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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research (n = 1,247)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training (n = 1,531)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special (n = 683)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (n = 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced (n = 90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange (n = 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling (n = 32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting (n = 32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (n = 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency table for Disrupted Term (no value=0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Hygiene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced study for members of medical school staffs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term (n = 28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition-Only (n = 149)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XX Admin (n = 24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granted by the XX Office (n = 224)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Commission Funds (n = 111)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Gunn’s Special Appropriation (n = 5) .............................................................................................................................................................................. 40
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RECIPIENT

Name (Given Name, Surname, Full Name, Alternate Names)

When searching for an individual, we recommend using the Full Name field since it contains both Given Name and Surname values. We gathered the data for the latter two fields from permanent recorder cards⁴ produced by Rockefeller-endowed organizations, most of which listed a person’s surname in all caps and capitalized only the first letter of a given name. However, not all cases proved so straightforward. For instance, whereas permanent recorder cards for Thai award recipients listed both surnames and given names in all caps, the nature of the Thai naming system made it impossible for us to distinguish given names from surnames. We therefore entered each recipient’s entire name in the Surname field, leaving the Given Name field empty. For Spanish recipients, we entered both surnames in the Surname field, although only one of them was written in all caps on permanent recorder cards. In other cases, we distinguished between surnames and given names based on naming conventions in the corresponding country or language. But despite the team’s strong familiarity with Arabic, English, French, German, Italian, Mandarin and Spanish naming systems, we undoubtedly made some mistakes.

The Full Name field also contains Alternate Name values, which include maiden or married names, names in the original language, and variations in spelling or syntax found on permanent recorder cards and in other materials produced by Rockefeller-endowed organizations. Although we did not conduct a comprehensive search for additional alternate names, they were sometimes clearly indicated on permanent recorder cards. In other cases, we made connections across cards or between a card and another source. However, we only associated multiple names with the same individual if the birth years matched (with a one-year margin of error; see Date, below).

---

⁴ For more information on permanent recorder cards, the source for most of our data, see Pierre-Yves Saunier, “History 5*7: A material history of ‘fellowship recorder cards’ in Rockefeller-endowed philanthropic organizations”, unpublished, https://www.dropbox.com/s/ex17mkb1dfyi9e3/History%205%2A7%20revised%20january%202023%20version.docx?dl=0
Sex

We used the Sex field to record a recipient’s biological sex. Most often, this information was gathered from permanent recorder cards. We also relied on the Rockefeller Archive Center’s Fellowship Files Finding Aid (Record Group 10.1). In a few hundred cases, neither of these sources indicated the person’s sex. Here, we either based the Sex value on our familiarity with the gender of given names in certain languages (Arabic, English, French, German, Italian, Mandarin and Spanish) or entered NO_INFO.

Frequency table for Sex (no value=139)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12,033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date of Birth

The Date of Birth field consists of three subfields: Month, Day, and Year. This information was primarily gathered from the following two sources:

- Published in 1972 by the Rockefeller Foundation, the Directory of Fellowships and Scholarships 1917-1970 provided the birth year for each recipient listed.
- Permanent recorder cards often specified a recipient’s day and month of birth.

In cases where birthdate information was unavailable, we attempted to estimate the year based on the age and appointment year listed on the permanent recorder card. In the absence of explicit or solid clues we entered 0000

Altogether, we were able to gather or estimate birth years for 92% of award recipients. But since different cultures calculate age differently, we recommend treating birth years as approximations, with a margin of error of between one and two years.
AWARD

Benefitting Country

Awards listed in the database were granted to individuals whose skills and knowledge was expected to benefit 129 different countries or territories. The median number of awards per country was twenty-four, with individual countries accounting for anywhere between one (Syria) to 4,194 awards (United States).

In most cases, we based the Benefitting Country value on the country usually indicated at the very top of the permanent recorder card. However, this information may have meant different things to the various staff members who filled out the cards. For instance, it may have referred to the recipient’s country of origin or nationality. In some cases, it may even have indicated the location of the prospective host institution. Nevertheless, we determined that such annotations normally referred to the country that would primarily benefit from the award, that is to say the country where (or on behalf of which) the recipient was expected to work after (or, more rarely, during) the award term. We therefore chiefly used this same criterion to establish the Benefitting Country value in cases where a country was not indicated at the top of the permanent recorder card. When a country was generally not indicated at the top of the permanent recorder card for awards granted by the following Rockefeller-endowed organizations:

- Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (Child Study and Parental Education Program awards only) and General Education Board
  Except in rare cases where the award recipient was explicitly connected to another country, we entered United States as the Benefitting Country value.
- International Education Board
  Where a country was not listed at the top of the permanent recorder card, we established the Benefitting Country value based on the recipient’s permanent address, their nationality, their place of work at the time the award was granted, or the place of work of the person who nominated them. In some instances, we consulted biographical dictionaries, Who’s Who, and obituaries.
- China Medical Board
  Where a country was not listed at the top of the permanent recorder card, we entered China as the Benefitting Country value. We did so even in the case of European or American missionaries, as well as Chinese nationals studying in the United States at the time the award was granted.

Standardized Country Names
The names of individual countries were not written consistently on permanent recorder cards. For example, rather than the full or current country name, the staff members responsible for filling out the cards sometimes used an abbreviation, a misspelling, an obsolete name (e.g., “Siam” after 1932, “Irish Free State” after 1937), a colonial appellation, the name of a sub-state entity (e.g., “Scotland,” “Mississippi”), or the name of a supranational region or continent (e.g., “Africa,” “Europe”).

We standardized the country names entered in the database according to those used by the political scientists and historians responsible for the Correlates of War Project (1963-). The latter maintains the most complete and coherent list of current and historical sovereign countries, including the dates of each country’s entry into and/or exit from the state system. By emphasizing geographical over political name components, this list facilitates standardization across long periods and political changes. Accordingly, we were able to consistently name countries like China (pre- and post-1949) and Yugoslavia (pre-1929 and post-1944) across the entire period covered by the database (1914–1970).

Colonial and Postcolonial Country Names

A country’s transition from colonial status to independence was often a key moment for the involvement of Rockefeller-endowed organizations. We therefore entered different names for the colonial and postcolonial periods, while including the name of the colonial power in the country’s pre-independence designation (e.g., British India before independence and India after, Netherlands East Indies before independence and Indonesia after). Where a colony spawned multiple independent countries, we specified the post-independence country in parentheses when naming the colonial entity (e.g., British West Indies (Jamaica), British Straits Settlements (Singapore), British India (Pakistan)).

However, rather than base a country’s name on its exact date of independence, we entered the colonial name up to 31 December of the year prior to independence and the postcolonial name as of 1 January of the year when independence was achieved. For example, Indian independence was proclaimed on 15 August 1947. Accordingly, we entered British India up to 31 December 1946 and India as of 1 January 1947. In other words, in the case of an award granted during the year independence was achieved but prior to the actual date of independence, we entered the name of the independent country. Such exceptions were rare, in part because Rockefeller-endowed organizations tended to suspend their activities during periods of political transition.

The following names were used for countries that gained independence during the period covered by the database:

● **Belgian Congo** up to 31 December 1959 and **Congo** as of 1 January 1960 (independence on 30 June 1960).
● **British Ceylon** up to 31 December 1947 and **Ceylon** as of 1 January 1948 (independence on 4 February 1948).
● **British Kenya** up to 31 December 1962 and **Kenya** as of 1 January 1963 (independence on 12 December 1963).
● **British Nigeria** up to 31 December 1959 and **Nigeria** as of 1 January 1960.
● **British Palestine** up to 31 December 1947 and **Israel** as of 1 January 1948.
● **British West Indies (Jamaica)** up to 31 December 1961 and **Jamaica** as of 1 January 1962.
● **British West Indies (Trinidad and Tobago)** up to 31 December 1961 and **Trinidad and Tobago** as of 1 January 1962.
● **French Algeria** up to 31 December 1961 and **Algeria** as of 1 January 1962.
● **French Indochina** up to 31 December 1953 and **South Vietnam** as of 1 January 1955.³
● **French Lebanon** up to 31 December 1942 and **Lebanon** as of 1 January 1943.
● **French Syria** up to 31 December 1944 and **Syria** as of 1 January 1945.
● **French Tunisia** up to 31 December 1955 and **Tunisia** as of 1 January 1956.
● **Japanese Korea** up to 31 December 1944 and **South Korea** as of 1 January 1945.⁴
● **Japanese Taiwan** up to 31 December 1944, **China** from 1 January 1945 to 31 December 1948, and **Taiwan** as of 1 January 1949.
● **Japanese Manchukuo** up to 31 December 1944.
● **Netherlands East Indies** up to 31 December 1948 and **Indonesia** as of 1 January 1949.

**Special Cases**

We were forced to deal with a small number of special cases individually.

● For references to Germany, we entered **Germany** up to 31 December 1948 and **Federal Republic of Germany** as of 1 January 1949.⁵
● The United Arab Republic was a union of Egypt and Syria established in 1958. However, we continued to distinguish between the two countries by entering **Egypt** or **Syria** up to 31 December 1957 and **United Arab Republic (Egypt)** or **United Arab Republic (Syria)** as of 1 January 1958.
● We entered **Free City of Danzig** for all references to that territory.

---

³ No awards were made in connection to present-day Vietnam between 1 January 1954 and 31 December 1954. No awards were made in connection to North Vietnam, either before or after independence.

⁴ No awards were made in connection to North Korea.

⁵ No awards were made in connection to the German Democratic Republic.
- Established in 1922, the Irish Free State officially changed its name to Ireland in 1937. We therefore entered **Irish Free State** from 1 January 1922 to 31 December 1936, and **Ireland** as of 1 January 1937.
- Since all awards received by Russians were granted after 31 December 1922, we consistently entered **Union of Soviet Socialist Republics**.
- Although Siam changed its name to Thailand in 1932, the historical name continued to be used on permanent recorder cards for some time. Given the large number of awards granted to residents of the country, we wanted users to be able to search using either name, regardless of the period. Accordingly, we entered **Siam (Thailand)** up to 31 December 1931 and **Thailand (Siam)** as of 1 January 1932.
- We entered **United Kingdom** for all references to “England,” “Scotland,” “Wales,” and “Great Britain.”
- To differentiate the Philippines, which was never formally established as a colony by the United States, from European colonial possessions, we entered **United States Territory of the Philippines** up to 31 December 1945 and **Philippines** as of 1 January 1946.
- Hawaii was admitted as a state of the United States in 1959. We therefore entered **United States Territory of Hawaii** up to 31 December 1958.
- For Puerto Rico, we entered **United States Territory of Porto Rico**.
- For the United States Virgin Islands, we entered **United States Territory of the Virgin Islands**.

**Alternate Names and Spellings**

References to countries with alternate names or whose names have alternate spellings were standardized as follows:

- All references to “Esthonia” were entered as **Estonia**.
- All references to “Rumania” or “Roumania” were entered as **Romania**.
- All references to “Holland” were entered as **Netherlands**.
- All references to “Jugoslavia” were entered as **Yugoslavia**.

**International Organizations**

For awards granted to staff members of the following international organizations, we entered the organization’s name as the country name.

- **League of Nations**
- **United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)**
- **World Health Organization**

---

6 Awards in connection with Northern Ireland were entered under United Kingdom.
Type

In most cases, the permanent recorder card provided a suitable value for the Type field. Codes were sometimes used. For instance, the Rockefeller Foundation used different colored cards to distinguish between “fellowships” and “scholarships,” whereas cards produced by the General Education Board between 1945 and 1947 were marked with either an “F” or an “S”.

Sometimes, we had to consult other sources. The detailed lists of recipients included in the Rockefeller Foundation’s annual reports proved particularly useful for determining a Type value for awards granted by the China Medical Board in the early 1910s (most often, physicians received “fellowships,” whereas nurses and pharmacists received “scholarships”). We also used special reports and lists to determine whether the roughly 150 recipients of Child Study and Parental Education Program awards from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial in the 1920s were “fellows” or “scholars” (no cards were produced for these awards). Finally, we occasionally relied on the team’s knowledge of Rockefeller-endowed organizations to determine whether a particular award was a “scholarship” or a “fellowship.” For instance, different sources sometimes provided contradictory information on the nature of a given award. In these cases, we selected a Type based on the nomenclature we knew had been used for similar awards granted during the same period. But despite our best efforts, we undoubtedly made some mistakes. There were also a small number of cases where we could not confidently determine a Type value, and we entered NO_INFO.

We want to stress the extent to which Rockefeller-endowed organizations used these terms interchangeably. For instance, we found references to hundreds of individuals who received three months of funding to visit one or more countries. The permanent recorder cards variously classified such awards as “fellowships,” “scholarships,” or even “travel grants” (awards described as “travel grants” were not included in the database due to inconsistent information and/or record. This was also the case for other types described as “travelling guests”, “visitors” and “training grants”). The nomenclature varied according to the Rockefeller-endowed organization responsible; the policies in force at the time the award was granted; the prevailing budgetary situation; and attempts by program officers to enhance the reputation of a recipient, an organization, or a group of funders. A recipient’s race, nationality, sex, academic status, and domain of study or research also came into play when determining how this or the other type of award was given.
To make things even more complicated, the different terms tended to fall in and out of fashion at the various Rockefeller-endowed organizations. The Rockefeller Foundation used “fellow” and “fellowship” as generic terms for referring to awards granted to individuals by Rockefeller-endowed organizations (as observed, for example, in the diaries of Rockefeller Foundation officers). Meanwhile, the General Education Board, which began granting awards in 1922, tended to use “scholarship” and “fellowship” interchangeably. In other contexts, “scholarship” and “fellowship” seemed to refer to distinct categories of recipients, although usage often varied from one year to the next. Consider the General Education Board’s *Directory of Fellowship Awards for the Years 1922-1950*, whose preface repeatedly refers to a “fellowship program.” And although the explanatory notes refer to both “fellowships” and “scholarships,” suggesting two different categories of recipients, one note candidly admits that “the distinction between fellowships and scholarships in this directory is purely an administrative one.” And yet, this does not appear to be correct. Rather, scholarships were a separate category of award, created in the 1940s specifically for recipients “below the M.A. level.” Finally, in its 1955 annual report, the Rockefeller Foundation explained: “Though the differences among the various kinds of assistance are more technical than real, it is Foundation practice to designate as fellowships, awards for advanced training to men and women who have their doctorates or professional degrees and who are well launched on professional careers, and as scholarships the awards to people who have not taken their degrees but are seriously working toward them.”

---

7 See, for example, the various General Education Board documents in Fellowships Annual Reports, 1925, Rockefeller Foundation Papers, record group 1.2, series 100 E, box 37, folder 278, Rockefeller Archive Center. See also Dockets, June 1923-February 1924, General Education Board Records, record group 3, box 15, Rockefeller Archive Center, New York, NY. In the 1925 annual reports on fellowships, “fellowship” seems to be reserved for awards in “White Education,” whereas “scholarship” is used for awards in “Negro Education.” However, this race-based distinction between award types was not maintained in documents produced in later years. Likewise, although various budgetary appropriations were initially described in terms of “scholarships and fellowships,” subsequent references to the same appropriation would simply refer to “scholarships.”

