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The differences between regions and countries in the status of social science research could hardly be greater, yet the need for social science is the same throughout the world. Civil actors, citizens and policy-makers everywhere require the analyses of social scientists to make sense of global and local evolutions and challenges, and to move ahead with responses, adaptations and change. However, the diversity and the discrepancy between the size, the institutional structures and the overall condition of social science research systems around the world are astounding. Systems have expanded and continue to generate new knowledge in different regions of the world. The number of higher education social science students is increasing rapidly everywhere. But in many low-income countries, and in sub-Saharan African countries in particular, social science institutions are facing a critical situation: insufficient public subsidies, deterioration of the scientific profession, changes in the modes of knowledge production, a relative decline in the number of books and articles produced, and on top of everything else, the brain drain.

This chapter focuses on the institutional organization of social science research systems in different regions and countries, and highlights the institutions involved, the structures of agenda-setting, the financing mechanisms, the evaluation procedures, the status of research, relations with policy analysis and other issues. It provides a geographical outlook on these trends and practices, and shows their interconnections in different contexts.

The authors of this chapter have used various methods to delineate and describe what they regard as the most striking issues in the evolution of social science research in their region and country: bibliometrics, local and regional databases, surveys, statistics, reviews of recent studies and consultations of networks of researchers. But more significantly, all of them draw on their experience as privileged observers of the social science in their region.

By discussing data such as the number of social scientists, their financial resources, their working conditions and their output (expressed for example by the number of students graduating in social sciences, the numbers of publications or the number of journals edited) the authors sketch formidable divides between and within regions and countries. In Latin America, 90 per cent of higher education institutions do not produce any research at all, while over two-thirds of all postgraduate programmes are offered by public universities in Brazil and Mexico, and this is where most research is taking place (Vessuri and Sonsiré López). In sub-Saharan Africa, 75 per cent of academic publications in the Web of Science database come from South African, Nigerian and Kenyan social scientists, and from only a few universities. Similar disparities in the knowledge production process and concentration in major universities and research centres can be found in other regions.

In most countries, research is predominantly conducted in universities or in research centres associated with them. In countries previously under Soviet influence, social science research continues to be carried out broadly in institutes and academies outside universities (Pipiya; Huang). Public research centres where academics can devote themselves entirely to research and do little or no teaching also exist in western and Central Europe. Those research academies, centres and institutes have long traditions of achievement and are not likely to disappear in the near future. Worldwide, however, the dominant tendency is to grant universities broader responsibilities for the organization of research, and to maintain links between research and teaching.

Many regions and countries have seen an increase of short-term applied research conducted outside universities by consultancy firms and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), at the request of international donors or private foundations. In low-income countries this trend follows the relative or absolute shrinking of public funds allocated to universities, for research in general and to social sciences in particular. The tendency is so strong that we can talk of a ‘deinstitutionalization of research’ (Mouton) in sub-Saharan Africa but also in South Asia. In such conditions, academics rarely have the chance of working on long-term projects involving strong theoretical considerations. In these regions and countries, short-term empirical research (Arvanitis, Waast and Al-Husban) dominates, and often it is conducted by poorly qualified consultants. In developed countries as well, more and more research is undertaken by NGOs and privately funded think-tanks outside universities.

Funding is almost everywhere an issue. This is obviously the case where state subsidies have become the exception rather than the rule. There social scientists and research centres have become completely dependent on external donor funding. But funding is also an issue in richer countries where fewer public resources are allocated
The status of social science research in society, and society’s influence on public debates and policy, are addressed in several of the following articles. In some countries (for example, China and Brazil), social science research is considered essential to support the country’s development, while in others natural science is given all the attention (Krishna and Krishna; Pipiya). In some regions or countries research is not well regarded, but because of their public presence as columnists, advisors or think-tankers, social scientists enjoy broad social recognition. Finally, while the issue of academic freedom in developed and democratic countries is mainly concerned with the choice of research topics and this is the subject of lively discussion and debate, the question in other regions concerns censorship and the different ways in which the state tries to control the content of research. This issue, and others only touched upon in the following articles, require greater attention.

Directly to research institutions and universities, and where competitive allocation of funds and project funding has become predominant. In developed countries, mixed public and private funding of research institutions is already a growing phenomenon (Van Langenhove), and this is now expanding to many other regions and countries. The agencies in charge of distributing such funding have become major institutional players. The United States of America has no such reliance on one central public funder. The diversity of funding sources in that country has been a source of the vitality of its research in social sciences (Calhoun). Other countries can also count on a tradition of private or semi-private support, be it through foundations (for example, in western and Central Europe), liberal elites (Egypt, Lebanon), or influential families (the Gulf States) but not to the same extent as in the USA. The extent to which funding agencies at national or international level (for example, national agencies, foundations, multilateral and bilateral financing organizations) influence the research agenda and the conduct of the research itself raises concerns in many countries in the global North and South.

Tertiary education spending
Territory size shows proportion of spending on tertiary education worldwide, when measured in purchasing power parity.
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Chapter 2

Social sciences in North America

Craig Calhoun

In global terms, the most distinctive feature of North American social science, besides its size, is the extent of the investment made in time, facilities, training and incentives for research since the Second World War. In both the USA and Canada, social science research has grown substantially and very high educational standards have been achieved.

North American social science exerts a large global influence due to its scale, its research productivity and the number of international social scientists educated in its Ph.D. programmes. There are more than 100,000 social scientists engaged in academic research in the USA and Canada. Thousands more with an advanced education in social science work in government, private business and non-profit organizations. The influence of social science is also strong in a range of professional fields from management to public health, education and social work.

In global terms, the most distinctive feature of North American social science, besides its size, is the extent of the investment made in time, facilities, training, and incentives for research since the Second World War. In both the USA and Canada, social science research has grown substantially and very high educational standards have been achieved.

In both the USA and Canada, professors and students are drawn from a wide range of national backgrounds, and campuses are important sites of international exchange and connection. Social science departments have also been leaders in the pursuit of gender, ethnic and racial equity, although their success here varies. Most departments hire new staff from outside, and in most departments there is a great diversity of theories, methods, intellectual orientations, empirical foci and questions addressed.

Growth and differentiation

Social science has been a part of North American life since the colonial era. But until the late nineteenth century it was largely a non-academic enterprise. Social science flourished in the context of social reform movements, both religious and secular, and in the development of social welfare institutions. It was advanced by both middle-class advocates of moderate reform and more radical partisans of populism, agrarian reform and workers’ movements. A strong engagement with evolutionary theory and ideas of progress linked reformers and academicians, and both groups fed the academic establishment by pressing for the collection of detailed and robust social statistics. While social science in the USA retains connections to social movements and social reform, they have become attenuated since that era.

Between about 1870 and 1910, social science disciplines were consolidated by the founding of major departments, academic journals and professional societies. Social science disciplines took the lead when the USA adopted the Ph.D. degree as a standard and remodelled undergraduate curricula to emphasize disciplinary concentrations. At the same time, an effort was made to counterbalance disciplinary organization with interdisciplinary agenda-setting and improvements in research methods. These were among the central goals for the Social Science Research Council when it was founded in the USA in 1923.

After the Second World War, North American universities expanded dramatically. Social science courses were among the fastest growing, and this demand ensured employment for Ph.D. graduates. During this period, enduring institutional patterns were established. As well as disciplinary departments, universities created interdisciplinary programmes, centres and institutes. Among the most prominent foci for these were international area studies, urban studies and survey research. Later, race and ethnic studies, gender studies and environmental studies would be organized in similar ways. There was an expansion of government support for both pure and applied research, and especially in the USA, a major expansion of foundation funding, commonly focused on addressing social problems or supporting international development.
Social science attracted students engaged with social issues. During the student movements of the 1960s, it both informed radical thought and was attacked for not being radical enough. For most disciplines, rapid growth ended in the mid-1970s. Exceptions are economics, psychology and new fields such as communications. Professional schools grew rapidly and interdisciplinary fields expanded, such as international studies and gender studies. Enrollments in the remaining social science disciplines began to expand again in the 1990s and are generally robust today. In the USA, about 340,000 students receive Bachelor’s degrees in social science fields annually – about 20 per cent of all graduates (NIES, 2008).

The major social science associations based in the USA all include substantial Canadian membership and recurrently hold their annual meetings in Canada. Their proportion of Canadian members varies from subject to subject, but they all consist mainly of researchers based in the USA, and this sometimes leads to the neglect of Canada’s specificity. There are also Canadian associations in each field, with overlapping memberships. In general, Canadian social science disciplines are about 5 to 7 per cent of the size of their counterparts in the USA (CAUT, 2009).

While the disciplines are broadly similar, there are some national variations between the USA and Canada. The presence and prominence of First Nations has influenced both Canadian anthropology and political science, leading to further exploration of group rights and related issues. Likewise, Canada’s multilingual and multicultural constitution and high rates of immigration have drawn the attention of many social scientists. Research on the environment and social service delivery also figures more prominently in Canada.

