

SSRC WORKING PAPER SERIES

Social Science Research Capacity in South Asia

A Report

vol.6

Partha Chatterjee
in collaboration with
Nirmala Banerjee, Apurba K. Baruah, Satish Deshpande,
Peter Ronald de Souza,
Krishna Hachhethu, B.K. Jahangir, M.S.S. Pandian,
Nira Wickramasinghe, S. Akbar Zaidi
and Itty Abraham



copyright © SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL, 2002.

810 SEVENTH AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10019

South Asia Regional Advisory Panel

RAJ CHANDEVARKAR, Cambridge University, UK

PARTHA CHATTERJEE, Centre for Studies in Social Science, Calcutta

DIPAK GYAWALI, Nepal Water Conservation Foundation, Kathmandu, Nepal

HAMEEDA HOSSAIN, Ain-o-Salish Kendra (ASK), Dhaka, Bangladesh

M.S.S. PANDIAN, Madras Institute of Development Studies, Chennai, India

JAYADEVA UYANGODA, University of Colombo, Sri Lanka

WILLEM VAN SCHENDEL, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Staff to the Regional Advisory Panel

ITTY ABRAHAM, SSRC

TINA HARRIS, SSRC

MUNMEETH SONI, SSRC

Acknowledgments

We interviewed more than 100 social scientists in the course of this study: a full list is appended at the end of this Report and we thank them all. We are especially grateful to Krishna Raj and the staff of *Economic and Political Weekly* for their help with the analysis of articles published in that journal. We are also grateful to our research assistants who are individually thanked in the Regional Studies. We would also like to thank Professor Nuket Sirman of Bogazici University, Istanbul, and Harsh Sethi of *Seminar* magazine, New Delhi, for their advice and comments during the October workshop. The coordinating team would like to thank Sarbani Bandyopadhyay in Calcutta, Tina Harris in New York and Munmeeth Soni in Washington, DC, for their valuable research assistance. Funds for this report were provided by the Ford Foundation, Delhi. We would like to thank Mark Robinson for his encouragement and involvement in this initiative.

Contents

Preface	1
Chapter One: Decline and Crisis	3
Chapter Two: Research, Training, Dissemination	49
Chapter Three: Social Science and Society	83
Chapter Four: Public and Private Sponsors	121
Chapter Five: What Can Be Done	141
Appendix	155
Bibliography	160

IN July 2001 the Social Science Research Council, New York, commissioned a report on the currently existing capacity for social science research in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka and a forward-looking assessment of the potential and needs in those countries. One preparatory meeting was held in Chennai on July 29 and 30 and another in Kathmandu on August 10 and 11, 2001. The study was carried out by the members of the assembled team from the middle of August to the end of October with the following distribution of tasks:

1. Bangladesh (B. K. Jahangir)
2. India East, including Bihar, Jharkhand, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal and West Bengal (Nirmala Banerjee)
3. India North, including Delhi, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Punjab and Rajasthan (Satish Deshpande)
4. India Northeast (Apurba K. Baruah)
5. India South, including Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Pondicherry and Tamil Nadu (M. S. S. Pandian)
6. India West, including Chhattisgarh, Goa, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra (Peter deSouza)
7. Nepal (Krishna Hachhethu)
8. Pakistan (S. Akbar Zaidi)
9. Sri Lanka (Nira Wickramasinghe)

Itty Abraham and Partha Chatterjee were responsible for coordinating the different parts of the study. The team met in New Delhi on October 30 and 31, 2001, to discuss the findings and prepare the contents of the report. It was decided that the findings would be presented in two formats. One would be called the Report and would consist of a thematic summary of the main findings and recommendations for all five countries in South Asia. The other would be called

Regional Studies and would consist of reports on the nine studies listed above, plus lists and tables of important information on institutions, resources, publications etc.

Two themes occur repeatedly in most discussions about social science today in South Asia. One is an apparently pervasive sense of crisis, an idea that the institutions and practices of social science research are on the point of irretrievable collapse. The other—and associated—theme is the idea that the crisis is the result of the precipitous decline of major institutions of social science research built mainly in the decades following the end of colonial rule. Those who make these arguments have many observations to present as symptoms of the decline or crisis and many examples to illustrate their case.

A closer study of the facts, however, shows that the decline-crisis story does not hold for all regions of South Asia or for all social science disciplines. There are regions where social scientists do not believe that their institutions or research capacities are in a worse state today that they were, say, 20 years ago. There are disciplines in which there is little sense that opportunities or resources are less available for worthwhile projects than they were in the 1970s or 1980s. More interestingly, even when one looks at specific institutions about which the story of decline is most commonly told, one discovers that it is not such a simple story after all.

A Great Institution in Decline?

There is no better place to examine the "decline hypothesis" than the great institutions of social science research set up in Delhi in the 1950s. For three decades or more, they were at the forefront of research in several disciplines, putting social science research in South Asia at par with the highest international standards. As an example, we give below an account of the two major departments of the Delhi School of Economics (DSE). Many of the issues we will be concerned

with in this Report can be usefully introduced through a slightly detailed analysis of the alleged decline of the DSE.

Few educational institutions in South Asia have been mythologized as much as the Delhi School of Economics. (There are probably only a few other comparable instances: Presidency College, Calcutta; University of Ceylon (now Peradeniya); Government College, Lahore; and St. Stephen's College, Delhi.) While this would lead one to expect that much material may already be available on such institutions, this is not often the case. On the contrary, these legends are being built out of anecdotal, largely nostalgic-hagiographic reminiscences rather than solid research. But we are very lucky that there exists an entire volume of essays on the DSE (Kumar and Mookherjee 1995). The Delhi School and the literature on it offer us a uniquely privileged site to explore the "decline legends" that are so common in the history of South Asian academic institutions.

Economics at the "D School"

The story of the establishment of the Delhi School of Economics is well known. By all accounts it is the story of the successful consummation of a grand vision nurtured by one man, Professor V.K.R.V. Rao. The golden age of DSE, in one version, stretches from about 1953 when India's Second Five-Year Plan was being mooted to 1971 or so when there was the famous exodus of the stars. In another version, the golden age is limited to the decade of the 1960s, from about 1963 when the stars begin to come in to 1971 when these luminaries leave in quick succession. In both versions, the 1960s are undoubtedly the peak period of the DSE's golden age, which is usually distinguished by the following characteristics:

(i) a "dream team" of top notch economists and economic historians (including, in alphabetical order, Jagdish Bhagwati, Sukhamoy

Chakravarty, Mrinal Datta Chaudhuri, K.L. Krishna, Dharma Kumar, A.L. Nagar, Khaleeq Naqvi, K.N. Raj, Tapan Raychaudhari, Amartya Sen, Arjun Sengupta, Manmohan Singh, and S. Sivasubramonian);

(ii) a vibrant MA teaching program that attracted students from all over the country, a very large number of whom went on to become distinguished economists themselves;

(iii) an active doctoral program that produced pathbreaking PhD dissertations (such as those of Prasanta Pattanaik or Nanak Kakwani);

(iv) a vigorous research program that was not only intensely involved with national debates on planning and policy but also shaped them in large measure; and

(v) a global reputation as a center of excellence in economics, not only in fields such as development economics where it may have had a comparative advantage, but also in "hard" mainstream areas of pure theory such as social choice, international trade or econometric estimation.

Barring minor variations, this is what the decline narratives use as their reference point. Although the tendency of such narratives is to preempt questions of evidence, what if we were to go against the grain and insist on proof? What could, and should, count as evidence for or against the assertions of decline? How much of it is available?

The simplest and perhaps least controversial evidence would be a purely quantitative comparison of the productivity of the faculty "then" and "now" as measured by the number of publications. (This would sidestep questions of qualitative assessment, but it would still be necessary to argue about how much weight to place on such evidence.) Although such evidence would clearly not be decisive, the preemptive fact here is that it is not easily available. This may seem surprising, but it is an outcome of the low priority accorded to institu-

tional recordkeeping in the department. As Professor Pulin Nayak informed us, the official annual reports of the department are often incomplete and are thus unreliable documents. In any case, it is apparently impossible to unearth annual reports from several decades ago within the School bureaucracy or to extract them from the university apparatus. Our request for annual reports elicited only a few recent ones. The only reliable method of checking publications of the faculty is to do a comprehensive search of academic journals of the last 40 years using lists of faculty names. Has anyone done this? No. Then how is it known that the productivity of the faculty has declined in recent years? Well, everyone in the profession knows that it has. Just think of the reputation of the stalwarts of the 1960s! It is hard to quarrel with such universally shared judgments.

We are able to make more headway when we move on to the other attributes of the "golden age," namely, the MA teaching program, the doctoral program, policy-oriented research and basic theoretical research.

Every member of the DSE faculty that we spoke to invariably began by emphasizing the primacy of the teaching mission of the institution. They unanimously agree that the department today is understaffed. The problem is not with the availability of positions, but with filling them: several positions have been vacant for the last two decades or so. There are as many as 9 professorships and several readerships currently vacant; and in the last 10-15 years, there have been only two rounds of recruitment—one in 1996, the other in 2001.

However, the problem of understaffing is more complicated than it appears at first. On further discussion, faculty members admit that it is not only a matter of getting the university administration to recruit; the more daunting problem is getting suitable applicants, particularly at the professorial level. At the most recent round of recruitment, for

example, there was no net addition to the faculty as open positions were filled by granting promotions to existing members of the department. At this point, the discussion usually broadens to include several related issues: the greater attraction of jobs in research institutions; the pull of the West, particularly in a discipline like economics; and the declining quality of students.

Where does this leave us on the "then" versus "now" question of teaching? Although the statistics are unreliable, it is almost certain that the School today has fewer teachers than it had in the past. It is probably also true that the attractiveness of teaching as a profession—even in once glamorous institutions like the DSE—has declined relative to the media, the IT sector and perhaps even the corporate sector. And several commentators have pointed out that since the 1980s, an MA in Economics from an Indian institution is no longer among the preferred choices of the top rung of undergraduates: the management institutes are the first choice, followed by various types of options abroad. In sum, it seems that it is not so much a case of decline in the DSE as a decline in the prestige of the MA in Economics.

Things are even more stark when it comes to the PhD program. This is one area where all social science disciplines and all kinds of institutions in India have been experiencing a crisis of enrollment. Since 1990, only 6 PhDs have been awarded in Economics at DSE. But the important point to note here is that many observers feel that the doctoral program at the DSE never really took off, even at the height of the "golden age," and that the stellar PhDs (even those of a later period, such as Sanjay Subrahmanyam) were really the exceptions. There has been a strong feeling that the DSE values foreign degrees more than its own, and the vast majority of its better students have preferred to go abroad for their PhDs. Indeed, even in the "golden age" the great majority of the faculty had PhDs from Western insti-

tutions, and this in itself sent a strong message to students. Over the years, the doctoral program has actually been dependent on a small number of college teachers of the University of Delhi who are committed to academics and register at the DSE for their PhDs. This is not really a question of lack of fellowship support, for there are research fellowships on offer; it has more to do with changing expectations. The supply of PhD students seems to have shrunk drastically across disciplines, probably because alternative careers are more easily available and more attractive.

As for research by the faculty, it is often emphasized that their research output has to be seen in the context of their teaching responsibilities. Indeed, for institutions like the DSE, the main research support provided by the University is in the form of tenured jobs for faculty. Provided the department has enough positions to make for a relatively light teaching load, this is the main way in which research is facilitated—it is left to the individual initiative of teachers to do research. There is some amount of peer pressure to publish, but its effects and intensity can vary.

One major concern expressed by the faculty is of the overall decline in the general infrastructure provided by the university system. Thus, although positions have not really been cut back, additional infrastructure for research is very scarce. In the early 1990s, there was a severe funds crunch, felt most severely by the Ratan Tata Library of the DSE. The years 1991-93 are remembered as the years of fiscal crisis. However, toward the end of that period, intensive lobbying by the School resulted in a major grant from the Finance Ministry in the form of a budget appropriation in the national budget of 1993. It helped, of course, that the then-Finance Minister (Manmohan Singh) was a former faculty member and that his Finance Secretary (Montek Singh Ahluwalia) was a former student at the School! The Library

received a grant of Rs.50 million, while a Rs.30 million endowment grant was made to launch the Centre for Development Economics (CDE) at the School. There was also an initial grant of about Rs.5 million from the Ford Foundation.

As Dr. Aditya Bhattacharjea explains, the Centre for Development Economics was set up mainly to compensate for the lack of infra-structural support from the university system, to provide funds for bringing visitors to the School and to finance modest levels of research expenses (particularly research assistance). The CDE earns approximately Rs.5 million as interest on its endowment, half of which is re-invested to protect the real value of the endowment, and the other half of which is available for meeting the outlays of the Centre. If one adds the main budget of the department (which pays the salaries of the faculty and administrative staff), the funds available under the UGC's Centre for Advanced Study program, and the newly added funds of the CDE, the DSE's effective budget runs to a little under Rs.20 million per annum, which is not a mean sum for an institution of this size.

What this has meant in practice is that the CDE is able to provide the sorts of facilities for which research institutes depend on project grants: computers for faculty and research scholars, a telephone system, provisions for visiting faculty, and research assistants. The CDE does not normally fund research projects or travel. There is no doubt that the CDE has substantially eased the financial pressure on the DSE. However, there is concern that the CDE's resources are being drawn upon even to support the teaching program (through providing a computer lab, for example), something that was not part of its original mandate. On the other hand, faculty members admit that the research funds available are not being fully utilized, although this is put down to the current understaffing and increased teaching load of

the faculty. In this regard, the major portion of the teaching load is said to be due to the tutorial system followed at the DSE rather than actual course load.

Thus, major funds for research must still come from externally funded projects, and some faculty members are currently engaged in such ventures. Although some senior members of the faculty continue to be involved in the traditional Planning Commission, Finance Commission and other government-related research activities, the volume and intensity of this kind of work has declined considerably over the previous decade. This is, of course, a direct offshoot of the decline of the planning regime in the country. But it is not as though this decline is the sole or even the major factor affecting research activity at the DSE. Apart from teaching responsibilities, lack of faculty initiative is probably also a contributory cause. However, the overall research output of the faculty (estimated by one member at a little more than two articles per person per year) is considered satisfactory under the present circumstances. At present, however, the Economics departments at the Indian Statistical Institute, Delhi, and Jawaharlal Nehru University have more reputed theoretical economists than DSE.

Looking at the research areas of the Economics faculty at DSE in the period 1993-2000, what is surprising is that the two most significant areas, accounting for almost a third of all research publications, are economic history and political economy. These are followed by Indian macroeconomic policy and studies of agriculture and food policy. Faculty members suggest that there are no longer any thrust areas of research in the department, and individual faculty members choose subjects of research much on their own initiative. This seems to account for the great diversity of research fields.

To summarize the major issues that emerge in this quick survey of

the department of Economics at DSE:

(i) While the decline legend seems to imply a degeneration of the institution itself in comparison to an earlier golden age, the search for evidence on this claim suggests that contextual changes are crucial to this perception, and may in fact change the whole terrain of discussion.

(ii) From the pedagogical perspective, the DSE was and remains primarily an MA-producing institution; the doctoral program has never been able to achieve or sustain high levels of vitality, and is currently at a low ebb.

(iii) While resource constraints seem to have been very severe a decade ago, they have eased considerably since the launching of the Centre for Development Economics in 1993, and finances do not seem to be the binding constraint for research at present.

(iv) The major constraint today is the teaching/tutorial load that unfilled faculty positions place on the current members, which is believed to adversely affect their research output.

Sociology at DSE

The department of Sociology at the DSE was established at V. K. R. V. Rao's initiative in 1959, a little over a decade after the establishment of the School. The department has been almost as significant to the discipline of Sociology in India as its older sibling has been to Economics, except that in the hierarchy of social science disciplines in post-independence India, Economics occupied the first position and History the next, so that Sociology could occupy the third place at best.

Despite the fact that they share the same campus and some of the same institutional constraints, the Sociology department presents a sharp, and in many ways an instructive, contrast with Economics. To

begin with, the decline legend, if there is one at work here, is very different. Unlike the frequent and eventful comings and goings of Economics faculty, the Sociology department has enjoyed (if that is the word) a truly remarkable stability. Like the founder of the DSE, the founder of the Sociology department, M. N. Srinivas, also spent about 11 years in the institution. However (in sharp contrast to the experience of Economics), the next generation of professors in sociology have stayed put, with almost all of them spending well over three decades in the department.

The flip side of this stability is that, since the late 1990s, four senior professors have retired and one has left for the United States, leaving a major vacuum at the top of the faculty structure. This has meant that the decline narrative crops up in Sociology in very different form, as the problem of generational succession. While the Srinivas generation seems to have been successful in reproducing itself, this success has proved difficult to repeat.

Sociology differs in yet another major respect: its faculty is almost entirely homegrown, in contrast to the predominance of foreign degrees in Economics. In fact, with very few exceptions, members of the faculty are also alumni of the department. Conversely, graduate students in Sociology tended to stay on to do their PhDs at Delhi, except in the last decade or so, when the westward trend has caught on in a big way. The cozy familial ethos that this evokes has been double-edged, allowing credible claims to be made about the greater sense of institutional camaraderie and commitment to the department, but simultaneously opening the door to charges of inbreeding and insularity. Senior members of the department are aware of these charges, but tend to dismiss them as baseless. Besides, they feel that the training that their own department provides is superior to anything else in India, so that there is an objective basis for believing that their own

students are the best.

Given the stability of its faculty, it is not surprising that the MA program in Sociology should seem more close-knit and integrated than its counterpart in Economics. The tutorial system is emphasized even more here than in Economics, and most faculty are rather proud of the way it has functioned in the department. Complaints about the decline in quality of students entering the program are voiced privately by the faculty, but they are not as intense or as unanimous as they seem to be in Economics. Most of the senior faculty subscribe to the view that the average student today is very poorly equipped and much less motivated compared with previous decades. The one specific complaint that is expressed across the board is about 'flight' of students after the MA; in fact, this is increasingly happening even after the BA. In general though, the teaching program in Sociology appears to be in somewhat better shape than the one in Economics, though with the retirement of most of the old stalwarts, there is a sense of void felt by everyone.

The research training program (MPhil and PhD) has been considerably more successful in Sociology than in Economics. Most important, the program has maintained its vitality for over three decades, though it is now facing the same general crisis that PhD programs are facing all over India. One notable feature of the department has been the weekly seminar in which visitors, research students back from the field and department faculty present papers. This institution has been sustained for over three decades, which should count as a major achievement. Attendance at the seminar is mandatory for MPhil students, and the considerable involvement and interest of the faculty make it an institutionally valued event.

Table 1.1

The Doctoral Program, DSE Sociology, 1959-1999

	Average Enrollment in PhD Program	PhDs Awarded (Total Number)
1959-1970	-	6
1970s	39	25
1980s	44	29
1990s	31	20
1959-1999	-	80

Note: Averages rounded to nearest integer; enrollment data not available for the following years: 1959-70, 1972, 1982, 1983, 1990, & 1995.

Source: Annual Reports of DSE, Sociology

Table 1.1 shows the progress of the doctoral program in Sociology. The overall total of 80 PhDs in 40 years is quite impressive. In the 1990s, for instance, the Sociology department awarded 20 PhDs compared to only 6 by the Economics department. The enrollment figures are somewhat misleading though, because a large number of students remain "dormant" rather than active research scholars and drop out at various stages of the program. The effective number of active PhD scholars is thus much smaller, though it is difficult to give precise numbers. The recent drop in admissions to the PhD program is among the most serious challenges faced by the department: there have been some years when no new PhD students were admitted, and even in other years the number has been in the low single digits. Most faculty have ready lists of promising students lost to the West in recent times, and it is generally believed that this is responsible for much of the decline in numbers. Senior faculty members are also very forthright about their desire to maintain standards and make no bones

about their readiness to keep places vacant if applicants are found to be insufficiently qualified.

Coming to the question of faculty research, important contrasts with Economics are again visible, though both departments have been at the forefront of their respective disciplines in India. The dominant position in Sociology, ever since the days of Srinivas, has been strongly biased towards empirical work, especially in the form of ethnographic fieldwork. At the same time, this dominant tendency has also been hostile toward "policy-relevant" research. Srinivas always expressed grave reservations about policy-oriented research, and other influential members of the department have generally concurred. Dharma Kumar believed that the empirical orientation of the department had something to do with the fact that Sociology did not lose its faculty to the West and, unlike Economics, generally managed to avoid provoking decline narratives (Kumar & Mookherjee 1995:3-4). But this story of decline at the Delhi School Economics department may have more to do with the relative status of empirical and theoretical work in Economics and Sociology, empirical research having much less prestige in Economics compared to Sociology.

In terms of general infrastructure for the Sociology department, there are the usual complaints about the constraints of being enmeshed in the gigantic bureaucracy of the University. In 1998, the department had 16 faculty members. It is thus about 40-50% smaller than the Economics department. Financial resources, in the form of annual budgetary support from the University, stand at about Rs.8.7 million per annum, which is less than half of what seems to be available to Economics. The difference, of course, is that there is nothing like the CDE for Sociology. As with all South Asian university systems, faculty salaries have been the main form of support for research. Srinivas mentions that early in his tenure as head of the department

he was able to negotiate paid leave of up to six months for faculty to do fieldwork and all members of the department availed themselves of the opportunity. (Kumar and Mookherjee 1995) In the last decade or so, an important new development in the department has been the taking on of research projects funded by outside agencies. It is estimated that at least four projects worth about Rs.4 million are being undertaken by department faculty at present. One large project on immunization funded by a European agency has been particularly important in that it seems to have financed several research assistants and enabled publication of doctoral dissertations as well as books . Some members of the department feel, however, that project support tends to distort the relative perception of sub-disciplines, artificially inflating the worth of those that receive funding and causing students to congregate in those areas. Major areas where project funding has been playing a role are environmental sociology, gender relations and media studies.

One crucial contrast with the department of Economics lies in the meticulous recordkeeping of the Sociology department. A complete set of annual reports is available, almost from the inception of the department . What is more, these reports provide detailed information on faculty publications, which allows for an analysis of trends in areas of research interest. The reports show that, over the past four decades, department faculty have become less interested in political sociology and the sociology of change, while subjects like medical anthropology, gender relations, economic sociology and the sociology of development have come into prominence.

The general infrastructure is much sparser than in the Economics department. Computer facilities are very limited and of recent origin. There is no real backing for research activities other than salary support. Projects are thus essential if any major field research is to be

undertaken.

To sum up: (i) Rather than a decline narrative, the department faces what may be called "continuity anxiety" because of the retirement of senior faculty without any comparable set of inheritors.

(ii) Unlike Economics, there has been remarkable stability (it could even be argued that this has elements of stagnation) in the composition of the department —it is only recently that students have started going abroad for PhDs, and most faculty are former students.

(iii) Resource shortages are felt more in Sociology because there is no institutional backup as with the CDE, and externally sponsored projects seem to have emerged as the main solution.

(iv) The general orientation of the faculty has been away from policy-oriented work and has concentrated almost exclusively on ethnographic research; this is both the cause and the consequence of the early distance between the two departments of the School.

Other Stories: Two Institutes in South India

In South India, by contrast, while there are persistent concerns about the decline of universities (which, incidentally, were never major institutions of social science research in the region), ***the more pointed complaint is a much more specific one about the recent decline in government funding for social science research.*** This has led, not necessarily to an absolute shortage of funds for research, but rather to difficulties in carrying out research in the old and established ways. The choices involved are complex and not necessarily easy to resolve, but alongside the apparent drying up of old sources of funding, new possibilities have emerged. Let us look at two major research institutes in South India. Since many of the issues we will be concerned with in the rest of this Report are frequently conflated with the decline-crisis

hypothesis, as we saw in the case of the DSE, it will be worth our while at this point to discuss these two institutes in some detail.

Madras Institute of Development Studies (MIDS), Chennai

The MIDS was founded in 1971 and reconstituted in 1977 as a national research institute within the framework of the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR), the central body that regulates government funding of social science research in India.

MIDS, like most other ICSSR institutes, began with a small faculty. In 1979-80, it had five members. In the course of the past two decades, it has expanded its faculty, though at a slow pace, and today its faculty strength is 17. Though the Institute claims that it is committed to promoting interdisciplinary research, the distribution of faculty members across disciplines shows that it is primarily oriented towards Economics. In its initial years, the Institute's faculty was fully constituted by economists. This feature of the faculty composition continued through the 1980s. For instance, in 1989-90, MIDS had one sociologist, the only non-economist in a faculty of 18. Today the Institute has five non-economists—one sociologist, one anthropologist, two political scientists and one historian—accounting for 30% of the faculty. While this diversification of the faculty across disciplines is real and welcome, the Institute still continues to be dominated by economists.

The other feature of the faculty composition in MIDS is that it is top-heavy with a large number of Professors and very few younger faculty members at the level of Research Associates. While in 1979-80, Research Associates accounted for 50% of the total faculty, in 2000-01 this number has declined to a meager 23.5%. As the MIDS vision document notes, "Injection of fresh blood, particularly at the middle and lower ends of the academic pyramid, is an urgent

necessity." (MIDS 2000) The obvious reason for this trend is the lack of new recruitment of faculty in the face of financial stringency. In fact, the number of faculty posts sanctioned is 22, of which five positions remain unfilled. But for the latest recruitment drive in 2001, these figures would be even more disappointing. This is a fact of importance, since it points to the larger story of the narrowing of possibilities in research for younger social scientists in India.

As the MIDS is a non-teaching institution with an exclusive emphasis on research, the publication of research papers is an appropriate index of the volume and quality of the Institute's academic performance. After all, as the Institute itself declares, "faculty members ... set their own agenda of research, which gives them considerable autonomy and flexibility." (MIDS 1995) The faculty members of the MIDS have published both in renowned Indian social science journals (such as *Economic and Political Weekly*, *Studies in History*, and *Contributions to Indian Sociology*) and foreign journals (such as *Journal of Peasant Studies*, *Dialectical Anthropology* and *Journal of Quantitative Economics*)

Having said this, one needs to add that the distribution of publications across faculty members is glaringly uneven, i.e. a small number of faculty members publish a large number of papers. This is so even at the level of professors. A look at the publication history (based on research that appeared in standard social science journals and publications) of five professors at MIDS who have spent 20 years on the faculty of the Institute is revealing. During the period 1980-81 to 1998-99, the most productive of them contributed 13 papers to journals or edited volumes and published two books. The least productive contributed five papers to journals or edited volumes. During this period (the equivalent of 90 faculty years) all five of them together contributed 57 papers to journals or edited volumes and published three

books. Given the fact that the faculty at the MIDS does not engage in teaching but rather in full-time research, the research output could be expected to have been much greater.

