



**EVALUATION OF THE ESRC  
INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP AND  
NETWORKING SCHEMES**

**Dr Michele Schweisfurth  
University of Birmingham**

**EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

**NOVEMBER 2011**

## **Table of Contents**

Executive Summary.....	2
1. Introduction to the Evaluation.....	5
1.1 Methods.....	5
2. The Fellowship and Networking Schemes.....	6
2.1 ESRC-ICSSR India-UK Scholar Exchanges.....	6
2.2 ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Visiting Scholarship.....	7
2.3 BA-AHRC-ESRC Visiting Fellowships for South Asia and the Middle East.....	7
3. Commentary.....	7
3.1 ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India).....	7
3.2 ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas).....	9
3.3. BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East).....	10
4. Case Studies.....	12
4.1 Case Study One (ESRC-ICSSR).....	12
4.2 Case Study Two (ESRC-SSRC).....	14
4.3 Case study Three (ESRC-SSRC).....	15
4.4 Case Study Four.....	16
5. Emergent Themes and Areas for Development.....	19
5.1 The Wider Context of Purpose.....	19
5.2 Career and relationship cycles.....	20
5.3 Is bigger better?.....	21
5.4 Joined-up-thinking and administration.....	21
5.5 Impact expectations.....	22
5.6 Value-for- money.....	22
5.7 Partnerships with other national research councils:.....	22
6. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	23
Appendix One – On-line Questionnaire.....	24
Appendix Two – Results by Scheme.....	33
Appendix Three – Semi-structured Interview Schedule.....	43
Appendix Four – List of Interviewees.....	44
Appendix Five – Questionnaire Responses by Career Stage.....	45

## **Executive Summary**

1. The report evaluates three international fellowship schemes: : (i) the ICSSR (Indian Council for Social Science Research)-ESRC India-UK Scholar Exchange Scheme; (ii) the ESRC-SSRC (Social Science Research Council) Collaborative Fellowship Scheme for the Americas; and (iii) the BA (British Academy)-AHRC (Arts and Humanities Research Council)-ESRC Visiting Fellowships for South Asia and the Middle East. Methods included documentary analysis of calls for proposals and end-of-award reports; interviews with ESRC staff involved in the

scheme; an on-line survey questionnaire to participants; and telephone interviews with participants and other stakeholders.

2. The ICSSR-ESRC scheme aimed to establish greater research interaction between Indian and British researchers, and was for established researchers on the verge of making major contributions, facilitating travel to either country. The ESRC-SSRC scheme was for researchers from the Americas and the UK, linked to larger ESRC projects or research centres, and was for collaborative and preferably comparative research. The BA-AHRC-ESRC scheme called for early-career researchers in the social sciences or humanities from the Middle East or South Asia, enabling them to be hosted by a UK academic.
3. All three schemes were very well received overall by the participants, and outcomes planned were largely achieved, with broadly similar activities reported across all of them, with minor differences. The most important activities were named by the participants as discussions about future collaborations, original research, and joint publications. To a greater or lesser degree, all three schemes facilitated the development of international networks. Academic impact was substantially more significant than non-academic impact. The ICSSR-ESRC scheme suffered from administrative difficulties around communications, finances, and ownership of datasets, as reported by respondents. However, Indian participants particularly appreciated the opportunities it afforded them, given the limited resources normally available in their home institutions. The ESRC-SSRC scheme was successful across most parameters and particularly in terms of professional development and comparative work. The BA-AHRC-ESRC scheme involved scholars researching the humanities as well as social sciences. It was judged favourably across most questions (although slightly less so on some), but the use of rapporteurs to assess research outcomes was considered inappropriate.
4. Four case studies are presented which illustrate various aspects of the schemes and particularly their impact, including: individual professional development; the importance of flexibility in the research and visit agenda; complementary original collaborative research; academic publications and interactions with non-academic stakeholders; and the value-for-money indicated by these outcomes at minimal cost to the ESRC.
5. Six emergent themes from across the schemes are discussed, which have implications for future schemes. i) What it means to be an international scheme in a context of globalisation and university internationalisation is considered, with questions raised about how far research within these schemes should have an international or comparative dimension, and who does or should benefit most from such schemes. ii) The stage in participants' career cycles at which the schemes are most advantageous is addressed. The simple answer is that earlier-stage participants seem to benefit most, but the issues are complex and the benefits are felt widely but differently across the career span. iii) The report considers the question of whether larger, more comprehensive schemes would be an improvement. There is evidence from the quantitative data that participants would welcome this, but some interviewees were concerned that this would exclude some people and create problems for others. iv) The advantages of having schemes which are embedded in larger projects are explored, and the importance of having tight administration across the Council so that expectations are both realistic for the specific call while being in line with other schemes. v) Given the relatively low costs of these schemes, and the high impact, they are judged to be

very good value-for-money. vi) The benefits of working with other councils are weighed against some of the issues that the evaluation has raised with regard to joint schemes.

6. Ten recommendations are made: i) That the ESRC consider raising the level of investment in international schemes of this nature, given the value-for-money they offer. ii) That not all schemes be region-specific. iii) That even if it is not a condition for funding, the value of comparative and international dimensions to research be signalled as advantageous. iv) That if non-academic impact is expected, that this be made clear but that expectations be kept realistic. v) That if calls for applications have higher funding ceilings than these fellowships, that individual applications for smaller amounts are not judged negatively, and that the pool of funds is spread accordingly. vi) That flexibility continue to be granted to award holders to respond to unforeseeable opportunities that arise during international fellowships and exchanges. vii) That international fellowship schemes not be dependent on co-operation with other Councils, and that the ESRC be prepared to fund them independently. viii) Given the above recommendations, there are many good reasons to combine international fellowships into one large, flexible, long-term scheme, which includes all regions and which allows for a wide range of activities and outcomes. ix) That the scheme be open to applicants at all stages of their careers and collaborative relationships. X) That the scheme be administered with regard to reporting, archiving and assessment, in line with its expectations.

7. There are five appendices to the report: the questionnaire and overall responses; the questionnaire responses according to each scheme; the interview schedule; the list of interviewees; and the questionnaire responses disaggregated according to career stage.

## 1. Introduction to the Evaluation

This report is based on an evaluation of three international fellowship and exchange schemes: (i) the ICSSR (Indian Council for Social Science Research)-ESRC India-UK Scholar Exchange Scheme; (ii) the ESRC-SSRC (Social Science Research Council) Collaborative Fellowship Scheme for the Americas; and (iii) the BA (British Academy)-AHRC (Arts and Humanities Research Council)-ESRC Visiting Fellowships for South Asia and the Middle East. The terms of the consultancy reflected the ESRC's need to evaluate individually, comparative and holistically these schemes, in order to assess their individual and collective achievements. This includes their value-for-money, to ensure the ESRC's accountability for investment, and the capacity building potential, quality and impact of the activities funded.

The consultant is an experienced academic and evaluator with expertise in comparative and international education, in mobility within the HE sector, in university internationalisation, and in intercultural communication. This report presents an independent, fair and balanced view of the schemes, based on a comprehensive review methodology.

### 1.1 Methods

The evaluation period ran from May to August 2011. The ESRC supplied a substantial volume of relevant documents, which were reviewed by the consultant:

- General information and calls for applications for each of the three schemes, for each of the years which they were run.
- End-of-award reports as available for each of the schemes (12 for the ICSSR-ESRC exchange to cover three rounds; 59 for the ESRC-SSRC scheme, over six rounds; and 11 for the BA-AHRC-ESRC fellowships, which included rapporteur comments and grades for each of the reports, from the one round administered by the ESRC). Publications were included for several of the BA-AHRC-ESRC Fellowships. Not all the reports were available across all the schemes, not least because some rounds were administered by partner research councils in other countries, and the reports are held by them. Others could not be located. However, the documentary evidence includes a substantial and indicative sample of the reports.

The documentary review supplied background information to the schemes, and indicated the participants' self-assessment of some of their achievements and barriers. A number of themes emerged which were verified and explored through the next stages of the evaluation.

A series of interviews at the ESRC on 27<sup>th</sup> May helped to provide a context for the schemes and the review, and to give a steer as to themes of particular interest or concern.

The ESRC also supplied email addresses for most of the participants across the three schemes – 211 contacts in total – and notified the participants of the evaluation. An on-line survey was created, and all of these contacts were invited to complete the questionnaire (Appendix 1 – with results). The questionnaire consisted of 33 items, mainly Likert-scale-type questions, with four open questions. The first questions asked for background details

from each of the respondents, so that responses could be disaggregated according to scheme and stage of professional development. The main body of the questionnaire raised questions regarding the experiences and impact of the schemes. Open questions inviting other observations, and further personal information requests for those happy to participate in the next stage, completed the questionnaire. The questionnaire was piloted among colleagues and approved by the ESRC Senior Research Manager overseeing the evaluation. 126 responses in total were received after two reminders: 21 for the ESRC-ICSSR; 62 for the ESRC-SSRC; and 44 for the BA/AHRC/ESRC. This represents a highly-satisfactory 60% response rate. There were large numbers of out-of-office replies to the emails, due to the summer break period in which the evaluation took place. The overall results from the questionnaire are included in Appendix 1, and the answers presented comparatively according to responses from the three different schemes can be found in Appendix 2. The results are presented as percentages and graphs for the whole group of respondents, and as numbers for the smaller individual scheme samples.

A sample of respondents who had indicated a willingness to be involved in the next stage of the review was contacted to arrange telephone interviews. The sample was chosen to include all three schemes and to reflect overall trends in the responses and a range of experiences. Telephone interviews were conducted with 15 participants (the semi-structured interview schedule comprises Appendix 3). These led to further contact and interviews with others involved in the activities, including other academic and non-academic stakeholders.

Confidentiality and anonymity were assured in the questionnaire, and for the telephone interviews, interviewees were given the choice as to whether or not their names were included in the list of interviewees (Appendix 4) and their comments attributed to them in the text of the report. Most (but not all) were happy to have their identities clear for both purposes. Those who became subjects of case studies were sent their cases by email for respondent verification.

## **2. The Fellowship and Networking Schemes**

### Aims of Fellowship and Networking Schemes

#### **2.1 ESRC-ICSSR India-UK Scholar Exchanges**

This scheme ran from 2008-9 to 2010-11, with 25 awards made. The purpose of the scheme was to 'strengthen the quality and potential of research in both countries (ie India and the UK) by building greater research interaction'. The scheme aimed at established scholars, with a particular interest in those 'about to make major contributions in their research area'. The scheme facilitated visits in either direction for a period of one to three months. Any topic across the social sciences was eligible for funding, not only those specifically related to the UK or India. Particular interest was signalled by the Councils in six areas: survey research; economic restructuring and social equality and integration; environmental sustainability; health and wellbeing; education; and population mobility. Applicants were expected to demonstrate strength and fit of research in themselves and the research group or centre; the added value of developing and strengthening links, in the shorter and

longer term. The total value of each grant was not to exceed £8000 for visitors to the UK, or 500,000 rupees for visitors to India.