### Funding and agenda-setting

North American social science is based overwhelmingly in universities, and researchers are also teachers, though in more elite institutions teaching demands are moderated to allow time for research. Canada is more egalitarian, and the system in the USA is more hierarchically differentiated. Inequality in the USA is tied to competition over relative standing, though neither the USA nor Canada use official national ranking systems to evaluate universities or departments. Research productivity and citation indices loom large in the variety of unofficial indicators to which administrators pay attention.

In Canada, funding for social science research comes centrally from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). Formed in 1977 (consolidating earlier government funding offices), the SSHRC works mainly by providing grants for investigator-initiated projects. In recent years, the SSHRC has secured increased funds, partly by committing itself to thematic initiatives that can shape research agendas. Since receiving SSHRC grants is an important criterion of evaluation in many Canadian universities, there is anxiety over how open the process will be to different lines of research. Canadian social scientists also receive support for applied research from other government agencies at the federal and provincial levels.

In the USA, there is no primary, centralized government funder, and funding diversity is a major source of vitality for US social science. The National Science Foundation (NSF) is the most influential funder of basic research in the social sciences. Its Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences primarily funds investigator-initiated projects through the peer review process. This is thematically open, though some researchers believe the process is biased in favour of certain research methods. The NSF does not fund applied research but does undertake initiatives to increase the scientific work done on certain themes.

Though the NSF is the main US Government funder of basic social science, the vast majority of government funding for social science research comes from other federal agencies ranging from the National Institutes of Health to the Departments of Education, State, Commerce, Agriculture, Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development. Funding from the Defense Department is particularly controversial, though recent programmes have increased the extent to which funding is available for basic social

| Table 2.1 > Membership of major North American disciplinary organizations, 2009 |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------|
| American Psychological Society | 20,000 |
| American Economic Association | 18,000 |
| American Political Science Association | 15,000 |
| American Historical Association | 14,000 |
| American Sociological Association | 14,000 |
| American Anthropological Association | 10,000 |
| Association of American Geographers | 10,000 |

Source: Individual association self-reports, rounded down to the nearest thousand.

Note: The American Psychological Association is much larger – about 150,000 members – and includes a majority of practising psychologists who are not actively engaged in research. The American Psychological Society represents a partially overlapping constituency of mainly academic researchers. The discipline of history is larger than the number above would imply. Many historians belong to more specific associations such as the Organization of American Historians or other groups organized by period or region.
science research not tied to military operations. Most states in the USA also fund social science research at some level.

If decentralization and plural objectives are the hallmarks of government funding in the USA, the pattern is only intensified by the large role of private foundations. Some major foundations like Carnegie and Rockefeller date from the early twentieth century, but foundation funding grew substantially after the Second World War. The Ford Foundation was a leader. New foundations continue to be established, reflecting the creation of large private fortunes. The biggest is now the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Interest in health issues looms large at foundations in the USA, along with questions of global governance, new media, education, poverty reduction and security. USA-based foundations fund globally, though disproportionately in the USA. They have been funders of international social science, both in Europe – especially after the Second World War, when the Ford Foundation backed the creation of France’s Maison des Sciences de l’Homme – and in developing countries.

Most foundations aim to improve the human condition, and have historically supported social science because they expect it to contribute to this mission. In recent years, however, many have become disillusioned, arguing that social science is too academic, too little concerned with informing public dialogue, and too focused on specialist agendas rather than large social issues. They have sometimes sought to stimulate agendas with new funding, but recently many have shifted funds away from social science and towards organizations oriented to direct practical action.

In addition to direct grants to individual scientists, foundations and government agencies fund various efforts to encourage new lines of research and increase the mobilization of existing social science knowledge to inform policy-makers and the public. The Social Science Research Council is a private ‘operating foundation’ founded for this purpose. It has been influential in the spread of quantitative methods, the establishment of area studies fields, and advancing research in fields from business cycles and economic growth to cities, migration and religion in public affairs. In addition to grants and fellowships, it works by establishing interdisciplinary committees and research groups. In recent years, this approach has also been adopted by the MacArthur Foundation, which has established networks supporting research on themes from adolescent development and juvenile justice to socio-economic status and health. The Russell Sage Foundation, the only major foundation in the USA focused entirely on social and behavioural sciences, has taken a similar approach, notably in shaping the emergence of behavioural economics and studies of trust.

Despite the large role of government and foundation funders, the primary support for social science research in the USA and Canada comes from employment as university faculty members. This provides time and facilities for research, though in unequal amounts depending on the university resources. In recent years, there have been fiscal strains, particularly in state-funded institutions, and the inequality between and within institutions has grown. At even the richest universities, social scientists are acutely conscious that funding has grown much faster in the natural sciences and at many professional schools. Social science and humanities departments are more dependent on funding streams associated with undergraduate teaching. Further institutional upheavals may lie ahead. A financial crisis at the University of California, for example, has resulted in cuts that fall heavily on the social sciences and humanities.

Institutional pressures as well as resources promote productivity, but also keep it channelled in a competition for standing within disciplines. This encourages many to stay focused on long-recognized themes at a time when there are major changes in the world that social scientists study. Despite this, there is a great deal of intellectual ferment and excitement, and growing talk – if not yet much reality – of breaking out of customary disciplinary and subdisciplinary boxes. Some of this is encouraged by new research techniques such as neural imaging, by new interdisciplinary relations (notably to the biomedical sciences) and by a focus on major public problems such as environmental degradation.

Public engagement
An important recent concern in North American social science has been that academic research has become too inward-looking, oriented to highly specialized intellectual subfields and not to broader public concerns. In fact, this concern is as old as the disciplines themselves. The idea of interdisciplinarity was introduced when the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) was founded in 1923. Interdisciplinarity was not then regarded as an end in itself. It was valued as the basis for bringing different sorts of knowledge to bear on public issues. The same agenda informed the creation of interdisciplinary centres at universities. But disciplinary departments have remained more powerful, especially with regard to employment decisions. They rely mainly on a reward system heavily focused on the discovery of new knowledge. This usually
means an emphasis on incremental improvements within established explanatory or descriptive agendas rather than synthesis for students or the public, or indeed broader efforts to reorient scientific inquiry.

The desire for more public engagement has been reflected in discipline-specific efforts to nurture ‘public sociology’, ‘public anthropology’ and so forth. Scale is an issue. With 10,000 anthropologists or 15,000 political scientists, it is possible to sustain highly specialized subfields and many media of inside communication. Indeed, the concern for public communication is accompanied by a desire for more communication across subfields, addressing important general questions within disciplines. This has informed the creation of new journals, such as Perspectives in Politics and the Journal of Economic Perspectives, that seek to fill a gap between the general press and highly specialized academic publications. Similar desires to inform public debate and to address issues that are under-represented in specialist publications also shape the use of new media, as social scientists create web-based publications, podcasts and blogs.

Disciplinary and subdisciplinary specialization, and the emphasis on internal academic communication, peaked in the late twentieth century. North American social science is increasingly oriented outward and focused on pressing public problems. To these, social scientists bring both substantial accumulated knowledge and an impressive array of analytical approaches.

Craig Calhoun

Has served as the President of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) since 1999. He also holds the title of University Professor of the Social Sciences at New York University, and is the Founding Director of NYU’s Institute for Public Knowledge. He has written on culture and communication, technology and social change, social theory and politics, and on the social sciences themselves.
In the 1990s, an economic model of international competitiveness, following the so-called Washington consensus, was widely introduced in Latin America. This model replaced the previous development model based on the substitution of imports. The new model was based on the assumption that if the economy were allowed to grow unhindered, increased productivity and higher income would allow people to take care of their health, education and retirement needs with as little help from their governments as possible. This assumption has, however, been questioned. The gist of the debate is to explain a situation in which underdevelopment and democracy, inequality and ‘good’ governance, economic growth and lack of distributive justice may coexist in conditions where the state is efficient, the economy is competitive and large pockets of poverty are being reduced, but high levels of income inequality nevertheless persist.

In the Latin American region, major socio-economic changes – fast economic growth coexisting with major inequalities – raise a new set of social and economic issues of which the public were unaware just a few years ago. The social sciences can be crucial in providing understanding of the complexities and contrasts of this variegated social landscape. This paper presents the institutional aspects of the region’s social sciences, trying to find some clues to their mixed results in terms of quality and relevance.

The changing institutional landscape of the social sciences

In Latin America, the implantation and early development of the social sciences assumed different forms in keeping with each country’s political and cultural specificities. From the 1950s to the 1980s the complex political context, particularly in the Southern Cone countries (Argentina, Uruguay and Chile), forced many social science researchers into exile. Thus the institutionalization and professionalization process of many social science disciplines occurred in a framework of international exchanges. This framework expanded the field’s orientation towards a regional Latin American perspective.

