

NON-RETURN OR PROLONGATION OF STAY BY  
NIGERIAN STUDENTS AFTER COMPLETION  
OF STUDY IN THE USA

By

JAMES EBAY ONAH

Bachelor of Arts  
Oklahoma University  
Norman, Oklahoma  
1980

Master of Public Administration  
Oklahoma University  
Norman, Oklahoma  
1982

Master of Human Relations  
Oklahoma University  
Norman, Oklahoma  
1983

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirement for  
the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
December, 1987

NON RETURN OR PROLONGATION OF STAY BY  
NIGERIAN STUDENTS AFTER COMPLETION  
OF STUDY IN THE USA

Thesis Approved:

*Garry R. Bice*

Thesis Adviser

*John F. Bivill*

*John Smith*

*Paul Harper*

*Norman N. Durham*

Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The success and completion of this study rests on the contribution of many people. The author wishes to acknowledge the contribution of the committee members: Dr. Paul Harper, Dr. John L. Baird, Dr. H. Gene Smith, and the chairperson, Dr. Garry R. Bice, whose patience and critical eye evoked a well meaning consciousness toward the end product.

Much appreciation and thanks go to my family and equally to Desmond, Barbara and Tina. To Molly, a hefty thank you for keeping the house in order and holding the fort from destruction. As for my wife, Parvin Dokht (Pournader) Onah, the glory is well deserved. The author also wishes to acknowledge the immense contribution rendered by Richard Tatchia of the Department of Statistics at Oklahoma State University for his help in analyses and coding of data.

Last, but not the least, the author wishes to acknowledge the silent but constant support of Dr. George Henderson, a man who has shed some light in my life toward the role of academia in the United States.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Nature of Problem. . . . .	6
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	6
Limitations. . . . .	6
Definition of Terms. . . . .	7
The Nature and Severity of Non-Return or Prolongation of Stay. . . . .	8
The Effects of Non-Return on Manpower Development. . . . .	10
Position of Theory Buildings. . . . .	12
Policy Implications . . . . .	16
Organization of Body . . . . .	17
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE. . . . .	19
Concept of Brain Drain . . . . .	19
Criteria for Definition . . . . .	21
Operational Definition. . . . .	22
Relativity of the Concepts. . . . .	22
Time Element. . . . .	23
Categories of Definition . . . . .	23
A Professional Criterion. . . . .	23
The Qualitative Criterion . . . . .	24
Definition. . . . .	25
Manpower Implication . . . . .	25
High-Level Manpower . . . . .	25
Higher Education. . . . .	30
Labor Market Supply. . . . .	34
Failure to Return . . . . .	39
Effect on Economic Development . . . . .	44
Loss of Human Capital . . . . .	45
Loss of Money Invested. . . . .	47
Effect of Brain Drain on Policy Development . . . . .	48
Realistic Manpower Policies . . . . .	48
Recruiting Practices and Selection Procedures. . . . .	49
Summary. . . . .	51

Chapter	Page
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	53
Introduction . . . . .	53
Criteria for Selection of Factors. . . . .	53
Research Questions . . . . .	53
Rationale for the Research Questions . . . . .	54
Variables. . . . .	55
Population . . . . .	56
Sample . . . . .	56
Sample Size. . . . .	57
Questionnaire Development. . . . .	58
Procedure. . . . .	59
Returned Questionnaires. . . . .	59
Analysis of Results. . . . .	60
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS. . . . .	61
Collection of Data . . . . .	61
Pertinent Demographics . . . . .	62
Tribal Group. . . . .	62
Marital Status (MSTATUS). . . . .	62
Age . . . . .	64
Sex . . . . .	64
Visa Status (VSTATUS) . . . . .	66
Years in USA (LSTAY). . . . .	66
Degree Objective (DEGROBJ). . . . .	67
Analysis of Results. . . . .	68
Comparable High Wages Expectations. . . . .	68
Uncertain Employment Opportunities . . . . .	70
Incentives for Professional Advancement . . . . .	75
Political Instability . . . . .	77
Discrimination (Nepotism and Tribalism). . . . .	80
Manpower Policies . . . . .	84
Comparable Environment. . . . .	85
Major Findings as Related to Manpower Development . . . . .	91
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	98
Summary. . . . .	98
Purpose of Study . . . . .	98
Major Findings from the Analysis of Data. . . . .	98
Comparable High Wages Expectations. . . . .	99
Uncertain Employment Opportunities. . . . .	99
Political Instability . . . . .	99

Chapter	Page
Discrimination (Nepotism and Tribalism) . . . . .	99
Manpower Policies . . . . .	100
Comparable Environment. . . . .	100
Conclusions. . . . .	100
Recommendations. . . . .	101
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	103
APPENDIX A - LETTER TO RESPONDENTS AND QUESTIONNAIRE .	107
APPENDIX B - CORRELATION MATRIX FOR RESEARCH QUESTION ONE AND TWO . . . . .	115
APPENDIX C - REGRESSION MODEL FOR RESEARCH QUESTIONS THREE TO SEVEN. . . . .	118

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Nigerian Students Distribution in the USA by School Year(s) . . . . .	32
II. Leading African Countries With Students in the USA by Percent. . . . .	33
III. Projected Enrollment for Nigerian Universities (1981-1985) . . . . .	35
IV. Estimated Manpower Requirement of the Fourth National Development Plan . . . . .	37
V. Percent, Frequency, Cumulative Frequency and Cumulative Percent of Tribal Distri- butions Among Respondents. . . . .	63
VI. Frequency, Percent, Cumulative Frequency, and Cumulative Percent of Respondents by Marital Status . . . . .	64
VII. Frequency, Percent, Cumulative Frequency, and Cumulative Percent of Age Distribution Among Respondents. . . . .	65
VIII. Frequency, Percent, Cumulative Frequency, and Cumulative Percent of Distribution Between the Sexes. . . . .	65
IX. Frequency, Percent, Cumulative Frequency, and Cumulative Percent of Visa Status Among Respondents at the Time of Survey. . . . .	66
X. Frequency, Percent, Cumulative Frequency and Cumulative Percent of Distribution of the Minimum to Maximum Length of Stay Among Respondents . . . . .	67
XI. Frequency, Percent, Cumulative Frequency, and Cumulative Percent of Immediate Degree Objectives Among Respondents. . . . .	68

Table	Page
XII. Frequency, Percent, Cumulative Frequency, and Cumulative Percent of Distribution of Respondents to Variable 'Comparable High Wages' . . . . .	71
XIII. Correlation Coefficients Between (LSTAY) Length of Stay and Selected Variables at $p = .05$ Significance. . . . .	72
XIV. Frequency, Percent, Cumulative Frequency, and Cumulative Percent of How Respondents Reacted to Variable 'Uncertain Employment Opportunities' . . . . .	74
XV. Frequency, Percent, Cumulative Frequency, and Cumulative Percent of Distribution of How Respondents Test on Variables Used to Determine 'Incentives for Professional Advancement' . . . . .	76
XVI. Regression Model for (LSTAY) With Measured Variables at P Value = .05 Significance. . . . .	78
XVII. Frequency, Percent, Cumulative Frequency, and Cumulative Percent of Distribution of How Respondents Answered to 'Political Instability' . . . . .	81
XVIII. Frequency, Percent, Cumulative Frequency, and Cumulative Percent of How Respondents Reacted to Variable 'Discrimination' (Nepotism and Tribalism) . . . . .	83
XIX. Frequency, Percent, Cumulative Frequency, and Cumulative Percent of How Respondents Reacted to 'Manpower Policies'. . . . .	86
XX. Frequency, Percent, Cumulative Frequency, and Cumulative Percent of How Respondents Reacted to the 'Comparable Environment'. . . . .	89
XXI. Whereempl by Environ Controlling for Sex = 4. . . . .	92
XXII. Whereempl by Environ Controlling for Sex = B. . . . .	94
XXIII. Whereempl by Resign Controlling for Sex = A. . . . .	95
XXIV. Whereempl by Resign Controlling for Sex = B. . . . .	97



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Manpower planning and development has been an integral part of the plan for economic development in Nigeria. For the past several years, government policies have reflected the need to develop a viable manpower program to meet manpower shortages in Nigeria. However, the need to develop a trained work force for the nation's economy has remained a central theme in Nigeria since the Ashby Commission of 1959. The responsibility of the Ashby Commission was to conduct a needs assessment for higher education within the next twenty (20) years, starting in 1960. The report of the Ashby Commission categorically called for the development of a "Higher-Level Manpower for Nigeria's Future" (E. R. Fapohunda, 1979, p. 125). Based on the recommendation of the Ashby Commission, the Nigerian Federal and State governments invested huge sums of money for education. Educational programs were expanded at home, and scholarship programs and grants-in-aid were made available to qualified Nigerians to obtain advance education in the United States. In the Fourth National Development Plan 1981-85, a recommitment was made by the Nigerian government

to strengthen its manpower resources. In that regard, the government stated that:

Our development planning efforts are laying increasing emphasis on human resources in appreciation of the vital role of the latter in the development process. Accordingly, the main thrust of policies in our recent development plans has been, among other things, to increase the nation's stock of trained manpower through the expansion of the establishment of new ones.... However, the implementation of these and other manpower policies and programs has not achieved the desired degree of success owing to a number of constraints... (p. 421).

The problems of developing adequate manpower in Nigeria were further explained in the Fourth National Development Plan (FNDP) in the following manner:

The various training efforts commendable as they are, can hardly be considered adequate in relation to the enormous manpower requirements of the economy. In quantitative terms, the gap between the demand and supply of manpower, particularly scientific and technical manpower, has remained very wide... (p. 421).

In light of the manpower situation, the move to invest in human capital was a pragmatic step. The importance of people acquiring and developing skills and useful abilities as inhabitants or members of a society is as old as man. Adam Smith (1957), on the concept of "Fixed Capital", argues that the acquisition of educated people is an important step toward development of human resources. Adam Smith went on to argue that:

The acquisition of such talents, by the maintenance of the acquirer during his education, study, or apprenticeship, always costs a real expense, which is a capital fixed and realized, as it were, in his person. Those talents, as

they make a part of his fortune, so do they likewise of that of the society to which he belongs (pp. 265-66).

Alfred Marshall (1930), on the importance of education as an investment, wrote: "The most valuable of all capital is that invested in human beings" (p. 216).

Perhaps investment in human beings is a bold concept for manpower development. By the same token, if the capital invested in humans is not retrieved after the investment period, a loss is incurred by the investor(s). In the case of Nigeria, the situation seems to be aggregating steadily and causing tremendous manpower shortages. The shortages have been aggravated due to migrations of Nigeria's manpower to other countries, especially the United States (Okediji and Okediji, 1973, p. 73). Yesufu (1978), observed that the migration of trained Nigerians to other countries seriously affects manpower development in Nigeria due to the fact that trained Nigerians possess the professional training and expertise needed back home (p. 335). The loss of those Nigerians either temporarily or permanently constitutes what Aderinto, (1978) called the Nigerian "Brain drain" to the United States. On loss of Nigerian manpower to western nations, especially the USA, Aderinto (1978) asserts that:

This loss of well-trained scientists, doctors, and professionals is lamented, partly because the cost of educating them has been borne, in the main, by the Nigerian society, and their skills cannot now be employed in the efforts to develop a verile and egalitarian society (p. 320).

In regards to the loss of trained Nigerians by migration to other nations, Yesufu (1978) made the following observation:

While it was the intention that these students should return immediately upon completion of their courses, experience has shown that many either prolong their stay overseas or fail altogether to return to Nigeria (p. 333).

On the degree and severity of the problem, Grubel and Scott (1966) argue that emigration of highly skilled persons is likely to cause economic losses in the short run until replacement for the emigrants can be trained. Perhaps the replacement could be short lived in a country like the USA with a large pool to select the necessary manpower. On the contrary, a country like Nigeria only at the basement of development, cannot afford the luxury of losing trained personnel. Further, the replacement of these trained personnel may not be done with any degree of equity, especially where policy matters have to be affected, such as hiring expatriates at high costs to the nation. In addressing the issue of replacing trained personnel, Aderinto (1978) argued that those people who emigrate to the developed western nations are not replaced by an equitable source. As such, the outflow by trained Nigerians to other nations creates a manpower problem. Aderinto went on to make the following observation:

The outflow of these professionals is not compensated for by any significant counterflow of talent and that it includes some eminent and well-established Nigerians makes the problem ever more pressing (p. 321).

The outflow of students (Nigerians), and the prolongation of their stay abroad, especially in the USA, and in some instances the adaptation to the USA as a place for permanent residence is what constitutes a brain drain. Kannappan (1968) posits that the "rate of emigration among students receiving their training abroad thus represents the most significant statistic in discussions of the brain drain from developing countries" (p. 3). It should be pointed out that the seriousness of the loss due to the implication of non-return has prompted much concern and debate both by the losing and gaining countries (Chukunta, 1976, p. 3). Chukunta (1976), asserts that a background to the phenomenon traces its roots to the loss of scientists, engineers, and doctors to the USA by the British (p. 3). According to reports cited by Chukunta (1976), "a large proportion of total scientific migration from developing countries are students" (p. 3). Since students are admitted as temporary visitors with an intent to return, the adjustment of visa status from temporary to permanent immigrants constitutes an intent to delay return temporarily or permanently. The present study was an attempt to understand the problem of "non-return or prolongation of stay" and how it affects manpower development in Nigeria.

### Nature of the Problem

The problem is that there is a brain drain and there is no conclusive evidence identifying specific reasons why American educated Nigerians fail to return after their studies are completed. The prolongation and non-return or the establishment of permanent homes in the USA affects the development of high-level manpower in a developing country like Nigeria. No study has been completed in recent years to determine factors that influence Nigerians not to return after completing their studies in the USA.

### Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to identify the factors that influence non-return. Specifically, the study was designed to:

1. Differentiate those factors associated with prolongation of stay in the USA and the establishment of permanent residency.
2. Identify the effects of professional accomplishment and educational aspiration with their stay in the USA.
3. Identify how personal achievements and desire to prolong or reside in the USA permanently affects manpower development in Nigeria.

### Limitation

No access to individuals returning to the USA after settling in Nigeria was possible at the time of this study.

Access to those people would have given a new dimension as to what makes people want to stay in the USA as compared to Nigeria after their studies are over.

#### Definition of Terms

Non-return - For purposes of this study, non-return is defined as those students who on completion of their studies take a permanent residence status with the intention of staying permanently.

Prolongation of stay - For the purposes of this study, prolongation of stay is defined as a willingness on the part of the individual to continue stay for a period of time until personal satisfaction for accumulation of property has been reached. Prolongation could also mean the desire to continually enroll in courses not related to area of specialization to maintain visa status.

F-visa - F-visas are documents issued by the USA foreign consulate to individuals whose primary purpose is to study in an approved institution.

J-visa - J-visas are documents given to students who are contracted by their governments for specific studies not to last more than two years in most cases.

Immigrant - For the purposes of this study, immigrant refers to those who have changed either their student visas F or J for the purpose of maintaining a permanent residence status.

The Nature and Severity of Non-Return  
or Prolongation of Stay

On a global context, the emigration of students to western nations, especially the USA, is a common trend. In regards to the USA, Das (1974) observed that "the opportunity structure significantly affects the stay-return decision" (p. 76). However, Das (1974) went on to say:

In some cases, the international migration of talents and skills and even of students going to highly developed countries for advanced education and training and later remaining in these countries subsequent to their graduation may be functional to both the sending and receiving countries as well as to the individuals concerned (p. 77).

Sharing the same views with Das is Grubel (1966), whose position, though similar to Das', presents a more controversial undertone. Grubel argues that:

In a fundamental sense foreign student exchange represents a transfer of resources among nations because as long as a student is in the USA, for instance, his native country does not have to feed or instruct him (p. 25).

Perhaps due to the lack of perspective on the nature of the problem, people like Das and Grubel will always favor the migration of talent to the west. The Institute for International Education, known for its accountability of foreign students in the USA, estimated that during the 1984/85 school year there were about 18,370 Nigerian students in the USA (Open Doors 1985). During that same year, The Chronicle for Higher Education had the population of students of Nigerian origin at about 20,000 (June, 1985).



Figures tabulated by both the INS (Immigration and Naturalization Services) and the Nigerian Embassy do not come close to other figures. In essence, the lack of adequate sources for data collection has made estimation difficult. Chukunta (1976) argues that students have been known globally as the dominant source for visa adjustments from temporary to permanent status. These adjustments are made from professional, technical, and kindred workers (PTKW) category. Chukunta (1976) observed that:

Within Africa, Nigeria is a major source country of visa adjustments. Nigeria's PTKW emigration was 46.1 percent, that is 35.4 percentage points above the world average of 10.7 percent (p. 8).

The magnitude of the problem does not rest solely on the adjustment of visa status. Studies have shown that several factors have contributed to inhibit the voluntary repatriation of Nigerians. For example, Okediji and Okediji (1973) found that among Nigerians interviewed in a survey, the incomes earned on the job in the USA were substantially adequate than what they would have earned on a similar job at home (p. 78). Many other factors have contributed heavily to the problem. Besides opportunistic gains and other remunerations, perhaps the most central factor is that educational opportunities are far more restrictive in Nigeria than in the USA. For example, Chukunta (1976) observed that in Nigeria as a whole, Nigerian universities awarded a total of 24 masters and 24 doctoral degrees in 1971-72 (p. 9). Diejomaoh (1976) also

noted that in 1975-76 there were only 1,228 graduate students out of a total of 32,286 university students. By world standards, this three percent portion is extremely low. Further, the FNDP, 1981-85 estimated that 2,300 students would be graduating at the end of 1985. Assuming that all the graduating students went to graduate school in Nigerian universities, the graduate output is still very small compared to standards in the developed world. In terms of Nigerian population, of about 80 million people, the graduate output by percentage is below one percent at .000028. As a result of limited facilities for graduate work in the country as well as college education, the propensity for migration by students to the USA in particular is high. If there were a steady counter-flow of those migrants from the USA back to Nigeria after their studies, the problem would not have been as severe on manpower as it is today.

