halberstam[73] 1966, focused on culture and personality factors affecting the adequacy of the training (curriculum) received by foreign physicians.[74]

Other than being over-specialized, culturally transformed and socially maladjusted there is the problem of "otherwise skilled." The latter refers to the student who changes his intention as he becomes more aware of the sophisticated offerings available to him in the host society. For example, the student who left his home country to study fiscal policies but changed to welfare economics may be regarded as a failure back home, so instead of facing the shame, he refuses to return as a welfare economist. Economists are highly regarded, but the fact that he transferred to economics reflects failure--at least so it is thought.[75]

In the latter case, where societal sophistication changes or modifies primitive drives or motivations, the curriculum is involved. However, in this case it is not the fault of the host country but rather how the nationals have to interact with and react to their social environment. Margaret Mead's statement is relevant in closing this review on this factor of curriculum. "The need now is to move away to new knowledge and skills, to a new place in a new social order. Education is now not for the maintenance of the old but for change."[76]

Government Policies and Politics

Surindar Suri, an Indian specialist in German history, said:

> It is the disillusionment with my peers in India that made me an intellectual refugee. . . . It is the faith in the fairness of my peers and superiors which has developed in me a sense of loyalty to the German academic institutions and to the American academic institutions, because here I can work with a sense of integrity. . . . I intend to stay in and continue to teach in Germany, the U.S.A. or Canada or Britain or some other western country, or Australia or New Zealand.

Suri's case is presented by Dondekar's case study of Indian brain drain. In assessing the case the author specifies some particular issues which have relevance to student drain as it is affected by government policies and politics of any country.[77]

Among the issues named are the alleged absence of academic freedom; the "lack" of British training of

Indians who were trained elsewhere; internal politics between "seniors" and "juniors" in working situations; and finally the "mob" of intellectuals who bow to every power there is to gain financial favor or power.[78] Coupled with these issues in any consideration of the movement of skilled manpower must be the discussion which assumes that any restrictions placed on freedom of movement is an infringement on an individual's rights--this is the academic argument. Policy makers, pressured by specific problems, tend to assume that immediate and sometimes drastic action must be taken to regulate apparent inequities associated with migration. In this way they often confuse the effects of migration with the effects of disadvantages which migration reduces but does not eliminate.[79]

Something that policy makers cannot overlook is that foreign educated students have played a most important role in stimulating changes, especially of a technological nature, but also changes in social mores. Historians document the fact that social innovations have more often been introduced from abroad.[80] Bennett and his colleagues found out that this influence became more pronounced depending on what the host country relationship with the particular home country was at any particular period.[81]

For these social changes to take place, attitudes of tact and a willingness to "make haste slowly" are often required to make new ideas acceptable.[82] "Although he was the favoured son of the founder of the hospital he found that a slow pace and subtlety produced better results than haste and impetuousness"[83] (Bennett et al., 1958). Naficy in his report on Iran echoes this same sentiment that personal attitudes of the western trained graduate are all-important for his success as a returnee.[84]

At the International Migration Conference in 1966, the point was made that primitive evidence indicates that a student who stays in a foreign country more readily becomes detribalized and desocialized from his country of origin.[85] It would not be doing ignominy to the context to replace "detribalized" with "depoliticized."

There are, however, the more drastic political implications. Some students are deterred by political persecution or the prospect of it.[86] The case of Lovemore Nyoni of Rhodesia is a typical example of a student searching for immigration privileges to avoid the prospect of political persecution which he anticipated on returning to Rhodesia. The State News ran several articles on Nyoni in May of 1975. They reported his legal struggle to obtain United States residency because of the fear of political prejudice.[87] Sari's case in India also had overtones of political interference.

> Soon after my arrival in India, I took up work as director of research of a small information center in New Delhi and made plans and suggestions for research to be carried out in Indian politics, Indian education, and Indian social structure. The first item of research taken up was political, the rule of the Communist Party in Karala. . . . I met a well wisher soon after. He said, "Well whom are you going to support? Neru or the Communist Party or the Americans?"[88]

This apparent political prejudice that inhibits scholarship for the mere sake of scholarship affects the decisions of students to return home. This not only affects social scientists but also natural scientists, engineers and physicians.

Of course, as Dandekar pointed out, Sari's case was affected by two factors--(1) the length of time he had been away from home and (2) the sensitivity of politics. In the above cases politics generally "pushed" students away from home base.

On the other hand, it may have a "pulling" power. The Useems report the Indian concept of British and American political power after students have studied in these countries. They seem to develop a perception in which the people and the politics are separated and the power of politics rejected while the people are held in high esteem. The result is that such politically conscious students would desire to return home. They see American and British domestic policy as democratic in domestic affairs but autocratic in international affairs.[89]

Despite the great degree of political freedom which Dandekar attributes to Indians educational structure and operation, not without some credibility, there are those who think life in India is a muzzled existence. Margaret Cormack, 1969, reported the exclamation of an Indian student, "I can't go back to India, because here I am a free man." Just about every foreign student has used that statement to express different sentiments of what freedom is[90] but not without some significant meaning to his personal life.[c]

Political policies carried out overtly by government as in the case of Nyoni of Rhodesia or covertly like in Sari's case in India affect not only those immediately involved but every other person who sees himself in a similar station academically or politically. If, like Cormack's Indian student, he sees himself in a free political environment it is most probable that he will seek to remain free.

In recent years Jamaica has embarked on a program of democratic socialism.[91] While many Jamaicans embrace the concept, even more are apprehensive about the outcome. Students in particular are often quoted as saying, "I would like to be away for a few years to see the direction it is taking." In an address in New York, 1974, Senator

---

[c]This refers to the period prior to the more recent declaration of a state of emergency by Prime Minister Indira Ghandi.

Dudley Thompson spoke on the "Government's Policy for National Development Through Democratic Socialism." The questions that followed showed a great interest in the new policy though accompanied by some apprehension.[92]

An important consideration to be examined is the fact that internationally the United States has been criticized for wooing foreign professionals to its labour market. Yet the United States affirms it is doing all within its power, short of drastic legislation, to alleviate the problem.[93] It is incumbent on critical consideration that the international implications on foreign student decision be considered before heaping the blame in any one place. Awasthi emphasizes this factor as he points to the historical reflection of how welcomed this movement was both socially and politically to developing countries.[94]

The most appropriate ending to a review of the literature on factor--government policies and politics--is the following excerpt from the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

> Oppression, instability and unrest, governmental indifference to scientific development, and erosion of loyalties among nationals are political elements that push professional manpower into migration. Science and technology can flourish within totalitarian systems, but seem most ideally to flourish in a free environment unhindered and unimpeded where freedom of thought and inquiry, so necessary to the pursuit of the scientific method, are given full reign. Failure to achieve this ideal often pushes scientists and other professionals into migration.

> Others suffering direct political persecution seek the same way out (those who are out--students--usually stay out), for political tyranny and politically inspired ante-intellectualism can destroy the scientific spirit.[95]

Classic cases of men who have suffered for their beliefs would currently include, the thousands who fled Cuba and Czechoslovakia in the sixties and personalities like Einstein and Solzhenitsyn. Indeed politics has historic precedence affecting peoples' decision whether or not to emigrate.

Sense of National Responsibility

One of the most serious criticisms leveled against the United States in regard to the student exchange program is the inducement of trained students by large salaries and the vast investment that is accordingly lost in student drain. In Grubel's study of this topic he sees the student as a servant to the world rather than to a parochial community. He questions the survival of any country that depends on the nationalistic model and presents his credible alternative in the internationalistic model. He points out that this consideration is particularly important to developing countries whose defense needs depend on more developed countries. He postulates that the most healthy goal for these countries would be their citizens welfare, and emigration of skilled manpower is one major way of achieving this end.[96]

There are certain unavoidable responsibilities of the foreign student. First, he is indebted to the home country for the education he received there. Girling gives a detailed summation of what that cost means to the developing nation. The finance and manpower energy exerted to mobilize an individual into college is phenomenal in any nation and moreso in developing nations with little natural resources.[97] Second, development of a cadre of youth leaders. The literature frequently refers to foreign students as "potential leaders" or "future leaders" of their home countries. As Walton puts it this could mean one of three things: " . . . that they will assume leadership roles in the political life of their countries, that they will be leaders in professional and technical fields, or that they will lead in bringing about social change and social reforms."[98]

Foreign students tend to be leaders or potential leaders because they belong to an elite group of college educated people. Third, maybe less visible, is the model for potential inspiration to other youth and relatives in general.

Juxtaposed alongside those national responsibilities is the basic responsibility as a citizen of the world. "The world is my parish" is more than a preacher's contemplation of his task; it has become the intellectual resolve of many professionals. It is conceivably included

in Johnson's Internationalist model. Speaking with similar sentiments Howland says that many of those whom we consider today as part of the brain drain will return home one day--perhaps at key points in the country's history--to help their nations go forward. One government official, when asked her views about the loss of Philippine medical professionals replied "We should accept a global view. America is our ally; we must do our part, to keep her healthy."[99] Howland's proposed benefits to the developing country has been substantially challenged by Oscar Gish in a sequence reply to Howland's essay. Gish points out that poverty, disease, and ignorance in the Philippines or elsewhere cannot be helped by the immigration of the most skilled people in the country. He charges that while the drain today may be the gain tomorrow, today's brain drain is being paid for by the poor people of the poor countries. Even the wealthy in the poor countries do not feel the pangs of the poor, who are the perennial losers.[100] Gish finds eloquent companionship in Shearer who censures Professor Grubel for shifting the traditional concept that any type of skilled manpower migration from a developing country is "bad." In this discussion Shearer takes the reader back to the national responsibilities denied or overlooked by both Grubel and Howland.

Contrary to Grubel, Shearer points out the value of nationalism. He asserts that nationalism could not be relegated to mere "military and economic power" in the light of the urgency given to nation-building by academicians and governments, as a necessary condition prior to political, social and economic progress. The international model as presented by Grubel proposes that nonreturn of students does not penalize the home country because they were not producers there. The more important fact is, however disguised, that the home country loses the potential contribution to production of students who do not return home. It is this prospect of future productivity which justifies the investment by home and host countries in developing students' abilities. As many as 43 percent of foreign students in the United States in 1965 were graduate students, most of whom gained undergraduate training at home.[101] There is therefore a national financial debt to be paid.

Professional responsibility cannot be argued away under the rubric of contribution made to the welfare of the state without benefits for one's own maintenance. While a veterinarian sends some of his earnings, Uraguayan cattle die untreated because of his expatriation. The logistics of his sending as much as he caused to be lost is minimal.[102]

Failure of the educational systems in many developing countries to develop qualified teachers in science and the technical arts compounds the large institutional problem. A further deficiency is that graduate training, so vital to the development of a national scientific infra-structure has not been adequately developed. The extent to which these needs go unheeded is the extent to which graduates or trained personnel have neglected to return home or have been forced by national conditions not to do so.

There is an increasingly disproportionate number of students from Less Developed Countries (LDC) who work on basic as opposed to applied problems. The applied issues are neglected causes, wasteful gaps in scientific knowledge which may make basic work premature and even inapplicable. The absence of lower level lacunae in knowledge makes the scientist's attractions unrealistic. Moreover, the scientist, preoccupied with making a contribution to his discipline, may easily forget his moral responsibility to contribute to the solution of the contemporary problems of his homeland.[103]

There is therefore a moral responsibility that students should discharge and when they have neglected it they should be encouraged to go back to it. Over and above one's moral obligation to his country, however, is that which he owes to himself. When the decision to

re-settle at home has to be made the "push factors" at home so heavily outweigh "pull factors" that it has to be a sacrifice.

Communication

A student who migrates from a developing country, whether from its rural interiors or its metropolitan areas, is faced with a phenomenal adjustment demand in order to survive in the more sophisticated developed nations, like Canada or the United States. From the moment of arrival, the acculturative process begins.

Any survey of the last 500 years would reveal a West whose life style has been decisively shaped by classical Greek and Roman models and these were most exquisitely expressed in the age of the Renaissance. The Renaissance expression became the catalyst in intercultural relations--communication between the peoples of the world. In fact it was the inventive genius of Europeans which has made global communications between distinct human groupings possible by supplying first the requisite conceptual, technical, and political schemes without which "communication" would have been an idle word.

From constant motifs they have particularized this connection between nations. First the Europeans have been infinitely curious about the other lands. Herodotus, in his appreciation of the difference between

neighboring Asia and North Africa and his native Europe points to this curiosity which has fostered intellectual and developmental communication. There is also a strong desire to identify with the novel and bliss and the peculiar advanced techniques of the more developed country. This type of communication was not always accepted as profitable, however, it was often referred to as one "downgrader of the native land."[104] Regardless of the view held in the Renaissance, there was a phenomenal movement of scholars towards new centers of learning and the case is no different today.

About twenty years ago the battery-powered transistor came to Jamaican villages and towns and changed the national outlook permanently. Ten years later the television and jet airline services placed international communication within the reach of millions. In 1967 Neil Armstrong took a "giant step for mankind" on the moon. Communication has "tobboggoned" into human lives with such speed that it is still not fully comprehended in systems and functions. The acceleration cannot be stopped and it is difficult for governments to master an international system--despite the computers. Yet it must be taken into account, "its consequences estimated, its ill effects mitigated and its useful potential reenforced. The flood that cannot be controlled can be channelled."[105] It is the tremendous expectations that

students have because of their awareness of communication possibilities and the evident lack of this communication between themselves and developing countries that will constitute this section of the review.

Students abroad are interested in communication from family, friends, government and private enterprises but the focal point of their interest is on job possibilities. Nearly all the literature covered referred to job opportunity as a leading motivator to return home. Klock and Ahmad say that such facts as traditional values or nature of general adjustment do not predict return. They contend that although returning students mention emotional ties and family responsibilities as important factors, it is clear that these motives are secondary to occupational security. Returning home may satisfy personal and emotional needs, but it is determined by professional contingencies. One important impact of this result is that it suggests that steps taken to assure students' professional security will be more effective in reducing "brain drain" than any attempt on the part of Americans or home officials to evoke patriotism or a sense of cultural community.[106]

Those who have job guarantees in their country tend to return home. This is true even though the salary may be lower than United States salary. In fact, Myers points out that this is due to the probability of rapidly

increasing monetary rewards at home by rising to the top. In part, it is a natural desire to return to family. Therefore, job guarantee is probably more important than a specific salary in inducing return.[107]

When lack of communication on job security is combined with the student's awareness of unemployment and underemployment back home the need to communicate specific job opportunities becomes clear. In a survey of six towns in Columbia, the rate of employment among professionals ranged between 1.1 and 5.7 percent, and the national average for professional unemployment in that country was 4 percent.

Dallot reports Britain and Italy as fostering a policy, developed to maintain contact with those who had left, keeping them grouped around their consuls, teachers and priests, helping them to maintain their national consciousness. This was especially the case with regards to Italian emigrants to France, and the emigration Department of Italian Foreign Ministry which became Department for Citizens Living Abroad. Unless such contact is maintained alienation from home will most probably result.

Alienation is a direct function of age, length of absence from home, and the nature of the student's "stake" in his homeland. The younger the student, the longer his stay abroad, the greater the risk of alienation. Age and

long stay may easily be offset by the third point, "nature of the student's stake in the homeland." "Alienation is less likely to occur if the individual's career development possibilities at home are clear and promises upward mobility."[108] Sharma's study on Indian students found 22 percent of the 64 percent who intended to return had been drawn by what they considered "attachment to the way of life" and 19.1 percent considered "family and friends back home" as the important factor for returning. The researcher made distinction between the above mentioned emotional reasons and the more rational situational reasons given by those who did not plan to return. Emotional reasons can be easily minimized by the experience of a "good time." Americans care for foreign students; they try to see that the students adjust to American society and institutions.[109]

The literature on this factor makes the overwhelming point that there is a tremendous need for private and public communication about job opportunities. Where job possibilities, with its concomitant advantages have been clearly spelt out there have generally been professionals willing to return home. In the same vein when information has been absent or unspecific there has been reluctance to return.

Alternative Life Style

In his essay, "Why Did Daedalus Leave?" Dedijer concludes that with all the evidence considered, it was safe to hazard a guess that higher salaries, higher standard of living abroad and purely political reasons--except in extreme cases--do not play as decisive a role in emigration as some decision makers are inclined to think.[110] An analysis of exchange students remaining in the United States compared with those returning home indicates that those in the lower and lower middle classes are more prone to emigrate.[111] David McClelland reported the psychological need for achievement as an important factor in emigration. In a study of British scientists, he discovered that they wanted more than good jobs and opportunity for advancement. They wanted the challenge of competition with other highly competent persons in their fields and did not mind being a small fish in a big pond.[112] This acceptance of minor recognition for professional involvement with other people is dramatically different from the positions these people would hold in a developing country. In a series of studies conducted under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council, the culture shock theory was generated by social scientists. Foreign students suffered from severe "culture shock." Deeply ingrained habits associated with the simplest aspects of daily life had to be modified or abandoned and new ones acquired.

The foreign student's survival demands that he learns and internalizes behaviors that will facilitate his adjustment, within a few months.[113] This immersion into a more technologically sophisticated way of life becomes a bargaining factor in a later decision as to whether or not to emigrate. It is at this point that one moves from the U-curve concept as the student anticipates the W-curve experience.[114]

Another factor that affects life styles and consequently emigration is the trend toward urbanization. Invariably, intellectuals concentrate in cities. Cities provide centers of intellectual intercourse, opportunity and wealth. Educational and cultural institutions, hospitals, seats of government, major industries, and places of entertainment are generally within easy access in urban areas. "Life is more comfortable in the cities than in rural areas."[115] The same generalizations made above about urban and rural areas are true of both developed and "underdeveloped" countries.

The nature of traditional societies in developing countries work at cross-purposes with the spirit of the scientific technological age and accordingly creates conditions that generate "brain drain." Institutions, like society itself, rigidly structured and closed to innovation, become both the perpetuator and protector of socially archaic and outmoded values. "The higher an

individual moves in the technical and professional scale, the greater his mobility and the less the differences which are attributable to national culture."[116] He is no more the patriotic parochial champion of traditional values but takes on a more universal image.

The total immersion of the immigrant professional in the environment of the advanced western country hastens the process of acculturation. Students from LDC's fall under the dual influence of the total society as well as the academic curriculum.[117] Most vulnerable to the forces of acculturation are those who remain overseas longest;[118] those who date and/or live with Americans; and those who remain one or more years after completion of the course of study.[119] As Professor Kindleberger puts it, "They become uprooted 'detribalized by the experience of foreign study.'"[120]

Despite its tremendous limitations, American social democracy has a special appeal for the discontented professional in developing countries. The American social order offers the professional such important values as freedom of social choice and prospects for social mobility. Contrary to the traditional modes of existence in developing societies, the developed societies foster a national tradition of pragmatism and experimentalism. One British scientist said, "Probably one is more free in this country (North America) than one is in Europe, and it is the

essential freedom that is so attractive about this country." Making the same observation a German scientist said, "In this country there are fewer restrictions. . . . I find more possibilities of creating my style of life, and not being narrowed down."[121]

North America provides a wide latitude for upward social mobility based on merit and success. Responsibilities are given to the young and rewards are quick. Careers advance foster, initiative is welcomed, age and seniority are not prime factors. In developing countries where patriarchal tradition is strong, a premium is put on age. Traditional, generational conflicts can be further exacerbated by student training abroad which feeds rebellion against conformity to less excellent standards at home.[122]

Of even greater significance in one's life is the state of marriage and the style of the person to whom one is devoted. The incidence of marriages of Americans to foreign students, scholars, and other professionals reflects another aspect of American egalitarianism. Marriage between, for example, some traditionalist-oriented Middle Eastern men and American girls can make it impossible for them to return home and re-enter their traditionalist societies.[123] Even in the Western sphere of affluence (for example, English professionals) marriage to Americans poses both a professional and social hazard.

According

to Nor

it pex

"Brain

less

This

have

a hea

"hope

some

refus

Iranil

recuz

The s

towe

and a

ticle

the

appe

fere

the

of e

the

they

According to a study of the correlation between marriage to North Americans and brain drain to North America, 92 percent of British scientists with American wives "drained."[124]

North Americans accept student failure with far less serious social stigma than most other countries. This stigma has encouraged nonreturn among students who have failed their studies. The foreign student carries a heavy burden, not only in his studies but also in the "hopes of his university, family and government." In some societies failure is so disgraceful that the student refuses to return. According to Naficy, 90 percent of Iranian student failures will seek to "drain" rather than return home. Returning home means "loss of face."[125] The story of the Chinese student who lived in the church tower near the Michigan University campus for one year and a half gives credence to the social castigation orientals anticipate if they fail.

In summation of the factor, Alternative Life Style, the words of one Middle Easterner best epitomizes the appeal to North American life, "Listen, this is a different world, with different concepts."[126] Exposed to the social dynamics of American urban life and the spirit of egalitarianism, emigrant professionals are induced, in the words of a Korean Ph.D. candidate, "to reconsider their own philosophy of life."[127]

n the

tion i

ntry o

ne's m

mmigra

country

peculia

studen

knowled

perceiv

It wa

satisf

availa

Schola

taps a

Interc

and i

if li

the "

today

Satisf

As Abaul Said, a Saudi Arabian graduate student at the University of Kansas, observed: In a social situation in which the "individual's needs are gaining priority over the feelings of sacrifice and commitment to one's nation," the transition is easy from emigrant to immigrant.[128]

Desire for Adventure

As the goals of the United States and the native country, in supporting the foreign students program, are peculiar to each country so are the motives that prompt students to travel. Each student goes in search of knowledge or experience peculiar to his own needs or his perceived needs of the country.

Scholars have been wondering ever since men began to wander. No student, in mind and imagination, has been satisfied with the imperfect and incomplete knowledge available to him in his little kingdom or nation. Scholarship still needs the discipline of the cell--caps and gowns typifies the monks--but it also needs the interdiscipline, international atmosphere of disputing and interacting minds and the illumination of other ways of life and love.[129] The "threadbare scholars" then are the "foreign students" now. The foreign students of today represent the "threadbare scholars" of the past.