The main institutional actors have been universities, science councils, public and private social science research centres, NGOs, consultants and consultancy firms, and regional centres such as the Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO), the Latin American Social Sciences Faculty (FLACSO) and the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA). In the region, these agencies have had a strategic role in the definition of dominant research themes. Between 1950 and 1970, ECLA was among the key centres for the creation of knowledge and critical social thought about issues related to Latin American ‘underdevelopment’, such as state–society and centre–periphery interactions. This involvement resulted in an original contribution that inspired social and political reflection and action for decades. In the absence of national policies to set social science priorities, CLACSO became the regional body shaping the field’s expansion.

Universities are crucial institutional actors. The evolution of the social sciences in Latin America can only be understood by taking into account the changing relationship between the public universities and the state, and the conflicts and social movements which have involved universities. They have led to the partial transformation of universities and to the creation of new institutions. The expansion of higher education in Latin America, especially since the 1970s, produced a substantial increase in the number of social
science and humanities students. This increase was related to the expansion of private-sector higher education, a phenomenon that varied between countries. In Argentina, 79 per cent of all higher education students are still in public institutions, while private enrolment far surpasses public enrolment in Mexico, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, the Dominican Republic, and above all Brazil. Brazil has one of the most privatized higher education systems in the world, comprising 72 per cent of students and 90 per cent of institutions (Dias Sobrinho and Lemaitre, 2007). It is also worth mentioning that 90 per cent of higher education institutions in the region are only engaged in teaching activities. Most research is carried out at postgraduate level, where some public universities play a major role. In fact, more than two-thirds of all Latin American postgraduate programmes are offered by the public universities of Brazil and Mexico (Brunner, 2003).

In most countries a science council is the state agency that funds research, training researchers by granting scholarships and funding graduate programmes. Some councils, such as CONICET in Argentina, CNPq in Brazil, and CONACYT in Mexico, have their own institutes, often linked with universities. In some countries (Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Mexico, Costa Rica and Venezuela), the science councils provide substantial funding. They have also contributed to the emergence of social science research communities, without interfering with their content and orientation. In general, social science research communities have developed their own agendas, policies and research approaches. But science councils have recently assumed a more active role in redefining research agendas by asking social science research to tackle certain social agenda issues. Poverty eradication has become a top priority of some governments in the region.

Independent social science research centres, NGOs and consultancy firms comprise a very varied mix. They are more dependent on government and international funding and the sale of specialized services than are the independent institutions. Short-term consultancies, particularly in Central America and the Andean countries, prevail over more ambitious, high-quality research. The presence of international research funding also has an impact on research agendas throughout Latin America.

There is no reliable information about the distribution of social science researchers in different employment sectors, but it seems to be diverse. In 2007 in Argentina, for example, 41 per cent of full and part-time social science researchers worked for private universities, 24 per cent for public universities, 25 per cent for non-profit non-academic entities (NGOs and others), 7 per cent for public non-academic organizations and 1 per cent for firms (MINCYT, 2008).1 Costa Rica’s situation is very different: in 2006–07, 86 per cent of social science researchers were in the academic sector (public and private), 12 per cent in the government sector, 2 per cent in non-profit units and 0.25 per cent in international agencies (MICIT, 2007).

The growing importance of social science training and research

Between 1970 and 2000, social science experienced much greater growth than any other knowledge field. In 2006, 57 per cent of university graduates in the region were in social sciences.

Postgraduate education grew particularly fast. Masters courses in social sciences have expanded rapidly. In 2006, they comprised 42 per cent of the total Masters degree market. The trend is different at the doctoral level. Here social science plays a relatively minor role in terms of student numbers, but has shown a considerable growth rate (14 per cent in 2006) (RICYT, 2008).

Brazil makes the greatest effort to train graduates by Ph.Ds and Masters degrees. Today it can produce 10,000 Masters graduates and a little over 2,500 Ph.Ds in the social sciences and humanities per year (CAPES, 2007). Government and the non-academic public sector seem to be absorbing considerable numbers of these social science graduates.

Brazil, Ecuador and Guatemala, together with Bolivia, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Argentina and Chile, form a

---

1. This appears to be a result of Argentine science policy in recent years, which has been characterized by the sustained growth of research funds allocated on a competitive basis to researchers in different centres, public or private, while the number of full-time lecturers in public universities has remained stagnant.
In 1999, local socio-institutional contexts for the development of research and the training of researchers showed important weaknesses due to unfavourable working conditions. Many Masters and Doctoral programmes did not even include research. Today, the larger countries (Brazil, Mexico and Argentina) are becoming centres of attraction for students and researchers from other countries and for international cooperation.

**Trends in the funding and evaluation of research and researchers**

The public-sector funding crisis has favoured the expansion of private universities and research centres. As a general trend, a depersonalization of the higher education teaching staff is noticeable, and the number of full-time researchers is declining. Funding for competitive projects has grown in importance, while the institutional funding allotted to universities has diminished. This has increased conflict between teachers and researchers, between institutions, and between institutions and ministries. In many cases, multilateral financing organizations such as the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) have driven this tendency.

In parallel to this trend, some governments have established mechanisms to evaluate researchers’ performance since the 1980s. Competition and excellence are emphasized by special programmes or agencies. In Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Mexico, Venezuela, and more recently Uruguay, researchers’ productivity determines their careers’ permanence and progress. Productivity also facilitates access to funding. In these countries, governments have delegated assessment to the researchers themselves via the scientific community’s own criteria, as determined by the National System of Researchers (SNI) in Mexico and the Program for the Promotion of Researchers in Venezuela (PPI).

As early as 1976, Brazil developed a system for evaluating postgraduate programmes coordinated by the Coordinating Agency for the Improvement of Higher Education (CAPES), a move unparalleled in Latin America. CAPES introduced clear rules and incentives, and provided important infrastructure inputs like broad, open access to international publications through a special CAPES subsidy. This led to a quantum jump in Brazilian participation in international publishing as well as in the country’s ability to train researchers and professionals with advanced degrees (CAPES, 2007; Russell and Ainsworth, in this Report).

In other Latin American countries, however, the effects of incentive programmes have not necessarily been satisfactory. There is a good deal of criticism, even among more successful countries, of the rules and procedures that have to be navigated, although they may be a significant source of extra income and social status. The challenge faced by this type of programme is to elaborate a formula that guarantees quality, respects the autonomy and preferred work methods of researchers in different knowledge fields, and does not overburden them with repetitive bureaucratic paperwork.

Supplementary measures should be implemented which might increase the alternative funding sources available to the social sciences. Methods should be explored that foster collaboration and networking with larger research teams rather than focus on rewarding individuals, and which increase the quality and visibility of Latin American scientific publications.

**International mobility**

The emigration of scientists, engineers and social scientists has long been observed in the literature on development, politics, science and technology, and higher education. Particularly since the 1960s, it has been analysed as damaging to community-building efforts and therefore as an obstacle to development strategies. In the 1970s and 1980s, researchers left for political reasons. Later on, they did so because of economic and working conditions. While the majority emigrated to the northern hemisphere, which has often meant a loss of local research capacities, the circulation of researchers in the region has fostered an awareness of commonalities and shared culture, and the possibility of a new interplay between social actors in the construction of integrated intellectual projects (Didou Aupetit, in the Report).

**The emerging agenda**

Towards the end of the 1990s, social science in the region entered a period of self-evaluation. Many social science researchers spoke of a crisis in the field and of new challenges posed by twenty-first-century developments. Social science was said to have lost much of its critical edge in its contribution to the analysis of social and cultural phenomena. At best, it became more instrumental to social management, and at worst, a trivial practice of little social use. In the universities, a new mode of thinking...
Emerged, which was associated with the New Public Management approach which prevails in OECD countries. A new discourse on themes such as the market, marketing, productivity, competitiveness, rationalization, governance, procedures and management, grew popular in some areas, replacing the traditional debate on dependency theory that had been dominant in the 1970s.

Do these changes mean that the region’s previous social science research agenda (sovereignty, legitimacy and power) has been forgotten? It does not seem so. By the middle of the first decade of the new century, when several centre-left and left-wing governments came to power in the region, the political landscape changed again. There has been a strong resurgence of concern with the very unequal distribution of power and resources in today’s world. In addition, there have been movements towards regional integration in which social, economic and political thought have played a fundamental role, trying to fill Latin American social science’s political theory gap.

Thus, in the 2000s we have seen a change in many of the programmes that ruled social science in the 1990s. We have witnessed a return to some of the ideas that guided regional social science in the 1960s and 1970s. Old theoretical perspectives have been vindicated, such as the subjectivities of indigenous and other marginalized social groups, contestations by feminism, cultural studies and science studies. Among the themes that are resurging or being reformulated are social movements, social participation, multiculturalism, endogenous development, Latin American identities, education and urban violence. At the same time, new topics have emerged, such as those related to the media, information and communications technologies, the deepening of democracy, sustainable development, and climate change (CLACSO’s website).

Perspectives and challenges for the social sciences

Increasing and often contradictory demands put enormous pressure on public authorities. Even in the best circumstances, with good governments and economic growth, the daunting social problems facing Latin America in areas such as health, poverty, education, employment and living conditions will endure for decades to come. Nevertheless, they can be faced, reduced and better administered if proper policy decisions, based on appropriate information and research, are taken and if public authorities’ administrative and managerial competencies improve.