#### The Effects of Non-Return on Manpower Development

Economic development is a concern for many developing countries. Many of those countries see economic development as the core of their individual advancement. To most of those countries, Nigeria included, a changing future is that which calls for the assembling of programs guided by well-trained individuals as set forth in their development plans. In essence, to institute change the developing

nations require highly functional and trained people who can guide them toward meeting the demands of the people for a better way of life. The systems in which they live and operate require concrete planning methods and pragmatic goals to ensure the attainment of development plans. This calling then requires that the technocrats should have realized that the maintenance of law and order, and the provision of some basic public services, are things of the past. Rather, these technocrats should gear efforts toward meeting the challenges for development posed by the system.. In the same vein, Saul Katz (1971) in Exploring Systems Approach to Institution Building, observed that there was a necessity to continue economic development for change. He went on to argue that for nations to develop, they no longer have to limit their development efforts on prebendary ascription. Katz (1971) further observed that government functions are no longer limited to providing civic functions. In regard to those concerns, Katz (1971) made the following observation:

No longer is it limited to the maintenance of law and order, the provision of some limited public services, and the collection of taxes; rather, it is specifically involved in the mobilization of resources and their allocation to a great variety of development activities on a massive scale. Flowing from the greatly increased scope of activity are the widely spread functional and structural emergence of many interdependent highly specialized activities which requires a high degree of coordination (p. 120).

In regards to manpower development in Nigeria, Hinchliffe (1973) observed that "the rationale for manpower

planning is that there are fixed amounts of particular types of manpower necessary to produce a given amount of each commodity or service" (p. 129). Implicit to this position postulated by Hinchliffe is that the different categories of manpower cannot be substituted for by other categories. Hinchliffe (1973) goes on to say that:

It follows from the no-substitutability argument, therefore, that production is specifically dependent upon particular types of manpower and that output of each good or service will have to be restricted until the requisite manpower 'needs' are available (p. 129).

The Plan Period 1981-1985, estimated that about 2,400 students would be graduating from Nigerian universities. Holding this to be true, it stands that out of 108,720 students enrolled during this Plan Period, a disappointing two percent were estimated to graduate. A logical position should be deducted from the Hinchliffe no-substitutability argument in regards to the manpower situation. That is, the inability of Nigeria to substitute required manpower due to prolongation of emigration or change of status by trained Nigerians in the USA affects manpower development. The stay of these trained Nigerians in the USA for various reasons constitutes "non-return".

#### Position of Theory Buildings

Although non-return or prolongation of stay is a universal trend by students, very few studies have been done on the nature of the phenomenon in Africa. From the context of a 'macrocosm' in terms of Africa, Okediji and

Okediji (1973), Das (1974), and Chukunta (1976) are the few studies that have been done. From a 'microcosmic' perspective, Nigeria has benefited from the studies on brain drain. However, apart from Okediji and Okediji (1973) and Chukunta (1976) two position papers by Aderinto and Yesufu have been presented on the subject of non-return from Nigeria. At any rate, the present study has established some relationships between certain factors studied to a global context, as explained in Chapter II. This does not mean that the findings of previous studies depict a universal trend for application of theory. For example, Chukunta (1976) asserted that in a study done on the phenomenon, Jamaicans and Ghanians differed on working conditions and preference while in the USA. On the other hand, it should be pointed out that previous studies devoted more emphasis on the non-students (professionals) in their perspective fields. As of now, it appears that only the Chukunta (1976) study was done on the question of the phenomenon in regards to Nigerian students. On the whole, it appears that no study has been done with empirical justification on the effect of the non-return of trained Nigerian students in the USA on manpower development in Nigeria.

The lack of empirical studies on the issue of Nigerian brain drain to the USA depicts the lack of guidelines for procedural policy making in regards to the problem. This study could only find two research studies and two position papers in regard to the problem in Nigeria. The two

research studies are those of Okediji and Okediji (1973) and Chukunta (1976). The Okediji and Okediji (1973) study was biased in that the study population was made up of 65.5 percent Yoruba, 26.2 percent minority, and 8.2 percent Igbos. The reliability of the findings are subject to doubt due to the ethnic bias and poor representation of the conglomeration of the Nigerian society. However, some findings of the study have some manpower implications. Okediji and Okediji (1973) observed that when subject(s) were asked about returning to Nigeria, they usually maintained that conditions at home have frustrated them into enforced migration (p. 87). Okediji and Okediji (1973) went on to say that "the reality is that he, the migrant, has psychologically conditioned himself to a fairly long exile before the decision is made to migrate" (p. 87). The existence of the vacuum constitutes a problem, hence a need for theory building in regards to manpower development in Nigeria.

Besides the Okediji and Okediji study, the other empirical study on Nigeria is that by Chukunta (1976), who tried to relate expatriation of American-educated Nigerians to theory and policy formulation. Whereas this study had its implication for theory formation, perhaps historical contribution to the nature of the phenomenon, manpower implications in regards to Nigeria were seriously lacking. On the other hand, the study was restricted to Nigerians in New Jersey and at Columbia University in the City of New

York. By restricting the subjects to New Jersey and Columbia University, a broader perspective of views and finding were neglected.

The position papers on the Nigerian brain drain to the developed nations, especially the USA, have postulated some mind-troubling hypotheses. Their lack of empirical findings second-guess their validity, especially in modern day research which requires proof of data and didactic implications.

Finally, the existing studies concentrate generally on political factors and economic development and present their scope on a global perspective. However, the reflection of manpower development in regard to Nigeria based on the nature of the problem has remained rare. In this study, the investigation of factors like opportunities for employment, marital status, and opportunity for professional advancement were used to determine factors that influenced delay of return by subjects tested.

In regards to the nature of the problem, this study focused on non-return or prolongation of stay to a new dimension--one which considered the impact of the problem on manpower development in Nigeria due to the prolongation of temporary or permanent residency of trained Nigerians in the USA.

## Policy Implications

Despite the fact that there has been a calling by scholars of the phenomenon for empirical data to support policy implications, some have reflected that emotions have overshadowed the need for policy. Among those who stressed the caution of allowing emotions to influence policy implications is Aderinto (1978). Aderinto has cautioned that:

In studies relating to migration of scientific and technical manpower, it is desirable to avoid the term 'brain drain' as much as possible because it connotes a one-way traffic of brain power and carries emotional undertones (p. 320).

Okediji and Okediji (1973) cautioned against the prevalence of sentimentalism on the issue of brain drain and called for facts to validate the assertion.

But appealing as the assumed effects of these factors in determining the professional choice of some Nigerian physicians to stay abroad may appear to be, they should be evaluated against the background of available empirical facts before effective steps aimed at motivating them to come home could be taken (p. 73).

Several other papers and articles have been written on the subject that reflect much emotionalism. Among those papers is one by Henderson (1964) who asserted that:

Sedulous in preventing "unfair competition" among ourselves (Americans), we place no restrictions on our efforts to bid with all our resources against less fortunate nations for their own citizens (p. 20).

Many may feel that emotions have no parlance in a phenomenon such as the brain drain. Perhaps to assert that emotional reaction only helps to confuse issues in regards to the problem is another way of looking at the problem.



However, it should be pointed out that replacement of these trained Nigerians, for example, is by far more costly. Thus, the question of emotions should be relegated to the background; and rather, pragmatic steps should be taken to curb the nature of the problem by the institution of policies that will attract trained Nigerians to repatriate themselves back home.

In respect to the lack of adequate information in the Nigerian bureaucracy, it stands to reason that policy makers in Nigeria need to be better acquainted as to the severity of the problem. Thus, factors affecting the voluntary repatriation of trained Nigerians need to be identified to help elevate the manpower situation in the nation. If this is not the case, policy makers in the country will not only operate without objectives, they will operate with no accomplishments.

#### Organization of the Body of the Dissertation

The review of literature in Chapter II will provide some operational definitions of brain drain and how the phenomenon affects manpower development in Nigeria. It will evaluate the critical aspects of manpower development and provide some empirical perspectives on how the brain drain phenomenon should be addressed in terms of how the hypotheses of this study were formulated.

Chapter III deals with methodology and procedures of the study. It identifies the operational definitions and requirements, and explains the assumptions and limitations of the study. The instruments for measurement and method for recruiting subjects for this study are also addressed in this chapter.

Chapter IV provides findings of the study in terms of the background characteristics of the respondents, analyses, and a discussion of the results of the study.

Chapter V summarizes the study, provides conclusions drawn from the study, and makes recommendations. Some possible suggestions for more empirical studies are provided in this section.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In the last decade there has been a plethora of articles, papers, speeches and opinions aired about the issue of "brain drain" from developing nations. Just as much as this platitude of papers, speeches, views and opinions were being aired, the complexity of perspective was even more apparent in the definition and usage of the term "brain drain". Amidst all these complexities was the institutionalization of a concept which to an extent appeared to have provided a new term for ridicule of international students in the USA. As a result of these complexities, a need arose for an operational concept.

#### Concept of Brain Drain

Perhaps one notable characteristic of the concept of brain drain is the difficulty of definition. Many scholars have attributed this difficulty to the apparent elusiveness of the concept. Among these scholars is Robert G. Myers (1967) who made the following assertion:

One of the factors contributing to controversy and to the seemingly contradictory 'facts' is a continuing problem of definition--which would not disappear with a change from 'brain drain' to 'IMIS' [International Migration of Technical Skills] (p. 64).

Prominent among other scholars who have conducted studies on the subject is Grubel (1968), who recognizes the magnitude of the problem for definition. In Grubel's perspective:

The more the brain drain turns out to be more complex and more difficult to define the more its magnitude, nature, consequences and causes are analyzed beyond the point made by emotionally laden and dramatic stories and episodes about emigrating scientists, engineers and medical doctors (p. 541).

Due to the complexities of the problem, some scholars claim that it is usually not clear as to where a yardstick is to be used to determine the loss or non-return. John R. Nilan (1970) presented the argument that "it is not always clear at what skill level the cut-off should be made in defining manpower whose international migration constitutes a loss" (p. 17). Irrespective of the controversy that exists, some people have chosen to adopt a common position which reflects in large extent the same connotation and meaning; that is, the loss of trained persons of one country (nationality) in the form of international migration to another country or non-return and prolongation of stay in the country where an individual's education was obtained.

If one should implore a workable definition for the term, perhaps among the several definitions, the one arrived at by the Lausanne Conference on Brain Drain (1967) best represents the problem:

The international migration of scientists, doctors, engineers, and servants is the catch phrase used to describe the movement of top-level manpower from the under-developed countries to West-

ern Europe, and from both these areas to the United States (p. 44).

In respect to the loss of trained manpower (brain drain) from Nigeria, Aderinto (1978) defined the problem as:

The loss to foreign countries (especially to the developed countries of Western Europe, United Kingdom, and the United States of America) of Nigerians, be they technicians, executives, teachers, scholars, scientists, and professionals with middle level and high skills which are relevant to the process of development in Nigeria, either now or in the future... (p. 320).

The loss of those people, Aderinto maintains, fits a definition of brain drain. However, since this study correlates with brain drain, the definition is in perspective because non-return and prolongation of stay prevents Nigeria utilizing its trained manpower.

Due to the superfluous of definitions, disagreement remains based on the fact that the use of the term has been broadened in scope. In some contexts, the use of the term has given the phenomenon more of a whimsical connotation than actual substance. However, the problem of definition remains as diverse and controversial as the term itself. Perhaps the examination of the criteria for defining non-return and prolongation of stay should shed some light on the nature of the problem.

#### Criteria for Definition

In defining "non-return" and "prolongation of stay", some criteria need to be established to facilitate the un-

derstanding and application of the terms. At the same time, there is a need to relate how the application correlates to the Nigerian situation. This researcher found a few research and position papers that reflected directly on the manpower situation in Nigeria. Such reflections were treated as subsidiary problems in the studies of brain drain from Nigeria. As a result of the lack of concrete statements on the criteria for definition, the following considerations govern the definition of non-return and prolongation of stay in relation to manpower development in Nigeria.

#### Operational Definition

The need for an operational definition is aimed at providing the reader easy access for recognizing the properties of non-return and prolongation of stay. The operational definition should also provide the reader easy access to understanding the correlation of non-return and prolongation of stay to manpower development in Nigeria.

#### Relativity of the Concepts

At this point, an operational definition should be such that provides a recognizable impact of the problem on manpower development in Nigeria. That is, to stress the relative impact non-return or prolongation of stay by trained Nigerians in the USA has on the Nigerian manpower

situation. In essence, the concept should be relative to time.

### Time Element

On the question of time element, studies relative to the Nigerian situation abhor the need for a cut-off point. According to Chukunta (1976), "The cut-off point at which a migrant should be considered is difficult to determine" (p. 19). However, for the purposes of this study, a definition with the inclusion of the time element will consider all those who have been seeking employment after graduation and those who are seeking employment at the verge of graduation rather than to return to Nigeria. The definition will also include those groups of people who maintain non-professional jobs to pay their bills after the completion of their education while in the USA.

### Categories of Definition

#### A Professional Criterion

Although earlier studies focused greater attention on the criterion for professional definition on science and technological fields, professionalism includes a wide variety of highly trained skilled manpower. In regards to Nigeria, this includes all those students who have acquired associate degrees in a specific discipline.

### The Qualitative Criterion

The qualitative criterion as used in this context depicts the level of training and skills possessed by the emigrant either before entering the USA or after acquisition of training while in the USA. Thomas L. Bernard (1970) posits that "the term refers to the international flow of highly skilled and well-educated professionals" (p. 31). He further contends that the qualitative attributes these emigrants possess led to the liberalization of immigration laws. Bernard (1970) made the following observation in that regard:

Quite clearly, one of the chief reasons for the liberalization of the immigration laws is to enable greater selectivity of highly qualified manpower, while at the same time relegating the less skilled to lower priorities (p. 31).

Although there are ambiguities to clarification and use of the term "skill", as was the case in the brain drain literature in this study, it represents one who has not only mastered theoretical application but practical application. Such a skilled individual would at the very least possess a college degree. "Professional", as used by this researcher, represents all those who have gone through the rigor of academia and have been accepted as members of their various professions. Based on the attributes arrived at for a postulate of a definition, the researcher arrived at a working definition. However, it should be borne in mind that lack of adequate literature in regards to non-



return or prolongation of stay by Nigerians in the USA has prompted the following definition.

### Definition

For the purpose of this study, non-return or prolongation of stay has been defined as: The loss to the USA of highly trained manpower in the form of professionals, scientists, engineers and students by immigration from Nigeria. The loss of professional manpower to the USA from Nigeria constitutes the problem of this study. The purpose of the study is to examine those factors that have prompted non-return or prolongation of stay in the USA by these Nigerians, and possibly arrive at some alternative methods to reduce or eliminate the problem.

### Manpower Implication

#### High-Level Manpower

In a given society, the development of high-level manpower exemplifies the rate and amount of economic development. Echoing the same views are Frederich H. Harbison and Charles A. Myers (1963) who argued that:

Human resources development, therefore, may be a more realistic and reliable indication of modernization or development than any other single measure. It is one of the necessary conditions for all kinds of growth; social, political, cultural, or economic" (p. 14).

When this top-level manpower is lacking, the need to develop and acquire such caliber of people should become

more pressing than factories and dams that supply immediate and temporary needs. Harbison (1973) categorized the following as high-level manpower:

- Managerial, administrative, and entrepreneurial personnel in the public or private sectors of all functional institutions.

- Among the professional personnel inclusive in this category are engineers, lawyers, doctors, scientists, veterinarians, economist, accountants, journalists, artists, college professors, demographers, etc.

- Also inclusive in the list for high-level manpower are labor leaders, political advisors, and top-ranking political leaders of nations, justices of the peace, highly ranked police and armed forces officers, etc. (p. 16).

These categories of people are at the helm of any society. Their roles affect society in one way or another. The training of these people in terms of money and years involved and the ability to have these people in adequate numbers affects the rate and level of economic development. Most developing countries, Nigeria included, suffer huge shortages of this caliber of people. The loss of this caliber of persons affects policy implications and the manpower structure in general. The need for skilled manpower is in high demand if steady development of the country is to be achieved. On examining some developing countries, Hoffman (1963) made the following observation:

The underdeveloped countries need high-level manpower as urgently as they need capital. Indeed, unless these countries are able to develop the required strategic human resources they cannot effectively absorb capital. Of all the resources required for economic development, high talented manpower requires the longest 'lead time' for its

creation. Dams, power stations, textile factories and steel mills can be constructed in a few years but it takes 10 to 15 years to develop managers, engineers, and the administration to operate them. The existence of such manpower, however, is essential if the countries are to achieve self-sustaining growth (pp. 16-17).

On studying problems for economic development in the developing world, John W. Gardner (1963) observed that manpower is crucial for any sort of development plan. According to Gardner (1963):

The demand for high-talent manpower is firmly rooted in the level of technological complexity which characterizes modern life, and the complexity of modern social organization. And even more important, either of these is the rate of innovation and change in both technological and social spheres. In a world that is rocking with change we need more than anything else a high capacity for adjustment to changed circumstances, a capacity for innovation. The solutions we hit today will be outmoded tomorrow. Only ability and sound education equip a man for the seeking of new solutions (p. 17).

Using Gardner as a point of departure in the world today development depends heavily on the acquisition of people with high ability and sound education. The acquisition of such nationals is great, but the loss of these nationals of any country (Nigeria) to the USA creates an unfortunate manpower problem in the country. In terms of brain drain, the loss of these people represents the crux of the phenomenon. Thus, a need for higher education to bolster manpower development remains prima-faci in most developing nations. Nigeria is no exception to this need. Although other factors play an integral role toward meeting

the manpower needs, professional development through education stands out glaringly as the one aspect of development that would alleviate over-all development.

