

ESO  
608

INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE OSU  
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, SCHOOL OF  
HOME ECONOMICS AND SCHOOL OF NATURAL  
RESOURCES FACULTY: PAST EXPERIENCES  
AND FUTURE PREFERENCES\*

David O. Hansen  
and  
Barbara A. Kohl

Department of Agricultural Economics  
and Rural Sociology

\*Data reported in this paper are from a study sponsored  
by the Office of International Affairs in Agriculture,  
Home Economics, and Natural Resources.

INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF OSU COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,  
SCHOOL OF HOME ECONOMICS AND SCHOOL OF NATURAL RESOURCES FACULTY:  
PAST EXPERIENCES AND FUTURE PREFERENCES

Introduction

The Ohio State University has a long tradition of involvement in international education. Perhaps one of the most active units has been the College of Agriculture, School of Home Economics and School of Natural Resources (CAHENR). It has participated in formal training programs for staff from foreign universities, helped institute undergraduate and graduate programs in related fields in developing countries, carried out significant research on development problems both in the U.S. and abroad, and provided advisory services to foreign governments and international development agencies. All of these activities have broadened the domestic training program, enriching its content and expanding the horizon of our students. These activities and their consequences for the domestic training program have been universally defined as good and proper.

Since 1970, however, there has been a tendency for development assistance agencies to focus on rural poverty and to give priority to programs that directly affect the rural poor. Policy shifts of this nature have led to a decrease in the "institution building" activities that were carried out by the CAHENR during the preceding two decades. Reductions in "hard" funding for international activities have resulted in decreased faculty participation in them.

The principal objectives of this report are the following:

- 1) to determine past experiences by CAHENR faculty in international activities; and by inference, the resource base on campus for future international programs; and

- 2) to determine the extent and nature of CAHENR faculty interest in participating in future international activities.

This information is necessary in order for the CAHENR administration to provide support to the international dimension of its research and training programs. A grant is expected to be made by USAID through BIFAD to the Ohio State University to strengthen its capability to participate in Title XII research and institution-building activities. Adequate programming of these funds requires knowledge of staff expertise and preferences. In addition, requests for the CAHENR to participate in other development related activities are regularly received by the administration. Greater knowledge of staff strengths and preferences will facilitate a more accurate response to them by the administration. Finally, the Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation, the National Science Foundation, and other research-sponsoring organizations signify a potential for financing collaborative international research. The administration of the CAHENR can assist individual faculty and departments in applying for these funds, be they for disciplinary or multidisciplinary activities. Its assistance will be greater if it has information about faculty interests and desires.

#### Sample and Data Collection

Data reported here are from a questionnaire survey of the CAHENR faculty entitled, "Faculty Interest Inventory," conducted in early 1979. The survey was supervised by the Office of International Affairs in Agriculture and included all staff members of the CAHENR teaching-research-extension complex. In all, 19 separate departments and divisions were surveyed,<sup>1/</sup>

---

<sup>1/</sup> Extension area supervisors, program directors and other officials were included as a separate department. Staff on three quarter or full-time extension appointments were coded as extension staff.

and included personnel located off-campus at the Agricultural Technical Institute, the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center and at extension offices throughout Ohio. The OSU staff is probably representative of most other agricultural college staffs at land grant universities that have extensive research programs and that have been involved in foreign technical assistance activities.

The questionnaire was mailed to all 556 staff members in February. A total of 241 (43.3%) returned completed questionnaires. A follow-up questionnaire was mailed in March and an additional 132 completed questionnaires were obtained. The total of 373 represents a 67.1% response rate. Analyses of the follow-up questionnaire responses indicated that many lacked interest in international activities which was less true of responses associated with the first mailing. We felt this to reflect the fact that those with interest had probably already responded and, therefore, we decided against additional follow-ups. Additional time and monetary expenses were difficult to justify in view of the limited additional information to be obtained.

A breakdown of the sample by department and rank is found in Table 1. Most respondents were from academic departments in the College of Agriculture. Approximately 65 percent fell under these categories. Greatest number of responses came from Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Agronomy, and Animal Science. This undoubtedly reflects in part the comparatively larger size of these departments; and in part, the relatively high level of past involvement in international activities of their members. Home Economics and Natural Resources had the smallest number of responses, which probably reflects the opposite case, i.e., fewer staff members and less past involvement in international activities.