Some foreign students go abroad merely for the satisfaction of curiosity. DuBois attributes this

[illegible]

and al[illegible]

have g[illegible]

in his[illegible]

"If we[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

accor[illegible]

. . .

is an[illegible]

world[illegible]

Abroa[illegible]

[illegible]

High[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

"Qua[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

curiosity to their awe of American leadership of democracy and alludes to the fact that they would just as easily have gone to Russia if they had the chance.[130] Dollot in his "Race and Human Migrations" puts it this way: "If we view the whole history of the settlement of new countries, side by side with a regular influx of immigrants coming to cultivate the land of the colonies according to their needs, masses of adventurers arrive. . . ."[131]

Among the factors that stimulate these adventurers is an interest in other people and other parts of the world. In listing reasons for which students travel abroad, Groves includes "his search of the new and unusual for realistic answers to his country's problems."[132] High level migrants differ from other migrants in that they tend to move more frequently, for longer distances and over greater periods of their lives. However, there is substantial difference even among high level migrants. The "quality" of the professional often affects his style of movement.[133]

Another aspect of student emigration incorporated into the desire for adventure is the relative social and professional value of the individual who studies at home versus the one who goes abroad. From Useems' and Dandakar's studies in India, and Howland's study of the Philippines' case, it is impossible to equalize the value of

foreign to home study in the minds of those who see the foreign student as the one who gets first chance at job opportunities. To that native educated student, foreign study becomes a model of success with which he has to contend in vying for a job. Indeed he may see it as such a threat that Myers "Migration Paradigm" becomes a reality where as many natively educated people leave the country, as those who studied abroad and never return. In some cases a higher percentage of the former leave when compared with students who study abroad and adopt their host country as home. Below is a reproduction of Myers paradigm (p. 63) in which he examines several hypothetical numerical examples.

	Home	Abroad
Home	1 50	2 5
Abroad	3 40	4 5

	Home	Abroad
Home	1 70	2 20
Abroad	3 5	4 5

	Home	Abroad
Home	1 85	2 5
Abroad	3 5	4 5

Migration Paradigm

The systematic prejudice to foreign trained personnel could well account for the results of a study done on two Jamaican institutions of higher education--University of the West Indies and the College of Arts, Science, and Technology. In this study it was discovered that 47.7 percent of the students planned to study and

wck a

lso r

n suc

ncell

fredi

hght

ferenc

mpra

n Car

thers

Canada

nuden

f iss

he fa

he th

ast e

ecmon

ot ye

f lon

Claus

rue,

Retiat

Reple

s the

Rd in

work abroad at least for a short while. The same study also revealed that these students with the highest desire to succeed while having to compete with some standard of excellence were significantly prone to want to include foreign travel and work in their plans for the future. Right across the board, there was no significant difference in the type of occupations and the desire to emigrate. The bauxite industry pays the highest salaries in Jamaica today and when students were asked to advise others about a well-paying bauxite job and emigration to Canada, the more highly achievement-oriented ones advised students to emigrate to Canada.[134]

It is regrettable that Jamaica might lose so many of its people through emigration. Even more alarming is the fact that national losses will be in those people who are the most "achievement-oriented" and presumably the most enterprising. Although the causation factor between economic growth and high potential for achievement are not yet fully established, no country can afford the risk of losing its ambitious and potentially productive citizens.

One reason forwarded for this is the national claustrophobia--Jamaica is just too small. If this is true, the immutability of Jamaica's smallness will perpetuate the established emigration tradition of young people who wish to free themselves from what they see as the island's social constraints and seek anonymity and independence elsewhere.[135]

Attitude Toward the Future

Conceivably, all the factors mentioned in this study bear some reference to the future of the student. Therefore this factor as used means--the individual's attitude toward his professional, educational and social life, as he sees them at the point at which he made his decision.

In describing the youth of the developing Caribbean, Ursula M. Von Eckardt uses the following adjectives: optimistic, sober, realistic, and intensely practical. What they want from life is a "chance" to make it. R. Fernandez Marina, in "The Sober Generation" issues the same sentiments: "They are committed to their careers, their families and their immediate communities, seeking no happiness beyond the tranquility of rational and realistic expectations." Further description was given that solidifies the descriptions of Eckardt and Marina. One journalist describes the Caribbean youth as cautious, prudent, responsible, overly moral, and quite staid. They are willing to work hard and see this work rewarded through security and comfort. What they need most of all to realize their goals is a "chance." It is the attitude to this "chance" that affects the decision students make toward their future. Their decision will hinge therefore on the avenue that provides the greatest "chance."

This chance changes with people at different professional levels. For example, undergraduates as a rule are more apt to return to their native countries promptly and usually have a higher motivation to do so. They are more optimistic about job opportunities and have greater respect for their newly acquired knowledge. At the graduate level, job offers are fewer and consequently students at the doctoral level are more apt to drain.[136] There is a psychological difference in realization in both types of people. As one Ph.D. candidate said, "I left Jamaica as an unthinking person . . . now I am back and working on my thesis I am a thinking person." The optimism of the undergraduate may be very realistic but as he advances professionally fears for the future at home begin to annoy him. At such a point he takes his chances where they are most evidently beneficial to his future.

As is mentioned elsewhere in this chapter it is not only the level of advanced work achieved that changes the perspective but other factors, such as length of stay.

A final note on "attitude towards profession and the future" has direct bearing on whether each student sees himself as a member of the nationalistic model or the international model. At one stage of development competition for top positions becomes world-wide. The individual whose aspirations are confined to the

nationalist model will not be affected but his counterpart who has international ambition will naturally not be limited to thinking only of the less developed country in which he lives. A young Italian student attended the Pittsburg meeting of AEA as a visitor and received two unsolicited job offers. He debated the wisdom of returning to Italy and the ease with which a United States job could be had.[137]

In less developed countries it is sometimes possible for a person without a patron to get "on the tracks" if he has been successful abroad; moreso if he has support from patrons who have been successful abroad.[138] There is therefore tremendous advantage professionally and socially, if not also economically, to do some work abroad before returning to one's developing country.

Fear for his educational, professional and social future may affect the attitude of a student in considering emigration. Such fears may be a crystallization of political crises, military coups, university crises, racial, religious, ideological or political persecutions, the loss of a war or a foreign invasion.[139] In these extreme circumstances it is difficult and maybe inaccurate to call the increment of emigration "brain drain." Such decisions are not taken on rationally economic grounds but are born of circumstance. Indeed these cases could be considered accidents.[140]

In a study undertaken by the Economic Commission for Africans, with the assistance of UNESCO,[141] it was found that African students in some disciplines took nine to ten years in completing studies which in western European countries require at most five to six years. In some even more abnormal cases some students have spent fifteen years or more in obtaining academic and professional qualifications. During this time most of them have to work substantially to augment their funds and through such interaction they take root in the foreign land.[142] This eventually leads to social exchange which becomes exceptionally meaningful to the foreign student.

The result of such social involvement will necessarily limit one's need for correspondence with friends back home and he will eventually lose contact. At the point when one's course of study is completed and the decision to return home is contemplated, this social shift in acquaintances and the acculturation to the foreign society will affect the preferential differential. The individual will be faced with both professional and social uncertainties and make a decision within the frame of his perception of the factors involved.

Background Influences

Although no one would question the importance of background influences in the decision a student makes to return home or remain abroad, there is very little in the

available literature supportive of this factor. Indeed it may well be argued that background is intricately woven throughout each other factor. It is the intention here, however, to call attention to a few particular aspects of the background influences that could easily go unnoticed although referred to in the exposition of other factors.

Recent studies show the importance of looking beneath the superficial indices of academic background to understand the social, economic, religious and professional attitudes of students who stay abroad.

Vera Rubin and Morisa Zavalloni's study of the youth of one Caribbean nation gives tremendous insight into the factors that drive the youth first to seek an education and secondly, a profession.[143] The title of their study is "We Wish To Be Looked Upon: A Study of the Aspirations of Youth in a Developing Society." The title is a derivative from a typical student essay that contained the most frequently expressed yearning of the young people of Trinidad.

According to the study, Negroes, East Indians, Colored and Whites valued a fair chance to fulfill their aspirations for, in order of importance, respectability, economic security and comfort, and power in their local community. Any system, political, educational or mystic, that could provide these received their favor.

Independence was welcomed throughout the Caribbean as a vehicle of social justice and the justice as a vehicle for economic development and prestige. It is not very clear which of these two factors holds precedence since they are usually colleagues.

However, in Rubin's study, subjects cited security and respectability as the essence of their goal orientation. Conceivably these could as easily mean economic as well as other abstract types of security. However, when this is put together with their aforementioned ordered list where respectability held pre-eminence over economic security and comfort, it is impossible to miss the fact that their focal point is not economic, but personal prestige and self-worth.

Another study carried out on Jamaican university and college students showed that most of the students from upper middle class to upper class wanted to study abroad and then return home. Those of lower middle and lower classes felt their Jamaican education was enough. However, those in the latter group who wanted to get out of the country had a higher percentage not desiring to return.

In this picture there are two salient points, one of hopelessness and the other of desperation. Hopelessness as reflected in the lack of expectation that they will get beyond their shores scholastically and desperation

in the fact that once they get out they will never return. This behavior is very typical of that proposed by Robert Myers[144] for the marginal type students in the societal life. These are social, and economic marginals whose intellect becomes marginal because of their own limited expectations.

Rubin's study alludes to the fear that haunts these youth in their search for personal and survival goals. "All my hopes, expectations, plans, aspirations depend on the successful outcome of this examination, but still if by some misfortune of fate, I happen to fail this exam . . . "[145] In this reference there is the deep-rooted despairing cry for a "lucky break." There is no avarice there. A more indepth consideration of this theme leaves one with the idea that these youth have learned to depersonalize the failure as a product of their society and not of themselves.

It is therefore quite natural that the marginal sufferer will be more likely to attrit than the person whose psychological schemes have a more positive frame of reference.

Some societies have become famous for discriminatory practices on grounds other than efficiency and qualifications. The Chinese in Malaya, the Asians in Kenya, and the Tamils in Ceylon are adversely affected by discrimination and legislation.[146] Qualified native

therc

of fo

for na

disew

al c

milit

task

profe

meat

of ta

exclu

prope

intel

the r

has d

"Thes

Wcho

servi

intel

the y

the t

and t

and i

forms

Cameroonians are often denied jobs that go to employees of foreign organizations, thus closing off career prospects for native professional cadres and forcing them to go elsewhere.[147]

Inherited social status, family positions, political connections, rather than individual talent and capability, and the importance of particular jobs for the task of nation building, become the criteria for holding professional positions, structuring salary scales, and creating social status and prestige. Such a dislocation of talent, rewards, and status in society effectively excludes the talented young intellectual from playing a proper and positive role in his society. As a result the intellectual classes of India are alienated totally from the rest of society and anything but an intellectual life has developed within the ranks of the intellectuals.[148] "These ranks have been infiltrated by wrong persons with wrong aptitudes and wrong motivations, and bureaucracy, servility, frustration, and resentment permeate the intellectual life in the country. These conditions keep the young talented persons away from their home."[149]

Another subtle societal background phenomenon is the traditional society's unreceptive attitude to science and technology in favor of jurisprudence, the humanities and liberal arts. This prejudice permeates the cultural norms of such societies and this becomes a deterrent to

the scientific spirit. Its values are consistently in conflict with the requirements of a modern industrial order. It pushes scientists and technologists into emigration and the students repose in their foreign habitat. Such societies like the Hispanic cultures of Latin America,[150] African nations,[151] and even Britain share these prejudices.[152]

Students of self-worth who "wished to be looked upon" eschew even their own country when social and professional prejudices inhibit research development; when their caste or class structure affects their mobility; when salary differentials are not structured according to professional contributions and efficiency; and when a society is rooted in tradition prejudices to science and technology.

Pre-Departure Sets

Only those totally ignorant of international student exchange would question the right of J. W. Fulbright in interpreting what the American mandate has been in opening its doors to foreign students with all the cordiality and economic endowment put into such programs each year. One can readily accept his statement: "In the field of international relations the purpose of education is the civilizing and humanizing of relationships between nations in ways which are within the limits of human capacity."[153] Whether we accept that version, or

tune our minds to President L. B. Johnson's interpretation in his address to the Smithsonian Institute, we hear the same theme--understanding.

> Together we -ust embark on a new and noble adventure: First, to assist the educational effort of the developing nations and developing regions. Second, to help our schools and universities increase their knowledge of the world and the people who inhabit it. Third, to advance the exchange of students and teachers who travel and work outside their native lands. Fourth, to increase the free flow of books and ideas and art, of works of science and imagination. And, fifth, to assemble meetings of men and women from every discipline and every culture to ponder the common problems of mankind.
>
> In all these endeavors, I pledge that the United States will play its full role.
>
> L.B.J.[154]

Bozeman presents the United States as typical to Britain and France in the practice of colonialism. Here principle, ideology, tradition and experience combine to foster the vision of a multinational egalitarian and open society. Convinced of the superior worth of model of their society, and convinced that what happened in the United States could happen elsewhere in the world, Americans have become the natural proponents of globally and regionally unifying schemes. " . . . do education and cultural exchanges have political relevance? The question is thus readily answered in the affirmative, and this is the light of both international history and the state of contemporary international relations."[155] Therefore it is evident that in addition to understanding, which social scientists hold is very encouraging to the American, there is also the

selling of a philosophy model which involves political democracy and its supporting values.

Although there is general satisfaction with and acceptance of American society and customs, the same attitude is not carried over into the United States as a political entity or to American foreign policy (Riegel, 1953; Useems, 1955; Pool, 1965). Pool asserts that study after study has found no particular relationship between liking for Americans and support of American political policies.[156]

The governments of developing countries, intent upon economic and social development, have little concern about how much the exchange student appreciates American culture. In fact such appreciation creates critical attitudes towards their own country. Foreign governments support exchange programs only as far as skills related to their development go.[157] There seems to be very little, if any other, evidence which supports anything but a primary motive for acquisition of technological skills. To become "Americanized" is more often a derogatory labelling. Of course nations want to understand and be understood by the United States.

This brings us to the final and most important question, what motivates students to study in North America?

exch
and
cure
succe
To i
radi
Stat
radi
ction
exch
and
well
age
new
the
secu
kins

symb
foun
supe
to s
And
Chai
Natu

Cormack reports that overseas study for most exchange students in developing countries is a familial and social "push" more than a personal "pull" of adventure.[158] Most of the students are subject to strong success imperatives for which they may be ill-prepared. It is therefore difficult to generalize about the motivations of exchange (foreign) students in the United States, their background and personalities being as varied as the stimuli sifting through meshes of traditional and familial environment. Some students are enthralled by the United States as a dominant world power, and as a leader of the democratic nations. It is a model well worth scrutinizing.[159] Some students are merely eager to meet the needs of their own country in acquiring new skills. The advance knowledge and golden degrees of the United States represent shortcuts to status and security for those living in societies hustling from kinship to achievement systems.

To many former colonial peoples America was a symbol of hope and a model of success.[160] This model has found roots in its educational credibility, technological superiority and the integration of the academic community, to the extent that visually and ideologically students and faculty have crossed chronological lines. It sets a challenge therefore to those who want to create their own native model; to those who are satisfied with the American

model and are ready for its transportation; and to those who are unsure of where they want to go or what they want to do, the United States provides a wider and richer scope for whichever alternative is chosen.

In conclusion, it is appropriate to say that the United States encourages exchange for international understanding and dissimination of its political culture. The developing countries foster it for international understanding also but most of all for the skills to develop socially and economically.

Peculiarity of Student Drain

In this section a brief review of the peculiarity of "student drain" problem as opposed to the general problem of the "brain drain" is presented. Barbara Walton suggests two factors that distinguish the nonreturning student from emigrating manpower at a higher level, more popularly designated as the "brain drain."

First, the student drain consists of talent that is still functionally unrealized, of potential talent rather than that which is already fully established and functioning within an economic system.[161]

Second, a distinguishing characteristic is that with individual exceptions, the intention of most students when they go abroad is to return home. They, however, go through the process of deciding otherwise during their stay. More senior talent on the other hand goes through

the process of deciding to emigrate at home and migrates only after a decision is reached. The established professional makes the decision at home where the realities of the prospective host country is somewhat hazy. The locus of the decision is made abroad for the students where the image of the host country is clear and compelling and that of the home country hazy.[162]

In addition to Walton's observations, three other factors may be considered. First, it is difficult to decide, in the case of students, whether they represent a serious loss to the home country, or whether, at the point of decision to emigrate they do not.[163]

Second, statistical data on foreign students have been poorly handled in the past and are still not systematically satisfactory--it is presently much better than in 1965. In that year Open Doors excluded from their survey foreign students who, at the time of survey, planned to emigrate. Included in the group desiring to emigrate are those who have protracted their stay for years under the guise of academic requirements and those who are on professional internships indefinitely.[164]

Third, despite the fall in percentage increase of students coming to the United States, the numbers from developing countries continue to increase. So even when the entry of established professionals has been denied, the student's entry because of his position as learner

rather than dispenser of knowledge is permitted. At present the greater increase is heavily concentrated in African, Latin American and Far Eastern countries.[165]

In a study on Jamaicans alone, by a New York social worker, it was discovered that professionals who emigrated directly from a practice in the home country talked little about returning to re-establish a life profession. Professionals who immigrated after or during their studies consistently talked about returning to establish themselves in a life profession.

Conclusions

However skeptical we may be about the usefulness of social science research in guiding government programs, we must admire the courage, even the temerity of the researchers who have elected to study foreign students. If the results they have achieved so far are not fully satisfying, it is due as much to the complexity of the subject, as to faulty reasoning and technique. The researcher is trying to make statements about 1 million or more human beings, representing nearly 200 countries and perhaps twice as many cultures and languages. Add to this that all of these diverse factors are interacting, and the research is conducted under the self-imposed handicap of demonstrating findings statistically (a sophisticated need to demonstrate scholarship today),

and it is remarkable that the researcher comes up with any conclusions at all.

The findings on foreign students research contained in the literature reviewed are not simple and straightforward. They are, at best, tentative and complex, as befits the subjects they deal with. Some studies supported idealistic hopes for changes; some illuminated the subject wonderfully, and others added to the confusion. However, they all basically agreed that there were some psychological, social and economic factors involved in any study of why foreign students are apt to emigrate. Some definite conclusions were reached regarding factors that contributed to emigration.

The literature was overwhelming with data on physicians, engineers and natural scientists and was equally lacking in reliable data for people in other professional groups. Both government and privately financed studies centered more on the three aforementioned professions than on any other. Indeed it is conceivable that those are areas of greatest need but they, by no means, reflect the true picture of foreign professional immigration to developed countries.

Even among these areas of highly concentrated research, done on foreign students since World War II, very little is known about the magnitude, the causes, or the consequences of student nonreturn. The literature

is replete with speculations in these areas but very, very limited empirical data are available. Most of the research done has focused on problems of foreign student adjustment to his host country, his image of the host country, and similar social and psychological issues. Ritterbrand points out that the issue has more consistently been dealt with in more polemical than analytic terms. Serious dispassionate analysis of the student brain drain has just begun. The only notable exception is Wharton's study of Asian graduates who returned, but this study is again limited to the field of economics. But for very few exceptions, authors who priorize the factors that facilitate student drain have placed economics at the head of the listing. Indeed, their discourses are convincing and intelligent but the only other factor that receives equal attention and care is the professional development of the individual.

In most credible studies the emigration-immigration movement has been cradled between the operative "push" and "pull" factors. These are substantially covered both from the point of view of the native and the host countries. In each case the negative and positive inducements throw substantial light on some phenomena that may affect the student's decision to drain.

There are some notable limitations to the literature covered. Except for the "International Cultural and

Educational Exchange" quarterly, most other sources dealt with "brain drain" of established professionals emigrating to developed countries--especially the United States of America.

In this same vein it is peculiarly evident that no substantial longitudinal study has been originally established from developing countries. They seem to face the greater loss eventually. There was no study worthy of particular attention that looked on the same country's returnees and nonreturnees to see what factors maximally separated their decisions to remain or return.

Finally, as yet there has been no study done that has a good model or theory with adequate explanatory and predictive powers. At least none that was obvious in this literature survey which was considered very extensive, if not exhaustive.

The evidence from this review makes the present study worthwhile in consideration of student drain. First, it is directed toward a consideration of the factors that maximally separate people who return home from those who do not. Second, there is an attempt to develop some definite recommendations. Third, from the data gathered there is an effort to qualify and authenticate some of the hypotheses proposed by studies on the subject of student drain.

NOTES--CHAPTER II

[1]Walter Adams, ed., The Brain Drain (New York: The Macmillian Company, 1968), p. 12.

[2]Ibid., p. 4.

[3]United Nations Institute for Training and Research, Research Report No. 5, The Brain Drain From Five Developing Countries (New York, 1971), p. 15.

[4]Herbert G. Grubel, "Non-returning Foreign Student and the Cost of Student Exchange," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Spring 1966, pp. 20-29.

[5]Adams, Brain Drain, p. 6.

[6]Franklin D. Scott, "Academic Vikings," American Scandanavian Review 4 (Spring 1959): 55-60.

[7]Robert G. Myers, "Some Thoughts on Foreign Student Non-return," International Educational and Cultural Exchange 4 (Fall 1968): 45-48.

[8]Ibid., p. 46.

[9]Canadian Government, "The Professional," Canadian Government Immigration Service, No. cl-61/2066 (Ottawa: Queens Printer & Controller, 1966).

[10]UNITAR, Brain Drain, p. 27.

[11]Herbert G. Grubel and Anthony D. Scott, "International Flow of Human Capital," American Economic Review 56 (May 1966): 268-74.

[12]Louis Dallot, Race and Human Migration (New York: Walkers Company, 1964), p. 2.

[13]Ibid., p. 27.

[14]Quoted in "The Workers Day" (editorial), The Washington Post, 3 September 1973, p. A26.