Though some of these requirements could be attainable within local higher education systems, the mass development of other institutions has created a need for a continuous overseas training. In the study of Sub-Saharan countries, Nigeria inclusive, Moock (1984) argues that a need for overseas training remains paramount to meet some educational goals of the Sub-Saharan countries (p. 221). Moock also made the following observation:

The old topic is resurfacing as international assistance agencies once again consider support of high education as a fundamental, long-range strategy for accelerating growth and improving social equity within low-income countries of the region (p. 221).

In respect to the short-comings of trained professionals to meet the acute manpower needs of the region, Moock (1984) made the following observation: "Widespread weaknesses in planning, decision making, and managerial capacities with resulting over-extension of the public sector plague the region (p. 221). Moock (1984) went on to argue that:

Underlying these limitations is still an acute scarcity of highly qualified indigenous professionals with the skills that are crucial to devising and carrying out effective strategies for national development (p. 221).

Echoing this same problem is the Nigerian Manpower Board. In the Fourth National Development Plan (FNDP), the Board

observed that in the areas of highly technical and professional careers, it would require two (2) additional people out of every three (3) they have in these badly needed professions (FNDP, 1981, p. 422). The need for professional and highly trained personnel was further emphasized in the Plan in this manner:

The problem of shortage of staff has been identified as one of the crucial constraints on the expansion of the facilities of all our educational institutions, including the universities, polytechnics. It was recently estimated that about two-thirds of the available staff do not possess adequate professional and teaching experience... (p. 422).

Moock (1984) echoed the same problem of manpower shortages in Sub-Saharan Africa, Nigeria inclusive. Moock observed that several universities and institutions of higher learning in Sub-Saharan Africa suffer tremendous shortages in qualified manpower. In Nigeria, for example, it was estimated that a minimum of 4,200 lecturers were needed at the university level, and an estimated 5,500 lecturers were needed at polytechnics (FNDP, pp. 430-31). The sincerity of the problem can best be exemplified by the observation made by Moock (1984):

There are currently 56 universities in Sub-Saharan Africa with nearly all African states having at least one. Many, however, are very small, with less than 1,000 students, only 11 have over 10,000 students, and there is no discipline in which African universities have achieved self-sufficiency in staffing (p. 226).

Similar findings on the nature of manpower shortages have been made by international agencies like the World Bank. On the question of shortages in professional man-

power in Sub-Saharan Africa, the World Bank on "World Development Report, 1980," found the problem to be rather acute. The report was summarized in the following manner: "Their shortages, i.e., (professional manpower) has been one of the the biggest brakes on development projects in Africa" (p. 88).

### Higher Education

In order to arrest the problem of shortages in manpower, it became necessary for the government to expand and develop facilities for higher education. Particular emphasis has been laid on developing more people in the technical and science oriented disciplines. For example, in the Second Development Plan, the Manpower Board as a rule of thumb suggested ways by which labor in the skilled and highly technical and scientific fields could be abridged. The Board did recommend that sixty percent (60%) of admission to Nigerian universities and scholarship awards should be for the sciences and highly technical fields.

In the Third National Development Plan, like the Second National Development Plan, the Manpower Board recommended and emphasized the need to maintain a ratio of 60:40 in favor of the sciences (60%) and the liberal arts (40%) (FNDP, p. 248). Similarly, in the Fourth National Development Plan the Manpower Board emphasized developing science-based manpower people at a ratio of 60:40 in favor of the sciences and technology (p. 434). Perhaps one of the major

weaknesses of "high education" in Nigeria is the lack of adequate post-graduate facilities. In the Fourth National Development Plan, it was explained that a major weakness in the academic planning of universities (sic in Nigeria) is the absence of adequate post-graduate facilities to produce within a reasonable time frame the large numbers of academic staff required (p. 258).

However, it should be emphasized that based on the total outlays in capital expenditure, education has been singled out as one area that can foster economic development. Nigeria spends more money on education than any developing nation (p. 259). It is estimated that approximately 9.3 percent of the total planned public expenditure program of 82 billion (\$131.2 billion) or 10.6 percent of the public sector programs will be spent on education (p. 259). Emphasis should be laid on the fact that expenditures for education does include scholarships and bursaries to enable qualified Nigerians to study at home and abroad, particularly in the USA. "A total of 273 million has been earmarked for student financing by the Federal Government.... A sum of \$120 million was targeted for financing existing bursary awards and granting new ones" (p. 261). A bulk of the bursary awards go to students in the USA since this country harbors more Nigerian students than any other nation.

Based on all figures compiled for the foreign student body in the USA, Nigeria had been ranked third for the

years 1977 through 1985. The drop to the rank of eighth occurred in the 1985/1986 period when the economy was quite bleak at home and authorities were forced to tighten foreign exchange funds.

Among African countries, as the tables indicate, Nigeria has represented a bulk of African students in the USA in the last several years with the highest percent gain of 48.2percent during the 1983/84 school year. Table I indicates how Nigerian students were ranked during school years 1977/1978 through 1985/86.

TABLE I  
NIGERIAN STUDENTS DISTRIBUTION IN  
THE USA BY SCHOOL YEAR(S)

Year	Students	Country Rank
1977/78	13,510	3
1979/80	16,360	3
1980/81	17,350	3
1981/82	19,560	3
1982/83	20,710	3
1983/84	20,080	3
1984/85	18,370	3
1985/86	13,980	8

Source: Open Doors, 1981/82, 1983/84, and 1984/86.



Table II, on the other hand, indicates that among African countries, Nigeria sent more students to the USA during school years 1969/1970 through 1985/86 than any other African country.

TABLE II  
LEADING AFRICAN COUNTRIES WITH STUDENTS  
IN THE USA BY PERCENT

	Country	Percent
<u>1969-1970</u>	Nigeria	24.3
	Egypt	13.1
	Ethiopia	7.1
	Ghana	7.1
	Kenya	6.5
	Total	58.3
<u>1974-1975</u>	Nigeria	39.2
	Ethiopia	11.1
	Ghana	7.3
	Egypt	5.3
	Libya	5.3
	Total	68.2
<u>1979-1980</u>	Nigeria	45.2
	Libya	8.4
	Kenya	5.1
	Ghana	5.0
	Egypt	4.6
	Total	68.3
<u>1983-1984</u>	Nigeria	48.2
	Egypt	5.6
	Ethiopia	5.0
	Kenya	4.7
	Libya	4.1
	Total	67.6

TABLE II (Continued)

	Country	Percent
<u>1984-1985</u>	Nigeria	46.5
	Egypt	6.1
	Ethiopia	5.4
	Kenya	4.8
	South Africa	4.1
	Total	66.9
<u>1985-1986</u>	Nigeria	40.1
	Egypt	6.6
	Ethiopia	5.7
	South Africa	5.2
	Kenya	5.0
	Total	62.6

Source: Open Doors, 1985/86.

Table III shows the projected 1981-85 enrollment for Nigerian universities.

#### Labor Market Supply

The question of adequate labor market supply continues to haunt development policies and plans in Nigeria. In the Fourth National Development Plan of 1981-1985, it was indicated that selected categories of manpower were seriously lacking. According to the Plan:

TABLE III  
PROJECTED ENROLLMENT FOR NIGERIAN  
UNIVERSITIES (1981-1985)

University	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
Ibadan	8,595	9,557	10,034	10,285	10,485
Lagos	8,894	9,557	10,242	10,595	10,905
Nigeria, Nsukka	8,060	8,642	9,411	10,170	10,625
Zaria	10,396	11,122	12,279	12,170	12,985
Ife	8,771	9,217	9,620	10,343	10,675
Benin	3,890	4,660	5,681	6,560	6,985
Jos	3,293	4,135	5,158	6,045	6,610
Calabar	2,751	3,436	4,151	5,031	6,015
Kano	2,775	3,550	4,275	5,035	6,115
Maiduguri	3,393	4,398	5,009	5,685	6,150
Sokoto	1,717	2,532	3,317	4,217	4,625
Ilorin	2,042	2,999	4,024	5,220	6,215
Port Harcourt	1,976	2,504	3,155	3,935	4,830
Bauchi	--	400	600	800	1,000
Markurdi	--	250	500	750	1,000
Owerri	--	250	500	750	1,000
Ondo	--	--	250	500	750
Gondola	--	--	250	500	750
Ogun	--	--	--	250	500
Niger	--	--	--	250	500
Totals	66,553	77,209	88,636	99,090	108,720

Source: Fourth National Development Plan 1981-85, 1981, p. 269.

This implies that during the 1981-85 period, we need to obtain, through our local training efforts, recruitment of expatriate personnel, etc., more than the existing stock of various categories of manpower. Otherwise, the problem of manpower shortage will continue to be felt (FNDP, p. 428).

In a 'Labor Market Survey' in Nigeria by the World Bank in 1985, Keith Hinchliffe (1985) observed that:

Substantial numbers of expatriates are employed and high levels of vacancies are identified in the public service particularly for technical, scientific and professional personnel (p.34).

Hinchliffe (1985) goes on to say that "In Nigeria, a 1977 manpower survey showed one-fifth of administrative and managerial workers to be expatriates" (p. 30). Substitution with expatriate personnel will continue even more during the next plan period, especially with poor returns of trained Nigerian nationals. Table IV provides a clue to the nature of the shortages in manpower in Nigeria. As indicated in the Plan period, the estimated manpower requirements for meeting shortages stands at an alarming 161,311. The categories of the required manpower indicate that at the very least individuals would have to spend a minimum of three to four years in college to acquire a basic qualification for the vacancy. If the estimated 2,300 students should graduate from Nigerian universities annually, it stands to reason that chances of meeting demands for intermediate manpower shortages are far from realistic. Out of the 161,311 trained manpower required, 60,751 are in the senior level, while 100,580 are at the

TABLE IV  
ESTIMATED MANPOWER REQUIREMENT OF THE  
FOURTH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Architects	650	620	860	50	880
Accountants	6,000	2,650	8,500	465	5,615
Town Planner	300	350	400	25	475
Civil & Structural Engineers	4,000	4,700	6,000	310	7,010
Builders	300	240	500	25	465
Electrical & Elec- tronic Engineers	350	260	600	30	540
Land Surveyors	600	350	800	50	600
Quantity Surveyors	400	2,250	500	30	350
Estate Surveyors	500	250	690	40	480
Geologists & Geo- Physicists	450	370	600	35	555
Technicians	1,080	1,220	1,500	85	1,725
Civil Engineering Technicians	9,800	5,950	12,300	760	9,210
Electrical & Elec- tronic Engineering Technicians	10,600	8,060	13,500	825	11,785
Medical Doctors	8,400	4,830	15,000	650	12,080
Dentists	400	286	900	30	816
Pharmacists	3,000	1,690	5,000	230	3,920
Veterinary Sur- geons	1,000	505	3,000	80	2,585
Nurses & Mid- wives	50,000	21,430	90,000	3,880	65,310

TABLE IV (Continued)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Medical Laboratory Technician	1,200	640	4,000	100	3,540
Radiographers	400	190	800	30	620
Agricultural Officers	2,500	1,440	4,000	195	3,135
Agricultural Assistants	6,300	2,040	10,300	490	6,530
Statisticians Administrative Officers	4,500	2,370	6,500	350	4,720
Executive Officers	6,800	2,270	10,000	530	6,000
Librarians	1,000	850	3,500	80	2,930
Legal Practitioners	5,650	2,260	8,135	440	5,185

- (1) Category of Manpower  
(2) Estimated Current Stock 1980  
(3) Requirements for Meeting Existing Shortage  
(4) Requirements for Meeting 1985 Employment Population Target  
(5) Requirements for Meeting Wastage, 1980-85  
(6) Additional Requirement, 1980-85

Source: Fourth National Development Plan 1981-85, 1981, pp. 428-29.

intermediate level which constitutes the bulk of first degree holders and associate diploma equivalence.

As the estimates indicate, a dire need for trained manpower personnel is required to help in economic development in Nigeria. Thus, the prolongation of stay or non-return constitutes a serious problem for development plans in the country. Based on the manpower needs of the country, one would expect that a greater proportion of the demand should have been met by this time with several students in colleges and universities in the USA. Unfortunately, this is not the case. Although several Nigerians attend school in the USA, it does appear that a good majority of these students would rather stay permanently or prolong their stay in the USA.

#### Failure to Return

Failure to return to the homeland after a period of schooling is not a new problem posed by international students to their nations. To most developing nations, the problem of manpower shortages is further aggravated by non-return or failure to return. For many international students, if not most, the transition from developing to developed takes awhile. At the same time, the transition from developed to developing would probably take a long time.

Schieffer (1983) observed:

For the foreign student, the passage from academic to professional life is complicated by hav-

ing to make the adjustment from a developed to a developing country (p. 2).

This transition is not by any means easy. Facilities are not available in most instances to help the student(s) with the transition back to the local levels. Schieffer (1983) has observed that:

Having returned home, the student from the developing world does not find institutions or services to help him in this transition process. Nor can the student generally look to parents or peers for guidance of this type (p. 2).

The university infrastructure with its academic and social amenities, friends who listened and empathized with the student are all left behind in the USA (p. 2). To most, failure becomes eminent and the return to the USA or country where their education and professional advancement was obtained becomes inevitable. To the bulk of students who are still abroad the word gets around and prolongation of stay or non-return becomes a logical alternative.

Non-return or prolongation of stay is not a recent occurrence. Kindleberger (1968) observed that "many (foreign students) never go home on a permanent basis. They become uprooted, detribalized by the experience of foreign study" (p. 139). Kindleberger (1968) goes on to argue that several reasons abound for not going home by foreign students trained in the USA (p. 139). Kindleberger (1968) made the following observation in regards to non-return or prolongation of stay by foreign students:

The reasons for staying are many, and fairly obvious. The standard of living is one thing, marriage to an American spouse, another. The



successful foreign student becomes addicted to the intellectual life of the developed country, including libraries, quality of students, and quality of potential colleagues (p. 139).

Besides problems of forming new colleagues and friends, the long stay abroad has helped to isolate the individual from a patronage system that plagues the developing nations. Thus, the ladder for advancement grows taller while the individual is at the bottom of the totem pole. In this respect, Kindleberger (1968) argues that:

Further, by studying abroad the student may have cut himself off from the normal ladder of advancement in his country, and hesitates to take the risk of return and finding himself excluded. A reason for staying may be connected with failure at his studies (pp. 139-40).

Kindleberger (1968) also observed that:

Many universities in these countries have been operating under a system of patronage, and the student who is trained abroad lacks a patron or may even incur the enmity of the most powerful patrons who control the avenues of advancement (p. 141).

Based on the numerous problems faced by developing nations, Gardner (1968) has also observed that many Africans go abroad for their college education. Gardner (1968) argued that "the lack of adequate facilities locally, has made thousands of Africans go abroad annually in pursuit of further education and training (p. 195). Of this bunch, many have been found to have spent a very long time abroad before completion of their programs of studies. In the same bent, Gardner (1968) made the following observation:

In some even more abnormal cases, African students have spent up to 15 years or more overseas trying to obtain academic or professional qualifications. The amount of time spent by such students over and above the period normally required for the completion of such studies is a 'dead loss' to their countries (p. 1985).

Gardner goes on to argue that finance is top of the many factors that plague African students abroad. According to Gardner:

The lack of funds is the chief factor responsible for their long exile from home, since not infrequently financially stranded students have to work while they study, and end up by taking root in a foreign land (p. 195).

A typical example on the lack of funds is the Nigerian situation as recent as 1984. Articles like "Nigerian Official asks U.S. colleges for lists of students owing money" (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1984, p. 29) were common in the local and national papers. In the fall of 1983, the Chronicle of Higher Education ran the following:

"Nigerians Failure to Pay U.S. Tuition Bills Jeopardizes Standing of 10,000 Students" (Malcolm G. Scully, 1983, p. 27). The article went on to say that:

While most of the problems have been with students from Nigeria, the association's guidelines also mention students from Ghana and Guyana. Nigerian students in the U.S. have traditionally had difficulty in getting money from home to pay for tuition and living expense (p. 27).

In the spring of 1984, another article read: "Student funds unaffected by coup" (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1984, p. 29). In the summer of 1984, another article read: "No Easy Solution Seen for Financial Problems that Face

Nigerian Students in the United States" (Scully, 1984, p. 25).

Coupled with the financial problems encountered by foreign students, Nigerian students are even plagued by bureaucratic subtafuge. Gardner observed that some African students specialize in high technical areas and find themselves inoperable in their home countries. This contributes to the decision to stay abroad. Gardner (1968) goes on to say: "In West Africa a government withdrew financial support from students who were pursuing courses not in any way related to their country's manpower needs" (pp. 195-96).

Amidst all the numerous research done on factors associated with non-return or the prolongation of stay in the USA by foreign students, much is yet to be done to reasonably explain the trend with regard to Nigerians. From an international perspective, much has been done to present a world view of the problem. In terms of reliance to specific countries, much is yet to be done. For example, in the case of Nigeria, there are a maximum of two research studies done on the issue. The last research was done ten years ago and very little reference was made to how non-return (brain drain) affects manpower development and economic development in general.

Among the research done on Nigeria, similar factors have been associated with reasons for non-return or prolongation of stay. For example, in the research done by

Okediji and Okediji (1973) the following factors were associated with non-return:

...undertaking post graduate studies, marriage to indigens, lack of patriotism, commitment to materialism, opportunity to contribute to the development of the field, security in employment and opportunity to be original and creative (pp. 78-79).

Chukunta (1976) tested more variables than Okediji and Okediji, but neither he nor Okediji and Okediji associated their studies to manpower development in general. Further, the studies were done ten and thirteen years ago respectively. Based on the population of Nigerian students then in the USA, the population has doubled and at some point tripled comparatively today, and a much greater diversity can be found today among Nigerian students than at the time earlier studies were conducted.

As a result of these diversities and lap in time, coupled with the changing socio-political climate in Nigeria today, a need has arisen to examine those factors that are encouraging Nigerians to not return or to prolong their stay in the USA after completion of their academic and professional pursuits.