In most Latin American countries, social conditions have improved slowly due to faster economic growth. But they remain far from satisfactory. Improvements have been too slow, the problems of an ageing population and urban decay bring new and very difficult challenges, and crucial social, economic and political problems are addressed with varying degrees of success. Nonetheless, there are many individual examples of good practice. In this new scenario, some of the challenges to social science are to build renewed theoretical approaches capable of guiding research and action. These approaches should also have the potential to overcome the most prominent social and natural problems, to address the networking of researchers and the integration of results in such a way as to constitute a renovated regional view, to improve output dissemination and use in academic and decision-making bodies, and to ensure the financial and institutional sustainability of scientific research committed to social advancement.
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The state of social science in sub-Saharan Africa

Johann Mouton

The social sciences in sub-Saharan Africa continue to operate under conditions that are seriously under-resourced. The fact that there is still sustained and vibrant social sciences research in countries which, with a few exceptions, have little government support, poor institutional facilities and many other challenges says a great deal about the resilience and resolve of the scholars concerned.

Introduction

In sub-Saharan Africa, social sciences and the humanities are predominately practised within universities. A few countries have government-funded research institutes devoted to the social sciences (for example, the Human Sciences Research Council in South Africa). Independent social research institutes (for example, the Institute for Basic Research in Kampala, and again, many examples in South Africa) and research NGOs are more prevalent in many countries. An increasing number of these research institutes and centres are funded either through international agencies or by donor organizations with little if any government support. But it is not surprising that the history of social sciences in this region is intimately related to the history of African universities.

As Sall (2003) rightly observes, the independence, nation-building and development euphoria of the 1960s and 1970s; economic and social crises; the subsequent structural adjustment process, mainly induced by external actors; the crisis of the state; and the spread of armed conflict have all left their mark on the social sciences, on higher education and research institutions, and on researchers and research communities in Africa. More recently, democratization processes in increasing numbers of African states, the end of the Cold War, globalization, the general conversion to liberal economic doctrines, the information and communications technology revolution, and the popular and intellectual struggles that these processes have engendered, have all impacted on the social sciences in various ways.

Before independence, there were colleges, university colleges or fully developed universities in countries such as Sierra Leone, Ghana, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Uganda, Senegal, Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Egypt, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and South Africa. However, the development of social science research and the teaching of the social sciences are very much post-colonial phenomena. Even in South Africa, which has had universities for more than 150 years, university-based social science research only really developed and expanded in the era after the Second World War. In many African nations the post-colonial state built most of the research and training institutions (universities, institutes and centres) in the first few decades after independence, mainly since the 1960s.

Trends in research output

It is well known that Africa's share of world science as measured by papers published in ISI indexes has been declining steadily over the past decades. Various studies by Gaillard, Waast and others have examined this issue (Gaillard, Krishna and Waast, 1997), but arguably the most comprehensive and up-to-date bibliometric analysis of this trend is captured in Robert Tijssen's 2007 article in *Scientometrics*.

In his analysis, Tijssen shows that sub-Saharan Africa has fallen dramatically behind in its share of world science production – from 1 per cent in 1987 to 0.7 per cent in 1996 – with no sign of recovery. This diminishing share of African science overall does not reflect a decrease in the absolute number of papers, but rather an increase in output below the global growth rate. Africa has lost 11 per cent of its share in global science since its peak in 1987; sub-Saharan science has lost almost a third (31 per cent). The countries of North Africa – Egypt and the Maghreb

---

1. We are aware that any exclusive focus on papers published in the more than 9,000 journals of the Thomson ISI Web of Science ignores a significant body of scholarship published elsewhere: either in local journals or journals (very often francophone or lusophone) not included in the ISI indexes.
(Algeria, Mauritania, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco and Tunisia) – accounted for the modest growth in the African share of the worldwide output from 1998 to 2002.

Table 2.2 presents the breakdown of ISI papers for the social sciences and humanities (SSH) over the past 20 years by country. Only countries that produced more than 200 papers over this period are included. The table shows that over this time, output has increased steadily with an overall growth rate of 112 per cent. A number of countries that did not produce many papers in the ISI journals twenty years ago have recorded huge increases. The noticeable exception is Nigeria, with a negative growth rate (-27 per cent), presumably an indication of the impact of the high-level brain drain on that country. South Africa’s dominance in sub-Saharan Africa is evident; the country produces about half of all output in the social sciences and more than three times more than Nigeria, the second most productive country.

A breakdown of output by university reveals the domination of South Africa. Eight of the top ten and eleven of the thirty most productive universities are located there. However, the data also raises the question of whether a critical mass of universities exists in the region, which is able to maintain a steady annual output. Only the top seventeen universities are able to produce an average of twenty papers per year in ISI journals. Many traditionally strong universities in countries such as Nigeria, Kenya, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe struggle to maintain even these levels of output.

In an attempt to address African journals’ lack of presence in international indices such as ISI, the International Network for the Availability of Scientific Publications (INASP) launched a project in 1997 to give African journals greater exposure – African Journals Online (AJOL). According to the latest figures, more than 340 journals are currently indexed in AJOL, which is based in Grahamstown in South Africa and managed by the National Inquiry Service Centre. Of these 340 journals, approximately 100 are categorized as being in the social sciences or the humanities (SSH). This list does not represent all SSH journals published in Africa, but it does allow us to gain a sense of local social science scholarship. We counted the articles produced in the 78 AJOL journals during the period 1999–2007. In addition, we also counted the number of articles published in the 120 SSH journals published in South Africa during the period from 1990 to 2007.

When we look at articles published in AJOL as well as in South African social science and humanities journals, the overall scholarship picture changes considerably.

**Table 2.2** > Social science and humanities output by country in sub-Saharan Africa according to ISI, 1987–2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>2,785</td>
<td>10,895</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>+185%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>3,552</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>-27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>1,739</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>+127%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>+54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Republic of Tanzania</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>+235%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>+174%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>+224%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>+250%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>+890%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>+2,282%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>+325%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>+920%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>+2,814%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>2,792</td>
<td>2,839</td>
<td>3,651</td>
<td>4,982</td>
<td>21,506</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>+112%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.3** > SSH articles in sub-Saharan Africa by source, 1990–2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSH articles in ISI journals</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>2,792</td>
<td>2,839</td>
<td>3,651</td>
<td>4,982</td>
<td>19,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSH articles in non-ISI journals</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>4,948</td>
<td>5,900*</td>
<td>30,673</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,299</td>
<td>7,720</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>3,975</td>
<td>9,962</td>
<td>13,129</td>
<td>54,775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *Conservative estimate based on information in SA Knowledgebase.*

Note: There are many South African journals in AJOL which in this table have been counted under South African journals.
First, we see that international publication in ISI journals (19,154 articles during the period 1990–2007) only constitutes about one-third of the total social science scholarship in the region. Given that these figures exclude significant francophone journals and journals not listed on AJOL, the ISI share is undoubtedly even smaller in practice than this figure suggests.

Second, leaving aside South Africa, a small number of countries again produce the biggest shares of the AJOL output: Nigeria (37), Ghana (7), Ethiopia (6), Senegal (5), the United Republic of Tanzania (4), Uganda (5) and Zimbabwe (4). However, of the total (78) number of non-SA AJOL journals on this list, 27 have not produced any articles since 2006. Finally, these figures show how invisible African scholarship in the social sciences and humanities is, and why initiatives to give these publications greater exposure by supporting journals, open access repositories and other measures are so important.

Research institutes, centres and networks

The lack of government support for social science research in sub-Saharan Africa translates into very little support for research institutes and centres dedicated to the social sciences and humanities, whether based at universities or effectively operating as NGOs. CREST compiled a list of research centres dedicated to the social sciences in twenty-five sub-Saharan countries excluding South Africa. Of these, only seventy-nine (or 53 per cent) had an active website at the time of writing this chapter. But even having an active website does not necessarily mean that the website has current contents: we assessed a website as ‘current’ if it contained news or listed events at the centre during the period from 2007 to 2009. According to our assessment, only 65 (43 per cent of the overall total) of these websites have contents that could (very charitably) be regarded as recent.

A noticeable exception to this trend is the state support for the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) in South Africa. The HSRC is a parastatal body, more correctly one of nine science councils, which receives core funding from the South African Government under the national science vote. Its mission is to conduct strategic and applied social science research in support of national developmental goals. In recent years, because of cuts to its parliamentary grant, it has been forced increasingly to compete with other South African research institutions including universities and NGOs for international and national contracts. But it remains a significant national asset with a research staff complement of nearly 165 social scientists working in areas such as democracy and society, education and science, HIV/AIDS and health systems, poverty and development, the world of work and others. More information can be obtained from its website: www.hsrc.ac.za.