TABLE 1: Breakdown of Sample by Department and Rank

Department	Rank										
	Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor		Total		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
I. AGRICULTURE										239	
a) Ag Econ & Rural Soc	15	10.7	13	14.3	12	10.5	3	12.5	43	11.7	
b) Ag Education	10	7.2	11	12.1	7	6.1	-		28	7.6	
c) Ag Engineering	10	7.2	6	6.6	4	3.5	-		20	5.4	
d) Agronomy	20	14.3	8	8.8	9	7.9	-		37	10.0	
e) Dairy Science	9	6.4	9	9.9	3	2.6	-		21	5.7	
f) Animal Science	16	11.4	4	4.4	8	7.0	2	8.3	30	8.1	
g) Food Sci & Nutr	1	0.7	1	1.1	3	2.6	-		5	1.4	
h) Horticulture	12	8.6	5	5.4	9	7.9	1	4.2	27	7.3	
i) Plant Path	8	5.7	7	7.7	2	1.8	1	4.2	18	4.9	
j) Poultry Science	4	2.9	3	3.3	1	0.9	-		8	2.2	
II. HOME ECONOMICS										35	
a) Home Econ Ed	2	1.4	-	-	3	2.6	-		5	1.4	
b) Fam Rel & H D	-		2	2.2	4	3.5	2	8.3	8	2.2	
c) Home Mgt & H	1	0.7	3	3.3	3	2.6	-		7	1.9	
d) Nutr & Food Mgt	3	2.1	2	2.2	3	2.6	2	8.3	10	2.7	
e) Textiles & Cloths	1	0.7	1	1.1	2	1.8	-		4	1.0	
III. NATURAL RESOURCES										22	
a) Environment Ed	1	0.7	3	3.3	3	2.6	-		7	1.9	
b) Fish & Wldlf Mgt	2	1.4	-		3	2.6	-		5	1.4	
c) Forestry	5	3.6	1	1.1	2	1.8	-		8	2.2	
d) Parks & Rec	-	-	1	1.1	1	0.9	-		2	0.4	
IV. EXTENSION	16	11.4	11	12.1	18	15.9	6	25.0	51	13.8	
V. OTHER	<u>4</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>12.3</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>29.2</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>6.8</u>	
TOTAL	140	100.0	91	100.0	114	100.0	24	100.0	369	100.0	

Previous Overseas and Domestic International Experience

The number of respondents that were previously involved in international work is broken down by departments in Table 2. Here the suspicion that Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Agronomy, and Animal Science have been most involved is verified. Together they account for almost 43 percent of the faculty with previous overseas experience and 54 percent with previous domestic-base participation in international activities. The relative non-involvement of Home Economics and Natural Resources faculty is also evident. Only seven staff from Home Economics and only five from Natural Resources had taken previous overseas assignments.

Over 80 percent of the respondents with previous overseas experience are from core departments in agriculture, and approximately another 10 percent are extension line or staff personnel. Clearly, if one is to assign relative strength values on the basis of past experience, core departments in agriculture are the most outstanding.

The geographic regions with which these previous international activities are associated are presented in Table 3. Obviously, the regions in which respondents have been most involved overseas are Latin America (31.7%) and Europe (23.4%). In part, this probably is a result of the large number of USAID and other development assistance projects in Latin America in which OSU has participated. They have provided considerable opportunities for staff members to take assignments related to them. Undoubtedly, much of this effort has been in staff training for agricultural universities and for extension and research networks in these countries which has resulted in the establishment of collegial ties between staff and counterparts overseas.

TABLE 2: Previous International Activities by Department - Domestic and Overseas

Department	Type			
	Domestic		Overseas	
	No	%	No	%
<b>I. AGRICULTURE</b>				
Ag Econ & Rural Soc	14	37.8	21	19.1
Ag Education	3	8.1	6	5.5
Ag Engineering	3	8.1	8	7.3
Agronomy	5	13.6	14	12.7
Dairy Science	0	-	9	8.2
Animal Science	1	2.7	12	10.9
Horticulture	1	2.7	7	6.4
Plant Pathology	4	10.8	6	5.5
Poultry Science	-	-	5	4.4
<b>II. HOME ECONOMICS</b>				
Home Econ Ed	1	2.7	1	0.9
Family Rel & Home Dev	-	-	2	1.8
Home Mgt & Hsg	-	-	2	1.8
Nutrition & Food Mgt	-	-	2	1.8
<b>III. NATURAL RESOURCES</b>				
Fish & Wldlf Mgt	1	2.7	2	1.8
Forestry	-	-	3	2.7
<b>IV. EXTENSION</b>				
	4	10.8	7	6.2
<b>V. OTHER</b>				
	-	-	3	2.7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>100.0</b>

a/ Two longest projects or all those reported with less than two projects.

b/ Three longest tours or those reported by respondents with less than three tours.