A breakdown by discipline of the 156 working papers brought out by MIDS during the period 1978-79 to 1998-99 tells us that the Institute's research output lacks disciplinary diversity. Of the total number of working papers, 135 (86.5%) fall within the disciplinary boundaries of Economics; 14 (8.9%) can be broadly classified as dealing with sociological issues; and 7 (4.6%) belong to History. This reflects the dominance of economists in the faculty. The skewed distribution of faculty members across disciplines has its own negative impact on the possibility of collaborative work. Once again, we have taken the working papers to index the degree of collaborative work. Of the 156 working papers, only 12 (7.7%) were co-authored and all of them by economists. Though the extent of collaborative work itself is quite low at the Institute, those who pursue disciplines other than Economics are further constrained by the fact that they do not have a critical number of faculty members in their disciplines to carry out collaborative research ventures.

The MIDS has systematized procedures to evaluate faculty performance. First, every member of the faculty has to furnish an annual work report for discussion by the Academic Council. In essence, this is a peer group review. Second, the work of every member of the faculty is reviewed by the Academic Council once every three years on the basis of the periodic work reports and a self-assessment prepared by the faculty member. This review is conducted by a committee of the Academic Council consisting of the Director and two external members of the Council. However, the evaluation procedures have not really worked. This is evident from the actual performance of the faculty in terms of their publications.

The principal sources of funding for the MIDS continue to be the ICSSR and the government of Tamil Nadu. In 1999-2000, the grant from the ICSSR accounted for 38.6% of the total funds, while the grant from the government of Tamil Nadu (including a special library grant) accounted for 49.24%. This reliance on the ICSSR for funding has been a reason for the acute financial crisis in which the Institute was entrapped in the 1990s. According to the silver jubilee document of the MIDS, "since 1992 the ICSSR has been urging institutes funded by it to find their own sources of funding and has nearly frozen its grants. So the Institute faces a deficit every year, which is getting accumulated over the years." (MIDS 1995) Often both the ICSSR and the state government did not release their sanctioned grants. As of 31 October 2000, the unreleased grants from the ICSSR amounted to Rs.1.1 million and that from the Government of Tamil Nadu, Rs.7 million.

As a result, from 1995-96 on, the MIDS was confronted with substantial operating deficits each year. An internal exercise of the Institute carried out in 2000 projected that, at the current level of funding by the ICSSR and the State government, the annual operating deficit of the MIDS would reach Rs. 1.7 million by 2004-05 (MIDS 2000). To bridge its deficits, the Institute resorted to borrowing. As of November 31, 2000, its liabilities, including a debt of Rs.9.63 million to be repaid to a commercial bank and arrears of Rs.3.2 million to be paid to its employees, stood at Rs.19.62 million (MIDS 2000).

The reliance of the MIDS on the ICSSR and the State government for its funding is a result of its explicitly stated philosophy of research. As the vision document notes:

Most researchers at MIDS primarily set their own research agenda. Individual autonomy has meant immeasurable

academic freedom.... The strong individual ethos has conferred advantages on MIDS. Coupled with concern for quality this has engendered in the Institute an attitude of healthy caution towards projects. The caution is dictated by a well-founded apprehension that excessive involvement with projects (more generally, sponsored research) can deprive faculty of the creative leisure and indeed impetus for reflective research. It [a project] can have an especially deleterious impact on young researchers who [in pursuing projects] would find it difficult to obtain a secure foothold in a particular specialty (MIDS 2000).

Funding from projects sponsored by outside agencies accounted for a meager 3.9% of the total funds received by the Institute in 1999-2000. However, in recent years, there is a noticeable increase in the number of foreign-sponsored projects taken up by the MIDS faculty.

Institute for Social and Economic Change (ISEC), Bangalore

In contrast to other research institutes in South India, ISEC is the only one that, from the beginning, has had a multidisciplinary focus. Economics and Sociology are well represented in the Institute. Political Science and Education as disciplinary fields also have an impressive presence. It may be remembered that M. N. Srinivas, the eminent sociologist, headed the Sociology unit of the ISEC for a decade. Also, in comparison to the MIDS, the ISEC is a much larger institution in terms of faculty strength. In fact, the ISEC is the largest social science research institute in India within the ICSSR network. It is endowed with a 16-hectare campus, hostels for students, guesthouse for visitors, housing for the faculty and staff and a 300-seat auditorium.

At the moment, the ISEC has a faculty strength of 39. But for the resource constraint faced by the Institute, the strength of the faculty would have been much larger. Of the posts sanctioned by the ICSSR, two posts of Professors, nine posts of Associate Professors and ten posts of Assistant Professors (21 in all) are vacant for lack of funds. Almost half of the current faculty of the ISEC are economists, while Sociology accounts for 17.9%, Education 7.7%, and Political Science 5.1%. Interestingly, the dominance of Economics has declined over the years. In 1982-83, Economics accounted for 69.2% of the faculty, and in 2000-01 it has declined to 51.3%. On the other hand, Sociology has steadily increased its share in the faculty, which has risen in the same period from 7.7% to 17.9%. In short, the ISEC has greater disciplinary diversity than any other ICSSR research institute in South India.

In contrast to the MIDS, faculty members of the ISEC are better distributed across different cadres. In 2000-01, Professors account for a fourth of the faculty members. Their share in the total number of faculty members has declined from 28.2% in 1982-83 to 25.6% in 2000-01. A similar trend is witnessed among Associate Professors too. During the same period, their share in the faculty has declined from 33.3% to 23.1%. On the contrary, the share of Assistant Professors in the faculty has increased from 38.5% in 1982-83 to 51.3% in 2000-01. Since its inception, faculty members at ISEC have produced about 225 books and more than 2,500 technical articles. Of these articles, over 600 were published in refereed journals in India and abroad, 900 articles in various magazines and about 1,000 articles were presented in seminars and workshops (ISEC 2001). We do not have detailed data on the distribution of the quantity and quality of publication across faculty. However, as the Director of the Institute, Professor M. Govinda Rao reported, all is not well with the research output of the

Institute. According to him, there are some who actively publish while most do not; and the quality of publication varies. The internal evaluation of faculty performance, according to Professor Rao, has not really worked the way it was expected to. The Institute is in the process of developing a new scheme of evaluating academic performance of the faculty.

On the other hand, the research output of the ISEC is marked by a high level of collaboration. As in the case of the MIDS, we have used the working papers published by the Institute to index the degree of collaboration. Of the 88 working papers brought out by the Institute, 46 (41% of the total) were co-authored. This appears to be because there is a critical mass of faculty in each discipline to allow for projects to be undertaken jointly.

In addition to research and PhD training, ISEC also undertakes a large number of other training programs. It is one of the institutions recognized by the University Grants Commission to conduct refresher courses for university and college teachers. Such courses are conducted every year in the disciplines of Economics, Sociology and Education. Under the World Bank-aided capacity-building program on Ecological Economics, the ISEC is a recognized center for imparting training to teachers and government officials. The Institute also conducts a refresher course in quantitative techniques and computer applications for teachers and researchers in the social sciences. Recently, at the request of Action Aid, the Institute organized an international program in research methodology for functionaries of NGOs.

Over the years, the role of the ICSSR in financially sustaining the research activities of the ISEC has almost become irrelevant. As the recent vision document of the Institute notes: "The share of the ICSSR support in the total budget of the Institute plummeted year

after year. However, the State government, in recognition of ISEC's valuable research contribution, steadily increased its support. Yet, as the State's own finances came under increasing pressure, the volume of assistance fell short of the requirements. Thus, in 1998-99, the ICSSR funds constituted about 6 % of the total expenditures, and the share of the State government constituted about 25 % of the total expenditure of the Institute" (ISEC 2001). The figures clearly show that the shortage of ICSSR funds has not always produced an institutional collapse: in some cases, other funding opportunities have been found. The possible implications of alternative funding for the quality of social science research is, of course, an important question that has not yet been settled. We will take up this issue in Chapter Four of this Report.

A substantial part of the Institute's activities is supported by sources other than the ICSSR and the government of Karnataka. The Reserve Bank of India has endowed a chair in macroeconomic policy. The Union Ministry of Agriculture has instituted an agro-economic research center named Agricultural Development and Rural Transformation Unit. And the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare has established in the Institute a population research center. In addition, ISEC takes up a number of funded projects to keep its core activities going as well as to upgrade the infrastructure. In 1998-99, sponsored projects accounted for a hefty 46% of the total revenue of the Institute. This has had a definite impact on the quality of research. Although attempts have been made to ensure that the disease called "projectitis" does not adversely affect the quality of research, there appears to be a note of despair in the Institute's own assessment of the situation: "it has become increasingly difficult to maintain standards... taking sponsored projects to maintain the flow of funds and to get adequate access to computer and other facilities has become

inevitable" (ISEC 2001).

Our study of the different patterns of government and nongovernment funding at MIDS and ISEC shows that there has been, and can be, varied responses to the recent crisis caused by the shortage of government funds. We will consider the implications of these responses in Chapter Four of this Report. What is clear, however, is that ***the shrinking of government funding and a new reliance on project-driven research has not produced a uniform narrative of the decline and crisis of social science research.*** These cases show the possibilities for a strategic mix of different sources of funding as well as different kinds of research.

The "Old" and the "New" in Pakistan

To bring out even more starkly the contrast between research institutes of the "old" style and those of the "new," we present here a description of the Applied Economics Research Centre (AERC) at the University of Karachi and the Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI) in Islamabad. SDPI and AERC are at two ends of the spectrum of research institutions in Pakistan. The AERC used to be one of the two best institutions conducting research in Pakistan from the early 1980s to around the middle of the 1990s when it went through major changes, primarily represented by the exodus of its highly qualified and productive faculty. The decline of the status of the AERC is symbolic of the demise and decline of public sector institutions in the country, and also marks the moment when alternate, private sector and donor-funded opportunities began to emerge outside the public sector. Just as the decline of the public sector accelerated, institutions like SDPI emerged. SDPI is of far more recent vintage and has emerged as a new, vibrant and dynamic type of institu-

tion, funded by donors.

Applied Economics Research Centre

The AERC was established in 1973 with funding from the Ford Foundation and the Provincial Government of Sindh. From its inception, the Centre has undertaken research on issues in applied economics, with special interest in the areas of agriculture, human resources, urban and regional economics, and public finance. With the subsequent growth of the Centre, its activities broadened to include the advanced training of economists from all parts of Pakistan. A major development in this connection has been the introduction of its own postgraduate degree program, the Master of Applied Science (Economics), which began in 1976. Since 1998, this has been upgraded to an MPhil/PhD program.

From its early years, the Centre has expanded considerably, and now employs over 70 full-time staff. The staff include 34 full-time economists, of whom 5 hold PhD degrees from leading US and British universities, 5 have MA/MSc/MPhil degrees from recognized universities abroad and the rest have postgraduate qualifications from Pakistan. In addition, the Centre draws on the staff of the departments of Economics, Sociology, Statistics, Computer Science and Commerce from the University of Karachi, whenever required. The Centre also has arrangements with NED University of Engineering and Technology, the Aga Khan University and various national and multinational consulting firms to undertake joint research projects. Institutionally, this growth in capacity, size and scope has led to the Centre being awarded the title of *Institution of National Capability in Applied Economics* by the University Grants Commission of Pakistan.

Research activities at the AERC fall into two categories: contract research for clients and core or staff research. Research is based on

primary data collection carried out by AERC and analysis of secondary data from outside sources. The Centre's research is policy oriented with emphasis on areas such as the economics of agriculture, public finance, urban and regional economics, trade, human resources, health and environment, poverty and social issues.

Contract research has rapidly become one of the major activities of AERC. There is considerable demand from international agencies and government departments for policy-oriented quantitative research, and the Centre possesses the capacity to provide it. Some of the largest clients of the Centre are international agencies like the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, USAID, various UN agencies, International Food Policy Research Institute, Hajj Research Centre, Umm-ul-Qura University and others. Research also has been undertaken for national and provincial agencies such as Pakistan Agriculture Research Council, Planning Commission, Sindh Regional Plan Organisation, Karachi Metropolitan Corporation and Karachi Water and Sewerage Board. Moreover, the services of AERC's staff members have been loaned on several occasions to the World Bank, Asian Development Bank and International Labour Organisation, for inclusion in fact-finding or appraisal missions and to the Government of Pakistan for membership of commissions, committees and task forces.

Core research comprises projects undertaken by staff members on their own initiative. Two kinds of core research may be distinguished. First, projects initiated by the Centre staff have been concerned with issues in the areas of human resources, agriculture, urban and regional economics, public finance, public policy, trade, development, planning, industry and women's issues. Second, projects initiated by MAS/MPhil students have made it possible for the Centre to undertake research on relatively small projects in several areas.

The teaching program at AERC started in 1976 and offers MAS/MPhil/PhD degrees from the University of Karachi. The coursework is intensive and spread over four quarters requiring the completion of 42 credit hours of study. A major component of the degree is training in special fields where students are able to apply the theory and quantitative techniques acquired in the program to write a thesis. Candidates in the second year are required to write and defend a thesis in one of the special fields. Major areas of such research have been Public Finance, Urban and Regional Economics, Industrial Economics, International Trade, Agricultural Economics, Human Resource Economics, Project Evaluation, Finance and Monetary Economics, Health and Nutrition and Islamic Economics.

The Centre's research work is disseminated to policymakers and interested audiences through its own publications. The Centre publishes a Discussion Paper series and a research report series. The Discussion Papers series reports on research projects undertaken by the staff. The research reports are monographs on major research efforts of the Centre commissioned by clients. The AERC publishes its own biannual journal, the *Pakistan Journal of Applied Economics*, which is internationally refereed and is widely recognised as one of the better economic journals in the region.

The Centre maintains an expanding library in the field of economics, with particular emphasis on areas of economics related to its principal research interests as well as a wide range of materials used for the teaching program. The library currently subscribes to over 200 periodicals in economics and the social sciences and its collection numbers approximately 16,000. Included in the library is an extensive collection of government of Pakistan publications used by researchers as a valuable source of data.

AERC's main source of income is the University Grants

Commission, which provides around half of AERC's funds. Between 1981 and 2001, AERC's UGC funds have shown an 11-fold increase, while funds for projects from 1981 to 1995, increased only by a factor of four, revealing the Centre's growing dependence on UGC funds.

Table 1.2
AERC's Income and Expenditure

	In percentages	1981-82	1984-85	1994-95	2000-01
Income					
	UGC Grant	46	41	51	95
	Own Income	4	6	9	0
	Contract Research	50	53	32	0
Expenditure					
	Recurring	52	71	67	88
	Research Expenses	0	0	0	5
	Contract Research	48	29	33	7

Note: So far no funds have been received by AERC for this financial year and there are considerable delays as these are disbursed in foreign exchange.

Sustainable Development Policy Institute, Islamabad

In the early 1990s, environmentalists implementing the National Conservation Strategy were concerned by the lack of Pakistani institutions working effectively on issues related to the environment and sustainable development. SDPI was established in 1992 in Islamabad, following a two-year design process, upon the recommendation of the National Conservation Strategy, which felt that there was a need for an independent think tank in Pakistan to address these issues. The design of the Institute was initiated by the International Union for the

Conservation of Nature-Pakistan (IUCN-P) with significant support from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), SDPI's only source of core institutional support.

SDPI is an independent, public interest think tank that provides advice to public, private and voluntary organisations and undertakes policy-oriented research and advocacy. The SDPI mission is "to catalyse the transition towards sustainable human development, defined as the enhancement of peace, social justice and well-being within and across generations." Using this broad definition, the specific focus of the Institute is the implementation of the Pakistan National Conservation Strategy.

SDPI's research program tries to provide support for informed decision-making and thus to catalyze the transition to sustainable human development. The research program is "problem-oriented rather than discipline-oriented." The National Conservation Strategy and Pakistan's Agenda 21 form the basic ethos of SDPI. In addition, SDPI has undertaken extensive research in the areas of Governance, Devolution/Democratic and Decentralization. In the areas of the Environment, SDPI focuses on urban and industrial environment policy, trade and the environment, water and hazardous waste management. The research program in the areas of Human and Social Development involves issues of Gender, Education, Population and Development, Peace and Security, and Community Development. Macroeconomic policies and structural adjustment also feature in SDPI's research program.

SDPI publishes research bulletins, working papers, research reports, policy briefs, policy papers, edited volumes of papers, monographs and other periodic publications. SDPI has also published working papers and books in English and Urdu. The focus of SDPI's output is policy advice, advocacy and networking, and training.

SDPI provides policy advice to a number of organizations in the public, private and voluntary sector, on issues and themes related to different aspects of sustainable development. This policy advice emanates from SDPI's research program and identifies alternatives for existing policies and practices. SDPI also plays an active role in providing advice and suggestions on contemporary issues, such as the government's Devolution Plan, on environmental policy in general, as well as that related to the Kalabagh Dam, and on issues related to education. In addition, SDPI serves as a resource center for local and foreign scholars, and usually has a high number of visiting Pakistani and international scholars. SDPI also has a large net of regular affiliated scholars who are in residence at the Institute from time to time.

SDPI participates in international conferences and holds its own Sustainable Development Conference almost annually. These conferences organized by SDPI address issues particularly related to emerging sustainable development in Pakistan and its problems, yet with an international focus. Participants are drawn from local NGOs, from government, academia and the media, and also include foreign scholars, many of whom are from other countries in South Asia.

In its role as one of Pakistan's most active and successful advocacy and networking organizations, SDPI has played a key role in raising awareness about environmental and social issues in Pakistan, particularly in the Islamabad region. In its advocacy role, SDPI has played a "reactive" role on such issues as human rights, gender, academic freedom, peace, religious tolerance, the nuclear issue and other themes pertaining to justice, freedom and development. In addition, it undertakes research on the basis of its research findings. Using its research output, the SDPI lobbies by participating in conferences and workshops and through contributions in local newspapers and magazines. SDPI also has strong links with many NGOs in Pakistan as well as

with several networks of NGOs both locally in the South Asian region, and internationally.

SDPI's Resource Centre provides information to multidisciplinary users. The Library is a valuable source of information for researchers at the Institute, for the academic community linked to SDPI and for the general public. The 10,000-volume library emphasises the themes of interest to SDPI Research Faculty, with particular focus on the environment and on different aspects of sustainable development. It has one of the best libraries on these issues in Islamabad. Other than a separate section for government publications, the Library also has a CD-ROM and audiovisual collection, and is part of a number of library networks.

SDPI has a very diverse and unique research faculty, which for its composition, diversity and variety is perhaps unparalleled in Pakistan. There are seven foreign PhDs at SDPI, one each in Demography, Anthropology, Economics, Science and Technology, Energy and Environment, Agricultural Economics, and in Political Science; a chemical engineer working on science and industrial development is also part of the research faculty. In addition, SDPI has eight visiting faculty, including an agronomist, four economists, one physicist now active on the issue of peace, and two experts on international relations.

CIDA, the Canadian International Development Agency, was SPDI's main source of funding and provided an initial grant. Since then, while it continues to support the institution, SDPI's sources of funding have changed considerably and have been diversified. From around 50% of SDPI's funding in 1994-95, CIDA's share has fallen to slightly over a quarter. The rate in the funding by CIDA over the period 1994-99 has increased by about 50%, while that of other sources has increased more than three-fold. In between these years, CIDA's share has varied, and for example, in 1996-97, was less than

20%, the lowest in this period, yet still very significant.

The financial picture of SDPI has improved considerably over the 1994-99 period in terms of income. This is attributed to the increasing maturity of the Institute and the demand for its activities, products and advice. While CIDA is still the main funder, SDPI also gets funds from government, multilateral agencies and the United Nations. SDPI has also recently established an endowment fund for the future. In the future, SDPI hopes to acquire funds from domestic business and government, from overseas donors, through the endowment fund and from research studies and projects in line with SDPI's broader areas of interest.

The main sources of income at SDPI are "unrestricted grants"—for which the primary contribution comes from CIDA—and project-specific income, which is now considerable.

Table 1.3

SDPI's Income

In percentages	1998	1999	2000
Unrestricted Grants	42	46	47
Project Specific	57	52	51

Drawing Inferences

Perhaps the reproduction of (largely) publicity material from both institutions itself shows the differences between the two. It is not just that one institution belongs to the declining public sector and the other to the vibrant and ascendant donor sector. In this section, we reflect upon all the broader themes and connotations related to these large trends.

In the late and mid-1980s, when AERC was at its peak, 11 qualified foreign PhDs were working there and contributing critically to its teaching program. According to information provided by the AERC, there were 5 PhDs working there until recently. However, visits to the AERC revealed that the only PhD was the director and a research professor; three other PhDs had, within the last few months, left the AERC and joined other institutions. Though still "technically" on the AERC staff roster as having taken "foreign service leave," for all practical purposes, they were on their way out. This decline of the AERC and the exodus of all competent and senior economists are indeed symptomatic of the general trend in the social sciences in Pakistan.

Of the 11 PhDs who were at the AERC in the late 1980s and early 1990s, three joined the World Bank, one the Asian Development Bank, and one the United Nations; 6 of the 11 went abroad, only one to a university (in the US), and one went to teach at a college in the Middle East. Of the five who stayed in Pakistan, one joined the World Bank in Islamabad, one joined a private sector teaching organization, one an NGO, another became a consultant, and the one who stayed on at the AERC became its Director. From 11 PhDs actively involved in research at the AERC, and hence in Pakistan, in the 1980s and early 1990s, there are now only two left who are active researchers—the one at the AERC and one at a local NGO. This loss is not restricted to the AERC, though that institution may show an exaggerated form of it. It is also evident at the other leading economic research institute, Pakistan Institute of Development Economics (PIDE), where many of the faculty have followed the same path as their colleagues at AERC, with many leaving the country and joining international organizations (in Pakistan and abroad), and only a few staying on in Pakistan at other nongovernmental research organizations (Naseem et al. 1998). The two senior economists at PIDE joined the government, one as its

Chief Economist and the other as the main advisor to the Ministry of Finance. It is also interesting to point out that the Social Policy and Development Centre (SPDC) in Karachi (not be confused with the similar-sounding SDPI in Islamabad), generously funded by donors, was created by three senior faculty members at the AERC *while they were working at the AERC*. Subsequently, three more middle-level faculty members left to join SPDC, while others ended up moonlighting there.

SDPI, on the other hand, has been around for less than a decade and has gradually built its reputation as a model for other research organizations in the country. It has not had the problem of attrition of staff as the public sector has and has attracted many scholars, some of whom worked in the public sector previously. Perhaps the greatest asset of SDPI is its flexibility in terms of management, attitude, disciplines and "space" created for and allowed to research scholars. Another great asset of SDPI as well as of SPDC, both funded by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), is that they can pay handsomely. The pay scales at both places are four to five times what the public sector pays and clearly constitute a major reason for the exodus from the public sector to this new breed of institutions. The limited salary in the public sector is also a cause for the exodus of Pakistani academics to foreign organizations and other countries. If one looks at the change in research projects over time, we find that in economics, research has shifted in line with the government's priorities. For example, there was a great deal of research on planning in general in the 1960s, followed by agriculture in the 1970s and especially on the consequences of the Green Revolution. Many theses and papers were also written on the industrial sector and on inequality. The Islamic economics school of thought flourished in the 1980s, while in line with Pakistan's subservience to agendas set by donors,

and with communications far easier, the 1990s onwards have seen research largely on global issues such as the environment and other governance-related themes. Public Finance, Poverty and Public Debt have also been popular themes, as has the Structural Adjustment Programme. These changes are reflected in the publications record of scholars at various institutions. Moreover, as donor money began to determine research, individual initiative gave way to expediency and to the need to supplement one's income. Nowadays research does not take place unless someone funds a "project."

Clearly, as compared to AERC, SDPI seems to be doing a better job at carrying out multidisciplinary research and continuing to attract exceptional talent. AERC is instead largely moribund and does not seem to have managed at all to change with the times. This is partially a victim of self-neglect and the changing environment, but particularly attributable to the decline of the public sector and its universities.

Other Trends

In the past, a huge percentage of academics in most social science disciplines in Pakistan were foreign-trained, as grants and scholarships from USAID, the Ford Foundation and other sources allowed many young scholars to go abroad to study. Now, with fewer grants and more applicants, it is becoming difficult to go abroad to study. Many students go for a year or so, to do another Masters degree after having done their Masters locally. But when they return, they are also liable to drop out of teaching or research and enter different professions. Compared to the past, it seems that there are far more Pakistan-trained social scientists working in the country than ever before. This is not surprising given the arithmetic, with more institutions producing more students and with more opportunities opening up. However,

this is mainly the case in subjects such as international relations, political science, history and Pakistan studies; it is not the case in economics. Surprisingly, Karachi University, which has been around for 50 years and has 8,000 students enrolled, has produced only one PhD in Economics in all these years. Despite the high ambitions mentioned in the brochure of the AERC, since 1986 it has awarded degrees at the MPhil level to only five students. The International Islamic University has produced some PhDs in Economics as have the Punjab and Quaid e Azam universities. Even Lahore University of Management Studies, which is mainly a business school, has only recently started an undergraduate program in economics and is now thinking about a Masters level program.

Karachi University presents an extraordinarily unique situation that differs significantly from the Pakistani stereotype, in that as much as 70% of the student population is female. In fact, there are a number of departments in the social sciences and in the humanities where there are no male students. Interestingly, a similar situation is found at Government College, Lahore, where 90% of students in Economics are women. While this huge proportion may not be reflected in other universities, particularly Baluchistan and Peshawar, there is no denying the fact that compared to, say, two decades ago, women have begun to be highly visible at all levels of society. The NGO sector is dominated by professional women from all backgrounds, including the social sciences, and there are at least 30%, if not more, women faculty members in all subjects. There has been a remarkable transformation in Pakistani society as a consequence of the revolution that has taken place in the lives of women.

The Indian Council of Social Science Research

What about the role of national bodies supporting social science research? As we have mentioned before, the ICSSR has functioned as an apex body for social science research in India. In this capacity, it supports as many as 27 research institutes all over the country and gives research grants and fellowships to university and college teachers and doctoral students. A persistent theme in much recent talk in India about the crisis in social science research is the institutional decline of the ICSSR and its failure to do what it used to do earlier (Ghosh 2001; Mathew 2001; Sethi 2000).