8 *General Education Board Directory of Fellowship Awards for the Years 1922-1950* (New York: General Education Board, 1952), xv.

9 Executive Committee Meeting, January 1943, General Education Board records, series 1, subseries 2, box 232, folder 2349, Rockefeller Archive Center, New York, NY.

We kept all these factors in mind when determining Type values. Although not strict definitions, the following descriptions outline our approach to characterizing awards granted by different Rockefeller-endowed organizations.

**Fellowship**

With a term of between six months and several years, fellowships were granted to individuals who held a university degree and/or a stable position. The funding associated with these awards was used to undertake research, visit outside institutions, or pursue an advanced degree. The term “fellowship” was the only one used across all Rockefeller-endowed organizations. As a result, it accounts for the largest share of awards both within each organization and across all organizations.

**Scholarship**

With a term of up to six months, scholarships were granted to individuals pursuing undergraduate or graduate studies at a college, university, or technical institute. They did not necessarily require recipients to conduct research. Overall, scholarships (as opposed to fellowships) tended to be granted in fields, regions, and countries that Rockefeller-endowed organizations deemed less prestigious.

The General Education Board, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, and some divisions of the Rockefeller Foundation all developed scholarship programs tailored to specific fields, regions, or audiences.

- The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial awarded a set of scholarships to individuals undertaking research or training in the context of its Child Study and Parental Development Program. Almost all the recipients were women.
- The General Education Board launched a scholarship program in 1943 for individuals whose academic achievements were “below the M.A.” level. After the corresponding budget line was removed in 1949, the initiative was rebranded as the New Scholarship Program (see Special Tags).

---

11 Executive Meeting, January 1943, General Education Board records, series 1, subseries 2, box 232, folder 2349, Rockefeller Archive Center, New York, NY.
The Rockefeller Foundation described the mobility awards granted by its China Medical Board as “scholarships” when they were announced in 1914.\textsuperscript{12} Between 1914 and 1924, they were bestowed on some 20 Chinese nurses and pharmacists, most of whom were starting or continuing studies abroad. The organization would go on to adopt the same term for training awards granted to agricultural technicians and engineers from Mexico (1944–1950) and Latin America (1951–1969). Finally, the database contains references to another set of Rockefeller Foundation scholarships granted between 1957 and 1971 under the Special Expanded Program for men and women from Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and Africa.\textsuperscript{13} Although we have not conducted a detailed comparison of the 292 scholarships and 352 fellowships associated with the program, the term “scholarship” appears to have been reserved for awards granted to individuals who did not hold a graduate degree.

By contrast, the International Education Board, with its focus on scientific excellence (Director Wickliffe Rose famously spoke of “Making the peaks higher”) never granted any scholarships. Once again, this suggests that scholarships were considered less prestigious than fellowships.

**Professor**

This **Type** value covers several related categories used by different Rockefeller-endowed organizations.

- The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial granted awards to “guests” and “visiting professors.” Such “authorities” were invited to the United States for consultations with the organization’s officers and visits to prominent institutions.\textsuperscript{14} Such exchanges lasted no longer than a year.
- The International Education Board granted a limited number of “traveling professorships” to individuals it considered “distinguished scientists.”\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{12} China Mission Board Meeting, 11 December 1914, Rockefeller Foundation records, record group 4, series 1.1, box 7, folder 78, Rockefeller Archive Center, New York, NY. Thanks to Sonya Grypma who provided this reference.


\textsuperscript{14} Analysis of Fellowships Granted by Rockefeller Boards, 1925, General Education Board records, series 1, subseries 2, box 195, folder 1848, page 14, Rockefeller Archive Center, New York, NY.

\textsuperscript{15} Analysis of Fellowships Granted by Rockefeller Boards, 1925, General Education Board records, series 1, subseries 2, box 195, folder 1848, page 11, Rockefeller Archive Center, New York, NY.
The International Education Board granted awards to two “exchange professors” who traded positions for a year.

The main factors considered by organizations when using the subtypes grouped under Professor appear to have been whether the recipients were professors or held a senior position at their home institution; and whether they would lead research (as opposed to pursue studies, undertake observations, or conduct research under the supervision of someone else) at the host institution. To locate specific subtypes, database users can search for “exchange,” “traveling,” etc. in the Special Tags field.

**Training Award**

Starting in 1957, with its Special Expanded Program, the Rockefeller Foundation began granting what it described as “training awards” to men and women from Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and Africa. It is not entirely clear what differentiated these new awards from the existing categories. Indeed, the backgrounds of several training award recipients were very similar to those of fellowship and scholarship recipients. However, 28 training awards (out of a total of 53) were granted to Indonesian trade union officials with no academic credentials, all of whom attended the Training Institute of the International Ladies’ Garment Workers’ Union in New York City and observed union work in several different countries. This suggests the term “training award” may have been used to distinguish these recipients from the postsecondary students and academics who usually received fellowships and scholarships.

Frequency table for Type (no value = 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fellowship</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Training Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12,172</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Granting Organization**

As shown in the table below, the Rockefeller Foundation and three other independent organizations endowed by the Rockefeller family were responsible for funding, granting, and managing a grand total of 14,647 awards over the period covered by the database. The unbalanced distribution of awards across these different organizations reflects multiple factors. To begin with, the Rockefeller Foundation received the largest endowment. Furthermore, notwithstanding some degree of overlap and collaboration, each organization had its own
sphere of action. Finally, the organizations’ life spans ranged from just a few years to more than half a century.

In the case of awards granted by organizations other than the Rockefeller Foundation, the name of the granting organization was usually typed in red ink on the permanent recorder card. We relied on this information (or its absence, in the case of awards granted by the Rockefeller Foundation) when assigning Granting Organization values, except in the case of obvious errors (i.e., where an award was associated with an organization that no longer existed).

**RF = Rockefeller Foundation**

The Rockefeller Foundation was responsible for more than two thirds of all awards in the database. It granted awards to individuals worldwide who were active in fields ranging from radio broadcasting and drama to nuclear physics and nursing. However, it mainly focused on public health, agriculture, and biomedicine. The database covers fellowships, scholarships, and training awards granted by the Rockefeller Foundation between 1914 and 1970.

Database users should note that the China Medical Board was part of the Rockefeller Foundation when it was created in 1914. After becoming independent in 1928, it continued administering medical education and public health programs in China under the same name. However, mobility awards granted by the new, self-governing organization were not covered by our sources and have therefore not been included in the database.

Although the Rockefeller Foundation continued to grant mobility awards after 1970 (and still does), later recipients were not covered by our sources. However, we were successful in identifying more than 2,000 (24% of the total) granted during the period covered by the database that were not listed in the Rockefeller Foundation’s 1972 *Directory of Fellowships and Scholarships 1917-1970*. These included scholarships received by Mexican agricultural engineers and technicians who attended American universities during the 1940s; fellowships and scholarships granted by the China Medical Board between 1914 and the end of 1928 (when the organization became independent from the Rockefeller Foundation); fellowships and scholarships granted during the Cold War to individuals living in countries ruled by communist regimes (the organization had ceased announcing such awards and/or corresponding with such recipients as early as 1946-1947; accordingly, they were not listed in the *Directory*); awards that were granted but not taken up (due to illness or death, immigration issues, failure to meet language requirements, marriage, career choices, etc.); and a small number of cases that were
simply overlooked by those responsible for preparing the *Directory* but for which permanent
recorder cards exist.

Users should note that the number of awards in the database for a particular year sometimes
differs from the figure provided in the corresponding Rockefeller Foundation annual report: one
more award in 1970, one fewer in 1967, four more in 1961, etc. The discrepancies become
significantly larger in the late 1950s: for 1958 and 1959, the number of awards in the database
exceeds the figure listed in the annual reports by 115 and 98, respectively. Aside from the fact
that the annual reports appear to have omitted figures for newly granted scholarship-type
awards, we have been unable to determine the reason behind these differences.

**GEB = General Education Board**

The General Education Board was responsible for granting the second-largest number of
awards (17.62% of the total) in the database. Incorporated in 1903, the organization was given
a mandate to develop elementary and secondary education in the Southern United States. It
quickly expanded the scope of its activities in the region to include postsecondary education,
with a strong emphasis on agriculture and medicine. In its early days, the General Education
Board bestowed a number of “scholarships” to a number of young students of education in the
South but their beneficiaries were not systematically recorded. Following a 1921 pilot project in
North Carolina, the General Education Board decided in May 1922 that it would be granting
“fellowships and scholarships open to persons having definite opportunities for leadership in the
field of education” in the Southern United States.\(^{16}\) This program was consistently managed
along racial lines. Indeed, the distinction between White and Black Southerners was pervasive
in all the sources we consulted (guidelines, budgets, reports, etc.). In 1933, the General
Education Board launched a nationwide fellowship program for postsecondary research. The
organization continued independently granting awards to researchers in the field of child study
until 1941 and in the field of general education until 1943. Awards to researchers in medicine,
the natural sciences, and the humanities were granted in collaboration with the Rockefeller
Foundation (which was already active in these areas) until 1936. During this time and after it
ceased granting fellowships nationwide, the General Education Board maintained its programs
focused on education and agriculture in the Southern United States.

\(^{16}\) 25 May 1922 meeting, cited in Dockets June 1923-February 1924, General Education Board records,
record groupe 03, box 15, Rockefeller Archive Center, New York, NY.
Database users should note that although the General Education Board granted awards almost exclusively to Americans for study in the United States, a small number of cases involved foreign recipients or foreign study by Americans.

IEB = International Education Board

The International Education Board was responsible for 4.31% of the total number of awards. Established in 1923, the organization operated for five years. Although it focused on funding research in the natural sciences in Europe and the United States, it also granted mobility awards in mathematics and physics. When its activities ceased at the end of 1928, amid a general reorganization of Rockefeller-endowed organizations, the International Education Board’s budget and programs were transferred to the Rockefeller Foundation. Users should note that the database includes 167 awards willingly left out of the Rockefeller Foundation’s Directory of Fellowships and Scholarships 1917-1970 because their recipients were based in so-called Iron Curtain countries (mainly the USSR and Eastern European nations). The Directory lists only 416 awards, compared to a total of 583 in the database (40% more).

LSRM = Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial

Incorporated in 1918, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial initially made charitable donations to religious organizations. Then, in 1924, it launched an ambitious program to support university research in the social sciences, along with work in the fields of child study, parental education, and interracial relations. The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial operated its mobility award program until the end of 1928, when the organization was shut down. At that time, the organization’s budget and programs were transferred to the Rockefeller Foundation (social sciences) and to the Spelman Fund of New York (child study and interracial relations).

The awards granted by the organization between 1924 and 1928 represent 2.44% of database records. Along with 178 previously acknowledged mobility awards, our list has added several “guest” and “visiting professor” awards, bringing the total number of awards granted for social science research to 192. Furthermore, the database includes 160 Laura Spelman Rockefeller

17 References to these two other award types were found in Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial records, series 3, subseries 3.06, box 51, folder 347 and box 52, folder 348, as well as in European Fellowships, 1917-1943, Rockefeller Foundation Papers, record group 1.2, series 100, box 43, folder 319, Rockefeller Archive Center, New York, NY.
Memorial fellowships and scholarships granted in the fields of child study and parental education. We found references to these additional awards—which are not included in any directories or indexes—in a variety of sources. However, the COVID-19 pandemic prevented us from fully documenting recipients in the field of interracial relations.

Frequency table for **Granting Organization** (no value = 0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Granting Organization</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education Board</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Board</td>
<td>2,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Foundation</td>
<td>11,078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Division**

The Rockefeller Foundation was the largest, wealthiest, and longest-lasting of the Rockefeller-endowed organizations covered by the database. It also boasted the most robust administrative structure. And although, in theory, the different organizations all had separate units led by officers responsible for specific areas of activity, the Rockefeller Foundation was the only one where this division of labor was truly put into practice. Accordingly, each Rockefeller Foundation unit had its own staff, budget, and policies. Known as “boards,” “divisions,” and sometimes “programs,” these units generally worked together to coordinate their efforts. However, they also competed for appropriations within the Rockefeller Foundation and sometimes for prominence within shared fields of activity. For many years, each unit was simply named for its thematic and/or geographic mandate: Medical Sciences, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, Humanities, China Program, International Health, etc. For the corresponding database field, we adopted the term most frequently used in our sources: **Division**.

There were many changes to the mandates of Rockefeller Foundation divisions between 1914 and 1971. Major reorganizations (1929, 1955) and even year-to-year adjustments saw entire

---

18 We consulted CVs, letters of appointment, correspondence, and lists contained in the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial records and the Spelman Fund of New York records.
areas of activity shifted from one division to another. For example, three different divisions were
given responsibility for nursing awards between 1927 and 1933. As a result, we found it
impossible to draw a classic tree-shaped organizational chart. There were simply too many
intersecting branches. Instead, we want to propose two alternative ways of understanding the
evolution and trajectory of Rockefeller Foundation divisions.

First, consider the approach followed in the 1972 Rockefeller Foundation’s Directory of
Fellowships and Scholarships 1917-1970.

Listing of Rockefeller Foundation Divisions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Designations</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHB</td>
<td>International Health Board, 1917-1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHD</td>
<td>International Health Division, 1927-1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMPH</td>
<td>Medicine and Public Health, 1951-1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEPH</td>
<td>Medical Education and Public Health, 1955-1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNS</td>
<td>Medical and Natural Sciences, 1959-1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical Research and Medical Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DME</td>
<td>Division of Medical Education, 1919-1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Division of Studies, 1923-1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Medical Sciences, 1929-1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMPH</td>
<td>Medicine and Public Health, 1951-1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEPH</td>
<td>Medical Education and Public Health, 1955-1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMR</td>
<td>Biological and Medical Research, 1955-1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNS</td>
<td>Medical and Natural Sciences, 1959-1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Natural Sciences, 1929-1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSA</td>
<td>Natural Sciences and Agriculture, 1951-1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMR</td>
<td>Biological and Medical Research, 1955-1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNS</td>
<td>Medical and Natural Sciences, 1959-1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agricultural Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSA</td>
<td>Natural Sciences and Agriculture, 1951-1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Agriculture, 1955-1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Agricultural Sciences, 1959-1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Social Sciences, 1929-1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>Humanities and Social Sciences, 1962-1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humanities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Humanities, 1929-1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>Humanities and Social Sciences, 1962-1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWF</td>
<td>Post War Fellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Here, the organizational structure of the Rockefeller Foundation is presented in terms of major programs and fields of activity, along with a highly comprehensive list of acronyms used by the organization over the years. However, this approach does not reflect how the term “division”
was actually used by the organization, nor could it provide the level of consistency, coherence, or thoroughness required for the database. For instance, because of the policy (first adopted in the late 1940s) not to publicly mention awards granted to recipients from communist countries, the Directory overlooks both the activities of the China Medical Board before it became an independent organization (1914-1928) and those of the separate China Program, another Rockefeller Foundation unit that operated from 1935 and 1946. Conversely, the list shown above mentions postwar fellowships (“PWD –Post War Fellow”), which were not overseen by a separate division. Rather, they were managed by the Rockefeller Foundation’s Humanities Division. Furthermore, the approach used in the Directory makes it impossible to clearly assign an award to the unit that granted it. Specifically, it indicates the life span of individual units in years, creating considerable chronological overlap. In fact, many awards are listed under units that had yet to be created or had ceased to exist at the time the award was granted. Nor does the Directory appear to have used a coherent or consistent method for assigning awards to units in years when new units were established or existing ones were dissolved. For these reasons, we decided to assign values to the Division field based on our own generational analysis of Rockefeller Foundation units that had their own budget, staff, and policies. To begin with, this involved compiling a comprehensive list of such units that existed at some point between 1914 and 1970, based on information available in annual reports and other sources. New units usually came into existence on January 1, May 1, or June 1—based on accounting practices or other administrative considerations that we were unable to fully grasp. We then linked each award to a unit that existed on the date it received approval from a Rockefeller-endowed organization (in most cases, this date is provided on the corresponding permanent recorder cards).