[15]Seymour Lutzsky, "Some Thoughts on the Use of Brains," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Winter 1976, pp. 1-14.

[16]Arnold C. Harberger, "Investment in Men Versus Investment in Machines: The Case of India," Education and Economic Development (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965), pp. 11-50.

[17]Lafi Ibrahim Jaafavri, "Study of Palestinian and Jordinian Students," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Spring 1966, pp. 39-41.

[18]Robert G. Myers, "A Study Abroad and the Migration of Human Resources" (Ph.D. dissertation, Chicago, 1967), p. 94.

[19]United States Immigration and Naturalization Act, Congress Sub-Committee, Washington, 1965.

[20]John C. Shearer, "In Defense of Traditional Views on Brain Drain Problem," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Fall 1966, p. 17.

[21]United States House of Representatives, The Brain Drain into the United States of Scientists, Engineers and Physicians (printed for use of the Committee on Government Operations, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 1.

[22]Annual Reports of Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1966.

[23]Note that scientists do not include social scientists, physicians include surgeons and dentists. Scientists, engineers, and physicians include college or university instructors.

[24]U.S. House of Representatives, Brain Drain into U.S., p. 2.

[25]According to unpublished N.S.F. data only 1,844 out of 34,060 immigrating scientists in 1962-64 from Canada to the U.S. were Canadian born. Japan is used in the same way by students from Asia desiring to qualify for permanent residence in the United States.

[26]Charles V. Kidd, "The Growth of Science and Distribution of Scientists Among Nations," Impact of Science on Society, UNESCO 14 (1964): 5-18.

[27]Franklin Huddle, The Evolution of International Technology (Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 1970), 70 pp.

[28]John Useem and Ruth Useem, The Western Educated Man India: A Study of His Social Role and Influence (New York: Dryden Press, 1955), p. 94.

[29]Ibid., pp. 83-84.

[30]Report UN Secretary General, House of Representatives Committee on Immigration, 1968.

[31]UNITAR, Brain Drain, pp. 86, 91.

[32]United States Judiciary Committee, House Report from Sub-Committee, 1970.

[33]Rathore G. Naeem, "A Study UNESCO of Pakistanian Students," United Nations Educational Social & Cultural Organization (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1957).

[34]Barbara Walton, Foreign Student Exchange in Perspective Research on Foreign Students in the United States (Washington, D.C.: Office of External Research, U.S. Department of State, September 1967), p. 8.

[35]Grubel, "Non-returning Foreign Student," p. 270.

[36]Sergio Gutierrez--Olivos and George Riquelme Perez, The Emancipation of High Level Manpower: The Case of Chile (Washington, D.C.: Pan American Union, 1966).

[37]Ivan Putman, Jr., "The Foreign Student Advisor and His Institution in International Student Exchange," National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1964 and 1965, 24 pp.

[38]Senator Walter F. Mondale, Speech at The University of Minnesota, Congressional Record, May 15, 1967, p. S 6858.

[39]Paul Pre-bisch, Report to the Conference of Society for International Development, 1966.

[40]Walton, Foreign Student Exchange, p. 20.

[41]George C. Hamiotis, "An Exercise in Voluntary Repatrication," International Development Review 6 (December 1964).

[42]Marjorie Klein et al., "The Foreign Student Adaptation Program . . . Social Experience of Asian Students in the U.S.," International Educational and Cultural Exchange 6 (Winter 1971): 77-88.

[43]Ralph L. Beals and Norma D. Humphrey, No Frontier to Learning: The Mexican Student in the United States (University of Minnesota Press, 1967).

[44]Cora Dubois, Foreign Students in Higher Education in the United States (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1956).

[45]William H. Sewell and Oluf M. Davidson, "The Adjustment of Scandinavian Students," Journal of Social Issues 12 (1956): 19.

[46]Suerre Lysgaard, "Adjustment in a Foreign Society: Norwegian Fulbright Grantees Visiting the United States," International Social Science 7 (1955): 45-51.

[47]John T. and Jeanne E. Gullahorn, "An Extension of the U-Curve Hypothesis," Journal of Social Issues 19 (1963): 33-47.

[48]F. Heider, The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations (New York: Wiley, 1958).

[49]L. Festinger, S. Schachter, et al., Social Pressures in Informal Groups (New York: Harper, 1950).

[50]Gullahorn and Gullahorn, "Extension of the U-Curve," p. 40.

[51]Susan T. Pettis, "Whitten International Educational Exchange?" International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Summer 1970, p. 58.

[52]Dubois, Foreign Students, p. 12.

[53]Ibid.

[54]Klein, "Foreign Student Adaptation," p. 80.

[55]Gullahorn and Gullahorn, "Extension of the U-Curve," p. 42.

[56]Useem and Useem, Western Educated Man, p. 117.

[57]Gullahorn and Gullahorn, "Extension of the U-Curve,"; Dubois, Foreign Students.

[58]Grubel and Howland: The work of both men in building a case for the cosmopolitan model presented by Adams seems to attack parochial nationalism.

[59]Adda B. Bozemon, "Do Educational and Cultural Exchange Have Political Reliance?" International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Fall 1967, p. 15.

[60]Ibid.

[61]U.S. House of Representatives, Brain Drain, p. 9.

[62]Michael Manley, "Our Changing World" in the Bill Moyers Journal Television Interview (New York: Jamaica Consulate General Newsletter, May 1, 1975), p. 8.

[63]Barbara Walton, "Foreign Student Exchange in Perspective: What the Research Tells," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 1968, pp. 1-14.

[64]Maurice Harani, "Priorities for Research and Action in the Graduate Foreign Student Field," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, pp. 17-22.

[65]Useem and Useem, Western Educated Man, p. 68.

[66]Charles Suskind and Lynn Schell, "Exporting Technical Education: A Survey and Case Study of Foreign Professionals with U.S. Graduate Degrees," Institute of International Education (New York: 1968), 97 pp.

[67]Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., U.S. Graduate Training of Asian Agriculture Economists (New York: Council of Economics & Cultural Affairs, 1959).

[68]Barbara Walton, "Research on Foreign Graduate Students," International, Educational and Cultural Exchange 6 (Winter 1971): 21, 22.

[69]Wharton, U.S. Graduate Training, p. 108.

[70]Maunie Haravi, "International Studies: The Dynamics of Change," Internal, Educational and Cultural, Spring, 1973, pp. 47-53.

[71]Suskind and Schell, "Exporting Technical Education," 97 pp.

[72]Jacob L. Halberstam and Michael M. Dacso, "Facts and Fiction in Cross Cultural Evaluation of Graduate Medical Training in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation by Foreign and U.S. Medical Residents," Institute of International Education Center, 1965, 30 pp.

[73]Ibid., p. 15.

[74]Gayle Marsh and Jacob L. Halberstom, "Personality Stereotypes of U.S. and Foreign Medical Residents," Journal of Social Psychology 68 (1966): 187-96.

[75]C. P. Kindleberger, In Adams' Brain Drain, p. 139.

[76]Margaret Mead . . . unable to locate source.

[77]W. M. Dandakar, In Adams' Brain Drain, pp. 203-24.

[78]Ibid., pp. 229-32.

[79]John B. Lansing and James N. Morgan, "The Effect of Geographic Mobility on Income," Journal of Human Resources 2 (Fall 1967): 460.

[80]Guy S. Metraux, "Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross Cultural Education," Social Science Research Council, Pamphlet No. 9 (1952): 53 pp.

[81]John W. Bennett, Herbert Possin et al., Dr. Search of Identity: The Japanese Overseas Scholar in America and Japan (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958), p. 27.

[82]Beals and Humphrey, No Frontier to Learning, p. 30.

[83]Walton, "Research on Foreign Students," p. 12.

[84]Habib Naficy, "The Brain Drain: The Case Study of Iranian Non-returnees" (report presented in Conference of Society for International Development, March 17, 1966).

[85]International Migration of Talent and Skills: Proceedings of a Workshop and Conference (Washington, D.C.: Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, October 1966).

[86]Walton, "Research on Foreign Students," p. 44.

[87]State News, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, May 1975.

[88]Dandekar, p. 218.

[89]Useem and Useem, Western Educated Man, p. 159.

[90]Margaret L. Cormack, "The Wondering Scholar," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Spring 1968, p. 46.

[91]News of Jamaica, The Consulate General of Jamaica (New York: Pan Am Building, 1974), p. 9.

[92]Grubel, "Non-returning Foreign Student," p. 20.

[93]Paul H. Douglas, In Adams' Brain Drain, introduction, p. 4.

[94]Prakash Awasthi, "Brain Drain," Manpower Journal, 1966.

[95]Committee on Foreign Affairs, p. 18.

[96]Grubel, "Non-returning Foreign Student," p. 22.

[97]R. K. Girling, "The Migration of Human Capital from the Third World: The Implications and Some Data on the Jamaican Case," Social and Economic Studies 23 (March 1974): 86-88.

[98]Walton, Foreign Student Exchange in Perspective, p. 42.

[99]H. G. Johnson, In Adams' Brain Drain, pp. 81-91.

[100]Harold E. Houland, "Brain Drain from Philippines," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Fall 1967, pp. 23-28.

[101]Oscar Gish, "Brain Drain From Philippines Part II," International Educational and Cultural Exchange 14 (Winter 1969).

[102]Shearer, "In Defense of Traditional Views," pp. 17-25.

[103]William G. Thiesenhusen, Professor, in Report to Committee on Government Operations (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office), p. 25.

[104]Gustave E. Von Gruenebaum, ed., Medieval Islam, A Study in Cultural Organization (Chicago: University Press, 1946), p. 42.

[105]Bryant Wedge, "World Communication Culture and State Craft," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 1970, p. 22.

[106]Carolyn Klock and Boshin Ahmad,

[107]Myers, "Foreign Student Non-return," p. 47.

[108]Dubois, Foreign Students, p. 90.

[109]Wolfrom Eberhard, "Problem of Students Returning to Asia," International Educational and Cultural Exchange 5 (Spring 1970): 41-45.

[110]Stephen Dedijer, "Why Did Daedaulus Leave?" Science 13 (June 30, 1961): 2047-7052.

[111]Iraj Valipour, "A Comparison of Returning and Non-returning Iranian Students in the United States" (Ed.D. dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1961). See also Maficy, 1966; Myers, 1967.

[112]David C. McClelland, The Achieving Society (Princeton: D Van Nastrand Company, 1951), p. 372.

[113]Beals and Humphrey, No Frontier to Learning, p. 43.

[114]Gullahorn and Gullahorn, "Extension of the U-Curve," p. 16.

[115]The Committee on International Migration of Talent, The International Migration of High Level Manpower: Its Impact on the Development Process (New York: Praeger, 1970), p. 683.

[116]Saleh Amlah, "The Role of the College of Petroleum and Minerals in the Industrialization of Saudi Arabia," Nuder & Zahlam, p. 253.

[117]Brain Drain: A Study of the Persistent Issue of International Scientific Mobility, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1974, p. 115.

[118]Albert G. Simms, "Proceedings of Workshop on International Migration of Talent & Skills," October 1966, p. 117.

[119]Stephen E. Deutsch, International Education and Exchange: A Sociological Analysis (Cleveland Case, Western Reserve University, 1970), pp. 178-79.

[120]Kendelbereer in Brain Drain into U.S. of Scientists, Engineers and Physicians, p. 65.

[121]Brain Drain, Committee on Foreign Affairs, p. 120.

[122]Melvin J. Fox, "Some Pluses and Minuses of the Brain Drain," International Development, 1966, p. 74.

[123]Abdul Said, Brain Drain: The Developing Countries--Causes, Ramifications and Prospects (University of Kansas, 1970).

[124]James A. Wilson and Jerry Goston, "New Light on Brain Drain," New Scientists No. 43 (1969): 236.

[125]Naficy, "Iranian Non-returnees," p. 67.

[126]Said, The Developing Countries, p. 15.

[127]Ibid., p. 10.

[128]Ibid., p. 17.

[129]Cormack, "The Wandering Scholar," pp. 45-51.

[130]Dubois, Foreign Students, p. 4.

[131]Ibid., p. 131.

[132]Marion H. Groves, "Contribution to Development by Asians Who Have Studied Abroad," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Summer 1967, p. 14.

[133]Robert G. Myers, Education and Emigration (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1972), p. 28.

[134]Kathryn Tidrick, "Need for Achievement, Social Class and Intension to Emigrate in Jamaica," Students, Social and Economic Studies 20 (University of the West Indies, 1971): 52-60.

[135]Ibid., p. 59.

[136]T. R. Fernendez Manira, "The Sober Generation," Social and Economic Studies (University Press, 1974).

[137]Kindleberger, in Brain Drain into U.S., p. 141.

[138]Ibid.

[139]Enrique Oteiz, In Adams' Brain Drain, p. 131.

[140]Mordechai M. Levy, "United Nation Educational and Cultural Affairs," Report on a Study of Africans Studying and Training Abroad, 1967.

[141]Dubois, Foreign Students, p. 162.

[142]R. K. A. Gardner, Adams' Brain Drain, p. 195.

[143]Vera Rubin and Morisa Zavalloni, We Wish To Be Looked Upon: A Study of the Aspirations of Fourth in a Developing Society (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1969).

[144]Myers, Education and Emigration, p. 41.

[145]Rubin and Zavalloni, We Wish To Be Looked Upon, p. 58.

[146]Ditchley and Park, Report, Conference on Brain Drain, 1968, p. 15.

[147]UNITAR--Five Developing Countries, p. 122.

[148]Science and Technology and American Diplomacy, Subcommittee on National Security and Scientific Development (Washington, D.C., September 1973), p. 19.

[149]Dondekar, In Adams' Brain Drain, p. 55.

[150]Pan American Health Organization, Migration of Health, Personnel, Scientists, Congress from Latin America, Washington D.C., September 1966, p. 48.

[151]Gardner, Adams' Brain Drain.

[152]James A. Wilson: The scientific research of such is not respected; the scientists are not welcomed into general industrial management and that it remends in Britain to go the Liberal Arts route--Oscford & Eaton types.

[153]J. W. Fulbright, "Education for a New King of International Relations," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Winter 1967, p. 9.

[154]From President Johnson's remarks to the bicentennial celebration of the Smithsonian Institute, September 1965.

[155]Bozeman, "Political Reliance," pp. 7-21.

[156]Ithiel de Sola Pool, Effects of Cross-National Contact on National and International Behavior (New York: Holt Rinehart, Winston, 1965), pp. 106-29.

[157]Dubois, Foreign Students, p. 12.

[158]Margaret L. Cormack, "International Educational Exchange: Visa to What?" International Educational and Cultural Exchange 5 (Fall 1959): 52.

[159]Dubois, Foreign Students, p. 71.

[160]Cormack, "Visa To What," p. 52.

[161]Walton, Foreign Student Exchange, p. 14.

[162]Ibid.

[163]Awasthi, Economic Studies, p. 90.

[164]Open Doors, 1965, Institute of International Education.

[165] Open Doors, 1974, Institute of International Education.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Design of Study

The study was designed to determine the differences that separate Jamaicans who returned home and those who remained in North America after graduating with professional degrees from North American colleges and universities. A further purpose of the study was to identify the factors that both returnee and nonreturnee Jamaican students thought influenced their decisions most.

The Population and Sample

The subject population of the study were graduates of North American colleges and universities who (1) returned home (returnees) or (2) remained (nonreturnees) in North America. The population, therefore, formed a homogeneous group--they were all professionals.

Among the anticipated professions in this population are educators in numerous subject areas, medical personnel, library scientists, engineers, social workers, insurance life underwriters, accountants, management consultants, administrators, sales representatives, and

civil servants. They were both male and females who have studied in North America during the twenty-year period (1955-1975).

Jamaicans who study in North America largely attend colleges and universities in the states of Maryland, New York, Michigan, and in Ontario province. These were the principal areas that will be tapped to acquire a sample.

Acquiring a sample frame from this elusive population without a longitudinal study would demand considerable finance and time, both of which this researcher had in limited quantities. However, it can be demonstrated that where the population is homogeneous in its attributes which are under investigation, a smaller sample is required than if the population is quite diversified. Granting, however, that cluster sampling increases the variability within each cluster, the standard variation within a given cluster tends to be large.[1]

Because of financial and time limitations involved in the study the survey population was not as exhaustive as it might have been. Therefore, any generalizations from this population would have to be viewed with caution if its external validity is to be meaningful.

The sample consists of 120 professionals clustered into those who were returnees and those who were non-returnees. The subjects, who formed the sample, were

acquired from (1) The Jamaican Government Building and The Jamaican League, in Toronto, Canada, (2) The Jamaican Embassies in Washington D.C., and New York, (3) Clubs and Associations in the United States and Jamaica, (4) From associates who knew graduates either in North America or Jamaica, (5) Additional names from Jamaica were acquired through employers in Jamaica.

The sample was restricted by limitations of the population but meets all the general qualifications outlined in Chapter I. All the subjects were Jamaicans, all were professional graduates of North American universities and had chosen to return to Jamaica or remain in North America.

Limitations that are inherent in this sample are:

1. The subjects were mostly those who are likely to join organizations and those who want to maintain some link with the government of Jamaica and voluntarily submitted their names to the embassy.

2. The fact that many subjects were referred by individuals who knew them means the random sample advantages would be eliminated.

3. Names of people who were not necessarily interested in clubs and associations would not have been included in the sample.

4. The actual number of subjects surveyed was much smaller than anticipated. The sample was necessarily limited because of the limitations of adequate sources of origin. Nonetheless on the basis of Rowntree's[2] study of working-class in New York and a Cornell[3] study of a Congressional Committee during World War II, it was deemed appropriate to conclude that with the aforementioned limitations taken into consideration the sample size is adequate to undertake the study as it was designed.

Instrumentation

The instrument was constructed primarily for this study and designed to the purposes of this investigation as outlined in Chapter I. The "Likert Scale" popularized by Rensis Likert was used as a design to summarize the attitudes of respondents. However, instead of Likert's use[4] of "agreement" respondents were asked to respond to "influence": "strong influence," "some influence," "neutral," "little influence," and "no influence" on all but one factor.

Questions were prepared from three sources:

(1) Reference from the literature survey;

(2) From interviews with the educational attachés from Nigeria, Trinidad, Guyana, Barbados, Jamaica, and from other Jamaican professionals;

(3) From the researcher's own perception of the problem.

Parts A and B consisted of ninety questions generated through the above sources. Part C consisted of the factors into which the questions were categorized and the preliminary part of the questionnaire covered the demographic data on which the research questions were based. Part C was included to compare the rating of the factors--RANKED FACTORS--as originally conceived with the factors generated from the items--ITEM FACTORS.

The questionnaire was given to five Jamaicans as a pre-test to get feedback for the final form of the questionnaire. The groups consisted of people in various professions who were graduates of American schools. A personal interview with each pre-test respondent was conducted on completion of his/her response to the questionnaire (see Appendix A). This pre-test enabled the researcher to reconstruct some items and eliminate those which did not seem to tap the factors that were being considered.

Data Collection

Questionnaires (see Appendix B) were sent to sixty-eight subjects of the North America population under consideration. Three weeks later another questionnaire was sent with a letter of encouragement to respond;

two weeks later a post card with a message of urgency to respond was sent; and finally, telephone calls were made to some nonrespondents to ascertain why they did not respond.

Questionnaires were sent to fifty-nine legitimate members of the Jamaica population. Two reminders, one in letter form and the other on a post card, were sent to the nonrespondents.

The second aspect of data collection was by follow-up interviews of a limited number from the North America sample. The particular interest would be to get more information on new concerns raised that were not covered in the questionnaire and to qualify, by in-depth interviews, the type of consideration given to the factors in the questionnaire.

Data Analysis Methodology

Responses to the section on demographic data were done through filling in the blanks.

Responses to each question in Section A were labelled "Strongly Agree" (5), "Agree" (4), "Uncertain" (3), "Disagree" (2), "Strongly Disagree" (1). Answers were coded accordingly to meet computer analysis programming requirements.

Responses to each question in Section B were labelled as: "Strong Influence," "Some Influence," "Neutral," "Little Influence," and "No Influence."

Again answers were numbered 5 - 1 for "Strong Influence" to "No Influence" respectively for the purposes of computer analysis programming.

Responses to Section C were ranked on a 1 - 11 scale; with one being the "most important" and eleven "least important in influencing the decision made by respondents."

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to establish frequencies, means, and standard deviation on each item used in the survey. An item-by-item summation of the responses appears in Appendix C.

Further analysis was made through the use of The Hoyt Reliability Model to establish Factor Reliability Coefficients and means on each factor to be developed from the item scores.

The statistical procedure used in the analysis of the data, unless otherwise designated, is the multivariate analysis of variance. The analysis of the data for this exercise was done on a packard program entitled "Multivariance: Univariate and Multivariate Analysis of Variance and Covariance, a Fortran IV Program, Version 4, June 1968." This program was developed by Jeremy Finn, Department of Educational Psychology, State University of New York at Buffalo. The program was adapted for use at Michigan State University by Dr. David Wright for the CDC 3600 computer. All generated test statistics are

properties of the program and follow the outline provided by R. Darrell Bock in an article entitled, "Programming, Univariate and Multivariate Analysis of Variance," Technometrics, Vol. 5, No. 1 (February, 1963), pp. 95-117. Readers are referred to this article for computation formulae and subsequent explanation of the symbols therein.

To ascertain reliability on the differences reflected in respondents' rating of the ten named factors (Ranked Factors) and the factors developed from the items in Part B, Item Factors, the Ranked-Difference Coefficient formula was used as indicated in Non-Parametric and Shortcut Statistics (p. 13).[5]

$$r_d = 1 - \frac{6\Sigma d^2}{N(N^2-1)}$$

"Ranked-Difference correlation can be applied to bivariate data available only in ranks, such as judges ratings; . . . or in situations where one variable is ordered and the other measured. . . . "[6] As a rule the coefficient r_d varies from -1.00 (perfect direct relationship). So the further r_d moves from "O" the stronger the relationship.

The raw data were coded and punched on IBM cards. Data analyses were performed using the CDC 3600 computer at Michigan State University Computer Center.