The ICSSR was set up in 1969 following the recommendation of a Social Science Research Committee chaired by V. K. R. V. Rao and including D. R. Gadgil, A. Aiyappan, Ramkrishna Mukherjee, M. S. Gore and other eminent social scientists. Rao was an economist who played a key role both as a government minister and leading member of the government Planning Commission, and in setting up several key institutions of social science research such as the Delhi School of Economics, the Institute of Economic Growth and later the ISEC in Bangalore. Professor Rajni Kothari, who was associated with the ICSSR in its early years, remembers that a key motivation behind the setting up of the Council was the feeling that apart from research that had a direct bearing on economic policy or the planning exercises, there was no domestic source of funding for academic research in the social sciences. The few large-scale survey-based researches that were being carried out were funded from abroad or by agencies such as the Ford Foundation. Rao, Gadgil and others felt strongly that there should be an autonomous agency, funded by government but run by social scientists themselves that would support as well as promote new

research in all social science disciplines. D. R. Gadgil was the first chairman of the ICSSR and J. P. Naik the first member-secretary. Among the early members of the Council were such stalwarts as D. S. Kothari, P. N. Dhar, C. R. Rao, Nirmal Kumar Bose, M. L. Dantwalla, Rajni Kothari, M. N. Srinivas, Sukhamoy Chakravarty, Ravi Matthai and others.

Reading the debates that took place in the early years of the ICSSR, one is struck by the very different concerns and motivations that drove the leading Indian social scientists of the time. An overwhelming concern was the lack of a sufficient number of trained social scientists in the country: the task was seen as one of promoting social science. In 1975, M. S. Gore, then chairman of the ICSSR, announced that there was no funding constraint on research projects. On the contrary, the problem was that there were not enough projects worth funding. The majority of applications for ICSSR grants had to be rejected. That year, the Council approved 400 research projects for grants but had to reject twice as many. (Gore 1975)

The second concern was about the relevance of social science research. J. P. Naik fired a major salvo in 1973 by arguing that the ICSSR should take the lead in formulating a "national social science policy." This policy would spell out the significance and relevance of different types and areas of research (i) for theory-building and methodological innovations in the disciplines and (ii) for solving social problems. He refused to accept that the issue of deciding on priorities for an apex organization like the ICSSR could be settled merely by reference to some notion of "academic quality". Individual scholars and institutions made their own choices in this matter; a national organization like the ICSSR could make such a choice only as a set of "national decisions." He agreed that since the ICSSR was a government-sponsored institution, there was a genuine fear that those

brought under its policy could lose their autonomy. The way to ensure that this did not happen was to insist that all decisions in this regard would be made by "an academic authority consisting largely, if not exclusively, of social scientists." Naik added that the ICSSR should respect differences in ideology, that it should provide equal funding for theoretical and applied research and that it should also set aside, as a matter of policy, some funds for non-priority areas out of which much new and innovative research tends to emerge (Naik 1973).

Although Naik announced that a national social science policy would be formulated by the end of 1973, the debates over it apparently proved more difficult to resolve than he had expected. After the experience of the Emergency in 1975-77, little more was heard about such a policy. The interesting point remains, however, that even in his fervent plea for a national policy in what was perhaps the most interventionist period of the developmental state in India, J. P. Naik never stepped beyond the scrupulously drawn boundaries of academic self-regulation by social scientists.

The third major concern in the early years of the ICSSR was the need, emphasized again and again, for a direct and active link between research and teaching. The first committee to review the working of the ICSSR, headed by Malcolm Adiseshiah, recommended in 1973 that the ICSSR intervene in the university system to update and upgrade syllabi and courses and provide fellowships and training to doctoral students and younger teachers. The object was to remedy the dearth of trained social scientists (First ICSSR Review Committee 1974). The second review committee, headed by V. M. Dandekar, urged once more that the ICSSR should organize workshops with college teachers and extend its facilities and programs to them. In 1981, when each of the ICSSR institutes had acquired a distinct identity in the forefront of research in several social science disciplines, P. C. Joshi

warned that the universities were being left behind in problem-oriented empirical research (Joshi 1981). On the other hand, C. T. Kurien argued that universities were better suited to maintaining the continuity with received knowledge, while institutes should try to push to the frontiers and also develop links with administration, industry, trade unions, social movements, etc. The relation between teaching and research, he was suggesting, should be complementary rather than one in which universities and institutes try to do the same thing (Kurien 1981). One gets a sense that by the early 1980s, it was already becoming apparent that most universities in India were growing disconnected with the domains of advanced social science research in the country.

It is widely acknowledged among social scientists in India that the creation of the ICSSR made an enormous difference. A. Vaidyanathan, the economist, has called it "a particularly farsighted and bold step" (Vaidyanathan 2001). This is particularly emphasized by the unmistakable note of optimism in both major reports on social science research carried out before 1985 (Weiner 1979; Sathyamurthy 1984). The ICSSR made available research grants and fellowships to hundreds of university and college teachers and doctoral students. It set up a chain of 27 research institutes across the country, at least a few of which have established themselves among the foremost institutions of social science research in the country, producing work at the highest international standards in several disciplines. More significantly, as Professor Vaidyanathan points out, the ICSSR performed a crucial function in promoting social science by persuading State governments to recognize the importance of research and to contribute to the infrastructure and funding of the institutes. On the research front, the ICSSR organized and published two series of surveys of research in Political Science, Sociology, Psychology, Economics, Public

Administration and Social Anthropology written by leading scholars in the field and considered landmark surveys. It sponsored some large-scale research projects of which at least the following were immensely influential in their fields: (i) The Status of Women Report by Vina Mazumdar and others; (ii) the Population and Social Change project by Asok Mitra, Asish Bose and others; (iii) the Rural Poverty project by T. N. Srinivasan, Pranab Bardhan, Ashok Rudra and others; (iv) the Kerala Development project by the Centre for Development Studies, Trivandrum; and (v) the Women's Studies Programme, which sponsored what were, at the time, unconventional and risky projects such as the *Women's Writing in India* volumes edited by Susie Tharu and K. Lalitha.

Critics usually date the decline of the ICSSR as the apex body of social science research to the latter half of the 1980s. One often-cited reason for the decline is the familiar bureaucratic phenomenon of the expansion and entrenchment of the administrative apparatus at the expense of the activities of the organization. There is no doubt that the permanent administrative staff of the ICSSR increased significantly through the 1980s and that expenditure on its own administration ate up a large part of the grants received from the government. In 1996-97, for instance, the ICSSR received a total grant of Rs.96.9 million from the Government of India. Of this, Rs.46.4 million, i.e. 47.9%, was distributed in the form of grants to the ICSSR research institutes. Only Rs.4 million, i.e. just over 4%, was given as research grants to scholars, while a whopping Rs.22.5 million, i.e. 23%, was spent under various heads on the ICSSR's own administration (ICSSR 1998). But more than the physical expansion of the administrative apparatus that consumed an ever-increasing share of resources, the delays, hassles and unimaginative routinization of the ICSSR's procedures for awarding grants and fellowships troubled the social scientists. The organization

was clearly no longer able to identify new and potentially significant research areas; its evaluation of grant applications was slow, utterly conventional and discouraged innovation. By the early 1990s, many scholars with serious and creative research projects were looking for other sources of funding, preferring not to approach the ICSSR at all.

It is significant that the ICSSR, despite being a body funded entirely by the government, has throughout maintained the principle that it should be run by social scientists themselves. Professor T. N. Madan, who was associated with the ICSSR from the beginning and was for several years its member-secretary, is emphatic that the principle was preserved even during periods when the government in New Delhi tended to meddle in the affairs of many autonomous institutions and even when the ICSSR was headed by a man like G. Parthasarathi who was not a professional social scientist. This was because, he says, the most prominent social scientists with huge reputations in their field were encouraged to take an active part in the affairs of the ICSSR. Their views on academic matters carried great weight with bureaucrats in the ministries. By the 1990s, however, the ICSSR tended to deal with the government through members of its own permanent staff who could not wield the same authority or respect. In the end, by the late 1990s, the situation developed into a serious standoff between the Ministry of Human Resources Development and the ICSSR, leading in 2001 to the appointment of an officer of the Indian Administrative Service as member-secretary of the ICSSR. The move appears to have been met with a mixed response from social scientists in India. While most would still subscribe to the principle of autonomy and academic self-regulation, they are also sceptical of the ability of academics to manage large and complex organizations in an environment where political pressure is not only applied on academic institutions but is often invited by academics themselves. Most recently, the ICSSR has

seen the formation of a Council consisting largely of figures whose only scholarly qualifications seem to be their affiliation to Hindu right-wing organizations. This led to a public dispute between the chairman and members of the Council and the sacking of the chairman by the Ministry, ending up in a court of law. The story of institutional decline, many would say, has reached its nadir: things could not be any worse.

Problems and Possibilities

In the course of our Report, we will have occasion to refer to the institutional histories of several other centers of social science research in South Asia. For the moment, let us summarize the issues we have raised so far.

1. Not all regions, institutions or disciplines share a sense of decline or crisis. In Nepal, for instance, the problem is seen as one where the institutional foundations of serious social science research were never adequately created. In Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Pakistan, and in some regions of India, existing institutions declined or faced a crisis because of the cumulative impact of the political circumstances in which they had to operate: we will consider this matter in Chapter Three of this Report. But considering South India as a region, for instance, it is arguable that centers and networks of research in several social science disciplines show no less, and possibly greater, promise today than they did a decade or two ago. Research in the discipline of Economics as a whole does not appear to suffer from a lack of funds or indeed any general institutional crisis. And while it is true that several older institutions have declined because of lack of government support, new institutions and new sources of funding have also

appeared. *The single most important reason for the prevailing sense of crisis is the recent shortage in the assured government funding of established institutions of social science research.* The shortages are ascribed mainly to the budgetary constraints of national and state governments that have led to cuts in spending on higher education. But there is also the recent withdrawal of governments from large-scale developmental planning that had earlier produced a need for scientific research around various issues of development policy. These days, it is often said, the government has less need for research of the earlier kind. The budgetary crisis and withdrawal from developmental activities may actually be even more severe in the case of many of the State governments which seem increasingly unable to provide the infrastructural and revenue support they once did to research institutes located in their states. In addition, there is the familiar problem of oversized, unimaginative and inefficient bureaucracies such as that of the ICSSR.

2. The general climate of lack of expansion in higher education and greater opportunities in other professions as well as in higher education abroad has led to a critical shortage of qualified and motivated students wanting to take up a career in social science research. Alongside the funding shortages, this is the other most frequently cited symptom of crisis. From all over South Asia and in all social science disciplines—Economics most predominantly, but increasingly in the other disciplines as well—the complaint is that the best students in the graduating class leave for the West. Since recruitment to leading research and teaching institutions has fallen, those who go abroad to get advanced research degrees are not hopeful that they can come back to teach or do research at home. This means that even if the funding situation were to ease, or if alternative funding was found, the shortage of young social scientists would remain unless something can

be done to revive the PhD programs.

3. Interestingly, there are signs that the earlier dominance of particular disciplines within the field of social science in South Asia is changing. In most of India as well as in Pakistan and Bangladesh, Economics was by far the dominant and most prestigious discipline. In Sri Lanka and in Northeast India, on the other hand, History had pride of place, followed by Anthropology. In Nepal, History and Political Science were the dominant disciplines. In recent times, especially with changing patterns of funding and new possibilities of employment, the demand for advanced education in History seems to have declined in most regions. On the other hand, Sociology seems to have greater attraction among postgraduate and research students, apparently because of the rapid growth of the NGO sector.

The gender balance among research students and faculty in the social sciences is clearly shifting in favor of women. In many institutions today, the majority of students in postgraduate classes in the social sciences are women. There are many more women among the younger faculty today than would have been the case 20 or 30 years ago, and it is not at all unusual to have women in positions of responsibility in academic institutions in South Asia today. It is often alleged that the shifting gender balance is itself an indication that the prestige of the social sciences is declining. But, like many other popular sayings, this one too is an oversimplification. Later in this Report, we will look into this matter in more detail.

4. The shortage of government funding has meant smaller faculties. In university departments, the result is an increased teaching load for faculty and less time for research. In the institutes, the way out has

been to seek sponsored projects from outside agencies. These projects pay for equipment, research assistance, travel and fieldwork. But they cannot replenish the size of the full-time faculty. Institutes with an inadequate faculty size find it hard to undertake team research or indeed to create a viable academic community to foster new ideas.

Institutions of Research

IN 1947, there were 21 universities in South Asia—18 in India, two (in Lahore and Dacca) in Pakistan and two campuses (in Colombo and Peradeniya) of the University of Ceylon. All had postgraduate departments of History, some had departments of Economics and only a few had departments of Sociology, Anthropology, Political Science or Psychology. A large part of the professional research in the social sciences was carried out in these university departments. Some of the older learned societies, like the Asiatic Society of Bengal, the Maharashtra Itihas Sanshodhak Mandal or the privately set-up Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, acted as forums for historical research. The Anthropological Survey of India was established in 1946 as a government research organization. Some privately sponsored institutions, especially in Bombay, did economic research. The Tata Institute of Social Sciences, privately funded, was started in 1936 primarily to give professional training in Social Work.

The situation changed rapidly in the 1960s and 1970s. A major boost was provided to social science research by the new efforts at economic planning by the postcolonial state. The planning exercise, and the many developmental programs that followed, required reliable data collected through large-scale surveys and sophisticated analysis by professional experts. The university departments, primarily devoted to teaching, did not have the capacity to do this job. It was necessary to set up specialized institutions with personnel and infrastructure geared to take up developmental research on such a scale. The researchers were mainly economists, with a sprinkling of demographers and sociologists. The two institutions that would be the pioneers in this field were the Indian Statistical Institute in Calcutta and the Institute of Economic Growth in Delhi. The former, established in the 1930s as a statistical laboratory at Presidency College, Calcutta, acquired a com-

pletely different character when P. C. Mahalanobis, its founder, was given charge of formulating the Second Five-Year Plan. In the 1950s, the ISI became host to some of the leading economists and statisticians from all over the world who participated in the discussions and debates over the Plan. It also gave birth to the National Sample Survey, the principal organization carrying out large-scale sample surveys in India on incomes, consumption, living standards, health and a host of other subjects. The Institute of Economic Growth was the child of V.K.R.V. Rao, another stalwart of the new establishment of economists advising the government.

One practice was firmly established at these institutions in their early years, and it was to have a significant influence on the quality of social science research in India. Although much of the research agenda was set by the demands of policymaking, and even when specific research projects were commissioned by government agencies, it was understood that the research results would be available to the scholarly community at large and would have to be defended before it, unless they related to defense or security matters. This meant that the theoretical frameworks, methodological principles, sources and quality of data, methods of inference and the practical and ethical implications of the research findings were all subjected to scrutiny and public debate, not only in wider public arenas but, most crucially, in professional academic forums. It also meant that the results of such research cumulated within disciplinary knowledge formations in Economics, Sociology, Anthropology or Political Science as theoretical debates, methodological practices and well-tested empirical findings.

In the course of the last two decades, however, the situation has changed radically because of the greatly reduced importance of planning, the budgetary crisis of national and state governments in the region and the general withdrawal of the state from many of the social

sectors. We give below a summary description of the various institutions of social science research in South Asia today in the context of these recent changes.

Bangladesh

There are five universities in Bangladesh funded by the University Grants Commission that have social science departments: Dhaka, Rajshahi, Chittagong, Jahangirnagar and Shahjalal Science and Technology University. In addition, there are three research centers located in the universities that carry out and promote social science research, namely, the Bureau of Economic Research and the Centre for Advanced Research in Social Science at Dhaka University and the Bureau of Socio-Economic Research and Training at the Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh.

Apart from the UGC, Bangladesh also has a Social Science Research Council under the Ministry of Planning that acts as the apex body on social science research in the country. The following are government agencies that collect and analyze social data and conduct social science research and training: Bangladesh Academy of Rural Development, Comilla; Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies, Dhaka; Centre on Integrated Rural Development for Asia and the Pacific, Dhaka; National Academy of Educational Management, Dhaka; National Institute of Mass Communication, Dhaka; National Institute of Local Government, Dhaka; Rural Development Academy, Bogra; Bangladesh Institute of International and Strategic Studies, Dhaka.

Of the other autonomous institutions with significant research or training activities in the social sciences, the following are worthy of note: Bangladesh Institute of Management, the Institute of Development Policy Analysis and Advocacy, Bangladesh, Rice

Research Institute, Association for Rural Development and Studies, Women for Women, Centre for Policy Dialogue, Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee, Asiatic Society of Bangladesh, Bangladesh Centre for Advanced Studies.

India

In 2000, there were more than 200 universities in India. Of them, 112 had postgraduate departments in the different social sciences. The total number of postgraduate social science departments in India was 423. The largest number of departments were in Economics, History and Political Science, but the number of Sociology departments has been on the rise. There were very few Psychology and Anthropology departments. Most of these departments are purely teaching institutions. Although many have PhD students and some individual faculty members carry out research, only a few of these university departments have established a reputation as centers of advanced research. The following departments are recognized by the University Grants Commission as advanced centers of research for which they get special financial support: Aligarh Muslim University and the University of Calcutta in History; the Deccan College, Pune, in Archaeology; the University of Delhi and the University of Mumbai in Economics; the University of Pune in Agricultural Economics; the University of Delhi in Sociology; and Panjab University, Chandigarh, in Anthropology. Of the other universities and institutions with this status, the following are in the forefront of research in different social science disciplines: Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi; Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta and Delhi; Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Pune; Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai; and the Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Mumbai.

The ICSSR has over the years set up a network of 27 social science

research institutes all over the country. Of them, the following continue to have a significant presence in the forefront of research and training: Institute of Social and Economic Change, Bangalore; Centre for Development Studies, Trivandrum; Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta; Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi; Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi; and Madras Institute of Development Studies, Chennai. Of the ICSSR institutes, the A. N. Sinha Institute of Social Studies, Patna; the Gandhian Institute of Studies, Varanasi; and the Centre for Social Studies, Surat, were once very active places of research, but have for various reasons declined in recent times. The Centre for Economic and Social Studies, Hyderabad; the Centre for Women's Development Studies, Delhi; and the Institute of Development Studies, Jaipur, though small in size, have carried out some significant research in specific areas. The Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi, is a prominent institution that concentrates less on academic research and more, as its name suggests, on policy-related studies.

Among the significant research centers outside university departments and ICSSR institutes, the following are noteworthy: The Nehru Memorial Museum and Library in New Delhi, besides having one of the best social science libraries in the country and one of the most important archival collections on modern Indian politics, has functioned as a major center of research on modern Indian history. The Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla, was established as a prestigious institution on the model of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton and All Souls College, Oxford. It functioned as a place for lively conferences but, even in its heyday in the 1970s, did not quite create an institutional tradition of sustained research of high quality. In recent years, it has done little of note. The National Council of Applied Economic Research in New Delhi is a large gov-

ernment body that collects and analyzes economic data relevant for policy-making. The Anthropological Survey of India with its main offices in Calcutta is a huge government establishment that has done little research of significance in recent times except for the publication of the 43-volume *People of India* series that has yielded some empirical findings of interest but remains deeply flawed in its theoretical and methodological assumptions. The Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations in New Delhi does policy research sponsored by government, private and foreign agencies. The Madras School of Economics was started in 1995 with a capital grant from the government of India and land from the government of Tamil Nadu, but it is mainly funded by Indian business houses and financial institutions. It carries out sponsored research and runs an MSc and a PhD program in Economics. The National Institute of Public Finance and Policy, New Delhi, conducts policy-related research and offers training programs. The field of gender studies is a new but productive field of research; here the Anveshi Research Centre in Hyderabad has been a significant place for initiating research on women's history. The School of Women's Studies at Jadavpur University, Calcutta, has recently emerged as a prominent center of research, training and publication in gender studies. We have included descriptions of several other institutions in the *Regional Studies* section of this Report.

Nepal

Of the five universities in Nepal, only Tribhuvan University has an active research program in the social sciences. PhDs are offered by the central postgraduate departments of History, Political Science, Economics and Sociology, as well as the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences; the Centre for International Relations maintains links with foreign institutions and scholars; and two research centers—

Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies (CNAS) and Centre for Economic Development and Administration (CEDA)—carry out research projects.

Among nongovernment organizations, the Institute of Integrated Development Studies, New Era and South Asia Partnership-Nepal are large consultancy and action-research organizations. The following organizations carry out and promote academic research and publication: Sansodhan Mandal, Nepal Foundation for Advanced Studies, Nepal Centre for Contemporary Studies, South Asia Study Centre and Centre for Social Research and Development. The Informal Sector Service Centre is an advocacy NGO that publishes the *Human Rights Year Book*.

For members of the central departments at the Kirtipur Campus of Tribhuvan University (TU), teaching is obligatory. In addition to teaching, faculty are institutionally involved in two types of research activities: they serve as dissertation advisors to MA students and publish the departmental journal. History and Political Science departments have suffered from a common problem—a lack of institutional support from outside the university. Both departments sometimes sponsor talks, workshops and seminars whenever they receive a grant, but such support is very rare. In the four decades of its existence, the History department has received small external grants only three times: one by UGC, the second by the Nepal-India B.P. Foundation and the third by the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES). As a result, this department has the credit of producing three sponsored books: *Conventional Themes on Nepali History* (in Nepali), *State of Nepali Historiography* and *Political Instability in Nepal*. The History department has also published a biannual journal since 1975, but it has come out regularly only since 1999. The Political Science department is in the most backward position in terms of research output. It has

not published a single book nor has it been able to revive the departmental journal, which has not been published since 1983.

Economics and Sociology/Anthropology are more prosperous but not necessarily more productive departments. Thesis writing by MA students is optional in Economics but compulsory in Sociology/Anthropology. International agencies like Winrock International and GTZ have provided small grants for the MA thesis-writing program in Sociology/Anthropology and Economics. In addition, the former is receiving similar support from the University of Bergen, Norway, and Cornell University. For the Economics department, Nepal Rastra Bank has long provided research fellowships for both students and teachers. It has also borne the financial cost of the departmental journal, which has been published regularly since its inception in 1978. The Sociology/Anthropology department has its own occasional papers, but it has produced only seven between 1987 and 2001. One additional departmental/institutional contribution is the publication of an edited volume, *Development Practices in Nepal*.

Research at the institutional level by central departments of Kirtipur Campus is negligible. But individual efforts by TU social scientists to get themselves involved in research through other platforms are an open secret. Some historians at the Kirtipur Campus have already published their research from CNAS, Royal Nepal Academy, Itihas Samsodhan Mandal and other research centers. There are plenty of nonuniversity academic journals, which publish articles on history. Among these are: *Purnima*, *Rolamba*, *Ancient Nepal*, *Abhilekh*, *Kailash*, *Journal of Nepal Research Centre*, *Journal of Nepalese Studies*, and *Historia*. Most articles published in these journals are written by university teachers, suggesting that although much research on Nepali history is sponsored and published by nonuniversity organizations, the researchers are in fact TU teachers.

In relative terms, political scientists have limited scope for research both inside and outside the university. A journal published by the department of Political Science and Sociology of Prithivi Narayan Campus, Pokhara, is in its infant stage: it has produced just three issues between 1998 and 2001. At one time, the Political Science Association of Nepal (POLSAN), established in 1991, had planned to publish nine books and one annual journal, but the association suddenly disappeared from the scene in 1999. Since the late 1990s, Nepal Centre for Contemporary Studies, a research-based NGO run by some TU political scientists, has come up with ambitious programs such as workshops, seminars, data generation, fieldwork-based research, publication of books, journals and occasional papers, and training for younger scholars in political science and other social sciences.

For sociologists/anthropologists, the space for academic research outside the university is virtually nil, though NGOs and INGOs have provided substantial support for nonacademic research. Some research articles on Nepal related to this discipline are published in journals like *Kailash*, *Janajati*, *Prajya*. Because of the lack of a sphere of academic research outside the university, the TU sociologists/anthropologists are behind other social scientists in terms of production of books. Only 4 out of 21 faculty members of the Sociology/Anthropology department of Kirtipur Campus have published single-author books, even though this department has 9 PhDs of whom 6 are from the USA and 3 from India.

The picture at the Economics department is not much different. Out of 41 faculty members, 22 have PhDs, but the number of single-author books is just 7. However, economics is a rich discipline for applied research, and most TU economists are busy with projects granted by government agencies, as well as domestic and internation-

al NGOs. Most project research by economists is policy-related or consists of feasibility/impact studies of development projects.

Coming back to social science research in the university, the Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies (CNAS) and Centre for Economic Development and Administration (CEDA) are social science research centers within TU. CNAS focuses on academic research and CEDA on applied research. The difference is well reflected in their publications. One hundred forty CNAS publications are in book form while 33 are mimeographed. CEDA on the other hand has published only 12 books but has 1,689 of its own research reports in its library. CEDA's priority is further explained by the fact that out of its 34 researchers, only seven have published books (whether singly, jointly or edited). To contribute to academic research, CEDA has published a journal since 1975, albeit irregularly. Both CNAS and CEDA are multidisciplinary if one looks at the disciplinary background of their faculty. But in terms of research areas, only CNAS is multidisciplinary whereas CEDA focuses exclusively on development issues.

Since its foundation in 1969 as an autonomous research institution, CEDA, which was integrated into the university in 1972, has focused on applied research and training. In the 1970s, CEDA was the most active think tank in Nepal, but since then it has declined. Three reasons are noteworthy. First, most of its founder researchers were co-opted into the National Planning Commission and INGOs and never came back to their parent organization. Two, the opening of the Staff College for training of government employees led to the curtailing of CEDA's training activities. Three, CEDA has long suffered from mismanagement, as witnessed by the irregularity in the publication of its journal, lack of records in its library and above all the tendency of individual researchers to take up private consultancies at the expense of institutional responsibilities.

Social science research in the university is definitely neglected and marginalized. Since the restoration of democracy in 1990, a new type of social science culture has emerged in which the motto seems to be "no research without extra money." This has led TU social scientists to devote more time to working for other organizations, mainly for private universities, NGOs and INGOs, even at the expense of their responsibility to the university. Many university teachers have their own private teaching establishments or NGOs. The high demand for TU teachers in the new commercialized education market and the consultancy research business has seriously hampered the academic environment of the university. Another problem that has emerged is the separation of research and teaching jobs and the hostility between those who work in research centers and those in teaching departments.

Pakistan

The following university social science departments and centers do significant research. However, it is important to point out that it is not the department or institution that does research, but a few individuals who happen to be working there. In one department, for instance, the three most senior professors, all of whom were about to retire, had among them 140 publications; the rest of the faculty of eight had seven papers among them, some of which were co-authored by the senior professors.

At the University of Karachi, the following departments have some research output, although quality, quantity and frequency vary widely: Women's Study Centre, Area Study Centre for Europe, Pakistan Study Centre, Department of International Relations, and the Applied Economics Research Centre. At the Aga Khan University, a private university in Karachi, the Department of Community Health

Sciences contributes to research in the health/population disciplines.

At Quaid e Azam University, Islamabad, the following departments have some output: the Economics Department, Department of Anthropology, Department of International Relations, Department of Defence and Strategic Studies, and the Area Study Centre for Africa, North and South America. At the University of the Punjab in Lahore, the Department of Political Science and the Centre for South Asian Studies produce output, while the Economics Department at the private Lahore University of Management Sciences makes a substantial contribution both in terms of quality and quantity. The faculty at the Economics Department at the Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, in the Punjab, has a number of publications to its credit. The International Islamic University, Islamabad, and its International Institute of Islamic Economics, produce a great deal of research in economics, primarily Islamic studies. Finally, the Area Study Centre for Central Asia, University of Peshawar, is probably the main center there that produces research in the social science disciplines.