The following table illustrates the results of our analysis, showing the years when the relevant units were established or dissolved (including the month, where available).

### Years of Activity for Rockefeller Foundation Divisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CMB</th>
<th>IHB</th>
<th>DME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of post-war fellowships in other fields, the Rockefeller Foundation worked through third-party organizations, such as the Social Science Research Council.
With just nine exceptions, we were able to associate a division with every award granted by the Rockefeller Foundation. For all the other awards, we entered the value **NA**. The following graph summarizes the distribution of awards by division.
Countries Visited

This field provides basic information on the extent of travel by individuals who received awards from Rockefeller-endowed organizations. The values in the Countries Visited field refer to the number of countries visited by each recipient (collecting data on individual cities would have been impractical). Based on the information provided by permanent recorder cards, we assigned one of three possible values: One country, Two countries, or More (than two countries). In most cases, the countries in question corresponded to those of host institutions where recipients pursued studies or conducted research. We disregarded countries visited solely for the purpose of attending a conference. The value NO_INFO was entered when we had no solid ground to determine a number of countries visited. Note that we entered a value in Countries Visited when it was available, including in cases where the award was not taken or canceled (see Disrupted Term).
The key criterion for counting a country was whether the recipient’s visit was in some way sponsored by a Rockefeller-endowed organization. We only considered instances where recipients paid their own expenses if they were in receipt of an award-related stipend at the time of the visit. By contrast, in cases where recipients independently arranged and paid for travel to additional destinations (e.g., on their return home, above and beyond the cost of the return ticket covered by the Rockefeller-endowed organization), we did not count any additional countries visited unless additional funding was provided for the purpose.

Nor did we count countries that were merely mentioned as potential destinations (without any details on actual travel), since any travel financed by Rockefeller-endowed organizations was normally meticulously documented on permanent recorder cards.

Finally, we left the field empty in cases where a permanent recorder card was obviously missing its final page(s), where travel details would normally appear.

For information on the standardization of country names, see the relevant section under Benefitting Country.

### Frequency table for Countries Visited (no value=74)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One country</th>
<th>Two countries</th>
<th>More than two countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td>11,628</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>1,166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appointment Year

Appointment was the final stage in the process of granting an award, pursuant to a decision made at a meeting of the relevant committee (the approval process varied across the different Rockefeller-endowed organizations. The year (and sometimes the exact date) of a decision was usually indicated on the corresponding permanent recorder card.

We turned to other sources when permanent recorder cards failed to provide adequate information. For instance, we relied on information available in the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Records to determine Appointment Year values for awards granted by this
organization in the mid-1920s. The corresponding permanent recorder cards were created after the fact and did not include this information.20

Altogether, we were able to determine an **Appointment Year** value for 99.6% of awards (the others have a NO_INFO value). We decided to only record the year because it was almost always available - days and months were sometimes missing.

Database users should note that **Appointment Year** values do not necessarily correspond to the year when an award term began. In the case of appointments made in the late fall, the start of the award term often coincided with the start of the following academic year, which fell in the following calendar year. By contrast, in the case of appointments made in the winter or spring, the **Appointment Year** value and the year of the **Start Date** are usually the same.

### Appointment Age

The **Appointment Age** value consists of the age of the fellow at the time of the award. It was either mentioned on permanent recorder cards or we obtained it by the difference between the year of birth and the **Appointment Date** value. When not available, we entered a 0000 value (435 instances)

### Start Date

Whenever possible, we entered a **Start Date** value based on the information provided on most permanent recorder cards under “First Stipend” or “Begins.”

In cases where the permanent recorder card did not include one of these headings, we relied on the information provided under “Arrival Date.” This was the date on which a recipient arrived in the host country. Most often provided for recipients who visited the United States, this information was likely collected for use by immigration authorities. During our research, we

---

20 Rockefeller Archive Center, Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial records, Series 3, subseries 3.06, box 51, folder 347 “Foreign fellowships- yellow sheet (A-H)” et “Foreign fellowships- yellow sheet (I-Z)”
noted that in cases where both an “Arrival Date” and a “First Stipend” or “Begins” date were recorded, they were often identical. Otherwise, they tended to differ by only a few days.

In the case of cards that failed to provide a day and month but nevertheless indicated the year when the award term began, we entered only the year.

We were able to associate a Start Date value with about 95% of the awards in the database. A 0000 value was entered in cases where no relevant information was available and where an award was canceled before the term began. Remember than when only the month is available, any calculation of the Duration of Term has a one month margin of error.

In the case of about 60% of awards with a Start Date value, the award term began in August, September or October—a reflection of how strongly the academic calendar shaped the itineraries of recipients.

End Date

Most permanent recorder cards contained a “Termination” or “Ended” heading, under which a full date corresponding to the end of the award term was normally provided.

We entered an End Date value even in the following cases, where the information provided on the permanent recorder card was incomplete:

1. Some cards, especially those corresponding to awards granted by the General Education Board, provided imprecise information (e.g., “fall,” “winter”). Where such a card provided precise information for both Start Date and Duration, it was possible to calculate at least a month and/or year for the End Date value. However, without a specific day indicated for the start of the award term, any End Date values determined in this way have a one-month margin of error.

21 For more information on permanent recorder cards and their headings, see Pierre-Yves Saunier, “History 5*7: A material history of ‘fellowship recorder cards’ in Rockefeller-endowed philanthropic organizations.” unpublished, temporarily available at https://www.dropbox.com/s/ex17mkb1dfvi9e3/History%205*7%20revised%20january%202022%20version.docx?dl=0
2. In the case of cards that did not include a “Termination” or “Ended” date, we relied on the information provided under “Departure Date,” that is to say the date when recipients left the host country. Most often provided for recipients who visited the United States, this information was likely collected for use by immigration authorities. During our research, we noted that in cases where both a “Departure Date” and a “Termination” or “Ended” date were recorded, they were often identical. Otherwise, they tended to differ by only a few days (and occasionally by a couple of weeks). Accordingly, we used “Departure Date” entries as a source for End Date values in cases where no “Termination” or “Ended” date was provided.

We were able to associate an End Date value with about 92% of the awards in the database. A 0000 value was entered for awards where no information was available and for awards that were canceled before the start of the award term.

In the case of about 60% of awards with an End Date value, the award term ended in June, July, August, or September—a reflection of how strongly the academic calendar shaped the itineraries of recipients.

Duration of Term

The Duration of Term field indicates the length of the award term in months. We rounded the values to the nearest month based on whether the remainder of the award term was greater or less than 15 days. For example, the Duration of Term value for an award with a term of 6 months and 10 days was entered as 6 months, whereas the value for an award with a term of 11 months and 20 days was entered as 12 months. However, we retained figures expressed in half-months on permanent recorder cards.

We determined Duration of Term values in one of two ways. In cases where the permanent recorder card included a “Duration” heading, we entered the corresponding information so long as it was reasonable (renewals, extensions, and major interruptions sometimes required corrections to this information). In cases where the permanent recorder card lacked a “Duration” heading, we calculated a Duration of Term value based on the award’s Start Date and End Date values. If no such information was available, we entered 0000.
Dozens of General Education Board permanent recorder cards, for awards granted between 1924 and 1933, presented a special challenge. Instead of a “Duration” or “Begins” heading, they provided inconsistent and imprecise information expressed in terms such as “consecutive semester,” “one term,” “two quarters,” “fall,” “year,” “school year,” “academic year,” “summer term,” or “[X] weeks.” To begin with, although the meaning of the other units appeared stable, that of the word “term” fluctuated. Depending on the context, it might refer to a “quarter,” a “semester,” or a “trimester.” Furthermore, different American colleges and universities defined quarters, trimesters, and semesters differently during the interwar years.

For the purposes of calculating Duration of Term values, we consistently defined the various terms used as follows:

- “academic year,” “school year,” “year,” “year (scholastic)” = 9 months
- “summer term,” “summer session” = 3 months
- “semester” = 4.5 months
- “Quarter” = 3 months
- “6 weeks” = 1.5 months
- “7 weeks” = 2 months

However, when a permanent recorder card used the word “term” but provided no additional information to indicate whether it was in reference to a semester, a quarter, or a specific number of months or weeks, we entered 0000 in the Duration of Term field.

We were able to confidently establish a Duration of Term value for about 92% of the awards in the database. A 0000 value was entered for 1,122 awards: some of them had insufficient information (mostly from the General Education Board or the Rockefeller Foundation’s China Medical Board), some because they were canceled before the start of the award term.

Extension

The Extension field indicates whether an award was extended or renewed. It has three possible values: Yes, No, or N/A. The latter value (not applicable) was entered for awards that were not taken (see Disrupted Award, below). A NO_INFO value was entered in cases where the other values did not apply.
Recipients or their tutors, several months into their award term, could apply for an extension by explaining why they needed one. The officers of the relevant Rockefeller-endowed organization would decide whether to grant the extension, in consultation with the recipient, the host institution, and the organization’s staff. An extension could be denied for any number of reasons, and such a refusal did not necessarily mean that the granting organization was dissatisfied with the recipient’s work. On the other hand, approval of an extension generally reflected satisfaction with the recipient’s work during the initial award term, which was often considered as a trial period during which recipients were expected to demonstrate their suitability before additional support was granted.

The term “extension” was often used on permanent recorder cards to indicate that an award term had been extended by a portion of its initial length, whereas “renewal” was mainly used in situations where the term was extended by its initial length. However, since we could not establish a truly consistent pattern of usage, we decided to record all instances where an award was extended beyond its initial term under a single Extension field. Furthermore, although the word “renewal,” “extension,” “renewed,” or “extended” was sometimes printed in red, permanent recorder cards could also indicate award extensions in less obvious ways.

We did not consider “supplementary awards” when determining Extension field values. Such awards were designed to allow recipients to extend their time at the host institution for thesis writing purposes. We were unable to determine why some supplementary awards were documented on separate permanent recorder cards, whereas others were simply noted on a card corresponding to an existing award (as in the case of extensions and renewals).

Thirty-four percent of the awards in the database were renewed or extended, for anywhere between a few weeks and twelve months. Not all recipients were willing or able to accept an extension; several had to leave their host institution for personal reasons or at the request of their home institution.

Database users should also note that an award could be extended or renewed multiple times (as many as five). Furthermore, recipients could remain at their destination or host institution for a few days beyond the end of the award term without formal approval. We carefully reviewed the relevant permanent recorder cards to verify the circumstances of any such informal extensions, so as not to identify them as “real” extensions.
Frequency table for Extension (no value=91)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>4,988</td>
<td>8,695</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disrupted Term**

Some recipients could not accept their awards, while others had to abandon theirs at some point before the end of the term. Often, these situations were the result of mental or physical illness, changes in personal circumstances (e.g., marriage, family crises, career choices), and geopolitical events (e.g., war, political upheaval). However, academic results and immigration restrictions could also be factors.

On the permanent recorder cards for these awards, handwritten entries were sometimes made at the top of the first page specifying that the award had been “rescinded” or “canceled,” that it had “lapsed”, or that the recipient “resigned”. In other cases, we had to dig through the card’s content to find indications that an award had been “canceled” or “suspended.” In any case, we consistently relied on permanent recorder cards when determining whether an award term was completed, to the exclusion of all other sources.

It took some time to make sense of all the relevant descriptions included on permanent recorder cards. Initially, we tried to distinguish between awards marked as “rescinded” or “canceled” and those marked as “lapsed.” We assumed the difference lay in whether any portion of the award term had been completed. However, we quickly realized that the different card entries reflected no such distinction, and we struggled to clearly interpret additional comments like “interrupted” and “voided.” We also came to recognize that the use of these words was likely based on accounting considerations that we were unable to fully grasp.

Ultimately, we decided that the key consideration was simply whether an award failed to follow its expected course (without distinguishing between awards that were never taken up and those whose term remained unfinished). We therefore entered Yes in the Disrupted Term field for any award described as “rescinded/canceled,” “lapsed”, or when the card mentioned that the award was interrupted before its planned term. Such cases accounted for about 5% of all awards in the database.
Frequency table for **Disrupted Term** (no value=0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>745</td>
<td>13,905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Tags**

Permanent recorder cards, our main source of data, consist of 5-inch-by-7-inch index cards.\(^2^2\) Clerical staff at Rockefeller-endowed organizations managed to crowd a lot of information onto such a small surface. In fact, certain subsets of cards (relating to specific organizations, time periods, groups of awards, or groups of recipients) contain information that simply does not fit under the standard headings used by the Rockefeller Foundation between 1914 and 1970. These annotations were normally typed (and occasionally handwritten) in the upper left-hand or right-hand margin of a card.

Some of them reflect the use and management of permanent recorder cards by successive generations of clerical staff at Rockefeller-endowed organizations (e.g., tallies, IBM punch card system processing codes, accounting references). Although these kinds of information would be valuable to researchers interested in how the organizations developed and managed their programming, we chose not to include them in the database due to limited time and resources. What we did record, in the **Special Tags** field, were selected annotations that provided additional information on awards and/or their recipients.

We recorded such information for about two-thirds of the awards in the database. Many of the remaining awards had characteristics matching the annotations included on other permanent recorder cards. In most of these cases, we were unable to pinpoint a reason why these annotations had not been added to the cards in question: a specific annotation might not yet have been in use when a particular card was created, it might have fallen out of use, the staff involved might not have been aware of its meaning (some cards were created years or even decades after an award was granted), or there may simply have been an oversight.