#### Effect on Economic Development

On discussing the effects of brain drain (non-return or prolongation of stay) by Nigerians in the USA on economic development, two factors stand out glaringly. Among these factors are: (1) loss of human capital, and (2) loss of money invested. Emphasis should be placed on the

fact that although these two factors constitute effects on economic development, the magnitude of effect cannot be measured on the same scale. Each factor plays a separate role toward economic development and should only be seen as singularly as possible.

### Loss of Human Capital

The problem of evaluating loss of human capital in the process of brain drain has always stimulated controversial arguments among scholars. Grubel and Scott (1967), for example, argued that the economics on the loss of human capital should be measured in terms of personal loss against national loss. Kannappan (1968), on the other hand, argues that "the losses from brain drain stem mainly from the complementarity of high level human capital to other productive resources" (p. 12). Kannappan goes on to argue that:

The losses do appear to be greater for some countries and professions than for others. They seem to be higher among those receiving their training abroad, and, within this group, among those with advanced or specialized skills (p. 12).

The utilization of human capital exemplifies orderliness in developmental programs. The lack of human capital or loss of these typifies the sluggish or ineffective development programs. In essence, if the people are not there to put plans into operation, no machines can work and programs cannot be implemented. On the other hand, when human resources are bountiful and utilized properly, bene-

fits are reaped by nations who are able to utilize these resources. On the importance of human capital, Boulding (1968) observed that:

With human capital left untouched during World War II, it did not take countries like Germany and Japan long to recover their physical capital due to the existence of human capital" (p. 112).

Boulding (1968) goes on to argue that the presence and utilization of human capital in any given society provides avenues for development. The following observations by Boulding are in order in regards to how effectively countries like Germany and Japan utilized their human capital to advance economic development.

With the human capital intact, however, it did not take those countries long to recover not only their former extent of physical capital, but to generate a rate of development which far exceeded what they had before. Many other countries which were not destroyed at all during the war have nevertheless stagnated or even gone back within the post-war period because of the absence of human capital and the absence of a sufficient 'quantity of service,' as Adam Smith calls it. It is clear that the distribution of human capital may be a much more important factor in determining relative rates of economic development than the distribution or redistribution of physical capital (pp. 112-113).

In terms of brain drain, Boulding argues that if the educated migrates to another society, he or she causes depletion in resources from the society. In that vein, Boulding contended that:

If, however, he migrates, the society which raised him loses a valuable piece of quasi-property without any way of collecting the invisible debt which the migrant has incurred. He may pay it off personally to the new society to which he goes, as he raises a new generation of children

and educates them. This does not do very much good for the society from which he came (p. 114).

Thus, as argued by Aderinto (1978), Nigerians who on completion of their education decide to stay abroad, do a disservice to their country, especially since the core of their education has been borne by the Nigerian Society. In terms of economic development, the loss of human capital affects the country as whole.

#### Loss of Money Invested

Developing countries are not in any position to lose money since most of these countries, like Nigeria, suffer heavy losses by embezzlement and misappropriation of funds. Sadly, developmental efforts through overseas education are contributing heavily to the loss of money.

When Nigerian citizens are either sponsored by the government(s) of Nigeria or through private funds, huge sums of money are lost through various foreign exchange processes. The losses are multiplied if the trained individual becomes a loss to the society that has invested in such an individual's education. It would be profitable to a country if such monies were invested on another individual who would have returned to serve the nation. In this respect, Kannappan made the following observation:

Grants for overseas study (whether out of donor country contributions or the poor country's scarce foreign exchange) represent a subsidy to the beneficiary by his country, since these could have been awarded to other individuals in the society also (p. 11).

In terms of manpower and economic development, such losses do not help foster developmental programs. Rather, they negate efforts for development since most planning programs are futuristic and heuristic in nature. As a result of money invested on non-returning students, the efforts made and money used for planning a viable future manpower resource in the country becomes a liability to economic development efforts.

#### Effect of Brain Drain on Policy Development

Although several possibilities may be suggested as to the effects of brain drain on policy development, two factors stand out in the question of Nigeria which should be considered: Realistic manpower policies, and recruiting practices/selection procedures.

#### Realistic Manpower Policies

Some scholars have argued that manpower policies in most developing nations are unrealistic and politically motivated. These policies, they claim, tend to present attractive goals and project a demand at the time of conception, but fall short during implementation. Unless realistic projections and clarity as to demands and availability for a qualified labor force are present, such tainted and politically motivated policies only add to the confusion and misdirection of prospective returning stu-



dents from abroad and particularly from the USA. As Myers (1973) observed:

There is a fuzziness about the concept of manpower needs that undercuts its usefulness as a basis for policy. As has been shown repeatedly, manpower projections, whether geared to politically chosen goals or whether based on attempts to anticipate future demands, have not provided successful guidelines for educational planning at home. It is not likely that projections of vague manpower needs will be any more helpful as a general basis for issuing visas and judging whether students will or will not return home (pp. 334-35).

On the question of adopting realistic manpower policies in Nigeria, Olaleye (1982) argues that the implementation of these policies is lacking. He goes on to say: "Because of the lack of adequate government policies, the implementation of national manpower policy has so far yielded disappointing results in Nigeria" (p. 30). At any rate, in order to meet demands, pragmatic manpower policies should be adopted in the future. These policies should actually address the problem of shortages due to brain drain, and efforts should be made to target programs and planning procedures to meet existing manpower situations. At the same time, provisions should be made in future plans to accommodate students abroad.

#### Recruiting Practices and Selection Procedures

Perhaps the key to reducing the problem for many is the provision of adequate information to prospective students and employers alike. Policy makers should endeavor

to assist prospective employers through contact with embassies and consulates abroad to finalize recruiting and selection procedures before students are advised to return. Where vague promises have been made, like in the past, returning students have faced frustrations and passed the word around to others abroad.

The experience of Canadian, British, Argentine, Ugandan, and other recruiting teams suggest that recruiters must have the authority to actually negotiate contracts on the scene. Vague promises of employment are seldom adequate inducement to return (Myers (p. 345).

Recruiting does cost money. However, policy makers should consider the benefit of actually inducing trained Nigerians back home to help in the development efforts. Such incentives will encourage other Nigerians to return after graduation. On "Manpower Assessment and Planning," Navarro Gondin (1982) made these recommendations which developing nations should utilize to meet manpower requirements. According to Gondin (1982): "Developing countries should provide incentives to attract the return of their own nationals who have studied abroad and remained there to work" (p. 29).

Perhaps another aspect of the problem on policy is that reliance on foreign expatriates to substitute for shortages has become inevitable. In the FNDP 1981-85, indications show that for the most part of the selected manpower requirements, demands exceed supply. According to the plan:

This implies that during the 1981-85 period, we need to obtain through our local training efforts, recruitment of expatriate personnel, etc., more than the existing stock of various categories of manpower (p. 428).

At any rate, although other factors could be conceived as effects of brain drain on policy, realistic manpower policies and recruitment practices/selection procedures will always remain affected any time human resources are lost to other countries from Nigeria.

### Summary

The first section of this chapter highlights shortcomings and difficulty of defining non-return or prolongation of stay, and how these factors are associated with manpower development in Nigeria. The literature was selected to cover the following sectioned topics: (1) Criteria for definition, operational definition relative to the concepts and categories of definition, (2) Manpower implications, (3) Higher education, (4) Failure to return, (5) Labor market supply, and (6) Summary.

The following problems were uncovered facing development plans among African nations, particularly Nigeria:

1. Opportunities for professional advancement are grossly limited in Nigeria; and
2. Nigerian students, like many other African students with financial difficulties, take a longer time to graduate.

Perhaps it should be emphasized that the lack of related literature has forced the study to take a restricted path. The lack of study about Nigeria in particular has not provided any access to new findings. Due to the lack of study on Nigeria, the lack of identification of specific factors related to the problem has further restricted the study. Finally, emphasis should be placed on the fact that no studies have been done on non-return or prolongation of stay that relate to the 1981-85 development plan.

It is anticipated that in the near future, as the problem intensifies, more people will start addressing the issues related to non-return or prolongation of stay and how it could affect manpower development in developing nations such as Nigeria.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

This chapter is designed to deal with the methods of data collection and analysis. Included in this section are basic assumptions, research questions, independent and dependent variables, and control variables.

#### Criteria for Selection of Factors

The factors selected for investigation in this study are either (1) those which had not been investigated in previous studies, or (2) those which had been investigated but whose application and relevancy to manpower development in Nigeria need confirmation.

#### Research Questions

Based on the criteria, the assumptions and purpose of the study as defined in Chapter I, the following research questions were arrived at:

- RQ-1 Are students who expect to earn fairly high wages at home comparable to wages earned in the USA more likely to prolong their stay in the USA?
- RQ-2 What effect do uncertain employment opportunities

have on the decision for prolongation of stay or non-return?

RQ-3 What effect does the lack of incentives for professional advancement in Nigeria have on the decision of Nigeria's trained high-level manpower to prolong their stay or reside permanently in the USA?

RQ-4 Is the instability in the political system a reason which affects Nigeria's trained high-level manpower personnel to reside in the USA permanently?

RQ-5 What effect does perception of discrimination (nepotism or tribalism) at home have on the decision to prolong stay or not to return?

RQ-6 What effect does the lack of pragmatic manpower policies have on the decision to not return or prolongation of stay by Nigeria's trained high level manpower?

RQ-7 Are Nigerians who perceive a comparable environment in Nigeria to that in the USA more likely to prolong their stay or not return?

#### Rationale for the Research Questions

The researcher emphasizes that the variables of this study (that is, factors associated with the study) are not meant to be absolutes; they have been accorded no numerical values. Rather, the students' perception of the variables

will facilitate the determination of their respective influence on non-return or prolongation of stay.

### Variables

#### Independent Variables:

- Opportunities for employment
- Expectations for equivalent wages
- Opportunities for professional enhancement
- Perception for political stability
- Perception for discrimination (nepotism and tribalism)
- Lack of pragmatic manpower policies
- Perception of social environment

#### Dependent Variables:

- Non-return/prolongation of stay

#### Control Variables:

- Sex
- Age
- Level of Education
- Tribe
- State of origin
- Place of study
- Source of funding
- Nationality

## Population

The population for the study was 13,710 as published in "Open Doors", 1985/86, identified as bona fide Nigerian students residing or attending colleges or universities in the USA. For the purposes of the study, respondents were divided into two groups: sponsored or non-sponsored students. Non-sponsored students were those students whose source(s) of financial support is not supplied by any Nigerian government or international agency.

## Sample

The sample consisted of Nigerian students identified in the seven regions in the USA. The seven regions, Florida, Minnesota, Georgia, California, Texas, North Carolina, and Oklahoma were chosen to give the study a broader perspective of reaching more Nigerians. On the other hand, a random sampling was not used simply for the reason that Nigerian students, like most foreign students, fear reprisals from the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). This is especially true with the new "Immigration Reform and Control Act," commonly known as the "Simpson-Mazzoli" Bill (1982) which is designed to enforce tighter restrictions on foreigners in the USA. Random samplings would confirm fears of reprisals from the INS, especially among those working illegally, and poor return of questionnaires would have been inevitable. In a similar study done in the 1970's, OH (1970) observed that random



sampling has been found to accentuate suspicion among foreign students, thus reducing the rate of return.

The names of Nigerian students used in the study were obtained from Nigerian students' organizations in the seven regions and international students' advisors in schools with large numbers of Nigerian student enrollment.

#### Sample Size

Since an accurate figure has not been established for current Nigerian student population in the USA, it was difficult to arrive at a target population for sampling. However, since demographic data show a minimum of 13,710 Nigerian students for the 1985/86 school year as published in "Open Doors," (p.18), 374 subjects were used. Krejcie and Morgan (1970) maintain that:

A sampling size should be chosen from a given finite population of N cases such that the sample proportion P will be within P .05 of the population proportion P with a 95 percent level of confidence" (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970, p. 607).

Since the table provided for the measurement of a P .05 does not provide for 13,710, the nearest confidence level was figured at 15,000. At 15,000, Krejcie and Morgan suggests that 375 subjects should be used and at 10,000, 374. Thus, at 13,710, 370 subjects were targeted as an appropriate estimate at P .05 with a 95 percent confidence level.

## Questionnaire Development

Questionnaires have been commonly used in the studies associated with foreign students non-return or prolongation of stay especially in the USA. These questionnaires, more or less, have measured the same factors in many instances and the similarities between them rest on the fact that all of these questionnaires measure some aspects of foreign students.

Among these questionnaires are Myers (1972) which measured Peruvian students in the USA. According to Myers, "a preliminary form (questionnaire) was pre-tested first by administering it to several Peruvian students and allowing them to comment on it as they answered questions, and secondly, by mailing out a revised form to Latin American students on the University of Chicago campus (p. 394).

For the purposes of this study, the researcher used Chukunta's (1976) questionnaire which is a Likert type scale and looks at social factors such as political socialization. Chukunta's questionnaire was modified from Oh (1970). According to Chukunta, Oh's questionnaire was pre-tested twice and was modified from Myers. Some modifications were made to accommodate a larger perspective of time, geographical locations from which respondents originated, and reside. As a result of these modifications, a pre-test (pilot study) was conducted with 20 Nigerian students at Langston University, Guthrie, Oklahoma. Modifications for clarity and length of questions followed before the final questionnaire was put together for use in the study.

## Procedure

A pre-test (pilot study) was conducted using 20 students, randomly chosen, who represent a broad spectrum of Nigeria's regional representation in the USA. Each questionnaire sent out was accompanied with an introductory letter explaining the purpose of and need for the study.

A self-addressed, stamped envelope was included to enable respondents to mail the completed questionnaires to the regional moderators contacted through Nigerian organizations (Nigerians who volunteered to distribute the questionnaires) who in turn mailed the completed questionnaires to the researcher. A follow-up letter was sent through the volunteers as a reminder to those students whose questionnaires had not been received. In situations, a telephone call was initiated by the researcher and regional moderators to help remind students as to the importance of their cooperation.

## Returned Questionnaires

On the issue of returned questionnaires, Fowler (1984) has observed that the Bureau of Census is among the few research organizations that experience a 95 percent return rate of surveys. According to Fowler,

The experience of the Bureau of the Census is extreme in the positive direction. At the other extreme, one occasionally will see reports of mail surveys in which 5 to 20 percent of the sample responded (Fowler, 1984, p. 48).

Fowler went on to say that "most survey research projects lie somewhere between those two extremes" (p. 48). He argues that, "there is no agreed-upon standard for a minimum acceptable response rate" (p. 48). According to Fowler, "...Rates of response for surveys of central city samples using random-digit dial telephone samples are distinctively likely to be lower" (p. 48).

### Analysis of Results

Due to the fact that the research questions involved more than one variable and the scores obtained were interval and ordinal, the data were analyzed by correlation and multiple regression analysis. "Where as correlation measures the amount of relationship between two variables, regression attempts to predict from the other" (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1983, p. 49). These statistical techniques were utilized by means of Statistical Analysis System (SAS).

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Chapter IV is divided into three sections: Collection of Data, Pertinent Demographics of Respondents, and Analysis of Results.

#### Collection of Data

A refined questionnaire was administered to each respondent by the seven regional moderators as stated in Chapter III. A follow up by telephone was initiated by the researcher to each regional moderator after two weeks had elapsed. After the third week, another follow up was initiated by telephone to each of the moderators by the researcher. At this time, (45 percent) of the surveys had been collected. Two weeks later, a final follow up by the researcher was initiated to all the regional moderators. By the end of the sixth week, collected questionnaires were requested to be mailed by each moderator to the researcher. A total of 63.3 percent of the questionnaires were returned for analysis.

## Pertinent Demographies

### Tribal Group

The tribal groups represented in this study were not selected by choice. They are only representative of respondents to the survey. Without any doubt, the representation here reflects the Nigerian tribal configuration in the USA. As depicted in Table V, Ibos represent 33 percent or  $N = 73$  of the entire population surveyed who responded to the questionnaire. The Yorubas are represented by 21.7 percent or  $N = 48$ , while the next largest representation are the Ibibios and Ijaws with 7.2 percent or  $N = 16$  respectively. The Hausa who are the predominant tribe in Nigeria were accounted for by 4.1 percent or  $N = 9$ .

### Marital Status (MSTATUS)

The marital status (MSTATUS) had a close representation among respondents contrary to Chukunta (1976) were all respondents in this category were males. However, the marital status was represented by  $N = 119$  or 50.4 percent for respondents who were single at the time of this survey. On the other hand,  $N = 116$  or 49.2 percent of the respondents were married. Among the married with children  $N = 1$  or .4 percent with  $N = 3$  who did not respond to the question. Table VI is a representation of respondents' marital status.

TABLE V

PERCENT, FREQUENCY, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY  
AND CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF TRIBAL  
DISTRIBUTIONS AMONG RESPONDENTS

Tribes	N = 237 #	%	Cumulative #	Cumulative %
Anang	4	1.8	4	1.8
Basang	1	0.5	5	2.3
Bekwa	2	0.9	7	3.2
Bini	7	3.2	14	6.3
Boki	3	1.4	17	7.7
Efik	11	5.0	28	12.7
Ekoi	3	1.4	31	14.0
Etung	3	1.4	34	15.4
Fulani	3	1.4	37	16.7
Hausa	9	4.1	46	20.8
Ibibio	16	7.2	62	28.1
Ibo	73	33.0	135	61.1
Idoma	1	0.5	136	61.5
Igala	3	1.4	139	62.9
Ijaw	16	7.2	155	70.1
Ishang	3	1.4	158	71.5
Isoko	4	1.8	162	73.3
Kwale	2	0.9	164	74.2
Mbembe	1	0.5	165	74.7
Mbube	3	1.4	168	76.0
Nkim	1	0.5	169	76.5
Tiv	4	1.8	173	78.3
Yoruba	48	21.7	221	100.0

# Denotes the number of respondents per tribe

TABLE VI  
 FREQUENCY, PERCENT, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY,  
 AND CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS  
 BY MARITAL STATUS

MSTATUS	#	%	Cumulative #	Cumulative %
Single	119	50.4	119	50.4
Married	116	49.2	235	99.6
Married/ Children	1	0.4	236	100.0
Non-respondent	3			

### Age

Although 19 respondents did not indicate their age, the distribution ranged from 20 to 48. As indicated in Table VII, respondents between age 27 and 31 account for a greater proportion of the student population surveyed.