The main autonomous research institutes, funded by government and nongovernment sources, include the following: in Karachi, at Karachi University, Applied Economics Research Centre, which is funded by the University Grants Commission; the Institute for Educational Development of the Aga Khan University also conducts research on gender and on education; the Social Policy and Development Centre, Karachi, is a donor-funded (CIDA) organization. In Islamabad, the Pakistan Institute of Development Economics is funded by the government and conducts research in economics and demography; the Sustainable Development Policy Institute is funded by CIDA as well; the Mahbub ul Haq Human Development Centre is a private nonprofit organization funded by UNDP; the Institute of Strategic Studies is a nonprofit, purportedly autonomous, research

center working on international and regional issues funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and the Institute of Regional Studies produces work on numerous issues related to a vast region from Central and West Asia to Southeast Asia. In Peshawar, the Pakistan Academy for Rural Development, and the Institute of Development Studies (NWFP), are government-funded research institutes, both past their prime, very much like the once formidable Punjab Economic Research Institute at Lahore and the Singh Development Centre, Ashore University, Singh.

While there are many thousands of NGOs operating in Pakistan, very few do what one would call research. Hague and Khan (1998) argue that "the NGOs working in the economic and social sectors have been able to attract many economists to work for them. Almost all this work has no serious academic or research content—in fact, it is anti-intellectual since it wants immediate answers to self-serving propositions or questions...." The short list given below includes NGOs whose work may be described as social science research. In Karachi, the NGO Resource Centre, the Urban Resource Centre and the Pakistan Institute of Labour Education and Research are three NGOs that conduct research on a regular basis. The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), World Conservation Union in Karachi, Peshawar, Quetta and Islamabad is a very valuable resource for anything related to the environment and has published a great deal of research. In Lahore, the Aurat Foundation, Shirkat Gah (Women's Resource Centre), and Applied Socioeconomic Research (ASR) are groups that produce research and output related to women's issues, while the Society for the Advancement of Higher Education produces research on education. It is no longer possible to do any sort of research on Pakistan's Northern Areas without consulting the voluminous micro- and macro-level studies of the Aga Khan Rural

Support Programme, in Gilgit. In Islamabad, among the NGOs that contribute to broader themes of research are the Population Council and Action Aid.

Sri Lanka

The National Science Foundation is the apex state-funded body that sponsors and initiates scientific research in Sri Lanka. One of its working committees is on the social sciences. Most university departments focus on undergraduate teaching. The following are significant research centers in the social sciences: Centre for Policy Research and Analysis in the Faculty of Law at the University of Colombo, the Programme to Improve Capacities for Poverty Research at the University of Colombo, the Centre for Anthropological and Sociological Studies in the Department of Sociology at the University of Colombo, and the Social Science Research and Training Centre at the University of Jaffna.

Among government-funded institutions, the following have significant activities in social science research: the Institute of Policy Studies, the Sri Lanka Association for the Advancement of Science and the Sri Lanka Foundation Institute. Among NGOs, the following have a significant presence in the field of research in the social sciences: the Centre for Society and Religion, the Centre for Women's Research, the International Centre for Ethnic Studies, the Marga Institute, the Regional Centre for Strategic Studies, the Social Scientists' Association, and the Women's Education and Research Centre, all in Colombo.

Who are the Social Scientists?

Sri Lanka

In Sri Lanka, the *Directory of Social Scientists* published by the National Library of Sri Lanka estimated in 1998 that there were about 500 social scientists in the country of whom it gave details for 258. The total number of faculty members of university social science departments is 292. There are 72 social scientists in the main autonomous research institutes. Together, the total figure is 364.

In recent years, there has been a major shift in the type of post-graduate training of junior staff in universities. Sri Lanka differs from many other countries in its procedure for staff recruitment to the university: assistant lecturers are recruited on the strength of a First Class or Second Upper in their BA degree (4 years). They are then given 8 years to acquire a postgraduate degree. Unlike the situation 20 years ago when lecturers easily found placements in universities in the UK or the USA, today most lecturers are faced with immense problems if they attempt to go abroad for postgraduate work. The first problem they face is their inability to communicate in the English language. Even if they write a good proposal and are supported by strong recommendations, they have to face the hurdle of the TOEFL, GRE or TFES. Recently a staff member was selected for the Commonwealth scholarship but failed the English test by half a point, thus losing his opportunity. Gananath Obeyesekere lamented the present Sociology department at Peradeniya where all the new recruits are monolingual and thus not qualified for postgraduate programs anywhere else in the world.

Of 10 young lecturers, on average two go abroad for an MPhil or MA and one for a PhD. The rest either acquire an MPhil in a Sri Lankan university or, very rarely, a PhD. Although Sri Lankan uni-

versities have enough resources to provide guidance and supervision at the Masters level, this is not the case for PhD research. Further, most universities do not have a well-structured MA or MPhil program in the social sciences, and this leads to a high drop-out rate. Dr. Uswatte Arachchi mentioned the difficulties not only in finding supervisors in very advanced fields of economics but also examiners capable of evaluating a thesis. Strangely very few researchers consider other South Asian countries—even India—as a suitable destination for postgraduate training: probably a result of our colonized minds!

Figures on the gender composition of students are not available at a department level. On the whole, among Arts students females count for around 60% and males around 40%. Within the social science disciplines, most female students seem to be in sociology, followed by history, political science and economics. The gender composition of the faculty varies from university to university. There is a fairly equal distribution of male and female lecturers in the Sociology departments. Economics departments are generally about 90% male, while History and Political Science departments have between 60 to 80% male faculty. Many of the top positions, including that of the head or chair, are held by women in these departments.

There is no data available on the social background of social science students. It is generally accepted, however, that the 5% of students who read for a degree in the English language come from urban middle-class homes and that Sinhala or Tamil-language students are from lower middle- or working-class backgrounds. For some students, coming to Colombo and studying at the university constitutes a major culture shock: everything from stairways to computers is new. Many students feel faculty members who drive cars and speak in English are alien. Among faculty too, there are cleavages based on the social distance from the Colombo elite. University teachers coming from the

Colombo elite constitute a very small minority, unlike the situation in the 1950s.

Young researchers who have an undergraduate or postgraduate degree from a Sri Lankan university would still prefer joining a state academic institution rather than an NGO. A university job is still prestigious for the vast majority of people as it is considered a noble and stable profession, unlike a research job in an NGO. Salaries were revised in the early 1990s, and for a young researcher, the flexibility and prestige brought by an academic job compensate for the slightly lower salary offered. NGOs do not pay their junior staff well enough to lead to an exodus of the best students from the university system. If there is an exodus, it is for the purpose of pursuing graduate studies in the USA and eventually settling there.

Young researchers with foreign qualifications often hesitate to join the state university system for many reasons. First, teaching is in the vernacular languages. Many researchers feel their knowledge of Sinhala or Tamil is inadequate and do not wish to spend time to reach the required level. Second, university campuses are known for their radical politics and violence. Third, university lecturers are public servants and hence subject to the same rules for travel abroad, namely, application must be made, one month in advance, and permission of the Minister of Higher Education is required. Fourth, there is a perception that no cutting-edge research is taking place in the university system. For these reasons, many PhDs have joined, often on temporary contracts, research institutes such as the International Centre for Ethnic Studies or the Institute for Policy Studies or the private sector. Sri Lanka does not have a state-financed postgraduate institution for the social sciences (comparable to JNU in India) that could welcome people highly qualified in the social sciences who are able to teach in English and undertake research on cutting-edge issues.

Bangladesh

In Bangladesh, the number of faculty members in the social science departments of Dhaka University is 163; at Jahangirnagar University, 93. The number of faculty members of the major research institutes is a just over 300. Using these numbers as a rough indicator and including estimates from the other universities, the total number of social scientists in Bangladesh would be in the region of 700.

Pakistan

In Pakistan, the total number of faculty members in social science departments at 13 universities is 421. If one adds the number of faculty in the institutes or centers located in universities, the total would come to 519. But we also tried to estimate the number of "active" researchers, based on our own knowledge about publications and comments and opinions from those academics interviewed. The economists interviewed felt that there were between 250-300 economists in Pakistan, either teaching or doing research in universities, at some kind of research institute, or with donors and NGOs. Of these, they felt, that at best 50 should be considered *active* economists involved in research, the standards and quality being variable. For history, there were said to be at most 70 academic historians of whom only seven were said to be active in research, most of whom were either retired or working outside any institution. Historical research is clearly not very popular among academics in Pakistan. There are about 80 political scientists of whom perhaps eight are active. In international relations too, there are said to be 70 to 80 social scientists of whom perhaps 15 are doing active research. In all other disciplines in the social sciences, the ratio is not more than 10% of the total number of social scientists. It is not easy to estimate the number of social

scientists working with NGOs in Pakistan. If one were to hazard a guess about the size of this community, the number would be no more than 100.

Although there is little doubt that here has been a huge quantitative expansion in the number of teaching departments and students in the social sciences in Pakistan in the last few decades, there is also little doubt that the quality of education across the board has deteriorated very sharply. A few decades ago, the quality of graduate and Masters level programs at Pakistani universities was thought to be of a decent standard, but all academics interviewed were unanimous in the view that this is no longer true. Everyone felt that in the public sector at least, the quality of postgraduate training would fall further in the years to come.

The reasons for the decline in quality are easy to understand. Cuts in resources to state sector institutions of learning, particularly in those subjects that are in the Arts and Humanities faculties, have been marked in recent years as the state has had to cut its budget deficit and spending. Since the 1980s, there has also been an explosion in the growth of private sector universities and colleges that have poached off the faculty from the public sector. At the Social Policy and Development Centre cited in the previous chapter, senior faculty of the Applied Economics Research Centre of the University of Karachi built a donor-funded institute paying lucrative salaries and eventually attracted many of the faculty as well as administrative staff of the public sector institution to work for the new private institute. Another factor that has resulted in the decline in quality is the fact that so many academics, particularly in the field of economics, have left the country.

Some interesting facts are indicative of the poor state of the social sciences in Pakistan. For example, Karachi University, which, along

with the University of the Punjab in Lahore, is the biggest university in Pakistan and has over 300 students enrolled in the Economics department, does not have a teacher with a degree higher than a foreign Masters'. Perhaps this partially explains the fact that Karachi University has been able to produce only one PhD in economics in 50 years. Equally interesting is the fact that the Lahore University of Management Sciences, a private university, which has yet to establish a postgraduate degree in the social sciences, has 30 foreign PhDs on the teaching faculty.

Nepal

We were able to get a more detailed picture of social scientists in Nepal. Table 2.1 gives a social profile of university teachers in the social sciences.

Table 2.1

Social Profile of Tribhuvan University Social Scientists by Gender and Religion

Department/Institution	Gender		Religion			
	Male	Female	Hindu	Buddhist	Muslim	Total
History	19	2	19	2	-	21
Political Science	19	1	18	1	1	20
Economics	39	2	38	3	-	41
Sociology/Anthropology	19	2	18	3	-	21
CNAS*	18	2	16	4	-	20
CEDA*	26	8	29	4	1	34
Total	140	17	138	17	2	157

* Excluded Executive Directors as their profile accounted to the department they belong to.

The table shows the gender imbalance in the social sciences at Tribhuvan University (TU): women constitute only 10% of teachers. Most TU social scientists are Hindus and only 11% are Buddhist. Hill Brahmins and Newars constitute 49% and 26% respectively; other caste groups, including Chhetri, constitute smaller numbers; and the complete absence of scheduled castes is also notable. This figure more or less matches the power distribution in politics and administration in Nepal. The question is: does under-representation of marginalized sections of society in the university have an impact on the research agenda and other academic activities? This issue is not much debated by TU social scientists. The fact is that except for one study by CEDA on the status of Nepali women in the 1970s, gender has never been an important issue in teaching or research in the university.

Table 2.2

Tribhuvan University Social Scientists by Caste/Ethnicity

Department/Institution	Hill				Tarai		Schedule Caste/Tribal
	Brahmin	Chhetri	Newar	Ethnic/Tribal	Caste	Ethnic/Tribal	
History	11	5	5	-	-	-	-
Political Science	9	3	4	1	3	-	-
Economics	25	2	8	1	5	-	-
Sociology/Anthropology	13	2	1	3	2	-	-
CNAS*	8	2	8	2	-	-	-
CEDA*	11	4	15	1	3	-	-
Total	77	18	41	8	13	-	-

*Excluded Executive Directors as their profile accounted to the department they belong to.

For Nepali social scientists, questions related to scheduled castes, hill ethnic groups and tarai communities remain relatively unexplored, even though a number of foreign researchers have produced volumes of research on these issues. Research and advocacy are being carried out on those subjects by NGOs and other organizations that are campaigning for the cause of disadvantaged sections of society.

Table 2.3

Tribhuvan University Social Scientists by Source of PhD

Department/Institution	Source of PhD			Ratio of PhD to Total Academic Staff
	Nepal	India	Other	
History	5	6	1	12/21
Political Science	3	7	1	11/20
Economics	3	11	8	22/41
Sociology/Anthropology	-	3	6	9/21
CNAS*	2	3	4	9/20
CEDA*	-	7	4	11/34
Total	13	37	24	74/157

*Excluded Executive Directors as their profile accounted to the department they belong to.

Out of a total of 157 social scientists working in four disciplines (history, political science, economics, sociology/anthropology) at the Kirtipur Campus of TU and the two research centers, 40 are professors, 55 readers and 62 lecturers. Around 50% of academics at CNAS

Table 2.4

Publication and Rank of Tribhuvan University Social Scientists

Department/Institution	Author of Research Books		
	Single	Joint	Edited
History	13	7	2
Political Science	8	6	5
Economics	7	6	3
Sociology/Anthropology	4	5	4
CNAS	12	8	2
CEDA	5	4	6
Total	49	36	22

Department/Institution	University Rank		
	Professor	Reader	Lecturer
History	7	10	4
Political Science	11	7	2
Economics	13	15	13
Sociology/Anthropology	4	2	15
CNAS*	3	9	8
CEDA*	2	12	20
Total	40	55	62

*Excluded Executive Directors as their profile accounted to the department they belong to.

and 32% at CEDA have PhD degrees. In total, the highest number of PhD holders is from Indian universities (37%); the lowest is from Nepal (13%). Degrees from overseas, most of them from American and British universities, accounted for another 24%.

Among 157 social scientists, 49 have published at least one single-author book, 36 have produced multi-authored books and 22 have published edited volumes. This figure does not reflect the volume and quality of books contributed by individual members of these teaching departments and research centers—as consultants to NGOs and other agencies.

India

In India, M. S. Gore estimated in 1975 that there were about 2,000 social scientists in the universities and another 400 in the research institutes (Gore 1975). In 2000, with 423 postgraduate social science departments, the estimate would be somewhere around 2,500 social scientists in the universities and another 600-700 in the institutes. But, as we have mentioned before, not all teachers in university departments, and indeed not all faculty in social science institutes, are active researchers. In order to get a sense of who belongs to the latter, undoubtedly smaller, group, we will have to use other methods of estimation attempted below.

Publications

We carried out a quick survey of five leading social science journals published in South Asia in order to identify authors' institutional affiliations. The five journals are *Contributions to Indian Sociology* and the *Sociological Bulletin* in Sociology, the *Indian Economic and Social History Review* and *Studies in History* in History, all four published in

Table 2.5

Institutional Affiliations of Authors Published in *Contributions to Indian Sociology* and *Sociological Bulletin*, 1996-2000

Institution	Number of Articles	Percentage
Foreign institutions	58	47.93
University of Delhi	17	14.05
Jawaharlal Nehru University	12	9.92
Other Indian universities	15	12.39
ICSSR institutes	12	9.92
Other institutes	7	5.79

Note 1: Total articles surveyed 126; total authors with affiliations 121 (100%).

Note 2: Foreign institutions = Europe 20, USA & Canada 29, Japan 2, Australia 2, Israel 1, Malaysia 1, Jamaica 1, Sri Lanka 1, Lebanon 1.

Delhi; and the *Economic and Political Weekly*, the multidisciplinary social science journal published in Mumbai. Tables 2.5 and 2.6 show the institutional locations of authors published in the four Sociology and History journals.

What is striking is that nearly half the articles published in the two leading Indian journals of Sociology are by scholars located outside South Asia—mainly in Western institutions. Of those located in India, the weight of two universities in Delhi is twice as much as all the other universities in India. It is worth mentioning that a single volume of *Sociological Bulletin*—in the year 2000—contained eight articles from other Indian universities. Without this, the situation would have been even more skewed. The ICSSR institutes account for about 10% of the articles, but here too only six of the institutes are represented and only four more than once.

Table 2.6

Institutional Affiliations of Authors Published in *IESHR* and *Studies in History*, 1996-2000

Institution	Number of Articles	Percentage
Foreign institutions	42	33.60
Jawaharlal Nehru University	17	13.60
University of Delhi	16	12.80
Nehru Memorial Museum and Library	5	4.00
Other Indian institutes	19	15.20
Other Indian universities	16	12.80
ICSSR institutes	9	7.20

Note 1: Total articles surveyed 128; total authors with affiliations 125 (100%).

Note 2: Foreign institutes = Europe 20, USA & Canada 17, Australia 2, Mexico 1, Sri Lanka 1, Nepal 1.

The proportion of authors located abroad is smaller in History than in Sociology, but it is still almost one-third of the total. The two major universities of Delhi and the Nehru Memorial Museum in New Delhi, whose fellowships are largely held by university and college teachers from Delhi, together accounted for another one-third of all articles published in the two journals in the last five years. It is also significant that the number of multi-authored articles is very small, probably reflecting the relative rarity of collaborative research in both Sociology and History.

Table 2.7

Institutional Affiliations of Books, 1996-2000

(Publishers: OUP India, Sage, Manohar and Orient Longman)

Institution	Number of Books	Percentage
Foreign institutions	88	32.71
Jawaharlal Nehru University	40	14.87
Nehru Memorial Museum and Library	6	2.23
Other Indian universities	46	17.10
ICSSR institutes	36	13.38
Other Indian institutes	21	7.81

Note 1: Edited volumes = 63, 23.42%.

Note 2: Total books surveyed: 222; total authors with institutional affiliations: 269 (100%).

Note 3: Foreign institutions = Europe 46, USA & Canada 31, Japan 3, Australia 2, Sri Lanka 2, Trinidad 1, Israel 1, Nepal 1, Pakistan 1.

Virtually the same pattern is repeated in our survey of books published by four leading social science publishers in South Asia, namely, Oxford University Press (India), Sage, Manohar and Orient Longman. The figures are shown in Table 2.7.

Of the 46 volumes from other Indian universities, as many as 25 were published by a single publisher—Manohar. The share of foreign institutions is once again around one-third, and the weight of the two major universities of Delhi is still impressive. The ICSSR institutes account for more than 13% of books, but there again only three institutes have three or more books each: the Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi (7); the Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta (6); and the Institute of Economic and Social Change, Bangalore (3). The number of edited and multi-authored volumes is significant,

which probably means that there is a far greater level of collaboration in research output published as books than articles.

Table 2.8

Publications in Journals and Books by Location, 1996-2000

(Data Based on Tables 2.5-2.7)

Institution	Sociology Journals	History Journals	Books
Foreign affiliations	58 (47.93%)	42 (33.60%)	88 (32.71%)
Institutions in Delhi	34 (28.10%)	49 (39.20%)	119 (44.24%)
Non-Delhi Indian institutes	29 (23.97%)	34 (27.20%)	62 (23.06%)

Note 1: Total number of authors published in each journal are respectively 121 and 125 and the total number of books published is 269.

The weight of Delhi in the Indian academic scene is brought out even more starkly if we pool together all of the institutions located in the Indian capital and compare their output against the rest of India. The figures are shown in Table 2.8.

It could be argued, of course, that it is because all four journals are published in Delhi and all four publishers have their principal editorial offices in Delhi that the stronger international connections are with scholars working on South Asia in foreign institutions, and that there is a predominance of Delhi-based authors. These biases, we might think, would be eliminated when we consider the *Economic and Political Weekly* of Mumbai, a unique institution in the world of social science—a weekly journal that combines the functions of a critical news magazine and forum of economic and political debate with that

of the most widely read multidisciplinary journal of academic social science published in South Asia.

We performed a similar analysis of the papers published in the "Special Articles" section of *EPW* in the three-year period from 1998

Table 2.9

Classification by Discipline of *EPW* Special Articles, 1998-2000

Discipline	1998	1999	2000	Total	
Economics	111	117	114	342	55.70%
Political Science	30	49	29	108	17.59%
Sociology	17	18	38	73	11.89%
Gender	6	7	18	31	5.05%
Environment	7	4	7	18	2.93%
History	5	5	6	16	2.61%
Demography	5	9	2	16	2.61%
Anthropology	2	4	4	10	1.63%

Note: Total *EPW* special articles for each year is respectively 183, 213 and 218 and the total for the three years is 614, the basis for percentages for each region.

to 2000. These are the equivalent of research articles in professional social science journals. Table 2.9 shows that more than half the articles are in Economics. In Table 2.10, we give a breakdown of the regions where the authors of these articles were located.

Almost 20% of the articles were from outside South Asia, although a small share of articles was from Bangladesh, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. Within India, it is clear that North India has the largest share, followed by Western India. The Western Indian share is interesting,

partly because it reflects the fact that the journal is based in Mumbai and is presumably more accessible to scholars from the region, but also because it indicates the strength of Economics as a discipline in Western India compared to the other social sciences. The share of Eastern India, we find, declined sharply between 1998 and 2000: it is hard to tell if this is a trend. The distributions become clearer when we consider the actual institutional locations of the authors. Institutional locations are not indicated in the EPW: we were able to track these from the records maintained at the *EPW* offices in Table 2.10

Classification by Region of *EPW* Special Articles, 1998-2000

Region	1998	1999	2000	Total	
North India	46	65	59	170	27.69%
West India	29	51	51	131	21.34%
South India	25	26	33	84	13.68%
East India	26	15	12	53	8.63%
USA	22	12	19	53	8.63%
UK	12	5	12	29	4.72%
Northeast India	0	3	2	5	0.81%
Nepal	1	2	1	4	0.65%
Sri Lanka	2	0	2	4	0.65%
Pakistan	1	1	0	2	0.33%
Bangladesh	1	0	0	1	0.16%
Location Not Available	4	21	15	40	6.51%
Rest of World	14	12	12	38	6.19%

Note: Totals from each are respectively 183, 213 and 218. Altogether, the total for three years is 614, the basis for percentages for each region.

Mumbai, which we were able to access by courtesy of Krishna Raj, the editor.

The share of Indian universities in *EPW* articles is a little above 20%, the same as the share of foreign-based authors. The share of Indian institutes is more than 55%, which clearly indicates that in a social science journal in which the majority of articles are in Economics, the institutes predominate over the universities. Among the universities, Jawaharlal Nehru University and the University of Delhi are, as expected, major contributors. But once again, partly because *EPW* is a Mumbai journal and partly because it publishes more articles in Economics, the University of Mumbai is the single most important university among the contributing institutions. Among institutes, the share of the ICSSR institutes is an impressive 16.52%. Of the 75 articles coming from the ICSSR institutes, the largest number of contributions came from the Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi (14); the Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta (11); the Centre for Development Studies, Trivandrum (11); the Centre for Economic and Social Studies, Hyderabad (11); and the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi (8). The single largest contribution from an institute came from the Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Mumbai (23).

We should add, however, that the *EPW* is not strictly speaking a refereed journal. And although many of the articles published in the journal are in Economics, most of these are on empirical findings on the Indian economy and issues of economic policy. The *EPW* does not reflect research on theoretical economics, for instance, a field in which the few researchers in Indian universities and institutes publish in international journals.

Table 2.11

Classification by Institute of *EPW* Special Articles, 1998-2000

Institution by Location	Total Number of Articles 1998-2000	Percentage
ICSSR Institutes	75	16.52
USA and Canada	39	8.59
Europe	35	7.71
Other countries outside India	28	6.17
University of Mumbai	26	5.73
IGIDR, Mumbai	23	5.07
Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi	23	5.07
Indian Institutes of Management (all campuses)	20	4.41
University of Delhi	14	3.08
National Council of Applied Economic Research, Delhi	10	2.20
Universities in South India	9	1.98
Universities in East India	9	1.98
National Institute of Public Finance and Policy, New Delhi	8	1.76
Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai	8	1.76
Other Universities in North India	7	1.54
Other Universities in West India	6	1.32
Universities in Northeast India	5	1.10
All other institutes	109	24.01
Total	454	100

Sri Lanka

In Sri Lanka, a total of 127 books were published between 1996 and 2000. Of these, 28 were by scholars based in universities, 62 by those in research centers and 40 by authors whose locations were unknown. Eighty-two authors were based in Colombo, 19 based elsewhere in Sri Lanka and the locations of the remaining 20 were unknown. One hundred of these books were published in Sri Lanka, 22 in India and 5 elsewhere.

Our survey of social science journals published in Sri Lanka shows the following distribution by disciplinary fields (see Table 2.12).

South Asia in International Publications

Another interesting measure of the research output of South Asian social scientists can be found in the *Social Sciences Citation Index*. This is an international index that also includes a few journals published in South Asia. The number of articles by authors with addresses in South Asia is presented at five-year intervals in the figures in Table 2.13

It appears that there was a steep fall in the number of articles from South Asia, attributable largely to the decrease in articles from India in the mid-1980s. The trend picked up again in the early 1990s, but there was a precipitous fall again in the one year between 1996 and 1997. Although it is difficult to draw conclusions from this single piece of evidence, the trends suggest that: 1) there has been a steady rise in research output in Pakistan until 1996; 2) the output in Bangladesh has remained steady; and 3) the output in India would appear to be related to the rise and fall in funding patterns and perhaps UGC policies concerning recruitment and promotions in universities.

Table 2.12

Classification by Discipline of Journal Articles in Sri Lankan Journals

Discipline	Number of Articles
Economic/Development	107
History	72
Gender	63
Political Science	33
Sociology/Anthropology	28
Literature/linguistics	25
Ethnicity	15
Art/Archeology	11
Philosophy	5
Environment	3

Note 1: Data gathered from the following non-university journals: *South Asia Economic Journal*, *Marga Quarterly*, *Nivedini*, *Sri Lanka Journal of Social Sciences*, *Ethnic Studies Report*, *Identity Culture Politics: An Afro-Asian Dialogue*, *Staff Studies* (Central Bank) Vols. 25-28, *Sri Lanka Economic Journal*, *Upanathi*, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* and *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*; and the following university journals: *Kalyani*, *Studies in Social Sciences*, *Sri Lanka Journal of Humanities*, *Modern Sri Lanka Studies* (Peradeniya), *Vidyodaya Journal of Social Sciences* (Sri Jayawardenapura) and *Studies in Humanities* (Rajarata).