\(^{22}\) On the history of these documents, see Pierre-Yves Saunier, “History 5x7: Biography of a Source, Source for Prosopography. Permanent Recorder Cards at Rockefeller-Endowed Organizations 1914-1970”, to be published at [https://rockfellows.hypotheses.org/](https://rockfellows.hypotheses.org/)
Abbreviations, acronyms, alternate phrasings, and synonyms made for a wide array of often overlapping annotations. To ensure some coherence, we adopted the following three principles for transferring annotations from permanent recorder cards to the **Special Tags** field of the database.

1. We never recorded a **Special Tags** value in cases where the permanent recorder card had no annotations. This applied even when information provided elsewhere on the card suggested that the award matched one of the **Special Tags** values listed below.

2. When consolidating annotations, we relied on knowledge acquired during data entry, through the consultation of other primary sources (annual reports, officers' diaries, correspondence, meeting minutes, memorandums), and from the rich scholarly literature on the history of Rockefeller-endowed organizations. For instance, confident that the annotations “nurse” and “nursing” had been used interchangeably, we consolidated them under **Nursing**.

3. When standardizing **Special Tags** values, we endeavored to retain the wording of the annotations used on the cards themselves.

Users should note that individual database entries often have multiple **Special Tags** values, sometimes belonging to the same category. It is also important to remember that, as explained above, many cards did not include any annotations, despite the fact that the corresponding awards had characteristics matching annotations used elsewhere.

The following is a comprehensive list of the values used, including a brief explanation for each one. Although we have divided them into categories for the purposes of this document (Subtype, Domains, Duration, Financial Details, Management, Recipient Characteristics, Program), these headings do not appear in the database itself. A **NO_INFO** value was entered when no **Special Tags** were retained.

**Subtype**

These values indicate the types of activities undertaken by an award recipient.
**Research (n = 1,247)**

This value identifies cases where recipients undertook a defined research project involving fieldwork, library or archival research, interviews, etc. The monthly stipend for *Research* awards was higher than for *Training* awards.

First appearing in 1927, the “Research” annotation was essentially abandoned in 1957 (except for one appearance in 1969 and another in 1970). Although primarily used by the Rockefeller Foundation, it also appeared on cards produced by the General Education Board between 1933 and 1942, in the context of the latter organization’s nationwide fellowship program (conducted in cooperation with the Rockefeller Foundation). It was used for awards described as either “fellowships” or “scholarships.”

**Training (n = 1,531)**

This value identifies cases where recipients spent most of their time at one or more postsecondary institutions (studying for a degree or taking a defined set of courses), or at one or more organizations active in a specific domain (e.g., a theater company, a radio station, an art gallery). The monthly stipend for *Training* awards was lower than for *Research* awards.

First appearing in 1926, the “Training” annotation was abandoned in 1956. Although it was primarily used by the Rockefeller Foundation, it also appeared on cards produced by the General Education Board in the context of the organization’s nationwide fellowship program (see *Research*) and its core Southern Program (sporadically, starting in 1929, and more regularly after 1934).

**Special (n = 683)**

This value identifies cases where the recipient held a position or collected a regular stipend before receiving their award. There was no limit on the stipends associated with such awards. Rather, funding was tailored to the needs of each recipient. Since the awards in question involved either research or postsecondary studies, *Special* often appears alongside *Research* or *Training*.

Used on permanent recorder cards from 1919 to 1970, the “Special” annotation only appeared sporadically after 1964. Although it was primarily used by the Rockefeller Foundation, it also
appeared on cards produced by the General Education Board in the context of its nationwide fellowship program (see Research) and its core Southern Program (starting in 1933).

**Experience** (n = 10)

When the General Education Board launched a nationwide fellowship program (see Research), it followed Rockefeller Foundation practice by distinguishing between “research” and “training” awards. The former were occasionally described as “fellowships for experience.”

**Advanced** (n = 90)

This value primarily identifies three specific groups of recipients who were already established, fully trained professionals. The corresponding awards were designed to allow these individuals to update or expand their expertise. The first group consisted of 52 medical school faculty members who received a General Education Board fellowship between 1922 and 1930 to pursue advanced university studies in Europe. A second group was made up of 13 senior nurses who received a fellowship to attend a custom nursing education program at Columbia University’s Teachers College. The final group contained 19 of the 34 medical school faculty members and hospital employees selected by the General Education Board for the medicine component of its nationwide fellowship program (see Research).23

**Exchange** (n = 8)

This value only applies to a small number of awards granted by the International Education Board. The corresponding recipients—one pair of “professors” and three pairs of “fellows”—traded positions for a term of between 10 and 12 months. All these exchanges involved institutions in Great Britain and the United States.

---

23 We were unable to determine the criteria used to define awards whose permanent recorder cards included the annotation “Advanced”. Recipient profiles, stipend amounts, and activities tended to be very similar to other awards.
**Traveling** (n = 32)

This value identifies recipients of a “traveling professorship” from the International Education Board. Such awards were designed to allow “distinguished scientists to travel to other countries, not for the purpose of completing their training by a period of concentrated study, but in order to meet their colleagues of equally advanced standing and exchange professional experience as it relates to problems and technique.”

**Visiting** (n = 32)

This Special Tags value was only entered for awards that have a Professor Type value. The corresponding annotation appeared on cards prepared by both the International Education Board and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial.

The latter organization funded two categories of Visiting professors:

1. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial envoys, charged with studying or managing the recruitment of award applicants, especially in Europe,
2. Guests of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial in the United States, who were largely free to design their own program (lecturing, conducting research, meeting with colleagues, visiting research centers and government agencies, etc.).

In the case of the International Education Board, although we were unsure of the basis for distinguishing between “visiting” and “traveling” professors, we did not want to assume the two annotations were synonymous. Some “visiting” professors were given a mandate that involved a lot of travel, although the “visiting” dimension remained the defining feature of their award.

**Travel** (n = 3)

We found the “Travel” annotation rather surprising, since most recipients traveled at some point during their award term to conduct research, pursue training, meet with peers, and visit academic institutions or professional societies. Indeed, travel was the very aim of many awards, whose recipients followed an itinerary prepared in consultation with the officers of Rockefeller-endowed organizations and academic supervisors. And yet, three Rockefeller Foundation permanent recorder cards specifically note that an award was a “traveling fellowship” or “travel

---

24 Fellowships Annual Reports, 1925, Rockefeller Foundation records, record group 1.2, series 100 E, box 37, folder 278, Rockefeller Archive Center, New York, NY.
fellowship.” We found nothing in the profiles or activities of the recipients that set these cases apart, but nevertheless decided to create a **Travel Special Tag** value for these three cases.

One of the awards in question was granted in 1922 and the two others in 1923, during a period when the Rockefeller Foundation was developing and expanding its mobility award programs. This suggests that the erratic use of the annotation may reflect a context where the Rockefeller Foundation’s system for naming awards was still developing.

**Domain**

These values indicate the sphere of knowledge or activity associated with an award. The corresponding annotations were used on permanent recorder cards in two ways:

1. To identify a specific field among those covered by a Rockefeller Foundation division.

2. To distinguish between different fields covered by the General Education Board’s nationwide fellowship program, which ran from 1933 to 1942.

**Agriculture**
- Rockefeller Foundation (n = 75)

**Nursing**
- Rockefeller Foundation (n = 1,009)
- General Education Board (n = 1)

**Medicine**
- General Education Board (n = 35)

**Child Study**
- General Education Board (n = 54)

**Humanities**
- General Education Board (n = 59)

**General Education**
- General Education Board (n = 119)

**Natural Sciences**
- General Education Board (n = 48)
Human Biology
- Rockefeller Foundation (n = 1)

Mental Hygiene
- Rockefeller Foundation (n = 1)

Psychiatry
- Rockefeller Foundation (n = 10)

Scientific Management
- Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (n = 1)

Advanced study for members of medical school staffs
- General Education Board (n = 52)

Duration

Short-Term (n = 28)

In the 1930s, the General Education Board granted several “short term” fellowships covering a specific portion of the academic year (e.g., summer session, one or two semesters).

Part Time (n = 1)

One individual who received a seven-month fellowship had his courses organized in such a way that he only had to attend two days per week. This allowed the recipient to keep his existing job. We found this arrangement unique enough to merit its own Special Tag value.

Financial Details

Tuition-Only (n = 149)

Between 1936 and 1949, some employees of the United States Public Health Service received Rockefeller Foundation fellowships that only covered tuition costs. Instead of an award stipend, these individuals continued to receive their salary from the United States Public Health Service for the duration of the award term.

Management

These values provide information on the specific body that granted or oversaw an award.
**XX Admin** (n = 24)

These values indicate the Rockefeller Foundation division responsible for overseeing awards granted through the China Program in the late 1930s.

**Granted by the XX Office** (n = 224)

The Rockefeller Foundation established several international field offices between 1914 and 1970. Locations included Belem in Brazil, New Delhi and Bangalore in India, Bogota and Cali in Colombia, Mexico City in Mexico, Ankara in Turkey, and Manila in the Philippines. Along with the Paris field office in France, the Shanghai and Beijing field offices in China held special significance because of the autonomy they enjoyed before World War II. For instance, the importance of the Paris office was reflected in its power to grant awards with terms of up to a year and a value of up to $3,000 without approval from Rockefeller Foundation headquarters in New York. During the 1920s and 1930s, Paris was the hub for the activities of all Rockefeller-endowed organizations in Europe. All Rockefeller Foundation divisions had a permanent representative in Paris, and a committee of these officers had the authority to make award appointments. The annotation “Granted by the Paris office” appeared on permanent recorder cards produced between 1929 and 1933. However, for reasons we were unable to determine, it was not added to every card related to an appointment approved in Paris.

The “Granted by XX Office” annotation also appeared on cards for awards approved by the “Peiping” or “China” offices maintained by the Rockefeller Foundation’s Natural Sciences Division between 1931 and 1933.

**Health Commission Funds** (n = 111)

In July 1940, the Rockefeller Foundation established its Health Commission to Europe, which was mandated to address public health issues on that continent. Early in 1941, the agency’s name was shortened to Health Commission and its mandate was expanded to include war emergency activities worldwide. Funds were managed by the International Health Division. Starting in 1945, a portion of the Health Commission’s funding was earmarked for fellowships, which continued to be granted until 1948.

---

25 For more information on the Paris office, see [https://dimes.rockarch.org/collections/Q25Z4ybRnksbkx2pyQU5ac](https://dimes.rockarch.org/collections/Q25Z4ybRnksbkx2pyQU5ac).
**Mr. Gunn’s Special Appropriation** (n = 5)

Selskar Gunn was already a fixture at the Rockefeller Foundation when he developed an integrated “rural reconstruction” program for North China. The China Program, as it came to be known, was approved in 1934 and initiated in July 1935. Some forty-one China Program fellowships were granted and overseen by the Rockefeller Foundation, in addition to hundreds of local awards granted through the North China Council for Rural Reconstruction (permanent recorder cards were not produced for local awards; see Type, above). The “Mr. Gunn’s Special Appropriation” annotation appeared on a few permanent recorder cards associated with the China Program, suggesting that additional sums had been placed at his disposal.

**National Research Council** (n = 152)

The National Research Council was a major partner of Rockefeller-endowed organizations in the United States. Like the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies, this agency was able to manage its own fellowship program thanks to generous grants from Rockefeller-endowed organizations. In addition, several National Research Council committees participated in the selection of award recipients at Rockefeller-endowed organizations. From 1924 to 1928, the National Research Council’s Fellowship Board recommended potential fellows to the International Education Board in different disciplines, and to the Rockefeller Foundation in psychiatry. The National Research Council’s Committee on Child Development did the same for awards in child study offered by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial between 1926 and 1928.

Recipient Characteristics

**Racial mention:** *Negro* (n = 1131) and *White* (n = 1077)

Following a 1921 pilot project in North Carolina, the General Education Board decided in May 1922 that it would be granting “fellowships and scholarships open to persons having definite opportunities for leadership in the field of education” in the Southern United States.26 As reflected in treasurer’s reports, annual reports, and other documents relating to this “Southern Program,” the General Education Board consistently structured activities, funding, and results

---

26 25 May 1922 meeting, cited in Dockets June 1923-February 1924, General Education Board records, record groupe 03, box 15, Rockefeller Archive Center, New York, NY.
along racial lines. The clear distinction between “Negro education” and “White education” also determined the annotations used on permanent recorder cards.

For Southern Program awards granted in 1922 and 1923, cards were not created until the early 1950s, when annotations identifying recipients as either “White” or “Negro” were included. For awards granted in 1924 and 1925, such annotations appear to have been retroactively added to cards initially created in the 1920s. As for the cards used for awards granted between 1926 to 1933, they included pre-printed check boxes for classifying recipients as either “Colored” or “White.” The Special Tags values White and Negro reflect the terms most often used in annotations.

The General Education Board continued making such racial distinctions on permanent recorder cards until the organization ceased its activities in the mid-1950s. Furthermore, notes on the cards indicate that race data was tallied by clerical staff, suggesting that the information was used to manage other aspects of the program. A document from the mid-1930s shows that Southern Program fellowship stipends were 20% higher for “White” recipients.

IMPORTANT: the racial mention being crucial to understand of the General Education Board policies and activities, we created a “racial mention” field with values “none” “black” and “white”.

Database users should note that, at least in the 1940s, the fellowship application forms used by the Rockefeller Foundation’s International Health Division included a “Race” question, which many European applicants either ignored or answered by restating their nationality. The question was removed when a new form was introduced in the early 1950s.

Hindu (n = 1)

We found only one annotation potentially indicating a recipient’s religion. The application forms used by Rockefeller-endowed organizations did request such information, which was not always provided by applicants.

Program

These values refer to priorities and initiatives that were not assigned to a separate administrative unit (i.e., not assigned to a Rockefeller Foundation unit with its own staff, budget, and policies, as identified in the Division field).
In 1929, the Rockefeller Foundation decided to begin offering fellowships “to faculties of schools of Public Health of Harvard University, Johns Hopkins University, University of Toronto and the Department of Public Health of the Yale University School of Medicine. These awards would be “for graduates in medicine, preferably to men who have had an internship and who give promise of becoming leaders in public health” (Meeting of scientific directors, 5 June 1929). In the early 1930s, funds were earmarked for similar fellowships in Nursing Education at Teachers College (Columbia University), upon the request of that institution’s director, who wanted to train distinguished nurses for research work. The same approach was used to develop a program to support the advanced training of selected staff members of the New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Centre. In most cases, the “Special” annotation also appeared on permanent recorder cards for such awards, meaning that recipients were eligible for enhanced stipends. This underscores the fact that these were all made-to-measure awards, reserved for institutions that had a special relation with the Rockefeller Foundation.