NOTES--CHAPTER III

[1]Gilbert Sax, Empirical Foundations of Educational Research (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1968), p. 142.

[2]B. Seebohm Rowntree, Poverty and Progress: A Second Social Survey of York (London: Longmans, Green & Company, Ltd., 1941), p. 489.

[3]Francis Cornell, "The Sampling Problem in Educational Research," Research Design & Analysis, ed. Raymond O. Collier, Jr. et al. (Bloomington, Ill.: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1961), pp. 70-71.

[4]Renis Likert, "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes," Archives of Psychology 140 (1932).

[5]Merle W. Tate and Richard C. Clelland, Non-Parametric and Shortcut Statistics (Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1959), pp. 14-15.

[6]Ibid., p. 15.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Description of Response Data

The initial limitations in sampling were further compounded by a low response rate. Fifty-four percent of the North American group (N=37) responded and 32 percent of the Jamaican group responded (N=19). Francis G. Cornell[1] points out, however, that homogeneity of samples, in a social science survey, will offset the disadvantages of a small sample. The researcher therefore made the assumption that since the generalization of the results in this study is to Jamaican professionals who studied in North America, the group can be regarded as homogeneous for the purposes of the study. However, caution is advised in generalizing because the basic sample was small initially.

The dependent measures used in this study are Ranked Factors and Item Factors. The former represents Part C of the questionnaire and the latter represents the factors developed from items in Part B and processed by the Hoyt Reliability Coefficients. Table 3 is the

TABLE 3.--Reliability level of item factors: As established by the Hoyt Reliability Test

	North America	Jamaica
Predeparture (Not to be Compared)[a]	0.69	0.67
Desire for Adventure	0.82	0.68
Alternative Life Styles	0.76	0.83
Communication with Country	0.80	0.79
National Responsibility	0.90	0.75
Government Policies and Politics	0.80	0.75
Professional Development	0.82	0.50
Relevance of Professional Skills	0.73	0.64
Attitudes Towards Future	0.77	0.72
Adaptation	0.74	0.77
Economic	0.83	0.91

Note: These factors (Item Factors) were developed from items in Part B.

[a]Pre-departure is not considered part of this Reliability rating.

summary of Item Factor reliability as measured by the Hoyt Reliability method. In each case the level of reliability is above .70. This point was set to accommodate all the Item Factors considered.

Description of Demographic Data

The demographic information covered sex, years of residence in North America, age group, community background, occupation of parents, religious and denominational affiliation, income bracket, present occupation, level of educational achievement and whether subjects were bonded.

Table 4 represents the demographic profile that evolved out of the study: 24(64.9) represents frequency (24) and percentage (64.9).

The remaining portion of this chapter contains the statistical analysis of data obtained from the questionnaire responses. Each research question is restated and accompanied by the results of the multivariate analysis of variance with the significance level established at the .10 level. The only exception to this is question one, which is answered with the aid of the Ranked Difference Coefficient Instrument.[a]

---

[a]The researcher is aware that the social sciences level of significance is usually established at the .05, .01 or .001 level. The researcher used the .10 level because he believed that the size of the sample warranted a wide marking of sampling errors.

TABLE 4.--Demographic data for North American (nonreturnees) and Jamaican (returnees) respondents

N = 37 (North America)

Sex								Male 24(64.9)	Female 13(35.1)
Years of Residence								Mean 9.5	S.D. 4.7
Bonded (Yes, No)								1(2.7)	36(97.3)
Type of Community							Rural 20(54.1)	Urban 10(27.0)	Suburban 7(18.9)
Age Group						21 under 2(5.4)	22-31 11(29.7)	32-41 20(54.1)	42 & over 4(10.8)
Income Bracket						Lower 9(24.3)	Lower Mid 14(37.8)	Mid 13(35.1)	Upper 1(2.7)
Highest level of Education						B.A. 10(27.0)	M.A. 14(37.8)	Ph.D. 5(13.5)	Medical 8(21.6)
Father's occupation				Profess. 6(16.2)	Trades 12(32.4)	Farmer 11(29.7)	Laborer 2(5.4)	Factory 0(0.0)	Other 6(16.2)
Mother's occupation				Profess. 3(8.1)	Trades 3(8.1)	Hs.wife 29(78.4)	Laborer 0(0.0)	Factory 0(0.0)	Other 2(5.4)
Subject's present occupation			Educat. 14(37.8)	Business 5(13.5)	Medical 9(24.3)	Adminis. 2(5.4)	Religion 2(5.4)	Social Sc. 3(8.1)	Engineer 2(5.4)
Denomination: Religion	Methodist 6(16.2)	Anglican 6(16.2)	Baptist 3(8.1)	S.D.A. 12(32.4)	Rm. Cath. 4(10.8)	Ch. of God 1(2.7)	Ch. of Christ 1(2.7)	Bretheren 1(2.7)	Other/None 3(8.1)

N = 19 Returnees (Jamaican Sample)

Sex								Male 15(78.9)	Female 4(21.1)
Years of Residence in N.A.								Mean 4.4	S.D. 2.6
Bonded? (Yes, No)								4(21.1)	15(78.9)
Type of Community							Rural 9(47.4)	Urban 3(15.8)	Suburban 7(36.8)
Age Group						0-21 1(5.3)	22-31 6(31.6)	32-41 6(31.6)	42 & over 6(31.6)
Income Bracket						Lower 0(0.0)	Lower Mid 9(47.4)	Mid 10(52.6)	Upper 0(0.0)
Highest level of Education						B.A. 10(52.6)	M.A. 8(42.1)	Ph.D. 1(5.3)	Medical 0(0.0)
Father's occupation				Profess. 8(42.1)	Trades 3(15.8)	Farmer 5(26.3)	Laborer 0(0.0)	Factory 1(5.3)	Other 2(10.5)
Mother's occupation				Profess. 3(15.8)	Trades 1(5.3)	Hs.wife 14(73.7)	Laborer 0(0.0)	Factory 0(0.0)	Other 1(5.3)
Subject's present occupation			Educat. 13(68.4)	Business 3(15.8)	Medical 0(0.0)	Adminis. 0(0.0)	Religion 0(0.0)	Social Sc. 1(5.3)	Engineer 2(10.5)
Denomination: Religion	Methodist 1(5.3)	Anglican 4(21.1)	Baptist 2(10.5)	S.D.A. 5(26.3)	Rm. Cath. 2(10.5)	Ch. of God 0(0.0)	Ch. of Christ 0(0.0)	Bretheren 1(5.3)	Other/None 4(21.1)

Testing Research Questions

The research questions which tested the difference in the response of nonreturnees (North American) and returnees (Jamaica) are:

Research Question 1:

(a) Was there a difference in the response to Ranked Factors and Item Factors between returnees and non-returnees? (b) By ordering both Ranked and Item Factors what factors are considered most, less and least influential in a three-four-three order?

The above research questions were not answered by a strictly statistical scientific method because of the small returns from the Jamaican sample. However, Table 5 reflects the response of both groups. As was previously mentioned Ranked Factors are rated 1-11; so the lowest score is "most influential." The Item Factors scores are all consistent with the 1-5 rating on the items, with five being most influential.

As may be observed from Table 6, the Ranked Factors in North America versus Jamaica, show some difference but it must also be observed that these differences are peculiar to the movement of Economic Influence, Attitude to The Future and Desire for Adventure. For all practical purposes the responses to the Item Factors are identical in each level of influence between the Jamaican and North American samples.

TABLE 5.--Factor rating of ranked and item factors by means

	Abbreviations	North America				Jamaica			
		Factor Ranking	Place	Item Factors	Place	Factor Ranking	Place	Item Factor	Place
Professional Development	PD	3.7	1	1.7	9.5	4.3	3	1.8	9.5
Government Policies and Politics	GPP	6.8	7	1.7	9.5	7.6	9	1.8	9.5
Sense of National Responsibility	SNR	6.0	5	3.8	1	4.6	4	3.8	1
Relevance of Professional Skill	RPS	5.3	3	3.5	2	4.2	2	3.6	2
Desire for Adventure	DA	6.5	9	2.6	5	8.9	10	2.6	5
Economic Influencw	EI	4.4	2	2.1	8	7.1	7	2.1	8
Communication with Country	CC	6.6	6	2.2	7	6.0	5	2.2	7
Attitude Towards the Future	ATF	5.5	4	2.7	3.5	3.6	1	2.7	4
Adaptation	A	6.9	8	2.3	6	6.8	6	2.3	6
Alternative Life Style	ALS	7.0	10	2.7	3.5	7.3	8	2.8	3
Pre-departure Concepts	PC	6.6	6	3.4	(3)	5.8	(5)	3.4	(3)

TABLE 6.--Item factors ordered by the degree of influence they had on respondents' decisions

North America		Jamaica	
Ranked	Item	Ranked	Item
Most Influential		Most Influential	
PD	SNR	ATF	SNP
EI	RPS	RPS	RPS
RPS	ATF & ALT	PD	ALT
Less Influential		Less Influential	
ATF		SNR	ATF
SNR	DA	CC	DA
CC	A	A	A
Least Influential		Least Influential	
GPP	CC	EI	CC
A	EI	ALS	EI
DA	PD	GPP	PD
ALS	GPP	DA	GPP

Key: PD (Professional Development), EI (Economic Influence), RPS (Relevance of Professional Skills), ATF (Attitude Toward Future), SNR (Sense of National Responsibility), CC (Communication with Country), GPP (Government Policies and Politics), A (Adaptation), DA (Desire for Adventure), ALS (Alternative Life Style).

The one factor that is common to both Ranked and Item Factors at the level of most influence is Relevance of Professional Skills (RPS). The factor that is common to both ratings at the level of least influence is Government Policies and Politics.

Research Question 2:

Was there a difference between the response of subjects from Rural and Nonrural backgrounds?

The result of the multivariate test of equality and mean vectors which was established at the .10 level would indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between respondents of Rural and Nonrural origin. This was true for the nonreturning population with $p < .751$ and the returning population with $p < .420$, Tables 7 and 8.

Although the overall response from returnees was not significantly different, there was significant difference on the dependent variable, Alternative Life Style, with $p < .011$. Other dependent variables that demand attention are Desire for Adventure with $p < .119$; Communication, $p < .178$; Professional Development, with $p < .195$. In the case of nonreturnees on dependent variable was near the significant level.

The nonreturnees registered remarkable consistency in how they viewed the influence of these factors on their decision. There was, however, a difference on Economic

TABLE 7.--Multivariate analysis of variance--Community Bk.: North America

Variable	Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P <
Professional Development	.0521	.0267	.8711
Government Policies & Politics	.3975	.3152	.5781
Sense of National Responsibility	1.0240	.6646	.4205
Relevance of Professional Skills	.0623	.0483	.8273
Desire for Adventure	2.1511	1.6492	.2076
Economic Influences	.4945	.6697	.4187
Communication with Country	.0588	.0519	.8211
Attitude Towards the Future	.0000	.0000	1.000
Adaptation	.0605	.1633	.6887
Alternative Life Style	.0939	.1197	.7315

Note: F Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = .6580;
D.F. = 10. 8,0000; P < .7515

Degree of Freedom for Hypothesis = 1
Degree of Freedom for Error = 35

TABLE 8.--Multivariate analysis of variance--Community Bk: Jamaica

Variable	Mean Sg.	Univariate F	P <
Professional Development	.8986	1.8190	.1952
Government Policies & Politics	.0812	.1741	.6817
Sense of National Responsibility	.2518	.2449	.6271
Relevance of Professional Skills	.7834	1.4596	.2436
Desire for Adventure	2.5939	2.6950	.1191
Economic Influences	1.5062	1.2073	.2872
Communication with Country	1.4271	1.9672	.1788
Attitude Towards the Future	.5331	.8723	.3634
Adaptation	.2445	.4335	.5192
Alternative Life Style	4.8040	8.0449	.0114

Note: F Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 1.1690; D.F. = 10. 8,0000; P < .4206

Degree of Freedom for Hypothesis = 1
Degree of Freedom for Error = 17

Influence, National Responsibility, Professional Development and Relevance of Professional Skills. The Rural nonreturnees were more influenced by Economic Influences and Relevance of Professional Skills. The Nonurban nonreturnees were influenced, in order, by National Responsibility and Professional Development.

Among the returnees Nonrural and Rural the greatest influence was Sense of National Responsibility while Relevance of Professional Skills was the next greatest influence.

Among these groups the differences do not seem meaningful. Neither do these differences seem meaningful between the returnees and nonreturnees.

Research Question 3:

This question sought an answer to the following question: Was there a difference between the responses among the different levels of education achieved with regard to: (a) Bachelors and (b) Masters and (c) Doctors of Philosophy/Medical Doctors?

Consistent with the .10 level for significance only the Jamaican group with $p < .0741$ was significant. The dependent variables on which the difference was most evident were Desire for Adventure, Professional Development and Attitude Towards the Future, which have scores of $p < .038$, .075 and .091, respectively. The North American population with $p < .720$ was not significantly different. Communication was the variable, in the North

American population, with the only significant score of $p < .089$. However, some attention should be given to Government Policies and Programs with $p < .120$.

As Tables 9 and 10 of means will show the people at the M.A., Ph.D., and M.D. levels were more prone to see Level of Education as a contributing factor than those at the B.A. level. Between the M.A. and Ph.D./M.D. groups, the former saw Levels of Education as having a greater influence on their decision to return home. The results are different among the American population. The Ph.D./M.D. saw Levels of Education as influencing their decision to remain in North America to a greater degree than the M.A. and B.A. respondents who have nearly the same average means.

Research Question 4:

Was there a difference among the responses of (a) Education and (b) Medical/Engineer and the Other professional groups?

Consistent with the results of both the North American and Jamaican populations, Tables 11 and 12 show that there was no difference at the .10 level of significance. The multivariate test of equality and mean vectors had a significance level of $p < .399$ and .692 for North America and Jamaica respectively. Among the dependent variables, Sense of National Responsibility is significantly different with $p < .058$, on the North American scale. Also of importance on the same scale

TABLE 9.--Multivariate analysis of variance--Level of Education: Jamaica

Variable	Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P <
Professional Development	1.2864	3.0611	.0749
Government Policies & Politics	.0928	.1898	.8290
Sense of National Responsibility	1.2472	1.3097	.2974
Relevance of Professional Skills	.6417	1.1905	.3297
Desire for Adventure	3.1796	4.0385	.0381
Economic Influences	.3626	.2638	.7714
Communication with Country	.2405	.2898	.7523
Attitude Towards the Future	1.4170	2.8034	.0905
Adaptation	.0938	.1555	.8573
Alternative Life Style	.1924	.2112	.8119

Note: F Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 2.1438;
D.F. = 10. 8,0000; P < .0741

Degree of Freedom for Hypothesis = 2
Degree of Freedom for Error = 16

TABLE 10.--Multivariate analysis of variance--Level of Education: North America

Variable	Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P <
Professional Development	.1231	.0615	.940
Government Policies & Politics	2.3567	2.2558	.1203
Sense of National Responsibility	.0184	.0107	.9894
Relevance of Professional Skills	.4302	.4084	.6679
Desire for Adventure	1.7388	1.4960	.2385
Economic Influences	.0355	.0455	.9556
Communication with Country	2.6656	2.6059	.0886
Attitude Towards the Future	.1695	.2163	.8067
Adaptation	.2807	.5880	.5611
Alternative Life Style	.1693	.2069	.8184

Note: F Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = .7829;
D.F. = 10. 8,0000; P < .7203

Degree of Freedom for Hypothesis = 2
Degree of Freedom for Error = 34

TABLE 11.--Multivariate analysis of variance--Vocation: North America

Variable	Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P <
Professional Development	.1047	.0600	.9419
Government Policies & Politics	1.0143	.9086	.4127
Sense of National Responsibility	4.5014	3.0842	.0588
Relevance of Professional Skills	1.5714	1.6057	.2156
Desire for Adventure	.7746	.6229	.5425
Economic Influences	.1440	.1770	.8336
Communication with Country	.1199	.1075	.8985
Attitude Towards the Future	.0476	.0595	.4424
Adaptation	.8204	1.8979	.1655
Alternative Life Style			

Note: F Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 1.1473;
D.F. = 10. 8,0000; P < .3368

Degree of Freedom for Hypothesis = 2
Degree of Freedom for Error = 34

TABLE 12.--Multivariate analysis of variance--Vocation: Jamaica

Variable	Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P <
Professional Development	.2950	.5420	.5919
Government Policies & Politics	.7118	1.7286	.2091
Sense of National Responsibility	1.8892	2.1665	.1471
Relevance of Professional Skills	.1041	.1717	.8438
Desire for Adventure	.0973	.0830	.9208
Economic Influences	.7005	.5259	.6010
Communication with Country	.6035	.7692	.4998
Attitude Towards the Future	.6833	1.1443	.3432
Adaptation	.0557	.0916	.9130
Alternative Life Style	.2351	.2559	.7745

Note: F Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = .7900;
D.F. = 10. 8,0000; P < .6926

Degree of Freedom for Hypothesis = 2
Degree of Freedom for Error = 16

is $p < .144$ and .165 on Alternative Life Style and Adaptation. The Jamaican scale in which $p < .336$ also draws attention to Sense of National Responsibility. All three groups are fairly consistent in their response. The "Other Professionals" are consistently more positive that vocations was a motivating factor; after this group comes the medical/engineer professions and the educators are less inclined to attribute immigration to vocation.

Research Question 5:

Was there a difference in response on Factors by respondents who perceive themselves as coming from (a) Upper and Middle, (b) Lower, (c) Lower Middle Income brackets?

Results in Tables 13 and 14 show that there was no significant difference at the .10 level. The multivariate test of equality and mean vectors had a significance level of $p < .399$ for nonreturnees and .332 for returnees.

The only subscale from the dependent variables of the returnees that have $p < .031$ is Communication. Sense of National Responsibility has $p < .117$. On the nonreturnee scale it is Sense of National Responsibility which really hits the significance level with a $p < .089$. Statistically, therefore, there is no difference among the three groups. Yet it should be observed that the Lower Middle income bracket has the highest mean, 3.642 on Sense of National Responsibility and the lowest 1.842

TABLE 13.--Multivariate analysis of variance--Income: North America

Variable	Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P <
Professional Development	4.0840	1.5721	.2224
Government Policies & Politics	.6556	.5941	.5577
Sense of National Responsibility	3.6989	2.5952	.0894
Relevance of Professional Skills	.2929	.2188	.8046
Desire for Adventure	.5336	.4065	.6692
Economic Influences	.7852	1.1154	.3395
Communication with Country	.3394	.3403	.7140
Attitude Towards the Future	.3288	.4604	.6349
Adaptation	.0568	.1419	.8683
Alternative Life Style	.3952	.5896	.5879

Note: F Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 1.0780; D.F. = 10. 8,0000; P < .3998

Degree of Freedom for Hypothesis = 2
Degree of Freedom for Error = 34

TABLE 14.--Multivariate analysis of variance--Income: Jamaica

Variable	Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P <
Professional Development	.2728	.5140	.4832
Government Policies & Politics	.3482	.7725	.3918
Sense of National Responsibility	2.4518	2.7281	.1170
Relevance of Professional Skills	.1811	.3166	.5810
Desire for Adventure	.4685	.4308	.5204
Economic Influences	.4263	.3252	.5760
Communication with Country	3.3778	5.5308	.0310
Attitude Towards the Future	.2439	.3884	.5415
Adaptation	.5735	1.0528	.3193
Alternative Life Style	1.8301	2.3703	.1421

Note: F Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 1.2756;
D.F. = 10. 8,0000; P < .3324

Degree of Freedom for Hypothesis = 1
Degree of Freedom for Error = 17

on Professional Development. On other dependent variables there is very little difference among the three groups, except that the Lower income bracket population scores Economic Influence as their greatest influence.

Research Question 6:

Was there a difference between the responses of subjects between 1-31 years and 32-upwards?

In both the North American and Jamaica populations there is a significant difference in the influence of the factors as they are perceived by respondents who are classified by age.

The effect is evidenced in Tables 15 and 16 ratio for multivariate tests of equality and mean vectors in which the significance was $p < .016$ and .032 for Jamaica and North America respectively. Dependent variables at the established level of significance for the nonreturnees (North America) are Relevance of Professional Skills and Economic Influence with $p < .080$ and .036 respectively. The difference between these two is, for all practical purposes, not meaningful. Other variables that are close to the level of significance are Professional Development and Alternative Life Styles with $p < .168$ and .139 respectively.

In the Jamaican data, Relevance of Professional Skills and Government Policies and Politics scored $p < .061$ and .070 respectively. The difference between the

TABLE 15.--Multivariate analysis of variance--Age: North America

Variable	Mean Sg.	Univariate F	P <
Professional Development	2.7508	1.9795	.1683
Government Policies & Politics	.8536	.8252	.3699
Sense of National Responsibility	.4336	.2645	.6103
Relevance of Professional Skills	2.9392	3.2490	.0801
Desire for Adventure	.4607	.3525	.5568
Economic Influences	3.5873	4.7369	.6364
Communication with Country	.4925	.4452	.5091
Attitude Towards the Future	.1883	.0012	.6158
Adaptation	.0006	.2564	.9728
Alternative Life Style	1.6444	2.2933	.1390

Note: F Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 2.4548;
D.F. = 10. 8,0000; P < .0322

Degree of Freedom for Hypothesis = 1
Degree of Freedom for Error = 35

TABLE 16.--Multivariate analysis of variance--Age: Jamaica

Variable	Mean Sg.	Univariate F	P <
Professional Development	1.6683	3.7177	.0708
Government Policies & Politics	1.5333	4.0235	.0611
Sense of National Responsibility	.2087	.2025	.6585
Relevance of Professional Skills	.0002	.0004	.9846
Desire for Adventure	1.8687	1.8592	.1906
Economic Influences	.2964	.2248	.6415
Communication with Country	.1448	.1807	.6415
Attitude Towards the Future	1.4208	2.5422	.6761
Adaptation	.6258	1.1552	1.1552
Alternative Life Style	.2785	.3226	.5776

Note: F Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors = 4.9906; D.F. = 10. 8,0000; P < .0161

Degree of Freedom for Hypothesis = 1
Degree of Freedom for Error = 17

two does not seem to be meaningful. Other factors which seem to warrant attention are Desire for Adventure, $p < .190$, Attitude Towards the Future, with $p < .129$.