Table 2.13

Articles with South Asian addresses in Social Sciences Citation Index

Year	Bangladesh	India	Nepal	Pakistan	Sri Lanka	Total
1981	38 (4.95%)	699 (91.02%)	4 (0.52%)	13 (1.69%)	14 (1.82%)	768
1986	42 (6.98%)	510 (84.72%)	12 (1.99%)	22 (3.66%)	16 (2.66%)	602
1991	35 (4.65%)	660 (87.65%)	14 (1.86%)	27 (3.59%)	18 (2.39%)	753
1996	34 (4.80%)	598 (84.46%)	10 (1.41%)	51 (7.20%)	15 (2.12%)	708

Note: Percentages calculated from total articles produced in the year shown.

IN this chapter, we will consider in detail three issues that have already been raised in this Report. The first is the question of the *relevance* of social science research. Is relevance an important question? How and by whom is it to be determined? We have noted that in the early years of the ICSSR, the suggestion that there should be a national social science policy provoked an interesting debate in India and appears to have been resolved by the experience of the Emergency regime of 1975-77. But although the idea of a government-supervised consensus on relevance is not widely favored, the question of relevance in terms of the uses of social science research is still very much a matter of discussion.

The second question, in part connected to the first, concerns the *accountability* of social scientists. Part of the accountability question has to be answered in terms of relevance: if social scientists are producing useful knowledge, then they could be seen to be accountable to the users of that knowledge. But there is a different question of institutional accountability. If universities and research centers are public institutions funded by public money, to whom should the social scientists working there be accountable? How should their work be evaluated and either rewarded or punished?

The third question we have raised bears on the relation of social science research, both in its content and in its institutional location, to the political environment. Is there political interference in research? Is there interference in institutional functioning? This need not only be a matter of the use of external power. Political interference may sometimes be invited by scholars themselves. In addition, there is the question of how social science research itself responds to the *political environment* by participating in political debates, affiliating with or opposing movements and causes, supplying arguments and data for use by

activists and political organizations. Are there professional and ethical questions involved here for social scientists?

The Relevance Question

Pakistan

Is it possible to get a sense of how the relevance of social science research was defined in Pakistan two or three decades ago and how it is being redefined now? Some would argue that *relevance is actually the problem*. In an effort to be relevant to problem-solving, Pakistani social scientists, particularly economists, have become clerks or at best bureaucrats, trying to find practical ways to improve things. In Pakistan, knowledge is defined as something that must have a practical use. Abstract thinking is discouraged and academics are told to "get out of their ivory towers." In a sense, the demand for "relevance" has limited the growth of social science research as a medium for the search for knowledge. It is merely a search for solutions, often without efforts to understand the problems in their wider social context.

On the other hand, some academics have complained that their disciplines are not considered "relevant" by the authorities and that no one listens to them. Thus, Political Science and History, for example, are not considered relevant enough to attract students to these disciplines. Unless these subjects are made as "relevant" as Economics, or other fields with explicit policy implications for government or other agencies, few students will be attracted to these disciplines. Clearly, academics are not expected to do policy-irrelevant research.

Given this need to find acceptance from the authorities, much research is limited by its "relevance." For example, in History, almost all historians and students pursuing higher degrees do research on the Pakistan Movement, and there is a great desire to justify the two-

nation theory. As a consequence, there is no historian in Pakistan who works on historiography, for example, or on social and cultural history, or on the British period, or on the Mughals. All the work is related to Jinnah, the Muslim League and perhaps some to Muslims in India prior to partition. The colonial period has been ignored, as has regional and provincial history. Some historians feel that History in Pakistan has always been subordinate to Political Science and that there are numerous amateurs, dilettantes and untrained non-historians trying to do the work of the historian.

When Islamic ideology dominated as the state ideology, many social scientists rediscovered Islam and its relationship and relevance to Pakistani society. They started doing research with an Islamic angle, primarily because this was considered a useful way to be accepted by the authorities and a means to legitimize oneself. This was particularly so in the period during Zia ul Haq's reign and has now acquired its own historical and institutional dynamics. Even Anthropology was recast in a Central Asian context in order to draw links with Pakistan's Muslim heritage in that region, negating or minimizing the South Asian links. For these reasons, some scholars have found that the "relevance and use of social sciences produced in Pakistan is low. The social science knowledge produced is primarily for the use of state agencies and only marginally for creating social awareness of social problems ..." (Inayatullah 1998). Nonetheless, the desire to find government approval by claiming relevance remains strong. Pakistan's best-known sociologist argued in the mid-1980s that in order to promote socio-economic development—"like senior economists, why can't we have senior sociologists in the Planning Commission to begin with?" (Hafeez 2001).

In some cases, research is relevant only because donors fund it: they have a far more pressing need to address specific problems. For exam-

ple, the huge bandwagon of poverty research in Pakistan is led by the World Bank in association with local institutes, and the interest in poverty is due to the very noticeable growth in funding. Much of the research in the social sectors five to ten years ago was also funded by donors prior to their launching a huge social sector development program. The current buzzword is "governance" in the way that the World Bank and other donors define it, focused on the political policies and institutions that will promote economic growth.

Writing mainly about economists, since they are in the greatest demand by donors, Haque and Khan (1998) identify a bigger problem that affects social science in general. Addressing the consultancy scourge, they write that careers in the consultancy industry have "affected the economics profession in a disastrous way in Pakistan," a phenomenon associated with the rise of foreign aid and donor funding. They write:

"Given the largely unfavourable environment for academic research in economics and the lucrative monetary gain and social status from consulting services, the industry has drawn the energy and time of almost every academic economist in the country. In fact, most of the so-called research agenda and output in almost all of the academia and institutes is driven by the demands for studies and reports by donor agencies and government departments or organisations."

The relevance of the social sciences can be gauged by the government's recent attitude as reported in a national newspaper. On August 23, 2001, *Dawn* quoted informed sources in a report that "the [North West Frontier Province] NWFP government has decided to abolish the Humanities subjects from the college curriculum" as "the students could not benefit from these 'worthless' subjects in their practical life." The report added that "the government, particularly its finance ministry, thinks that economics, political science, philosophy, literature,

sociology, history, Islamiyat and several other disciplines dealing with human thoughts are useless." A follow-up article quoted the Director of Colleges, NWFP, as saying that five newly opened women's colleges will not have humanities and social sciences. It also quoted the Director of Planning and Development, Directorate of Colleges, to the effect that the reason for the move is the opposition of the NWFP Finance department to the launching of humanities subjects in these newly-established institutions due to a shortage of resources. This article also quotes an NWFP Minister who said that "the government wants to introduce subjects in colleges according to the market demands ... Education should have some purpose and one of them should be to help people in getting employment. ...Our education should be responsive to the needs of the society so that our graduates do not sit idle after completing their schooling and get employed." (*The News on Sunday*, Karachi, September 20, 2001) Clearly, the social sciences are being forced to respond to the market by becoming less oriented towards basic knowledge and thus more "relevant."

Sri Lanka

Many of the concerns about the relevance of social science research in Sri Lanka are similar. In the last few years, there has been, for instance, a rise in interest in issues such as poverty—a result of the new research agenda set by international aid institutions. Many Sri Lankan scholars feel that the research agenda is now set from outside far more than it had been in prior years. The popularity of certain concepts such as "governance" or "empowerment," without any serious critical appraisal of what they might mean, is a reflection of this trend.

Another change caused largely by internal political developments is the shift from political economy and development issues in the 1970s

to a focus on ethnicity, nationalism and gender in the mid-1980s. Personalities too played a role in the visibility of a discipline at a given time. Gananath Obeyesekere points out that many sociologists today are public figures who predict election results or give verdicts on environmental issues, but in the 1950s and 1960s history and archaeology were the most respected disciplines because of such figures as Paranavitharana and Malalasekere. Uswatte Arachchi notes, however, that the heritage of historical thinking still continues: most Sri Lankans feel that the key to understanding modern society is to look back into the past. It is not uncommon to read an Economics dissertation that begins with an entire chapter devoted to the *Mahavamsa*, the ancient chronicle.

The Accountability Question

Pakistan

Are mechanisms of self-regulation, such as peer review, review committees, accreditation procedures and so on, seen as effective? How do mechanisms of regulation by others, such as government bodies or funding agencies, affect the productivity and autonomy of scholars?

In most academic and research institutions in the world, publications play an important role in the accountability of the professional academic researcher and determine the value of his or her work. Given the poor state of journals in Pakistan, however, this is not likely to have a significant impact on the quality of research. If non-refereed in-house journals are used for decisions on promotion or tenure, this will clearly give rise to a closed club, where those who control or manage the journal will determine who publishes. Also, in many of the non-refereed journals, articles are solicited from friends or "noted" scholars who have pretty much a free hand in what they want to say. In

some cases, especially for those who are invited to write, quality is severely compromised. There is a dubious process at work here that is often difficult to avoid: everyone knows that a particular journal is of poor quality, yet in order to be promoted, one needs a number of publications, and thus many respected and established researchers publish in poor quality un-refereed journals, simply to add to their list.

This phenomenon is even more evident when we consider book publishing. While most publishers in Pakistan do not send manuscripts for review, they must nevertheless meet certain standards because they have to sell the book. This is not the case with in-house journals. Perhaps this explains the fact that given the few hundred social scientists in Pakistan, only a handful have written academic books. As a passing example, of the 11 PhDs in Economics at the Applied Economics Research Centre, not a single one wrote a book while there, or afterward, though a few edited books based on conference proceedings were produced. At the Pakistan Institute of Development Economics, considered to be the premier institution for economics research, the situation is no better. In the other social sciences, too, only a handful of academics are conspicuous for their books and published work, because they are far too few and tend to write frequently.

Since academics in the social sciences publish so infrequently, they rise up the professional ladder on the basis of number of years served. Although technically all are required to publish, they manage to get by with publishing in lesser-known journals or with another collaborator. Peer reviews are usually done locally, and it is not uncommon to receive requests to "clear" a candidate. Many academics we interviewed were disgusted by what went on in the name of "research," and felt that there were major flaws in even the refereeing system with no established procedures or rules, and hence varied and arbitrary stan-

dards.

Some scholars feel that research (in Economics in their example, but this is generalizable) suffers on account of the following constraints:

"The major factors affecting the volume and quality of academic research in economics include the internal management structure, work environment, and the reward system in academia and research institutes. Reflecting the pathology of the larger feudal-bureaucratic social order in Pakistan, the senior management generally follows the national model of centralized power without consultation and participation. A large proportion of the junior research and teaching staff finds itself in a patron-client relationship, in which the patron has considerable power to punish and reward. This personalized nature of power breeds mediocrity since salary, scholarship, and promotion are rarely based on merit and personal achievement. Some of the senior research staff and faculty have achieved their positions through this system and suffer from a sense of insecurity" (Haque and Khan 1998).

One cannot but agree with this observation. Indeed, it reflects the very sad state of accountability in public sector institutions in Pakistan. Haque and Khan continue and say that, "the internal management structures are by and large non-participatory, based on hierarchy by seniority. The reward system follows the national model of patronage." Naseem (1998) adds that "there has also been little tradition to encourage freedom of expression and debate in a genuine fashion, either in-house or outside. In the absence of peer interaction and review, regardless of one's position in the hierarchy, it is no wonder what the quality of research output is. Individual consultation with and supervision by senior staff members is hardly a substitute for open interaction with peers. The highly centralised and bureaucratized (some would say feudal) work culture .. stifles initiative and participation among research staff." Inayatullah (2001) adds a broader per-

spective when he argues that, "working within the framework of government controlled and government funded academic institutions, some of the Pakistani social scientists opt for the convenient and possibly twisted meaning of value neutrality and adopt the perspective and preferences of those who happen to be in power regardless of the nature of the rule they impose on the society and degree of their political legitimacy."

Some academics have argued that Pakistan's authoritarian history has affected the nature and quality of research and accountability in the academy. Inayatullah (2001), for example, argues that Pakistan's "highly authoritarian" bureaucratic and military state placed "narrow limits on freedom of enquiry, expression and dissent," and that "the conduct of scholarship and the limits on scholarship are determined by government, not by the scholar." Such factors did compromise the nature of social science at public universities and institutes for many years and may have laid the conditions for deterioration. However, to be fair, such constraints do not exist in Pakistan today, and there is far greater freedom of expression than in the past.

While one can generalize from these comments, only very few institutes in the private sector are free from these biases. After all, many of the new institutes have been set up by individuals who worked for many years in the public sector and knew no other model. Clearly, how an institution is run, what norms are instituted and what signals given—the institute's working culture, in other words—are very much determined by who leads that institution, and how it is managed and governed, often by one individual. Some academics feel that the approach in universities is to stop others from doing work, and with so many political appointees, retired bureaucrats and military personnel serving as vice-chancellors and heads of centers and institutes, "accountability" tends to be based on nonacademic criteria and large-

ly related to patronage. The imprint of one's personal style has made and destroyed numerous institutions in Pakistan. A simple change in leadership can often transform an institution quite dramatically, for better or worse.

Sri Lanka

The concept of peer review is in decline in Sri Lanka and has nearly disappeared in some social science disciplines. Indeed, refereed journals have practically disappeared, and even if there is an editorial board that is supposed to review journal articles, it appears that such a procedure does not take place. NGOs publish the work of their researchers without subjecting them to a rigorous review procedure. The quality of this work is often wanting. When NGOs publish jointly with reputed publishers such as Sage or Oxford University Press, the quality of the work published is generally better. While the quality of research in Economics seems to have been sustained, the problem of evaluating sponsored project research is serious. "There is no institutional mechanism to monitor research," argues D. Weerakoon. "Since most research is carried out for a specific agency, once it is completed it is given to the funding agency. But this does not necessarily help the quality of research in the country."

In the university system, promotions are based on years of service, contribution to the university or to government and research publications. Most academics gain promotion on the first two criteria. In some cases, academics have been promoted on the basis of self-published books; in other cases, academics with as few as three articles to their credit have been made professors. In general, there is a sense of cynicism regarding these procedures.

The UGC is in the process of putting forward a promotion scheme that will give more emphasis to research and less to teaching and non-

research activities. The majority of teachers do not favor this scheme. Teachers in universities are recruited as probationary lecturers or senior lecturers. In the first case, tenure can be obtained if the lecturer completes a postgraduate degree within eight years, and in the second, if the senior lecturer passes a language test (ability to teach in Sinhala or Tamil) coupled with the head of the department's recommendation for tenure. Tenure is obtained quite easily and does not depend on research or publications. Very recently, however, lecturers have been recruited on two-year contracts with no guarantee of further employment.

If a consultancy is obtained through the university, a certain percentage of the grant (5-10%) goes to the university fund. In practice, most grants that university teachers get are channeled through private research institutions such as International Centre for Ethnic Studies or Social Scientists' Association.

NGOs are autonomous. Attempts by the state to control or at least to check the finances of the NGOs were shelved. Today, NGOs function just like any private company. They have to file their audited accounts with the registrar of companies and are accountable only to their funders, to whom they have to present accounts and reports of work in progress. Recruitment to these institutes is generally project-based and ad hoc. Posts are not advertized. For instance, if a funding agency indicates to a research institute that it is ready to fund a project on "women and governance," the institute writes a research proposal and submits it to the funder. If there is no person in the institute capable of writing the project proposal and taking charge of the project, a person with suitable qualifications is recruited for these tasks for the duration of the project. The salary is negotiable but generally conforms to the standards set by the funder. A chief researcher on a project might get a tax-free salary comparable to or slightly higher

than a full professor at the university.

In some NGOs, researchers get fixed salaries and are supposed to fund their own research by raising funds. In this case, they negotiate the percentage of the grant that goes to the institute and are generally more autonomous in the disbursement of funds.

India

Whenever questions of autonomy and accountability are raised in India, there is usually a difference in responses between scholars based in the universities and those based in the institutes. University teachers tend to brush aside the question of accountability, saying that as teachers they are accountable to their students on a "daily basis." (Almost the same phrase was used by several teachers we interviewed.) On the other hand, scholars at the research institutes were more troubled by the question and clearly felt that they needed to justify what they were doing. They agreed that the institutes were the appropriate places for serious academic research in the basic as well as the applied disciplines of the social sciences, referring to their connections with training programs and dissemination efforts, such as attempts to take their research results beyond the usual academic contexts, especially by reaching out to decision-makers, movements and activists.

As for autonomy, it was not a serious concern for most university people. The major funder has been and in many ways continues to be the state, but there have not been serious complaints about political interference in teaching or research in Indian universities. This is largely because of the many layers of institutions of self-regulation that have been established in the Indian academic world. There are other forms of interference, of course, in the case of appointments or the relative funding of different institutions, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

The question of funding agencies influencing the content of research has been raised in the research institutes over the recent anxiety born out of the dependence on project funds. We will take up this question once more in Chapter Four. Some concern was expressed in the course of our interviews about the present government in New Delhi and its ideological inclinations, which might prompt it to intervene where previous governments had not. There have been ominous moves made recently with respect to the composition of the UGC, the ICHR and the ICSSR. However, these are still concerns that have to do with this particular government. They do not, as yet, indicate any definite tendencies of the state as such.

Mechanisms of peer review such as the periodic review committees (conducted for all institutes and universities every five years by the ICSSR or the UGC) elicited little concern or comment. It is not believed that these reviews are anything more than routine exercises: good performance is not rewarded, nor does poor performance lead to a cut in funds. The recent innovation of a National Accreditation system of universities is also not seen to be a credible measure of genuine quality: most of the assessment appears to be based on infrastructure and readily quantifiable indices of performance.

The Political Environment and Research

Sri Lanka

A public awareness of the need for a national science policy and organization of the sciences emerged for the first time in Sri Lanka in the years immediately preceding independence. In 1944, a group of scientists organized themselves into an academic body known as the Ceylon Association for the Advancement of Science (CAAS) on the lines of similar associations in the countries of the Commonwealth.

Their main objectives were to promote the advancement of pure and applied science, establish contacts between scientists, disseminate scientific knowledge and give a direction to national research. Social scientists as a body became aware of the need for organization and management of research and training a decade later and joined the association in 1953. The CAAS pressed for the establishment of a National Research Council, which was approved in principle in 1968.

The insurrection of 1971 led a number of civil servants and left-wing intellectuals, mainly of the Lanka Sama Samaj Party (LSSP), to rethink their position vis-à-vis the coalition government of Mrs. Srimavo Bandaranaike. New nongovernmental institutes emerged as responses to the questions raised by the insurrection and the counterinsurgency. The Marga Institute was the response of the liberal bureaucrats, while the Center for Society and Religion was the response of the Catholic church. In both cases, the emphasis was on issues of political economy since the dominant paradigm was dependency and underdevelopment.

The nonaligned movement (NAM) led to a change in the organization of social science research in Sri Lanka. The NAM meeting in 1976 in Colombo brought to Sri Lanka a number of leading social scientists who met under the aegis of the SLAAS (section F). Sri Lanka became the meeting point for Third World economists and from these international contacts social sciences were considerably strengthened. Apart from the universities, Marga and CSR, other institutions such as the People's Bank research division and its journal the *Economic Review*, and the National Institute of Management played a valuable part. A year later the Social Scientists' Association (SSA) was created as a rallying point for Marxist social scientists.

While in most Asian countries, the 1970s was the decade when NGOs witnessed a phenomenal growth, over 65% of the develop-

ment NGOs in Sri Lanka were established only after 1977. In Sri Lanka, the most inhibiting factor was probably the all-encompassing power of the United Front government (1970-1977), a coalition of left-wing parties committed to a tightly regulated system that left little room for independent institutions of intellectual activity. In the late 1970s, the change of government heralded an era of openness that had a bearing on the growth of non-state organizations. The role of government during the decade after 1977 remained significant but while it increased its efforts to develop the nation's infrastructure, it reduced its role in regulation, both in the economy and in intellectual life. Its initiatives received the enthusiastic support of the international development community.

Hettige (1997) has stressed the changes that took place in the social sciences after the liberalization of the economy, the most significant of which is the growth of the non-state sector and its near hegemony in the field of social sciences. He argues that the inflow of large amounts of development aid and foreign investment has created many income-earning opportunities for social scientists in the form of consultancies. Inflow of donor funding for independent, nongovernmental organizations engaged in diverse activities led to a proliferation of such organizations opening further avenues for social scientists to engage in lucrative consultancies and other assignments. Consultancy firms, advocacy groups, associations and so on have also emerged to attract foreign funding. Yet most of these are small cliques that hardly penetrate the larger body of atomized younger social scientists who are mostly monolingual and swabasha-educated.

The implementation of a standardization scheme for entrance to universities first led liberal and conservative social scientists to speak of ethnicity. The International Centre for Ethnic Studies was a consequence of the debates over standardization and its effect on Tamil

entrants. The left created Movement for Inter-Racial Justice (MIRJ) to address such issues but Social Scientists' Association remained dominated by issues of class. Since the mid-1980s, there has been a huge expansion of social science research on ethnic conflict. A significant part of this research comes under the theme of "strengthening of democracy." In the past 20 years, the focus of social science research has been on finding the roots of the ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka, studying its various manifestations and trying to find solutions. New research areas—devolution, comparative federalism, minority rights, women and development, security—and even new fields such as conflict studies, have emerged as a response to these queries. The result has been a division among social scientists concerned with the present who use theoretical and conceptual frameworks emanating from the West to think about their own world, and those social scientists who are unaware of these trends or deliberately distance themselves from them.

The growth of women's studies was strengthened by the trends described above but predate the civil war of 1983. Interest in feminism existed in the 1970s but it was the pouring in of aid and the conceptual link up with "ethnicity" that consolidated its position. Ultimately, at least five institutions emerged to carry out serious research in this area.

The war in the North and the East has led to a brain drain from these areas that has left most departments there in a shambles. Many faculty members who left after 1983 have settled in Western seats of academia. The hardships are indeed difficult to surmount: lack of infrastructure facilities, lack of books and journals and difficulties in communicating with scholars in other universities. There are, for instance, no e-mail facilities for Jaffna and Eastern Universities.

The history of the social sciences in Sri Lanka is thus intrinsically

enmeshed in the political and social changes of the period. The switch to education in the vernacular as well as ethnic conflict has profoundly influenced the shape of social science research. Hettige (1997) is severe in his judgment that the social sciences in the country are plagued by some sort of a crisis. He believes that atomization and the formation of self-serving cliques at the expense of a sense of community and the lack of professionalism at the national level prevent social scientists from discharging their primary responsibilities. Instead of guiding policymakers, many have either become bystanders or succumbed to political pressures.

Although self-promoting cliques exist in the non-state sector, the true decline in standards has taken place in the universities, where the production of knowledge at an international standard has been stalled. More than in the NGO sector, the situation can be remedied at the university through certain simple, invariably unpopular but necessary policies such as the requirement that faculty must have postgraduate degrees (rather than first degrees, as at present) and must pass a test in English comprehension and writing conducted by a nonpartisan board. If the university takes the lead by recruiting and producing quality scholars, this will compel other organizations to raise their standards similarly.

Pakistan

Given the strong tendency toward authoritarianism in Pakistan, groups and individuals in power thrive on their ability to offer patronage and largesse. In their turn, even members of the intelligentsia seek to please representatives of the state in order to benefit from its largesse. Perhaps the poor output of social scientists, particularly in terms of intellectual pursuit (as opposed to problem-solving), can be explained by this need for social scientists to gain acceptance by the

institutions and representatives of the state.

If the state dominates, and if the bureaucracy plays a key role in influencing and running society where alternative organic institutions (such as mass-based political parties) do not exist, the road to power and influence must run through the bureaucracy. This seems to be specifically so for economists who are required in the Planning Commission, Ministry of Finance and other government departments to provide advice and formulate policy. Over the years, they have become influential and powerful members of the state, and are still able to remain economists. On the other hand, if anthropologists or historians joined the civil service, they would cease to remain rooted in their academic disciplines since their particular expertise would no longer be required for the purposes of "problem solving." Not so for economists.

If the acquisition of power and influence, and perhaps even prestige, is an important goal for an economist, then his or her career path will have to be through government. No academic economist wields power or much influence in Pakistan. As Naseem (1998) demonstrates in his historical evaluation of the economics profession in Pakistan: "for a variety of reasons, the economics profession has been dominated by practitioners, initially bureaucrats, rather than by those who have academic and research interests... Government economists and bureaucrats have generally enjoyed a much higher pecking-order than their academic or research counterparts in the Pakistani economists establishment."

While the route through the structures of the state has been the traditional way to power for economists, over the last decade or so the route has shifted to the international financial institutions, in particular the World Bank and the IMF. Several high-profile cases in the last decade suggest that a stint in either of these two international institu-

tions can lead to a prominent, often ministerial, position in government in Pakistan. The status of even junior staff members at the lending agencies stands far higher than that of the generalist civil servants and the domestic expert.

One explanation often advanced for the low status of social science in Pakistan is the lack of a culture promoting free discussion and debate (see, for example, Hashmi 2001). Many social scientists would argue that Pakistan is an intolerant society made up of individuals who are not willing to be criticized. Some link this to the absence of democracy, even in its formal electoral form. The lack of democracy is a favorite whipping horse for many social scientists. And while this could be a cause for many of the problems faced by Pakistan, including the lack of a vibrant social science culture, it is an *insufficient* explanation, since it does not explain how in numerous other countries, authoritarianism and a lack of democracy have in fact produced a vibrant opposition to government supported by an active social science community. Significantly, Pakistan lacks both.

A convincing argument, on which most academics concur, which explains the poor state of the social sciences in Pakistan, is related to the marked and highly visible decline of all sorts of institutions, particularly those in the public sector. This is manifest in the visible demise of public-sector educational and research institutions in Pakistan, as described in Chapter One of this Report. Most of the social science research in public sector institutions in Pakistan is done by individuals who merely happen to be based there, and not by the institution as such. If this handful of individuals were placed elsewhere, they would continue to do research. Their former institution, on the other hand, would probably have no research output to speak of. Institutions in the public sector no longer provide the space for an academic or intellectual community. Yet, while individuals are becom-

ing very important, in some cases even more important than the institution itself, the individual *must* be based at an institution. There is no viable category of the free-floating "independent" research scholar in Pakistan.