## **2.2 ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Visiting Scholarship**

There were six rounds of awards funded through the SSRC, from 2004-5 to 2009-10, with 59 awards listed. The calls for applications signalled that the 'ESRC and SSRC have a common mission of promoting, funding and disseminating important and useful knowledge in the social sciences'. The scheme was designed to 'encourage communication and co-operation between social scientists in Great Britain and the Americas'. Qualified applicants from the Americas had to be endorsed by a collaborator who held a major ESRC award, such as Director of an ESRC-supported centre, or holder of a large grant. Fundable activities included collaborative or complementary original research to add an international/comparative focus to existing projects; engagement with a range of researchers to extend the international/comparative thinking; co-authored publications; and the development of new research proposals. Preference was given to applicants whose projects clearly developed collaborative and comparative development and sustainable co-operation. Each award was to a maximum of \$9500/£5000 (approximate, depending on exchange rates during the period of each round).

## **2.3 BA-AHRC-ESRC Visiting Fellowships for South Asia and the Middle East**

There were three rounds of this scheme, one run by each of the three Councils. 53 awards were made in all, between 2006-7 and 2008-9. The scheme aimed to attract early career researchers (less than five years post-doctorate) in any branch of the social sciences or humanities, 'to collaborate on research and develop ideas likely to lead to a joint research proposal in the near future'. Researchers applied in conjunction with a UK host academic, and were expected to spend at least two months working on a specific project. Applications were judged 'on the basis of academic merit, taking into account originality, timeliness for the visiting scholar's career development' along with scholarly importance, methodology, feasibility, and intended outcomes. Applicants were to be ordinarily resident in one of 23 specified countries in the region (including Turkey). The maximum award for each grant was £15,000 at full economic costs (BA-AHRC-ESRC to provide up to £12,000).

## **3. Commentary**

### **3.1 ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)**

#### **3.1.1 Design and effectiveness of meeting aims**

It is evident from the survey results that overall, the participants were happy that they met the goals that they set themselves within the framework of the scheme's aims. 17 out of 21 agreed or strongly agreed that their ambitions were realistic; none disagreed that the fellowship had a positive impact on their professional development; and only 3 felt that they had not achieved all the intended outcomes of their application. So, the intention to strengthen research and research capacity within the framework of the scheme seems largely to have been met.

The scheme was aimed at established scholars, and the question regarding career stage indicates that the largest group were experienced, later-career researchers (10). However, there were also 8 mid-career and 3 early-career researchers, presumably on the verge of a major contribution, as

stipulated by the call for applications. The questionnaire respondents were happy with the funding and time allocated to achieve the outcomes set, although 8 respondents did not agree that they had achieved all of these.

One evidently problematic area was administration: 4 of the respondents strongly disagreed that the administration was efficient, and in the open questionnaire items and in interview, three particular issues were raised. One was the slow and problematic communications and actions by the partner council. As one interviewee noted, bluntly:

They take a lot of time to make decisions and inform me. I'm very disappointed with ICSSR. They insist on travelling with national airline – so one can't chase cheapest flights or the most convenient. The ESRC should work independently – do they really need an Indian partner? Questions and emails go unanswered. What are they doing at the end of the day? They're just buying a ticket and nothing else.

The second issue regarded finances; respondents indicated the difficulties they experienced as people from developing countries with low incomes in having to be initially out-of-pocket in an expensive country. There were complaints about having to reclaim each expense through a slow process through the host institution, and more than one found this embarrassing as well. In their views, a per diem given in advance would have been more effective. The third issue was regarding the requirement to archive data gathered. Two respondents objected very strongly to this, not least because the requirement was not made clear from the beginning and so the data was not ready for this use, much time was belatedly spent preparing it, and perhaps most importantly, the participants had serious concerns about the ethics of archiving sensitive data when they had not notified their subjects of this condition. The feeling was that it was inappropriate for a small-scale project such as this, which was as much about facilitating collaboration as it was about generating datasets.

### 3.1.2 Activities funded

Grant holders participated in the full range of activities listed in the questionnaire. The most common were discussions about future collaborations (16), original research (15), and joint publications (14), with original research considered to be the most significant outcome for one-third of the respondents. This is in keeping with the aims of the scheme.

### 3.1.3 Value added: increasing collaboration and innovation

The answers to the questions regarding the development of international networks were rather more equivocal, with only just over half (11) indicating that an international network had been established. The development of such networks was not an explicit goal of the scheme, but is implied in the desire to build greater research interaction.

### 3.1.4 Capacity and personal development

The majority (15) agreed or strongly agreed that there was positive impact on their professional development, although this is slightly lower than for the other schemes, for reasons unknown. However, in interview, it was evident that the scheme made a very big difference to those Indian scholars, for whom the status of the funding, as well as the research opportunities it created, were significant for their career progression.

In interview, Indian participants were particularly emphatic about the importance of this scheme given the difficulties of accessing resources and wider scholarly networks in India. There were several reports of connections growing exponentially once the visiting scholar was in the UK and able to tap into the networks of their collaborators and new acquaintances, and to take advantage



of opportunities such as conferences and seminars. They were also able to use resources such as books, journals, archives and grey literature not accessible in India.

### 3.1.5 Quality and impact: academic and non-academic

16 out of 21 agreed or strongly agreed that academic impact had been an outcome. However, there was less impact on non-academic stakeholders: not an explicit aim of the scheme, but a noticeably less significant impact nonetheless.

### 3.1.6 Relative strengths and weaknesses

This relatively small and short-lived scheme was evidently much appreciated, particularly by the travelling Indian scholars involved, as it offered them opportunities which would have been impossible at home. It appears that schemes like this are of particular value to scholars from developing countries, although participants' levels of personal expendable income raise some administrative issues. There were also, unfortunately, evident administrative weaknesses perceived by quite a few participants, particularly in relation to ICSSR conditions and management.

## **3.2 ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)**

### 3.2.1 Design and effectiveness of meeting aims

This scheme differed from the others in that fellowships had to be linked to wider projects or centres already funded by the ESRC, and in its explicit reference to comparative perspectives developed through the trans-Atlantic collaboration. It is therefore to be expected that 42 out of 61 questionnaire respondents indicated that their work was part of a larger project, and a bit surprising that 19 indicated that it was not. Over half of the respondents strongly agreed that their work took on an enhanced comparative dimension through the fellowship, with only 2 disagreeing: the strongest response of the three schemes. The scheme also allowed for, and respondents reported, more and longer visits than the ESRC-ICSSR, and more visits than the BA-AHRC-ESRC schemes, although the opinions regarding sufficiency of funds and time were broadly similar to the other schemes, with high levels of satisfaction. Despite this flexibility, 6 respondents still felt that they did not achieve all the intended outcomes set.

### 3.1.7 Activities funded

Participants engaged in the full range of activities listed. The most frequently-reported activities as direct outcomes of the award were: discussions about future collaborations (52); seminar presentations (51); original research (42); and conference presentations (42). Discussions about future collaborations (17), joint publications (13) and original research (12) were considered the most significant outcomes, although the responses were distributed widely across the possible answers.

### 3.2.3 Value added: increasing collaboration and innovation

The development of long-term collaboration was built into the expectations of this scheme, and for most, this was successful. Only 3 respondents did not develop an international network through this scheme, and only 4 were not sustained up to the time of responding.

### 3.2.4 Capacity and personal development

40 of 61 respondents strongly agreed, and 21 agreed, that participating in the scheme was positive for their professional development, universally acknowledging its impact.

### 3.2.5 Quality and impact: academic and non-academic

In terms of the participants' self reports, the vast majority were satisfied with the academic impact of their research, and over half (35) strongly agreed that it was a significant contribution in this regard. As for the non-academic impact, as with the other schemes, this was substantially lower. There were 15 equivocal answers, although over half (36) either agreed or disagreed to the statement regarding this contribution.

As the case studies from this scheme will illustrate, there were some truly impressive achievements among the projects, suggesting a particularly rich cross-fertilisation and balanced collaboration, regardless of the theme of the research. This could have been facilitated by the greater parity and complementarity of the institutions involved. One comment from the questionnaire is illustrative on this question of complementary specialist knowledge and facilities:

At the time I was doing a part-time PhD in a discipline that is not as developed in the UK as in the US. The fellowship allowed me to visit a US university that has a graduate programme in this field, to participate in some of the courses and seminars, to get to know my peer students, and to meet some of the leading professors in the field. As a result of the fellowship, I was able to ask one of the US professors to be the external examiner of my PhD and I am collaborating with another professor.

Interviewees from this scheme were able to point to public-domain and consultancy outputs which had considerable potential for impact on public perceptions and on government policy and industry. Examples can be found in the case studies below from this scheme. It is worth noting that the impact of most of the non-academic collaborations reported was potential rather than realised at this stage.

### 3.2.6 Relative strengths and weaknesses

There were no obvious weaknesses with this scheme, and the comments from the interviewees and open questions were glowing, apart from minor practical and personal complications. The flexibility of the scheme, and its proximity to existing projects, appeared to be helpful factors. However, given the proximity to existing projects, it is sometimes difficult to tell where the experience and impact of the actual fellowships began and the wider project ended.

## **3.3. BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)**

### 3.3.1 Design and effectiveness of meeting aims

This grant scheme was the only one of the three which was open to the humanities as well as the social sciences; it was also quite open in its original remit for collaboration and had the highest funding ceiling of the three. In line with the rubric, this resulted in longer (but fewer) study visits by the grantholders. Despite the higher funding ceiling, a slightly higher proportion of respondents from this scheme (7 out of 44) disagreed or strongly disagreed that they had sufficient funding. Respondents were broadly in agreement that the time allocation and outcomes were satisfactory, but 9 of them were equivocal as to whether they had achieved all the outcomes they had set themselves, and responses regarding the development of networks were also less enthusiastic than other schemes, with 26 out of 44 indicating that an international network had been established.

### 3.3.2 Activities funded

The most frequently-mentioned activities for this scheme were: 34 discussions about future collaborations (which was the stated aim in the call for applications); original research (33); conference presentations (26); access to new data (24); and visits to other institutions (23). Original research (12) and access to new data (8) were considered the most important outcomes, with discussions about future collaborations only third (6).

### 3.3.3 Value added: increasing collaboration and innovation

It is apparent from the points raised above that while collaborations were developed, these were slightly less prioritised and sustainable than in the other schemes, although certainly not dramatically so. The question of innovation could be linked to the access to new data and the production of original research, which were prioritised.

### 3.3.4 Capacity and personal development

37 out of 44 of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the scheme had positive impact on their professional development. While this is obviously a strong response, again, it is slightly more equivocal than for the other schemes.

One interviewed respondent raised a particular issue of potential importance. As a host scholar who knew both the visitor and his institution, he had hoped that the research would continue in the original context, and that the fellowship would help to raise capacity at the visitor's university. However, the fellow had the opportunity to move to a more prestigious institution within the region, and so that potential was lost. The individual benefited but at the expense of his colleagues and perhaps his national context.