**Peiping Union Medical College (n=2)**

As the leading medical education institution supported by the Rockefeller Foundation in China, the “Peiping” or “Peking” Union Medical College was the home institution of many award recipients. We were unable to determine why this annotation was only used for two awards, both granted in 1928. We decided to retain these annotations as **Special Tags** values because they may indicate funding granted to the college immediately prior to the China Medical Board becoming independent.

**Postwar or Postwar & Regular (n = 111)**

Beginning in 1943, the Rockefeller Foundation earmarked significant financial resources for fellowship programs designed to help young war veterans resume studies or research after the war. Responsibility for granting of postwar fellowships in medicine, the natural sciences, and the social sciences was delegated to third-party organizations (medical schools, the National Research Council, the Social Science Research Council). However, awards in the humanities were managed by the Rockefeller Foundation and its Humanities division. The “Postwar” annotation was added to permanent recorder cards created for these fellowships, which were granted between 1945 and 1947. Once funding for the postwar program ran out, recipients
seeking renewals or extensions had to apply to the regular fellowship program. The “Postwar & Regular” annotation was added to the corresponding permanent recorder cards.

**New Scholarship Program** (n = 67)

From 1943 to 1949, the General Education Board operated a scholarship program in the Southern United States designed to prepare “promising personnel” for leadership positions in the fields of health education, nutrition, and agricultural economics. When this program was terminated, the General Education Board launched another, which lasted four years: the “New Scholarship Program” funded study at American universities outside the South by graduating students interested in pursuing an academic career in the South. Candidates were nominated by faculty committees, and sixty-seven universities and colleges from fourteen Southern states and the District of Columbia were invited to participate. The “New Scholarship Program” annotation appeared on cards created for awards granted in 1950 and 1951. Database users should note that subsequent awards granted under the same program were given the annotation “Training Scholarship,” and will therefore need to search **Type = Scholarship** and **Special Tags = Training** to find post-1951 recipients.

**Hungarian Refugee Program** (n = 16)

In late 1956, after the Hungarian Uprising had been suppressed, the Rockefeller Foundation introduced a series of measures to support refugees from the country. A number of fellowships were granted as part of these efforts. Except for single instances in both 1956 and 1958, “Hungarian Refugee Program” annotations were added to permanent recorder cards for all awards granted in 1957.

**Latin American Scholarship** (n = 239)

The corresponding annotation was used on permanent recorder cards for awards granted between 1951 and 1961, although its origins and meaning remain unclear. The timing of its introduction corresponds to neither the expanded Latin American Scholarships Program mentioned in the Rockefeller Foundation’s 1954 *Annual Report* nor the different agricultural training scholarships offered to Latin Americans for study in Mexico as early as 1943. The fact that permanent recorder cards for 79 awards granted between 1951 and 1956 were not created until 1966 helps explain the uneven use of this annotation. Furthermore, recipients of similar
awards granted during the same period may have been overlooked. Accordingly, care should be taken when analyzing search results based on this Special Tags value.

**Mexican Scholar** (n = 11)

The corresponding annotation was used on permanent recorder cards created for awards granted between 1949 and 1955 to Mexican agricultural specialists and agronomists. However, numerous cards created before and after 1949 for scholarships with very similar characteristics do not include this annotation. For instance, the first Mexican agricultural specialists to receive an award in 1946 were initially described as “fellows” on their permanent recorder cards. Later, annotations such as “Training Scholarship,” “Training,” “Scholarship,” and “Scholar” were used. As a result, the number of database entries with the Mexican Scholar Special Tags value is much smaller than the total number of Mexican agricultural specialists who received awards.

**Polish Program** (n = 117)

In 1957, following a visit to Poland by its representatives, the Rockefeller Foundation resumed operations in that country. They had been suspended in 1947. Under what was known as the Polish Science Program, fellowships were granted to young scientists in the fields of medical education, public health, biology, medicine, and agriculture. This coincided with efforts by the Ford Foundation to establish programs in the social sciences and humanities. The “Polish Program” annotation was added to cards for awards granted between 1956 and 1959.

**Regular Program** (n = 22)

When, in 1957, the Rockefeller Foundation resumed its operations in Poland, Polish scientists became eligible for the regular fellowship and scholarship program, in addition to the Polish Science Program. For awards granted in 1959 and 1960, the “Regular Program” annotation was used to distinguish between the two categories of Polish award recipients, whose stipends were funded by two separate budgets. When the Polish Science Program was terminated, this annotation ceased being used.

**Expanded Program** (n = 773)

In 1956, the trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation dedicated a portion of their capital funds to supporting an "expanded program" in Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. This
decision had an organization-wide impact, immediately leading to the creation of new fellowships, scholarships, and training awards earmarked for countries in these regions.

**Problems of Population (n = 4)**

The Rockefeller Foundation’s 1963 Annual Report announced a new policy outlook for the organization. Going forward, rather than being categorized by discipline or division, activities would be presented as the “sublimated product of program evolution, set in the contemporary context and projected into the future.” Accordingly, subsequent annual reports presented information based on “areas of major interest” or “areas of concentration,” the names of which were included on permanent recorder cards as annotations. The **Problems of Population Special Tags** value corresponds to one of these areas, which focused on activities connected to the “stabilization of the world population.”

**Allied Interests (n = 165)**

The Rockefeller Foundation’s 1963 Annual Report announced a new policy outlook for the organization. Going forward, rather than being categorized by discipline or division, activities would be presented as the “sublimated product of program evolution, set in the contemporary context and projected into the future.” Accordingly, subsequent annual reports presented information based on “areas of major interest” or “areas of concentration,” the names of which were included on permanent recorder cards as annotations. The **Allied Interests Special Tags** value corresponds to one of these areas. The 1964 Annual Report noted that “the grants reported under the heading ‘Allied Interests’ were made for work in the sciences and humanities in fulfillment of commitments entered into before the reorientation of the Foundation’s program.”

**University Development (n = 724)**

The Rockefeller Foundation’s 1963 Annual Report announced a new policy outlook for the organization. Going forward, rather than being categorized by discipline or division, activities would be presented as the “sublimated product of program evolution, set in the contemporary context and projected into the future.” Accordingly, subsequent annual reports presented information based on “areas of major interest” or “areas of concentration,” the names of which were included on permanent recorder cards as annotations. The **University Development Special Tags** value corresponds to one of these areas, which focused on activities designed to foster the development of selected universities in emerging countries.
Toward Equal Opportunity for All (n = 5)

The Rockefeller Foundation’s 1963 Annual Report announced a new policy outlook for the organization. Going forward, rather than being categorized by discipline or division, activities would be presented as the “sublimated product of program evolution, set in the contemporary context and projected into the future.” Accordingly, subsequent annual reports presented information based on “areas of major interest” or “areas of concentration,” the names of which were included on permanent recorder cards as annotations. The Toward Equal Opportunity for All Special Tags value corresponds to one of these areas. The 1963 Annual Report described the corresponding awards in terms of efforts “to help stimulate greater educational opportunities for the disadvantaged citizens of this country [the United States].”

Toward the Conquest of Hunger (n = 443)

The Rockefeller Foundation’s 1963 Annual Report announced a new policy outlook for the organization. Going forward, rather than being categorized by discipline or division, activities would be presented as the “sublimated product of program evolution, set in the contemporary context and projected into the future.” Accordingly, subsequent annual reports presented information based on “areas of major interest” or “areas of concentration,” the names of which were included on permanent recorder cards as annotations. The Toward the Conquest of Hunger Special Tag value corresponds to one of these areas. The 1963 Annual Report described the corresponding awards in terms of the Rockefeller Foundations “attempts to develop knowledge and practices, useful in themselves, which others can apply and extend so that the gap between food production and national requirements may gradually be closed.”

Intercultural Understanding (n = 122)

The Rockefeller Foundation conducted a review of its Humanities Program in 1950. As a result, that year’s Annual Report listed activities in the field under a series of thematic headings, including “Intercultural Understanding.” The latter was defined in terms of “the consolidation of a well-established Foundation goal: to promote research and interpretative work aimed at making one culture, or group of cultures, more understandable to members of another.” The “Intercultural Understanding” annotation began appearing on permanent recorder cards for awards granted in 1951. Of special interest are the some 30 Indonesian trade unionists who
attended the Training Institute of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union in New York City and observed union work in several different countries.

**Study Program (on card)**

For most awards, the permanent recorder card contained at least some information on the recipient’s program of study, usually under the “Studies” heading on the first page. Often, such entries were limited to a single word or a short phrase specifying a field, discipline, or domain (e.g., “medicine,” “public health administration,” “Chinese studies”); a type of activity (“field work”); or an institution (“at Harvard University”). However, they sometimes meticulously described the recipient’s activities. This was one of our favorites: “Biology: Animal Behavior. To study the social behavior, the orientation, the sense physiology, and the ‘Language’ of the honeybee in an environment as broadly different from that of the Bavarian, and Austrian region as possible not only with Indian bees but with bees already habituated to European conditions.”

We entered a **Study Program (on card)** value for 99.4% of the awards in the database (no value = 88, a NO_INFO value was entered). Each entry contains the full description of the program of study as it appeared on the permanent recorder card for the corresponding award.

**Study Program (standardized)**

We used this field to distill the more than 7,940 unique **Study Program (on card)** values, with the goal of providing a more coherent overview of the activities undertaken by award recipients. We adopted a three-step process:

1. We simplified the **Study Program (on card)** values to obtain shorter entries.
2. We grouped similar activities under a single value to reduce the number of unique entries.
3. We strove to preserve the words and phrasing used by Rockefeller-endowed organizations, as entered in the **Study Program (on card)** field. However, when this stood in the way of the larger objective, we sometimes identified a single, more generic value to stand in for a variety of others.

For example, in the **Study Program (standardized)** field, we used **Child Study** to consolidate several **Study Program (on card)** values: **Adolescence**, **Child Development**, **Child Psychology**, and **Child Study**. Likewise, we used **Plant Science** to cover **Bean Breeding**, **Botany**, and **Plant Breeding**.
Crop Breeding, Forage Breeding, Plant diseases, Plant Morphology, and Vegetable Crops.

Where necessary, we devised new wordings. For instance, School Administration and Supervision is a Study Program (standardized) value used to describe various closely related activities involving the administration of educational institutions. And although no Study Program (on card) value matches this one exactly, it nevertheless contains two terms regularly used on permanent recorder cards (i.e., “administration” and “supervision”).

Database users should note that certain Study Program (standardized) values were also used in the Study Field (standardized) field, in cases where there were many corresponding awards. For instance, this occurs with Plant Science and Educator Training and Education Science. For more information, see Study Field (standardized), below.

Our efforts to standardize card-based classifications resulted in a set of 2,935 values. Database users can also use specific terms to search across multiple values. For instance, the word “agriculture” or “agricultural” appears in 55 different Study Program (standardized) values, whereas “nurse” or “nursing” appears in 53.

Any issues with how we chose to group the data can be overcome by searching the Study Program (on card) field, whose entries preserve the original wording used on permanent recorder cards. A NO_INFO value was entered for awards where the Study Program (on card) field itself had received a NO_INFO value.

Study Field (standardized)

We used this field to group the 2,395 unique Study Program (Standardized) values into a limited number of general categories. Our aim was to broadly identify the domains where Rockefeller-endowed organizations were active and make it possible to identify patterns in how awards were granted. Again, we adopted a three-step process:

1. We considered several existing approaches to classification. However, because Rockefeller-endowed organizations were active in such a wide variety of domains, both academic and vocational, no existing classification proved fully adequate for our purposes. The one that had the most overlap with the domains referred to in the database was the UNESCO Nomenclature for Fields of Science and Technology
It consists of three levels, with 24 “Fields” divided into “Disciplines” and “Subdisciplines.” We focused on the 24 main fields.

2. We made several adjustments to the top level of the UNESCO Nomenclature. For instance, we established Public Health as a separate field, rather than treating it as a component of “Medical Sciences.” This decision reflects the important and distinct role played by public health in the activities of the Rockefeller-endowed organizations. The table below indicates which of the 24 top-level UNESCO Nomenclature categories we left unchanged and which ones we divided into two separate values (where we deemed such a distinction necessary, often due to the large number of corresponding awards).

We also created a certain number of new values (where awards had been granted in domains not covered by the UNESCO Nomenclature) and sometimes altered the wording (when a name failed to properly describe the activities of award recipients).

Furthermore, we discarded some UNESCO Nomenclature categories that only covered a few dozen of the awards in the database, associating the awards in question with other Study Field (standardized) values. Finally, we created an Unclassified value for twenty-four awards that fell outside the other categories but whose quantity did not justify the creation of a new category. We were left with a total of twenty-eight Study Field (standardized) values, as listed in the table below.

3. We linked each Study Program (standardized) value to one or more Study Field (standardized) values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNESCO NOMENCLATURE TOP-LEVEL CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROGRAM OF STUDY (STANDARDIZED) VALUE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth and Space Sciences</td>
<td>Earth and Space Sciences</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Sciences</td>
<td>Simplified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juridical Sciences and Law</td>
<td>Simplified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Sciences</td>
<td>Simplified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>Expanded to encompass language studies awards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Expanded to highlight the fact that this value covers awards in both academic sociology and social work. In many countries, these two fields were closely connected until the mid-twentieth century.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health and Hygiene</td>
<td>Added based on a second-level category in the UNESCO Nomenclature (which lists “Public Health” as a discipline within the field of “Medical Sciences”), due to the large number of public health awards granted by Rockefeller-endowed organizations. We also added the term “hygiene” because the latter was often used as a synonym of “public health” by program staff, especially during the interwar period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Changed to more precisely describe the main priorities of education-related award programs, namely the training of teachers and professors (at all levels), as well as the study of education as a science.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science of Arts and Letters</td>
<td>UNESCO Nomenclature top-level category split into two separate values to highlight awards in the performing arts. As a result, we were able to associate Drama awards with either Literature (in the case of playwrights) or Arts (in the case of performers).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultures and Civilizations</td>
<td>New values to cover important fields of activity for Rockefeller-endowed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Diffusion of Information</td>
<td>Organizations in which many awards were granted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutional Administration and Supervision</td>
<td>New value to cover an important field of activity for Rockefeller-endowed organizations, which granted many awards related to the management of public or private institutions (high schools, universities, hospitals, nursing schools, municipal/state/national boards of health, museums, etc.). Whereas the term “administration” refers to senior positions (e.g., a hospital or nursing school director), ”supervision“ refers to middle management positions (e.g., a ward supervisor).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Science</td>
<td>New values to cover important fields of activity for Rockefeller-endowed organizations, in which many awards were granted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>New value to reflect the very large number of nursing awards granted by Rockefeller-endowed organizations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>New value to reflect the very large number of nursing awards granted by Rockefeller-endowed organizations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>New value.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological Sciences</td>
<td>Discarded because there are no corresponding awards in the database.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy and Astrophysics</td>
<td>Discarded because Rockefeller-endowed organizations granted few awards in astronomy or astrophysics. In the database, all corresponding awards have been grouped under Earth and Space Sciences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Discarded because Rockefeller-endowed organizations granted few awards in demographics. Based on the descriptions provided on permanent recorder cards, all corresponding awards have been grouped under Sociology and Social Work, Economics, History, Mathematics, or Public Health and Public Hygiene.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>Discarded because Rockefeller-endowed organizations granted very few awards in logic. Based on the descriptions provided on permanent recorder cards, all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
corresponding awards have been grouped under *Languages and Linguistics, Mathematics*, or *Arts*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Field (directory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discarded because there are no corresponding awards in the database.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The values in this field were based on the entries in the Rockefeller Foundation's *Directory of Fellowships and Scholarships 1917-1970* (1972), as compiled by Rockefeller Foundation staff at that time.
HOME INSTITUTION AND LOCATION

Institution

Most permanent recorder cards included information on the recipient’s home institution (i.e., the institution where they were working or studying when they received their award). This information would have been provided by recipients themselves, either on an application form or in subsequent correspondence with a Rockefeller-endowed organization. Although a few recipients may have misrepresented their status, we deemed the available information to be generally accurate. Given that it was used by the officers of Rockefeller-endowed organizations to make approval decisions, applicants would have been wary of the consequences of overembellishment.