TABLE 3: Previous International Activities by Region - Domestic and Overseas

Region	Type			
	Domestic <sup>a/</sup>		Overseas <sup>b/</sup>	
	No	%	No	%
Latin America	12	25.0	64	31.7
Caribbean	1	2.1	4	2.0
Near East	-	-	3	1.5
Far East	1	2.1	7	3.5
Middle East	1	2.1	19	9.5
Western Europe	-	-	34	17.0
Eastern Europe	1	2.1	13	6.5
North America	2	4.2	8	4.0
Australia & New Zealand	-	-	2	1.0
Southeast Asia	3	6.2	7	3.5
Southern Africa	-	-	1	0.5
Western Africa	1	2.1	7	3.5
Eastern Africa	-	-	7	3.5
India & Pakistan	4	8.3	24	11.8
Micronesia	-	-	1	0.5
General	<u>22</u>	<u>45.8</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
TOTAL	48	100.0	201	100.0

<sup>a/</sup> Two longest projects or all those reported with less than two projects.

<sup>b/</sup> Three longest tours or those reported by respondents with less than three tours.



Other international assignments appear to be rather evenly distributed among India and Pakistan (24), the Near and Middle East (22), the African continent (15), and the Far East (14). The bulk of these assignments were again associated with development related programs and activities.

Frequencies of involvement in non-overseas international activities demonstrate the same trend of broad involvement by region. Approximately 46 percent did not specify a region, 25 percent indicated Latin America, and the remainder were distributed among other regions.

No one region of the world has monopolized the attention of the CAHENR faculty. Latin America has been the location of more overseas assignments, but represents less than one third of the total.

Data is presented in Table 4 to summarize the periods during which international activities were undertaken. The number of overseas assignments increases progressively as the present is approached. Actually, these figures may be misleading since many faculty take overseas assignments towards the end of their careers, and retire shortly thereafter. Thus, the number of assignments carried out during the last decade is probably greater than for the present one. This is somewhat less true for domestic based participation, since younger staff can participate with less risk to promotion and tenure opportunities.

TABLE 4: Time Periods of Realization of Previous International Experience - Domestic and Overseas

Time Period	Type			
	Domestic <sup>a/</sup>		Overseas <sup>b/</sup>	
	No	%	No	%
1950-1959	0		14	6.8
1960-1965	2	5.6	37	18.0
1966-1970	12	33.0	39	18.9
1971-1975	13	36.4	50	24.3
1976-Present	<u>9</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>32.0</u>
TOTAL	36	100.0	206	100.0

a/ Number of domestic international projects.

b/ Number of overseas international projects.

Interest in Future U.S. Based International Activities

Trends of interest in future participation in the U.S. based international activities parallel those of past experiences. A breakdown of number of interested faculty by department is presented in Table 5. Again, Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Agronomy, and Animal Science have the greatest number of interested faculty. Together they represent 35 percent of those indicating interest in future involvements (N=74). Over 70 percent of those demonstrating interest are from departments in the College of Agriculture. However, in absolute terms, the number of Home Economics faculty with interest in these activities is substantially greater than those with past comparable experience. The same is true although to a lesser extent for the College of Agriculture and for Natural Resources.

TABLE 5: Interest in Future Domestic International Activities by Department

Department	No	%	Department	No	%
I. AGRICULTURE			II. HOME ECONOMICS		
Ag Econ & Rur Soc	29	13.7	Home Ec Ed	3	1.4
Ag Education	18	8.5	Fam Rel & Hm Dev	3	1.4
Ag Engineering	14	6.6	Home Mgt & Hsg	5	2.4
Agronomy	26	12.3	Nutr & Food Mgt	4	1.9
Dairy Science	14	6.6	Textile & Clth	-	-
Animal Science	19	9.0	III. NATURAL RESOURCES		
Food Sci & Nutr	2	0.9	Environ Ed	2	0.9
Horticulture	14	6.6	Fish & Wld Mgt	2	0.9
Plant Pathology	10	4.7	Forestry	2	0.9
Poultry Sci	3	1.5	Parks & Rec	1	0.5
Entomology	2	0.9	IV. EXTENSION		
				27	12.7
			V. OTHER		
				<u>12</u>	<u>5.7</u>
			TOTAL		
				212	100.0

Frequencies of interest expression for domestic international activities by geographical regions also parallel past experiences. Most faculty failed to indicate specific preferences (68%) and among those that did, approximately 40 percent listed Latin American countries. This was followed in frequency of citation by European countries (20%).