### Sex

Among the survey population, N = 183 or 76.6 percent of the respondents are males while N = 56 or 23.4 percent females. For frequency distribution of age by sex of respondent, see Table VIII.



TABLE VII  
 FREQUENCY, PERCENT, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY, AND  
 CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF AGE DISTRIBUTION  
 AMONG RESPONDENTS

Age	#	%	Cumulative #	Cumulative %
20	3	1.4	3	1.4
21	8	3.6	11	5.0
22	5	2.3	16	7.3
23	4	1.8	20	9.1
24	9	4.1	29	13.2
25	11	5.0	40	18.2
26	14	6.4	54	24.5
27	25	11.4	79	35.9
28	17	7.7	96	43.6
29	17	7.7	113	51.4
30	21	9.5	134	60.9
31	18	8.2	152	69.1
32	8	3.6	160	72.7
33	13	5.9	173	78.6
34	7	3.2	180	81.8
35	6	2.7	186	84.5
36	12	5.5	198	90.0
37	4	1.8	202	91.8
38	5	2.3	207	94.1
39	3	1.4	210	95.5
40	5	2.3	215	97.7
41	2	0.9	217	98.6
44	1	0.5	218	99.1
45	1	0.5	219	99.5
48	1	0.5	220	100.0
Non-Respondents	19			

TABLE VIII  
 FREQUENCY, PERCENT, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY, AND  
 CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF DISTRIBUTION  
 BETWEEN THE SEXES

Sex	#	%	Cumulative #	Cumulative %
Male	183	76.6	183	76.6
Female	56	23.4	239	100.0

Visa Status (VSTATUS)

Although most of the respondents indicate having a students visa "F", N = 135 or (59.7 percent), N = 64 or (28.3 percent) had immigrant visas. The other categories of visas were N = 14 or (6.2 percent) with "J" visas while N = 13 or (5.8 percent) not identified and N = 13 who did not respond to the question. Visa status is represented in Table IX.

TABLE IX  
FREQUENCY, PERCENT, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY, AND  
CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF VISA STATUS AMONG  
RESPONDENTS AT THE TIME OF SURVEY

VSTATUS	#	%	Cumulative #	Cumulative %
"F" I Visa	135	59.7	135	59.7
J Visa	14	6.2	149	65.9
Immigrant Visa	64	28.3	213	94.2
Not specified	13	5.8	226	100.0
Non-Respondents	13			

Years in USA (LSTAY)

Table X provides information leading to the number of years respondents have spent in the USA. Among these people, N = 2 or (.8 percent) have spent 15 years, N = 5 or (2.1 percent) have spent 12 years, N = 4 or (1.7 percent)

have spent 11 years. On the whole, 62.8 percent of the respondents have spent five years or more in the USA.

TABLE X  
 FREQUENCY, PERCENT, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY AND  
 CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF DISTRIBUTION OF THE  
 MINIMUM TO MAXIMUM LENGTH OF  
 STAY AMONG RESPONDENTS

LSTAY	#	%	Cumulative #	Cumulative %
1	7	3.0	7	3.0
2	25	10.5	32	13.5
3	19	8.0	51	21.5
4	37	15.6	88	37.1
5	37	15.6	125	52.7
6	41	17.3	166	70.0
7	27	11.4	193	81.4
8	20	8.4	213	89.9
9	5	2.1	218	92.0
10	8	3.4	226	95.4
11	4	1.7	230	97.0
12	5	2.1	235	99.2
15	2	0.8	237	100.0
Non-Respondents	2			

#### Degree Objective (DEGROBJ)

Table XI reflects immediate degree objectives of respondents. Based on the immediate degree objectives of respondents, as shown in Table XI N = 79 or (33.1 percent) were undergraduates, N = 99 or (41.4 percent) were working on a graduate degree at the masters level while 51 or (21.3

percent) indicate graduate work at the doctoral level. This confirms the popular view that most Nigerians seek to obtain a graduate degree before returning to Nigeria.

TABLE XI  
 FREQUENCY, PERCENT, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY, AND  
 CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF IMMEDIATE DEGREE  
 OBJECTIVES AMONG RESPONDENTS

DEGROBJ	#	%	Cumulative #	Cumulative %
Associate Degree	10	4.2	10	4.2
Bachelors Degree	79	33.1	89	37.2
Masters Degree	99	41.4	188	78.7
Doctorate	51	21.3	239	100.0

### Analysis of Results

#### Comparable High Wages Expectations

Three variables which constitute 'high wages expectations' were used in testing this parameter. These variables were codified for purposes of analysis as GDEC 9, WHYFLD 2, and DFACTR 3 respectively. These variables were correlated with LSTAY.

GDEC 9: Earning Power  
WHYFLD 2: Highly marketable field  
DFACTR 3: High salaries in USA  
LSTAY: Length of stay

Each variable correlated with LSTAY was rated by 'Extremely Important', 'Slightly Important', and 'Unimportant' respectively. Rated responses were weighted 3, 2, 1 respectively with 3 being the highest weight. Respondents were asked to rate how they perceive the possibilities of 'higher earning power' would affect their decision to delay return or not to return. Respondents to this variable were  $N = 233$  with an estimated correlation coefficient of  $r = .0290$  between decision to stay longer (LSTAY) and earning power or (GDEC 9). The small correlation coefficient indicates no significant relationship between these two variables at the .05 level of significance. In other words, the significant period of ones decision to prolong stay or not to return, is not influenced by the expectation to earn high wages after graduation.

Respondents were asked to rate if (WHYFLD 2) the 'marketability of their field' in the USA had any effect on (LSTAY) 'length of stay'. Weighted scores were also used. Again, 'Extremely Important,' 'Slightly Important,' and 'Unimportant,' were used and scored 3, 2, 1 respectively. Respondents were  $N = 233$ . The estimated correlation between LSTAY and WHYFLD 2 was .0453 indicating that the relationships were not significant at the .05 significant

level. In essence, this correlation coefficient indicates that marketability of field of study had no relationship with the decision to prolong stay or not to return.

In the third category, respondents were asked to rate "High USA Salaries," as a possible reason for prolongation of stay or non-return. Here again, a scale of 'Extremely Important,' 'Slightly Important,' and 'Unimportant' was used respectively. Respondents to this variable were  $N = 228$ , and had an estimated correlation coefficient of .0564 at .05 significant level. The correlation coefficient between High USA Salaries (DFACTR 3) and the decision to prolong stay or not to return was not statistically significant.

These findings are in correlation with Chukunta (1976) findings which concluded that 'high wages' were not considered a major factor for prolongation of stay or non-return by educated Nigerians in the USA. Appendix B provides a correlation matrix for variables tested. Table XII provides frequency distribution by respondents. Table XIII is a correlation coefficient between (LSTAY) and selected variables at p value of .05 or .05 percent significance level.

#### Uncertain Employment Opportunities

Respondents were asked to respond to the following parameter(s): Did you resign your job in Nigeria before coming to the USA (RESIGN)?

TABLE XII

FREQUENCY, PERCENT, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY, AND  
 CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF DISTRIBUTION OF  
 RESPONDENTS TO VARIABLE 'COMPARABLE  
 HIGH WAGES'

	GDEC9				WHYFLD2				DFACTR3			
	#	%	C#	C%	#	%	C#	C%	#	%	C#	C%
1	20	8.5	20	8.5	65	28.9	65	28.9	60	26.3	60	26.3
2	48	20.4	68	28.9	80	35.6	145	64.4	67	29.4	127	55.7
3	167	71.1	235	100.0	80	35.6	225	100.0	101	44.4	228	100.0
Non-Respondents:												
4					14				11			

C# denotes cumulative frequency  
 C% denotes cumulative percent

- 1 = Unimportant
- 2 = Slightly Important
- 3 = Extremely Important

TABLE XIII  
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN (LSTAY) LENGTH  
OF STAY AND SELECTED VARIABLES  
AT  $p = .05$  SIGNIFICANCE

Variable/Variable Code	N	Correlation Coefficient
Comparable High Wages Expectations		
---GDEC 9	233	.0290
---WHYFLD 2	223	.0453
---DFACTR 3	228	.0564
Uncertain Employment Opportunities		
---RESIGN	232	.2272

GDEC 9 = Earning Power  
WHYFLD 2 = Highly marketable Field  
DFACTR 3 = High salaries in USA  
RESIGN = Resignation from place of employment before embarking on USA study

GDEC 9 = .0290\*  
WHYFLD 2 = .0453\*  
DFACTR 3 = .0564\*

\*Statistically not significant at .05  $p$  value or (5 percent significant level):

RESIGN = .2272\*\*

\*\*Statistically significant at .05  $p$  value or (5 percent significant level):



A = Resign

B = Took leave of absence

C = Was not working

Of a total frequency distribution of  $N = 232$ , 34.9 percent or  $N = 81$  said they 'resigned' from their jobs before coming to the USA. Those who were 'not working' were 35.8 percent or  $N = 83$  and those who 'took leave of absence' totaled 29.8 percent or  $N = 68$ . A correlation was computed between these variables (RESIGN) and decision to prolong stay or not to return. An estimated correlation coefficient of .2272 was established at the .05 significant level. This indicates that those who resigned their jobs or have no job assurances in Nigeria after graduation are more susceptible to prolong their stay or not to return. Thus, uncertainty to job availability in Nigeria affects the decision to early return or non-return. Chukunta (1976) observed that "...Nigerians are willing to return after graduation but an assurance of jobs is the key to early return" (p. 143). Table XIV shows frequency distribution of respondents to this question. For purposes of analysis Appendix B provides a correlation matrix for the variables LSTAY and RESIGN. A correlation coefficient between LSTAY and RESIGN has been provided in Table XIII.

TABLE XIV  
 FREQUENCY, PERCENT, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY AND  
 CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF HOW RESPONDENTS  
 REACTED TO VARIABLE 'UNCERTAIN  
 EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES'

	#	%	Cumulative #	Cumulative %
<u>RESIGN</u>				
1 = Unimportant	68	29.3	68	29.3
2 = Slightly Important	81	34.9	149	64.2
3 = Extremely Important	83	35.8	232	100.0
Non-Respondents	7			
<u>JOBNOW</u>				
1 = Unimportant	10	4.3	10	4.3
2 = Slightly Important	151	65.4	161	69.7
3 = Extremely Important	70	30.3	231	100.0
Non-Respondents	8			
<u>EMPDIFF</u>				
2 = Slightly Important	72	74.2	72	74.2
3 = Extremely Important	25	25.8	97	100.0
Non-Respondents	142			
<u>NOJOBWHT</u>				
1 = Unimportant	106	46.1	106	46.1
2 = Slightly Important	82	35.7	188	81.7
3 = Extremely Important	42	18.3	230	100.0
Non-Respondents	9			
<u>STPERF 5</u>				
1 = Unimportant	176	79.3	176	79.3
2 = Slightly Important	36	16.2	212	95.5
3 = Extremely Important	10	4.5	222	100.0
Non-Respondents	17			
<u>DFACTR 11</u>				
1 = Unimportant	110	48.0	110	48.0
2 = Slightly Important	44	19.2	154	67.2
3 = Extremely Important	75	32.8	229	100.0
Non-Respondents	10			

### Incentives for Professional Advancement

Four variables which have qualities of 'Incentives for Professional Advancement' were used in testing their effects on LSTAY. The variables tested were based on respondents perception of:

- STPERF 2:       Your state support for students abroad
- STPERF 4:       Supplying information about state to  
                  indigens abroad
- USTUDY 4:       Studies in my field are most advanced  
                  in the USA
- DFACTR 5:       Delay Factor: Greater professional  
                  satisfaction

Multiple Regression was used in the analysis of effect among these variables and (LSTAY) decision to prolong stay or not to return after graduation. The regression was  $R^2 = .0315$  which indicates that the variables tested can only explain 3 percent of effect on LSTAY or decision to prolong stay or not to return by American educated Nigerians. This indicates that if these variables are used to determine their effect on LSTAY or decision to prolong stay or not to return by American educated Nigerians, 97 percent of the time we would be in error. Thus, this model is not significant at the .05 significance level. In the final analysis, these variables do not account for prolongation of stay or non-return by American educated Nigerians. Table XV indicates frequency of response, and

TABLE XV  
 FREQUENCY, PERCENT, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY, AND  
 CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF DISTRIBUTION OF HOW  
 RESPONDENTS TEST ON VARIABLES USED TO  
 DETERMINE 'INCENTIVES FOR  
 PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT'

	#	%	Cumulative #	Cumulative %
<u>STPERF 2</u>				
1 = Unimportant	165	73.0	165	73.0
2 = Slightly important	38	16.8	203	89.8
3 = Extremely important	23	10.2	226	100.0
Non-Respondents	13			
<u>STPERF 4</u>				
1 = Unimportant	175	77.8	175	77.8
2 = Slightly important	35	15.6	210	93.3
3 = Extremely important	15	6.7	225	100.0
Non-Respondents	14			
<u>DFACTR 5</u>				
1 = Unimportant	66	28.8	66	28.8
2 = Slightly important	56	24.5	122	53.3
3 = Extremely important	107	46.7	229	100.0
Non-Respondents	10			
<u>USTUDY 4</u>				
1 = Unimportant	44	19.0	44	19.0
2 = Slightly important	64	27.6	108	46.6
3 = Extremely important	124	53.4	232	100.0
Non-Respondents	7			

STPERF 2 denotes: Your state support for students abroad  
 STPERF 4 denotes: Supplying information about state to  
 indigens abroad  
 DFACTR 5 denotes: Delay factor; greater professional  
 satisfaction  
 USTUDY 4 denotes: Studies in my field are most advanced  
 in the USA

Table XVI provides a regression table for variables analyzed at .05 significance level. Appendix C provides information on how variables were analyzed.

### Political Instability

Three variables were used which are associated with political instability. The variables are:

DFACTR 12 denotes: Dislike for military government

DFACTR 13 denotes: Dislike for unstable government

CGOVT: Change from military to civilian government

Each of these variables were tested with LSTAY. DFACTR 12 and DFACTR 13 were rated by 'Extremely Important,' 'Slightly Important,' and 'Unimportant,' respectively. The weights on how variables were rated are 3, 2, 1 respectively. On the other hand, CGOVT (change from military to civilian government) was rated by 'increase,' 'decrease,' and 'no effect.' The values of 3, 2, 1 were used respectively as weights for each response. A frequency distribution is provided in Table XVII on the responses.

Variables were tested for strength of association among DFACTR 12, DFACTR 13, CGOVT and LSTAY. LSTAY was regressed on DFACTR 12, DFACTR 13 and CGOVT. The regression  $R^2$  was 0.0061. The regression was to find out if the three variables jointly account for the reasons of variation in LSTAY. The value of  $R^2$  at .0061 indicates that variables DFACTR 12, DFACTR 13 and CGOVT jointly accounted for virtually no effect in the variation observed in LSTAY.

TABLE XVI  
 REGRESSION MODEL FOR (LSTAY) WITH MEASURED  
 VARIABLES AT P VALUE = .05 SIGNIFICANCE

Variables/codes	N	R <sup>2</sup>
Incentives for Professional Advancement	213	.0315
STPERF 2		
STPERF 4		
USTUDY 4		
DFACTR 5		
Political Instability	222	.0061
DFACTR 12		
DFACTR 13		
CGOVT		
Discrimination (Nepotism and Tribalism)	218	.0131
INFLUNC		
STPERF 7		
Manpower Policies	197	.0275
GDEC 1		
GDEC 2		
WHYFLD 2		
CONTACT		
REFFORTS		
STPERF 3		
DFACTR 1		
DFACTR 14		
Comparable Environment	200	.0596
USTUDY 1		
WHEREEMPL		
ENVIRON		
DFACTR 2		
DFACTR 6		
DFACTR 8		
DFACTR 16		
DFACTR 17		

TABLE XVI (Continued)

STPERF	2	denotes:	Your state support for students abroad
STPERF	4	denotes:	Supplying information about state to indigens
USTUDY	4	denotes:	Studies in my field are most advanced in the USA
DFACTR	5	denotes:	Delay factor; greater professional satisfaction
DFACTR	12	denotes:	Dislike for military government
DFACTR	13	denotes:	Dislike for unstable government
CGOVT		denotes:	Change from military to civilian government
INFLUNC		denotes:	Having contact with influential people in Nigeria
STPERF	7	denotes:	Discrimination (Neopotism and Tribalism)
WHYFLD	2	denotes:	My field is highly marketable in the U.S.
CONTACT		denotes:	Has any government official from Nigeria federal or state government contacted you since your arrival in the U.S.
EFFORTS		denotes:	How would you rate official Nigerian efforts to recruit American educated Nigerian students in the U.S.?
STPERF	3	denotes:	Rate your state efforts on manpower development
DFACTR	1	denotes:	Nigeria discriminates against American trained manpower
USTUDY	1	denotes:	American way of life appeals to me
WHEREEMPL		denotes:	Where primarily do you plan to seek employment when your studies are completed?
ENVIRON		denotes:	In what kind of environmental setting you like to work?
DFACTR	2	denotes:	High standards of living in the U.S.
DFACTR	6	denotes:	Merit is recongized in the U.S. not in Nigeria
DFACTR	8	denotes:	I feel very comfortable in the U.S.
DFACTR	16	denotes:	Friends advise against going home
DFACTR	17	denotes:	I can live where ever I choose

That is, if we were to use these variables to predict LSTAY, on the average, we would be wrong 99.4 percent of the time. In essence, this model does not explain any association by the variables on prolongation of stay or non return by the respondents. Thus, political instability at the .05 significance level was not significant.