Summary

Research Question 1:

(a) Was there a difference in the response to Ranked Factors and Item Factors between returnees and nonreturnees? (b) By ordering Ranked and Item Factors, what factors are considered most, less, least influencial in a 3-3-4 order.

(a) There was a difference in the Item Factors but no difference in the Ranked factors.

(b) The results of Levels of Influence are in Table 6.

Research Question 2:

Was there a difference in the response of subjects from Rural and Nonrural background?

No significant difference was found on community background in either returnee or nonreturnee groups.

Research Question 3:

Was there a difference among the responses among the difference levels of education achieved with regard to (a) Bachelors, (b) Masters, (c) Doctors of Philosophy and Medical Doctors?

There was no significant difference among the nonreturnees; the returnees, however, were significantly different.

Research Question 4:

Was there a difference among the responses of (a) Education and (b) Medical and Engineering and (c) The Other Professional groups?

No significant difference was found in either group.

Research Question 5:

Was there a difference in responses on Item Factors by respondents who perceived themselves as coming from (a) Upper and Middle, (b) Lower and (c) Lower Middle Income brackets?

No significant difference was found in either

returnees or nonreturnees.

Research Question 6:

Was there a difference between the responses of subjects between 1-31 years and 32-upward?

A significant difference was found in each group.

CHAPTER V

SUMMATION OF INTERVIEWS DATA

General Introduction

Subjects for the interview experiences were selected because they introduced new factors into the study which were not previously considered in the questionnaire. In all other respects, these subjects were deemed similar to the remainder of the sample in the estimation of the researcher. Each interview was conducted in the home of the respective subjects. The researcher evaluated each setting as informal and friendly. This type of rapport was developed through at least three telephone calls previous to the actual interview. Subjects were told that they were selected because of the respective new factors they had introduced into the study. Each subject responded with enthusiasm and agreed to the interview. Although the interviews followed one basic format, some exercises took as long as two hours while others took half that time. The average interview took one and one-quarter hours. At all interviews only the subject and the researcher were present.

Although in some cases only one person originally mentioned some of the new factors, respondents were asked to respond to each new factor and also the original factors in the questionnaire. All the respondents were asked:

> What would you advise a young graduate today who wants advice on whether to remain in North America or return to Jamaica in light of the present factors that are before you?

Each respondent was asked for the recommendation he would make on each factor to the young graduate. He was then asked to supply some rationale for the response he gave. Table 17 summarizes the responses on three scales of Positive, Uncertain, and Negative. "Positive" means that respondents would advise the young subject to return with regards to the particular factors in question. "Uncertain" means that for reason(s) the respondent is not sure what recommendation he would make. "Negative" suggests the respondent would say no because of his perception of that particular factor in relationship to returning to Jamaica.

Summary of Rationale Given for Each Factor

The first factors considered were the four new factors introduced in questionnaire comments by the respondents.

TABLE 17.--Percentage response categorized: N = 10 for interview data

	Positive	Uncertain	Negative
Professional Development	40	10	50
Governmental Policies & Politics	40	50	10
Sense of National Responsibility	60		40
Relevance of Professional Skills	20	20	60
Desire for Adventure	40	30	30
Economic Influences	40		60
Communication With the Country	30	60	10
Attitude Towards the Future	30	40	30
Adaptation	40	20	40
Alternative Life Style	40	20	40
Black Consciousness	40	20	40
Perception as Threat to Society	30	20	50
Marriage	30	20	50
Latitude of One's Life	30	10	60
Overall Recommendation	20	50	30

Note: Positive = Return; Uncertain = Undecided, Negative = Nonreturn

Black Consciousness

As Table 17 indicates there was equal split on how respondents felt about their recommendation to the young graduate regarding how black consciousness should affect his decision. There were three basic points promoted by those who would discourage the young graduate from returning if the factor he is considering is black consciousness. They gave the following reasons:

1. There is a need to have more Black ambassadors comfortably established and willing to assist students or new immigrants from Black countries during their early days in the new land. This

is particularly true in Canada where a Black populace with professional skills and civil and political contacts is limited. Although not to the same extent this rationale is also for the United States.

2. Black identity and solidarity are more fostered and therefore more valuable and more sought by Blacks in North America. The immigrant soon finds the potential good in sharing this identity and solidarity which for myriads of reasons are not as overtly evident in his homeland.

3. One's conscious psyche makes him feel that he is not only "man" but "blackman" and consequently he meets his negative subconscious head-on and eventually becomes satisfied with himself as a person. He does not see the whiteman as one with more advantage except economically and it becomes a challenge to gain as much or more. "North America in this context gives us a better self-concept."

4. There was a good opportunity to cash in on privileges given to the disenfranchised. Although North America was not the primary beneficiary (Britain) yet she is its kin so there is no abuse in realizing these benefits offered in Education and Special Work situations.

Those who supported returning (Positive) pointed out a few factors supporting their recommendation.

1. There was no significant difference in their perception of the degree of positive self-concept they experienced in North America as opposed to that which they had experienced in Jamaica previous to their initial departure.

2. Being black in North America is used as a fad. It is a more exterior camouflage which a foreign black does not really utilize since he has already established self-confidence.

3. As Jamaicans, caucasion norms in music, literature, general manners seem to be consistent with our more sedate type behavior. But we realize we are black. This fundamental fact, blackness, and cultural acquisition, social norms, put us in the middle of a conflict. Such people conclude that Jamaica is therefore the best place to be.

4. "I never felt black until I came to North America." The conclusion of such realization is to return home where the other forms of prejudicial behaviors seem to orientate towards facets of life that are changeable.

Perception of Threat to Society

The immensity of this threat is not generally realized except by the returnee and people who are directly threatened by their perception of the returnee. Notice that 50 percent recommended that the young graduate does not return. They generally qualified this advice with the potential of the returnee to endure this threat during an incubation period of re-acculturation. They proposed four basic reasons for their positions.

1. They are perceived as a threat for jobs.
   (a) The people who have remained in the country perceive them as competition for the limited job possibilities.
   (b) Seniors feel their positions threatened because they are less qualified, and that type of insecurity facilitates malicious reactions.
   (c) His higher qualifications may make him legitimately displace others. He may be able to perform more tasks or organize for their performance to the detriment of others.
2. The returnee is perceived as an agent of infringement on the normal fabric of the society. Any recommendation he makes in personal or social life is regarded as an unnecessary infraction.

The result is frustration to any young enthusiastic returnee.

3. Any reaction that brings the operating system into question is regarded as a threat to the security of the system. Politicians are acutely alert for any such invasion. As one person said,

> His presence is acknowledged as a threat. . . . the whole society sees him as a threat to the cosmetics of the society. He threatens the security and legitimacy of the political establishment. . . . This is especially true if he flirts with any brand of nationalism.

People in government are more aware of this type of threat. However, each respondent qualified his/her response with the fact that the present political party is more disposed to political innovations regarding nationalism.

Those who viewed this factor positively had one basic reason.

1. They agreed that initially returnees are perceived as a threat but very soon they become absorbed in the system and everyone soon forgets, so it should not be an argument for not returning.

Latitude of One's Life

The response to this factor was highly skewed towards recommendation not to return home. Some of the respondents perceived this as similar to the factors,

Alternative Life Style, but most thought there was a tremendous difference. Latitude of One's Life was perceived in the latters' opinion as quality of life rather than variety of life styles as they perceived the former. The researcher did not mean to separate the two perceptions originally. Two basic reasons were given for encouraging young graduates not to return home on this factor.

1. There is the possibility of taking part in the society at a very exciting level. This excitement transcends professional orientation. This latitude may be described in terms of, " . . . he is exposed to everything that happens in the world at the moment it happens."

2. One has the possibility of going back to the Caribbean as often as his psych can endure it and yet returning to the North American society with no feeling of alienation re-threats or competition. His presence on the home landscape pre-supposes a tremendous excitement which he will not experience if he stays in Jamaica.

Those who recommended returning simply qualified their recommendation with the idea that they were unable to perceive a difference in the "Latitude of Life" referred to as a factor.

Marriage

This factor received serious consideration and respondents generally gave the following reasons as this motive for considering marriage as negative inducement.

1. If one's wife was from any part of the world other than the Caribbean (British West Indies) she could not adopt to the Jamaican situation. Cultural and/or climatic differences would be major hurdles, with the former being far more serious.

2. One's academic ascendency, particularly in the case of women, would be a progressive eliminating process from the marriage market. An unmarried woman finds more satisfaction outside of Jamaica so it is practical to remain in North America.

Those who considered marriage as positive inducement proposed the following reasons:

1. The educated woman (most women who have been abroad fall in this category) can contribute more to the social and professional life of her husband in Jamaica than in North America.

2. It is easier to hold the family relationship together in Jamaica because the ethos of the society credits marriage with more serenity than is accorded it in North America.

Perceptions on the Original Factors

Ninety percent of the respondents perceived the factors as they were originally conceived by the researcher. Their responses are tabled in the first ten factors in Table 17. The same question regarding advice to the young graduate was the background for the summaries given below.

Professional Development

The younger people were generally more positive towards people returning when professional development was considered. The older respondents were more negative and suggested that their positions may have been precipitated by a longer absence from home and a lack of knowledge about recent changes. However, the summarized reasons are as follows:

1. It is very difficult to acquire satisfactory jobs which facilitate your progress and continued efficiency. The result is that one becomes dissatisfied and " . . . job satisfaction is most important to me."

2. Foreign expatricates have had too many fringe benefits and privileges.

3. In a short time innovative, enthusiastic young people are relegated to fanatics and labelled

rebels and the opportunities for promotion or further study are denied them.

4. Most Jamaicans who remain home are satisfied with mediocre performance. They are therefore envious of those who return more qualified.

5. There is relentless antagonism to personal professional development, especially against younger professionals, exercised by older and more seasoned administrators.

Those who recommended return did so on two premises.

1. The North American professional market was overstocked and since most Jamaicans were in the arts, professional possibilities were better at home.

2. The soil for exploration was still virgin in Jamaica and if one was able to win favor the possibilities for professional development were limitless.

Government Policies and Politics

It is important to note the high degree of uncertainty involved with this factor. The reason for this uncertainty is associated with the policy of Democratic Socialism announced by the government. Most respondents said they would counsel new graduates to consider the implications that a new philosophy of government would

have on them. Respondents themselves for the most part were uncertain what effect it had upon them. The reasons given by the one who discouraged return were:

1. A prejudiced Ministry of Education, where nepotism was practiced. One interviewee cited the following incident: "I applied to the Ministry (Education) for a scholarship and received an abrupt letter saying the Ministry had stopped offering scholarships. . . . The very next month the lady who responded to me got a scholarship. . . . Many people work in the Ministry in order to get scholarships."

2. Government operates more on "who one knows rather than on one's professional qualification."

3. The government's policy has been one of systematic denial to the under-privileged social and economic class. So they opt not to return because they have no positive schema with which to view the country.

   Very few people know what privileges or benefits the government offers as inducements to return. Some people spend thousands of dollars to acquire an education and they should be reimbursed. If the government had given a scholarship they would have paid anyway.

4. Politics is too heavily involved with professional decisions when in reality these two have only remote functional connections.

Those who supported return had two reasons.

1. Their party is in power so their opportunities should be good. If the returnee is of the current ruling political party, it is a favorable time to return.

2. This party is historically the most supportive of professionals so it is reasonable to anticipate serious reforms that would positively affect returning professionals.

Sense of National Responsibility

Sixty percent recommended returning and 40 percent recommended against returning. Those for returning suggested the following reasons:

1. The country has been responsible for laying the foundation on which most respondents have built their professional life.

2. Some considered their social status in Jamaica unequalled in North America and such a privilege warranted commensurate returns in service.

3. There is an unqualified love for the society, geography and culture of Jamaica.

4. This is the opportune time to return to help others.

Those who suggested that it was not wise to return qualified their decision with the fact that they really loved the country. However, the following reasons were marshalled to support not returning.

1. The system of the country does not make adequate provision for the disinherited to absolve himself from the social, educational, economic, and psychological chains of defeat and failure.
2. The administrative system of the country has not developed a systematic and operative program of priorities.

Relevance of Professional Skills

Sixty percent recommended against returning and 20 percent recommended returning. The reasons that fostered these advices are:

1. Different philosophical bases. One respondent pointed to the "free school concept"; the "open classroom"; or the "alternative education" philosophy as impractical for Jamaicans to academically accept with this older core of British trained leaders. Even the neo-colonial educations would find it difficult to accept.

2. Some doctors, dentists, nurses, social scientists, agriculturists find that the transition back to their society and its appliances and equipment become a traumatic professional experience.

3. The majority believed their skills were not geared enough for their peculiar sociological and physical environment.

4. A substantial number believed their mastery of their skills changed their perspective on life so it is best for their home society if they support it by gifts rather by their skills.

Those who encouraged returning presented one point in support of their argument.

1. Unless a progressive percentage of these "so-called overskilled or other-skilled individuals returned the society will never be able to create that demand." They would not suggest an individual returning as a mere sacrificial lamb. They hoped that such skills would receive government protection in their embryonic period.

Desire for Adventure

This factor is included in the study on the researcher's own preconceived notions. It is interesting to note that the respondents all confessed that they had not thought of this as a factor before. They, however,

conceded that it had relevance to many of the experiences that motivated their decision to remain in North America. Those who thought that despite desire for adventure people should return home gave the following reasons:

1. The adventure for a professional really begins after he has become professionally popular. Jamaica now offers the opportunity for research that would foster that professional recognition.
2. No educated person really leaves his homeland merely for adventure.

Those who negatively responded made the following observations:

1. Jamaica cannot offer the means for movement nationally and internationally which the professional craves.
2. A professional person is an adventurer. Geographically, Jamaica is suffocating to his fully realizing his life's satisfaction which is to see new places, meet different people and experience the battle of minds in different cultures.

Economic Influences

Generally proposed as the most evident cause of immigration, it is meaningful to note that the degree of discouragement for economic factor is the same as

Relevance of Professional Skills. It is also worthwhile observing that while only 20 percent suggest return on the "Relevance of Professional Skills" 40 percent do so on "Economic Influence," which superficially suggests less cognition of economics in the North American setting as more important than relevance of professional skills. The reasons for recommending return may help to divulge how respondents were thinking.

1. The labor market in North America is hiring people for jobs far below their proficiency. This is directly related to the recession and a glut of professionals available in most fields.
2. There is really no substantive difference in salaries when the purchase power of the dollar in the respective nations is considered.

Those who recommend not returning give three precise reasons:

1. Better salaries can be had in North America.
2. The ability to acquire more of the "creature comforts vastly expanded in this economy."
3. Education is cheaper and better in North America.

Attitude Towards the Future

This is the second factor developed purely on the researcher's perception. It is important to note

that only Government Policies and Politics has a higher degree (50%) of uncertainty than Attitude Towards the Future (40%). This degree of uncertainty would be explained to the young graduate in light of (1) a youthful political party, (2) new political philosophies and (3) present sociological and economic unrest in the country. Those who were for returning introduced the following explanation:

1. There was much hope for professionals to realize their goals.
2. The society gave children a more moral perception of life and the traditions were more protected. A child's chances of success may be less academically, but with regard to character building children would be guided more positively.

Those who opt for not returning advanced the following reasons:

1. There is little hope in realizing professional goals.
2. Children's life will be stilted and the opportunity for creative growth stifled.
3. Children's academic potential would not be fully realized because of limited facilities, a closed societal concept and traditional conformity.

Communication

The respondents overwhelmingly agreed that they found it particularly difficult to respond to this question because communication with home has been haphazard, uninformative and informal. The 60 percent uncertainty reflects the lack of commitment that lack of communication has precipitated. The few who supported return did so out of their limited correspondence with their kin.

Adaptation

Most respondents believed that they would not be seriously affected either way by adaptation. A 40-40 percent between returning or remaining reflects this split. Those who remained forwarded two points in support of their position.

1. The opportunities offered in North America were the best to be found anywhere. "There is no place in the Western World that offered the kind of opportunity that North America offered and at the same time facilitates one's adjustment."
2. Culturally, linguistically, and politically both systems have many similarities that make adaptation a pleasant experience.

Those who recommended returning made basically three points to support their line of reason.

1. After a protracted time of sojourn they are still unable to be assimilated into the cultural norms of the North American society. The result is the building of subcultures which are unobservable professionally, but are socially evident.

2. The racial situation creates a milieu in which they are made to react concomitantly.

3. There is a constant mental re-commitment to return home regardless of the consequences and this increases as one gets older. Concurrent with this desire is an equally repelling awareness that one may be professionally and socially ostracized on returning.

Alternative Life Style

The subjects agreed that North America and Jamaica presented two distinct life styles that were mutually exclusive in many points. They generated a 40-40 percent split in the type of recommendation they would give to the young graduate when this point is considered. Those who favored returning presented the following encouragements:

1. The friendliness at home and the neighborly interaction is one coveted aspect of Jamaican life that is not practical in the American industrial phenomena.

2. Some respondents proposed that urban Jamaica had very few dissimilarities to urban metropolitan North America. They suggest the basic difference to be size. Therefore, returning would not incur a loss.

3. The functional rapidity and restlessness of North American society is too pervasive for one to absorb the quality of life that is possible.

4. This society is too ungodly. There are too few religious scruples.

Those who proposed remaining made the following observations:

1. The anonymity that is possible in the North American society is invaluable. It provides one with the assurance of self-exploration and a feeling of personal destiny.

2. Religion is not forced, therefore, it sheds its superficiality and sincere people worship out of spiritual preferences rather than societal taboos or pressures.

3. North America was the first experience for many respondents of the sophisticated, urban existence and their projection of similar realities back home is restricted to their homely environments.

4. The professional relationship at home was one of subservience rather than colleagubity between administrative professionals and those who wish to get anywhere in the system. The North American system seems to facilitate more cooperation and sharing of professional relation with neither losing respect for the other.

Overall Recommendation

At the end of responding to the recommendation one would give to a young graduate, respondents were asked, "What would be your final recommendation now?" Overwhelmingly, they concurred that they were uncertain. They advanced basically one reason for their uncertainty. The present political milieu was one of unpredictability. In such a position one's best investment, if he is out of the country, should be a careful assessment of the progressive trends of government policies. The oft expressed fear from people who are ardent supporters of the present government is uncertainty as to what is functionally implied in the theoretic concept of Democratic Socialism.

Summary

The factors that seem to weigh most heavily in the recommendation not to return home are in order of influence Relevance of Professional Skills, Economic Influences, Latitude of One's Life and Professional

Development. The first three were rated as important by 60 percent of the population interviewed. Fifty percent placed Professional Development as second most influential consideration.

Conversely, Sense of National Responsibility was the single most influential factor at or above the 50 percentage mark. It was actually 60 percent.

Communication with Country and Government Policies and Politics presented 60 and 50 percent uncertainty respectively. Indeed both scores seem to be precipitated by acute political changes that have not yet matured. This is reflected in the 50 percent Overall Recommendation given to the young graduate.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose and methodology are briefly reviewed at the beginning of this chapter. An amplified discussion of the hypotheses and other relevant findings follow. Implications of the study, recommendations for further research are then outlined.

Summary of Purpose and Methodology of the Study

The purpose of this study was originally to determine the factors that maximally separate Jamaican students who return to Jamaica (returnees), from those who remained in North America (nonreturnees) after they had completed their academic studies. Because of the limitations of subject response the study was redesigned to look at each population separately with demographic splits on age, vocation, level of education, income bracket and community background.

The instrument used to operationalize the demographic data and the factors in this study was designed

by the researcher for this particular study. The Likert Scale was the tool from which the scoring design was adopted.

The dependent variables were created from a review of literature, interview experiences and the researcher's experience with the population to be studied. The Hoyt Reliability Model was used to establish Factor Reliability Coefficients above 70 percent.

The Statistical Package for Social Science (Northwestern University) was used to establish frequencies, means and standard deviations on each item in the questionnaire used in the study (Appendix B). The Ranked-Difference Coefficient[1] formula was used to ascertain reliability on the differences between RANKED FACTORS and ITEM FACTORS.

The design of this study included the selection of the sample, collection of the data, analysis and the formulation of implications and recommendations which could be appropriately drawn from the research results. The multivariate analysis of variance was the statistical technique used to analyze the data. An interview research was employed to qualify responses to the questionnaire and to new factors introduced.

Findings

The discussion of the testing of each research question follows.

Research Question 1:

(a) Was there a difference in the response to the RANKED FACTORS and the ITEM FACTORS, returnees and nonreturnees; (b) By ordering both RANKED and ITEM FACTORS what factors one considered, most, less, least influencial in a three-four-three order.

1a. There was a difference in the RANKED FACTORS between the two groups; there was no difference between both groups on the ITEM FACTORS.

1b. Table on the Ranked Factors shows that the most influence among the nonreturnees was exerted by professional and economic interest. The returnees cited that professional and future considerations were most influential in their decision. The less influential factors for nonreturnees revolved around communication and nationalism. The least influential among both groups had identical factors except for the nonreturnee who pointed out Adaptation and the returnees, Economic Influences. The Item Factor ratings were similar for both returnees and nonreturnees. The researcher will later comment on the possibility of socialized responses.

Research Question 2:

Was there a significant difference in response on ITEM FACTORS shown by respondents who perceived themselves as coming from (a) Upper and Middle, (b) Lower Middle and (c) Lower income bracket?

No difference was found among the nonreturnees or returnees on the variable income bracket.

1. It must be noted, however, that the factor, Adaptation, as a dependent variable had a variance of $p < .141$ as against the level of significance set at .10. This may indicate that in subsequent considerations of similar studies Adaptation should be given careful consideration when income is considered.

2. The result of no significant difference on the returnees should not be given very weighty considerations because the response sample was not adequate. This particular variable is therefore reported only to complete the research questions on this group.