The precarious state of many of the SSH research centres in the region is indicative of a more general trend in research and scholarship in many African countries — the deinstitutionalization of science. With the decline in the number of robust and vibrant university-based research centres, we are witnessing an increase in transnational and regional research networks. It could be argued that such networks are emerging as a direct result of globalization, greater international collaboration and increased access to the internet. At the same time, such networks are also filling the void left by the lack of strong national research centres. The vast majority of these networks focus on interdisciplinary and more applied fields of the social sciences. Examples are the SAHARA network for the social aspects of HIV and AIDS, and the African Labour Research Network. These networks are predominantly sustained by international agency funding. Most of them are engaged in a range of activities which include research but also capacity-building and training, networking through conferencing and other means, as well as advocacy and policy work.

Modes of knowledge production

What kind of social science is being practised in African countries? Here we discuss two ‘types’: academic science in universities, and consultancy science for international (overseas and locally based) organizations.

Academic science refers to science practised by individual scientists or groups within universities. Much of this research is underfunded and is published in local journals that are not internationally visible. This form of research is very often driven by the individual scholar’s priorities and interests, and is ultimately aimed at advancing their career. Given Africa’s lack of a research infrastructure (strong-research centres with a critical mass, sustained funding and institutional continuity), these scholars end up engaging in projects that do not translate into building institutional capacity.

This individualistic research does not have much influence on society and rarely carries much weight. Governments and decision-makers – but also university bureaucrats – are impressed and influenced by size (large centres, networks and think-tanks) and continuity in scholarship over time. Where social science scholarship is primarily individualistic, it is unlikely to be taken seriously or to influence policy. So its status will be low to negligible.
Perhaps even more serious are the intellectual consequences of this form of research. It leads to fragmentation of effort, lack of critical dialogue within a community of scholars and often a lack of methodological rigour. Discipline-based work will eventually decline and basic scholarship such as social theory will also suffer.

Individualistic research is one side of the coin, of which the other face is consultancy research. ‘Consultancy’ social science refers to the widespread practice of academics engaging in consultancy work – mostly for international agencies and governments – to augment their meagre academic salaries. It is most prevalent in specific disciplines such as the health sciences, business studies, ICT, and monitoring and evaluation work, but is still widespread and on the increase. In an attempt to quantify the extent of consultancy work in many African countries, and also to shed more light on the underlying reasons for its growth, CREST recently completed a study in the Southern African Development Community region which addressed a number of these issues.2 The results show that more than two-thirds of all academics in the fourteen SADC countries regularly engage in consultancy.

What were the respondents’ main reasons for engaging in consultancy? We distinguished between the responses of South African and other SADC-country scholars, but there was very little difference between these two regions in the answers to our first two questions. First, consultancy is undertaken because the respondent enjoys the variety in topics that this brings (87 per cent versus 82 per cent); second, consultancy is undertaken because of the demand in the market (32 per cent versus 38 per cent).

The other reasons provided, however, demonstrate large differences between the South African and other respondents:

- Inadequate salary (cited as a reason by significantly more SADC respondents): 54 per cent in South Africa and 69 per cent elsewhere in SADC.
- Consultancy advances my networks and my career: South Africa 39 per cent, SADC other 72 per cent.
- My research interests are not addressed by my own institution: South Africa 18 per cent, SADC other 47 per cent.
- Consultancy improves my knowledge and skills: South Africa 78 per cent, SADC other 92 per cent.

A further breakdown by scientific field revealed significant differences, mostly in an expected direction. Large percentages of respondents in the more applied scientific fields where there are close links with industry and also government, such as applied sciences and technologies, earth sciences, engineering and material sciences, engage in different forms of consultancy. Academics in the economic and social sciences also reported high levels of consultancy engagement. In both groups, the majority of respondents reported carrying out consultancy. Perhaps the most surprising result is that a majority of academics in the humanities (61 per cent) indicated that they do some form of consultancy work. The overall picture points to the wide prevalence of consultancy work across all scientific disciplines.

**Funding of social science research**

State funding of social science research in sub-Saharan Africa is the exception rather than the rule. The majority of social scientists in the region depend on international donors such as Sida/Sarec, NORAD, DANIDA, on the Netherlands, French and British governments in Europe, on various foundations in the USA (most notably Ford, Rockefeller, Mellon, Kresge, Kellogg, Atlantic Philanthropies and Carnegie) or on IDRC in Canada, for their research funding. A distinction should be made between those grants that support social science research more directly (as is the case with CODESRIA, and the Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa (OSSREA), and more indirect institutional support aimed at strengthening scientific institutions, such as Sida’s support of journals in Ethiopia and Carnegie’s support of libraries and ICT networks in East and West Africa.

A recent study of the role of international funding in countries in Southern Africa confirms these trends, and perhaps for the first time, indicates how dependent academics in the region are on such donor funding. The study of the SADC countries evoked responses from more than 600 academics. The results showed that a very substantial 42 per cent of all respondents from SADC (South Africa excluded) indicated that they source between 70 per cent and 90 per cent of their research funding from overseas, compared with only 6 per cent of South African respondents. The responses show very clearly the dependence of SADC scientists on international funding, and conversely, how little domestic funding is available for research. The actual state of affairs is probably even worse than these figures suggest. The scientists in our sample were identified because they are the most active and productive researchers in their fields and countries.

---

2. Study conducted by the Centre for Research on Science and Technology at Stellenbosch University under commission for the Southern African Regional Universities Association (SARUA). Final report is available from the SARUA website: www.sarua.org
Themes in social science research
To what extent does science in the region (including both the social sciences and the humanities) address the most important development goals of the respective countries? Do scientists pursue research that is consistent with national priorities, or are these of secondary concern?

A breakdown of the SADC study by field of research shows that we always need to keep in mind differences between scientific areas. The results show that significant proportions of scholars in all fields either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that their research agendas are consistent with their countries’ development goals. For scholars in the arts and humanities, this percentage was 75 per cent, for the economic and management sciences 87 per cent, and for the social sciences 83 per cent. These proportions compare favourably with fields such as agriculture and health, which are traditionally regarded as the more applied sciences.

Another thematic area to which the social sciences are making an increasingly significant contribution is the bibliometric assessment of the number of HIV/AIDS-related articles with SADC institutional affiliation. A steady increase over the past 17 years, from 2,156 in 1990 to 3,305 in 2007, especially between 1999 and 2006. This trend is mainly due to an increased output in the medical and health sciences, but publications in the field of the social sciences and humanities have also increased since 2000 despite a small decline in 2007.

Major challenge for social sciences in sub-Saharan Africa
This review has demonstrated that the social sciences in sub-Saharan Africa continue to operate under conditions that are seriously under-resourced. The fact that there is still sustained and vibrant social sciences research in countries which (with a few exceptions) have little government support, poor institutional facilities and many other challenges says a great deal about the resilience and resolve of the scholars concerned. We should also add that most official science policy statements and national research plans make little mention of the social sciences.

The emphasis is on the health sciences (especially HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis [TB] and malaria), popular priorities such as biotechnology and nanotechnology, and the more applied sciences. Where reference is made to the social sciences and humanities, they usually appear in an appendix, in support of the natural sciences. A noticeable recent exception is the latest strategic thrusts of the Department of Science and Technology in South Africa, where the humanities and social sciences are identified as one of five main priorities.

Building an individual and institutional research capacity remains the main priority for the social sciences in the region. And although there are many examples of research capacity-building initiatives sponsored and supported by various international agencies, donor organizations and foreign governments, there is still very little consensus about the most effective approach (Simon, 2000). Debates continue, for instance, on investing in individuals or institutions (Costello and Zumla, 2000; Nchinda, 2002), whether postgraduate training in the global North exacerbates the brain drain (Nchinda, 2002) and on southern African control of research budgets (Lansang and Dennis, 2004; Nchinda, 2002). The science institutions in many sub-Saharan countries have been systematically eroded and destroyed over the past three decades through international economic policies as well as by the devastating effects of domestic policies and events. The cumulative effect of these policies over time has been a decline (at least in relative terms) in scientific output, changes in modes of scientific work, the devaluing and degrading of the science profession, and of course, the brain drain.

Many commentators (Aina, Zeleza and Mkandawire to mention a few) have commented on the lack of indigenous African theories and conceptual models to address the region’s social dynamics and challenges. This is not a new observation. It is clear, however, that this call for theoretical innovation and more sociological imagination is even more relevant in an age of globalization and internationalization, of the continuous decline of key scientific institutions including research centres, societies and journals, in many countries, and of the widespread lack of government support for social sciences research in sub-Saharan Africa.
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Social sciences in the Arab world

Rigas Arvanitis, Roland Waast and Abdel Hakim Al-Husban

The Arab world is home to a large number of talented students and academics. Paradoxically, no specific goal has been assigned for their research. As one of us observed:

*the social understanding of science considers obtaining a PhD degree as the end of the reading and research process. The degree rather than the research record is what determines an individual’s social status, both outside and inside the university.*

(Al-Husban, 2008)

In other words, the social embedding of science remains unsteady and research does not play a specific role.

This general statement must be nuanced since there are significant differences between regions and countries: histories, social contexts, institutional arrangements, the role of the state and past and present development models must all be taken into account. By integrating these criteria, four different research and innovation models seem to emerge: the Gulf countries, the larger developmentalist states (Egypt, Iraq, the Syrian Arab Republic), the Maghreb, and the Middle East.