However, when factors were examined independently of the other, respondents were more inclined to saying that the instability in government had an effect on their decision to prolong stay or not to return. As shown in Table XVII, N = 115 or 50 percent who claim unstable government had something to do with their decision to prolong stay or not return. N = 69 or 30 percent said it had no effect while N = 46 or 20 percent said it had little effect. Table XVI provides information on the regression for variables tested.

#### Discrimination (Nepotism and Tribalism)

Two variables were used to determine the effect on LSTAY. These variables are:

INFLUENC denotes: Having contact with influential people in Nigeria

STPERF 7 denotes: Nepotism and tribalism

Respondents were asked to indicate if they had any contacts with influential people in Nigeria by answering (a) Yes and (b) No. Each of these rates was weighted by 3 and 2 respectively for the variable (INFLUENC). For the variable



TABLE XVII

FREQUENCY, PERCENT, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY AND  
CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF DISTRIBUTION OF  
HOW RESPONDENTS ANSWERED TO  
'POLITICAL INSTABILITY'

	#	%	Cumulative #	Cumulative %
<u>DFACTR 12</u>				
1 = Unimportant	97	42.4	97	42.4
2 = Slightly Important	43	18.8	140	61.1
3 = Extremely Important	89	38.9	229	100.0
Non-Respondents	10			
<u>DFACTR 13</u>				
1 = Unimportant	69	29.9	69	29.9
2 = Slightly Important	46	19.9	115	49.8
3 = Extremely Important	116	50.2	231	100.0
Non-Respondents	8			
<u>CGOVT</u>				
1 = Unimportant	115	49.8	115	49.8
2 = Slightly Important	31	13.4	146	63.2
3 = Extremely Important	85	36.8	231	100.0
Non-Respondents	8			

Note:

DFACTR 12 denotes: Dislike for military government  
DFACTR 13 denotes: Dislike for unstable government  
CGOVT denotes: Will a change from military to civilian  
government tend to increase or decrease  
your desires of early return to Nigeria?

STPERF 7 (nepotism and tribalism) by Good, Fair, Poor; and each rate had a weight of 3, 2, and 1 respectively.

The length of stay (LSTAY) was regressed on STPERF 7 and INFLUENC. The regression was used to help find out if these variables STPERF 7 and INFLUENC jointly account for the reason(s) of variation in LSTAY. It turned out that the value of  $R^2$  was 0.0131 or just over 1 percent. This means that STPERF 7 and INFLUENC accounted for just over 1 percent of the variation observed in LSTAY. That is, if we were to use STPERF 7 and INFLUENC to predict LSTAY, then on the average, we would be wrong 99 percent of the time. This model clearly states that the variables STPERF 7 and INFLUENC jointly do not account for LSTAY. Table XVI provides information on the frequency distribution by respondents.

However, when discrimination STPERF 7 or nepotism and tribalism were regressed on LSTAY,  $R^2$  was .0005, and had no significance at the .05 significance level. The value of  $R^2$  at .0005 indicates that at virtually 99.95 percent of the time, nepotism and tribalism would not influence decision to prolong stay or not to return by American educated Nigerians. In essence, the educated Nigerians in the USA do not perceive nepotism and tribalism as important factors influencing prolongation of stay or non-return. A frequency distribution for this variable is provided in Table XVIII. Using Table XVIII as a point of departure, we can see that  $N = 156$  or 70 percent of the respondents felt

TABLE XVIII

FREQUENCY, PERCENT, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY, AND  
CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF HOW RESPONDENTS REACTED  
TO VARIABLE 'DISCRIMINATION'  
(NEPOTISM AND TRIBALISM)

	#	%	Cumulative #	Cumulative %
<u>INFLUENC</u>				
1 = Unimportant	22	9.5	22	9.5
2 = Slightly Important	131	56.5	153	65.9
3 = Extremely Important	79	34.1	232	100.0
Non-Respondents	7			
<u>STPERF 7</u>				
1 = Unimportant	157	70.1	157	70.1
2 = Slightly Important	47	21.0	204	91.1
3 = Extremely Important	20	8.9	224	100.0
Non-Respondents	15			

INFLUENC denotes: Having contact with influential people  
in Nigeria

STPERF 7 denotes: Discrimination (Nepotism and  
Tribalism)

nepotism and tribalism had no effect on their decision to stay longer or not to return. Of the remaining totals, N = 47 or 21 percent felt it had some effect while N = 20 or 9 percent felt it had much effect on their decision to prolong stay. A regression table at 5 percent significance level has been provided in Table XVI.

### Manpower Policies

To enable the analysis of respondents perception on how they felt manpower policies affected their decision to prolong stay or not to return, eight variables were regressed with LSTAY. The eight variables were regressed based on the position that:

- GDEC 1: Most Nigerian employers have difficulty comparing a bachelors degree from an American university to that in Nigeria
- GDEC 2: A higher degree is important in my field of study
- WHYFLD 2: My field is highly marketable in the USA
- CONTACT: Has any government official from Nigeria, federal or state contacted you since your arrival in the USA?
- REFFORTS: How would you rate official Nigerian efforts to recruit American educated Nigerian students in the USA?
- STPERF 3: Rate your state efforts on manpower development
- DFACTR 1: Nigeria discriminates against American trained manpower
- DFACTR 14:Jobs advertised in Nigeria require lots of experience I don't have

These factors were cumulatively regressed with LSTAY as the dependent variable. The regression effect  $R^2$  was .0275 which means that 2 percent effect on LSTAY was accounted for by the variables tested. In essence these variables GDEC 1, GDEC 2, WHYFLD 2, CONTACT, REFFORTS, STPERF 3, DEFACTR 1, and DFACTR 14 if used jointly to determine LSTAY, 98.8 percent of the time their residual effect would be non-significant. This means that manpower

policies have no significant effect on the decision to prolong stay or not to return by American educated Nigerians. This position can be further supported by the frequency distribution in Table XIX. However, it should be noted that GDEC 2 and WHYFLD 2 had some degree of significance on the decision to prolong stay or not to return. At any rate, when these variables were regressed jointly their effect was not significant enough to support the research question. Further details of the regression can be seen in Table XVI on how variables tested were jointly regressed at .05 significance level.

#### Comparable Environment

Comparable environment was perceived as a possible factor associated with LSTAY by American educated Nigerians. To test this position, eight variables were regressed on LSTAY. The eight variables are:

USTUDY 1: American way of life appeals to me

WHEREEMPL: Where primarily do you plan to seek employment when your studies are completed?

ENVIRON: In what kind of environmental setting would you like to work?

DFACTR 2: High standards of living in the USA

DFACTR 6: Merit is recognized in the USA not in Nigeria

DFACTR 8: I feel very comfortable in the USA

DFACTR 16: Friends advise against going home

DFACTR 17: I can live wherever I choose

TABLE XIX  
 FREQUENCY, PERCENT, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY, AND  
 CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF HOW RESPONDENTS  
 REACTED TO 'MANPOWER POLICIES'

	#	%	Cumulative #	Cumulative %
<u>GDEC 1</u>				
1 = Unimportant	110	48.0	110	48.0
2 = Slightly Important	62	27.1	172	75.1
3 = Extremely Important	57	24.9	229	100.0
Non-Respondents	10			
<u>GDEC 2</u>				
1 = Unimportant	24	10.2	24	10.2
2 = Slightly Important	95	40.4	119	50.6
3 = Extremely Important	116	49.4	235	100.0
Non-Respondents	4			
<u>WHYFLD 2</u>				
1 = Unimportant	65	28.9	65	28.9
2 = Slightly Important	80	35.6	145	64.4
3 = Extremely Important	80	35.6	225	100.0
Non-Respondents	14			
<u>CONTACT</u>				
1 = Unimportant	164	69.2	164	69.2
2 = Slightly Important	50	21.1	214	90.3
3 = Extremely Important	23	9.7	237	100.0
Non-Respondents	2			
<u>REFFORTS</u>				
1 = Unimportant	189	80.8	189	80.8
2 = Slightly Important	19	8.1	208	88.0
3 = Extremely Important	26	11.1	234	100.0
Non-Respondents	5			
<u>STPERF 3</u>				
1 = Unimportant	132	58.7	132	58.7
2 = Slightly Important	61	27.1	193	85.8
3 = Extremely Important	32	14.2	225	100.0
Non-Respondents	14			

TABLE XIX (Continued)

	#	%	Cumulative #	Cumulative %
<u>DFACTR 1</u>				
1 = Unimportant	118	51.8	118	51.8
2 = Slightly Important	65	28.5	183	80.3
3 = Extremely Important	45	19.7	225	100.0
Non-Respondents	11			
<u>DFACTR 14</u>				
1 = Unimportant	126	54.5	126	54.5
2 = Slightly Important	50	21.6	176	76.2
3 = Extremely Important	55	23.8	231	100.0
Non-Respondents	8			

GDEC 1 denotes: Most Nigerian employers have difficulty comparing a bachelors degree from an American university to that in Nigeria

GDEC 2 denotes: A higher degree is important in my field of study

WHYFLD 2 denotes: My field is highly marketable in the U.S.

CONTACT denotes: Has any government official from Nigeria federal or state contacted you since your arrival in the USA?

REFFORTS denotes: How would you rate official Nigerian efforts to recruit American educated Nigerian students in the USA?

STPERF 3 denotes: Rate your state efforts on manpower development

DFACTR 1 denotes: Nigeria discriminates against American trained manpower

DFACTR 14 denotes: Jobs advertised in Nigeria require lots of experience I don't have.

Length of stay (LSTAY) as regressed on the eight variables USTUDY 1, WHEREMPL, ENVIRON, DFACTR 2, DFACTR 6, DFACTR 8, DFACTR 16, and DFACTR 17 was to find out if these variables jointly accounted for the variation in decision to prolong stay among American educated Nigerians. These variables were regressed at  $R^2 = .0596$  on LSTAY. The regression at  $R^2 = .0596$  was an indication that just about 5 percent of the observed variation in LSTAY was accounted for by the eight variables used in the regression. This observation provides means for a conclusive argument. That is, when the variables USTUDY 1, WHEREMPL, ENVIRON, DFACTR 2, DFACTR 6, DFACTR 8, DFACTR 16, and DFACTR 17 are used jointly to predict LSTAY, on the average, the propensity for error is 94.04 percent of the time. This model indicates that the environment has no significant effect on the decision to prolong stay or not to return by American educated Nigerians who reside in the USA. A frequency distribution on how respondents reacted on each of the variables regressed on LSTAY is on Tables XX. Also, an explained calculated value for each variable regressed jointly on LSTAY is attached on Appendix C for easy reference. A regression for the variables tested at .05 significance level has been provided in Table XVI.



TABLE XX  
 FREQUENCY, PERCENT, CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY, AND  
 CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF HOW RESPONDENTS REACTED  
 TO THE 'COMPARABLE ENVIRONMENT'

	#	%	Cumulative #	Cumulative %
<u>USTUDY 1</u>				
1 = Unimportant	83	37.6	83	37.6
2 = Slightly Important	84	37.6	167	75.6
3 = Extremely Important	54	24.4	221	100.0
<u>WHEREEMPL</u>				
1 = Unimportant	116	50.2	116	50.2
2 = Slightly Important	26	11.3	142	61.5
3 = Extremely Important	89	38.5	231	100.0
Non-Respondents	8			
<u>ENVIRON</u>				
1 = Unimportant	103	44.0	103	44.0
2 = Slightly Important	103	44.0	206	88.0
3 = Extremely Important	28	12.0	234	100.0
Non-Respondents	5			
<u>DFACTR 2</u>				
1 = Unimportant	85	37.8	85	37.8
2 = Slightly Important	65	28.9	150	66.7
3 = Extremely Important	75	33.3	225	100.0
Non-Respondents	14			
<u>DFACTR 6</u>				
1 = Unimportant	88	38.4	88	38.4
2 = Slightly Important	50	21.8	138	60.3
3 = Extremely Important	91	39.7	229	100.0
Non-Respondents	10			
<u>DFACTR 8</u>				
1 = Unimportant	91	39.4	91	39.4
2 = Slightly Important	85	36.8	176	76.2
3 = Extremely Important	55	23.8	231	100.0
Non-Respondents	8			

TABLE XX (Continued)

	#	%	Cumulative #	Cumulative %
<u>DFACTR 16</u>				
1 = Unimportant	124	53.7	124	53.7
2 = Slightly Important	55	23.8	179	77.5
3 = Extremely Important	52	22.5	231	100.0
Non-Respondents	8			
<u>DFACTR 17</u>				
1 = Unimportant	47	20.3	47	20.3
2 = Slightly Important	70	30.3	117	50.6
3 = Extremely Important	114	49.4	231	100.0
Non-Respondent	8			

USTUDY 1 denotes: American way of life appeals to me  
 WHEREEMPL denotes: Where primarily do you plan to seek  
 employment when your studies are  
 completed?  
 ENVIRON denotes: In what kind of environmental setting  
 would you like to work?  
 DFACTR 2 denotes: High standards of living in the USA  
 DFACTR 6 denotes: Merit is recognized in the USA not in  
 Nigeria  
 DFACTR 8 denotes: I feel very comfortable in the USA  
 DFACTR 16 denotes: Friends advise against going home  
 DFACTR 17 denotes: I can live wherever I choose

## Major Findings As Related To Manpower Development

Table IV in Chapter II, shows the various levels of estimated manpower requirements to meet the plan period 1981-85 in Nigeria. Major findings related to this 'plan period' in regards to manpower development show that on the average, 62.8 percent of respondents to the questionnaire have spent a minimum of 5 years or more in the USA. Also, an estimated 62.7 percent of the respondents say they are working toward a graduate degree. Among this category of respondents, 41.4 percent were working on some sort of masters degree program while 21.3 percent were on a doctoral program.

A comparison between males and females on where they would like to seek employment after graduation shows that N = 93 males indicated they would like to seek employment in the USA. Out of the 93 males, 47 of them would work either in the urban or rural areas. N = 16 indicated they would like to seek employment in another African country. N = 66 said they would like to seek employment in Nigeria. Among this group of respondents, 31 would like to seek employment in urban areas while 28 would work in either urban or rural areas. Only 7 say they would like to work in rural areas. Distribution on choice of environment to work by males is provided in Table XXI. Overall, 53.14 percent males who responded to this question indicate a likelihood to seek employment in the USA.

TABLE XXI  
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF WHEREMPL BY ENVIRON  
 CONTROLLING FOR SEX = A

WHEREMPL	ENVIRON			Total
	1	2	3	
Frequency				
Percent				
Row Pct				
Col Pct				
1	47 26.83 50.54 57.32	38 21.71 40.86 52.05	8 4.57 8.60 40.00	93 53.14
2	7 4.00 43.75 8.48	4 2.29 25.00 5.48	5 2.86 31.25 25.00	16 9.14
3	28 16.00 43.42 34.15	31 17.71 46.97 42.47	7 4.00 10.61 35.00	66 37.71
Total	82 46.86	73 41.71	20 11.43	175 100.00

Frequency Missing = 8

Row

- 1 = Either
- 2 = Urban
- 3 = Rural

Col

- 1 = USA
- 2 = Another African Country
- 3 = Nigeria

Among females N = 22 indicated likelihood to seek employment in the USA or approximately 40.74 percent. A comparable number of females N = 22 also indicated a likelihood to seek employment in Nigeria or approximately 40.74 percent among those who responded to the question. The distribution on choice of environment to seek employment is provided in Table XXII.

Another comparison was done for those who took 'leave of absence,' 'resigned' their jobs and who were 'not working' before coming to the USA. Once again, males and females were also compared. Among males, N = 92 indicated they would like to seek employment in the USA or 52.87 percent. Among this category of respondents, 19 males who took 'leave of absence' of some sort indicated they would like to seek employment in the USA. While N = 3 would like to seek employment in another African country and N = 32 say they would like to go back to their old jobs in Nigeria.

Among males who resigned their jobs before coming to the USA, N = 29 would like to seek employment in the USA. N = 10 and N = 17 indicated they would like to seek employment in another African country and Nigeria respectively. Table XXIII is a frequency distribution of where respondents would like to work by category before coming to the USA for males.

Among female respondents who took leave of absence, N = 6 would like to seek employment in the USA while N = 1

TABLE XXII  
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF WHEREMPL BY  
 ENVIRON CONTROLLING FOR SEX = B

WHEREMPL	ENVIRON			Total
	1	2	3	
Frequency				
Percent				
Row Pct				
Col Pct				
1	11 20.37 50.00 55.00	10 18.52 45.45 35.71	1 1.85 4.55 16.67	22 40.74
2	4 7.41 40.00 20.00	4 7.41 40.00 14.29	2 3.70 20.00 33.33	10 18.52
3	5 9.26 22.73 25.00	14 25.93 63.64 50.00	3 5.56 13.64 50.00	22 40.74
Total	20 37.04	28 51.85	6 11.11	54 100.00

Frequency Missing = 2

Row

- 1 = Either
- 2 = Urban
- 3 = Rural

Col

- 1 = USA
- 2 = Another African Country
- 3 = Nigeria

TABLE XXIII  
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF WHEREMPL BY  
 RESIGN CONTROLLING FOR SEX = a

WHEREMPL	RESIGN			Total
	1	2	3	
Frequency				
Percent				
Row Pct				
Col Pct				
1	19	29	44	92
	10.92	16.67	25.29	52.87
	20.65	31.52	47.83	
	35.19	51.79	68.75	
2	3	10	2	16
	1.72	5.75	1.72	9.20
	18.75	62.50	18.75	
	5.56	17.86	4.69	
3	32	17	17	66
	18.39	9.77	9.77	37.93
	48.48	25.76	25.86	
	59.26	30.36	26.56	
Total	54	56	64	174
	31.03	32.18	36.78	100.00

Frequency Missing = 9

Row

- 1 = Leave of Absence
- 2 = Resign
- 3 = Not working

Col

- 1 = USA
- 2 = Another African Country
- 3 = Nigeria

and N = 5 would like to seek employment in another African country and Nigeria respectively. For those who 'resigned' their jobs N = 9 would like to seek employment in the USA, while N = 4 and N = 9 would like to seek employment in another African country and Nigeria respectively. Table XXIV is a frequency distribution on how respondents reacted to choice of work place or environment.