Research Question 3:

Was there a significant difference between the responses given by the subjects with respect to age groups 1-31 and 32-41?

Both returnees and nonreturnees responded with $p < .016$ and .032 respectively. This registers a difference at the .10 level established by the researcher.

1. Among the returnees the greatest level of differences were reported under dependent variables (factors), Relevance of Professional Skills and Communication with Country.

2. Nonreturnees cited Attitude Towards the Future as their major difference.

Research Question 4:

Was there a significant difference between the response of subjects from Rural versus Nonrural areas?

Both returnees and nonreturnees showed no difference when they were divided into Rural versus Nonrural background.

Research Question 5:

Was there a significant difference between the responses of (a) Medical and Engineering profession and (b) Education professions and (c) Other professions?

At the level of significance established there was no difference in either group. However, particular factors did have significant difference when taken on their own.

The nonreturnees had a $p < .0588$ on Sense of National Responsibility. On the same subscale the returnees had $p < .1471$. Although only one factor is at the level of significance, the relatively close probability of the second does indicate some indication that it is also influencial in the consideration of these factors.

Research Question 6:

Was there a significant difference between the responses among the different levels of education achieved with regard to (a) B.A., (b) M.A., and (c) Ph.D. and M.D.?

There was no significant difference among the nonreturnees on the variable, levels of education. However, the returnees did have a difference that was significant.

1. Among the nonreturnees, Communication with Country and Government Policies have levels of significance that warrants attention.

2. Returnees have significant differences in Professional Development, Desire for Adventure and Attitude Towards the Future. These differences are most apparent among the M.A. and Ph.D./M.D. groups on all three subscales.

Results of the data analysis show that there is no fundamental difference between the perception of the respondents regarding the influence these factors had on their respective decisions on emigration when they were categorized on the basis of age, vocation, level of education, income bracket and community background. Among the factors that may have affected the results of this study, however, are the size of the sample, the overweighted social and religious quality of the sample (see demographic data), the limitation of factors and possible difference of perception of the factors.

Several specific indications are evident from the general analysis despite its limitations for generalization.

1. Interest in professional development and/or relevance in the respondent's professional life is equally or more important than the economic influence which influences emigration.

2. Economic factors do have a strong influence on emigration of professionals.

3. Age is a significant factor in the decision to emigrate, with the older seeming more prone to do so.

4. The majority of the emigrants are from rural areas although that fact does not seem to indicate any significant difference with those who are not.

5. The majority of the respondents are from the lower or the lower middle income bracket, although that fact does not indicate that they view the factors any differently from the respondents in other categories.

6. There may be influential factors which the instrument used failed to cover sufficiently or did not deal with at all.

This study, therefore, does not concur with some recent studies that underscore Economic Influence as the most important factor in "student drain." Equally viable,

according to the results of this study, are Professional Development, Relevance of Professional Skills and Attitude Towards the Future.

The researcher introduced the new variables Attitude Towards the Future and Desire for Adventure into the study. It is important to note that in both groups these variables were in the upper 50 percentile range. Two implications are considered here for the response to these factors.

1. With regard to Attitude Towards the Future, the quality rather than the quantity of life is more attractive to individuals. The decision to emigrate or not to emigrate is dependent on the location of the best possibilities for realizing the quality life they desire. As was brought out in the interview on Attitude Toward the Future, Jamaica was considered the better place for children and family life, but for professional and economic advantages it was more advisable to remain in North America.

2. Desire for Adventure was also considered very influential by both returnees and nonreturnees. While the rationale for both perceiving these factors in the same light is not clear, it is the researcher's considered opinion that they

see adventure differently and so each could realize it in the society of his choice.

The results of this study strongly imply that there is no difference between the returnees and non-returnees. If this is true, then Senator Arnold Bertram, Parliamentary Secretary in the Prime Minister's Office (Jamaica), summed it in the claim that Jamaicans are "a migrant people" who know little about where they are coming from. . . . If "student drain" is the result of the wanderlust then countries must desist from labelling the phenomenon as "salary greed" and face the realities that the free human animal will always be moving. On the other hand this study also showed a very strong "Sense of National Responsibility." If students have strong nationalistic ties it is not mere surmising to think that there are reasons, other than Desire for Adventure, which keep them emigrating. Two reasons given are consistent with the personal interviews conducted.

1. First and foremost, the present Prime Minister has a messianic appeal to the professionals abroad. They believe in the published policy of the government. However, they are afraid of the very policy that has won their admiration. The uncertainty lies in two words "Democratic

Socialism." They have decided to support the government and watch (from afar) the evolution of this policy.

2. The majority of these people are from the periphery of the social, professional and economic force of the Jamaican society. Being highly conversant with the "political favoritism" and "professional nepotism" of the society they are uncertain of the future that awaits them.

Conclusions and Implications for Further Research

Future Research

A review of this study reveals the need for more in-depth studies of a basic nature. Many more studies with essentially more limited parameters for each could serve as building blocks for the organization of meaningful research to fully analyze the problem.

As a result of this research, the demand for one particularly challenging and worthwhile study is immediately apparent. An attempt will be made to generally define this study and its possibilities.

A longitudinal study should be conducted as a joint effort by the losing countries, the receiving countries, and the United Nations. Such a study should identify a representative number of students from each losing country and follow them to the point at which

they make their decision. In this sense two problems which this researcher faced would be offset. First, the elusive nature of the population to be studied would be controlled by well-monitored systems. Cost would not, therefore, be as exorbitant at the point when a sample is needed. Second, it would be easier to identify the adaptation rate of students and ascertain whether time is the most important factor in the acculturation process. The results from such study could help the losing government to decide whether special programs would serve useful purposes in limiting "student drain."

A predictive model should be developed, based on a sample of Jamaicans who studied in North America. The model will be related to possibility for better retention of human capital and more equitable distribution of economic resources through proper planning and administration of students studying abroad. This study should help administrators to understand how these students view the relationships they had with the home country while studying abroad. It should also be helpful to the government in selecting students and in relating to students who study abroad. It may even be necessary to accept loss through student drain as a natural phenomenon of foreign education.

Ramifications with Prospects

1. The colleges and universities attended by students of underdeveloped or developing countries become academies of national change. The hotels, boarding houses, cafes and restaurants educate foreign students to a culture contrary to their own.[2] If students were put in an environment where they were intellectually in touch with the best equipment and minds, without the accompanying fascination of the mega metropolitan "luxury clubs" of the developed nations the response to their country may be different.

   My suggestion therefore is that an international or regional university be set up through the United Nations Education and Scientific Cultural Organization to facilitate the educational needs of underdeveloped and developing countries.

2. From the study conducted it was evident that people who remained in North America stayed longer in school than those who returned to Jamaica. It would therefore be in the interest of the losing country to allow students shorter study periods for each session. This would prevent his establishing cultural ties within the new society.

3. From both the literature and this study there is ample evidence to conclude that permanent job offers with designated job descriptions are more likely to get people returning home.

4. Canada and Jamaica presently have a system of agreement which stipulates that the "brain-in-training" must return on completion of his designated academic goals. This is, however, only confined to people that are bonded by government. This same principle could be expanded to the entire North America with one added provisio. That is, if the person, bonded or unbonded, originally left the country solely on the understanding of academic pursuit, he should be made to return. This return should be for at least three years in the case of the unbonded student. People who financed their way should be reimbursed with the financial equivalent of a scholarship.

5. Government should publicize the benefits that are available to professionals who voluntarily repatriate. Communication with government was consistently rated low in this investigation. In the interviews it was evident that people were ignorant of the developments and benefits

possible for professionals in Jamaica. Information about Banking Loans should be circulated to professionals in potential private professions.

6. This researcher concurs with Joseph Chathaparampil, when he proposed a voluntary repatriation of foreign educated sponsored by the United States (and Canada) under programs similar to the Peace Corps. In this design they would have the security of the North American while serving their own country and the North American countries would be spreading their international good will and political influence.[3]

7. Finally, if Relevance of Professional Skills is the problem it is made out to be, then each North American University should undertake the awesome responsibility of encouraging the student, especially at the masters and doctors level to do his thesis or dissertation on something related to his country of origin.

8. The most revolutionary recommendation is for developing nations with low natural resources to adopt a policy of "brains marketing." The operating principle would be investment in education for sale. This would involve investigation of countries and their educational needs in an

effort to produce professionals as experts at a price to be decided by the two countries. The trained individual would choose the country, but before the investment begins he would be made aware of the process of transaction. The losing country would, at least, get a few million on its "student brain."

The final statement in this study is that the place of economics in this study cannot be minimized. Although the researcher is convinced that individual students do not "drain" for primary economic reasons, he is however convinced that "student drain" is contingent on the general economic well being of a nation or society. It is this contingency that is going to make professional desires realized, attitude toward the future secured. However, Sense of National Responsibility, Communication, Government Policies and Politics, Adaptation and Alternate Life Styles are not necessarily contingent upon Economic Stability of a country.

NOTES--CHAPTER VI

[1]Merle W. Tate and Richard C. Clelland, Non-Parametric and Shortcut Statistics (Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1959), p. 15.

[2]Stephen E. Deutsch, International Education and Exchange: A Sociological Analysis (Cleveland Case: Western Reserve University, 1970), p. 12.

[3]Joseph Chatharampil, "Brain Drain: A Case Study," Reprint from Asian Forum 2 (1970): 17.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PRE-TEST

APPENDIX A

PRE-TEST

THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION: ADMINISTRATION AND

HIGHER EDUCATION

Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823

June, 1975

Dear Colleague:

I am writing to you as a fellow Jamaican who has similar interest in our country. Presently I am involved in a research project to examine the influences that make some of us decide to emigrate from our homeland.

We know there are many influences involved, but most have been speculations rather than facts. Your cooperation in giving what you consider to be the real reason for your decision to return home or remain abroad, will help us to provide a more accurate picture of the real motives which are involved.

The questionnaire is devised so that the questions can be answered quickly and should take only 20 to 30 minutes to complete.

For convenience the questionnaire is divided into three parts with particular directions for each part. Please read these before attempting to answer.

This study is limited to Jamaicans who are graduates of North American colleges or universities. You are one of the persons selected to represent this group--therefore your response is very important to the study.

Please note that the questionnaire is already addressed and has prepaid postage for return for your convenience. Thus it only requires you to drop it in the mail after you are through.

Your response will be used in a general group assessment and not on an individual basis. The code number on the questionnaire is only for purposes of deciding whether your response has been received.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Trevor Geo. Gardner
Ph.D. Candidate

Walter F. Johnson
Committee Chairman & Advisor

TGG/pg

DIRECTIONS

1. READ each item carefully.
2. Make a check mark (✓) on one of the blank spaces for each item between 1 - 8.
3. For items 9 - 11 WRITE in the appropriate designations.
4. Mark your answers as shown in the following examples.

Example: Age group: ____ under 21; ____ 22 to 31; __✓__ 32 to 41; ____ over 40.

Example: The type of community in which you grew up in Jamaica: ____rural; __✓__urban; ____suburban.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Sex: ____male; ____female.
2. Years of residence in North America: 19__to 19__.
3. Age group: ___under 21; ___22 to 31; ___32 to 41; ___over 40.
4. The type of community in which you grew up in Jamaica: ____rural; ____urban; ____suburban.
5. Father's occupational category: ___professional; ___trades; ___farmer; ___labourer; ___factory worker; ___other (please explain).
6. Mother's occupational category: ___professional; ___trades; ___housewife; ___labourer; ___factory worker; ___other (please explain).
7. Denominational affiliation: ___Methodist; ___Anglican; ___Baptist; ___Seventh-day Adventist; ___Roman Catholic; ___Church of God; ___Church of Christ; ___Brethren; ___other (Please indicate)_____; ___none.
8. Income bracket (Family): ___lower; ___lower middle; ___middle; ___upper.
9. Your present fulltime occupation:_____
10. Highest level of education you have completed:_____
11. Were you a bonded student: _____ (Yes or No).

PART A

In responding to the following 12 items please make an effort to recapture your thoughts and feelings just prior to leaving Jamaica for your course of study. You may have to think back quite a few years but recapturing how you felt THEN is very important. Let's travel back over the years to the time shortly before you left to study.

DIRECTIONS

1. THINK BACK to those days.

2. Decide to what extent you agree or disagree with each item:

   5 - STRONGLY agree
   4 - Agree
   3 - Uncertain
   2 - Disagree
   1 - STRONGLY DISagree

3. Draw a circle around one of the numbers following the item to show the answer you selected.

4. Mark your responses as shown in the examples below.

   Example: Departure from Jamaica was my first real opportunity for success 5 4 3 2 1

   Example: I felt social justice was inadequate in Jamaica 5 4 3 2 1

5. It is important that you answer each question.

6. Replies to this questionnaire will be treated confidentially.

5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 Uncertain	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree

1. My departure from Jamaica was my first real opportunity to success 1. 5 4 3 2 1

2. I viewed North America as the land of opportunity and success. 2. 5 4 3 2 1

3. I planned to return after I had "established" myself 3. 5 4 3 2 1

4. Before leaving Jamaica I thought it was among the best countries in the world. 4. 5 4 3 2 1

5. I planned to return to my country immediately after studying abroad. 5. 5 4 3 2 1

5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 Uncertain	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree

6.	I felt that my future in Jamaica would be very secured even if I had never gone abroad	6. 5 4 3 2 1
7.	I felt some people did not get the respect they deserved in Jamaica compared to other countries	7. 5 4 3 2 1
8.	Before I left Jamaica I had already decided to emigrate permanently if I got the chance. . . .	8. 5 4 3 2 1
9.	Foreigners got a better break in Jamaica than did natives then	9. 5 4 3 2 1
10.	I felt it was unjust for Jamaicans to continue giving special treatment to some people because of their wealth	10. 5 4 3 2 1
11.	On a whole I felt satisfied with the social, economic and judiciary progress of Jamaica. . .	11. 5 4 3 2 1
12.	The Jamaican system would allow me the opportunity I need for success	13. 5 4 3 2 1

PART B

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the influences that may have affected you at the time you made your decision to return to Jamaica or remain in North America. Each item seeks to get your feeling about which item had the greatest influence on you. Although some items may appear similar they express differences that are important in the description of your considerations in making your decision to remain in North America or return to Jamaica. This is NOT a test in ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe as accurately as you can your attitude to these influences at the time that your decision to return home or remain abroad was made.

N.B. While it is true that some of us abroad may not yet be fully decided as to whether to remain here or return home, it is nonetheless important that you do this questionnaire. Provision has been made for people who are undecided. Begin to think about the time you made your decision.

DIRECTIONS

1. READ each item carefully.

2. THINK BACK to how you may have thought when you were deciding.

3. DECIDE how influential each item was: (5) STRONGLY influential (4) Influential (3) Neutral (2) NOT influential (1) STRONGLY UNinfluential.

4. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five numbers (5 4 3 2 1) following the item to show the answer you have selected:

   5 - STRONGLY Influential
   4 - Influential
   3 - Neutral
   2 - NOT influential
   1 - STRONGLY UNinfluential

5. Mark your responses as shown in the examples below.

   Example: Professional contribution I could make to my country 5 4 3 2 1

   Example: Satisfaction with my job before I left Jamaica 5 4 3 2 1

   Example: Marriage 5 4 3 2 1

6. It is important that you answer each question.

Administered by Trevor G. Gardner

	5 Strongly Influential	4 Influential	3 Neutral	2 Not Influential	1 Strongly Uninfluential
1. The thrill of living in a foreign country . . .					1. 5 4 3 2 1
2. Facination of living in a different culture . .					2. 5 4 3 2 1
3. Influence of relatives who travelled abroad . .					3. 5 4 3 2 1
4. Model of respect and success ascribed to those who study abroad					4. 5 4 3 2 1
5. Variety within live styles.					5. 5 4 3 2 1
6. Opportunity for me to be myself					6. 5 4 3 2 1
7. Variety of social activities.					7. 5 4 3 2 1
8. Attitude of my religious denomination to contemporary life styles					8. 5 4 3 2 1
9. My concept of relationship between religious life and social life					9. 5 4 3 2 1

5 Strongly Influential	4 Influential	3 Neutral	2 Not Influential	1 Strongly Uninfluential

10.	Perception of social adjustment	10.	5 4 3 2 1
11.	Marriage	11.	5 4 3 2 1
12.	Interplay of bureaucratic practices and opportunity for adequate use of my skills . .	12.	5 4 3 2 1
13.	Level of country's development as related to accomodation of my expertise.	13.	5 4 3 2 1
14.	Quality of professional adjustment.	14.	5 4 3 2 1
15.	Cultural contributions I could make	15.	5 4 3 2 1
16.	Professional contributions I could make . . .	16.	5 4 3 2 1
17.	Length of stay away from home	17.	5 4 3 2 1
18.	Awareness of the social, economic and cultural development from Jamaican sources . . .	18.	5 4 3 2 1
19.	Information about jobs from government sources	19.	5 4 3 2 1
20.	Jamaican newspaper or news source at the institution I attended.	20.	5 4 3 2 1
21.	Correspondence with friends in informing me about what was taking place in Jamaica. . . .	21.	5 4 3 2 1
22.	Probability of a permanent job.	22.	5 4 3 2 1
23.	Awareness of developments in my field of study	23.	5 4 3 2 1
24.	Information, in my field of study, supplied by Jamaican government.	24.	5 4 3 2 1
25.	Sense of responsibility to Jamaica.	25.	5 4 3 2 1
26.	My feeling about me being able to contribute to Jamaica.	26.	5 4 3 2 1
27.	Family responsibilities back home	27.	5 4 3 2 1
28.	Sense of identification with country.	28.	5 4 3 2 1
29.	My belief about the need for my skills. . . .	29.	5 4 3 2 1

5 Strongly Influential	4 Influential	3 Neutral	2 Not Influential	1 Strongly Uninfluential

30.	Government perceptions of me before and after I completed my studies	30.	5 4 3 2 1
31.	Influence of government policies	31.	5 4 3 2 1
32.	Government compensation, in benefits, for low salaries	32.	5 4 3 2 1
33.	Latitude for political freedom	33.	5 4 3 2 1
34.	Practice of favouritism in politics.	34.	5 4 3 2 1
35.	My attitude towards the political party in power at that time	35.	5 4 3 2 1
36.	Practice of human and civil rights in Jamaican system	36.	5 4 3 2 1
37.	Government's distribution of economic wealth .	37.	5 4 3 2 1
38.	Satisfaction with my job before I left Jamaica	38.	5 4 3 2 1
39.	Satisfaction with the job I'd receive on returning to Jamaica	39.	5 4 3 2 1
40.	Relationship with my immediate superiors prior to leaving Jamaica	40.	5 4 3 2 1
41.	Working conditions in Jamaica.	41.	5 4 3 2 1
42.	Relationship with my immediate subordinates before I left home	42.	5 4 3 2 1
43.	Attitude of older professionals toward new ideas from the "Young Upstarts" (younger professionals)	43.	5 4 3 2 1
44.	Opportunity to influence change in the society	44.	5 4 3 2 1
45.	Opportunity for professional development . . .	45.	5 4 3 2 1
46.	Opportunity for maintenance of research proficiency	46.	5 4 3 2 1
47.	Attitude towards Innovative people	47.	5 4 3 2 1
48.	Opportunities for professional promotion . . .	48.	5 4 3 2 1
49.	Opportunity for social status accorded me as compared with colleagues who remained at home.	49.	5 4 3 2 1

5 Strongly Influential	4 Influential	3 Neutral	2 Not Influential	1 Strongly Uninfluential

50.	Pressures of educational system	50.	5 4 3 2 1
51.	Social attitudes of those who remained home .	51.	5 4 3 2 1
52.	The part (role) Jamaican society played in effecting my achievements	52.	5 4 3 2 1
53.	Academic opportunity for my children.	53.	5 4 3 2 1
54.	Consideration of my children's future	54.	5 4 3 2 1
55.	Opportunity to develop self esteem here versus back home	55.	5 4 3 2 1
56.	Prestige accorded North American versus British degrees	56.	5 4 3 2 1
57.	Social status accorded my high school alma mater	57.	5 4 3 2 1
58.	Chances of acceptance to clubs and associations without consideration of "who one knows"	58.	5 4 3 2 1
59.	Adjustment to the North American way of life.	59.	5 4 3 2 1
60.	Self-perception of the country's need of me .	60.	5 4 3 2 1
61.	Effect of public holidays on me	61.	5 4 3 2 1
62.	Social interactions with North Americans. . .	62.	5 4 3 2 1
63.	Interest shown by American teachers in helping me realize my goals	63.	5 4 3 2 1
64.	American business or institutions interest in my skill	64.	5 4 3 2 1
65.	Academic interactions with North Americans. .	65.	5 4 3 2 1
66.	Sparcity of Jamaicans in the area	66.	5 4 3 2 1
67.	North Americans	67.	5 4 3 2 1
68.	Cultural identity	68.	5 4 3 2 1
69.	Attitude to North American holidays versus Jamaican holidays	69.	5 4 3 2 1

5 Strongly Influential	4 Influential	3 Neutral	2 Not Influential	1 Strongly Uninfluential

70. Attractive salary 70. 5 4 3 2 1

71. Purchasing power of the dollar in the respective country. 71. 5 4 3 2 1

72. The possibilities of picking up some "quick cash" 72. 5 4 3 2 1

73. Interest of firms/institutions in my financial needs 73. 5 4 3 2 1

74. Employment fringe benefits in N. America vs. those in Jamaica. 74. 5 4 3 2 1

75. Opportunity to help my relatives. 75. 5 4 3 2 1

76. Opportunity for social mobility 76. 5 4 3 2 1

77. Need to be respected 77. 5 4 3 2 1

78. Opportunity to associate freely across social and class lines 78. 5 4 3 2 1

79. This item requires you to give a numerical rating to each item that follows. The range of your rating must be, in order of importance, from one to eleven. Make sure each item gets either a 1 or 2 or 3 . . . up to 11. Use each number once only.