Four regional models

The Gulf countries

Having obtained their independence in the 1960s and 1970s, most of the Gulf countries have adopted an ‘Anglo-Saxon’ approach to research, leading to the creation of ‘elite’ universities specializing in the natural and exact sciences, and to the development of partnerships with foreign countries and institutions. The human and social sciences, on the other hand, are relatively closed to collaboration with foreign partners and priority is given to Arabic-speaking academics. A pragmatic approach to science has come into being, which largely draws on local issues. In the social sciences and humanities, an instrumental approach to research dominates: sociology effectively takes the shape of social engineering, economics is primarily business-oriented, and Islamic philosophy or law is dominant within the humanities. Research is mostly restricted to universities. It is sometimes funded by the state but more generally by foundations and is increasingly produced by an expanding number of foreign professors. In order to handle the ‘post-oil’ era, Gulf countries are allocating resources to manage the transition towards a knowledge economy. In order to do so, they import Western skills and expertise, through the creation of Gulf country campuses of internationally recognized universities (the Abu Dhabi chapter of the Sorbonne, for instance) (Romani, 2009).

The larger developmentalist states

From a very early stage, Egypt (as well as Iraq and to some degree the Syrian Arab Republic) established a mass education system – including universities – whose purpose was to train a technical workforce capable of implementing their development model of mass production geared to domestic markets. The so-called ‘developmentalist state’ (Amsden, 2001) played the main economic role. When it changed orientation, it also abandoned its monopoly over education. Private colleges and universities proliferated (doing little if any research) while the overall quality of public higher education diminished. It suffered from underfunding, leading to low staff incomes and status, and overcrowding. A number of academics and researchers have moved (at least temporarily) to the Gulf countries, where the increase in demand produces higher wages for foreign and Arabic-speaking academics. In Egypt, a substantial number of academics are drawn towards consultancy and expert positions. Support for research is mainly channelled through foreign – and more rarely local – funding agencies. Research no longer depends solely on state funding. These
new dynamics have significantly transformed academic hierarchies to the benefit of externally funded networks rather than state patronage.

The Maghreb countries
The Maghreb countries (Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria) have adopted an institutional and intellectual model that draws its inspiration from Europe (especially from France) with which they have important scientific relations. Following independence, they set up universities and prestigious polytechnic institutes, highly selective schools for high-ranking bureaucrats and business leaders. They also established national research centres that focused on a variety of different fields, including the social sciences. State oversight remains strong, and nationalist and secular governments are managed by technocratic elites. The entire education and research system functions without private-sector support, which (even lately) has been unable to carve out a significant share of the research activity. Scientific talents and vocations are abundant, and research is recognized and accepted as a career.

The Middle East
In stark contrast to the larger developmentalist states and the Maghreb countries, the smaller Middle Eastern countries (Jordan, Lebanon) have centred their social and economic models around commerce and international trade rather than on industrial mass production. In these countries, most universities are private and quite recent. Private institutions do little research, except for the two oldest and most prestigious ones: the American University of Beirut (AUB) and Saint Joseph, established in Beirut in 1863 and 1875 respectively. The Lebanese University, set up in 1953, is the only public university in Lebanon. It mainly focuses on teaching (concentrating half of the country’s student population) rather than research. Two or three others can be cited in Jordan: Jordan University in Amman and Yarmuk University at Irbid (which include human and social sciences, while the very good JUST University at Irbid is only for S&T disciplines).

A number of commercial research centres, consultancy firms and NGOs have recently been created in the social sciences in response to demand for internationally funded field studies from foundations and universities.

The social grounding of the social sciences
As in other scientific disciplines, social sciences training and research in the Arab world are mostly performed by academics who work in public institutions. They generally equal or outperform other university sciences numerically. Students in the human and social sciences account for two-thirds to three-quarters of total enrolment figures, and faculty members for a third to a half of total staff (Table 2.4). The main difference between the social sciences and other disciplines is not so much the working conditions (professional status, wages, careers, funding) but the ways in which they affect and are received by society. The social sciences are intimately related to local problems and realities. Research results are often published in local languages for a local audience. They reflect local values and understandings. They are not only influenced by these values, but can also have an influence on them. The social sciences are sensitive to the social environment and to its support to them.

Social and political environment
Arab societies are generally governed by social communities, lineage relations and religious beliefs, which all tend to impinge on creativity. A highly critical report from the United Nations Development Programme, written by recognized regional experts, has highlighted inadequate relationships to knowledge as one of the three main handicaps hindering progress in the Arab states (UNDP and Regional Bureau for Arab States, 2002). The report criticized a trend at both the teaching and family education levels to hinder freedom of thought, leaving little room for creativity. In societies that are dominated by power, wealth and patriarchal values, knowledge has a relatively low social status. Furthermore, the state and the political sphere dominate all other activities. There is a trend within authoritarian regimes to exercise a heavy control over the social sciences, limiting freedom of thought and setting boundaries in terms of acceptable and unacceptable areas for research and teaching (Al-Taheer, 2004).

Table 2.4 > Proportion of human and social sciences students and faculty members in the total number of students and faculty in selected Arab countries, circa 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Morocco</th>
<th>Algeria</th>
<th>Tunisia</th>
<th>Jordan</th>
<th>Kuwait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESTIME background reports (all countries except Kuwait) and UNESCO special initiative of the Global Forum on Higher Education and Research (Kuwait). Data refer to Morocco 2003/04; Algeria 2000/01; Tunisia 2004/05; Jordan 2003/04; Kuwait 2004.

Support for science through policy
Nevertheless, when we look at the overall figures, science is actually developing in the region (Arvanitis, 2007; Satti, 2005). Despite its reservations and doubts, the state has done a great deal for research through regulatory measures,
notably by linking academic careers to research activities. As a symbol of modernity (the Gulf), rationality (Tunisia), national unity (the Syrian Arab Republic), or the development model (Nasser in Egypt, but also Algeria), higher education, and to a certain degree research, has at one time or another benefited from the support of national governments. Despite a few exceptions in some specific periods in Egypt or Algeria, governments have not totally restricted academic freedom as happened in other parts of the world. Instead they have tied academia down to centrally controlled institutions (public services, research centres, polytechnics and even universities), preventing the emergence of autonomous scientific communities. In certain instances, modernist factions in power have developed strong alliances with the promoters of scientific activity in order to advance their own struggles in the political sphere. Algeria offers the clearest example of such a ‘socio-cognitive bloc’ (El Kenz, 1997), periodically uniting the research avant-garde with ‘technocrats’ in order to defeat the ‘patrimonialists’ (as the two opposed views of Algeria were labelled). This is a volatile and fragile form of support since it is conditioned by the regime, the factions in power, political alliances and personalities. In certain cases, policy changes reflect strong ideological oppositions over the role that scientific or religious knowledge should play in society (El Kenz, 1997; Waast, 2006).

**Other non-state sources of support for science**

Fortunately there are other sources of support for scientists who wish to devote more time to scholarly activities. International scientific collaborations help researchers to keep up to date and to gain access to funding. Over the past few years, the European Union has greatly influenced the research agenda in the region. Other countries such as Egypt or Jordan have privileged the development of ties with the USA (Pasimeni et al., 2006; Rodríguez Clemente and González Aranda, 2007). Throughout these countries, a diversity of ‘sociocognitive blocs’ contribute to link scientific activities to specific communities or social groups, such as liberal elites in Egypt and Lebanon, influential families in the Gulf states, or the technocratic strata in Algeria. Despite its idiosyncratic nature, this feature is paramount in explaining the appearance and survival of research groups and agendas. This has also been the case in peripheral countries on other continents (Vessuri, 2006). The very content of research in social sciences reflects these alliances by promoting a role for social sciences that can be qualified as a support to development rather than a critical stance toward society. Finally, the growth of science appears to stem from the professional norms that are internalized by a few individuals during their training, and by specific institutions (at least one or two per country) that compete for international recognition and which use research to demonstrate their value and status.

**The multiple roles of scientists**

The adverse features that have just been mentioned help us to understand the scientific community’s tendency to hold a variety of different professional positions, which are not always linked to research. This is due not necessarily to financial pressure, but rather to the desire for status. It is also a response to social and family pressures. Close relatives and the people in an individual’s direct social environment do not generally regard the job of ‘researcher’ as a proper professional activity. It does not have the same recognition as ‘professor’, ‘doctor’ or ‘engineer,’ for instance (Al-Husban, 2008).

Social scientists’ participation in the public sphere has risen. It now involves writing in reputable news magazines and newspaper opinion columns, working for think-tanks, organizing symposiums, taking part in empowerment initiatives, holding other more ‘reputable’ professional jobs (lawyers, entrepreneurs, political party representatives or government officials), and getting involved in policy design and political activism. All these activities are time-consuming, and have consequences for the type of research that is being undertaken in terms of methodologies (often hyper-empirical and instrumental), topic choices (linked to development issues), and the targeted audiences (wider public rather than academia). As a result, researchers who work in this way can look more like consultants or political activists than scholars. Their reputation is more grounded on a personal basis than in their role in collective research activities, their contributions to a school of thought or their actions to advance academic institutions.