Information on an applicant’s home institution was entered under different headings, depending on which organization’s permanent recorder card template was being used. Furthermore, different organizations did not enter such data at the same point in the record-keeping process.\(^{27}\) For instance, both the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board filled out the “Present Position” section upon creating a new card (i.e., as soon as an award was approved by the committee responsible). By contrast, the permanent recorder cards used by the International Education Board had no such heading, and the name of the recipient’s home institution was sometimes added months or even years after the end of the award term. Cards retroactively created for Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial awards in the early 1940s generally lacked any information on a recipient’s home institution.

We consulted other sources in the case of awards for which home institution information was not readily available, awards for which no permanent recorder card was produced, and Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial awards in the social sciences. Although the 1972 Rockefeller Foundation’s *Directory of Fellowships and Scholarships 1917-1970* was helpful in several instances, it excludes many recipients, including those from countries under communist regimes at the time of publication.\(^{28}\) The Rockefeller Foundation’s China Medical Board produced

---

\(^{27}\) On the production of these documents, see Pierre-Yves Saunier, “History 5*7: The Fellowship Recorder Cards of the Rockefeller Archive Center Collection.”, unpublished, temporarily available at [https://www.dropbox.com/s/ex17mkb1dfy19e3/History%205*7%20revised%20January%202023%20version.docx?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/s/ex17mkb1dfy19e3/History%205*7%20revised%20January%202023%20version.docx?dl=0)

\(^{28}\) See Saunier, “History 5*7.”
several “information cards” listing early award recipients along with their home institutions—information often missing from the main series of permanent recorder cards. Among other Rockefeller-endowed organization records, the minutes of the Executive Committee of the International Education Board were particularly helpful. The research was somewhat more demanding in the case of Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial awards, but we succeeded in finding relevant information in two other series of documents: reports and correspondence related to child study and parental education, and so-called yellow sheet material on recipients in the social sciences.29

After retrieving as much information as we could from other sources, we returned to the permanent recorder cards, which sometimes included implicit references to a recipient’s home institution. For instance, we knew that the General Education Board’s New Scholarship Program, which ran from 1951 to 1954, was intended to help students finishing an undergraduate degree pursue graduate studies. As a result, we could base the Institution value on the university or college from which a recipient was graduating. And because permanent recorder cards consistently included a list of degrees, this approach allowed us to identify dozens of home institutions for recipients of New Scholarship Program awards.

Altogether, we gathered about 13,000 home institution names from these various sources. That was a bit too much. We therefore set about standardizing Institution values, with the aim of identifying a single recognized and recognizable name for each home institution. This would make it possible to geocode each institution, in order to chart and map the geographic distribution of both institutions and awards. However, different languages, variations in spelling and syntax, irregular abbreviations, typos, and clerical errors made it difficult to group references to the same institution.

Through trial and error, we developed and applied a series of rules for standardizing home institution names, along with a method for distinguishing between recipients for whom we were unable to identify a home institution and those who were explicitly identified as being unaffiliated with any organization at the time they received an award.

29 We consulted CVs, letters of appointment, correspondence, and lists of child study and parent training awards contained in the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Records and the Spelman Fund of New York Records. For “yellow sheet” material, see Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial records, series 3, subseries 3.06, box 51, folder 347 and box 52, folder 348.
Each standardized **Institution** value reflects one of three situations:

1. For about 1.4% of the total of awards, the permanent recorder card or another source explicitly stated that the recipient was not affiliated with an organization. Such individuals may not have been working or studying at the time. They may also have been self-employed as a writer, an editor, a nurse, a physician, etc. We entered **NO AFFILIATION** for these recipients.

2. In the case 2.82% of the total, we were unable to find an explicit or implicit reference to a specific institution. Either no relevant information was available, or the information provided was too generic (e.g., “a law firm,” “a sugar factory,” “teaching position at Berlin,” “volunteer work in timber and wood pulp”). We entered **NO_INFO** for these recipients. Where appropriate, we reduced the number of such cases by combining generic descriptions and place names to identify a specific institution. For instance, based on a reference to a “junior high school” located in Tulsa, we entered **Tulsa Junior High School** in the **Institution** field. The same approach was used in cases involving a “medical district” or “health district.”

3. In the remaining cases, where we were able to identify a home institution, we standardized the **Institution** value based on the rules described below.

Some awards were granted to individuals who were already studying or working away from what would normally be regarded as their home institution. We estimate that there were between 100 and 300 such cases, involving recipients who may have been on leave or furlough, had been sent abroad by their government, or had already received an award of some sort to study elsewhere than at their home institution. Because we found it impossible to sort out these situations in a consistent manner, we decided to simply record the name of the institution where the individual was working or studying at the time they received an award from a Rockefeller-endowed organization.

Several dozen recipients had two or even three home institutions, between which they likely divided their time. Unable to determine an order of importance, we consistently entered the name of the institution that was listed first.

Our sources provided a myriad of names for university or college departments, as well as for research centers, hospital wards, government agencies, and educational or social service providers. We found it impossible to keep track of all these subentities, and follow their development over time. Accordingly, we decided to base the **Institution** value on the name of
the parent institution whenever it could be identified. For instance, the names of departments and schools often included the name of the corresponding university or college. Likewise, the names of divisions and offices often included the name of the corresponding ministry. Nevertheless, we did provide for some exceptions to this rule.

- Subentities were sometimes too numerous, too diverse, or too complex to be associated with a single parent institution. For example, primary and secondary schools could be private or public and overseen by municipal, regional, or national authorities. We lacked the time and resources to delve into the history of specific schools and establish their affiliations. Also, where subentities operated as autonomous units within a network of universities, it was important to recognize this autonomy. And where hospitals, research centers, and experimental stations were jointly established or managed by universities and government agencies or private institutions, it was not always possible to identify the true parent institution. Furthermore, relevant details on an institution’s historical development were not always available. In all these situations, we entered the name of the subentity rather than that of the parent institution.

- We chose to identify a subentity under its own name when it played a prominent role in the activities of Rockefeller-endowed organizations. Examples include university-affiliated hospitals, laboratories, experimental stations, and organizations established or operated by the Rockefeller Foundation in partnership with national or regional governments. However, where possible and appropriate, we included the name of the parent institution in parentheses after the name of the subentity (e.g., Iowa Child Welfare Research Station (State University of Iowa)).

We entered institution values that reflect the full and official name of the home institution at the time an award was granted. We saw this as a way of addressing the fact that permanent recorder cards often listed obsolete or otherwise improper names for institutions, both because cards were sometimes created after the fact and because applicants frequently provided older or informal names on forms. This approach was also intended to help avoid misunderstanding and confusion, given the large number of highly similar names used in the database, especially in the case of American colleges and universities. We identified the full and official names used during different periods by consulting institutional websites (“About Us” and “History” sections), Wikipedia pages, and other secondary sources (including period publications and recent scientific literature). Database users should note that we cross-checked names both in the
original language and in English. Furthermore, we used an institution’s new name as of January 1 of the year during which the name change took effect. It was simply not possible to apply the information down to a specific month and day.

We entered English-language names in the Institution field for all home institutions, with a view to facilitating database access and use for the largest possible number of users. In cases where our sources provided an institution’s name in the language of the country where it was based, we used a range of methods for arriving at an acceptable English-language version.

- We consulted the Virtual International Authority File (www.viaf.org), a compilation of name authority files from dozens of national libraries located around the world. Because many of the institutions in question published books, reports, pamphlets, and periodicals, the Virtual International Authority File proved an excellent source of widely recognized English-language versions of their names. Also, database users can search for our English translations in the Virtual International Authority File to find the names of home institutions in their original language, alongside translations into other languages.

- Where an English-language version of an institution’s name could not be found in the Virtual International Authority File, we searched for a recognized English-language name in period publications, recent scientific literature, and other databases (e.g., the Database of Hospitals and Medical Institutions created by the History of Western Medicine in China Resources Portal at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, https://old.ulib.iupui.edu/wmicproject/#hospital).

- Where no recognized English-language name could be found, we made our own translations. In doing so, we relied on our knowledge of the source language, dictionaries, and on-line translation tools.

- We did not translate proper nouns contained in institutional names. For example, we did not change “Ferenc József” in the Hungarian version of the name to “Francis Joseph” in the English translation.

- In a few dozen instances where we deemed the original name untranslatable or where translating it might cause confusion, we left the full name in the original language. Above all, these cases involved the names of corporations, companies, or publications.
• We created a separate VIAF ID field and entered a reference to the corresponding Virtual International Authority File identifier in almost all cases where such an identifier was found. However, we discovered a handful of cases where the Virtual International Authority File had mistakenly assigned the same identifier to two different institutions (usually institutions that shared a similar name but were located in different countries) or had mistakenly assigned two different identifiers to the same institution (usually institutions that had changed names multiple times). We did not enter a VIAF ID value if there were issues with the corresponding Virtual International Authority File entry or if the latter did not correspond to the institution’s official name duly verified by us: a NO_INFO value was entered in such cases.

Our preliminary list of Institution values included hundreds of home institutions whose names included a generic term (“Government”, “Army,” “Technical College,” “Normal School,” “School of Agriculture,” “College of Forestry,” “Board of Health,” “Ministry of Education,” “Ministry of Agriculture,” “Children’s Hospital,” “Central High School,” etc.) paired with a unique location (the name of a city, region, or country). In some cases, the generic term was even shared by multiple institutions within the same region or across different countries. For example, we identified four different institutions named “Ontario Hospital” in the Canadian province of Ontario, as well as institutions named “Victoria Hospital” located in various parts of the British Empire. In such cases, we added a sufficiently precise geographic reference to the Institution value. In this way, we were able to distinguish between the Cincinnati General Hospital, the Malmo General Hospital, and the Eppendorf General Hospital; between the Technical College of Berlin and the Technical College of Vienna; between the Florida State Board of Health and the City of Grand Mere Board of Health; and between the Japan Government and the Pakistan Government. Where similarly named institutions existed in multiple countries or regions, we specified the location in parentheses, such as in the case of the National Research Council (United States of America). And since counties in different American states often share the same name, we added state postal abbreviations to distinguish between them, as in the case of the Washington County (AL) Department of Health and Washington County (MS) Department of Health.

Institution values often include the name of a country or territory. We adapted this name according to our rules for the standardization of country names (see the relevant section under Benefitting Country).
For home institutions, we ended up with about 3,850 unique **Institution** values for the 14,650 awards in the database. However, these values were by no means evenly distributed:

- About 2,450 institutions (some 64% of the total) were identified as the home institution of only a single award recipient between 1914 and 1970.
- The University of the Philippines was the home institution for the largest number of awards (about 240), followed by the University of Valle in the Philippines and the United States Public Health Service (about 150 each).
- Twenty-three institutions (less than 1% of the total) produced more than 56 award recipients, or about one recipient per year.
- About 50% of all award recipients came from 242 institutions (6.2% of the total).

We are confident that the set of **Institution** values used in the database to designate home institutions consists of accurate, recognizable, and unique English-language names. But despite our best efforts, we undoubtedly made some mistakes. Database users are encouraged to report any possible errors by contacting us. We will investigate and, where appropriate, apply changes.

**Place**

Many permanent recorder cards mentioned a specific place (the name of a city, town, neighborhood, census division, etc.) in connection with the recipient’s home institution. Even when a card provided no information on the institution itself, other relevant geographic information was often available. If no permanent recorder card had been created for a particular award, we consulted other sources for a place name. In this way, we compiled an initial, albeit incomplete set of values for the **Place** field. Indeed, place names were not systematically recorded by the staff of Rockefeller-endowed organizations and are missing from thousands of permanent recorder cards.

Permanent recorder cards and other sources often provided quite imprecise data. Rather than a specific town or city, they might only refer to a larger administrative or geographic division (a province, an island, etc.). But to allow for spatial analysis of home institutions, we required

---

30 We consulted CVs, letters of appointment, correspondence, and lists of child study and parent training awards contained in the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Records and the Spelman Fund of New York Records. For “yellow sheet” material, see Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Records, series 3, subseries 3.06, box 51, folder 347 and box 52, folder 348.
recognized and recognizable **Place** values (i.e., the names of cities, towns, and census divisions). In the case of neighborhood-level data, which was only sporadically available, we substituted the name of the corresponding city.

We followed a three-step process to consolidate and standardize **Place** values based on the already standardized **Institution** values.

1. We determined and verified a location for each standardized **Institution** value (see above regarding the standardization process), paying special attention to any changes in the location of an institution between 1914 and 1970.
   a. We identified such changes by consulting institutional websites (“About Us” and “History” sections), Wikipedia pages, and other secondary sources (period publications and recent scientific literature). We then compared the list of locations with the place names identified from our primary sources. In case of discrepancy, we normally gave precedence to locations we had verified ourselves based on **Institution** values, given the frequency of errors observed on permanent recorder cards. However, we did not apply this rule to institutions that had branches or activities in different cities, towns, or census divisions (such as national and provincial/state governments, universities, and large corporations). In these cases, we recognized that the location provided for a home institution on the permanent recorder card could well be a local branch, decentralized agency, etc., rather than its main location or official headquarters.
   b. In the case of institutions that moved during the period covered by the database, we used the new location for any awards granted as of January 1 of the year when the move took place (based on the **Appointment Year** value).

   Furthermore, many place names changed during the twentieth century, especially following changes to national or municipal boundaries. In such cases, we entered the name in effect during the year listed under **Appointment Year**, except for names that could not be found in geographical databases (see Step 3, below). This ensured coherence with official institutional names, which we established according to the same principle. For example, the city whose German-speaking inhabitants called “Reichenberg” was entered as **Liberec** as of 1918, the year in which it became part of Czechoslovakia.