Professional Development ___; Government Policies and Politics ___; Sense of National Responsibility ___; Economic Influences ___; Communication with the Country ___; Relevance of Professional Skills ___; Desire for Adventure ___; Pre-Departure Concepts ___; Attitude Towards the future ___; Adaptation ___; Alternative Life Styles ___.

Thank you ! !

Comments:

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUMENT

THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION: ADMINISTRATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN 48823

July, 1975

Dear Colleague:

I am writing to you as a fellow Jamaican who is interested in our country. Presently I am involved in a research project to examine the influences that make some of us decide to emigrate from our homeland.

We know there are many influences involved, but most have been speculations rather than facts. Your cooperation in giving what you consider to be the real reason for your decision to return home or remain abroad, will help us to provide a more accurate picture of the real motives which are involved.

The questionnaire is devised so that the questions can be answered quickly and should take only 20 to 30 minutes to complete.

For convenience the questionnaire is divided into three parts with particular directions for each part. Please read these before attempting to answer.

This study is limited to Jamaicans who are graduates of North American colleges or universities. You are one of the persons selected to represent this group-therefore your response is very important to the study.

Please note that the questionnaire is already addressed and has prepaid postage for return for your convenience. Thus it only requires you to drop it in the mail after you are through.

Your response will be used in a general group assessment and not on an individual basis. The code number on the questionnaire is only for purposes of deciding whether your response has been received.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Trevor Geo. Gardner
Ph.D. Candidate

Walter F. Johnson
Committee Chairman & Advisor

TGG/pg

DIRECTIONS

1. READ each item carefully.
2. Make a check mark (✓) on one of the blank spaces for each item between 1 - 8.
3. For items 9 - 11 WRITE in the appropriate designations.
4. Mark your answers as shown in the following examples.
5. Example: Age group: ___ under 21; ✓ 22 to 31; ___ 32 to 41; ___ over 40.

   Example: The type of community in which you grew up in Jamaica: ___ rural; ✓ urban; ___ suburban.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Sex: ___ male; ___ female.
2. Years of residence in North America: 19___ to 19___.
3. Age group: ___ under 21; ___ 22 to 31; ___ 32 to 41; ___ over 40.
4. The type of community in which you grew up in Jamaica: ___ rural; ___ urban; ___ suburban.
5. Father's occupational category: ___ professional; ___ trades; ___ farmer; ___ labourer; ___ factory worker; ___ other (please explain).
6. Mother's occupational category: ___ professional; ___ trades; ___ housewife; ___ labourer; ___ factory worker; ___ other (please explain).
7. Denominational affiliation: ___ Methodist; ___ Anglican; ___ Baptist; ___ Seventh-day Adventist; ___ Roman Catholic; ___ Church of God; ___ Church of Christ; ___ Brethren; ___ other (please indicate) _____; ___ none.
8. Income bracket (Family): ___ lower; ___ lower middle; ___ middle; ___ upper.
9. Your present fulltime occupation: _____
10. Highest level of education you have completed: _____
11. Were you a bonded student: _____ (Yes or No).

PART A

In responding to the following 12 items please make an effort to recapture your thoughts and feeling just prior to leaving Jamaica for your course of study. You may have to think back quite a few years but recapturing how you felt THEN is very important. Let's travel back over the years to the time shortly before you left to study.

DIRECTIONS

1. THINK BACK to those days when you were leaving Jamaica.
2. Decide to what extent you agree or disagree with each item:

   5 - STRONGLY agree
   4 - Agree
   3 - Uncertain
   2 - Disagree
   1 - STRONGLY DISagree

3. Draw a circle around one of the numbers following the item to show the answer you selected.
4. Mark your responses as shown in the examples below.

   Example Travelling from Jamaica was fun. 5 (4) 3 2 1

   Example: Leaving my beaches was no fun. 5 4 3 (2) 1

5. It is important that you answer each question.
6. Replies to this questionnaire will be treated confidentially.

QUESTIONS

5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 Uncertain	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree

(1). My departure from Jamaica was my first real opportunity to success (1) (5) 4 3 2 1

(2). I viewed North America as the land of opportunity and success . . (2) 5 4 3 (2)

(3). I planned to return after I had "established" myself. . . . . (3) 5 4 3 2 1

5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 Uncertain	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree

(4). Before leaving Jamaica I thought it was among the best countries in the world. . . . . (4) 5 4 3 2 1

(5). I planned to return to my country immediately after studying abroad. . . . . (5) 5 4 3 2 1

(6). I felt that my future in Jamaica would be secure even if I had never gone abroad . . . . . (6) 5 4 3 2 1

(7). I felt some people did not get the respect they deserved in Jamaica compared to other countries . . . . . (7) 5 4 3 2 1

(8). Before I left Jamaica I had already decided to emigrate permanently if I got the chance . . . . . (8) 5 4 3 2 1

(9). Foreigners got a better break in Jamaica than did natives . . . . (9) 5 4 3 2 1

(10). I felt it was unjust for Jamaicans to continue giving special treatment to some people because of their wealth. . . . . .(10) 5 4 3 2 1

(11). On the whole I felt satisfied with the social, economic and judiciary progress of Jamaica . . . . . .(11) 5 4 3 2 1

(12). The Jamaican system would allow me the opportunity I need for success . . . . . .(12) 5 4 3 2 1

Please proceed to page 5 for Part B.

PART B

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the influences that may have affected you at the time you made your decision to return to Jamaica or remain in North America. Each item seeks to get your feeling about which items had the greatest influence on you. Although some items may appear similar they express differences that are important in the description of your considerations in making your decision to remain in North America or return to Jamaica. This is NOT a test in ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe as accurately as you can your attitude to these influences at the time that your decision to return home or remain abroad was made.

Note: While it is true that some of us abroad may not yet be fully decided as to whether to remain here or return home, it is nonetheless important that you complete this questionnaire. Provision has been made for persons who are undecided.

DIRECTIONS

1. READ each item carefully.
2. THINK BACK to how you may have thought when you were deciding about returning to Jamaica.
3. DECIDE on the degree of influence each item had on your decision: (5) STRONG influence (4) SOME influence (3) Neutral (2) LITTLE influence (1) NO influence.
4. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five numbers (5 4 3 2 1) following the item to show the answer you have selected:

   5 - STRONG influence
   4 - SOME influence
   3 - Neutral
   2 - LITTLE influence
   1 - NO influence

5. Mark your responses as shown in the examples below.

   Example: Contribution of parents to my education. . . . 5 4 3 2 1

   Example: Satisfaction with the subjects I did 5 4 3 2 1

   Example: Type of associations I formed. 5 4 3 2 1

6. It is important that you answer each question.

5 Strong Influence	4 Some Influence	3 Neutral	2 Little Influence	1 No Influence

(1). The thrill of living in a foreign country. . . . . (1) 5 4 3 2 1

(2). Facination of living in a different culture. . . . . (2) 5 4 3 2 1

(3). Influence of relatives who travelled abroad. . . . . (3) 5 4 3 2 1

(4). Model of respect and success ascribed to those who study abroad . . . . . (4) 5 4 3 2 1

(5). Variety within life styles . . . . . (5) 5 4 3 2 1

(6). Opportunity for me to be myself. . . . . (6) 5 4 3 2 1

(7). Variety of social activities . . . . . (7) 5 4 3 2 1

(8). Attitude of my religious denomination to contemporary life styles . . . . . (8) 5 4 3 2 1

(9). My concept of relationship between religious life and social life . . . . . (9) 5 4 3 2 1

(10). Perception of social adjustment. . . . . (10) 5 4 3 2 1

(11). Marriage . . . . . (11) 5 4 3 2 1

(12). Interplay of bureaucratic practices and opportunity for adequate use of my skills. . . . . (12) 5 4 3 2 1

(13). Level of country's development as related to accomodation of my expertise . . . . . (13) 5 4 3 2 1

(14). Quality of professional adjustment . . . . . (14) 5 4 3 2 1

(15). Cultural contributions I could make. . . . . (15) 5 4 3 2 1

(16). Professional contributions I could make. . . . . (16) 5 4 3 2 1

(17). Length of stay away from home. . . . . (17) 5 4 3 2 1

(18). Awareness of the social, economic and cultural development from Jamaican sources. . . . . (18) 5 4 3 2 1

(19). Information about jobs from government sources . . . . . (19) 5 4 3 2 1

(20). Jamaican newspaper or news source at the institution I attended . . . . . (20) 5 4 3 2 1

7

5 Strong Influence	4 Some Influence	3 Neutral	2 Little Influence	1 No Influence

(21). Correspondence with friends in informing me about what was taking place in Jamaica. . . . . (21) 5 4 3 2 1

(22). Probability of a permanent job . . . . . (22) 5 4 3 2 1

(23). Awareness of developments in my field of study . . . . . (23) 5 4 3 2 1

(24). Information, in my field of study, supplied by Jamaican government . . . . . (24) 5 4 3 2 1

(25). Sense of responsibility to Jamaica . . . . . (25) 5 4 3 2 1

(26). My feeling about me being able to contribute to Jamaica. . . (26) 5 4 3 2 1

(27). Family responsibilities back home. . . . . (27) 5 4 3 2 1

(28). Sense of identification with country . . . . . (28) 5 4 3 2 1

(29). My belief about the need for my skills . . . . . (29) 5 4 3 2 1

(30). Government perceptions of me before and after I completed my studies . . . . . (30) 5 4 3 2 1

(31). Influence of government policies . . . . . (31) 5 4 3 2 1

(32). Government compensation, in benefits, for low salaries . . . (32) 5 4 3 2 1

(33). Latitude for political freedom . . . . . (33) 5 4 3 2 1

(34). Practice of favouritism in politics. . . . . (34) 5 4 3 2 1

(35). My attitude towards the political party in power at that time . . . . . (35) 5 4 3 2 1

(36). Practice of human and civil rights in Jamaican system. . . . (36) 5 4 3 2 1

(37). Government's distribution of economic wealth . . . . . (37) 5 4 3 2 1

(38). Satisfaction with my job before I left Jamaica . . . . . (38) 5 4 3 2 1

(39). Satisfaction with the job I'd receive on returning to Jamaica. . . . . (39) 5 4 3 2 1

(40). Relationship with my immediate superiors prior to leaving Jamaica. . . . . (40) 5 4 3 2 1

(41). Working conditions in Jamaica. . . . . (41) 5 4 3 2 1

8

5 Strong Influence	4 Some Influence	3 Neutral	2 Little Influence	1 No Influence

(42). Relationship with my immediate subordinates before I left home. . . . . (42) 5 4 3 2 1

(43). Attitude of older professionals toward new ideas from the younger professionals. . . . . (43) 5 4 3 2 1

(44). Opportunity to influence change in the society. . . . . (44) 5 4 3 2 1

(45). Opportunity for professional development. . . . . (45) 5 4 3 2 1

(46). Opportunity for maintenance of research proficiency . . . . (46) 5 4 3 2 1

(47). Attitude towards innovative people. . . . . (47) 5 4 3 2 1

(48). Opportunities for professional promotion. . . . . (48) 5 4 3 2 1

(49). Opportunity for social status accorded me as compared with colleagues who remained at home. . . . . (49) 5 4 3 2 1

(50). Pressures of educational system . . . . . (50) 5 4 3 2 1

(51). Social attitudes of those who remained home . . . . . (51) 5 4 3 2 1

(52). The effect of Jamaican society in realizing my goals. . . . (52) 5 4 3 2 1

(53). Academic opportunity for my children. . . . . (53) 5 4 3 2 1

(54). Consideration of my children's future . . . . . (54) 5 4 3 2 1

(55). Opportunity to develop self-esteem here versus back home. . (55) 5 4 3 2 1

(56). Prestige accorded North American versus British degrees . . (56) 5 4 3 2 1

(57). Social status accorded my high school alma mater. . . . . (57) 5 4 3 2 1

(58). Chances of acceptance to clubs and associations without consideration of "who one knows". . . . . (58) 5 4 3 2 1

(59). Adjustment to the North American way of life. . . . . (59) 5 4 3 2 1

(60). Self-perception of the country's need of me . . . . . (60) 5 4 3 2 1

(61). Effect of public holidays on me . . . . . (61) 5 4 3 2 1

(62). Social interactions with North Americans. . . . . (62) 5 4 3 2 1

(63). Interest shown by American teachers in helping me realize my goals. . . . . (63) 5 4 3 2 1

5 Strong Influence	4 Some Influence	3 Neutral	2 Little Influence	1 No Influence

(64). American business or institutions' interest in my skill. . . (64) 5 4 3 2 1

(65). Academic interactions with North Americans . . . . . (65) 5 4 3 2 1

(66). Sparcity of Jamaicans in the area . . . . . (66) 5 4 3 2 1

(67). North Americans . . . . . (67) 5 4 3 2 1

(68). Cultural identity . . . . . (68) 5 4 3 2 1

(69). Attitude to N. American holidays versus Jamaican holidays. . (69) 5 4 3 2 1

(70). Attractive salary. . . . . (70) 5 4 3 2 1

(71). Purchasing power of the dollar in the respective country . . (71) 5 4 3 2 1

(72). The possibilities of picking up some "quick cash". . . . . (72) 5 4 3 2 1

(73). Interest of firms/institutions in my financial needs . . . . (73) 5 4 3 2 1

(74). Employment fringe benefits in N. America versus Jamacia. . . (74) 5 4 3 2 1

(75). Opportunity to help my relatives . . . . . (75) 5 4 3 2 1

(76). Opportunity for social mobility. . . . . (76) 5 4 3 2 1

(77). Need to be respected . . . . . (77) 5 4 3 2 1

(78). Opportunity to associate freely across social and class lines(78) 5 4 3 2 1

PART C

This section requires you to give a numerical rating to each item that follows according to how much influence each had on your decision. The range of your rating must be, in order of importance, from 1 to 11. Use each number once only, ordering them according to the influence they had on your decision.

(79). Professional Development ____

(80). Government Policies and Politics ____

(81). Sense of National Responsibility ____

(82). Relevance of Professional Skills ____

(83). Desire for Adventure ____

(84). Economic Influences ____

(85). Communication with the country ____

(86). Pre-departure concepts ____

(87). Attitude towards the future ____

(88). Adaptation ____

(89). Alternative Life Styles ____

THANK YOU!

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX C

INDIVIDUAL SCORES FOR EACH VARIABLE; COMPUTED ON SPSS:

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

PART B: INCLUDING FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE;

MEAN (M) AND STANDARD DEVIATION (S.D.)

APPENDIX C

INDIVIDUAL SCORES FOR EACH VARIABLE: COMPUTED ON SPSS: MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
PART B: INCLUDING FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE; MEAN (M) AND STANDARD DEVIATION (S.D.)

Variables	Questions	NORTH AMERICA 1	2	3	4	5	M	S.D.	JAMAICA 1	2	3	4	5	M	S.D.
12	1	8(21.6)	14(37.8)	5(13.9)	6(10.8)	4(10.8)	2.6	1.3)	7(36.8)	4(21.1)	3(15.8)	3(15.8)	2(10.5)	2.4	1.4
13	2	2(5.4)	4(10.8)	7(18.9)	18(48.5)	6(16.2)	3.6	1.1	5(26.3)	2(10.5)	3(15.8)	7(36.8)	2(10.5)	2.9	1.4
14	3	4(10.8)	4(10.8)	6(16.2)	9(24.3)	14(37.8)	3.7	1.3	5(26.3)	3(15.8)	0(0.0)	9(47.4)	2(10.5)	3.0	1.5
15	4	0(0.0)	7(18.9)	7(18.9)	15(40.5)	8(21.6)	3.6	1.0	2(10.5)	4(21.1)	3(15.8)	6(31.6)	4(21.1)	3.3	1.3
16	5	2(5.4)	11(29.7)	4(10.8)	5(13.5)	15(40.5)	3.5	1.4	2(10.5)	0(0.0)	3(15.8)	4(21.1)	10(52.6)	4.1	1.3
17	6	4(10.8)	4(10.8)	5(13.5)	14(37.8)	10(27.0)	3.6	1.3	3(15.8)	2(10.5)	1(5.3)	8(42.1	5(26.3)	3.5	1.4
18	7	4(10.8)	8(21.6)	6(16.2)	12(32.4)	7(18.9)	3.3	1.3	2(10.5)	2(10.5	5(26.3)	7(36.8)	3(15.8)	3.4	1.2
19	8	15(40.5	9(24.3)	5(13.5)	5(13.5)	3(8.1)	2.2	1.3	9(47.4)	5(26.3)	2(10.5)	2(10.5)	1(5.3)	2.0	1.2
20	9	3(8.1)	0(0.0)	6(16.2)	16(43.2)	12(32.4)	4.0	1.1	0(0.0)	3(15.8)	5(26.3)	5(26.3)	6(31.6)	3.7	1.1
21	10	2(5.4)	2(5.4)	3(8.1)	12(32.4)	18(48.6)	4.1	1.1	0(0.0)	2(10.5)	2(10.5)	10(52.6)	5(26.3)	3.9	0.9
22	11	12(32.4)	13(35.1)	6(16.2)	5(13.5)	1(2.7)	2.2	1.1	6(31.6)	6(31.6)	4(21.1)	3(15.8)	0(0.0)	2.2	1.1
23	12	4(10.8)	10(27.0)	9(24.3)	10(27.0	5(13.5)	3.1	1.2	1(5.3)	5(26.3)	2(10.5)	9(47.4)	2(10.5)	3.3	1.2
24	1	10(27.0)	12(32.4)	4(10.8)	9(24.3)	2(5.4)	2.5	1.2	4(21.1)	6(31.6)	3(15.8)	5(26.3)	1(5.3)	2.6	1.3
25	2	9(24.3)	13(35.1)	6(16.2)	9(24.3)	2(5.4)	2.5	1.2	3(15.8)	6(31.6)	6(31.6)	3(15.8)	1(5.3)	2.6	1.1
26	3	13(35.1)	10(27.0)	3(8.1)	6(16.2)	5(13.5)	2.5	1.4	6(31.6)	4(21.1)	2(10.5)	4(21.1)	3(15.8)	2.7	1.5
27	4	11(29.7)	8(21.6)	3(8.1)	13(35.1)	2(5.4)	2.6	1.4	6(31.6)	1(5.3)	3(15.8)	6(31.6)	3(15.8)	2.9	1.5
28	5	6(16.2)	8(21.6)	7(18.9)	13(35.1)	3(8.1)	3.0	1.2	2(10.5)	3(15.8)	8(42.1)	5(26.3)	1(5.3)	3.0	1.1
29	6	6(16.2)	2(5.4)	7(18.9)	12(32.4)	10(27.0)	3.5	1.4	2(10.5)	2(10.5)	5(26.3)	6(31.6)	4(21.1)	3.4	1.3
30	7	8(21.6)	5(13.5)	9(24.3)	12(32.4)	3(8.1)	3.0	1.3	0(0.0)	6(31.6)	5(26.3)	4(21.1)	4(21.0)	3.3	1.2
31	8	17(45.9)	8(21.6)	6(16.2)	5(13.5)	1(2.7)	2.1	1.2	7(36.8)	4(21.1)	6(31.6)	1(5.3)	1(5.3)	2.2	1.2
32	9	17(45.9)	7(18.9)	8(21.6)	4(10.8)	1(2.7)	2.1	1.2	8(42.1)	3(15.8)	7(36.8)	0(0.0)	1(5.3)	2.1	1.2
33	10	8(21.6)	5(13.5)	9(24.3)	11(29.7)5	4(10.8)	3.0	1.3	7(36.8)	3(15.8)	6(31.6)	3(15.8)	0(0.0)	2.3	1.1
34	11	16(43.2)	4(10.8)	4(10.8)	5(13.5)	8(21.6)	2.6	1.7	9(47.4)	2(10.5)	4(21.1)	2(10.5)	2(10.5)	2.3	1.4
35	12	5(13.5)	4(10.8)	7(18.9)	14(37.8)	7(18.9)	3.4	1.3	3(15.8)	3(15.8)	4(21.1)	7(36.2)	2(10.5)	3.1	1.3
36	13	7(18.9)	9(24.3)	2(5.4)	13(35.1)	6(16.2)	3.1	1.4	3(15.8)	3(15.8)	3(15.8)	6(31.6)	4(21.1)	3.3	1.4
37	14	4(10.8)	7(18.9)	6(16.2)	14(37.8)	6(16.2)	3.3	1.3	1(5.3)	5(26.3)	4(21.1)	7(36.8)	2(10.5)	3.2	1.1
38	15	7(18.9)	3(8.1)	10(27.0)	13(35.1)	4(10.8)	3.1	1.3	2(10.5)	3(15.8)	3(15.8)	7(36.8)	4(21.1)	3.4	1.3
39	16	5(13.5)	1(2.7)	4(10.8)	15(40.5)	12(32.4)	3.8	1.3	1(5.3)	1(5.3)	1(5.3)	8(42.1)	8(42.1)	4.1	1.1
40	17	7(18.9	12(32.4)	4(10.8)	8(21.6)	6(16.2)	2.8	1.4	3(15.8)	2(10.5)	7(36.8)	4(21.1)	3(15.8)	3.1	1.3
41	18	6(16.2)	6(16.2)	5(13.5)	13(35.1)	7(18.9)	3.2	1.4	2(10.5)	4(21.1)	8(42.1)	3(15.8)	2(10.5)	2.9	1.1
42	19	14(37.8)	5(13.5)	6(16.2)	9(24.3)	3(8.1)	2.5	1.4	11(57.9)	1(5.3)	3(15.8)	4(21.1)	0(0.0)	2.0	1.3
43	20	14(37.8)	8(21.6)	8(21.6)	5(13.5)	2(5.4)	2.3	1.3	10(52.6)	3(15.8)	2(10.5)	4(21.1)	0(0.0)	2.0	1.2
44	21	11(29.7)	7(18.9)	2(5.4)	11(29.7)	6(16.2)	2.8	1.5	5(26.3)	4(21.1)	5(26.3)	3(15.8)	2(10.5)	2.6	1.3
45	22	9(24.3)	5(13.5)	6(16.2)	9(24.3)	8(21.6)	3.1	1.5	7(36.8)	2(10.5)	2(10.5)	4(21.1)	4(21.1	2.9	1.7