**Increasing demands for the social sciences**

Demands for the social sciences arise from a variety of sources: from local businesses, from specific groups seeking legitimization (factions or lineages looking for historiographers), from the general public (interested in law, for instance), from the state (social engineering) and from the media (news corporations and television channels interested in culture and current affairs).

There are also steadily more international demands for social science. They include foreign scholars seeking local
correspondents and partners (for example, in the political sciences or in archaeology), and more recently, international organizations (the United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], the United Nations Children’s Fund [UNICEF], the UN Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia [ESCWA] and so on) seeking empirical studies and fieldwork on hot social topics. Foreign foundations (for example, the Ford Foundation, German foundations and large NGOs) have supported scholars in the region in their efforts to stimulate intellectual life there.

Various consequences of these changing priorities have been observed. The first is a change in the hierarchy of disciplines: those in poor demand (which curiously include economics) are pushed aside, whereas others that have a strong empirical and local orientation are promoted. These include anthropology, law and political science (Al-Husban, 2008; Kabbani and Moussaoui, 2007). The second consequence is the emergence of new priorities in topic choice. Researchers subcontracted by foreign sponsors tend to uncritically adopt the ‘global agenda’ for their own business reasons. Others focus on conventional topics so as not to shock the local public. The third and most visible consequence relates to institutions. Growing international demand for the social sciences has led to a proliferation of private research centres in the Middle East. These are devoted to empirical studies and take part in empowerment activities. Such centres are generally set up and managed by young ‘science entrepreneurs’. These are often talented scholars who keep one foot in the university system while simultaneously acting as a globalized elite mediating between local audiences and foreign sponsors (Hanafi and Tabar, 2005). These centres hire would-be academics on a contractual basis, introducing yet more diversity into their working conditions, and creating a proletariat of temporary investigators, transforming the structure of the research profession.

National or global social sciences?

In most countries, there are universities that adopt high standards for their academics and function as sanctuaries for research. In others, a few scholars stick to research, which they pursue in order to seek promotion and also by inclination. An inquiry into the research topics most favoured in the region shows that the chosen themes are influenced by national concerns. Literature, history and law are most active and valued, ahead of socio-anthropology and the political sciences. The research topics of local social scientists do not necessarily match those of foreign specialists working on these same countries (Rossi and Waast, 2003). Much engaging research goes unnoticed abroad, mainly because it is published in Arabic and rarely translated; and also because it is not necessarily connected to the global agenda. The bulk of the research output is centred on local issues (maybe too much), using hyper-empirical approaches rather than comparative analysis. Certain, generally young, scholars express a greater interest in international perspectives, notably when they join private research institutes to escape local mandarins and clichés. Yet even their research output goes generally unpublished, mainly because international funding bodies are more interested in ‘edible’ reports and practical research, rather than theoretical research.

The Arab world mostly has a common language and there is significant circulation of talent, which is principally drawn to the Gulf, with very limited movement between the Maghreb and the Mashreq. But intellectual cross-fertilization is confined to the subregions. Publishers and translators, as well as university syllabuses, are generally specific to their country of production (Mermier, 2005; Sghir Janjar, 2005). With some notable exceptions, the work of authors from other parts of the Arab world is neither well known nor sought after. Interest exists primarily in publications from Europe or North America. The academic scene is predominantly national in scope. When it does go beyond national borders, it tends to be globally rather than regionally oriented.

What role for research?

There is a wide variety of research-oriented bodies in the Arab world: real capacities, dedicated establishments, publishers, audiences, interested media, international funding bodies and governmental bodies. While social research is growing, it seems to lack a specific and socially acceptable role. In other disciplines (engineering, biomedical research and various natural sciences), research benefits from a relatively high degree of support, particularly in countries that are moving towards a knowledge economy in which innovation takes precedence over the exploitation of natural resources. But the usefulness of the social sciences is usually under debate. They tend to be regarded as a cultural activity, perhaps like a museum, or an ornament for their local sponsors. Alternatively they can be seen as a pragmatic social engineering activity with commercial opportunities, sponsored by foreign funding agencies.Rarely are they seen as a critical body of knowledge cultivated for its own sake.

This means that there is a growing imbalance between different types of research (public and private) depending on the approach taken to it, which may be reflexive or
In order for these new forms of support to produce positive results, scientists must agree on more formal and collective forms of organization. These might include labelled and assessed research units or laboratories such as the ones established or planned in the Maghreb, common research projects – far-reaching and linked to additional funding, as in some private bodies – and a keen sense of professionalism and responsibility.

If the social sciences are to be recognized as sound sources of constructive critiques and suggestions, they will have to become less atomized and less dependent on external factors. They will need to reinforce and consolidate their own self-regulated scientific communities, watching over the ethos of the profession, restoring interest in theory and rigorous methodology, and above all organizing and adding flavour to a vivid public scientific debate.

What are the prospects? Predictions are always risky since much depends on the attitudes of the state and of scientific communities. In an uncertain political context, it is interesting to note that several governments have expressed a sudden interest in the social sciences, recruiting a number of young academics and launching evaluations. This proves their increased awareness and justifies substantial funding efforts. Morocco and Algeria are good examples of this; Jordan, Lebanon and Egypt are less determined. The Gulf countries, which some observers consider to be the source of a future ‘Arab Renaissance’, are paying increasing attention to the arts and humanities and to the social sciences as a component of the future knowledge society.

What are the prospects? Predictions are always risky since much depends on the attitudes of the state and of scientific communities. In an uncertain political context, it is interesting to note that several governments have expressed a sudden interest in the social sciences, recruiting a number of young academics and launching evaluations. This proves their increased awareness and justifies substantial funding efforts. Morocco and Algeria are good examples of this; Jordan, Lebanon and Egypt are less determined. The Gulf countries, which some observers consider to be the source of a future ‘Arab Renaissance’, are paying increasing attention to the arts and humanities and to the social sciences as a component of the future knowledge society.
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The status of the social sciences in China

Huang Ping

Some of the issues on which social scientists are currently focusing in China include rapid urbanization and massive rural–urban migration; pension system reform; health care; education for all; housing; and political issues such as the reform of the legal system and the rule of law. Other themes include governance and social justice in the information-age society, ageing, and achieving a more harmonious order in a large and multicultural society that is better integrated into the globalized world network.

Historical overview
In terms of what we see today, the status of the social sciences in China can be traced back to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when the first generation of Chinese students and scholars returned from Western countries, mostly the UK and the USA, after completing their degrees or their research.

After the Second World War and since the founding of the People’s Republic of China in 1949, social sciences in China have developed along three traditions: Chinese scholarly academia, especially Confucianism, Daoism and Buddhism; focusing on economics in line with Soviet influences and Marxist studies; and later, Western approaches.

During the Cultural Revolution (1966–76), social sciences almost disappeared and were hardly taught. After the opening-up process initiated in 1978, social sciences, along with science and research in general, were resumed and given a mandate to support the reform process. The Soviet influence gradually disappeared, and Western, especially US, social science approaches became the most influential. Sociology, for example, had been banned since 1952 and was reintroduced in 1979. During the past decade, traditional Chinese academic traditions have been reintroduced in universities and have caught the interest of an increasing number of students.

Institutional landscape: actors in social science research
The key executive institution in the field of science, technology and innovation is the Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST) under the State Council. MOST is responsible for formulating the national medium- and long-term development plans, and for formulating and implementing policy guidelines in the field of science and technology.

Another key institution is the Ministry of Education (MoE), which also falls under the State Council. Amongst its various important tasks, it is responsible for managing higher education and postgraduate education. Furthermore, it is responsible for planning and directing higher education institutions’ research work in all sciences, including social sciences and the humanities. It also manages educational funds, and formulates guidelines and policies regarding fundraising and financial allocations.

The key actor and scientific institution for social sciences and humanities research is the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS), which again falls under the State Council. CASS used to be part of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) until 1977, when Deng Xiaoping was about to launch reform and open up China to the outside world. He regarded CASS as the government’s top think-tank, as well as the National Centre for Social Sciences and Humanities Research.

The following points need to be highlighted regarding the institutional landscape:

- Members of academe are traditionally gathered in the Shuyuan (House of Scholars and Learners). Shuyuan is an element of, and maintained, by CASS as the top national research institution, and its remit includes the humanities. CASS was established in 1977, growing from the Chinese Academy of Science’s Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences. The Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences, called Xuebu, had a staff of 2,200 in fourteen institutes (for instance, Economics, Archaeology, History and Law institutes) in 1976. Today, CASS has thirty-seven research institutes and more than 150 research centres, carrying out research activities covering about 260 subdisciplines of different levels of importance, as well as a graduate school. It employs more than 3,500 research
Thus, CASS remains the main actor in social science and engineering. According to China’s science and technology indicators (2004), only 5 per cent of universities’ R&D expenditure is on social science and humanities. Thus, CASS remains the main actor in social science research, and only elite universities can attract social scientists from CASS.