TABLE XXIV  
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF WHEREMPL BY  
 RESIGN CONTROLLING FOR SEX = B

WHEREMPL	RESIGN			Total
	1	2	3	
Frequency				
Percent				
Row Pct				
Col Pct				
1	6	9	6	21
	11.32	16.98	11.32	39.62
	28.57	42.86	28.57	
	50.00	40.91	31.58	
2	1	4	5	10
	1.89	7.55	9.43	18.87
	10.00	40.00	50.00	
	8.33	18.18	26.32	
3	5	9	8	22
	9.43	16.98	15.09	41.51
	22.73	40.91	36.36	
	41.67	40.91	42.11	
Total	12	22	19	53
	22.64	41.51	35.85	100.00

Frequency Missing = 3

Row

- 1 = Leave of Absence
- 2 = Resign
- 3 = Not working

Col

- 1 = USA
- 2 = Another Country
- 3 = Nigeria

CHAPTER V  
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This chapter is primarily designed to provide a summary of the findings of the study as related to the purpose of the study and major findings from analysis of data. Also, in this chapter conclusions and recommendations have been arrived at as deemed necessary for the study.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine how student non-return or prolongation of stay impacts on high-level manpower development in Nigeria.

Major Findings from the  
Analysis of Data

Findings on the research questions have been summarized based on the likelihood of student decisions to prolong stay or not to return. The research variables tested are based on the research questions and are as follows:

### Comparable High Wages Expectations

Decisions by educated Nigerians in the USA to prolong stay or not to return after graduation is not influenced by the high wages in the USA.

### Uncertain Employment Opportunities

A significant correlation was established between decisions to prolong stay or not to return after graduation with "uncertain employment opportunities." It can be concluded that when students anticipate better chances of gaining employment in Nigeria, these students are less willing to prolong their stay in the USA after graduation.

### Political Instability

Although the regression suggest that this variable is not a major factor influencing a student's decision to prolong stay, an estimated 50 percent of the respondents indicated that this variable (political instability) had some effect on prolongation of stay.

### Discrimination (Nepotism and Tribalism

Responses by students indicated that "nepotism and tribalism" were not a major factor hindering early departure from the USA after graduation. Of the population sampled, N=156, 70 percent of the respondents felt nepotism and tribalism had no effect on the decision to stay longer.

### Manpower Policies

When this variable was tested, respondents' responses indicted that the "lack of pragmatic manpower policies" was not a major factor influencing their decision to prolong their stay in the USA.

### Comparable Environment

Indications by respondents on the effect of "comparable environment" on the decision to prolong stay or not to return was as low as 5 percent. That is, respondents do not perceive that availability of comparable environment in Nigeria to that in the USA plays a major role in the decision to prolong stay or not to return.

### Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the findings arrived at after a careful review of literature and analysis of data. The review of literature indicates that several factors have contributed to the delay of return by Nigerians educated in the USA. On the analysis of data, respondents did reflect how some other factors such as comparable wage expectations, political instability, incentives for professional advancement, discrimination (nepotism and tribalism), manpower policies, and comparable environment for work contribute to the decision to prolong stay or not to return. Although these factors play some role toward prolongation of stay, their individual effects

are not as significant. The one major concern as depicted by the respondents as reason for prolongation of stay is "uncertainty for employment opportunities." This one factor supersedes all other factors as a major contributor to the delay of return.

#### Recommendations

1. Manpower policies should not be based on extrapolated goals. Rather, manpower policies should be based on pragmatic goals aimed at accomplishing two things:

- a. Providing jobs to meet the immediate demands of the country thereby attracting trained Nigerians abroad to seek employment in Nigeria.
- b. Creating avenues where highly qualified and specialized Nigerians can utilize their skills toward development in Nigeria.

2. Government policies toward students abroad (USA) should reflect interest and commitment. That is, government officials (consulates) should endeavor to periodically contact Nigerian students in the USA and provide information on types of jobs available in Nigeria. The government should contract with students by paying fares for those with financial problems who want to return but cannot afford the fare.

3. I strongly recommend that a follow-up study be conducted using a "step wise" technique" of multiple

regression to test variables. The step wise technique would provide individual analysis of variables (independent) against dependent variables.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aderinto, Adebayo. 1978. Toward a better understanding of brain drain. In Ukandi G. Damachi and Victor P. Diejomaoh (eds) Human Resources and African Development. Praeger Publishers, N.Y.
- Bernard, Thomas L. 1970. United States immigration laws and the brain drain. International Migration. Vol. VIII, No. 1/2.
- Boulding, K. E. 1968. The importance of human capital. In Walter Adams (ed) The Brain Drain. MacMillan Company, N.Y.
- Chukunta, Niki K. O. 1976. The Nigerian brain drain: Factors associated with the expatriation of American-educated Nigerians. An Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation. Rutgers - The State University of New Jersey.
- Das, Man Singh. 1974. Brain drain controversy and African scholars. Studies in Comparative International Development. Vol. IX, No. 1.
- Diejomaoh, Victor P. 1978. Nigerian's human resources: A preliminary assessment. In Ukandi G. Damachi and Victor D. Diejomaoh (eds) Human Resources and African Development. Praeger Publishers, N.Y.
- Fapohunda, E. R. 1979. Population, labor utilization, and manpower development. In F. A. Olalikh (ed.) Structure of the Nigerian Economy. St. Martin's Press, N.Y.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria. 1981. Fourth National Development Plan 1981-85. Federal Ministry of Planning. Lagos, Nigeria.
- Fowler, Floyd . 1984. Survey Research Methods, Applied Social Research Methods Series. Vol. 1, Sage Publication. Beverly Hills, CA.
- Gardiner, R. K. A. 1968. "Africa" in Walter Adams: The Brain Drain. MacMillan Company, N.Y.

- Gardner, John W. 1961. Excellence: Can we be equal and excellent too? In Frederick Harbison and Clark A. Masters (eds.) Education, manpower, and Economic Growth. Strategies of Human Resources Development. McGraw-Hill Book Company, N.Y.
- Grubel, H. G. 1966. The reduction of the brain drain: Problems and policies. Minerva. Vol. 3, No. 4.
- Grubel, H. G. and Scott, A. A. 1966. The immigration of scientists and engineers to the United States, 1949-61. The Journal of Political Economy. Vol. 74, No. 2.
- Harbison, Fredrick and Myers, Charles A. 1964. Education, Manpower and Economic Growth. Strategies of Human Resources Development. McGraw-Hill Book Company, N.Y.
- Hinchliffe, Keith. 1973. Manpower planning and labor substitution. Nigerian Journal of Economics and Social Studies.
- Hinchliffe, Keith. 1985. Issues related to higher education in Sub-Saharan Africa. World Bank Staff Working Papers. No. 780.
- Hoffman, Paul G. 1960. One hundred countries and one and one quarter billion people: How to speed their economic growth and ours--in the 1960's. Committee for Economic Development. Washington D.C.
- Henderson, Gregory. (1964). Foreign students: Exchange or immigration? International Development Review. December. Vol. 6, No. 4.
- Kannappan, Subbiah. 1968. The brain drain and developing countries. International Labor Review. Vol. 98 6/12.
- Katz, Saul M. 1971. Exploring systems approach to development administration. In Fred W. Riggs (ed.) Frontiers of Development Administration. Kingsport Press, TN.
- Kindleberger, Charles P. 1968. Study abroad and immigration. In Walter Adams (ed.) The Brain Drain. The MacMillan Company, N.Y.
- Krejcie, R. V. and Morgan, D. W. 1970. Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement. Vol. 30, pp. 607-610.



- Lausanne Conference on the Brain Drain. 1967.  
(Mimeograph) International Education and Cultural Exchange. Fall.
- Marshall, Alfred. 1930. Principles of economics. 8th edition, MacMillan and Company, Ltd. In Frederick Harbison and Charles A. Meyers (eds.) Education, Manpower and Economic growth strategies on Human Resources Development. McGraw-Hill Book Company, N.Y.
- Myers, Robert G. 1967. The 'brain drain' and foreign student non-return. Fact and fallacy in definition and measurement. International Labor Review. Vol. 98.
- Navarro, Gondim. 1982. Manpower assessment and planning. International Migration. Vol. 2, No. 1/2.
- Nilan, John R. 1970. The Asian Engineering Brain Drain: A Study of International Relocation into the United States from India, China, Korea, Thailand, and Japan. D. C. Heath Company, Lexington, Mass.
- Oh, Tai Keun. 1970. "Role of international education in the Asian brain drain." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin.
- Okediji, O. O. and Okediji, Francis O. 1973. A consideration of some factors influencing the loss of Nigerian medical and paramedical personnel to developed nations. West African Journal of Education. Vol. 17, No. 1.
- Olaleye, A. O. 1982. Environment for effective manpower policy. Nigerian Journal of Economics and Social Studies.
- Open Doors: 1980/81. Report on International educational exchange. Institute of International Education, N.Y.
- Open Doors: 1981/82. Report on International educational exchange. Institute of International Education, N.Y.
- Open Doors: 1983/84. Report on International educational exchange. Institute of International Education, N.Y.
- Open Doors: 1984/85. Report on International educational exchange. Institute of International Education, N.Y.
- Open Doors: 1985/86. Report on International educational exchange. Institute of International Education, N.Y.

- Schieffer, Kevin J. 1983. Introduction. In Mary Ann G. Hood and Kevin J. Schieffer (eds.) Professional integration: A Guide for Students from the Developing World. Education for International Development. National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. Washington, D.C.
- Scully, Malcolm G. 1983. Nigerians failure to pay U.S. tuition bills jeopardizes standing of 10,000 students. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Sept. Washington, D.C.
- Scully, Malcolm G. 1984. Nigerian officials ask U.S. colleges for lists of students owing money. The Chronicle of Higher Education. May. Washington, D.C.
- Scully, Malcolm G. 1984. No easy solutions seen for financial problems that face Nigerian students. The Chronicle of Higher Education June. Washington, D.C.
- Smith, Adam. 1937. An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations. Cannon (ed.) (Reissued by Modern Library), Random House Inc., N.Y.. In Fredrick Harbison and Charles A. Meyers Strategies of Human Resources Development. McGraw-Hill Book Company, N.Y.
- Simpson, Alan K. 1984. The politics of immigration reform. International Migration Review, Vol. XVIII, No. 3, Fall.
- Students funds unaffected by coup. Times Higher Education Supplement. 1986.
- The World Bank. 1980. World Development Report. The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- Yesufu, Tejani . 1978. Loss of trained personnel by migration from Nigeria. In Ukandi G. Damachi and Victor P. Diejomaoh (eds.) Human Resources and African Development. Praeger Publishers, N.Y.

APPENDIX A  
LETTER TO RESPONDENTS  
AND QUESTIONNAIRE

James E. Onah  
P. O. Box 2501  
Norman, OK 73070

Dear Fellow Nigerian:

I am conducting a study of Nigerian educated students in the U. S..

The problem of non-return or prolongation of stay in the U. S. by educated Nigerians is an on-going problem and several agencies in the federal and state governments have expressed great concern. Delayed return to Nigeria has had marked effect on the implementation of the country's manpower development plan.

As a student, I do share my own views. I think certain factors have contributed to the problem of non-return or prolongation of stay. I am convinced you have your own views. As such, I am trying to determine some of the factors that have contributed to these problem(s).

Your immediate cooperation in completing this questionnaire as soon as possible is highly appreciated.

Sincerely

James E. Onah

**NON RETURN OR PROLONGATION OF STAY BY  
NIGERIAN STUDENTS AFTER COMPLETION  
OF STUDY IN THE U.S.**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

INSTRUCTIONS

PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE SPACE AND FILL IN THE BLANKS AS REQUIRED BY THE QUESTION(S).

1. Age \_\_\_ 2. Sex: a. \_\_\_ male b. \_\_\_ female 3. What is your tribe? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Marital Status: a. \_\_\_ single (never married, divorced, widowed)  
b. \_\_\_ married without child  
c. \_\_\_ married with \_\_\_ child(ren)
6. Current visa status: a. \_\_\_ F(student) b. \_\_\_ J(exchange)  
c. \_\_\_ Immigrant d. \_\_\_ Other (specify)
7. How long have you been in the U.S.? \_\_\_ yrs. \_\_\_ mos.
8. Are there members of your immediate family currently studying or living in the U.S., excluding temporary visitors? a. \_\_\_ yes b. \_\_\_ no
9. Which college or university do you attend? \_\_\_\_\_
10. What is your immediate degree objective? a. \_\_\_ Associates b. \_\_\_ Bachelors  
c. \_\_\_ Masters d. \_\_\_ Doctorate e. \_\_\_ None
11. If pursuing a graduate program, in what country did you receive your undergraduate degree? \_\_\_\_\_
12. If pursuing an undergraduate program, do you plan to go to graduate or professional school in the U. S.? a. \_\_\_ Yes b. \_\_\_ No c. \_\_\_ Uncertain
13. Field of study (be as specific as possible; e.g., "biomedical engineering" rather than "engineering") \_\_\_\_\_
14. Rate the following reasons as they affect or have affected your decision to go to graduate school in the U. S.?

Extremely    Slightly  
Important    Important    Unimportant

Most Nigerian employers have difficulty comparing a bachelors degree from an American university to that in Nigeria.

\_\_\_\_\_

## Question #14 - continued

	<u>Extremely Important</u>	<u>Slightly Important</u>	<u>Unimportant</u>
A higher degree is important in my field of study.	___	___	___
To consolidate my future.	___	___	___
Everybody is doing it.	___	___	___
I have to be in school to maintain my visa status.	___	___	___
Family pride.	___	___	___
To extend my knowledge of my field.	___	___	___
To make me more mobile and to make my skills more marketable.	___	___	___
To increase my earning power.	___	___	___
Getting a higher degree is a challenge to me.	___	___	___
Other (specify).	___	___	___

## 15. Why did you choose your particular field of study? Rate the following reasons as indicated:

	<u>Extremely Important</u>	<u>Slightly Important</u>	<u>Unimportant</u>
I can more easily obtain an immigrant visa in the U. S. with a degree in my field.	___	___	___
My field is highly marketable in the U. S.	___	___	___
I was advised by:			
___ family	___	___	___
___ friends	___	___	___
___ teacher	___	___	___
___ counselor	___	___	___
My field is highly marketable in Nigeria.	___	___	___
My field of study offers me an opportunity to lead an independent life.	___	___	___

## Question #15 - continued

	<u>Extremely Important</u>	<u>Slightly Important</u>	<u>Unimportant</u>
Name of my field sound impressive.	___	___	___
My field is comparatively easy.	___	___	___
Personal interest.	___	___	___
Other (specify)	___	___	___

16: Why did you decide to study in the U. S. Rate your responses as indicated:

	<u>Extremely Important</u>	<u>Slightly Important</u>	<u>Unimportant</u>
American way of life appeals to me.	___	___	___
American system of education appeals to me more than any other.	___	___	___
Opportunity to work and study.	___	___	___
Studies in my field are most advanced in the U. S.	___	___	___
Snob appeal of foreign education.	___	___	___
Influence of family, friends, or teachers.	___	___	___
Could not be admitted into Nigerian university.	___	___	___
My field of study is not offered in Nigerian universities.	___	___	___
There is no opportunity in Nigeria to work and study.	___	___	___

17. Has any government official from Nigeria federal or state contacted you since your arrival in the U. S.?

a. \_\_\_ frequently    b. \_\_\_ occasionally    c. \_\_\_ hardly    d. \_\_\_ none

18. How would you rate official Nigerian efforts to recruit American educated Nigerian students in the U.S.?

a. \_\_\_ Nigeria is doing her best    b. \_\_\_ What Nigeria is doing is adequate  
 c. \_\_\_ Nigeria can do a lot more    d. \_\_\_ Nigeria can do a little more  
 e. \_\_\_ No opinion

19. Would you consider yourself as having contacts with influential people in Nigeria? a.  yes b.  no
20. How many times have you visited Nigeria since your arrival in the U.S.  
a.  number of times b.  none
21. If your answer to Question 20 is (a), did your visit tend to increase or decrease the likelihood of early return to Nigeria after your studies?  
a.  increase b.  no effect c.  decrease d.  uncertain of the effect
22. Did you resign your job in Nigeria before coming to the U. S.?  
a.  resign b.  took leave of absence c.  was not working
23. Do you have a definite job to go back to when your studies are ended?  
a.  yes b.  no
24. Where primarily do you plan to seek employment when your studies are completed?  
a.  Nigeria b.  Another African country  
c.  The U.S. d.  Uncertain
25. In what kind of environmental setting would you like to work?  
a.  rural b.  urban c.  either d.  uncertain
26. What kind of job would you like to do? Rank your preferences (1 for the first choice, 2 for the next choice, etc.).  
a.  managerial/administration b.  elementary teaching/admin.  
c.  secondary teaching/admin. d.  university teaching  
e.  politics f.  professional practice  
g.  independent business h.  other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
27. With whom would you primarily like to seek employment in Nigeria?  
a.  Civil Service: Federal b.  Private sector: Nigerian Co.  
c.  Private Sector: American Co d.  Private sector: Foreign Co other than American  
e.  Civil Service: State f.  Self  
g.  Undecided
28. Rank Nigeria's states as possible places for employment: (use 1 for 1st through last preference, etc.):  
a.  Lagos b.  Oyo c.  Anambra d.  Ogun  
e.  Imo f.  CrossRiver g.  Rivers h.  Bendel  
i.  Benue j.  Plateau k.  Kano l.  Sokoto  
m.  Gongola n.  Kaduna o.  Kwara p.  Ondo  
q.  Niger r.  Bauchi s.  Bormu



29. How difficult a problem is it for someone with qualifications in your field to find suitable employment in Nigeria?

- a. \_\_\_ extremely difficult    b. \_\_\_ moderately    c. \_\_\_ slightly  
 d. \_\_\_ no problem at all    e. \_\_\_ uncertain

30. If you do not find a job in Nigeria that will utilize your training, what will you do?

- a. \_\_\_ return to Nigeria    b. \_\_\_ remain in the U.S. temporarily  
 c. \_\_\_ remain in the U. S. permanently    d. \_\_\_ uncertain

31. Rank the performance of your state of origin in the following areas:

	3	2	1
	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Education	_____	_____	_____
Support of students abroad	_____	_____	_____
Manpower development	_____	_____	_____
Supplying information about the state to indigens abroad	_____	_____	_____
Combatting inflation and unemployment	_____	_____	_____
General efficiency (getting things done, on time and effectively).	_____	_____	_____
Combatting tribalism and nepotism	_____	_____	_____
Law enforcement	_____	_____	_____

32. Rate the following factors as possible contributors to the delay of your return to Nigeria.

	<u>Extremely</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Slightly</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Unimportant</u>
Nigeria discriminates against American trained manpower	_____	_____	_____
High standards of living in the U.S.	_____	_____	_____
High salaries in the U.S.	_____	_____	_____
Accumulation of savings	_____	_____	_____
Greater professional satisfaction	_____	_____	_____
Merit is recognized in the U. S. not in Nigeria	_____	_____	_____

## Question #32 - continued

	<u>Extremely</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Slightly</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Unimportant</u>
I will be more helpful to my family from the U. S.	___	___	___
I feel very comfortable in the U.S.	___	___	___
I cannot afford my fare home	___	___	___
I do not want to serve in the Nigerian youth Corps	___	___	___
I have no job to go to in Nigeria	___	___	___
Dislike for military government	___	___	___
Dislike for unstable government	___	___	___
Jobs advertised in Nigeria require lots of experience I don't have	___	___	___
Have no knowledge for jobs available in Nigeria	___	___	___
Friends advise against going home	___	___	___
I can live where ever I choose	___	___	___

33. Will a change from military to civilian government tend to increase or decrease your desires of early return to Nigeria?