Most respondents indicated a willingness to become immediately involved in these activities. Slightly over 61 percent (N=185) indicated that they would be interested in participating beginning in 1979 or 1980 and thereafter; 20.5 percent indicated either 1981 or 1982 and thereafter; and 18.4 percent indicated after 1982. Thus, there would apparently be support for these activities were they to be initiated in the near future.

Faculty interested in overseas assignments are broken down by department and type of program preferred in Table 7. Again, the frequencies follow the same pattern in absolute numbers. There is a slight preference for college sponsored programs over individually tailored ones, except for those from departments in Natural Resources. Thirteen favor participation in the latter, whereas only ten favor college sponsored programs. Overall, it appears that substantial support could be garnered for college sponsored programs provided they are compatible with faculty needs and interests.

The types of assignments listed by faculty as of interest to them are listed by region of preference in Table 8. The majority again indicate a willingness to take them in any region. This is truer for short-term assignments than for long-term ones. Of those indicating a preference, there was a tendency to favor Latin America. This probably is due to the fact that more faculty have previous experience in this region than in any other.

TABLE 6: Interest in Future International Overseas Experience  
by Department and Type of Assignment

Department	Type of Assignment			
	Short Term		Long Term	
	No.	%	No.	%
<b>I. AGRICULTURE</b>				
Ag Econ & Rural Soc	32	12.1	19	18.1
Ag Education	23	8.7	6	5.7
Ag Engineering	16	6.0	9	8.6
Agronomy	28	10.6	10	9.5
Animal Science	26	9.8	7	6.7
Dairy Science	14	5.3	7	3.8
Food Sci & Nutr	4	1.5	4	6.7
Horticulture	15	5.7	5	4.8
Plant Pathology	12	4.5	1	0.9
Poultry Sci	7	2.6	2	1.9
<b>II. HOME ECONOMICS</b>				
Home Econ Ed	1	0.4	0	-
Fam Rel & Hm Dev	5	1.9	1	0.9
Hm Mgt & Hsg	7	2.6	4	3.8
Nutr & Food Mgt	7	2.6	3	2.9
Textiles & Cltg	2	0.7	0	-
<b>III. NATURAL RESOURCES</b>				
Environ Ed	4	1.5	2	1.9
Fish & Wldlf Mgt	3	1.1	1	0.9
Forestry	5	1.9	3	2.9
Parks & Rec Adm	2	0.8	1	0.9
<b>IV. EXTENSION</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14.3</b>
<b>V. OTHER</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.8</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>100.0</b>

TABLE 7: Interest in Future International Overseas Assignment  
by Department and Type of Program

Department	Type of Program			
	College Sponsored Development Program		Individually Tailored	
	No.	%	No.	%
I. AGRICULTURE				
Ag Econ & Rural Soc	30	13.0	25	13.7
Ag Education	20	8.7	13	7.1
Ag Engineering	16	6.9	11	6.0
Agronomy	25	10.8	23	12.5
Animal Science	22	9.5	14	7.6
Dairy Sciences	13	5.6	9	4.9
Food Sci & Nutr	2	0.9	2	1.1
Horticulture	13	5.6	12	6.5
Plant Pathology	9	3.9	7	3.8
Poultry Science	6	2.6	5	2.7
II. HOME ECONOMICS				
Home Econ Ed	1	0.4	1	0.5
Fam Rel & Hum Dev	5	2.2	4	2.2
Hm Mgt & Hsg	6	2.6	5	2.7
Nutr & Food Mgt	6	2.6	5	2.7
Textiles & Clthg	1	0.4	0	-
III. NATURAL RESOURCES				
Environ Ed	2	0.9	3	1.6
Fish & Wldlf Mgt	2	0.9	3	1.6
Forestry	5	2.2	5	2.7
Parks & Rec Adm	1	0.4	2	1.1
IV. EXTENSION	31	13.4	24	13.0
V. OTHER	<u>15</u>	<u>6.5</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>6.0</u>
TOTAL	231	100.0	184	100.0

TABLE 8: Interest in Future International Overseas Experience  
by Region and Type of Assignment

Region	Type of Assignment			
	Short Term		Long Term	
	No	%	No	%
Latin America	39	16.2	31	27.9
Africa	2	0.8	-	-
Far East	1	0.4	-	-
Asia	6 <sup>a/</sup>	2.5	12 <sup>b/</sup>	10.8
Middle East	5	2.1	1	0.9
Southeast Asia	5	2.1	2	1.8
Western Europe	19	7.9	6	5.4
Russia	1	0.4	1	0.9
Australia & New Zealand	4	1.7	3	2.7
India & Pakistan	2	0.8	-	-
General <sup>c/</sup>	6	2.5	3	2.7
No Preference	<u>151</u>	<u>62.6</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>46.9</u>
TOTAL	241	100.0	111	100.0

a/ Includes two specifying China.

b/ Includes nine specifying China.

c/ Any English speaking country.