### 3.3.5 Quality and impact: academic and non-academic

39 of the 44 survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the fellowship had made a contribution to academic development. However, only 14 agreed that the impact was felt among non-academic stakeholders. This might be related to the humanities focus of the scheme. As one interviewee put it: 'this is literature research on 18<sup>th</sup> century studies. I didn't look beyond the academic community'. Two interviewees noted how the question of non-academic impact needs to be considered broadly in the humanities: one particular research project on the history of medicine was very meaningful for a library archive, for example, while another interviewee noted that simply by talking with people from the UK during field visits, those people would be exposed to different ways of seeing the world and the particular research questions.

This was the only scheme for which outputs (usually papers published or in-press) were systematically provided along with reports, and where these were evaluated by rapporteurs. The consultant does not have the subject expertise to judge the quality of the reported research or the appropriateness of the grades awarded. However, of the grades which were allocated in the available documentation, there were 4 grades of 'outstanding'; 20 of 'good'; and 11 of 'problematic'. I do not know how this compares with other ESRC evaluations, but 11 problematic grades is troubling, whether or not rapporteurs understood the full context of the assessment, not least because of the demoralising effect of such reviews. It is doubtful whether the rapporteur system is appropriate for a scheme which is as much about future-oriented collaboration as research outputs. As one interviewee noted:

The referee system is based on ignorance of the fellowship. Referees had too high expectations, and this soured my experience, as I had an unsatisfactory rating. I challenged the assessment, and fortunately the ESRC was willing to reconsider.

### 3.3.6 Relative strengths and weaknesses

Like the other schemes, this one was quite strong in terms of generating research relevant to the academic community. There were minor negative differences in terms of the overall satisfaction from participants regarding the outcomes and impact of the fellowships, but what stands out as a weakness is the use of external evaluators who did not seem to understand the expectations of the scheme. This could potentially leave people with a negative overall view of the experience, and could be demotivating in terms of following up links and research ideas.

## 4. Case Studies

### 4.1 Case Study One (ESRC-ICSSR)

Fillipo Osella (host - UK) and V J Varghese (visitor - India) worked together on a large EU-funded project on the theme of migration, involving eight universities. The ESRC grant was, in a sense, a complementary extension to the larger project, through which they aimed 'to produce research out of research' through collaborative writing, and to present work at various seminars and conference in the UK. The grant also created the opportunity to collect comparative data in Birmingham and other cities, allowing them to interview relatives of respondents in the Punjab. This aspect of the research was very successful. They also intended to interview immigration lawyers to gain insight into this aspect of the process, and while they were not able to access as many as they had hoped because of the lawyers' schedules, they did work with two who provided useful data. In a period of three months, they managed to collect these data, complete four joint papers for publication, complete a book proposal, and present their work at several seminars and conferences. This represented 'exceptional value for money'. The University of Sussex hosted the fellowship, and the presence of a large research centre for migration made it the ideal place to be, as the visiting fellow also made many contacts working in this area, and was able to access the extensive library.

The original research was based on extensive ethnographic fieldwork in Punjab, in villages with high emigration, looking into the formal and informal networks that sustain migration. This was new, difficult research to do, requiring time to gain trust. The data went 'against the grain of government thinking on migration'. Policy suggests that migration can be controlled through legislation, but the research actually found the opposite – the more regulation, the more they rely on informal (and sometimes extra-legal) networks. The research pursued under the ESRC-ICRSS grant was also very original, following up immigrants in the UK. The prevailing rhetoric is about nostalgia, but they showed that relationships between immigrants and Indian families are complex, with conflicts over money and how it is used when sent back. Attachment was found to be less important than anticipated, and they also found shifts over generations. The research has been very well received due to its challenges to orthodox thinking. As Dr Osella stated, 'We would have hoped for more involvement of non-academic stakeholders', and some community leaders came to seminars, but

the problem of time made them prioritise the academic impact, but with the hope that the conversation will continue and the policy implications be drawn out.

These outcomes would not have been possible without the fellowship, for a number of reasons. Funding is increasingly available in India, but this was 'beyond the means of a small funding body or small university'. There is an extensive network of people in the UK researching the Punjabi diaspora. As Dr Osella noted: 'Junior academics in India might struggle to find writing time as they are often burdened with other things'. Dr Varghese added: 'this visit has been a major boost in my career as it strengthened my connection with my present collaborator, and we are now keenly exploring the possibilities of working together beyond this project. I could also establish very fruitful new connections in the course of this visit. I am sure some of these connections would be very important in the future course of my academic life. I am already working on a proposal and application for next round of Newton fellowship along with one among them'.

The application form for this scheme was different from pure research schemes. There were 'no questions there about what sort of data you would collect, and whether you would produce data sets'. When they submitted the end of award report, they noted the small amount of comparative data collected and were then contacted by ESRC saying data had to be submitted, for UK archives. Dr Osella was willing and able to do this submission but there were a number of issues: they were not told in advance and so were not prepared; new rules were applied retrospectively to old schemes; and they were asking very sensitive questions (eg illegal migration, illegal networks, family disputes) and if they had known, they would not have asked those questions, and they weren't able to tell respondents that material would be archived. They tried to explain the particularity of the scheme to the contacts at the ESRC but failed and in the end, sent what they could. It was felt that for the funders, it is 'important to set out reasonable goals for small fellowships'. They also, like other participants in this scheme, found the ICSSR less flexible than the ESRC, for example with regard to the scheduling of the visit.

Dr Osella's view is that it is important for many reasons to spread the available funding across a large number of people, not only to benefit more individuals, but to maintain UK-Indian research relationships. The US is naturally attractive and many Indian academics have been enticed to go there. However, Dr Varghese also felt that further funding for an additional visit would have been of great benefit to him.

This case study illustrates a number of the issues raised above, about this specific scheme and about the schemes in general, which might have implications for future planning. It shows what is possible, even in a short time with limited funds, when there is a focused programme, demonstrating that a fellowship need not involve multiple or long visits, or a range of objectives. It highlights the benefits of working within a larger project framework with known collaborators. The specific theme of the project – immigration from the Punjab to the UK, and the ongoing relationships between migrants and their communities of origin – lends itself particularly well to such cross-national collaboration, giving added value to the international travel involved. As a more junior scholar, Dr Varghese's career was boosted by his participation, although the cases below show that this is not the only group likely to benefit. Like others involved in this scheme, however, these participants were concerned about aspects of administration, such as the slow and bureaucratic access to funds for the visiting fellow, and the need to archive data after the fact: these seemingly minor, administrative issues can have major implications for the experience of fellows, and have backwash effects on research.

## 4.2 Case Study Two (ESRC-SSRC)

Elizabeth Cooksey shares an interest in longitudinal studies on working mothers with researchers at the Institute of Education, University of London. Before applying for the grant, there had been talk of collaborative work, but it took the opportunity afforded by the grant to justify the time away and travel to herself and her institution: 'We had always said 'one day'...but one of these days never happens unless you have a formal arrangement...the funding gave me the extra clout to legitimate everything'. Family commitments meant that she could not stay for a long period, but much was accomplished during her series of short visits: 'we don't know when in the lifecourse we're going to get these chances'.

Professor Cooksey expressed a sentiment shared with many other interviewees and open question responses from this scheme, about the importance of being able to meet face-to-face in order to start the process and to collaborate effectively:

You've got to have that time just to have a coffee with someone to discuss in an informal way – that's how collaborations start. You need to be around, in the building, on a day to day basis. Things happen while you're visiting – lectures, conferences, then things take off – the dynamics are not the same when you are not in the same room.

She has had over \$100 million in grants from US sources, but felt the collaborative opportunities and flexibility of this grant made it unique, and exceptional value for money. She also found it straightforward to apply, and knew that she had a good chance, which is not always true for the time invested in major applications. She pointed, however – as did others – to the problem of being specific or quantifying the outcomes of the grant, not least because the doors it opened remain open and are likely to lead to future possibilities. The findings of their collaborative research on maternal employment challenged stereotypes and the negative findings which often get reported in the press. The work is very far reaching, with extensive longitudinal data on two large, sufficiently similar countries (UK and US) and their research found no negative effects on children of maternal employment. In fact, they found positives, and getting findings into the news will 'hopefully put a nail in the coffin of these misconceptions', and affect policymakers down the line. Professor Cooksey found that the opportunity to get these findings into the papers was more readily available in the UK, and citing findings that have gone into the press here will give further legitimacy to her work in the US. Following publication of their paper in the *Journal of Longitudinal and Life Course studies*, there was major national press coverage:

[http://207.45.125.82/x/track.asp?uid=72&clp=2431&clt=3674&d=18/10/2009&t=www%20Times%20Online%20\(uk\)&url=http://c.moreover.com/click/here.pl?z2272287285%26z=950244491](http://207.45.125.82/x/track.asp?uid=72&clp=2431&clt=3674&d=18/10/2009&t=www%20Times%20Online%20(uk)&url=http://c.moreover.com/click/here.pl?z2272287285%26z=950244491)

[http://207.45.125.82/x/track.asp?uid=72&clp=2432&clt=3674&d=18/10/2009&t=www%20Daily%20Telegraph,%20The%20\(uk\)&url=http://c.moreover.com/click/here.pl?z2272852774%26z=950244491](http://207.45.125.82/x/track.asp?uid=72&clp=2432&clt=3674&d=18/10/2009&t=www%20Daily%20Telegraph,%20The%20(uk)&url=http://c.moreover.com/click/here.pl?z2272852774%26z=950244491)  
1

[http://207.45.125.82/x/track.asp?uid=72&clp=2430&clt=3674&d=17/10/2009&t=www%20Society%20Guardian%20\(uk\)&url=http://c.moreover.com/click/here.pl?z2272194703%26z=950244491](http://207.45.125.82/x/track.asp?uid=72&clp=2430&clt=3674&d=17/10/2009&t=www%20Society%20Guardian%20(uk)&url=http://c.moreover.com/click/here.pl?z2272194703%26z=950244491)

The grantholder for this award was particularly enthusiastic about its impact, and its flexibility in allowing collaborations to develop effectively at a particular stage in her career. This highlights the risks of limiting schemes to scholars at particular stages. Like other respondents, she was also emphatic about the fact that for her, the interpersonal contact that came from the visit, and the scale, flexibility and simplicity of the grant were essential to its success, pointing to these as essential aspects of the awards that should be sustained. She raised the important point that larger, more fixed programmes for grants involving travel would discriminate against people at particular stages in their lives and careers, and are likely to have a negative effect particularly on women with responsibility for young children. This is one of many cases where the policy potential is enormous but is largely indirect in its pathway, through the considerable press coverage which could well shape public and policymaker opinion. This illustrates that while fellows can achieve a great deal and do much to ensure that their findings are in the appropriate public domain where they can have impact, they rarely have control over the shape that impact will take. Impact needs to be received as well as made.