- a. \_\_\_increase b. \_\_\_decrease c. \_\_\_No effect d. \_\_\_uncertain

APPENDIX B

CORRELATION MATRIX FOR RESEARCH

QUESTION ONE AND TWO

Correlation Matrix For  
Research Question One and Two

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS / PROB > |R| UNDER HO:RHO=0 / NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS

	LSTAY	GDEC9	WHYFLD2	DFACTR3	RESIGN	JOBNOW	EMPDIF	NOJOBWHT	STPERF5	DFACTR11
<b>LSTAY</b> LENGTH OF STAY IN US	1.00000 0.0000 237	0.02900 0.6596 233	0.04536 0.5003 223	0.05645 0.3972 227	0.22728 0.0005 231	-0.16326 0.0132 230	0.12747 0.2134 97	-0.17573 0.0078 228	0.00727 0.9145 221	0.10474 0.1147 228
<b>GDEC9</b> EARNING POWER	0.02900 0.6596 233	1.00000 0.0000 235	0.24932 0.0002 221	0.26938 0.0001 224	0.12452 0.0605 228	-0.09945 0.1352 227	0.07633 0.4598 96	-0.23092 0.0005 227	-0.06485 0.3406 218	0.14148 0.0339 225
<b>WHYFLD2</b> MARKETABILITY OF FIELD	0.04536 0.5003 223	0.24932 0.0002 221	1.00000 0.0000 225	0.34801 0.0001 219	0.13377 0.0480 219	-0.09051 0.1841 217	0.28637 0.0054 93	-0.12852 0.0562 218	-0.12129 0.0773 213	0.14784 0.0287 219
<b>DFACTR3</b> HIGH US SALARY	0.05645 0.3972 227	0.26938 0.0001 224	0.34801 0.0001 219	1.00000 0.0000 228	0.09213 0.1685 225	-0.16376 0.0144 223	0.03059 0.7698 94	-0.13978 0.0370 223	0.01807 0.7807 218	0.35296 0.0001 226
<b>RESIGN</b> EMPLOYMENT STATUS BEFORE US STUDY	0.22728 0.0005 231	0.12452 0.0605 228	0.13377 0.0480 219	0.09213 0.1685 225	1.00000 0.0000 232	-0.39378 0.0001 228	0.11346 0.2711 96	-0.13201 0.0475 226	-0.04293 0.5264 220	0.20235 0.0022 227
<b>JOBNOW</b> DO YOU HAVE A JOB IN NIGERIA NOW?	-0.16326 0.0132 230	-0.09945 0.1352 227	-0.09051 0.1841 217	-0.16376 0.0144 223	-0.39378 0.0001 228	1.00000 0.0000 231	-0.30154 0.0028 96	0.15078 0.0240 224	-0.04301 0.5276 218	-0.23318 0.0004 224
<b>EMPDIF</b> EMPLOYMENT DIFFICULTY WITH PRESENT QUAL	0.12747 0.2134 97	0.07633 0.4598 96	0.28637 0.0054 93	0.03059 0.7698 94	0.11346 0.2711 96	-0.30154 0.0028 96	1.00000 0.0000 97	-0.04672 0.6548 94	0.00962 0.8267 94	0.06417 0.5345 96
<b>NOJOBWHT</b> DECISION IF NO JOB FOUND	-0.17573 0.0078 228	-0.23092 0.0005 227	-0.12952 0.0562 218	-0.13878 0.0370 223	-0.13201 0.0475 226	0.15078 0.0240 224	-0.04672 0.6548 94	1.00000 0.0000 230	0.08415 0.2159 218	-0.15774 0.0184 223
<b>STPERF5</b> INFLATION & UNEMPL IN HOME STATE	0.00727 0.9145 221	-0.06485 0.3406 218	-0.12129 0.0773 213	0.01807 0.7807 218	-0.04293 0.5264 220	-0.04301 0.5276 218	0.00962 0.9267 94	0.08415 0.2159 218	1.00000 0.0000 222	-0.08523 0.2090 219
<b>DFACTR11</b> NO JOB IN NIGERIA	0.10474 0.1147 228	0.14148 0.0339 225	0.14784 0.0287 219	0.35296 0.0001 226	0.20235 0.0022 227	-0.23318 0.0004 224	0.06417 0.5345 96	-0.15774 0.0184 223	-0.08523 0.2090 219	1.00000 0.0000 229
<b>DFACTR15</b> NO JOB KNOWLEDGE	0.06272 0.3426 231	0.18933 0.0041 228	0.11625 0.0854 220	0.26237 0.0001 227	0.14198 0.0317 229	-0.10423 0.1174 227	-0.06030 0.5595 96	-0.16227 0.0146 226	-0.01792 0.7915 220	0.43798 0.0001 228
<b>DFACTR15</b>										
<b>LSTAY</b> LENGTH OF STAY IN US	0.06272 0.3426 231									

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS / PROB > |R| UNDER HO:RHO=0 / NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS

	DFACTR15
GDEC9	0.18933
EARNING POWER	0.0041
	228
WHYFLD2	0.11625
MARKETABILITY OF FIELD	0.0854
	220
DFACTR3	0.26237
HIGH US SALARY	0.0001
	227
RESIGN	0.14198
EMPLOYMENT STATUS BEFORE US STUDY	0.0317
	229
JOBNOW	-0.10423
DO YOU HAVE A JOB IN NIGERIA NOW?	0.1174
	227
EMPDIFF	-0.06030
EMPLOYMENT DIFFICULTY WITH PRESENT QUAL	0.5595
	96
NOJOBWHT	-0.16227
DECISION IF NO JOB FOUND	0.0146
	226
STPERF5	-0.01782
INFLATION & UNEMPL IN HOME STATE	0.7915
	220
DFACTR11	0.43798
NO JOB IN NIGERIA	0.0001
	228
DFACTR15	1.00000
NO JOB KNOWLEDGE	0.0000
	232

APPENDIX C

REGRESSION MODELS FOR RESEARCH

QUESTIONS THREE TO SEVEN

Regression Model for Research Question Three  
(Incentives For Professional Advancement)

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: LSTAY

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	4	46.05810961	11.51452740	1.70	0.1512	0.031515	47.3965
ERROR	209	1415.42319880	6.77235980				
CORRECTED TOTAL	213	1461.48130841					
					ROOT MSE		LSTAY MEAN
					2.60237580		5.49065421

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
STPERF2	1	1.30664226	0.19	0.6609	1	1.03731039	0.15	0.6959
STPERF4	1	0.47884468	0.07	0.7906	1	1.19246758	0.18	0.6752
USTUDY4	1	43.77398051	6.46	0.0117	1	42.79370042	6.32	0.0127
DFACTR5	1	0.49864215	0.07	0.7864	1	0.49864215	0.07	0.7864

PARAMETER	ESTIMATE	T FOR HO: PARAMETER=0	PR >  T	STD ERROR OF ESTIMATE
INTERCEPT	4.18533944	5.10	0.0001	0.82079853
STPERF2	-0.12093185	-0.39	0.6959	0.30899848
STPERF4	0.15056622	0.42	0.6752	0.35881805
USTUDY4	0.60302991	2.51	0.0127	0.23989376
DFACTR5	-0.05950210	-0.27	0.7864	0.21928445

Regression Model for Research Question Four  
(Political Instability)

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: LSTAY

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	3	9.28843721	3.08947907	0.45	0.7167	0.006143	47.4397
ERROR	219	1504.31591256	6.86902243			ROOT MSE	LSTAY MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	222	1513.61434978				2.62088200	5.52466368

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
DFACTR12	1	0.14574312	0.02	0.8843	1	0.14460357	0.02	0.8848
DFACTR13	1	2.80428938	0.41	0.5235	1	2.40438972	0.35	0.5547
CGOVT	1	6.34840472	0.92	0.3374	1	6.34840472	0.92	0.3374

PARAMETER	ESTIMATE	T FOR HO: PARAMETER=0	PR >  T	STD ERROR OF ESTIMATE
INTERCEPT	5.52761992	9.72	0.0001	0.56848521
DFACTR12	0.03463724	0.15	0.8848	0.23872682
DFACTR13	0.13723331	0.59	0.5547	0.23195545
CGOVT	-0.19669838	-0.96	0.3374	0.20460486



Regression Model for Research Question Five  
(Discrimination [Nepotism & Tribalism])

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: LSTAY

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	18.90908813	9.45454407	1.43	0.2404	0.013111	47.0833
ERROR	216	1423.33748721	6.58952540				
CORRECTED TOTAL	218	1442.24657534					
					ROOT MSE		LSTAY MEAN
					2.56700709		5.45205479

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
INFLUENC	1	5.03849052	0.76	0.3829	1	7.01304254	1.06	0.3034
STPERF7	1	13.87059761	2.10	0.1483	1	13.87059761	2.10	0.1483

PARAMETER	ESTIMATE	T FOR HO: PARAMETER=0	PR >  T	STD ERROR OF ESTIMATE
INTERCEPT	5.56685862	7.69	0.0001	0.72398176
INFLUENC	-0.28308194	-1.03	0.3034	0.28409454
STPERF7	0.39026937	1.45	0.1483	0.26899484

Regression Model for Research Question Six  
(Manpower Policies)

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: LSTAY

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	8	36.84643223	4.60580403	0.67	0.7182	0.027549	47.6088
ERROR	189	1300.63336575	6.88165802		ROOT MSE		LSTAY MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	197	1337.47979798			2.62329145		5.51010101

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GDEC1	1	29.92465351	4.35	0.0384	1	23.39827197	3.40	0.0668
GDEC2	1	0.00102005	0.00	0.8903	1	0.02173252	0.00	0.9552
WHYFLD2	1	0.78441823	0.11	0.7360	1	1.03974058	0.15	0.6979
CONTACT	1	0.95112887	0.14	0.7105	1	0.08638364	0.01	0.9109
REFFORTS	1	4.57682196	0.67	0.4158	1	4.11649186	0.60	0.4402
STPERF3	1	0.14470612	0.02	0.8849	1	0.15337741	0.02	0.8815
DFACTR1	1	0.02588132	0.00	0.9512	1	0.00040392	0.00	0.9939
DFACTR14	1	0.43780217	0.06	0.8011	1	0.43780217	0.06	0.8011

PARAMETER	ESTIMATE	T FOR HO: PARAMETER=0	PR >  T	STD ERROR OF ESTIMATE
INTERCEPT	5.39780903	4.95	0.0001	1.09138071
GDEC1	0.49487954	1.84	0.0668	0.26838247
GDEC2	-0.01780306	-0.06	0.9552	0.31680075
WHYFLD2	-0.09942265	-0.39	0.6979	0.25578166
CONTACT	-0.03323377	-0.11	0.9109	0.29662681
REFFORTS	-0.23390336	-0.77	0.4402	0.30242617
STPERF3	-0.03966216	-0.15	0.8815	0.26566980
DFACTR1	-0.00202283	-0.01	0.9939	0.26403263
DFACTR14	-0.05904662	-0.25	0.8011	0.23410067

Regression Model for Research Question Seven  
(Comparable Environment)

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: LSTAY

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	8	81.98259672	10.24782459	1.52	0.1513	0.059684	45.8921
ERROR	192	1291.63929382	6.72728799			ROOT MSE	LSTAY MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	200	1373.62189055				2.59370160	5.65174129

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
USTUDY1	1	0.70858442	0.11	0.7459	1	11.19782779	1.66	0.1985
WHEREEMPL	1	48.46151292	7.20	0.0079	1	43.16667180	6.42	0.0121
ENVIRON	1	5.52511854	0.82	0.3659	1	3.11852552	0.46	0.4968
DFACTR2	1	11.92772461	1.77	0.1846	1	3.14078114	0.47	0.4953
DFACTR6	1	0.00009447	0.00	0.9970	1	0.45842806	0.07	0.7943
DFACTR8	1	1.27333137	0.19	0.6640	1	0.36845010	0.05	0.8152
DFACTR16	1	13.87592145	2.06	0.1526	1	12.77037874	1.80	0.1699
DFACTR17	1	0.21030893	0.03	0.8598	1	0.21030893	0.03	0.8598

PARAMETER	ESTIMATE	T FOR HO: PARAMETER=0	PR >  T	STD ERROR OF ESTIMATE
INTERCEPT	5.95162413	5.78	0.0001	1.02986226
USTUDY1	-0.38038852	-1.29	0.1985	0.29483601
WHEREEMPL	-0.54568051	-2.53	0.0121	0.21541908
ENVIRON	0.19654006	0.68	0.4968	0.28866654
DFACTR2	0.20401652	0.68	0.4953	0.29858398
DFACTR6	-0.06376003	-0.26	0.7943	0.24424908
DFACTR8	0.07229571	0.23	0.8152	0.30891797
DFACTR16	0.35456553	1.38	0.1699	0.25734435
DFACTR17	0.04575122	0.18	0.8598	0.25875800

(Summary of Variables Used for Analysis)

VARIABLE	N	MEAN	STD DEV	SUM	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
LSTAY	237	5.48845148	2.59662724	1301.00000000	1.00000000	15.00000000
GDEC9	235	2.62553191	0.63732483	617.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
WHYFLD2	225	2.06666667	0.80178373	465.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
DFACTR3	228	2.17982456	0.82266140	487.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
RESIGN	232	2.06465517	0.80590401	479.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
JOBNOV	231	2.25874026	0.52921428	522.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
EMPDIFF	97	2.25773196	0.43965779	219.00000000	2.00000000	3.00000000
NOJOBWHT	230	1.72173913	0.75400330	396.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
STPERF5	222	1.25225225	0.52912407	278.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
DFACTR11	229	1.84716157	0.88766067	423.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
DFACTR15	232	1.79741379	0.86659619	417.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
STPERF2	226	1.37168142	0.66258337	310.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
STPERF4	225	1.28888889	0.58333333	290.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
USTUDY4	232	2.34482759	0.77964859	544.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
DFACTR5	229	2.17803930	0.85239443	499.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
DFACTR12	229	1.86506550	0.90253183	450.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
DFACTR13	231	2.20346320	0.87336737	509.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
CGOVT	231	1.87012987	0.92337730	432.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
INFLUENC	232	2.24568966	0.61368128	521.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
STPERF7	224	1.38839286	0.64651470	311.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
GDEC1	229	1.76855895	0.82380595	405.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
GDEC2	235	2.39148936	0.66661211	562.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
WHYFLD2	225	2.06666667	0.80178373	465.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
CONTACT	237	1.40506329	0.66100182	333.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
REFFORT5	234	1.30341880	0.65987785	305.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
STPERF3	225	1.55555556	0.73056838	350.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
DFACTR1	228	1.67982456	0.78428169	383.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
DFACTR14	231	1.69264069	0.83191108	391.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
USTUDY1	221	1.86877828	0.77809374	413.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
WHEREEMPL	231	1.88311688	0.93679415	435.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
ENVIRON	234	1.67948718	0.67754144	393.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
DFACTR2	225	1.85555556	0.84397961	440.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
DFACTR6	229	2.01310044	0.88595448	461.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
DFACTR8	231	1.84415584	0.78127435	426.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
DFACTR16	231	1.68831169	0.81709571	390.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000
DFACTR17	231	2.29004329	0.78454390	529.00000000	1.00000000	3.00000000

VITA

James E. Onah

Candidate for the Degree of  
Doctor of Education

Thesis: NON RETURN OR PROLONGATION OF STAY BY NIGERIAN  
STUDENTS AFTER COMPLETION OF STUDY IN THE U.S.

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Kakwagon Irruan, Cross River  
State, March 20, 1948.

Education: Graduated from St. Brendan's Secondary  
School, Iyamoyong, Obubra, Cross River State,  
Nigeria, in December, 1967; received Bachelor of  
Arts Degree in Geography from Oklahoma University  
in May, 1980; received Masters of Public Adminis-  
tration degree from Oklahoma University in May,  
1982; received Masters of Human Relation degree  
from Oklahoma University in May, 1983; completed  
requirements for the Doctor of Education degree  
at Oklahoma State University in December, 1987.

Professional Experience: Instructor, St. Thomas's  
College, Ogoja, in September, 1972 to December,  
1975.