In the first two phases of Pakistan's political history—from 1947-58 and the phase of the military-bureaucratic state from 1958-71—research output in the social sciences was constrained by the lack of institutions and was largely restricted to the universities of the Punjab and Dhaka, and to Karachi, Pakistan's first capital. It was also limited to the fields of demography, politics, history and of course, economics. The researchers in that era were primarily Urdu-speaking migrants (the latter day *muhajirs*) from India to independent Pakistan and Bengal. Pakistan's social and economic formation was largely pre-capitalist, with the urban population a mere 18% of the total and a literacy rate of only 15%. In the discipline of history, the focus of research was on Muslim India and the Freedom Movement in a nationalistic Islamic guise, on the Muslim League, and on the period from the early 20th century up to the Partition of India. This trend in history continued well into the 1960s and even beyond. What was significant in the late 1950s and throughout the 1960s, was the influence of economic planning and of the Planning Commission, and of administrative and managerial concepts related to political administration: theorists of modernization such as Samuel Huntington and historical sociologists such as Barrington Moore were influential.

The Pakistan Institute of Development Economics (PIDE), set up in Karachi in 1957 with the help of the Ford Foundation, began conducting research in economics and demography. Along with the Planning Commission, PIDE attracted the best economists of the time from both East and West Pakistan. Their research was very significantly focused on solving Pakistan's numerous economic problems,

and the Institute played an active role in giving "policy relevant" advice. An interesting distinction between economists drawn to academics and those drawn to the problem-solving bureaucracy has been pointed out by Naseem (1998): "a much higher proportion of good students from East Pakistan were inclined towards academic and research careers than those in West Pakistan, who preferred administrative and civil service and military careers." The consequence of this difference, according to Naseem, was expressed when East Pakistan became Bangladesh and quickly set up the Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies, unlike Pakistan, where the "economics profession paid the price for the neglect of research and academic activities as a result of its overemphasis of and zeal for policy-making and planning functions."

Pakistan's first 20 years were very heavily influenced by Western, and particularly, American contacts. Not only was the curriculum of university courses in political science and economics drawn almost exclusively from primarily US and some British texts and sources, but most of the important research on Pakistan's economy and political system was done by Western scholars. It is difficult to think of any book produced by a Pakistani economist, political scientist or sociologist until well into the 1960s.

The Ayub Khan government's heavy dependence on the US, in terms of advice and economic and military aid, with additional assistance for education and institutional development from the Ford Foundation, USAID, and the Harvard Advisory Group, meant that not only were American policies and theories taught, but not surprisingly, many Pakistani scholars also developed their empirical work in the Anglo-US academic tradition in political science and economics.

Toward the end of the 1960s it became clear that East Pakistan was being discriminated against. Research carried out by mainstream

social scientists began to show the extent and nature of this discrimination. Social science research took on a noticeably political color, perhaps for the first time, a trend that was to continue until about 1977. The political revolution that took place from the late 1960s onwards in what remained of united Pakistan had a democratic and leftist color, which was reflected in the type of research undertaken. Studies were published on the extent of income and regional inequality, on the rising expression of different forms of nationalism, on the state and many other subjects. This was a highly politicized era that had also enlarged its composition to include a newly emergent middle class that was vocal and played a key role in the movement for democracy in Pakistan. New colleges and universities were opened in the public sector to cater to this group, and the policy of nationalization of education also allowed middle- and lower-middle-income students to go to school. Many argue that this was an active period of research in the social sciences, when research was free, secular, political, interventionist and activist. With the end of the Bhutto regime, a new Islamic ideology began to dominate every aspect of Pakistan's public life, and social science was at the forefront of this reaction.

As Islam and Islamic ideology became the hallmark of the Zia regime, research under the banner of Islam began to thrive. There was a conscious move on part of the military government of General Zia to dislodge Pakistan from its South Asian roots and to reorient Pakistan into a Muslim, Middle and Central Asian nexus. A new sense of identity and identification was invented with Islam playing the pivotal, cementing, role. Universities and research institutions began to toe the line and became part of the Islamic "resurgence." Economics became Islamic economics, anthropology Islamic anthropology, the only sort of history that began to be promoted was that related to the Pakistan Movement and the Muslim freedom struggle in united India.

The establishment of the International Islamic University in Islamabad in 1980 is part of this trend.

A key phenomenon that emerged most forcefully in the 1980s was what is called the Gulf Boom. Large amounts of remittances from Pakistani workers in the Gulf states made their way back to Pakistan. One of the many effects was the demand for better education at all levels. The response by the state was not an attempt to improve the quality of public sector education, which was in decline, but to allow a parallel private sector to emerge, particularly at the higher levels of education.

Pakistan in the post-Zia period is still affected by the major changes brought about by the military government between 1977-88, and change since then has been noticeable but slow. Pakistan's economy since the end of the 1980s became dependent upon the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, which imposed their advisors and programs on Pakistan. While government economists and institutions churned out data and reports justifying these economic policies, a few researchers began to argue against structural adjustment, showing its deleterious consequences. There was never really an exchange of ideas or debate between the government and nongovernmental economists, but those who carried out research to show the negative consequences of these policies were increasingly listened to by the public at large.

Curiously, although Kashmir and India have defined Pakistan's domestic political agenda and dominated Pakistan's foreign policy, research on the Kashmir/India issue, both in terms of quality and quantity, does not reflect this centrality.

A final point concerns Pakistan's academic diaspora. There is unanimous agreement among social scientists in Pakistan that those Pakistani academics who have acquired an international reputation

did so, without exception, while living and working abroad. In the past 30 years certainly, no Pakistani social scientist based in Pakistan has made much of an intellectual contribution to his or her discipline. While the structural reasons for this may be debated, what is unquestionable is the supremacy of the diaspora in the Pakistani social science hierarchy.

Bangladesh

Social science research in the East Pakistan period (1947-1971) critiqued the Pakistan state, its economy, its culture and its internal colonial relations. On this, there were three distinct positions. On the one hand, there were those Harvard-trained economists who believed that Pakistan's economy was exploitative and that the alternative for East Pakistan was some kind of socialism. On the other hand, there were those cultural theorists who thought that Bengali culture was different from Pan-Islamic culture. Finally there were those who thought that agrarian reforms and peasant movements were important for the radical restructuring of Bengali society and culture. Almost all social scientists, in this phase, were from the universities and from the disciplines of economics, political science, sociology, history and Bengali literature.

After the establishment of Bangladesh, social science research addressed Bengali nationalism in politics, economics and culture. It investigated the changing nature of power relations and the limits to the distribution of basic goods caused by poverty and the inadequate capacities of the state. The mode of production debate continued for almost a decade and represented the currency of a certain neo-Marxist discourse.

After 1975, the research scene changed radically in the context of the prolonged military rule, massive doses of foreign aid, the prolifer-

ation of NGOs and non-state actors, the so-called empowerment of civil society, the assertion of *adibashis* in the hill and forest areas and, of course, globalization and market freedom. Rural development became the buzzword and funds were channeled to the government and the NGOs for the purpose of promoting social welfare programs aimed at the basic needs of the poor. The objectives were to establish a network of small savers, health clinics, immunization programs and rural literacy campaigns. Removal of poverty was central, along with a move away from state-centered development schemes towards "participation." This shift describes the "civil society empowerment" approach and involved grassroots development through social participation. A convergence emerged between neopopulist development theorists and economic liberals. While the neopopulists extol the virtues of grassroots NGOs as the pillars of democratic governance, the economic liberals emphasize deregulation and privatization. The Grameen Bank, Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) and Proshika have earned international recognition for innovative NGO work and have claimed a certain autonomy, but many other NGOs are merely extensions of Western donor agencies. International agencies are in fact enmeshed with the state system in Bangladesh, their staff members often developing strategies that are contradictory to the state's priorities, and in some cases even more progressive than the governmental policies. As donors determine the research agenda, globalization has become a research priority emphasizing globally integrated production structures with specialized but interdependent labor markets, the privatization of state assets and the linkage of technology across borders.

After the military coup in 1975, the government started a policy of development in the forest and hill tracts of Chittagong, which clashed with the rights of the *adibashis*. The military government tended to see

the hill tracts not only as a source of natural resources, but also as a vast territory of sparsely populated land that must be occupied in order to secure the national borders in a frontier region. The hill tracts have become a site of confrontation between Bengali nationalism and the autonomy of the *pahari* people, provoking armed conflict in the region. The issue is now a research agenda for both international and national researchers including academics, consultants and *pahari* activists.

Research interests have no doubt diversified over the years in Bangladesh, but the question is being asked: who determines the research agenda? Does the country need a central advisory body or national criteria to judge the value of diversification in different directions? Is there a need for a coordinated approach to strengthen research practices? Research, in many instances, is no more than consultancy and is dependent on donors and international agencies. The constraint of funds restricts independent initiatives in research. Though researchers are often capable, competent and well trained, they are retreating from the academia and cluster around consultancy firms and NGOs. Universities have been strengthened in some areas, but they are definitely weak in the research fields.

One of the aims of social science research is to constitute an interpretive community. Since the public institutions are not conducive to interpretive activity, social science in Bangladesh has become a closed system in which experts and academics are incorporated. International policymakers dominate this system and national policymakers play a subordinate role and hand over the social and intellectual authority to outsiders. Professor Rehman Sobhan pointed out to us that economists in Bangladesh no longer play any role in public debates as they did in the 1960s and 1970s.

There has been historical erosion in the independent role of social

science since the appearance of donor agencies. The large universities are sandwiched between the hegemony of the international agencies and the shrinking sphere of the national political authority. Social science today in Bangladesh does not reflect social concerns within the professional circle of intellectuals, but rather represents corporate and governmental interests.

The Bangladesh university, despite the autonomy granted to it by parliament, is a part of the political system. Academic appointments, from vice-chancellors to lecturers, are political appointments influenced by the government of the day. Access to political authority is necessary to get these posts, indicating the divisions within the teaching and research community and also the neutralization of dissent. This atmosphere, by and large, produces conformity, which helps authoritarianism at the cost of social inquiry. This is one kind of politicization (or depoliticization) that has precluded a sustained, systematic and critical examination of the relation between social thought and society.

Finally, the language of social science is English. The present cultural moment in Bangladesh has opted for Bangla as the medium of instruction in university education. This has produced a rupture between the world of ideas and scholarship and the national world of politics, policymaking, and corporate and state power. This rupture has produced a doctrine that the general mass is best left ignorant about social science, and crucial policy matters are best left to "experts" who speak in English and produce ideas and policies for an international audience.

Northeast India

In many of the northeastern states of India, a different set of problems having to do with insularity and regimentation has emerged as

social science research has become involved with political movements and organizations. The aspirations of the ethnic communities of the region have been articulated through a series of mass movements in which the educated sectors have played leading roles. The best known among such movements is of course the Assam Movement of the 1980s. The intolerance generated by these movements led to what Hiren Gohain called a "regimentation of the intellect." The communities of the region are becoming so intolerant that studies not conforming to the dominant ideas are often suppressed and scholars with independent opinions persecuted. A perusal of the MPhil and PhD dissertations of the North-East Hill University (NEHU), the most productive institution of the region, shows that students from the tribal communities have done research mainly on their own tribes. These dissertations reflect a considerable insularity. Most students merely reproduce the existing knowledge and take positions that reflect a certain parochialism.

It is instructive in this context to look at the largest and most productive social science department of northeastern India, namely, the History department of NEHU, established in 1974. This department has an impressive history of publications. The faculty has 20 books and about 40 articles to its credit. The department also edits and publishes the proceedings of the North-East India History Association.

In the 1970s, though the faculty strength was eight, thirteen teachers served the department in various capacities and for various periods. Of them, only six were from the region; of those four were from the tribal communities of northeast India. Two were Khasi, the other two were Garo. It is important to note that the university is in a hill tribal state, and the Khasi and the Garo are two important tribal communities of the region. The rest of the faculty came from all over India, with a good mix from north and south India. By 1985, all seven

teachers from outside the region had left the department. The six teachers from the region remained. In the 1980s, five more teachers were appointed from within the region and as many as six teachers from outside the region. All but one of the outside appointments had left by 1990. It is increasingly becoming a faculty predominantly from the northeastern region. In a faculty of ten, five are tribals from northeast India, four are non-tribals from northeast India and two are from the rest of India. Of the latter, one teaches ancient history and the other medieval history, areas of Indian history in which there are few specialists in the Northeast.

In the 1970s, only four faculty members were trained in the universities of the Northeast; the others were trained in various universities in other parts of India. In the 1990s, only three members of the faculty had been trained outside the northeast. In the 1970s, there were only two women in the faculty, both belonging to the tribal communities of the region. In the 1990s, in an effective faculty strength of 11, there were five women.

There was only one PhD student in the department in the 1970s. By 1985-86, the figure rose to 12. There was a healthy gender distribution too: six were males and six females. In the 1990s the equation remains the same. Most students are from the Scheduled Castes (S.C.) and Scheduled Tribes (S.T.). In the 1970s and 1980s, 50% of PhD students were from the Scheduled category. In 1999, there were nine PhD students; all of them were from S.T. and S.C. categories. The career path of students is easy to trace: almost all of them go on to teach at the college level. In terms of preference, however, the first choice is the Indian Administrative Services and the second the State civil services. Those who fail to qualify for these two services enter academia.

The situation we have described in this marginalized region of India

is, in some ways, paradoxical. One of the aims of institutional development in the northeast region is to develop local institutions where social scientists from the region would be trained and employed. In this sense, NEHU can claim to be a success. Yet, the pressure to recruit local scholars in local institutions has the adverse effect of inbreeding and isolation from the larger world of scholarship. Once again, the problem here is to strike the right balance. It could be argued that in most institutions in the Northeast, this balance has not been found.

Eastern India

Some of the most sensational stories in recent years of political interference in institutions of higher education have come from eastern India. There are many stories here of vice-chancellors and senior faculty of universities being appointed by political fiat. There are stories of particular universities becoming the preserve of a particular caste or ethnic or regional group. There are stories of funds being cut at institutes in order to press for particular appointments to its faculty. These stories are not unique to the states of eastern India; there are similar stories from other parts of India. But perhaps because of the relative lack of development in recent years in this part of the country, stories like these have become emblematic of the lawlessness and ungovernability of states like Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Orissa. In addition, there is the case of West Bengal where the proverbial long arm of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), which has been in power in the state since 1977, is said to have meddled in the affairs of every academic institution in the state. Since Calcutta was in many ways the leading center of social science scholarship in India until the 1960s, the narrative of decline is particularly strong among social scientists in West Bengal.

We first look at the situation in the field of Economics in West

Bengal to identify the nature of the decline and how it may be related to political factors. We then present an account of one research institute in Calcutta that claims to have successfully steered through the many political traps, maintaining its commitment to serious academic research without, however, relinquishing the duty of social scientists to reflect upon and engage with the social and political issues of the time.

Calcutta's reputation in the teaching of Economics rests, in particular, on the Economics department of Presidency College. Many of the most famous Indian economists working in different institutions in India and in the West since the 1960s were trained in this department. Until the early 1970s, a government institution such as Presidency College paid better salaries than other colleges, had more senior posts and consciously cultivated an institutional memory that emphasized quality and prestige, among its students as well as its teachers. Earlier, we mentioned the DSE as an institution that has been mythologized. The myths around Presidency College go back to the early decades of the 19th century and include many of the greatest intellectual figures of modern Bengal. Teachers at Presidency College prided themselves on their awareness of the latest intellectual trends in the West and successfully produced generations of students who went abroad and performed brilliantly at the most famous Western universities. Presidency College teachers also taught in the postgraduate department in the university. In Economics in particular, the Calcutta syllabus for economic theory at the undergraduate level was the most advanced in India. Students from Presidency College then went on to teach at Calcutta and Jadavpur universities and also at several undergraduate colleges in Calcutta. As a result, the general quality of Economics teaching in the Calcutta region was higher than anywhere else in India.

This advantage has eroded since the 1970s, first as a result of the UGC policy of equating the pay for all college teachers and later as a result of the policy of the West Bengal government of automatically transferring teachers from one government college to another every few years. The second reason was the attraction of Delhi, whose new institutions offered better infrastructure, better facilities, glamorous faculty (many of them educated in Calcutta) and much greater career opportunities in government, banking and financial services, management, research institutions and higher studies abroad. In seeking to convince its better-trained economists to return to West Bengal to teach, the state has had to compete with opportunities virtually all over the world. The new generation finds that in terms of pay and facilities, the differences between working in West Bengal and abroad or between teaching and other careers are too large to make teaching in Calcutta a viable option. All in all, it is becoming increasingly difficult for teaching institutions in West Bengal to find good economists.

Nevertheless, the best undergraduate colleges in West Bengal still produce students in Economics who flood the best postgraduate institutions in Delhi every year. Few, however, return to teach in West Bengal. Even in the case of an institution like the Indian Statistical Institute, its Delhi center now has a more glamorous presence in the world of economic research and training. Although the Calcutta campus remains much larger, Professor Dipankar Dasgupta, who has worked for many years at both campuses of ISI, says that the Delhi center is much better equipped in terms of infrastructure, computer and library facilities, largely because of generous grants from the Planning Commission. In the meantime, the stories circulate in Calcutta of the sad decline of the great institution called Presidency College, subjected to the left government's campaign against elitism in

education, its faculty packed with political favorites.

Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta

The CSSSC was set up in 1973 by the Government of India on the recommendation of a committee headed by Sukhamoy Chakravarty. Its funding was to be shared equally by the central government (later through the ICSSR) and the West Bengal government. Its faculty was multidisciplinary, and included economists, historians, sociologists, political scientists and geographers.

The Centre has established a reputation as one of the best social science research institutes in the country. In its early years, led by Amiya Kumar Bagchi, Asok Sen and Amalendu Guha, it was a major research institution in the field of economic history.. It was also an important site of research on the history of Assam and northeast India. During the 1980s, it served as the main institutional forum for *Subaltern Studies*, a new approach to political and cultural history that is now widely known throughout the world; scholars associated with the project such as Gautam Bhadra, Dipesh Chakrabarty, Partha Chatterjee, Gyan Pandey and M.S.S. Pandian were at various times members of the CSSSC faculty. It was also one of the first institutions in India to undertake studies on women and development. It is now the leading institute in the country for cultural studies and annually conducts a prestigious training workshop for younger scholars in the field.

The faculty has an impressive record of publication including books, edited volumes and articles in academic as well as popular journals. The output, of course, varies among individuals, both in quality and quantity. Faculty members will admit that methods of self-assessment, carried out annually in a review meeting on ongoing research, are not very effective in ensuring productivity. The prevailing culture

is one where there are few institutional impositions on the faculty's research. This ensures that scholars who are driven by their own intellectual agendas have the freedom and support to pursue their own projects. This is reflected, first, in the truly interdisciplinary character of much of the best research coming out of the Centre, and second, in the number of new areas and methodological approaches opened up by its best scholars. The underside of this climate of freedom, however, is that those who work better when tasks are set for them, or when they work in teams, find it more difficult to perform at an adequate level. It is also unclear whether this is the best climate for young researchers in the social sciences. The problem will now have to be tackled at CSSSC because of the passing of the first generation and the influx of a new group of young faculty.

The CSSSC library is now perhaps the most widely used social science library in Calcutta. It has more than 20,000 books and regularly subscribes to 178 periodicals, including 78 international journals. The faculty is especially proud of the fact that even in the days of the severest financial crisis, it decided not to discontinue any of its journal subscriptions. The library also has a major collection of government reports and is a repository library for World Bank publications. A special feature of the library is a major collection of microfilm and transparencies of print and visual sources on the history of Bengal and Eastern India.

From its early years, the CSSSC had the reputation of being dominated by Marxist scholars. While it always had on its faculty distinguished figures, such as the anthropologist Surajit Sinha or the historian Hitesranjan Sanyal, whose approach could hardly be described as Marxist, several of the leading lights of the Centre were indeed among the foremost Marxist social scientists of India. Even younger social scientists who came to work at the Centre in the 1970s and 1980s did

so because they were attracted by the particular theoretical approaches followed by leading scholars there. It is worth pointing out that the somewhat unique interdisciplinary flavor of the intellectual tradition at the CSSSC owes a great deal to the philosophical bent of mind of several of the Marxist scholars there and to their emphasis on holistic methods of social research.

The perception of a distinct political orientation in its research agenda could have, in the complex and changing political environment of India and West Bengal, opened the CSSSC to both support and attack from different branches of the political establishment. In the 1970s, the left in India was divided in its attitude toward the Indira Gandhi regime. Perhaps it was the fact that the CSSSC had among its faculty sympathizers of all sections of the Indian left that made it conscious of its vulnerability. From its early years, it built a tradition of fiercely defending its institutional autonomy as a center of professional social science, governed and regulated by social scientists. Although fully funded by the government in its first two decades, it insisted that government representatives on its board of governors should be eminent social scientists rather than bureaucrats. It did not follow the convention, virtually universal in Indian academic institutions, of inviting ministers and bureaucrats to inaugurate or preside over academic events. It did not use political lobbies to get additional funding from government. Susanta Ghosh, who was the Registrar of the Centre for its first 25 years, says that there was some feeling in the faculty that compared to many other institutions, the CSSSC had failed to get its due share of allocations, especially in terms of land, building and other infrastructure, mainly because of its refusal to play political games. But everyone agreed that the austere, even shabby, conditions of work in a cramped residential building were a price worth paying for the dignity, freedom and social respect earned by the

CSSSC faculty.

More interesting, although the CSSSC gets half of its basic funding from the government of West Bengal, there have never been any of the complaints that one often hears about interference from the political establishment in the state. Curiously, it is not the political orientation of the Centre's research that is distinctive in the West Bengal context, because some variety or other of Marxism is widely practiced there in most disciplines. What is distinctive is the Centre's reputation in the national and international scene, the quality of academic visitors and events at the Centre and the value of its library and archival collections. The CSSSC is regarded in West Bengal's intellectual world as an institution of great prestige and an object of pride for the state and the city. The Centre has always received its share of funds from the state government, including the land for its new campus, without in any way having to face interference in its affairs.

Until the 1990s, the CSSSC relied entirely on government funding, choosing to refuse offers of funding by other agencies because of fears of compromising its freedom to determine its own research agenda. In the 1990s, however, like other ICSSR institutes, it faced a severe budget crunch. In fact, every year since 1988-89, it ran a deficit and took on research projects funded by outside agencies to meet the shortfall. The largest of these projects, funded by DANIDA, was a collaboration with Roskilde University in Denmark and the Centre for Basic Research in Kampala, Uganda. It involved training young researchers from Uganda in Calcutta (three of them have since received their PhDs), holding an annual Cultural Studies workshop for participants from all over India and from Uganda, and building an urban history microfilm archive at CSSSC. Other projects, such as those funded by the ILO, the UNDP, the UBI, the EXIM Bank and the IDPI, were of substantial academic interest. Other projects fund-

ed by the Japan Foundation and the India Foundation for the Arts have allowed for the expansion of the urban history archive into a major collection of visual material. But not all projects had an academic content, and great pressure was put on a diminishing faculty to give considerable time and effort to these projects simply to cover the deficits of the Centre. Nonetheless, the Centre managed to tide over the difficult years of financial crisis without running up any overdrafts or loans entirely because of the cushion provided by the sponsored projects.

An important principle established at the time, and still adhered to, is that the Centre's faculty would not receive any extra compensation for carrying out sponsored projects and that all of the income would go to the Centre. There was a collective effort to distribute faculty time across the different projects, but not everyone had the required background or skills to contribute to all aspects of the project. Nevertheless, the CSSSC faculty feels that it was able to generate an exceptional degree of institutional loyalty in struggling through the difficult period of the 1990s.

The crisis forced a reduction of the CSSSC faculty from its sanctioned strength of 27 to 13 in 2000. In that year, the ICSSR announced that it would reduce its annual grant. The CSSSC Director resigned in protest and, the grants were restored at the end of 2000-01.

At present, the CSSSC stands at a crossroads. Its prestige and reputation as an academic institution of excellence is high. It expects to get the necessary funds from the governments of India and West Bengal to cover its basic salary and establishment requirements. But it accepts the fact that it will have to seek out other sources of funding for research expenses such as equipment, travel, fieldwork and research assistance as well as for the upkeep of its library and archival collec-

tions. The faculty feels that with assured government funding for maintaining a multidisciplinary faculty of a reasonable size, it is possible to choose appropriate sources of outside funding that would complement and not compromise its research needs. But this is a matter of steering the institution through a complex political environment by banking on its professional reputation without opening itself to political manipulation.

It is interesting to note that although several members of the CSSSC faculty have been associated with *Subaltern Studies*, the project itself was never formally or financially supported by the CSSSC or indeed by any funding body. In order to maintain full autonomy over the contents of *Subaltern Studies*, its editorial group chose to pool royalties from the sales of its volumes and from the many translation rights to pay for the expenses of editorial work and for organizing its meetings and conferences. Of course, *Subaltern Studies* has turned out to be a particularly successful publishing venture, and the example is not easily replicable for all collaborative projects.

Finances

India

AN interesting but little noticed study sponsored by the ICSSR in 1974-78 gives a picture of the funding of social science research in India in the early 1970s (Azad 1981). Carried out by J. L. Azad, Suresh Kulkarni and S. V. Khandewale, the study covered 181 research institutions of all kinds—19 in the East, 66 in the North, 53 in the South and 43 in the West. Until the mid-1960s, social science research institutes were mainly set up by private organizations, although they often received grants and projects from governments. Most of these institutes were very small in size; more than half of them had fewer than 10 faculty members and 10 supporting staff. Only 21 of the 181 institutes had total staff strength of more than 50. Government organizations were no larger; private and government institutes were evenly distributed by size. In terms of research facilities, only two institutes in the entire country had libraries of more than 100,000 books and only 21 others had more than 25,000 books. However, beginning in the late 1960s, increasing numbers of books were purchased because of a greater availability of funds. Again, nearly 60% of the institutes had no training programs or activities for younger social scientists.

As for funding, the single major source of funding in 1973-78 for institutes in the East, North and West of the country was the central government. In the South, however, it was the state governments. In the West, student fees constituted the second largest source of funding. Institutes in the South were the best funded and had the largest research staff and libraries. Institutes in the East had the lowest funds. The average per institute expenditure in the country in 1977-78 was Rs.1.37 million. This average was the highest in the West (Rs.1.84 million) and the lowest in the East (Rs.0.81 million).

Curiously, although institutes in the East had the fewest funds and research facilities, they published more books and journal articles per researcher. The number of programs per institute was also the highest in the East, even though the average size there was the smallest. Output in terms of published project reports was also the highest in the East. Performance per researcher was the highest on all counts in the institutes of the Eastern region. One surprising conclusion of this study, therefore, was that research output did not necessarily improve with increased funding. Clearly, other conditions are necessary.

The study also estimated that the total expenditure in 1977-78 from all sources of funding combined for social science research in the country was Rs.218.3 million. Compared to the size of the total government expenditure, this was about 0.09%. The total expenditure of the ICSSR in 1977-78 was Rs.17.93 million. This was only about 8% of the total social science expenditure in the country. Since the study found that except in the West, the largest source of funding for social science came from the central and state governments, it is clear that the ICSSR accounted for only a small part of the total government expenditure on social science. This appears to be true even today. Apart from the UGC expenditures on the centers of advanced study and special assistance programs, the greatest portion of government support comes through the various economic ministries and the Planning Commission, which finance institutions, programs and research projects, and the Anthropological and the Archaeological Surveys of India.