Also worthy of note in the Tables is the interest of nine faculty in long-term and two in short-term assignments in China. As cultural and economic ties are strengthened with this nation, perhaps more attention might be given by the CAHENR to developing formal relationships with Chinese universities and other organizations harboring agricultural scientists.

In Table 9 we present data detailing faculty interest in overseas assignments by department and region. Again, most failed to indicate a regional preference. Of those who did specify a preference, most opted for Latin America. Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, and Agronomy together had 18 faculty members indicating a preference for this region. Interests in the departments of Animal Science and Agricultural Engineering, on the other hand, were more diversified with a greater preference given to Asia and Europe by their faculty.

Substantial interest was also shown in alternative forms of international experience. One hundred and twenty-one respondents indicated that they would be interested in leading study tours. One hundred and thirty-six said they would be interested in taking a Fulbright or similar type grant for overseas work. And 213 staff members indicated an interest in attending international congresses or professional meetings. Most respondents thought that they would be free to undertake these alternative types of experiences over the coming two years.

#### Conclusions

Several general conclusions regarding the nature of past experiences, present interests and potential strengthening activities emerge from the data.



TABLE 9: Interest In Future International Overseas Experience by Region and Department

Department	Region									
	Latin America		Africa		Asia		Europe <sup>a/</sup>		No Preference	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
I. AGRICULTURE										
Ag Econ & Rural Soc	11	23.4	-	-	2	13.2	1		17	10.7
Ag Education	2	4.3	-	-	-	-	-		18	11.3
Ag Engineering	3	6.4	-	-	4	26.7	-		6	3.8
Agronomy	7	14.9	-	-	-	-	-		17	10.7
Animal Science	3	6.4	1	50.0	2	13.2	4		14	8.8
Dairy Science	3	6.4	-	-	-	-	1		12	7.5
Food Sci & Nutr	-	-	-	-	-	-	1		3	1.9
Horticulture	1	2.1	1	50.0	1	6.7	4		8	5.0
Plant Pathology	1	2.1	-	-	1	6.7	2		6	3.8
Poultry Science	1	2.1	-	-	1	6.7	1		4	2.5
II. HOME ECONOMICS										
Home Econ Ed	1	2.1	-	-	-	-	-		2	1.3
Fam Rel & Hm Dev	2	4.3	-	-	1	6.7	1		1	0.6
Home Mgt & Hsg	1	2.1	-	-	-	-	1		6	3.8
Nutr & Food Mgt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		7	4.4
Textiles & Clthg	1	2.1	-	-	-	-	-		-	-
III. NATURAL RESOURCES										
Environment Ed	1	2.1	-	-	-	-	-		3	1.9
Fish & Wldlf Mgt	-	-	-	-	1	6.7	-		2	1.3
Forestry	2	4.3	-	-	1	6.7	-		1	0.6
Parks & Rec Adm	-	-	-	-	-	-	2		-	-
IV. EXTENSION										
	2	4.3	-	-	1	6.7	5		23	14.4
V. OTHER										
	<u>5</u>	<u>10.6</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1</u>		<u>9</u>	<u>5.7</u>
TOTAL	47	100.0	2	100.0	15	100.0	24		159	100.0

(1) The study indicated substantial interest on the part of CAHENR faculty in international activities. There was more interest in short-term overseas assignments and in U.S. based activities than in activities implying long-term overseas commitments.

(2) Most respondents demonstrating an interest are from departments in the College of Agriculture. Those with the greater number of interested faculty are Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Agronomy, and Animal Sciences. These are also the departments whose faculty have had the greatest amount of overseas experience.

(3) Most faculty interested in overseas assignments indicated no regional preferences. Among those indicating a preference, Latin America was listed most frequently. This is parallel to past overseas experiences, since more of them were in Latin America than in any other region. Since the number who indicated a preference is small, however, it should be possible to develop international activities based on other regions of the world. To develop meaningful activities with strong base support, however, will require intimate dialog with departmental chairmen and faculty.