Variables	Questions	NORTH AMERICA 1	2	3	4	5	M	S.D.	JAMAICA 1	2	3	4	5	M	S.D.
46	23	5(13.5)	4(10.8)	4(10.8)	16(43.2)	8(21.6)	3.5	1.3	4(21.1)	6(31.6)	2(10.5)	6(31.6)	1(5.3)	2.7	1.3
47	24	18(48.6)	6(16.2)	6(16.2)	6(16.2)	1(2.7)	2.1	1.3	14(73.7)	3(15.8)	1(5.3)	1(5.3)	0(0.0)	1.4	0.8
48	25	6(16.2)	6(16.2)	7(18.9)	8(21.6)	10(27.0)	3.3	1.4	3(15.8)	1(5.3)	1(5.3)	5(26.3)	9(47.4)	3.8	1.5
49	26	5(13.5)	7(18.9)	3(8.1)	11(29.7)	11(29.7)	3.4	1.4	1(5.3)	1(5.3)	0(0.0)	7(36.8)	10(52.6)	4.3	1.1
50	27	13(35.1)	7(18.9)	3(8.1)	8(21.6)	6(16.2)	2.6	1.5	5(26.3)	4(21.1)	5(26.3)	2(10.5)	3(15.8)	2.7	1.4
51	28	6(16.2)	4(10.8)	7(18.9)	13(35.1)	7(18.9)	3.3	1.3	2(10.5)	1(5.3)	1(5.3)	6(31.6)	9(47.4)	4.0	1.3
52	29	7(18.9)	4(10.8)	3(8.1)	10(27.0)	13(35.1)	3.5	1.5	0(0.0)	1(5.3)	2(10.5)	11(57.9)	5(26.3)	4.1	0.8
53	30	15(40.5	9(24.3)	6(16.2)	6(16.2)	1(2.7)	2.2	1.2	14(73.7)	1(5.3)	3(15.8)	1(5.3)	0(0.0)	1.5	0.9
54	31	11(29.7)	8(21.6)	3(8.1)	10(27.0)	5(13.5)	2.7	1.5	9(47.4)	4(21.1)	3(15.8)	3(15.8)	0(0.0)	2.0	1.2
55	32	10(27.0)	4(10.8)	5(13.5)	11(29.7)	7(18.9)	3.0	1.5	15(78.9)	2(10.5)	2(10.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1.3	0.7
56	33	12(32.4)	5(13.5)	9(24.3)	10(27.0)	1(2.7)	2.5	1.3	9(47.4)	5(26.3)	2(10.5)	2(10.5)	1.5.3)	2.0	1.2
57	34	11(29.7	4(10.8)	9(24.3)	7(18.9)	6(16.2)	2.9	1.5	13(68.4)	3(15.8)	3(15.8)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1.5	0.8
58	35	11(29.7)	6(16.2)	8(21.6)	9(24.3)	3(8.1)	2.6	1.3	9(47.4)	2(10.5)	4(21.1)	4(21.1)	0(0.0)	2.0	1.3
59	36	12(32.4)	5(13.5)	8(21.6)	11(29.7)	1(2.7)	2.6	1.3	9(47.4)	3(15.8)	4(21.1)	3(15.8)	0(0.0)	2.1	1.1
60	37	12(32.4)	3(8.1)	8(21.6)	11(29.7)	3(8.1)	2.7	1.4	11(57.9)	5(26.3)	3(15.8)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1.5	0.8
61	38	15(40.5)	10(27.0)	7(18.9)	2(5.4)	3(8.1)	2.1	1.3	7(36.8)	2(10.5)	3(15.8)	4(21.1)	3(15.8)	2.7	1.6
62	39	14(37.8)	1(2.7)	3(8.1)	10(27.0)	9(24.3)	3.0	1.7	1(5.3)	2(10.5)	3(15.8)	8(42.1)	5(26.3)	3.7	1.1
63	40	16(54.3)	5(13.5)	6(16.2)	5(13.5)	5(13.5)	2.4	1.5	8(42.1)	3(15.8)	0(0.0)	5(26.3)	3(15.8)	2.6	1.6
64	41	7(18.9)	5(13.5)	6(16.2)	11(29.7)	8(21.6)	3.2	1.4	6(31.6)	4(21.1)	4(21.4)	5(26.3)	0(0.0)	2.4	1.2
65	42	20.54.1)	7(18.9)	7(18.9)	1(2.7)	2(5,4)	1.9	1.2	10(52.6)	3(15.8)	2(10.5)	3(15.8)	1(5.3)	2.1	1.1
66	43	10(27.0)	7(18.9)	2(5.4)	13(35.1)	5(13.5)	2.9	1.5	9(67.4)	2(10.5)	7(36.8)	1(5.3)	0(0.0)	2.0	1.1
67	44	6(16.2)	8(21.6)	4(10.8)	10(27.0)	9(24.3)	3.2	1.4	1(5.3)	5(26.3)	2(10.5)	8(42.1)	3(15.8)	3.4	1.2
68	45	6(16.2)	3(8.1)	4(10.8)	12(32.4)	12(32.4)	3.6	1.4	2(10.5)	3(15.8)	2(10.5)	8(42.1)	4(21.1)	3.5	1.3
69	46	10(27.0)	4(10.8)	5(13.5)	9(24.3)	9(24.3)	3.1	1.6	6(31.6)	4(21.1)	5(26.3)	1(5.3)	3(15.8)	2.5	1.4
70	47	6(16.2)	5(13.5)	8(21.6)	12(32.4)	6(16.2)	3.2	1.3	4(21.1)	3(15.8)	7(36.8)	5(26.3)	0(0.0)	2.7	1.1
71	48	6(16.2)	3(8.1)	4(10.8)	17(45.9	7(18.9)	3.4	1.3	4(21.1)	3(15.8)	3(15.8)	5(26.3)	4(21.1)	3.1	1.5
72	49	15(40.5)	5(13.5)	16(16.2)	8(21.6)	3(8.1)	2.4	1.4	5(26.3)	6(31.6)	2(10.5)	5(26.3)	1(5.3)	2.5	1.3
73	50	15(40.5)	8(21.6)	8(21.6)	5(13.5)	1(2.7)	2.2	1.2	6(31.6	6(31.6)	5(26.3)	1(5.3)	1(5.3)	2.2	1.1
74	51	8(21.6)	11(29.7)	6(16.2)	8(21.6)	4(10.8)	2.7	1.3	8(42.1)	4(21.1)	6(31.6)	1(5.3)	0(0.0)	2.0	1.0
75	52	6(16.2)	5(13.5)	9(24.3)	14(37.8)	3(8.1)	3.1	1.2	3(15.8)	4(21.1)	6(31.6)	5(26.3)	1(5.3)	2.8	1.2
76	53	10(27.0)	5(13.5)	5(13.5)	10(27.0)	7I18.9)	3.0	1.5	11(57.9)	1(5.3)	3(15.8)	1(5.3)	3(15.8)	2.8	1.6
77	54	12(32.4)	3(8.1)	3(8.1)	10(27.0)	9(24.3)	3.0	1.6	9(47.4)	2(10.5)	1(5.3)	3(15.8)	4(21.1)	2.5	1.7
78	55	14(37.8)	8(21.6)	6(16.2)	4(10.8)	5(13.5)	2.4	1.4	10(52.6)	2(10.5)	1(5.3)	3(15.8)	3(15.8)	2.3	1.6
79	56	15(40.5)	7(18.9)	8(21.6)	6(16.2)	1(2.7)	2.2	1.2	10(52.6)	3(15.8)	4(21.1)	1(5.3)	1(5.3)	1.9	1.2
80	57	18(48.6)	7(18.9)	8(21.6)	3(8.1)	1(2.7)	2.0	1.1	10(52.6)	3(15.8)	6(31.6)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1.7	.9
81	58	16(43.2)	6(16.2)	10(27.0)	5(13.5)	0(0.0)	2.1	1.1	12(63.2)	2(10.5)	3(15.8)	1(5.3)	1(5.3)	1.8	1.2
82	59	9(24.3)	8(21.6)	4(10.8)	10(27.0)	6(16.2)	2.9	1.5	7(36.8)	5(26.3)	2(10.5)	5(26.3)	0(0.0)	2.3	1.2

		1	2	3	4	5	M	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	M	S.D.
83	60	9(24.3)	2(5.4)	8(21.6)	10(27.0)	8(21.6)	3.2	1.5	3(15.8)	3(15.8)	3(15.8)	8(42.1)	2(10.5)	3.2	1.3
84	61	17(45.9)	5(13.5)	11(29.7)	4(10.8)	0(0.0)	2.1	1.1	13(68.4)	1(5.3)	4(21.1)	1(5.3)	0(0.0)	1.6	1.0
85	62	8(21.6)	11(29.7)	7(18.9)	7(18.9)	4(10.8)	2.7	1.3	5(26.3)	5(26.3)	1(5.3)	6(31.6)	2(10.5)	2.2	1.4
86	63	12(32.4)	5(13.5)	9(24.3)	10(27.0)	1(2.7)	2.5	1.2	9(47.4)	3(15.8)	4(21.1)	1(5.3)	2(10.5)	2.2	1.4
87	64	5(13.5)	6(16.2)	8(21.6)	10(27.0)	8(21.6)	3.3	1.3	11(57.9	2(10.5)	3(15.8)	1(5.3)	2(10.6)	2.0	1.4
88	65	6(16.2)	6(16.2)	3(8.1)	13(35.1)	9(24.3)	3.4	1.4	9(47.4)	2(10.6)	4(21.1)	2(10.5)	2(10.5)	2.3	1.4
89	66	18(48.6)	7(18.9)	7(18.9)	4(10.8)	1(2.7)	2.0	1.1	6(31.6)	3(15.8)	4(21.1)	6(31.6)	0(0.0)	2.5	1.3
90	67	12(32.4)	10(27.0)	13(35.1)	1(2.7)	1(2.7)	2.2	1.0	10(52.6)	3(15.8)	3(15.8)	2(10.5)	1(5.3)	2.0	1.2
91	68	8(21.6)	6(16.2)	12(32.4)	7(18.9)	4(10.8)	2.8	1.3	4(21.1)	5(26.3)	1(5.3)	8(42.1)	1(5.3)	2.8	1.3
92	69	19(51.4)	4(10.8)	10(27.0)	4(10.8)	0(0.0)	2.0	1.1	14(73.7)	2(10.5)	3(15.8)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1.4	0.8
93	70	3(8.1)	3(8.1)	7(18.9)	15(40.5)	9(24.3)	3.6	1.2	11(57.9)	0(0.0)	4(21.1)	2(10.5)	2(10.5)	2.2	1.5
94	71	7(18.9)	8(21.6)	6(16.2)	12(32.4)	4(10.8)	2.9	1.3	12(63.2)	1(5.3)	2(10.5)	3(15.8)	1(5.3)	1.9	1.4
95	72	5(13.5)	11(29.7)	8(21.6)	7(18.9)	6(16.2)	2.9	1.3	11(57.9)	3(15.8)	1(5.3)	2(10.5)	2(10.5)	2.0	1.5
96	73	12(32.4)	4(10.8)	9(24.3)	9(24.3)	3(8.1)	2.6	1.4	12(63.2)	1(5.3)	4(21.1)	2(10.5)	0(0.0)	1.8	1.1
97	74	8(21.6)	6(16.2)	6(16.2)	11(29.7)	6(16.2)	3.0	1.4	13(68.4)	1(5.3)	2(10.5)	1(5.3)	2(10.5)	1.8	1.4
98	75	4(10.8)	2(5.4)	5(13.5)	17(45.9)	9(24.3)	3.7	1.2	8(42.1)	2(10.5)	3(15.8)	3(15.8)	3(15.8)	2.5	1.6
99	76	9(24.3)	3(8.1)	5(13.5)	17(45.9)	3(8.1)	3.1	1.4	9(47.4)	2(10.5)	3(15.8)	5(26.3)	0(0.0)	2.2	1.3
100	77	10(27.0)	9(24.3)	11(29.7)	4(10.8)	3(8.1)	2.5	1.2	8(42.1)	2(10.5)	4(21.1)	3(15.8)	1(5.3)	2.4	1.4
101	78	9(24.3)	9(24.3)	6(16.2)	8(21.6)	5(13.5)	2.8	1.4	9(47.4)	1(5.3)	3(15.8)	3(15.8)	3(15.8)	2.5	1.6

PART C:

102	79	1	Prof Dev.	3.8	3.1	4.3	3.4
103	80	9	Govt. Policies & Proc.	6.8	3.5	7.6	3.2
104	81	5	Sense of N. Respon.	6.1	3.4	4.6	3.5
105	82	3	Rel. of Prof. skills	5.3	2.8	4.2	2.2
106	83	6.5	Desire for adv.	6.5	3.5	8.9	2.5
107	84	2	Economic	4.4	3.1	7.1	3.0
108	85	6.5	Comm with	6.5	2.7	5.9	2.2
109	86	8	Pre-departure concepts	6.7	3.1	5.8	3.2
110	87	4	AH to Future	5.5	2.9	3.6	1.9
111	88	10	Adapta.	6.9	2.7	6.8	2.4
112	89	11	AH Life style	7.0	3.2	7.3	2.8

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Walter, ed. The Brain Drain. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968.

Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs. Beacon of Hope. A Report from the U.S. Advisory Commission, Washington, D.C., April 1963.

Ambah, Saleh. "The Role of the College Petroleum and Minerals in the Industrialization of Saudi Arabia." In Science, Technology and U.S. Diplomacy. Edited by Nader and Zahlan. Washington, D.C., 1974.

Annual Reports of Immigration and Naturalization Service and App. A, 1966.

Awasthi, Prakash. "Brain Drain." Manpower Journal, 1966.

Beals, Ralph L., and Humphrey, Norman D. No Frontier to Learning: The Mexican Student in the United States. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1967.

Bennett, John W.; Passin, Herbert; et al. In Search of Identity: The Japanese Overseas Scholar in America and Japan. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958.

Bozeman, Adda B. "Do Educational and Cultural Exchanges Have Political Relevance?" International Educational and Cultural Exchange 5 (Fall 1969).

Brain Drain: A Study of the Persistent Issue of International Mobility. Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1974.

Brain Drain Into the United States of Scientists, Engineers and Physicians, Research and Technical Programs. Committee on Government Operations, Washington, D.C., 1967.

Canadian Government. "The Professional." Canadian Government Immigration Service, No. C1-61/2066. Queens Printer and Controller of Stationary, Ottowa, 1966.

Cormack, Margaret L. "The Wandering Scholar." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Spring 1968.

_____. "International Educational Exchange: Visa to What?" International Educational and Cultural Exchange 5 (Fall 1959).

Dallot, Louis. Race and Human Migrations. New York: Walker and Company, 1964.

Dedijer, Stephen. "Why Did Daedalus Leave?" Science 13 (June 30, 1961).

Deutsch, Stephen E. International Education and Exchange: A Sociological Analysis. Cleveland Case: Western Reserve University Press, 1970.

Dubois, Cora. Foreign Students in Higher Education in the United States. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1956.

Eberhard, Walfram. "Problem of Students Returning to Asia." International Educational and Cultural Exchange 5 (Spring 1970).

Festinger, L.; Schachter et al. Social Pressures in Informal Groups. New York: Harper, 1950.

Fox, Melvin J. "Some Pluses and Minuses of the Brain Drain." International Development, 1966.

Fulbright, J. W. "Education for a New Type of International Relations." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Winter 1967.

Girling, R. K. "The Migration of Human Capital from the Third World: The Implications and Some Data on the Jamaica Case." Social and Economic Studies 23 (March 1974).

Gish, Oscar. "Brain Drain from the Philippines--Part II." International Educational and Cultural Exchange 4 (Winter 1969).

Government of Canada. "Admissions of University Students to Canada." Immigration Requirements. Ottowa: Queens Printer and Controller, 1966.

Groves, Marion H. "Contributions to Development by Asians Who Have Studied Abroad." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Summer 1967.

Grubel, Herbert G. "Non-Returning Foreign Student and the Cost of Student Exchange." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Spring 1966.

Gullahorn, John T., and Gullahorn, Jeanne E. "An Extension of the U-Curve Hypothesis." Journal of Social Issues 9 (1963).

Gruenebaum, Gustave E. Von, ed. Medieval Islam, A Study in Cultural Organization. Chicago: University Press, 1946.

Halberstam, Jacob L., and Dacso, Michael M. "Facts and Fiction in Cross Cultural Evaluation of Graduate Medical Training in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation by Foreign and U.S. Residents." Institute of International Education, New York, University Medical Centre 1965.

Hariotis, George V. "An Exercise in Voluntary Repartriation." International Development Review 6 (December 1964).

Harari, Maurice. "Priorities for Research and Action in the Graduate Foreign Student Field." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 1969.

Heider, F. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Howland, Harold E. "Brain Drain from the Philippines." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Fall 1967.

Huddle, Franklin. The Evolution of International Technology. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 1970.

International Migration of Talent and Skills, Proceedings of Workshop and Conference. Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1966.

Kidd, Charles V. "The Growth of Science and Distribution of Scientists Among Nations." Impact of Science on Society, UNESCO 14 (1964).

Klein, Marjorie. "The Foreign Student Adaptation Program: Social Experience of Asian Students in the U.S." International Educational and Cultural Exchange 6 (Winter 1971).

Lansing, John B., and Morgan, James N. "The Effect of Geographic Mobility on Income." Journal of Human Resources 2 (Fall 1967).

Levy, Mordechai M. "United Nation Educational and Cultural Affairs." Report on a Study of Africans Studying and Training Abroad, 1967.

Lusgaard, Sverre. "Adjustment in a Foreign Society: Norwegian Fulbright Grantees Visiting the United States." International Social Science 7 (1955).

Manley, Michael. "Our Changing World." Bill Moyers Journal, Television Interview, Consulate General of Jamaica, New York, May 1, 1975.

Marina, R. Fernandez. The Sober Generation. New York: 1975.

Marsh, Gayle, and Halberstam, Jacob L. "Personality Stereotypes of U.S. and Foreign Medical Residents." Journal of Social Psychology 68 (1966).

Metraux, Guy S. Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross Cultural Education. Social Science Research Council, No. 9, New York, 1952.

McClelland, David. The Achieving Society. Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1951.

Myers, Robert G. Education and Emigration. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1972.

_____. "A Study Abroad and the Migration of Human Resources." Ph.D. dissertation, Chicago, 1967.

_____. "Some Thoughts on Foreign Student Non-return." International Educational and Cultural Exchange 4 (Fall 1968).

Naticy, Habib. "Brain Drain: The Case of Iranian Non-Returnees." International Development, Dobbs Ferry. New York: Oceana, 1967.

News of Jamaica. The Consulate General of Jamaica. New York: Pan Am Building, 1974.

Oh, Tai K. "A New Estimate of the Student Brain Drain from Asia." International Migration Review 7 (Winter 1974).

Olivos, Sergio Gutierrez, and Riguelmo-Perez, George. The Emancipation of High Level Manpower: The Case of Chile. Washington: Pan Am Union, 1966.

Pan American Health Organization. Migration of Health Personnel, Scientists, Engineers from Latin America. Washington, D.C., September 1966.

Pettis, Susan T. "Whither International Educational Exchange?" International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Summer 1970.

Pool, Ithiel de Sola. "Effect of Cross-National Contact on National and International Images." International Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.

Pre-bisch, Paul. Report to the Conference of Society for International Development, 1966.

Putman, Ivan Jr. "The Foreign Student Advisor and His Institution in International Student Exchange." National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1964.

Quoted in "The Workers Day." Editorial, The Washington Post, September 3, 1973.

Rubin, Vera, and Zavalloni, Morisa. We Wish To Be Looked Upon: A Study of the Aspirations of Youth in a Developing Society. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1969.

Said, Abdul. Brain Drain: The Developing Countries--Causes, Ramifications and Prospects. Lawrence, Kansas, June 1970.

Science and Technology and American Diplomacy. Subcommittee on National Security and Scientific Development, Washington, D.C., September 1974.

Scott, Franklin D. World Migration in Modern Times. New Jersey: Prince-Hall Inc., 1968.

_____. Emigration and Immigration. Maryland: Waverly Press Inc., 1966.

Sharma, Keshav Dev. "Indian Students in the United States." International Educational and Cultural Exchange 4 (1969).

Shearer, John C. "In Defense of Traditional Views of the Brain Drain Problem." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, Fall 1966.

Sims, Albert G. Proceedings of Workshop on International Migration of Talent and Skills, October 1966.

State News. Michigan State University, May 1975.

Suskind, Charles, and Schell, Lynn. "Exporting Technical Education: A Survey and Case Study of Foreign Professionals with U.S. Graduate Degrees." Institute of International Education, New York, 1968.

Thiesenhusen, William G. Report to Subcommittee on Government Operations. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.

Tidrick, Kathryn. "Need for Achievement, Social, Class and Intention to Emigrate in Jamaican Students." Social and Economic Studies 20 (March 1971), University of the West Indies.

United Nations Institute for Training and Research. Research Reports No. 5. The Brain Drain from Five Developing Countries. New York: 1971.

Useem, John, and Useem, Ruth. The Western Educated Man in India: A Study of His Social Role and Influence. New York: Dryden Press, 1955.

Valipour, Iraj. "A Comparison of Returning and Non-returning Iranian Students in the United States." Ed.D. dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1961.

Walton, Barbara. "Research on Foreign Graduate Students." International Educational and Cultural Exchange 4 (Winter 1971).

_____. Foreign Student Exchange in Perspective, Research on Foreign Students in the United States. Washington, D.C.: Office of External Research, U.S. Department of State, September, 1967.

Wharton, Clifton R., Jr. U.S. Graduate Training of Asian Agriculture Economists. New York: Council of Economics and Cultural Affairs, 1959.

Wilson, James A., and Gaston, Jerry. "New Light on the Brain Drain." New Scientist 43 (July 31, 1969).