As far as the ICSSR is concerned, its total expenditure in 1997-98 was Rs.128.7 million. Using a GDP deflator and calculating at a 1993-94 base rate, this means that between 1977-78 and 1997-98, the ICSSR expenditure increased in real terms by 30.07%. By 2000-01, when the revised scales of pay were introduced in the research

institutes, the expenditure had risen further.

Much of the financial crisis in the Indian research institutes in the late 1990s was caused by the freeze in grants from the ICSSR. In 2001, most of the allocations have been restored for the major institutes. As a proportion of the central government budget on higher education, the ICSSR grant is extremely small. However, the budgetary problems of the state governments are in many cases far more severe. With increased allocations from the ICSSR, several institutes may run into problems getting the equivalent level of support from their respective state governments.

It was not possible for us to estimate the relative proportions of government and nongovernment grants in all social science institutions. The accounts we have given of some individual institutions show that there are varying proportions in which the different types of funding are combined. What is undoubtedly true is that for most social science research institutes in India, the proportion of non-state funding is increasing. A significant part of this non-state funding is from international agencies. Rather than seek to prepare an exhaustive list of funding patterns across the region, a task that may be impossible due to the lack of reliable and comparable data, we present a number of institutional case studies to highlight the varied sources of funds today, the implications of the different kinds of funding and the many possibilities of strategic combination that might be appropriate for particular cases.

Varieties of Support

Sociology at University of Colombo

The department of Sociology of the University of Colombo is primarily devoted to the teaching of undergraduates. Most undergraduate classes accommodate from 200 to 500 students. The department

has a staff of one professor, three associate professors, ten senior lecturers, one confirmed lecturer and six probationary lecturers. All senior staff with postgraduate degrees have been trained outside Sri Lanka in universities in the UK, USA, Canada, Australia, France, Netherlands and India (New Delhi). Data on the social origins of the faculty is not readily available but an impressionistic view highlights a significant change since the 1950s and 1960s when the faculty—then located at Peradeniya University—was largely composed of the English-speaking upper middle class. It is not accidental that some of these faculty members moved into the most prestigious universities in the United States and produced work that is internationally recognized. Today's faculty, by contrast, hail with a few exceptions from a Sinhala-speaking background and are the children of the language reforms that dethroned English as the language of instruction in universities.

The Sociology department exemplifies the situation of most universities in Sri Lanka where structured PhD programs are nonexistent. At present, there are no PhD students in the department. Undergraduate students educated in Sinhala and Tamil have few career paths open to them. They go into the public sector, NGOs or teaching in schools and universities. Initially, they get involved in research projects on a temporary basis and then move on to the NGO and public sector.

In spite of the teaching load, a substantial number of research projects are being conducted in the department. The purpose of the research is either a UN consultancy, a conference paper—generally locally organized with the help of an NGO or a foreign foundation—or a Sri Lankan publication. Many staff members have authored textbooks or glossaries in Sinhala for undergraduates and published them with a grant from the university.

Information on research funding was not forthcoming but some

information was gathered on the sources of research support and types of research carried out over a decade. In the 1980s, the Netherlands Universities Foundation for International Cooperation (NUFFIC) funded a series of studies on rural development, especially in the Moneragala district. In the 1990s, a National Survey on Youth was carried out funded by the UNDP, together with quantitative research projects on the same topic funded by the German Cultural Institute, the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung and the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ). In 2000, a project entitled "Globalization, qualification and livelihood," funded by the British Department for International Development (DFID), was taken up. Many researchers engage in short-term consultancies for UN agencies or the World Bank without this causing much disruption to their teaching schedules.

In the mid-1990s, the British Council sponsored an exchange of scholars with the University of Edinburgh. Under this scheme, younger staff members were given an opportunity to visit Edinburgh for one term for research purposes or to follow short-term courses. This type of exchange has had a very positive effect on the outlook of younger staff and energized them to introduce new course material or even devise new courses. They have also become more computer-literate and make better use of the Sociology computer room.

With Leiden University, the emphasis has been more on staff training. Two faculty members went to the Netherlands for postgraduate studies (MA), while another got a PhD from New Delhi with NUFFIC funding. Following this, a number of scholars from Delhi's Jawaharlal Nehru University visited the department. Finally the South Asia Institute of the University of Heidelberg has an office in the Sociology Department and encourages the exchange of scholars, mostly on research and short-term training projects.

International Centre for Ethnic Studies (ICES), Colombo

The International Centre for Ethnic Studies is a nonprofit, non-governmental organization, founded in 1982, with a multiethnic staff and an international board of directors. The four principal objectives that run as unifying themes throughout all the work carried out by ICES are (1) the advancement of human rights; (2) engendering national cohesion; (3) promotion of international peace; and (4) creation of a more equitable development process. Additionally, women's studies has been one of the main areas of research at ICES.

The number of full-time researchers has increased from 6 to 8 in the space of 10 years. The male-female ratio tilted towards females in 2000 with 3 males and 5 females on the research staff. There seems to be, however, little concern to recruit researchers with PhDs. Most research fellows with PhDs were recruited in the early 1990s and have remained in a loose relationship with ICES. Research posts are never advertised, and ICES depends on its own networks to recruit consultants for specific projects. Visiting fellows essentially from USA and Europe are frequent but arrangements are most often informal.

The Centre has throughout the years published books, monographs, lectures, reports, and periodicals (The *Thatched Patio*, then *Nethra*, published by ICES, *Colombo and Ethnic Studies Report* published by ICES, Kandy) mainly in English, but also in Sinhala and Tamil. Most of the full-length books are born out of conferences or workshops organized by the ICES, and their quality varies. Generally books published by ICES in Sri Lanka are not subject to peer review and would not compare with international publications. Others published with academic presses such as Sage, New Delhi, are of better quality and intellectually more stimulating, a good example being *Ethnic Futures*.

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the research focus of the Centre

included electoral systems, devolution and governance. All projects were, of course, funded by donors, mostly from abroad. At present, the following projects are being carried out, reflecting a change of focus to the subject of violence and conflict:

1. Capacity building in Conflict Zones: Assisting Women in Sri Lanka (funded by OXFAM).

2. Comparative Federalism: papers examining the situation of ethnicity and federalism in China, Hong Kong, Cyprus, India, Spain, Ethiopia and Eritrea, Sri Lanka. Canada, South Africa, Scotland, Wales and Ireland, CIS and Bosnia are being edited for publication by Yash Ghai of the University of Hong Kong.

3. Minority Rights Protection in South Asia.

4. Multiculturalism and Modes of Ethnic Coexistence in South and South-East Asia: the four papers commissioned for this project edited by Darini Rajasingham-Senanayake and Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka were published by Sage, New Delhi.

5. Strengthening Democratic Governance in Conflict-torn Societies. This research (in collaboration with the Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex) analyzes democratic experiments in four countries with a history of violent conflict: Bosnia, Sri Lanka, South Africa and Uganda.

6. Violence against Women in Sri Lanka: associated with the work of Radhika Coomaraswamy, UN Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women.

7. Women and Governance in South Asia: six teams are engaged in this project—Ain O Salish Kendra (Bangladesh), Asmita (South India), Ekatra (North India), ICES (Sri Lanka), Shirkat Gah (Pakistan) and Shtrii (Nepal).

It could be argued that the research agenda at ICES has had to adapt itself to the changing interests and concerns of donor agencies. In

addition, despite the fact that academic events at ICES are often well attended and its library well used, there is a feeling that these events are only attracting people of a certain social set belonging to the English-speaking upper middle class. As a private institute funded by international agencies, ICES still suffers from its image as an elite and "American style" research organization.

South India

In Chapter One, we presented two intersecting and contrasting profiles of MIDS and ISEC to show that even in the context of the severe shortage of government funding in the 1990s, there was no simple story of institutional decline or crisis. There were alternatives; there was room for deliberate choice and the possibility of strategic combinations of different kinds of research funded from a variety of sources. A central issue posed by our comparison of MIDS and ISEC concerned the role of project research funded by external agencies. There were both new possibilities and new problems here.

Dr. A. R. Vasavi, a researcher at the National Institute of Advanced Studies, Bangalore, which is run on externally-funded research projects, identifies three key problems with project-based research. First, those with research funds have leverage over those without; they have access to facilities such as secretaries, computers and other office-related support. They are less accountable to the Institute for their time and the type of work they do. Second, funded research is valorized for its capacity to generate revenue (usually, 15% overhead charges go to the Institute) and is not really scrutinized for quality or academic significance. Further, the sources of funding are also not scrutinized. Finally, most funded research seems to culminate in reports submitted to the funding organizations. There seems to be no pressure on the researcher to develop the reports into academic publications.

According to Dr. Vasavi, "Contribution from such research to the general development of social science is missing and is also not encouraged."

However, Dr. Vasavi adds that funded research has its advantages, since most fundable research is directly linked to development themes and is based on field research, thus offering an opportunity to challenge or overcome some of the distance between academic work and the requirements of public policy. "Speaking for myself," she says, "the need to write proposals and do research that can be funded has forced me to engage with NGOs and other agencies such as government departments and personnel, which I would not have done otherwise. In some ways, the existing divide or the exclusiveness of the citadel of academia can be challenged. Funded research has the possibility of bringing about positive and much needed linkages between academic institutions, government agencies and civil society."

Professor G. K. Karanth of ISEC endorses Dr. Vasavi's opinion that researchers are forced to take up funded research in order to have access to facilities such as research assistance, computers and funds for fieldwork and travel. Talking about Sociology in particular, he notes that project-driven Sociology has by and large remained Development Sociology where the emphasis is on development rather than on sociology. This has impacted adversely on Sociology as a discipline. We may note, however, that this is a concern that has been voiced for a long time. Referring to funded research sponsored by government agencies, M. N. Srinivas noted in the 1950s: "The Government of India has an understandable tendency to stress the need for sociological research that is directly related to planning and development. And it is the duty of sociologists as citizens that they should take part in such research. But there is a grave risk that 'pure' or 'fundamental' research might be sacrificed altogether... The pressure in favor of

applied research is real, and besides, funds are not available for 'pure' research. Soon 'pure' sociology might disappear from this country" (Srinivas 1955, p. 6).

There are others who find state funding the source of many of the problems plaguing the social sciences in India today. Professor Govinda Rao of ISEC is in favor of state-funded research. But he also feels that social scientists often take advantage of state funding to get a "free ride." For him, the poor quality of the research output of many ICSSR institutions signals this problem. He also argues that it is possible to produce high-quality research papers, publishable in refereed journals, out of project work. In addition, project research, particularly that done for the government, can provide access to data that are not normally available and could be used for further research.

Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi

The CSDS is one major social science institute in India that has long tried to work out innovative combinations of government and nongovernment funding and developing appropriate institutional arrangements. It offers two main contrasts with the Delhi School of Economics: (a) it is outside both the university system and the disciplinary system, and this gives it important degrees of flexibility; (b) unlike the DSE, it has self-consciously grappled with the problem of institutional continuity.

Set up at the initiative of political scientist Rajni Kothari in 1963, the CSDS is probably the oldest research center outside the university system that is not primarily devoted to research on economic development issues. Contemporary observers may see some irony in the fact that the financial resources that helped launch it were derived from two large international studies coming out of the "modernization theory" paradigm then dominant in American social science. The

initial impetus for one kind of research that has always been associated with the Centre—electoral studies—was provided by the need to explain the Congress Party's first electoral losses in independent India in the elections of the mid-1960s. It is generally agreed that the period from its inception in 1963 until the promulgation of the Emergency in 1975 represents the first "phase" of the Centre's career. In this phase, the concerns of the faculty reflected the wider contemporary preoccupation with state-led development and its problems, although there was a special focus on the political process.

The second, post-Emergency, phase was marked by a movement away from the state and from conventional notions of development. The focus of the CSDS shifted to grassroots movements for political and human rights, and alternative knowledges and forms of development. One faculty member describes the second phase as the period when the CSDS became the "munshi" (record-keeper) of the movements. A large-scale project on "Democracy, Decentralization and Development" was launched that sought to bring together social and political activists, citizens' groups and academics in order to fashion collective forms of action and research on this set of themes. This project was later consolidated and turned into an autonomous organization named Lokayan. During the 1980s, Lokayan was among the premier organizations engaged in action research and in the networking of diverse social movements across the country. CSDS faculty also became influential nodes in international networks of scholars and activists that sought to challenge "Northern" or mainstream notions of development as distinct from "Southern," Third World or indigenous perspectives.

Since the 1990s, the CSDS may be said to have entered a third phase that is not as well-defined as the others. Some call this the "globalization" phase, when the involvement with social movements of the

previous phase had petered out and the structural adjustment paradigm and liberalization program at the national level had begun to reshape the academic field. This is also the phase marked by the revival of electoral studies at the Centre and by an emerging interest in media studies with a special emphasis on the "new electronic media."

On the question of institutional continuity and the transfer of power and responsibility across generations, the initial impression of the outsider is that of conspicuous success. It is rare to find organizations of this sort where the relatively younger members of the faculty are so central to the public image and day-to-day running of the institution. However, insiders are very aware of the difficulties faced by the Centre on this question. The striking feature about the CSDS is not so much that it managed to put together a strong "founding" team of core members, but that it managed to retain this group and sustain its vitality over almost four decades. All faculty members we spoke to agreed that Rajani Kothari played a crucial role in shaping the "culture" of the institution by taking such radical steps as resigning from the directorship even though he could well have continued in the post (as was the trend in those days) or ceasing to take a salary from the Centre after age 50. Moreover, the core faculty was unanimous on the need to subordinate the administrative functions and functionaries to the academic agenda and the faculty. Finally, the institutional culture has always maintained a very informal and easygoing work style that leaves faculty members free to determine their own schedules and agendas. The lunch meetings of the faculty—two or three hour sessions that sometimes stretch into the evening—are mentioned by all as a lively and productive source of debate and discussion among faculty, often also involving outsiders.

However, this institutional culture also has its weaknesses. The most serious perhaps is the problem of intergenerational succession. As

insiders point out, what now seems to be a successful transition is actually taking place one generation too late and is in part an attempt to stave off the consequences of an earlier failure. Not surprisingly, despite the general agreement on the existence of this problem, different members have somewhat different perceptions about its precise nature and causes. Some think that the informal culture and a close-knit core group of early members may have created anxiety among the middle-level faculty. Formal procedures for decision-making were never established; instead decision-making was based on informal consultations among the group of equals that constituted the core. This may have promoted insecurity among those who were unsure of their status vis-à-vis the core group. Others believe that there may have been personality or style-related incompatibilities between the founding generation and its successors. One member of the third generation that is now seen as the driving force of the Centre believes that these past difficulties may be partly responsible for the present efforts to effect a transition. "We came at a time when transition was inevitable," he says, adding that they may also have benefited from the indulgence that older generations often show towards their "grand-child" generation in contrast to the friction that sometimes affects relations between parent and child. Another problem that seems to affect the younger generation in particular is that the extremely informal style of work sometimes leads to administrative anarchy. The older generation is somewhat amused to find that the younger generation is in favor of greater regulation and more formal procedures. But they concede that the Centre may now have reached a stage where this may be beneficial.

Despite these problems, however, the CSDS has managed to retain a distinctive institutional profile and culture. Among the most striking of these features is the fact that it has managed to remain small—

something everyone from the founders to the current faculty agree on—despite the temptations and opportunities for growth. On the other hand, many faculty members have their own lists of good scholars who would have been assets to the Centre but were either eased out or never recruited. Faculty recruitment has been very strictly regulated, though the process is informal and unconventional. Senior faculty are on the lookout for promising young scholars who are invited to spend time at the Centre. It is only after extensive interaction (usually a year or two on a visiting fellowship) that a prospective entrant is recruited to the faculty. Formal requirements, degrees and qualifications are all subordinated to the overall question of whether a potential recruit fits the needs and expectations of the Centre. Another characteristic feature of the Centre is the strong emphasis on dissemination beyond the usual academic circles. One reason why the CSDS has a public profile that is disproportionate to its size is the visibility of its faculty in the media. The recent electoral studies and their sponsorship by newspapers and television is only the most noticeable feature of what has actually been a longtime trend. Although this has subsided in the current phase, the CSDS was at one time a major node in activist and social movement networks, particularly during the heyday of Lokayan.

The Centre has set up several mini-institutions within its own umbrella, which pursue research or other activities around particular themes. The Institute for China Studies is an association of sinologists that is a semi-autonomous entity within the CSDS. It has played a significant part in academic and governmental discussion of issues concerning India and China. The Centre also houses the Institute for Peace and Conflict Studies, which promotes studies on militarization and responses to it in the South Asian context. Two other initiatives in the area of new media (Sarai) and political democratization

(Lokniti) that are currently very active are discussed below. In addition, the Centre produces three journals (*Alternatives*, *Lokayan Bulletin* and *China Report*), and maintains a Data Unit that has an extensive database on electoral politics in India.

The Institute for Comparative Democracy, also named Lokniti, was formed after the Centre's successful National Election Study of 1996 to house the various projects on the electoral process and party politics under one roof. The major activities of Lokniti include: (a) monitoring the democratization process, especially the participation of hitherto marginalized groups in the political process; (b) developing a cross-cultural understanding of democratic politics in different contexts; (c) networking with other scholars nationally and internationally to create alternative perspectives on democracy; and (d) training a new generation of scholars and public intellectuals to intervene in public debates.

The most visible activity of Lokniti has, of course, been its election studies, for which it has received sponsorship and extensive publicity from the print and electronic media, particularly television. The Assembly and Lok Sabha election analyses of the Institute are now much sought after commodities in the media market. Lokniti also organizes an annual Summer Workshop on Democracy for young scholars. Yogendra Yadav, the key scholar involved in the project, speaks of his frustration in trying to get a grant from the ICSSR in 1995-96. When the ICSSR was unable to come up with the required funding, he approached the television and news media to support the project in return for exclusive election analysis of the media. The solution is not ideal, and many of the modalities are still negotiated in order to balance the demands of instant analysis with the needs of scholarly reflection and interpretation. But the Lokniti experiment, he thinks, is a good example of how unconventional sources of funding

can be sought out to formulate new kinds of research practices in the social sciences.

The New Media Initiative, also named Sarai, began as an attempt to go beyond the academy in trying to understand and respond to the challenges of the new media, particularly the Internet and other computer-based media. The program seeks to bring together media professionals, academics and community activists to explore the possibilities of exploiting the new media for furthering democratic politics in urban spaces. It also seeks to produce and support "solid academic research" on media history and to undertake archiving projects to collect materials in this area. Finally, it has an outreach program for taking new media to slum dwellers in Delhi.

Both Sarai and Lokniti are led by younger members of the faculty at CSDS, and they have attracted a large number of young researchers and activists to the Centre.

The Centre has led a relatively precarious financial existence until very recently. After the initial resources provided by two large international studies that the Centre was participating in, the major source of funds was the government of India through a half-yearly grant from the Education Ministry. With the formation of the ICSSR in 1969, the Centre began to receive institutional funding. However, as with the other ICSSR institutes, there was a financial crisis from the late 1980s onward. As the present director, Professor V.B. Singh, recalls, the Centre was even forced to "loan" some of its personnel to other organizations. The basic problem was that the ICSSR grant could not be raised above the prescribed ceiling of Rs.2 million, while the expenditure of the Centre, as in the other major ICSSR institutes, climbed well above that limit.

Recently, however, the Centre has obtained major funding from new sources including the Ford Foundation, Hivos, the Netherlands

government, and the Langlois Foundation for the Digital Arts, Canada. The most dramatic recent development has been the Ford Foundation endowment grant of \$1 million US, with an additional \$200,000 grant for infrastructure. The endowment is to be used mainly for faculty recruitment, while the infrastructure grant is for upgrading the building and other facilities. With the endowment drive bearing fruit, the Centre hopes to be able to meet around 70% of its recurring expenditure from the endowment income, while the other 30% will have to be raised by project grants. The Director says that this is the ideal mix, and that they would not try for a better ratio because the need to raise funds keeps the Centre healthy.

By Indian standards, such a comprehensive and sudden turnaround in fortunes is definitely rare. Though the Centre is relieved and pleased about their new financial stability, faculty say that they are not very sure why or how this sudden change of fortune has come about. Various factors are mentioned, including the change of personnel in funding organizations, fortuitous personal contacts with Centre faculty, and the current vogue of subjects like the media or election studies. They are also, on the whole, not worried about autonomy issues. Most faculty are well aware of their privileged position within the Indian academy and realize that they may be beneficiaries of exogenous events and developments. One faculty member is quite forthright about the mutually beneficial character of the funder-recipient relationship, noting that institutions like the CSDS are considered a feather in the cap of the funder. Nevertheless, he is also unhappy about the tendency for these relationships to be increasingly individualized, where funding agencies may deal directly with individuals without the institution itself being central to this relationship. He also worries that the urge to steer clear of state funding may feed into the privatization drive. Other faculty members are concerned that current

efforts to raise funds are almost invariably directed towards foreign sources. They would prefer a collective effort to explore local options more thoroughly. As for the specific question of media funding for the electoral studies, one faculty member feels this has actually created much stronger pressures for rigor, and thus helped raise the standard of such studies above what has been the norm in academic circles.

Most faculty, and especially the younger generation, are keen that the administrative structures be formalized and strengthened, in particular the financial division. There was concern that the overall financial management of the Centre, especially long and middle-term financial planning, had been lax. There has been a greater emphasis in the recent period on internal autonomy, including financial autonomy, for the different projects and programs. There is also the feeling that fundraising and public relations functions—now a permanent part of institutions such as the CSDS—must be formalized and, if necessary, full-time financial professionals must be recruited.

A related concern felt strongly by many is the relative lack of diversity in the faculty. Several mentioned the male bias in the composition of the faculty, while two also mentioned the caste composition. There is clearly an effort to address this issue, and the Ford endowment grant specifically requires the Centre to address the gender imbalance. One faculty member has strong views on the question of dissemination of research beyond the academy as well as in Indian languages in addition to English. He feels that the Centre's record in this respect has been far from satisfactory and that much more can be done.

As for the larger question of accountability, most faculty members recognize that there are no strong institutional mechanisms in place to ensure accountability. As one member says, the compulsion to be accountable has to "come from within" in such institutions. He feels that in general there has been a declining trend in this regard, with

even bureaucratic forms of accountability being eroded. And as for accountability to funders, he worries that there may be an inverse relationship between reputation and accountability: "the more well-known an institution, the less accountable it needs to be." He does not believe that there is any easy solution to this problem because accountability is inherently unenforceable and depends on self-motivation and moral pressure.

In sum, the CSDS today seems to be in a double-edged situation: on the one hand, its most serious worries—finances and the problem of institutional continuity—seem to be resolved, a major achievement. On the other hand, it now has no excuses since it does not (by its own admission) face any serious constraints, not even the ones that large bureaucratic institutions like the university must surmount. The coming years will therefore be decisive for determining the strengths and weaknesses of this institutional style and format.

It is difficult to imagine initiatives such as Sarai or Lokniti being launched by any university department. Clearly, the small institute framework is critical to the success of such ventures. At the same time, it is interesting to note that in an institution famous for its lack of admiration for the university system, two new developments have taken place: (a) the senior people who in the past were very enthusiastically oriented towards the extra-academic audience (of NGOs, activists and social movements) are now complaining about the dilution of academic rigor that this brings about; and (b) the new initiatives at the CSDS led by younger faculty members reflect a striving for academic rigor and "solid research." There is something here about the interplay between flexibility and innovation on the one hand, and the patient cultivation of rigor on the other, that will still need to be negotiated in working out the right mix between different types of funding for research.

Chapter Five

What Can Be Done

LITERALLY hundreds of suggestions were offered during our discussions with social scientists in South Asia. All of them came out of a genuine concern about the condition of the profession and its future; many were wishful, some nostalgic, others cynical. Some of the criticisms and suggestions implied a radical restructuring of institutions, practices and funding patterns. It was often argued that in all countries of South Asia, to a greater or lesser extent, the creation of a vibrant culture of social science research could only be achieved by large-scale institutional changes. Although we do not disagree with the spirit of these arguments, we are not making any radical suggestions below, largely because we feel that before any serious proposals for institutional restructuring can be worked out, there is a need for extended discussion and debate on the compulsions of the current situation in which social scientists today work in South Asia. We give below a few recommendations that we feel are practical, institutionally viable and likely to address some, although not all, of the problems we have raised earlier in this Report.

This Report is, to our knowledge, among the first attempts to survey social science research capacities in all the countries of South Asia. Working on the report has also brought home to us the crucial differences in the institutional conditions within the region. Consequently, the suggestions we make below will not apply equally to all countries.

Universities and Institutes

The debate, as we saw, is an old one. The relation between universities and institutes was meant to be complementary, but has not always been so. The connection between teaching and research has proved a difficult problem. In the social sciences in India, the highly

endowed and residential Jawaharlal Nehru University at New Delhi, concentrating primarily on postgraduate studies in the social science disciplines, is the most successful example of the complementarity between teaching and research. Some departments at Delhi University are also centers of advanced research, but the relation between undergraduate teaching in the colleges and advanced research is vexed, involving issues of study leave, grants, adequate rewards and recognition for research, etc. Some research institutes, such as the Indian Statistical Institute at Calcutta and Delhi and the IGIDR in Mumbai, are now recognized as "deemed universities" and have successful postgraduate degree courses in specialized fields in Economics. In Nepal, the state-funded Tribhuvan University is also the seat of the main state-funded research centers. But the effect has been to separate the teaching personnel from the research personnel within the university. In Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Nepal, with the decline in the state-funded university system, the main focus of social science research appears to have shifted in recent years to privately-funded institutes. Of course there are many individuals in various university departments who are distinguished researchers, just as there are a few researchers in the institutes who regularly participate in teaching programs in the university. In general, however, despite frequent pronouncements about the need to connect research to teaching, generally replicable forms have not been found at the institutional level. The tendency has been, in general, to assign the teaching functions to the universities and concentrate the research activities in the institutes.

It seems unlikely that this pattern will be radically changed in the near future. One must, therefore, think of ways to both improve the quality and productivity of research in the institutes and establish links to bring teaching in the social sciences in contact with the results of research. We have the following suggestions.

1. The Viability of Research Institutes

Where state-funded research institutes exist, it is vitally important to continue that funding. We have pointed out repeatedly in this Report that research carried out through sponsored projects has too many limitations and pitfalls to guarantee the steady accumulation of knowledge and training in the basic social science disciplines. If a large number of universities cannot be institutionally organized or adequately funded for the purpose of carrying out research, then institutes, even a small number, must be funded for this purpose. It is clear that the level of funding required for the average social science researcher is much lower, perhaps only one-fourth or one-fifth, of what has to be spent on the average researcher in the natural sciences.