2. We normally used the same standardized **Place** value for all entries with the same **Institution** value. This allowed us to assign accurate **Place** values to thousands of
awards where relevant information was not specified on the permanent recorder card. Exceptions were made for institutions with multiple locations (see Step 1, above). In such cases, we relied on the information provided in other sources. For home institutions with multiple locations, we left the **Place** field empty if the permanent recorder card failed to specify a particular site. Geographic information on the corresponding awards may nevertheless be available in the **Second-Order Administrative Division**, **First-Order Administrative Division**, or **Country** field. Furthermore, some cities were referred to by multiple names in both primary sources and the secondary literature (historical names, colloquial names, names in different languages, different spellings). Although we lacked the resources to establish the appropriate name and syntax for specific dates, we saw consistency as vital for meeting the needs of database users. In most cases, we therefore grouped any such variations under a single option. For example, Peiping and Peking were entered as **Peking**; Lyons and Lyon as **Lyon**; Angora and Ankara as **Ankara**; Helsingfors and Helsinki as **Helsinki**; and the different names used for the Mexican capital as **Mexico City**. However, we did not use any new names or spellings introduced since 1970 (Mumbai, Beijing, Faisalabad, etc.).

3. We cross-checked the resulting list of potential **Place** values with the two leading geographical databases—Geonames and Wikidata—both of which are substantial and broad enough to be used as authority lists. They also include alternate names (historical names, colloquial names, names in different languages, different spellings). Nevertheless, establishing **Place** values that were precise, recognized, and capable of being geocoded proved a challenge. Given the long period covered by the database and the variety of languages spoken in the locations referred to, our initial list of **Place** values naturally included a mix of names in both local languages and English. In most cases, and especially for smaller communities, we retained the name in the local language (transliterated into Roman script, where necessary). In cases where an English-language version of a place name exists alongside the name used in the local language, we normally opted for the English name (e.g., **Florence** for the city known as Firenze in Italian). However, we retained names in the local language if they were easily recognizable (e.g., **Addis-Ababa**) or helped distinguish the place from another with a similar name (e.g., we used **Frankfurt-am-Main** for the city in Germany to distinguish it from the city of **Frankfort** in the American state of Kentucky). Database users can refer to Geonames and Wikidata to look up place names in their preferred language. Finally, to facilitate database access and use by researchers speaking a range of languages and
using different keyboard layouts, we removed all accents and other diacritics from Place values.

Although we strove to follow these steps consistently and rigorously, we undoubtedly made some mistakes. Furthermore, certain complex situations required us to make arbitrary choices. Database users are encouraged to report any possible errors by contacting us. We will investigate and, where appropriate, apply changes.

We were able to associate recognized and recognizable Place values with most Institution values, thereby making it possible to geocode the location of the corresponding home institutions. We were unable to associate a Place value to an Institution value for 1,753 home institutions, which represent 12% of all awards. A NO_INFO value was entered in all such cases. In 277 of these cases, neither the permanent recorder card nor other sources provided information on the home institution (Institution = NO_INFO). In another 167, the award recipient did not have a home institution (Institution = NO AFFILIATION). A small number of the remaining 1,308 cases involved institutions for which we were unable to determine an accurate location at the time the award was granted. However, most involved institutions with multiple locations (or strongly suspected of having had multiple locations), with no indication as to which specific location should be associated with a particular award. As a result, we were unable to determine a Place value for a significant number of awards. For example, no Place value was entered for 133 of the 151 awards granted by the Rockefeller Foundation to members of the United States Public Health Service, seventy of the 130 awards granted to recipients affiliated with the University of Sao Paulo, and fifty of the 242 awards granted to recipients affiliated with the University of the Philippines. All three of these institutions had multiple locations. Nevertheless, database users can find reliable geographic information for many home institutions without a corresponding Place value by consulting the Second-Order Administrative Division, First-Order Administrative Division and Country fields.

Second-Order Administrative Division

The values entered in the Second-Order Administrative Division field correspond to geographic units directly above the municipal level but not directly beneath the national government. Assigned different names in different countries, such divisions were used for the purposes of political representation or policy implementation. Although permanent recorder cards frequently specified an appropriate Second-Order Administrative Division value for
home institutions in the United States and Canada, they were much less likely to do so for institutions in other federal states, and generally failed to do so for institutions in unitary states.

Given the frequency with which such information was missing from permanent recorder cards, we decided not to systematically record it. In any case, doing so would have been too demanding for a database of this size and covering such a long period. Accordingly, we are leaving the task to future researchers interested in refining the socio-spatial characteristics of awards and recipients.

Nevertheless, we did enter **Second-Order Administrative Division** values in specific instances where they provided more precise geographic information on home institutions:

- Where no **Place** value was associated with a home institution (usually one with multiple locations, in the absence of any indication of which location should be associated with a particular award). In these cases, the **Second-Order Administrative Division** value provides the most precise geographic information available.
- Where the **Second-Order Administrative Division** value can serve as a tool for distinguishing between cities, towns, and census divisions that share the same name within a particular country.

We applied three rules to ensure that **Second-Level Administrative Division** values were accurate, recognized, and recognizable:

1. We entered the official name used at the time indicated by the **Appointment Year** value.
2. We identified official names used at different times by consulting institutional websites, Wikipedia pages, and period publications. Database users should note that we used an administrative division’s new name as of January 1 of the year during which the name change took effect. It was simply not possible to apply changes down to a specific month and day.
3. To ensure that all **Second-Order Administrative Division** values entered in the database could be geocoded, we cross-checked them with the two leading geographical databases: Geonames and Wikidata. Furthermore, in a handful of cases where the administrative division listed on a permanent recorder card no longer exists, we entered the name of the county, district, etc. that today corresponds to the location in question.

We entered 178 distinct **Second-Order Administrative Division** values for home institutions associated with 268 different awards. Seventy-five percent of such entries corresponded to
home institutions in Canada or the United States, where the county often serves as the basic unit for managing education and health (key areas of focus for General Education Board and Rockefeller Foundation programs). A NO_INFO value was entered in all other cases.

Database users should note that, when the Second-Order Administrative Division value was the most precise geographical information at our disposal, we used its central coordinates (centroid) to geocode the corresponding institution.

First-Order Administrative Division

The values entered in the First-Order Administrative Division field correspond to geographic units directly below the national government. Assigned different names in different countries, such divisions were used for the purposes of political representation or policy implementation. For example, in the case of federal states (e.g., Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, India, Mexico, the United States, Venezuela), the geographic information provided on permanent recorder cards often included the name of a state or province. Similar information was less likely to be provided in the case of unitary states.

Given the frequency with which such information was missing from permanent record cards, we decided not to systematically record it. In any case, doing so would have been too demanding for a database of this size and covering such a long period. Accordingly, we are leaving the task to future researchers interested in refining the socio-spatial characteristics of awards and recipients.

Nevertheless, we did enter First-Order Administrative Division values in specific instances where they provided more precise geographic information on the recipient’s home institution:

- Where no Place value was associated with the home institution (usually one with multiple locations, in the absence of any indication of which location should be associated with a particular award) and no Second-Order Administration Division value could be determined. In these cases, the First-Order Administrative Division value provides the most precise geographic information available.
- Where the First-Order Administrative Division value can serve as a tool for distinguishing between lower administrative divisions that share the same name within a particular country. For instance, in the United States, counties in different states often have the same name.
We applied three rules to ensure that **First-Order Administrative Division** values were accurate, recognized, and recognizable:

1. We entered the official name used at the time indicated by the **Appointment Year** value.
2. We identified official names used at different times by consulting institutional websites, Wikipedia pages, and period publications. Database users should note that we used an administrative division’s new name as of January 1 of the year during which the name change took effect. It was simply not possible to apply changes down to a specific month and day.
3. To ensure that all **First-Order Administrative Division** values entered in the database could be geocoded, we cross-checked them with the two leading geographical databases: Geonames and Wikidata.

We entered **First-Order Administrative Division** values for the home institutions associated with slightly more than a third of all awards in the database. A **NO_INFO** value was entered in other cases.

Database users should note that, when the **First-Order Administrative Division** value was the most precise geographical information at our disposal, we used its central coordinates (centroid) to geocode the corresponding institution.

**Country**

We normally determined the **Country** value (the name of a sovereign country or colonial territory) either using the confirmed location of the recipient’s home institution or, in cases where the recipient did not have a home institution, using a **Place, First-Order Administrative Division**, or **Second-Order Administrative Division** value that had been based on information provided on the permanent recorder card. In a limited number of cases, we determined the **Country** value using various other available information. For instance, Rockefeller Foundation staff responsible for creating and maintaining permanent recorder cards often failed to specify a country for employees of the United States Public Health Service who received awards in the 1940s and 1950s. But clearly, the home institution was in the United States. For information on the standardization of country names, see the relevant section under **Benefitting Country**. We were unable to identify a country for 165 awards, mostly in the case of individuals who had no home institution, and entered a **NO_INFO** value.
Database users should note that, when the **Country** value was the most precise geographical information at our disposal, we used its central coordinates (centroid) to geocode the corresponding institution.
HOST INSTITUTION AND LOCATION

Institution

In this case, the **Institution** value indicates the recipient’s main institutional affiliation during the award term.

A recipient’s itinerary was set by the officers of the relevant Rockefeller-endowed organization, in consultation with the recipient, their supervisor, and other host institution staff. The complexity of an itinerary did not necessarily depend on the length of the award term. Some were very straightforward, with the recipient spending all their time at a single institution. Others could be highly complicated, especially where they involved visits to multiple institutions for courses or research, not to mention the occasional conference. Many recipients visited between six and eight institutions, with some visiting up to eighteen.

Our previous research had made us aware of these complexities, and we deemed it impractical to try and capture information on every one of the institutions involved. Among other issues, doing so would make tasks such as consolidating and standardizing **Institution** values much more difficult. Still, we recognized that other researchers might want to pursue this work or that we ourselves might eventually want to do so for certain subsets of awards and recipients.

Nevertheless, for the purposes of this database, we decided to enter only a single **Institution** value for each award, based on the information the permanent recorder card or other sources provided on host institutions. We determined the appropriate value as follows:

- If a recipient spent the entire award term at a single institution, we used the name of that institution.
- If a recipient divided their time between multiple institutions, we used the name of the institution where they spent the most time and at least 25% of the award term. In cases where a recipient spent an equal amount of time at two main institutions, we used the name of the one they visited first, unless they clearly had a stronger connection with the second institution visited (e.g., due to the presence of a mentor or supervisor).

Permanent recorder cards for awards granted by the International Education Board often failed to name any institutions. This reflected the organization’s focus on having recipients study with...
leaders in their fields. Accordingly, the corresponding permanent recorder cards list the names of these mentors, rather than the institutions where they were based. In these cases, we attempted to assign an **Institution** value based on the mentor’s name and city of residence. By consulting obituaries, biographical dictionaries, and other sources, we were often able to confirm where such individuals worked.

Permanent recorder cards and additional sources provided us with hundreds of names for host institutions—substantially fewer than for home institutions. Once again, different languages, variations in spelling and syntax, irregular abbreviations, typos, and clerical errors made it necessary to standardize the data with the aim of arriving at a single recognized and recognizable **Institution** value for each host institution. Through trial and error, we developed and applied a series of naming rules, along with a method for distinguishing between recipients for whom we were unable to identify a host institution and those who were explicitly identified as being unaffiliated with any organization during the term of their award.

Ultimately, each standardized **Institution** value for a host institution reflects one of the following three situations:

1. If a recipient divided their time between multiple institutions and failed to spend more than 25% of their time at any single one, we assumed the intent had been for the recipient not to be affiliated with any individual institution. Furthermore, the nature of the activities undertaken by some recipients did not fit at all with the idea of a host institution. Rather, they conducted fieldwork, visited libraries and archives, traveled between sites to collect data, performed psychoanalysis, or wrote at home. In such cases, we entered **NO AFFILIATION**.

2. If the permanent recorder card failed to identify an institution where a recipient spent at least 25% of their time, we entered **NO_INFO**.

3. In the remaining cases, for more than 90% of the awards, where we were able to identify a host institution based on the criteria outlined above, and we standardized the **Institution** value based on the rules described below.

Our sources provided a myriad of names for university or college departments, as well as for research centers, hospital wards, government agencies, and educational or social service providers. We found it impossible to keep track of all these subentities or follow their development over time. Accordingly, we decided to base the **Institution** value on the name of the parent institution whenever it could be identified. For instance, the names of departments
and schools often included the name of the corresponding university or college. Likewise, the names of divisions and offices often included the name of the corresponding ministry. Nevertheless, we did provide for some exceptions to this rule.

- Subentities were sometimes too numerous, too diverse, or too complex to be associated with a single parent institution. For example, primary and secondary schools could be private or public and overseen by municipal, regional, or national authorities. We lacked the time and resources to delve into the history of specific schools and establish their affiliations. Also, where subentities operated as autonomous units within a network of universities, it was important to recognize this autonomy. And where hospitals, research centers, and experimental stations were jointly established or managed by universities and government agencies or private institutions, it was not always possible to identify the true parent institution. Furthermore, relevant details on an institution’s historical development were not always available. In all these situations, we entered the name of the subentity rather than that of the parent institution.

- We chose to identify a subentity under its own name when it played a prominent role in the activities of Rockefeller-endowed organizations. Examples include university-affiliated hospitals, laboratories, experimental stations, and organizations established or operated by the Rockefeller Foundation in partnership with national or regional governments. However, where possible and appropriate, we included the name of the parent institution in parentheses after the name of the subentity (e.g., Iowa Child Welfare Research Station (State University of Iowa)).

We entered **Institution** values that reflect the full and official name of the home institution at the time an award was granted. We saw this as a way of addressing the fact that permanent recorder cards often listed obsolete or otherwise improper names for institutions, both because cards were sometimes created after the fact and because applicants frequently provided older or informal names on forms. This approach was also intended to help avoid misunderstanding and confusion, given the large number of highly similar names used in the database, especially in the case of American colleges and universities. We identified the full and official names used during different periods by consulting institutional websites (“About Us” and “History” sections), Wikipedia pages, and other secondary sources (including period publications and recent scientific literature). Database users should note that we cross-checked names both in the original language and in English. Furthermore, we used an institution’s new name starting on
January 1 of the year during which the name change took effect. It was simply not possible to apply the information down to a specific month and day.

We entered English-language names in the Institution field for all host institutions, with a view to facilitating database access and use for the largest possible number of users. In this case, because the overwhelming majority (77%) of host institutions were located in the United States, only a small proportion of the Institution values needed to be translated. Where our sources provided an institution’s name in the language of the country where it was based, we used a range of methods for arriving at an acceptable English-language version.

- We consulted the Virtual International Authority File (www.viaf.org), a compilation of name authority files from dozens of national libraries located around the world. Because many of the institutions in question published books, reports, pamphlets, and periodicals, the Virtual International Authority File proved an excellent source of widely recognized English-language versions of their names. Also, database users can search for our English translations in the Virtual International Authority File to find the names of host institutions in their original language, alongside translations into other languages.