### **4.3 Case study Three (ESRC-SSRC)**

Tim Kasser is a psychologist with expertise on consumerism. He had met Tim Jackson at a number of events around their shared research interests in public attitudes to environmental sustainability and consumerism, and so when the opportunity of this grant arose, he was keen to pursue collaboratively three agendas: 1. to spend time at the research centre RESOLVE (Research Group on Lifestyles Values and Environment) at the University of Surrey; 2. to give talks. Originally, they planned for one or two – although in the end there were nine in total, including at universities, the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, and at NGOs; 3. to begin scoping out a book he had been thinking of for a few years, requiring time away from ‘normal life’ to start writing. The first two agendas were so successful that the third was unfruitful, but as he notes: ‘that’s the way projects are sometimes’. RESOLVE was an ideal environment, both because of its research focus and because of its particular focus on the use of research evidence beyond academic purposes:

Funded by the UK Economic and Social Research Council, the aim of RESOLVE is to develop a robust understanding of the links between lifestyle, societal values and the environment, and to provide evidence-based advice to policy-makers seeking to influence people’s lifestyles and practices. (<http://www3.surrey.ac.uk/resolve/about.htm>)

Being at RESOLVE resulted in him ‘thinking much more about policy and interacting in policy related way’, a direction he had been moving in for some years. His understanding of the psychology of environmental campaigning has been very useful to NGOs and others interested in influencing behaviours in the direction of greater sustainability. Not only did the number of presentations and therefore contacts escalate, they led in a number of interesting and important directions, including close work with WWF-UK involving two reports, several seminars, and three papers, and discussions of how to raise the effectiveness of WWF-UK’s advocacy and advertising campaigns. Professor Kasser argued that this level of engagement is unusual among those in his discipline: ‘many psychologists check their lives as citizens at the door’. He noted that: ‘it takes sustained conversations between academics and the NGO world to shift things. Academic papers have

minimal impact – academics need to engage directly with policy and the NGO world. These tend to be difficult conversations, to work out implications; we each use different languages, and have different agendas’. Tom Crompton of WWF-UK, who first invited Professor Kasser to the organisation, concurred with this observation, noting that some academics are tokenistic in their courting of non-academic stakeholders, rather than being fully engaged. It was through WWF-UK’s connection to RESOLVE, who advertise their seminars widely among non-academic stakeholders, that the two met and the unplanned collaboration developed. While it has catalysed discussions about how to appeal to the intrinsic values held by people, Dr Crompton notes that ‘actual change is a slower process’.

Professor Kasser was pleased with the reasonably easy and quick application process, and was able to bring his family with him due to the flexibility of the grant. The moveable agenda allowed the best outcomes, and he believes this is crucial to the success of future grants: ‘the takeaway message is that ESRC shouldn’t get too hung up on making sure that what the fellow does is what the fellow plans to do. The message of my experience is that you need to be able to follow what happens. The ESRC didn’t complain and I would encourage them to be open to the process evolving, as long as good stuff ends up happening’. Tom Crompton also signalled the advantages of a flexible approach to such grants, while advocating attention to non-academic stakeholder engagement from the outset. While they could not have written their collaboration into the original proposal as they had never had any direct contact, ‘the application process could have welcomed this; if so then academics might be more alert and responsive to requests for help. They are more likely to reflect on practical applications and to energise them to make initial contacts. This shouldn’t close any doors – leave things flexible. Already naming another non-academic stakeholder shouldn’t make it any less likely that unexpected collaborations will develop’.

This was a particularly successful grant in terms of non-academic impact – one of the few where this was strongly in evidence. It was successful in this regard largely because the host institution had this as a particular focus to their own agenda, and already had the motivation, mechanisms and relationships in place to facilitate this. The visiting fellow’s research had practical implications for the work of NGOs and others trying to promote thinking about environmental sustainability among the public, and he welcomed its application in this regard. However, the stakeholders noted that this effective working relationship is, in their experience, unusual in the social sciences. And even in this case where non-academic stakeholders are evidently impressed with the evidence, and prepared to be influenced by it, the real impact is in the hands of the decision-makers and actual change takes time. Like other respondents, these also emphasised the importance of a flexible agenda in enabling grantholders to work responsively toward these ends, without defining them too specifically from the outset.

#### **4.4 Case Study Four**

Ben Hobbs was searching for a place to spend his year’s sabbatical from Johns Hopkins University in the US. He wanted to be in one place, rather than ‘flitting in and out’ of different places. He was also looking for somewhere that was ‘on the cutting edge’, where he could ‘raise his own game’ rather than being ‘the honoured visitor’. He identified Cambridge as an excellent choice, due to the mix of social science, engineering and business expertise, and considered it a premier place for his field of energy economics. In order for a stay in Cambridge to be financially feasible, however, he



needed some additional funding, which the ESRC-SSRC scheme was able to provide, 'paying the rent without being lucrative'. Other institutions offered better financial incentives, but he was also seeking a good quality of life during his sabbatical, and for his wife as well, who was accompanying him.

During his year in Cambridge, an opportune opening meant that he had a half time appointment as a research staff member at the electricity policy research group (EPRG).

The EPRG core discipline is economics, within a framework that encourages collaboration between experts from different academic traditions, drawing on insights from business, policy, engineering, political science and law. The continued success of EPRG depends on its ability to attract and retain world-class research expertise in all of these fields (<http://www.eprg.group.cam.ac.uk/category/research-themes/>).

While there, he was involved in a range of research projects which were developed collaboratively with Cambridge colleagues. One enormous help was the provision of a research assistant; this responsibility created a focus for his work, and incentive to interact and exchange ideas. This also aided the professional development of the junior researcher, who subsequently (and successfully) applied for Ph.D. study. Several academic journal papers, two already published, and others under review, resulted from those projects.

The group has a close relationship with the Department of Environmental and Climate Change, and the Office of Gas and Electricity Regulation. These connections facilitated access to policymakers that was unprecedented for such visitors. Recently, electricity markets have been going through a process of reform in the UK, and in terms of politics and policy, he was able to observe closely the policy process and its outcomes, and to be a participant in this process. He was invited to be a consultant to Ministries and other organisations on this issue. He also assembled a team of US consultants to share US experience in this area of the pricing of transmission of renewable energy. A wide range of reports, as listed by him below (quoted from email correspondence), were outcomes of these various contributions:

1. As part of the Energy Policy Forum of EPRG <http://www.eprg.group.cam.ac.uk/category/energy-policy-forum/>, I joined two EPRG researchers for half-day long visits in London with two corporate sponsors of EPRG: EDF (formerly Electricite' de France) (30 April 2010) and E.On (17 Dec. 2009) where we met with corporate officers and analysts and discussed a range of electricity policy issues of direct interest to them (including electricity policy markets and regulation).
2. EPRG had a half day meeting with analysts from DECC (Dept. Environment and Climate Change) in Cambridge 9 July 2010 to discuss a range of electricity sector reforms proposed by the new government in the electricity sector which I participated in, including a presentation I made on US experience with electricity capacity markets.
3. I made several formal presentations of my work to forums that included UK and EU policy makers and industry:
  - A formal presentation on capacity mechanisms in the US at the Cambridge/MIT annual meeting (Berlin, July 2010) (a very large meeting with attendance from across Europe)  
[www.eprg.group.cam.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/Agenda-web1.pdf](http://www.eprg.group.cam.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/Agenda-web1.pdf)  
[www.eprg.group.cam.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/Hobbs.pdf](http://www.eprg.group.cam.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/Hobbs.pdf)
  - A formal presentation on pricing of transmission at a Brussels conference, June 10, 2010

“Why Did the US (Mostly) Go With LMP? Benefits of Flow-Based Allocation,”  
Workshop on the Role of Power Market Design for the Achievement of the  
20% Renewable Target, Brussels, [www.eprg.group.cam.ac.uk/wp-  
content/uploads/OH\\_LMP\\_BrusselsJune10\\_2010\\_HobbsNeuhoff\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.eprg.group.cam.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/OH_LMP_BrusselsJune10_2010_HobbsNeuhoff_FINAL.pdf)

- A formal presentation on scenario analysis for long term energy planning at a UKERC meeting:

“How Can We Use Scenarios? Planning Transmission Under Uncertainty”  
UKERC Workshop on Energy Scenarios and Modelling, London, July 7, 2010,  
[www.eprg.group.cam.ac.uk/wp-  
content/uploads/OH\\_UKERC\\_July7\\_2010\\_BH.pdf](http://www.eprg.group.cam.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/OH_UKERC_July7_2010_BH.pdf)

4. Contacts I made while on sabbatical developed into a consulting arrangement with OFGEM to critique UK electricity transmission pricing arrangements as part of Project TransmiT in 2011

[www.ofgem.gov.uk/Networks/Trans/PT/Pages/ProjectTransmiT.aspx](http://www.ofgem.gov.uk/Networks/Trans/PT/Pages/ProjectTransmiT.aspx)

My group’s report and approximately 20 responses by stakeholders/industry/etc.:

[www.ofgem.gov.uk/Pages/MoreInformation.aspx?docid=98&refer=Networks/Trans  
/PT/WF](http://www.ofgem.gov.uk/Pages/MoreInformation.aspx?docid=98&refer=Networks/Trans/PT/WF)

We also had a final report and a presentation that my colleague Jim Bushnell (of the University of Iowa) made in London:

[www.ofgem.gov.uk/Pages/MoreInformation.aspx?docid=98&refer=Networks/Trans  
/PT/WF](http://www.ofgem.gov.uk/Pages/MoreInformation.aspx?docid=98&refer=Networks/Trans/PT/WF)

5. Contacts I made also resulted in me preparing a presentation on US transmission rights arrangements which I presented at a meeting sponsored by the European Community energy ministry at Booz, Ltd. in London on 31 May 2011 entitled:

"Financial Transmission Rights: California & PJM", B.F. Hobbs and G. Bautista,  
Workshop on Physical and Financial Capacity Rights for Cross-Border Trade in  
Electricity, London, 31 May 2011

6. One 1 June 2011, I visited DECC for a morning's discussion on possible generation capacity subsidy mechanisms. (This was the result of an invitation from a Cambridge Ph.D. student Christian Winzer who I interacted with who subsequently worked at DECC.) This resulted in an invitation by DECC in August 2011 to submit a proposal for consultative services which unfortunately I do not have the time to respond to.

Ivan Viehoff, an associate of Booz and Co, provided an example which helped to explain one route for the impact of Professor Hobbs’ work. Booz and Co is a management consultant firm which does general regulatory work. They had been commissioned by the EU to report on possibilities for reforming how cross-border electricity transmission is arranged and regulated. Booz and Co paid Professor Hobbs to give the ‘benefit of his wisdom’ on the US example. His input was particularly useful because the US has many different electricity markets tenuously connected across large spaces, with blocks of 4-10 states having markets in various regions. Thus, they are already doing something similar to what Europe is considering doing. Mr Viehoff notes that through Professor Hobbs’ input: ‘we learned things that have been significant in giving us confidence that we’re going in the right direction’. There is of, course, a complex EU process for making changes; the US example provided a ‘laboratory of different ways of doing things’, giving confidence that recommendations are sensible and tested elsewhere. Booz and Co have given the EU their draft final report, with which they are broadly happy, but in terms of the next policy process, ‘what happens is a bit more confounding’.