However, there is a crucial question of the viability of these institutes as suitable places for sustained research of high quality. While we have stressed that the narrative of decline is neither simple nor general, that is not to say that it does not contain the proverbial grain of truth. We have pointed out that to be viable, a research institute needs to be of a certain size. Judging by our understanding of the history of institutes in South Asia, it seems that a faculty size of 20 to 25, drawn from at least three or four disciplines or specializations, is a minimum requirement. Second, institutes are more likely to stay viable and productive if they have built a strong sense of institutional identity and commitment. Such institutions are not difficult to identify. Third, institutes that have built adequate infrastructure and research resources, such as library collections, or have easy access to such resources, are better placed to continue as productive institutions. If state resources are scarce, there is a strong argument for not spreading those resources too thin in order to support small, isolated and non-viable institutes. We have seen from our estimates that the total number of social scientists in India, including all university teachers, is

somewhere in the region of 3,000; in the other countries of South Asia, there are a few hundred each. If we consider only those who are actively engaged in research, the numbers are considerably smaller. The argument thus becomes more persuasive that one needs to have appropriate institutional concentrations of active researchers, based on disciplinary networks or theoretical and methodological approaches that are likely to produce a strong institutional identity.

2. Fellowships for Teachers

One way of strengthening ties between universities and institutes and opening up opportunities for teachers to do research would be to have short-term fellowships at the major research institutes for university and college teachers to carry out specific research projects. The Nehru Memorial Museum in New Delhi has been particularly successful in this regard, especially in the field of modern Indian history. Such fellowships would crucially require that teachers get leaves from their institutions, that bodies like the UGC recognize the results of research carried out by university and college teachers, and that the teachers are suitably rewarded. A relatively small number of such fellowships, awarded through a national competition or, if possible, one open to teachers from all South Asian countries, would carry some prestige and be highly regarded in the social science community.

3. Visiting Appointments

Another way to facilitate a greater exchange of scholars between universities and institutes would be to have more visiting appointments at both types of institutions. At present, the system of visiting appointments is virtually absent in South Asian universities and extremely rare in the institutes. More appointments of this kind would allow scholars in research institutes to teach advanced and spe-

cialized subjects in post-graduate university departments, thus disseminating their research among teachers and students in the universities. They would also make it possible for university teachers engaged in research to interact with the research community in the institutes.

4. Refresher Courses and Conferences

The UGC now has an elaborate program of required Refresher Courses for university and college teachers, which is meant to upgrade their knowledge in their disciplinary fields. At present, teachers find most of these courses unattractive, unenlightening and a chore. It would be worthwhile to explore the possibility of involving some of the research institutes in designing more innovative Refresher courses in new areas of scholarship. For instance, several teachers mentioned that recent Refresher courses in Gender Studies organized at Jadavpur University in Calcutta and at Hyderabad were both interesting and useful.

Another idea for invigorating scholarly exchanges between social scientists in the different South Asian countries would be to institute an annual South Asia Social Science conference on themes that have multidisciplinary appeal. At present, there is very little exchange among social scientists in the region, with the possible exception of Gender Studies and Security Studies, both these fields of course having been promoted by international NGOs.

A further point is worth considering here, namely, the role of scholars of South Asian origin in the diaspora. It is a fact, emphasized repeatedly, that the flow of scholars from South Asian countries to universities outside of South Asia has increased steadily, not only at the level of undergraduate and postgraduate students but also among established social scientists in the universities and institutes. It seems

unlikely that the trend can be reversed by any action that social scientists themselves take. In the circumstances, it seems reasonable to try to devise ways in which scholars in the diaspora might be utilized in research and training activities in South Asian universities and institutes. Visiting appointments might be used for this purpose. Usually, scholars based in Western institutions can come for research visits to South Asia on their own funding. Therefore, what is required are institutional arrangements to allow the most fruitful interaction with researchers and students. Diaspora scholars could also be involved in the conferences and workshops mentioned earlier in this chapter.

Training

We have commented several times on the problems of PhD training in the social sciences in South Asia. If there is one issue around which the crisis is both acute and general, it is PhD training. Everywhere, and increasingly in every discipline, the complaint is that the most promising students who are interested in an academic career choose to go abroad for their PhD training and never return. As we have indicated, this trend has to do with larger socio-economic processes that are beyond the control of the social science community. However, there are certain feasible steps that could be taken to improve the quality and attractiveness of the existing PhD programs.

5. Attractive PhD Fellowships

It is said that existing PhD fellowships are not financially attractive enough to provide incentives for the best students to spend three or four years on full-time doctoral research. Although award levels of UGC fellowships were raised in December 2001, the ICSSR doctoral fellows are still very poorly paid. A small number of prestigious PhD

fellowships for visiting scholars, nationally advertised, might be offered at selected university departments and institutes where advanced research is carried out and where there are adequate facilities for PhD training. These are likely to be more attractive to students who would otherwise be drawn to foreign universities or to nonacademic careers.

6. Training Workshops

Faculty from university departments and research institutes could come together for training workshops with PhD students and other young researchers in the social sciences. These workshops could be of varying duration and focus on different themes. One model that has proved very successful is that of the annual Cultural Studies workshop of the CSSSC in Calcutta, which focuses each year on a different theme straddling the humanities and the social sciences. This workshop typically has 10 faculty and 20 PhD students and lasts for a week. In recent years, this workshop has been attracting international students. Another model followed in many parts of the world is the Summer Institute that lasts for four to six weeks. Clearly, this would require a higher level of funding and organization, although given the availability of good university campuses in many places in South Asia, the costs would not be prohibitive. Perhaps this is an idea that international funding agencies might find worth supporting.

7. Advanced Postgraduate Courses in Specialized Fields

Some Indian social science institutes run specialized teaching programs that lead to postgraduate degrees such as the MA or the MPhil. The Indian Statistical Institute at Delhi and Calcutta, the CDS at Trivandrum and the IGIDR at Mumbai run such programs in different fields of Economics; the Tata Institute of Social Sciences sponsors

workshops in Sociology and Social Work; and the Deccan College, Pune, for instance, does so in Archaeology. It is worth exploring whether a few other research institutes might be in a position to organize similar specialized courses in other fields of the social sciences. The advantage of specialized courses taught by scholars who are established researchers in the field is that they would attract only those who have an academic interest in those fields. However, only institutes that have an adequate faculty size and infrastructure can afford to offer such regular programs. It would be necessary to allow the institute sufficient freedom to formulate and conduct the program. Needless to say, the status of the degree would naturally depend on proper accreditation by the relevant authorities in each country.

State and Non-state Funding

We have discussed this issue in several places in our Report and it is unnecessary to repeat the arguments for and against state and non-state funding of social science research. We accept that various forms of non-state funding are inevitable and, if properly used, even desirable. We have the following suggestions to offer.

8. Funding for Large-scale Research Projects

Although many sponsored projects require empirical and often field-based research, they are rarely conceived as part of large-scale projects in which data are systematically collected over large areas at several time points in order to build up data bases for large-scale analysis and generalization. Except for economic and demographic research, such large-scale projects in sociology, politics or anthropology are almost impossible to fund in South Asia today. In fact, because of the assumed lack of support, social scientists in the region do not

even think of empirically grounded projects that could lead to macro-level generalizations about social, cultural or political trends in South Asia. The example we gave in Chapter Four on the CSDS project on Election Studies in India is very much an exception and owes more to innovative fundraising than to the availability of research grants from funding agencies. It is extremely important to have some scope for undertaking large projects of this kind. They may be funded by state agencies such as the ICSSR or by private or international agencies. Ideally, it should be possible for research teams or networks that have already established a framework of collaborative research in the field to apply for such funding on the basis of grant proposals. It is sad that the ICSSR in India is no longer able to carry out this important function, which it did with much success until the mid-1980s.

9. Conditions of Sponsored Research

Although it is often said that those accepting sponsored projects from private donors or agencies have little choice in determining the conditions in which the research is to be carried out, at least two professional guidelines could nevertheless be asserted by social scientists. First, they could insist that the data, methodology and findings of the projects they carry out ***must be published*** in some form and made available to the larger community of scholars in the field. This is vital as much for the credibility of the research as for the production and accumulation of knowledge in the relevant discipline. Second, in the case of North-South collaborations, the Southern partners ***must participate*** in the formulation of the project and in the negotiation of its terms with the Northern donors. Much of the current concerns about the imposition of research agendas from outside are prompted by the feeling that Southern partners are hired practically as field assistants to fill out schedules and questionnaires prepared in advance. Clearly,

under such conditions, social scientists in the South have no creative role to play in the production of knowledge.

10. Innovations in Fundraising

In earlier chapters, we have given a few examples of innovative fundraising from private sources that were never before seen as having anything to do with social science research. Such possibilities clearly exist. This is not to say that conventional sources of funding should be forsaken. However, the search for unconventional funding sources could often go hand in hand with the discovery of unconventional research problems or methods. One of the problems with the "old" institutions of research in South Asia, including the universities, is the routinization of their functions and the lack of innovation in research areas or methods. Some of the new institutions, deprived of state funding, have been forced to look for other sources of funding, but have not resolved the problems of institutional continuity and cumulative contribution to the basic social science disciplines. It seems necessary now to think imaginatively about combining the two strategies. The successful institutions of the next two or three decades are likely to be those that do this most effectively.

Infrastructure and Research Resources

In this Report, we have not said very much about the state of infrastructure such as buildings, office space, hostel accommodation, etc., or about research resources such as libraries, archives, computers and so on. The Regional Studies section of this Report has detailed descriptions on these subjects from the different regions of India and from the other countries of South Asia. To summarize in one sentence: except for the institutions of Delhi, all other regions and institutions

suffer from a lack of access to library resources and most have inadequate space and equipment. However, it is clear that sufficient resources will not be available to make every social science library in South Asia adequate for advanced research. We have the following suggestion for improving library resources.

11. Regional Social Science Libraries

Instead of a thin spread of scarce resources, it seems more reasonable to identify two or three libraries in each region of India and two or three in each of the other countries to act as Regional Social Science Libraries. These libraries should be located at university departments where advanced research is carried out or at research institutes, so that the faculty can actively advise on, and if necessary supervise, the process of acquisition. These should be specialized social science libraries with adequately trained and efficient library staff. Funds may be provided by both state and non-state agencies to ensure that the main social science periodicals are regularly acquired and collected by each regional library, either as bound volumes or in electronic form. Access to unbroken series of periodicals is one of the most pressing needs of social scientists in all of South Asia, and mounting costs have forced most libraries to terminate their subscriptions to most international journals. The acquisition of books will, naturally, have to be selective, and it is best to rely on the advice of the research faculty at the regional center to decide how the funds available for the purchase of books should be distributed over the different disciplines and fields.

Systems of interlibrary loan are very poorly developed in South Asia, and without the growth of mutual trust and responsibility among institutions, it is futile to expect the system to emerge overnight. In order to make the resources of the regional libraries available to scholars in the region, the most practical solution seems to be one where

research students and teachers may apply for small grants to visit the nearest regional social science library for a few days or weeks. This is a system that presently exists under the UGC and ICSSR in India and it may be supplemented by other sources of funding. The regional libraries themselves might be given funds to make available to scholars in the region: this will give the libraries incentive to ensure that the grant is properly used by the awardees.

Such regional libraries may also be the appropriate places to locate electronic resources of social science information. Their staff may be given suitable training in such methods and equipment. These libraries could in turn act as nodal points for the further electronic dissemination of social science information in the region.

Dissemination

One of the problems that has emerged somewhat obliquely in the earlier chapters of this Report concerns the relation between English and the other South Asian languages. There is little doubt that the language of professional research in the social sciences in South Asia today is English, and it is likely to stay that way in the foreseeable future. However, most undergraduate, and some postgraduate, teaching is carried out in the South Asian languages. In the absence of an effective bilingualism, this frequently creates a divide between the privileged few who have easy access to avenues of advanced education and the deprived many who find that their lack of facility in English is a barrier to professional success in the academic world. The phenomenon is virtually universal in all regions and language communities of South Asia, with the sole exception of the hill states of north-east India where English is the major language of secondary and higher education. Once again, the phenomenon has deep roots in the

modern political and cultural history of South Asia, and there are no easy solutions within the grasp of the social science community. We offer two suggestions for consideration.

12. Social Science Vocabulary

The principal method followed in the last few decades to produce a pedagogical literature in the social sciences in the South Asian languages is translation, mainly from English. Building around a core of translated texts, each South Asian language now has a set of textbooks in the main social science disciplines that are used for teaching at the undergraduate and sometimes even the postgraduate levels. One difficulty, however, is that since few texts are sufficiently authoritative, there is often a lack of standardization in the terminology used for various social science concepts. Some concepts have wider currency than others and are often used in journalism or political debates. Others are more technical terms, coined to stand for specific concepts used in particular social science disciplines. Depending on the prevailing situation in specific languages, it may be useful to get teams of social scientists in particular language areas to put together handbooks of social science terms that might become acceptable as standard.

13. Social Science Texts in South Asian Languages

Translations are frequently inadequate in generating a vibrant social science discourse in South Asian languages. There are often complaints that translations are stiff, artificial and obscure. Not surprisingly, such translations cannot participate in a living culture of social science debate. The only way to ensure that they do is to insist that major, practicing figures in social science write and publish in their local languages. Some South Asian languages, such as Bangla or Assamese or Tamil or Marathi, are better placed in having their lead-

ing social scientists writing in those languages, in addition to their professional writings in English, and thus participating in public debates over social and political issues. If efforts could be made to encourage bilingual social scientists engaged in research to use their disciplinary knowledge to reflect upon social and political issues of the day in South Asian languages, , it would definitely contribute to the quality of those debates as well as serve a major linguistic function of creating a theoretically sophisticated social science discourse in the various South Asian languages.

Appendix

Interviews

Acharya, R., Reader in Economics, Jadavpur University, Kolkata
Ahmad, Nuzhat, University of Karachi
Ahmar, Moonis, University of Karachi
Ahmed, S. Jaffar, University of Karachi
Ali, Asghar, Engineer, Director, Centre for the Study of Society and Secularism, Mumbai
Ali, Mubarak, Sindh University, Jamshoro
Altaf, Anjum, World Bank, Lahore
Arachchi, Uswatte, Former Director, Marga Institute
Babu, Balgovinda, Utkal University
Bagchi, A.K., Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Kolkata
Bagchi, Y., Fellow, Asiatic Society, Kolkata
Bandewar, Sunita, Researcher, Center for Health and Allied Themes, Pune
Bandyopadhyay, N., Member, State Finance Commission, West Bengal
Banerjee, A.V., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge
Bapat, Ram, Independent Scholar, Pune
Baral, Uma, Tribhuvan University, Nepal
Baruah, Srinath, Gauhati University, Assam
Basant, Rakesh, Professor, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad
Baskaran, Theodore, Former Director, Roja Muthiya Research Library, Chennai
Bastian, Sunil, International Centre for Ethnic Studies, Colombo
Baviskar, Amita, Professor, Delhi University
Beteille, Andre, Retired, Delhi University
Bhadra, G., Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Kolkata
Bhagabati, A. C., Former Vice-Chancellor, Arunachal University
Bhargava, Rajeev, Professor of Politics, Delhi University
Bhattacharjea, Aditya, Delhi University
Bhattacharjee, J.B., Former Vice-Chancellor, Assam University
Bhattacharya, M., Jadavpur University, Kolkata

Bhattacharya, Ujjain, Lecturer, Department of History, Goa University
Bhattarai, Tulsi, Royal Nepal Academy
Bhowmick, Sharit, Professor and Head, Department of Sociology, Mumbai
Burki, Abid, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad
Butalia, Urvashi, Kali for Women, Delhi
Chatani, Lajwanti, Lecturer, M.S.University of Baroda, Vadodara
Chatterji, Roma, Delhi University
Chaudhary, Kameshwar, M.S.University of Baroda, Vadodara
Cheema, Ali, Lahore University of Management Sciences
Chhetri, Dil Bahadur, Tribhuvan University, Nepal
Chhetri, Ram, Bahadur, Tribhuvan University, Nepal
Chowdhury, Roy A., Jadavpur University, Kolkata
Danda, A., Professor of Anthropology, Calcutta University
Dasgupta, S., Member-Secretary, Asian Development Research Institute, Patna
de Silva, K.M., International Centre for Ethnic Studies, Kandy
Deraniyagala, Siran, Director General, Department of Archaeology, Colombo
Deshpande, Arvind, Retired Professor of History, Pune University
Dhamala, Ranju, Former Dean of Social Sciences, Assam University
Dhanagare, D.N., Retired Professor, Ex-Vice-Chancellor Shivaji University and Ex-
Member Secretary, ICSSR, New Delhi
Dhar, H., Giri Institute of Development Studies, Lucknow
Dholakia, Archana, Professor of Economics, Gujarat Vidyapith, Ahmedabad
Dhungel, Dwarika, Director, Institute of Integrated Development Studies, Nepal
D'Souza, Errol, Professor, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad
D'Souza, John, Director, Centre For Education and Documentation, Mumbai
Ghosh, A., Fellow, Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Kolkata
Ghosh, P., Director, Asian Development Research Institute, Patna
Guha, Amalendu, Retired, Professor of History, Gauhati University, Assam
Gupta, Anil K., Professor, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad
Guru, Gopal, Mahatama Gandhi Professor, Department of Political Science, Pune
University

Heredia, Rudi, Director, Social Science Centre, St Xavier's College, Mumbai
Inayatullah, Founder and President, Council of Social Sciences, Pakistan
Iyengar, V., Director, Gujarat Institute of Development Research, Gota, Ahmedabad
Jayaram, N., Professor of Sociology, Editor *Sociological Bulletin*, Goa University
Jayawardena, Kumari, Director, Social Scientists' Association
Kakade, S.R., Director, Indian Institute of Education, Pune
Kalpagam, U., Govind Ballabh Pant Institute, Allahabad
Kalyan, Bishwa, Tribhuvan University, Nepal
Karanth, G.K., Institute for Economic and Social Change, Bangalore
Karketta, R., Ranchi University
Karna, M. N., North-East Hill University
Karnik, Ajit, Professor of Economics, Department of Economics, Mumbai
University
Kashyap, S., Director, Sardar Patel Institute of Economic and Social Research,
Ahmedabad
Kazi, B.T., Fellow, Centre for Social Studies, Surat
Khan, Shahrukh Rafi, Sustainable Development Policy Institute, Islamabad
Kothari, Rajni, Chairman, Centre for Studies in Developing Societies, Delhi
Lal, A.K., Political Sociologist, Anugraha Narayan Sinha Institute, Patna
Lobo, Lancy, Director, Centre For Culture and Development, Vadodara
Madan, T.N., Retired, Delhi University
Maitra, B., Jadavpur University, Kolkata
Majumdar, B., Fellow, Govind Ballabh Pant Institute, Allahabad
Manandhar, Tri Ratna, Dean, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tribhuvan
University, Nepal
Mehta, Deepak, Delhi University
Miri, Mrinal, North-East Hill University
Mishra, G.P., Director, Giri Institute of Development Studies, Lucknow
Mody, Nawaz, Pherozshah Mehta Professor, Mumbai University
Mukherjee, S.C., Bardhaman University, West Bengal
Nag, Sajal, Assam University

Nasim, Anjum, Professor of Business-Govt. Relations, Lahore University of Management Sciences, Lahore

Nayak, Pulin, Delhi School of Economics

Noronha, Ligia, Senior Fellow, Tata Energy Research Institute, Western Regional Centre, Goa

Obeyskere, Gananath, Retired, Princeton University

Onta, Pratyoush, Center for Social Research and Development, Kathmandu

Oraon, Prakash, Director, Bihar Institute of Tribal Welfare and Research

Palshikar, S., Professor of Politics, Pune University

Pande, J., Govind Ballabh Pant Institute, Allahabad

Pantham, Thomas, Retired Professor of Politics, M.S. University of Baroda, Vadodara

Patel, Arjun, Fellow, Centre for Social Studies, Surat

Patel, P.M., Professor of Politics, M.S. University of Baroda, Vadodara

Patel, Sujata, Professor and Head Department of Sociology, Pune University

Perera, Sasanka, University of Colombo

Pethe, Abhay, Professor of Urban Economics and Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences, Mumbai University

Prabhu, M.R., Director, ICSSR-Western Regional Centre, Mumbai

Prakash, Gnanam, Senior Member, National Centre for Advocacy Studies, Pune

Prakash, Om, Delhi School of Economics

Rahman, Tariq, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad

Raj, Krishna, Editor, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Mumbai

Rajaram, Professor of Sociology, M.S. University of Baroda, Vadodara

Rakshit, M.K., Director, ICCRA

Rao, M. Govinda, Director, Institute for Economic and Social Change, Bangalore

Ray, A., Calcutta University

Ray, P., Presidency College, Kolkata

Rehman, Sobhan, Executive Chairman, Centre for Policy Dialogue, Dhaka

Rizavi, S. Ali Nadeem, Aligarh Centre for Studies in Medieval History, Kolkata

Rodrigues, Valerian, Professor and Head, Department of Political Science,

Mangalore University
Sanwar, A.S., Ranchi University
Sathar, Zeba, Population Council, Islamabad
Sen, S., Calcutta University
Shah, A.M., Retired, Delhi School of Economics
Shah, Rajkumar, M.S. University of Baroda, Vadodara
Sharma, Prem, Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies, Kathmandu
Sharma, Yadav, Tribhuvan University, Nepal
Sheth, D.L., Emeritus Fellow, Centre For the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi
Singh, V.B., Centre for Study of Developing Societies, Delhi
Sinha, D., Calcutta University
Siquiera, Alito, Lecturer, Department of Sociology, Goa University
Sirwardena, Regi, International Centre for Ethnic Studies, Colombo
Subramaniam, G., Assistant Editor, *The Hindu*, Chennai
Subramaniam, L., Calcutta University
Tahir, Pervez, Planning Commission, Government of Pakistan, Islamabad
Thakurta, T. Guha, Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Kolkata
Timilsina, Pathibeshower, Tribhuvan University, Nepal
Tyagi, D., Anthropological Survey of India
Unni, Jeemol, Fellow, Gujarat Institute of Development Research, Gota,
Ahmedabad
Vasavi, A. R., Indian Institute of Advanced Studies, Bangalore
Vasudevan, Ravi, Centre for Study of Developing Societies, Delhi
Verma, I.B., Economist, Anugraha Narayan Singha Institute, Patna
Vishwanathan, Shiv, Centre for Study of Developing Societies, Delhi
Vora, Rajendra, Professor of Politics and Head, Department of Politics and Public
Administration, Pune University
Waseem, Mohammad, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad
Weerakoon, Dushni, Institute of Policy Studies, Colombo
Yadav, Yogendra, Centre for Study of Developing Societies, Delhi

Bibliography

- Azad, J. L. 1981. "Financing of Social Science Research in India: An Analytical Review," *ICSSR Newsletter*, 12, 2 (March 1981), pp. 11-23.
- Block, David 2001. *Assessing Scholarly Communication in the Developing World: It Takes More than Bytes*. Report of the Social Science Research Council Inter-regional Working Group on Scholarly Dissemination. SSRC Working Paper Series vol. 4 (New York: Social Science Research Council).
- Drake, Paul et al. 2000. *International Scholarly Communication: Lessons from the Past*. Report of the Social Science Research Council Inter-regional Working Group on International Scholarly Collaboration. SSRC Working Paper Series vol. 3. (New York: Social Science Research Council).
- First ICSSR Review Committee 1974. "Report," *ICSSR Newsletter*, 4, 4, pp. 3-5.
- Ghosh, Partha S. 2001. "ICSSR and Social Science Research," *Economic and Political Weekly* (February 17)
- Gore, M. S. 1975. "A Note on Some Problems of Social Science Development in India," *ICSSR Newsletter*, 5, 3-4, pp. 3-8.
- Hafeez, S. 2001. "Development of Sociology as a Discipline in Pakistan," in S. H. Hashmi (ed.) *The State of the Social Sciences in Pakistan* (Islamabad: Council of Social Sciences).
- Haque, N. and Khan, M. H. 1998. "The Economics Profession in Pakistan: A Historical Analysis," *Pakistan Development Review*, 37, 4.
- Hettige, S. T. 1997. "Is There a Crisis in the Social Sciences?" *Proceedings of the Sri Lanka Association for the Advancement of Science*, 53 (2).
- Inayatullah 2001. "Social Sciences in Pakistan: An Evaluation," in S. H. Hashmi (ed.), *The State of Social Sciences in Pakistan* (Islamabad: Council of Social Sciences).
- Indian Council of Social Science Research 1998. *Annual Report 1996-97* (New Delhi: ICSSR).
- Institute of Social and Economic Change 2001. *Vision 2010* (Bangalore: ISEC).

- Joshi, P. C. 1981. "Some Basic Issues of Social Science Research and the Role of Research Institutes," *ICSSR Newsletter*, 12, 1, pp. 22-34.
- Kumar, Dharma and Mookherjee, Dilip (editors) 1995. *The D School* (Delhi: Oxford University Press).
- Kurien, C.T. 1982. "Social Science Research and Research Institutes," *ICSSR Newsletter*, 12, 2, pp. 16-21.
- Madras Institute of Development Studies 1995. 1971-95: Silver Jubilee Document (Chennai: MIDS).
- Madras Institute of Development Studies 2000. *Vision 2010* (Chennai: MIDS).
- Mathew, P. M. 2001. "Is Social Science Research Dying?" *Economic and Political Weekly* (January 6).
- Naik, J. P. 1973. "National Social Science Research Policy", *ICSSR Newsletter*, 4, 1, pp. 3-5.
- Naseem, S. M. et al. 1998. "Conditions of Teaching and Research in Economics: Some Preliminary Findings," *Pakistan Development Review*, 37, 4.
- Sathyamurthy, T.V. 1984. *Development Research and the Social Sciences in India since Independence* (Bergen: Chr. Michelsen Institute).
- Sethi, Harsh 2000. "Social Science Research," *Economic and Political Weekly* (September 30).
- Srinivas, M. N. (editor) 1955. *India's Villages* (Bombay: Asia Publishing House).
- Tsuya, Noriko O. and White, James W. 2002. *Collaboration and Comparison in International Social Science Research*. SSRC Working Paper Series vol. 5 (New York: Social Science Research Council).
- Vaidyanathan, A. 2001. "Social Science Research in India: Some Emerging Issues," *Economic and Political Weekly* (January 13), pp. 112-4.
- Weiner, Myron 1979. "Social Science Research and Public Policy in India," *Economic and Political Weekly* (September 15 and 22).