- Where an English-language version of an institution’s name could not be found in the Virtual International Authority File, we searched for a recognized English-language name in period publications, recent scientific literature, and various directories (e.g., World of Learning, Empire Universities Yearbook).

- Where no recognized English-language name could be found, we made our own translations. In doing so, we relied on our knowledge of the source language, dictionaries, and on-line translation tools.

- We did not translate proper nouns contained in institutional names. For example, we did not change “Friedrich-Wilhelms” in the German version of the name to “Frederic-William” in the English translation.

- In a few dozen instances where we deemed the original name untranslatable or where translating it might cause confusion, we left the full name in the original language. Above all, these cases involved the names of corporations, companies, or publications.

- We created a separate VIAF ID field and entered a reference to the corresponding Virtual International Authority File identifier in almost all cases where such an identifier
was found. However, we discovered a handful of cases where the Virtual International Authority File had mistakenly assigned the same identifier to two different institutions (usually institutions that shared a similar name but were located in different countries) or had mistakenly assigned two different identifiers to the same institution (usually institutions that had changed names multiple times). We did not enter a VIAF ID value if there were issues with the corresponding Virtual International Authority File entry or if the latter did not correspond to the institution’s official name duly verified by us. A NO_INFO value was entered.

Our preliminary list of Institution values included hundreds of host institutions whose names included a generic term (“School of Agriculture,” “Board of Health,” “Ministry of Education,” “Ministry of Agriculture,” “Children’s Hospital,” etc.) paired with a unique location (the name of a city, region, or country). In some cases, the generic term was even shared by multiple institutions within the same region or across different countries. For example, we identified four different institutions named “General Hospital” in various cities, including Toronto, Montreal, New York, and Philadelphia. In such cases, we added a sufficiently precise geographic reference to the Institution value. In this way, we were able to distinguish between the Boston Children’s Hospital and the Mexico Children’s Hospital; the Berlin Agricultural College and the North Dakota Agricultural College; the City of New York Department of Health and the New Zealand Department of Health; etc.

Institution values often include the name of a country or territory. We adapted this name according to our rules for the standardization of country names (see the relevant section under Benefitting Country).

For host institutions, we ended up with 905 unique Institution values. Three institutions located in the United States accounted for about 23% of all awards: Harvard University, Johns Hopkins University and Columbia University. With the sixth highest number of entries, the University of Toronto (Canada) accounted for the highest number of awards granted at a host institution outside the United States. Tied for the thirty-third highest number of entries, the University of Paris (France), the University of London (United Kingdom), and Oxford University (United Kingdom) accounted for the highest number of awards granted at a host institution outside North America. With the 110th highest number of entries, accounting for 0.1% of all awards, the University of Valle (Colombia) accounted for the highest number of awards granted at a host institution outside Europe and North America.
We are confident that the set of institution values used in the database to designate host institutions consists of accurate, recognizable, and unique English-language names. But despite our best efforts, we undoubtedly made some mistakes. Database users are encouraged to report any possible errors by contacting us. We will investigate and, where appropriate, apply changes.

Place

Many permanent recorder cards mentioned a specific place (the name of a city, town, neighborhood, census division, etc.) in connection with the recipient’s host institution. Even when a card provided no information on the institution itself, other relevant geographic information was often available. If no permanent recorder card had been created for a particular award, we consulted other sources for a place name.31 In this way, we compiled an initial, albeit incomplete set of values for the Place field. Indeed, place names were not systematically recorded by the staff of Rockefeller-endowed organizations and are missing from thousands of permanent recorder cards.

Permanent recorder cards and other sources often provided quite imprecise data. Rather than a specific town or city, they might only refer to a larger administrative or geographic division (a province, an island, etc.). But to allow for spatial analysis of host institutions, we required recognized and recognizable Place values (i.e., the names of cities, towns, and census divisions). In the case of neighborhood-level data, which was only sporadically available, we substituted the name of the corresponding city.

We followed a three-step process to consolidate and standardize Place values based on the already standardized institution values.

1. We determined and verified a location for each standardized institution value (see above regarding the standardization process), paying special attention to any changes in the location of an institution between 1914 and 1970.
   a. We identified such changes by consulting institutional websites (“About Us” and “History” sections), Wikipedia pages, and other secondary sources (period

31 We consulted CVs, letters of appointment, correspondence, and lists of child study and parent training awards contained in the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Records and the Spelman Fund of New York records. For "yellow sheet" material, see Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial records, series 3, subseries 3.06, box 51, folder 347 and box 52, folder 348.
publications and recent scientific literature). We then compared the list of locations with the place names identified from our primary sources. In case of discrepancy, we normally gave precedence to locations we had verified ourselves based on Institution values, given the frequency of errors observed on permanent recorder cards. However, we did not apply this rule to institutions that had branches or activities in different cities, towns, or census divisions (such as national and provincial/state governments, universities, and large corporations).

b. In these cases, we recognized that the location provided for a host institution on the permanent recorder card could well be a local branch, decentralized agency, etc., rather than its main location or official headquarters. In the case of institutions that moved during the period covered by the database, we used the new location for any awards granted after January 1 of the year when the move took place (based on the Start Date value). Furthermore, many place names changed during the twentieth century, especially following changes to national or internal boundaries. In such cases, we entered the name in effect during the year listed under Start Date, except for names that could not be found in geographical databases (see Step 3, below). This ensured coherence with official institutional names, which we established according to the same principle. For example, the city whose German-speaking inhabitants called "Reichenberg" was entered as Liberec as of 1918, the year in which it became part of Czechoslovakia.

2. We normally used the same standardized Place value for all entries with the same Institution value. This allowed us to assign accurate Place values to thousands of awards where relevant information was not specified on the permanent recorder card. Exceptions were made for institutions with multiple locations (see Step 1, above). In such cases, we relied on the information provided in other sources. For home institutions with multiple locations, we left the Place field empty if the permanent recorder card failed to specify a particular site. Geographic information on the corresponding awards may nevertheless be available in the Second-Order Administrative Division, First-Order Administrative Division, or Country field. Furthermore, some cities were referred to by multiple names in both primary sources and the secondary literature (historical names, colloquial names, names in different languages, different spellings). Although we lacked the resources to establish the appropriate name and syntax for specific dates, we saw consistency as vital for meeting the needs of database users. In most cases, we
therefore grouped such variations under a single option. For example, Peiping and Peking were entered as *Peking*; Lyons and Lyon as *Lyon*; Angora and Ankara as *Ankara*; Helsingfors and Helsinki as *Helsinki*; and the different names used for the Mexican capital as *Mexico City*. However, we did not use any new names or spellings introduced since 1970 (Mumbai, Beijing, Faisalabad, etc.).

3. We cross-checked the resulting list of potential *Place* values with the two leading geographical databases—Geonames and Wikidata—both of which are substantial and broad enough to be used as authority lists. They also include alternate names (historical names, colloquial names, names in different languages, different spellings).

Nevertheless, establishing *Place* values that were precise, recognized, and capable of being geocoded proved a challenge. Given the long period covered by the database and the variety of languages spoken in the locations referred to, our initial list of *Place* values naturally included a mix of names in both local languages and English. In most cases, and especially for smaller communities, we retained the name in the local language (transliterated into Roman script, where necessary). In cases where an English-language version of a place name exists alongside the name used in the local language, we normally opted for the English name (e.g., *Naples* for the city known as Napoli in Italian). However, we retained names in the local language if we deemed them untranslatable (e.g., *Banyuls sur Mer*). Database users can refer to Geonames and Wikidata to look up place names in their preferred language. Finally, to facilitate database access and use by researchers speaking a range of languages and using different keyboard layouts, we removed all accents and other diacritics from *Place* values.

Although we strove to follow these steps consistently and rigorously, we undoubtedly made some mistakes. Furthermore, certain complex situations required us to make arbitrary choices. Database users are encouraged to report any possible errors by contacting us. We will investigate and, where appropriate, apply changes.

In any case, we were able to associate recognized and recognizable *Place* values with most *Institution* values, making it possible to geocode the locations of the corresponding host institutions. We were unable to do so for 1,160 host institutions, accounting for almost 8% of all awards. In all such cases, a *NO_INFO* value was entered in the *Place* field. In 248 of these cases, it had also been impossible to identify a host institution (*Institution = NO_INFO*). In another 688, the recipient simply did not have a host institution (*Institution = NO*).
AFFILIATION. Most of the remaining cases involved institutions with multiple locations (or strongly suspected of having had multiple locations), with no indication as to which specific location should be associated with a particular award. This issue primarily arose with three institutions. We doubted that any of the 27 awards whose permanent recorder cards listed the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research as the host institution involved the institute’s Princeton branch, which specialized in animal pathology. However, we had no way of verifying whether award recipients were based at the Princeton branch or at the New York City headquarters. Likewise, we were unable to determine the specific site visited by the 38 individuals who received an award for Stanford University or the 25 who received one for the University of Virginia. Nevertheless, database users can find reliable geographic information for many host institutions without a corresponding Place value by consulting the Second-Order Administrative Division, First-Order Administrative Division and Country fields.

Second-Order Administrative Division

The values entered in the Second-Order Administrative Division field correspond to geographic units directly above the municipal level but not directly beneath the national government. Assigned different names in different countries, such divisions were used for the purposes of political representation or policy implementation. For instance, permanent record cards frequently specified a county for host institutions in North America, Ireland, the United Kingdom, Scandinavia, and former British colonies. Such divisions are often termed “districts” in other countries.

Given the frequency with which such information was missing from permanent record cards, we decided not to systematically record it. In any case, doing so would have been too demanding for a database of this size and covering such a long period. Accordingly, we are leaving the task to future researchers interested in refining the socio-spatial characteristics of awards and recipients.

Nevertheless, we did enter Second-Order Administrative Division values in specific instances where they provided more precise geographic information on host institutions:

- Where no Place value was associated with a host institution (usually one with multiple locations, in the absence of any indication of which location should be associated with a
particular award). In these cases, the **Second-Order Administrative Division** value provides the most precise geographic information available.

- Where the host institution itself was named for such an administrative division (e.g., *Jefferson County Schools*).

- Where the **Second-Order Administrative Division** value can serve as a tool for distinguishing between cities, towns, and census divisions that share the same name within a particular country.

We applied three rules to ensure that **Second-Level Administrative Division** values were accurate, recognized, and recognizable:

1. We entered the official name used at the time indicated by the **Start Date** value.
2. We identified official names used at different times by consulting institutional websites, Wikipedia pages, and period publications. Database users should note that we used an administrative division’s new name as of January 1 of the year during which the name change took effect. It was simply not possible to apply changes down to a specific month and day.
3. To ensure that all **Second-Order Administrative Division** values entered in the database could be geocoded, we cross-checked them with the two leading geographical databases: Geonames and Wikidata. Furthermore, in a handful of cases where the administrative division listed on a permanent record card no longer exists, we entered the name of the county, district, etc. that today corresponds to the location in question.

The database contains only four **Second-Order Administrative Division** values associated with a host institution. A **NO_INFO** value was entered in all other cases.

Database users should note that, when the **Second-Order Administrative Division** value was the most precise geographical information at our disposal, we used its central coordinates (centroid) to geocode the corresponding institution.

**First-Order Administrative Division**

The values entered in the **First-Order Administrative Division** field correspond to geographic units directly below the national government. Assigned different names in different countries, such divisions were used for the purposes of political representation or policy implementation.
For example, in the case of federal states (e.g., Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, India, Mexico, the United States, Venezuela), the geographic information provided on permanent record cards often included the name of a state or province. Similar information was less likely to be provided in the case of unitary states.

Given the frequency with which such information was missing from permanent record cards, we decided not to systematically record it. In any case, doing so would have been too demanding for a database of this size and covering such a long period. Accordingly, we are leaving the task to future researchers interested in refining the socio-spatial characteristics of awards and recipients.

Nevertheless, we did enter First-Order Administrative Division values in specific instances where they provided more precise geographic information on the recipient’s host institutions:

- Where no Place value was associated with the host institution, usually one with multiple locations, in the absence of any indication of which location should be associated with a particular award. In these cases, the First-Order Administrative Division value provides the most precise geographic information available.
- Where the First-Order Administrative Division value can serve as a tool for distinguishing between lower administrative divisions that share the same name within a particular country. For instance, in the United States, counties in different states often have the same name.

We applied three rules to ensure that First-Level Administrative Division values were accurate, recognized, and recognizable:

1. We entered the official name used at the time indicated by the Start Date value.
2. We identified official names used at different times by consulting institutional websites, Wikipedia pages, and period publications. Database users should note that we used an administrative division’s new name as of January 1 of the year during which the name change took effect. It was simply not possible to apply changes down to a specific month and day.
3. To ensure that all First-Level Administrative Division values entered in the database could be geocoded, we cross-checked them with the two leading geographical databases: Geonames and Wikidata.
We entered First-Order Administrative Division values for the host institutions associated with about two-thirds of all awards in the database. Most of these host institutions were in the United States. A NO_INFO value was entered in other cases.

Database users should note that, when the First-Order Administrative Division value was the most precise geographical information at our disposal, we used its central coordinates (centroid) to geocode the corresponding institution.

**Country**

We normally determined the Country value (the name of a sovereign country or colonial territory) either using the confirmed location of the host institution or, in cases where no host institution was associated with the award, using a Place, First-Order Administrative Division, or Second-Order Administrative Division value that had been based on information provided on the permanent record card. In cases where we had been unable to determine an Institution value for a host institution (see above), we determined the Country value as follows.

- If the permanent recorder card or another source clearly indicated that the award recipient spent time in multiple countries, we considered the time spent in each country. If at least 25% of the recipient’s time was spent in a single country, with the remainder of the award term split between shorter stints in other countries, we entered that country’s name as the Country value for the host institution.
- In several cases, we were unable to identify a specific sovereign country or colonial territory, due to the limited or vague information provided on permanent recorder cards and in other sources. If the permanent recorder card only mentioned a world region or continent, we entered that information in the Country field for the host institution: Africa (n = 4), Europe (n = 25), Latin America (n = 1).
- In cases where an award was canceled before the term began, no geographic information was available on the host institution, or a recipient visited multiple countries but no details were available on the time spent in each one (i.e., no clear indication that they spent at least 25% of the award term in a single county), we entered NO_INFO (n = 174) in the Country field.

For information on the standardization of country names, see the relevant section under Benefitting Country.
We successfully determined a **Country** value for the host institutions associated with 99.8 % of the awards in the database. **United States** is by far the most frequent value, accounting for 77.5% of all awards. **United Kingdom** is the second most frequent value, accounting for 6.3% of all awards.

Database users should note that, when the **Country** value was the most precise geographical information at our disposal, we used its central coordinates (centroid) to geocode the corresponding institution.