Professor Hobbs' original goals were both academic and personal, with the policy impact as a secondary aim. He 'naturally enjoys those discussions' but this was an 'unexpected benefit' facilitated by being in the right place at the right time. In his view, interchange is essential, and activities that facilitate engagement and exchange of ideas both among academics and between academics and non-academic stakeholders, including policymakers, should be built into any fellowship programme – 'you don't want people hiding in offices'. He attributed the success of his work to a number of factors, but evidently his own determination to make the most of the opportunity, the nature of the research group at Cambridge, and the desire of UK and European organisations to learn from the US example (and US mistakes as well), were a powerful combination. Again, we see the value of comparative work, as the UK and EU look to other national and regional comparators. We also see how much can be achieved through a flexible agenda with the right collaborators. And, again, while there is considerable evidence of influence here, actual policy impact is further down the line and will be subject to negotiations and the vagaries of the policy process.

## **5. Emergent Themes and Areas for Development**

### **5.1 The Wider Context of Purpose**

These schemes need to be seen in the context of globalisation on the one hand – the flow of people, resources and knowledge across borders – and higher education internationalisation on the other - policy and practice in universities to develop an international learning and research environment. Key questions that arise from examining these schemes in this wider context are: does international collaboration have to mean internationalised research? And who benefits, and who should benefit?

We can see from the ESRC-SSRC experience that working an expectation of comparative perspectives into the rubric seems to make these outcomes more likely. Across the schemes, many very successful projects had a directly international focus, either in terms of theme (eg immigration) or because of the interest in learning from other countries which are relevant comparators (eg US-UK work regarding maternal employment, energy use, or environmental campaigning). While interviews at the ESRC suggest that the main aim is to bring world-class researchers together across borders, given how much can be learned through comparative work or work which is explicitly international, it seems something of a missed opportunity not to stress this. Even if it is not necessarily a condition for receiving a grant, applicants could be encouraged to consider the international dimensions of their research.

As for the benefits of academic work across borders, there are a number of potential beneficiaries. The individual, one hopes, would experience professional development, and the survey backs this up across the schemes. On the whole, this is of course a good thing. However, an unintended outcome of such development – and there were examples among the interviewees – is 'brain circulation' between institutions and countries when individuals use their improved status and international perspective to seek work elsewhere. When the beneficiary is from the developing world, this carries the risk of 'brain drain'. This movement of individuals has implications for institutional capacity and indeed national capacity. Should personal and institutional capacity development (or loss) overseas be ESRC considerations? Whether the ESRC wishes to see itself having a role in this regard, in relation to the UK or other institutions, is a complex question, but the effects are there, intentional

or unintentional. In terms of the benefits to social science, there is evidence here of academic impact across the schemes, and in the light of the relatively low costs of these scheme, this is particularly impressive (although we would need to know how other funding schemes compared in order to judge the relative efficacy of these international fellowships). The prevalence of joint publications, publications in international journals, cross-fertilisation through international consultancy, and press coverage in different countries inevitably improve international impact. As well as the potential for enhanced comparative/international perspectives and impact, access to resources and people which are unavailable at home or which complement what is accessible in the usual workplace were also widely mentioned as benefits of the study visits.

## **5.2 Career and relationship cycles**

Generally, while considerable impact was recognised across the board, greater impact on professional development was reported among the earlier career researchers (see Appendix 5, answers disaggregated according to career stage). More experienced researchers also reported less impact from their research, both academic and non-academic, although this would need to be interpreted with care as their expectations of impact may well be higher.

However, the question is more complex than simply whether earlier or later in career is better. As several of the respondents were at pains to point out, the perfect time for an individual will depend on a wide range of personal and professional factors, and being too prescriptive about career stage can be discriminatory. Travel can be restricted for people with young families or aging parents, and two interviewees had experienced unconventional career structures with long breaks which put them out of the 'early career scholar' range personally but not professionally. A message that came through strongly in many of the interviews was the importance of the grantholder's own motivation to use the opportunity for clear ends, but within this, to be responsive as possibilities open up on the ground, and this can come up at different stages, as these two examples illustrate:

I received this fellowship at the perfect time in my career (soon after tenure). Previously, I had only focused my research on the US, and this fellowship started my international collaboration with British researchers. It also prompted me to focus my research more internationally.

When you reach mid-career, the challenge is always to find new discussions and debates in which to participate, and especially to gain access to conversations and research in other disciplines. This fellowship enabled me to join and participate in an-ongoing research project involving multiple parties from different disciplines working on similar research questions.

People at different stages also have different needs. Early-career researchers in interview signalled the importance of a supportive mentor, for example. Relationships, too, were at different stages at the application stage. 60% of survey respondents knew their collaborators well, but a significant minority did not (question 8a). This has implications for how much can be planned together in advance within the boundaries of tolerable risk. However, many significant relationships were established during the fellowship visits, which could not have been foreseen at the application stage, again pointing to the need for flexibility and responsiveness.

### **5.3 Is bigger better?**

There was some discussion with ESRC staff about increasing the funding level for individual grants, with a view to a more substantial programme being possible for each grantholder. Indeed, the new International Partnership and Networking Scheme accommodates this. 72% of survey respondents (question 8i) indicated that they would have liked the option to apply for a larger grant for a more comprehensive fellowship. However, it is worth taking the above comments into consideration before prescribing this across the board: grants involving longer or more frequent travel may favour, for example, male applicants or those with firmly-established and trusted relationships. Interviewees were concerned that if the funding pool remains the same but grants are bigger, fewer people will experience these opportunities. There is also evidence from the case studies that a little can be made to go a very long way. If larger grants also demanded a more comprehensive advance plan, interviewees' comments about the importance of flexibility could usefully be considered, along with the fact that a substantial minority (33% - question 8g) did not agree that their plans remained unchanged through the course of the fellowship. The more plans there are, the more would have to be changed.

### **5.4 Joined-up-thinking and administration**

The evidence cannot be treated as conclusive, but several interviewees signalled the advantages of being linked to larger projects funded by the ESRC or other funding bodies. This helped to give a sustainable focus and momentum to research. There were also administrative questions about the ESRC's wider practices, and how the schemes did or did not fit these. The use of standard rapporteur forms and standard expectations regarding archiving of datasets seemed inappropriate to these schemes.

Concerns about funding administration generally were particularly prevalent in the ICSSR scheme, but were mentioned across the board, including in 15 end-of-award reports. There were several pleas for in advance per diem allowances rather than the standard procedure of reclaiming expenses through university systems, and there were complaints about specific institutions not managing this process efficiently. Visitors to the UK from developing countries were particularly concerned about this issue, as they are unlikely to have substantial savings, and exchange rates and costs of living work against them. Many respondents mentioned in end-of-award reports, questionnaires and interviews the difficulties of visas and housing, and the time and effort spent on sorting these, and there were a few requests for the ESRC to find ways of intervening or helping. Several interviewees indicated that they would have liked to be able to use leftover funds for additional trips or other activities. However, these requests regarding funding mechanisms and flexibility, housing and visas would need to be seen in balance with other factors: the need for accountable and consistent financial practice; the administrative burden that fulfilling them would create for the ESRC; and the need for practices to be the same across all funding calls, for equity and to avoid confusion.

There were specific administrative issues related to the ICSSR. There is little point in cataloguing these at length, but the implications feed into the discussion on partnerships with other research councils.

## **5.5 Impact expectations**

There were, across the schemes, high levels of perceived knowledge production and dissemination for academic purposes: half the respondents strongly agreed, and other 36% agreed that this was successful (question 9d). The same was not true regarding impact outside academia, with less than half (45%) agreeing or strongly agreeing. Even among those interviewees who were positive about non-academic impact, it was mainly about conversations and knowledge-sharing, with actual effects of these less apparent. For some researchers, this area was simply not prioritised, and these schemes are probably not very different from others in this regard. This is an ongoing debate within the social sciences more broadly and not unique to these schemes. If non-academic engagement and impact are expectations for these schemes, then this will need to be made clear, and mechanisms illustrated, but the risks are that there will be tokenistic involvement in order to meet grant requirements, or that knowledge which does not have an immediately apparent practical application will not be generated.

## **5.6 Value-for- money**

Given that these schemes have low funding ceilings and almost never pay for the researchers' time, the outcomes were generally very impressive. Even experienced researchers with track records of large grants found these small inputs very valuable, for their simplicity and flexibility, and the ways in which they facilitated and legitimated focused research time, travel, and collaboration. The impact on participants' professional development and the wider contribution to social science point to excellent value for money. This suggests that they are an investment worth continuing or increasing.

## **5.7 Partnerships with other national research councils:**

Based on discussions at the ESRC, data were not gathered which directly addressed the question of whether such schemes benefit substantially from being run in partnership with other research councils. There are, no doubt, good reasons for joint calls, including the potential of interdisciplinarity, the sharing of costs and administrative burdens, and the signalling of cooperation in line with the collaborative purposes of the schemes. However, there are also costs to such collaborations. Where there are weaknesses such as administrative inefficiency, these become part of the experience of the scheme. It is also more difficult to monitor schemes in an ongoing way as they progress, as information is not always jointly held (for example, many of the end-of award reports for the BA-AHRC-ESRC scheme were held elsewhere). It means, too, that schemes might be tied mainly to regions where such co-operation exists. 74% of respondents (question 8c) knew they needed funds for this collaboration before the call was announced: presumably, this is also true for regions where there are not Council partnerships and no call is forthcoming. One interviewee was, for example, very disappointed as he had expected further opportunities to be open for travel from the UK to his region of interest, but these did not arise. And while the ESRC is probably less concerned about branding than many other organisations, it was interesting that participants could not always remember the ESRC's involvement. These all raise questions about whether the value added from such partnerships is sufficiently substantial in all cases.

## 6. Conclusions and Recommendations

There is no doubt that these are, overall, successful schemes which offer excellent value-for-money in terms of the ESRC's investment. In some form, then, the international fellowship/exchange model of scheme should be continued. The evidence presented in this report has a number of implications for future schemes. It is noteworthy that the new International Partnership and Networking Scheme incorporates some of these directions. The recommendations are as follows:

6.1 That the ESRC consider raising the level of investment in international schemes of this nature, given the value-for-money they offer, and the wider context of globalisation and internationalisation.

6.2 That not all schemes be region-specific, but be open to collaborations between UK researchers and those from any other country where meaningful partnerships exist or can be developed.

6.3 That the value of comparative and international dimensions to research be signalled as advantageous, even if these are not criteria for funding.

6.4 That if non-academic impact is expected, that this be made clear but that expectations be kept realistic. It is likely to be a question of engagement rather than impact for many, and for some, this expectation may need flexible interpretation.

6.5 That if calls for applications have higher funding ceilings than these fellowships, individual applications for smaller amounts should not be judged negatively, and that the pool of funds should be spread accordingly. Applications for any amount 'up to' the ceiling should be considered.

6.6 That flexibility continue to be granted to award holders to respond to unforeseeable opportunities that arise during international fellowships and exchanges.

6.7 Even if the ESRC wishes to continue with bilateral schemes involving other councils, that international fellowship schemes not be dependent on such co-operation, and that the Council be prepared to fund schemes independently.




6.8 Given the above recommendations, there are many good reasons to combine international fellowships into one large, flexible, long-term, ESRC-funded scheme, which includes all regions and which allows for a wide range of activities and outcomes. This will facilitate the Council's management of such schemes, and allow researchers to plan confidently for future collaborations.



6.9 That such a scheme be open to researchers at any stage of their professional development and collaboration relationship, and to evaluate the applications in line with what is feasible at each given stage.




6.10 That such a scheme be administered so that reporting, archiving and assessment procedures are in line with the flexibility of the expectations. The processes for these should be communicated transparently to applicants.





## Appendix One – On-line Questionnaire



### Section 1: About you and your fellowship

1. In which of the following international schemes did you participate? (choose one)			
ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India):		16.7%	21
ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas):		48.4%	61
BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East):		34.9%	44





2. Which of the following describes you?			
I was a visiting scholar for this grant.:		n/a	88
I was a host scholar for this grant.:		n/a	39



3. At the time of the grant, I would describe myself as			
An early-career researcher:		33.3%	42
A mid-career researcher:		38.9%	49
An experienced, later-career researcher:		27.8%	35







4. How many visits did you make or host as part of this scheme?			
1:		77.0%	97
2:		14.3%	18
3:		6.3%	8
4:		0.0%	0
more than 4:		2.4%	3

5. What was the average length of each visit?			
Less than one month:		15.1%	19
One month:		24.6%	31





































Two months:		24.6%	31
Three months:		20.6%	26
Four months:		6.3%	8
More than four months:		8.7%	11






















6. Was this fellowship linked to a larger research project?			
Yes:		53.2%	67
No:		46.8%	59



7. In which academic year were you awarded the fellowship grant?			
2004-2005:		4.8%	6
2005-2006:		7.1%	9
2006-2007:		12.7%	16
2007-2008:		15.9%	20
2008-2009:		28.6%	36
2009-2010:		31.0%	39

## Section 2: Experience of Fellowship/Exchange Scheme

















8.			
8.a. I knew my collaborators well before the visit/exchange.			
Strongly agree:		25.4%	32
Agree:		34.9%	44
Neither agree nor disagree:		15.1%	19
Disagree:		12.7%	16
Strongly disagree:		11.1%	14
Not applicable/Don't know:		0.8%	1
8.b. My ambitions for what could be achieved through this grant were realistic.			
Strongly agree:		32.8%	41
Agree:		57.6%	72
Neither agree nor disagree:		5.6%	7
Disagree:		3.2%	4

Strongly disagree:		0.0%	0
Not applicable/Don't know:		0.8%	1
<b>8.c. I knew before seeing the call for proposals that I needed funds to develop this collaboration.</b>			
Strongly agree:		23.8%	30
Agree:		50.0%	63
Neither agree nor disagree:		7.1%	9
Disagree:		6.3%	8
Strongly disagree:		4.0%	5
Not applicable/Don't know:		8.7%	11
<b>8.d. I had enough time during the visit(s) to fully engage with the objectives of the fellowship.</b>			
Strongly agree:		24.0%	30
Agree:		56.0%	70
Neither agree nor disagree:		11.2%	14
Disagree:		6.4%	8
Strongly disagree:		1.6%	2
Not applicable/Don't know:		0.8%	1
<b>8.e. The funds I was awarded were sufficient to meet the goals I set.</b>			
Strongly agree:		25.6%	32
Agree:		52.8%	66
Neither agree nor disagree:		10.4%	13
Disagree:		8.0%	10
Strongly disagree:		2.4%	3
Not applicable/Don't know:		0.8%	1
<b>8.f. The administration of the funding was efficient.</b>			
Strongly agree:		37.9%	47
Agree:		41.1%	51
Neither agree nor disagree:		11.3%	14
Disagree:		4.0%	5
Strongly disagree:		4.8%	6

Not applicable/Don't know:		0.8%	1
<b>8.g. My plans remained unchanged from the time of writing the proposal to the end of the fellowship period.</b>			
Strongly agree:		23.8%	30
Agree:		42.9%	54
Neither agree nor disagree:		14.3%	18
Disagree:		13.5%	17
Strongly disagree:		4.8%	6
Not applicable/Don't know:		0.8%	1
<b>8.h. I had a clearly planned schedule in advance of the visit(s).</b>			
Strongly agree:		24.2%	30
Agree:		51.6%	64
Neither agree nor disagree:		12.9%	16
Disagree:		9.7%	12
Strongly disagree:		0.0%	0
Not applicable/Don't know:		1.6%	2
<b>8.i. I would have liked the option of a larger grant in order to plan a more comprehensive fellowship programme.</b>			
Strongly agree:		41.6%	52
Agree:		30.4%	38
Neither agree nor disagree:		13.6%	17
Disagree:		8.8%	11
Strongly disagree:		3.2%	4
Not applicable/Don't know:		2.4%	3
<b>8.j. I would apply again for funding from a similar scheme.</b>			
Strongly agree:		57.6%	72
Agree:		32.0%	40
Neither agree nor disagree:		4.0%	5
Disagree:		0.0%	0

Strongly disagree:		3.2%	4
Not applicable/Don't know:		3.2%	4

### Section 3: Fellowship/Exchange Impact

<b>9.</b>			
<b>9.a. The fellowship had a positive impact on my own professional development.</b>			
Strongly agree:		56.3%	71
Agree:		33.3%	42
Neither agree nor disagree:		6.3%	8
Disagree:		1.6%	2
Strongly disagree:		0.0%	0
Not applicable/don't know:		2.4%	3
<b>9.b. Travel was essential to achieve the outcomes stated in my application.</b>			
Strongly agree:		71.4%	90
Agree:		20.6%	26
Neither agree nor disagree:		4.8%	6
Disagree:		1.6%	2
Strongly disagree:		0.0%	0
Not applicable/don't know:		1.6%	2
<b>9.c. I achieved all of the intended outcomes of the fellowship grant.</b>			
Strongly agree:		28.8%	36
Agree:		47.2%	59
Neither agree nor disagree:		12.0%	15
Disagree:		8.8%	11
Strongly disagree:		0.0%	0
Not applicable/don't know:		3.2%	4
<b>9.d. The fellowship contributed to the development and dissemination of knowledge in the academic community.</b>			
Strongly agree:		50.0%	63

Agree:		36.5%	46
Neither agree nor disagree:		7.1%	9
Disagree:		1.6%	2
Strongly disagree:		0.8%	1
Not applicable/don't know:		4.0%	5
<b>9.e. The fellowship contributed to the development and dissemination of knowledge among non-academic stakeholders (eg governments, industry).</b>			
Strongly agree:		15.1%	19
Agree:		30.2%	38
Neither agree nor disagree:		27.8%	35
Disagree:		14.3%	18
Strongly disagree:		0.8%	1
Not applicable/don't know:		11.9%	15
<b>9.f. An international network of researchers was developed through this fellowship.</b>			
Strongly agree:		33.6%	42
Agree:		33.6%	42
Neither agree nor disagree:		16.0%	20
Disagree:		10.4%	13
Strongly disagree:		0.8%	1
Not applicable/don't know:		5.6%	7
<b>9.g. (If so) this network of researchers is still active today.</b>			
Strongly agree:		32.5%	40
Agree:		29.3%	36
Neither agree nor disagree:		19.5%	24
Disagree:		7.3%	9
Strongly disagree:		0.8%	1
Not applicable/don't know:		10.6%	13
<b>9.h. The report form adequately captured the achievements from this grant.</b>			
Strongly agree:		16.9%	21

Agree:		56.5%	70
Neither agree nor disagree:		13.7%	17
Disagree:		3.2%	4
Strongly disagree:		1.6%	2
Not applicable/don't know:		8.1%	10

**9.i. My research took on an enhanced international or comparative dimension as an outcome of this fellowship.**

Strongly agree:		38.9%	49
Agree:		40.5%	51
Neither agree nor disagree:		12.7%	16
Disagree:		4.8%	6
Strongly disagree:		0.8%	1
Not applicable/don't know:		2.4%	3

**10. Which of the following were direct outcomes of your award? Tick as many answers as are relevant, but please only include those which would not have been possible without the grant.**











Original research:		n/a	90
Seminar presentations by me:		n/a	82
Attending seminars:		n/a	69
Access to new data:		n/a	66
Discussions about future collaborations:		n/a	102
Joint publications:		n/a	63
Personal publications:		n/a	50
Conference presentations:		n/a	73
Visits to other academic institutions, outside of the fellowship:		n/a	61
Discussions with non-academic stakeholders:		n/a	37
Other ( <i>please specify</i> ):		n/a	19

[View All Responses](#)

- There are too many responses to display on this page and so all the responses

to this question are available on a separate page.

**11. Which was the most significant outcome of your award? Please indicate only one.**

Original research:		24.6%	31
Seminar presentations by me:		1.6%	2
Attending seminars:		0.0%	0
Access to new data:		10.3%	13
Discussions about future collaborations:		21.4%	27
Joint publications:		17.5%	22
Personal publications:		10.3%	13
Conference presentations:		2.4%	3
Visits to other academic institutions, outside of the fellowship:		0.8%	1
Discussions with non-academic stakeholders:		4.0%	5
Other ( <i>please specify</i> ):		7.1%	9

[View All Responses](#)

- There are too many responses to display on this page and so all the responses to this question are available on a separate page.

**12. Please provide any further relevant information regarding your experience of the fellowship.**

[View All Responses](#)

- There are too many responses to display on this page and so all the responses to this question are available on a separate page.

**13. What would have enhanced the impact of your fellowship? This could be in terms of what you could have done differently, or in terms of how the fellowship scheme could be modified.**

[View All Responses](#)

- There are too many responses to display on this page and so all the responses to this question are available on a separate page.

**14. Any additional comments or questions are welcome:**

[View All Responses](#)

- There are too many responses to display on this page and so all the responses to this question are available on a separate page.

**15.** We hope to interview a number of participants to gain further insight into their experiences of the fellowships, and the impact on themselves, the academic community, and non-academic stakeholders. Would you be willing to be contacted for a telephone interview?

Yes:		65.1%	82
No:		34.9%	44

**16.** If so, please provide an email address and daytime telephone number. Many thanks.

[View All Responses](#)

- There are too many responses to display on this page and so all the responses to this question are available on a separate page.



## Appendix Two – Results by Scheme

### Cross Tabulation

Results are cross tabulated by question "1. In which of the following international schemes did you participate? (choose one)"

2. Which of the following describes you?	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	Totals
I was a visiting scholar for this grant.	9	60	19	88
I was a host scholar for this grant.	12	2	25	39
<b>Totals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>127</b>
3. At the time of the grant, I would describe myself as	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	Totals
An early-career researcher	3	17	22	42
A mid-career researcher	8	32	9	49
An experienced, later-career researcher	10	12	13	35
<b>Totals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>126</b>
4. How many visits did you make or host as part of this scheme?	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	Totals
1	18	43	36	97
2	3	9	6	18
3	0	8	0	8
4	0	0	0	0
more than 4	0	1	2	3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>126</b>
5. What was the average length of each visit?	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	Totals
Less than one month	0	16	3	19
One month	5	22	4	31
Two months	9	12	10	31

Three months	7	7	12	26
Four months	0	1	7	8
More than four months	0	3	8	11
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>6. Was this fellowship linked to a larger research project?</b>	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>
Yes	9	42	16	67
No	12	19	28	59
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>7. In which academic year were you awarded the fellowship grant?</b>	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>
2004-2005	0	6	0	6
2005-2006	0	9	0	9
2006-2007	0	8	8	16
2007-2008	4	10	6	20
2008-2009	8	14	14	36
2009-2010	9	14	16	39
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>8.</b>	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>
<b>8.a. I knew my collaborators well before the visit/exchange.</b>	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	9	13	10	32
Agree	7	16	21	44
Neither agree nor disagree	1	11	7	19
Disagree	1	12	3	16
Strongly disagree	3	9	2	14
Not applicable/Don't know	0	0	1	1
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>8.b. My ambitions for what</b>	ESRC-ICSSR	ESRC-SSRC	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting	<b>Totals</b>

could be achieved through this grant were realistic.	Scholar Exchange (India)	Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	
Strongly agree	10	18	13	41
Agree	7	37	28	72
Neither agree nor disagree	2	3	2	7
Disagree	1	3	0	4
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Not applicable/Don't know	0	0	1	1
<i>No Answer</i>	1	0	0	1
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>8.c.</b> I knew before seeing the call for proposals that I needed funds to develop this collaboration.	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	7	14	9	30
Agree	12	29	22	63
Neither agree nor disagree	1	5	3	9
Disagree	0	5	3	8
Strongly disagree	0	5	0	5
Not applicable/Don't know	1	3	7	11
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>8.d.</b> I had enough time during the visit(s) to fully engage with the objectives of the fellowship.	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	7	17	6	30
Agree	10	31	29	70
Neither agree nor disagree	1	7	6	14
Disagree	1	5	2	8
Strongly disagree	2	0	0	2
Not applicable/Don't know	0	0	1	1
<i>No Answer</i>	0	1	0	1
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>8.e.</b> The funds I was awarded were sufficient to meet the goals I set.	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>

Strongly agree	8	16	8	32
Agree	11	34	21	66
Neither agree nor disagree	2	4	7	13
Disagree	0	4	6	10
Strongly disagree	0	2	1	3
Not applicable/Don't know	0	0	1	1
<i>No Answer</i>	0	1	0	1
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>8.f. The administration of the funding was efficient.</b>	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	6	26	15	47
Agree	7	23	21	51
Neither agree nor disagree	2	8	4	14
Disagree	2	2	1	5
Strongly disagree	4	1	1	6
Not applicable/Don't know	0	0	1	1
<i>No Answer</i>	0	1	1	2
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>8.g. My plans remained unchanged from the time of writing the proposal to the end of the fellowship period.</b>	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	6	16	8	30
Agree	10	22	22	54
Neither agree nor disagree	1	11	6	18
Disagree	2	9	6	17
Strongly disagree	2	3	1	6
Not applicable/Don't know	0	0	1	1
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>8.h. I had a clearly planned schedule in advance of the visit(s).</b>	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	5	14	11	30
Agree	12	26	26	64

Neither agree nor disagree	0	13	3	16
Disagree	3	7	2	12
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Not applicable/Don't know	0	0	2	2
<i>No Answer</i>	1	1	0	2
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>8.i.</b> I would have liked the option of a larger grant in order to plan a more comprehensive fellowship programme.	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	9	23	20	52
Agree	9	19	10	38
Neither agree nor disagree	1	8	8	17
Disagree	0	8	3	11
Strongly disagree	0	3	1	4
Not applicable/Don't know	1	0	2	3
<i>No Answer</i>	1	0	0	1
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>8.j.</b> I would apply again for funding from a similar scheme.	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	11	38	23	72
Agree	8	18	14	40
Neither agree nor disagree	0	2	3	5
Disagree	0	0	0	0
Strongly disagree	1	1	2	4
Not applicable/Don't know	1	1	2	4
<i>No Answer</i>	0	1	0	1
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>9.</b>	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>
<b>9.a.</b> The fellowship had a positive impact on my own professional development.	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>

	(India)	(Americas)		
Strongly agree	8	40	23	71
Agree	7	21	14	42
Neither agree nor disagree	5	0	3	8
Disagree	0	0	2	2
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Not applicable/don't know	1	0	2	3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>9.b. Travel was essential to achieve the outcomes stated in my application.</b>	<b>ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)</b>	<b>ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)</b>	<b>BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	16	46	28	90
Agree	3	14	9	26
Neither agree nor disagree	1	0	5	6
Disagree	1	0	1	2
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Not applicable/don't know	0	1	1	2
<b>Totals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>9.c. I achieved all of the intended outcomes of the fellowship grant.</b>	<b>ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)</b>	<b>ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)</b>	<b>BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	5	21	10	36
Agree	8	31	20	59
Neither agree nor disagree	3	3	9	15
Disagree	3	6	2	11
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Not applicable/don't know	2	0	2	4
<i>No Answer</i>	0	0	1	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>9.d. The fellowship contributed to the development and dissemination of knowledge in the academic community.</b>	<b>ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)</b>	<b>ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)</b>	<b>BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	8	35	20	63

Agree	8	19	19	46
Neither agree nor disagree	2	5	2	9
Disagree	0	2	0	2
Strongly disagree	0	0	1	1
Not applicable/don't know	3	0	2	5
<b>Totals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>9.e. The fellowship contributed to the development and dissemination of knowledge among non-academic stakeholders (eg governments, industry).</b>	<b>ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)</b>	<b>ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)</b>	<b>BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	3	12	4	19
Agree	4	24	10	38
Neither agree nor disagree	8	15	12	35
Disagree	2	8	8	18
Strongly disagree	0	0	1	1
Not applicable/don't know	4	2	9	15
<b>Totals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>9.f. An international network of researchers was developed through this fellowship.</b>	<b>ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)</b>	<b>ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)</b>	<b>BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	8	27	7	42
Agree	3	20	19	42
Neither agree nor disagree	4	8	8	20
Disagree	4	3	6	13
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	1
Not applicable/don't know	1	2	4	7
<i>No Answer</i>	0	1	0	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>9.g. (If so) this network of researchers is still active today.</b>	<b>ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)</b>	<b>ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)</b>	<b>BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	6	27	7	40
Agree	5	16	15	36

Neither agree nor disagree	3	10	11	24
Disagree	2	4	3	9
Strongly disagree	0	0	1	1
Not applicable/don't know	4	4	5	13
<i>No Answer</i>	1	0	2	3
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>9.h.</b> The report form adequately captured the achievements from this grant.	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	5	9	7	21
Agree	13	31	26	70
Neither agree nor disagree	1	12	4	17
Disagree	1	2	1	4
Strongly disagree	0	0	2	2
Not applicable/don't know	1	6	3	10
<i>No Answer</i>	0	1	1	2
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>9.i.</b> My research took on an enhanced international or comparative dimension as an outcome of this fellowship.	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	5	32	12	49
Agree	11	19	21	51
Neither agree nor disagree	2	8	6	16
Disagree	2	1	3	6
Strongly disagree	0	1	0	1
Not applicable/don't know	1	0	2	3
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>10.</b> Which of the following were direct outcomes of your award? Tick as many answers as are relevant, but please only include those which would not have been possible without the grant.	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>
Original research	15	42	33	90
Seminar presentations by me	10	51	21	82



Attending seminars	10	38	21	69
Access to new data	11	31	24	66
Discussions about future collaborations	16	52	34	102
Joint publications	14	34	15	63
Personal publications	4	27	19	50
Conference presentations	5	42	26	73
Visits to other academic institutions, outside of the fellowship	9	29	23	61
Discussions with non-academic stakeholders	5	21	11	37
<i>Other</i>	2	10	7	19
<b>Totals</b>	101	377	234	712
<b>11. Which was the most significant outcome of your award? Please indicate only one.</b>	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>
Original research	7	12	12	31
Seminar presentations by me	1	0	1	2
Attending seminars	0	0	0	0
Access to new data	2	3	8	13
Discussions about future collaborations	4	17	6	27
Joint publications	5	13	4	22
Personal publications	2	6	5	13
Conference presentations	0	1	2	3
Visits to other academic institutions, outside of the fellowship	0	1	0	1
Discussions with non-academic stakeholders	0	4	1	5
<i>Other</i>	0	4	5	9
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126
<b>15. We hope to interview a number of participants to gain further insight into their experiences of the fellowships, and the impact</b>	ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	<b>Totals</b>

on themselves, the academic community, and non-academic stakeholders. Would you be willing to be contacted for a telephone interview?				
Yes	11	43	28	82
No	10	18	16	44
<b>Totals</b>	21	61	44	126

## Appendix Three – Semi-structured Interview Schedule

### Interview Questions

1. How interview will be recorded and documented. Confidentiality.
2. Tell me about the fellowship you were involved in. (topic, partners, why, how, where, when, spend time, communication with different funding agencies involved)
3. What made you apply? Was it the country, the theme, or the particular people that drew you to the grant and your particular partners?
4. How did the grant help? What were the most important outcomes, that couldn't have happened without the grant, and how did the grant help you to achieve them? What do you think the impact was on yourself, your colleagues, the wider academic field, and non-academic stakeholders? What facilitated that impact? What were the barriers, if any, that prevented you from making the most of the opportunities from the grant? Are the results sustainable, why or why not?
5. Non-academic stakeholder impact – why or why not – nature - contact
6. How did the fellowship grant compare to other research funding you have received? (eg in terms of value for money, status, helpful outcomes, organisation etc)
7. Most people said they would like to have been able to apply for a larger grant. Would you? What would you have done differently if
8. How did you find the application and reporting procedures? Other aspects of administration (eg finances)?
9. What advice would you give someone considering one of these grants?
10. What would you recommend to the ESRC regarding future schemes of this kind?
11. Willing to be case study of impact?

## **Appendix Four – List of Interviewees**

### *List of interviewees – ESRC*

Mike Bright – Head of International Strategy

Steph Remola – Case officer for the international fellowship and exchange schemes

Andrew Stafford – Senior Research Manager

### *List of Interviewees – participants and stakeholders*

Mohammed Alzyoud

Kripa Ananthpur

Elizabeth Cooksey

Tom Crompton

Debkusum Das

Pranab Das

Erdem Erten

Amy Garnai

Ben Hobbs

Tim Jackson (by email)

Tim Kasser

Jim Mills

John Morgan (by email)

Filippo Osella

Mark Reed

V.J. Varghese

Ivan Viehoff

## Appendix Five – Questionnaire Responses by Career Stage

### Cross Tabulation

Results are cross tabulated by question "3. At the time of the grant, I would describe myself as"

1. In which of the following international schemes did you participate? (choose one)	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	Totals
ESRC-ICSSR Scholar Exchange (India)	3	8	10	21
ESRC-SSRC Collaborative Fellowship Scheme (Americas)	17	32	12	61
BA/AHRC/ESRC Visiting Fellowship Scheme (South Asia/Middle East)	22	9	13	44
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>126</b>
2. Which of the following describes you?	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	Totals
I was a visiting scholar for this grant.	35	39	14	88
I was a host scholar for this grant.	8	10	21	39
<b>Totals</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>127</b>
4. How many visits did you make or host as part of this scheme?	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	Totals
1	35	36	26	97
2	5	8	5	18
3	1	4	3	8
4	0	0	0	0
more than 4	1	1	1	3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>126</b>
5. What was the average length of each visit?	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	Totals
Less than one month	4	10	5	19
One month	8	13	10	31
Two months	12	13	6	31
Three months	9	9	8	26

Four months	3	3	2	8
More than four months	6	1	4	11
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>6. Was this fellowship linked to a larger research project?</b>	<b>An early-career researcher</b>	<b>A mid-career researcher</b>	<b>An experienced, later-career researcher</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Yes	23	27	17	67
No	19	22	18	59
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>7. In which academic year were you awarded the fellowship grant?</b>	<b>An early-career researcher</b>	<b>A mid-career researcher</b>	<b>An experienced, later-career researcher</b>	<b>Totals</b>
2004-2005	1	2	3	6
2005-2006	3	4	2	9
2006-2007	7	6	3	16
2007-2008	7	8	5	20
2008-2009	11	15	10	36
2009-2010	13	14	12	39
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>An early-career researcher</b>	<b>A mid-career researcher</b>	<b>An experienced, later-career researcher</b>	<b>Totals</b>
<b>8.a. I knew my collaborators well before the visit/exchange.</b>	<b>An early-career researcher</b>	<b>A mid-career researcher</b>	<b>An experienced, later-career researcher</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	11	11	10	32
Agree	13	17	14	44
Neither agree nor disagree	5	9	5	19
Disagree	4	8	4	16
Strongly disagree	8	4	2	14
Not applicable/Don't know	1	0	0	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>8.b. My ambitions for what could be achieved through this grant were realistic.</b>	<b>An early-career researcher</b>	<b>A mid-career researcher</b>	<b>An experienced, later-career researcher</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	13	17	11	41
Agree	24	28	20	72
Neither agree nor disagree	2	3	2	7
Disagree	1	1	2	4

Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Not applicable/Don't know	1	0	0	1
<i>No Answer</i>	1	0	0	1
<b>Totals</b>	42	49	35	126
<b>8.c. I knew before seeing the call for proposals that I needed funds to develop this collaboration.</b>	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	11	12	7	30
Agree	17	26	20	63
Neither agree nor disagree	4	5	0	9
Disagree	1	3	4	8
Strongly disagree	2	2	1	5
Not applicable/Don't know	7	1	3	11
<b>Totals</b>	42	49	35	126
<b>8.d. I had enough time during the visit(s) to fully engage with the objectives of the fellowship.</b>	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	9	12	9	30
Agree	24	29	17	70
Neither agree nor disagree	6	3	5	14
Disagree	2	3	3	8
Strongly disagree	0	1	1	2
Not applicable/Don't know	1	0	0	1
<i>No Answer</i>	0	1	0	1
<b>Totals</b>	42	49	35	126
<b>8.e. The funds I was awarded were sufficient to meet the goals I set.</b>	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	12	13	7	32
Agree	18	28	20	66
Neither agree nor disagree	6	5	2	13
Disagree	5	2	3	10
Strongly disagree	0	1	2	3
Not applicable/Don't know	1	0	0	1
<i>No Answer</i>	0	0	1	1

<b>Totals</b>	42	49	35	126
<b>8.f. The administration of the funding was efficient.</b>	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	18	18	11	47
Agree	15	19	17	51
Neither agree nor disagree	5	6	3	14
Disagree	1	4	0	5
Strongly disagree	1	2	3	6
Not applicable/Don't know	1	0	0	1
<i>No Answer</i>	1	0	1	2
<b>Totals</b>	42	49	35	126
<b>8.g. My plans remained unchanged from the time of writing the proposal to the end of the fellowship period.</b>	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	14	8	8	30
Agree	19	18	17	54
Neither agree nor disagree	3	10	5	18
Disagree	3	10	4	17
Strongly disagree	2	3	1	6
Not applicable/Don't know	1	0	0	1
<b>Totals</b>	42	49	35	126
<b>8.h. I had a clearly planned schedule in advance of the visit(s).</b>	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	13	9	8	30
Agree	20	26	18	64
Neither agree nor disagree	4	8	4	16
Disagree	3	4	5	12
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Not applicable/Don't know	2	0	0	2
<i>No Answer</i>	0	2	0	2
<b>Totals</b>	42	49	35	126
<b>8.i. I would have liked the option of a larger grant in order to plan a more comprehensive fellowship</b>	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	<b>Totals</b>



programme.				
Strongly agree	20	20	12	52
Agree	7	20	11	38
Neither agree nor disagree	8	5	4	17
Disagree	3	2	6	11
Strongly disagree	2	2	0	4
Not applicable/Don't know	2	0	1	3
<i>No Answer</i>	0	0	1	1
<b>Totals</b>	42	49	35	126
<b>8.j.</b> I would apply again for funding from a similar scheme.	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	29	29	14	72
Agree	6	18	16	40
Neither agree nor disagree	2	0	3	5
Disagree	0	0	0	0
Strongly disagree	3	1	0	4
Not applicable/Don't know	2	1	1	4
<i>No Answer</i>	0	0	1	1
<b>Totals</b>	42	49	35	126
<b>9.</b>	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	<b>Totals</b>
<b>9.a.</b> The fellowship had a positive impact on my own professional development.	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	35	26	10	71
Agree	6	20	16	42
Neither agree nor disagree	0	2	6	8
Disagree	0	1	1	2
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Not applicable/don't know	1	0	2	3
<b>Totals</b>	42	49	35	126
<b>9.b.</b> Travel was essential to achieve the outcomes stated in my application.	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	33	35	22	90

Agree	4	12	10	26
Neither agree nor disagree	2	2	2	6
Disagree	1	0	1	2
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Not applicable/don't know	2	0	0	2
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>9.c. I achieved all of the intended outcomes of the fellowship grant.</b>	<b>An early-career researcher</b>	<b>A mid-career researcher</b>	<b>An experienced, later-career researcher</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	13	14	9	36
Agree	20	22	17	59
Neither agree nor disagree	5	6	4	15
Disagree	2	6	3	11
Strongly disagree	0	0	0	0
Not applicable/don't know	1	1	2	4
<i>No Answer</i>	1	0	0	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>9.d. The fellowship contributed to the development and dissemination of knowledge in the academic community.</b>	<b>An early-career researcher</b>	<b>A mid-career researcher</b>	<b>An experienced, later-career researcher</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	22	27	14	63
Agree	13	17	16	46
Neither agree nor disagree	4	3	2	9
Disagree	1	1	0	2
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	1
Not applicable/don't know	1	1	3	5
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>9.e. The fellowship contributed to the development and dissemination of knowledge among non-academic stakeholders (eg governments, industry).</b>	<b>An early-career researcher</b>	<b>A mid-career researcher</b>	<b>An experienced, later-career researcher</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	6	8	5	19
Agree	8	16	14	38

Neither agree nor disagree	12	17	6	35
Disagree	6	6	6	18
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	1
Not applicable/don't know	9	2	4	15
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>9.f. An international network of researchers was developed through this fellowship.</b>	<b>An early-career researcher</b>	<b>A mid-career researcher</b>	<b>An experienced, later-career researcher</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	15	20	7	42
Agree	16	12	14	42
Neither agree nor disagree	4	11	5	20
Disagree	3	4	6	13
Strongly disagree	0	1	0	1
Not applicable/don't know	4	1	2	7
<i>No Answer</i>	0	0	1	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>9.g. (If so) this network of researchers is still active today.</b>	<b>An early-career researcher</b>	<b>A mid-career researcher</b>	<b>An experienced, later-career researcher</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	16	19	5	40
Agree	11	10	15	36
Neither agree nor disagree	5	11	8	24
Disagree	3	3	3	9
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	1
Not applicable/don't know	5	5	3	13
<i>No Answer</i>	1	1	1	3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>9.h. The report form adequately captured the achievements from this grant.</b>	<b>An early-career researcher</b>	<b>A mid-career researcher</b>	<b>An experienced, later-career researcher</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	8	8	5	21
Agree	23	25	22	70
Neither agree nor disagree	5	7	5	17
Disagree	1	3	0	4
Strongly disagree	1	1	0	2

Not applicable/don't know	4	5	1	10
<i>No Answer</i>	0	0	2	2
<b>Totals</b>	42	49	35	126
<b>9.i. My research took on an enhanced international or comparative dimension as an outcome of this fellowship.</b>	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	<b>Totals</b>
Strongly agree	17	23	9	49
Agree	19	21	11	51
Neither agree nor disagree	3	4	9	16
Disagree	1	1	4	6
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	1
Not applicable/don't know	1	0	2	3
<b>Totals</b>	42	49	35	126
<b>10. Which of the following were direct outcomes of your award? Tick as many answers as are relevant, but please only include those which would not have been possible without the grant.</b>	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	<b>Totals</b>
Original research	33	34	23	90
Seminar presentations by me	33	32	17	82
Attending seminars	24	25	20	69
Access to new data	30	22	14	66
Discussions about future collaborations	34	41	27	102
Joint publications	21	26	16	63
Personal publications	20	21	9	50
Conference presentations	28	26	19	73
Visits to other academic institutions, outside of the fellowship	22	25	14	61
Discussions with non-academic stakeholders	12	14	11	37
<i>Other</i>	4	5	10	19
<b>Totals</b>	261	271	180	712
<b>11. Which was the most significant outcome of your</b>	An early-career researcher	A mid-career researcher	An experienced, later-career researcher	<b>Totals</b>

award? Please indicate only one.				
Original research	13	8	10	31
Seminar presentations by me	1	0	1	2
Attending seminars	0	0	0	0
Access to new data	9	2	2	13
Discussions about future collaborations	9	13	5	27
Joint publications	2	13	7	22
Personal publications	5	5	3	13
Conference presentations	2	1	0	3
Visits to other academic institutions, outside of the fellowship	0	1	0	1
Discussions with non-academic stakeholders	1	2	2	5
<i>Other</i>	0	4	5	9
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>15. We hope to interview a number of participants to gain further insight into their experiences of the fellowships, and the impact on themselves, the academic community, and non-academic stakeholders. Would you be willing to be contacted for a telephone interview?</b>	<b>An early-career researcher</b>	<b>A mid-career researcher</b>	<b>An experienced, later-career researcher</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Yes	28	33	21	82
No	14	16	14	44
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>126</b>