Over the past decades, the mechanisms that these agencies use to allocate resources to the social sciences have undergone regular revision and fine-tuning, as discussed in Wei’s papers in the present report.

Policy on social science research
Social science policy in China is largely influenced by science policy overall. In the past few decades, the general direction of the science system has been towards the marketization and downscaling of the dominant institutions to modernize them and make them more productive. With this objective in mind, China has moved from block to project funding, as have many other countries.

Since 1978, social sciences have been assigned three functions: training high-quality personnel, supporting policy-making and long-term plans, and being a channel for learning from abroad. More specifically:

- The universities have all re-established or empowered departments of economics, political science, sociology, anthropology and law. As a result, capacity-building in the social sciences has improved remarkably in both the universities and the national research institutions. In 2005, there were more than 1,300 Ph.D. graduates in the social sciences, and the country had 53,880 full-time social science researchers. The budget for the social sciences and the humanities, including teaching and research, has been increasing by about 15 to 20 per cent every year since 2003. Young students who want to become researchers in social sciences have to finish their graduate studies and obtain a postgraduate degree from one of the best universities, including a Ph.D. from a world-class university such as Oxford or Harvard.

- Supporting policy-making: social science research has developed in both quantity and quality. Starting with the rural reform of the early 1980s, economists, but also sociologists and legal experts, were asked to support the country’s social transformation. This help was later expanded to cover all the issues that face the whole of society. Never before have social sciences had such an impact on China’s social policy and social change.

- International collaboration and learning from abroad: China has a long history of international collaboration. CASS is the key institution engaged in such collaboration, participating in conferences, cooperating with foreign
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academic organizations and universities, inviting foreign SSH academics to China and cooperating with funding organizations.

The Chinese Government has also sent a large number of postgraduate students to study social sciences in the USA, Europe, and Japan. After completing their doctorates they are encouraged to return to China to teach and do research by being guaranteed good positions once they come back. Some are offered scholarships to study abroad on the condition that they return. The Chinese Government is also maintaining relations with Chinese scholars who live abroad, encouraging them to return for short periods to collaborate with local research teams or to engage in activities that can support China and its research.

In the twenty-first century, social sciences in China are becoming even more significant. Following an assessment by the Chinese Government, social sciences are considered as important as natural sciences for educating the younger generations and for promoting the country’s economic, social, legal, political, cultural and technological progress.

As in all other sciences, pressure has been applied to social scientists to publish in international journals. Incentives have been put in place to encourage them to do so. This has resulted in a growing number of Chinese articles in international social science journals. But the relative growth in the number of Chinese papers in the Social Sciences Citation Index is considerably lower than the growth in natural science publications included in the SCI-E, the expanded Science Citation Index (see statistics in the Annex to the present report).

Competition has increased and a new evaluation system has been introduced with a view to improving the performance of public research organizations and guaranteeing the efficient use of public resources (see Wei’s article in the present report). There are many – perhaps too many – national and local exams for younger or even middle-aged researchers who want to continue with an academic career or who wish to be promoted. This results in quite a significant time input and intellectual effort on the one hand, and high competition for short-term outcomes on the other.

Status of researchers
There was a time in China when the social sciences were considered less important than natural sciences and when social scientists had fewer opportunities for research, benefited less from funding and enjoyed less public recognition. When China became engaged in its deep social transformation, which involves economic reform, urbanization, political change and state-building, the social sciences, such as economics, sociology and political sciences, became key to supporting and monitoring change. Now the social sciences are the basis for policymaking alongside the natural sciences and humanities.

Social scientists now enjoy much greater prestige than many other professionals and more than their counterparts in other countries, including many developed countries, even if they still earn far less.

Social sciences and policy-making
The role of social sciences in China today is illustrated by their impact on policy-making. In the past, social sciences were essentially academic disciplines, taught at universities to educate the younger generation and practised in research institutions to develop new ideas on the way society should evolve. Today, while maintaining these functions, social sciences have become progressively more engaged in supporting policy-making at different levels – central, provincial, and local – and in organizing social interaction between the public and policy-makers. One way they do this is by conducting public opinion surveys. Social science researchers have become more deeply involved in social change by providing their insights and ‘solutions’, and by studying social issues with which both the public and policy-makers are concerned. Today social scientists have become interpreters and even ‘legislators’ of social change in China, though not necessarily in policy-making bodies or official agencies.

Major issues and priorities
The eleventh five-year plan, which runs from 2006 to 2010, identified three areas of major challenge for China:

- growth, competitiveness, employment and sustainability in a knowledge-based society
- societal trends in China and its citizens
- China in the world: understanding change in the interactions and interdependencies between world regions and China.

Some of the issues on which social scientists are currently focusing include rapid urbanization and massive rural–urban migration; related to this are social issues such as social welfare and social security, which includes pension system
reform; health care; education for all; housing; and political issues such as the reform of the legal system and the rule of law. Other themes include governance and social justice in the information-age society, ageing, and achieving a more harmonious order in a large and multicultural society that is better integrated into the globalized world network.
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India dominates the social sciences in South Asia, overshadowing its neighbours such as Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka. Partly this is because it is the largest country. In addition, it is the only country in the region where the relevance of social sciences for policy-oriented research and as an academic discipline has long been recognized and institutionalized. The article analyses the situation in India before briefly reviewing the social sciences in other countries.

Actors and agencies in social science research

In general, four types of institution conduct social science research in India:

- Educational institutions comprising social science departments at universities and postgraduate colleges under universities
- Research institutes set up by government departments
- Government-funded, but legally autonomous, specialized research institutes
- Research units and programmes set up or funded by private agencies, foundations and NGOs.

In 1947 there were only twenty universities in South Asia, of which India had eighteen. Initially these universities carried out a large part of the professional research in social sciences, enjoying a near monopoly of knowledge production. However, this situation is undergoing fundamental change, and universities are losing their monopoly. Moving away from Mode 1 knowledge production (in the style of Gibbons et al., 1994) to Mode 2 has led to the development of new knowledge production structures and funding arrangements in the South Asian region as a whole. This is the result of diminishing public support for academic research combined with the emergence of new actors undertaking research.

These include disciplines such as economics, sociology, political science, history, geography and psychology.
a number of specialized institutes\(^2\) to conduct research on specific social science topics.

The Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR), which is the second most important funding agency, was established in 1969. Its main objective was to nurture academic social science research by establishing autonomous research institutes in different parts of the country. So far, twenty-seven such institutions have been set up with funding from central and state government. Besides these, two other autonomous government-funded organizations have boosted the study of history and philosophy.

In the post-liberalization and globalization period of the past fifteen years, a number of non-governmental research institutes and private consultancy firms have been founded to carry out specific goal-oriented research. Public universities and research institutes continue to be the main academic research actors, but they find it increasingly difficult to sustain themselves on public funds alone. They have to attract private and international funding, and to combine sponsored and consultancy research with academic research.

Until the 1980s, the ICSSR, UGC, government departments and the Planning Commission were among the important funding sources. Since the beginning of the 1990s, various private foundations and trusts have begun funding social science research projects and programmes. Besides agencies such as the Tata and Birla Trusts and the Ford Foundation, which have been funding social science research for decades, corporate firms supporting social science research have established a number of new foundations. Furthermore, there has been an increase in international funding. India, like the whole of South Asia, has witnessed an increased flow of funds from multinational agencies such as the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the European Union and other agencies. Consequently the funding of Indian social science research is quite substantial, although no estimates are available of its total magnitude (ICSSR, 2007).

Like its funding patterns, India’s research culture is gradually changing. Instead of pure academic research being carried out, there has been a spurt in the number of applied projects and policy-oriented research programmes. The Indian social science community is concerned about this trend (ICSSR, 2007). But in India, unlike its neighbouring countries, the problem of international funding agencies governing the research agenda is not acute. Most social science research remains publicly funded.

**Social science research output in India**

In 2005–06, 45.13 per cent of the 11.028 million students in India enrolled in institutions of higher learning were studying the arts and social sciences. If we add commerce and education, the percentage increases to 64.60 per cent. The total faculty strength at this time was 4.88 million at 400 universities and 18,000 affiliated colleges. Approximately half this number were employed in arts and social science faculties. A somewhat similar ratio applies to social science doctorates, which accounted for 42 per cent of the 17,989 new Ph.Ds in all fields in 2005–06. Again, if we add commerce and education, the percentage increases to 50 per cent.\(^3\)

According to the Scopus database, India is the only visible South Asian country in terms of research publications at the international level. It ranks thirteenth in terms of the top twenty-six social science producing countries, which are led by the USA and the UK. India has a world share of 1 per cent with its 13,596 publications from 1996 to 2007 (Gupta, Dhawan and Ugrasen, 2009). On looking deeper into the trend during this period, it becomes clear that Indian social sciences witnessed either a relative stagnation, or a declining trend compared to China. The latter published 606 papers in 1996 compared with India’s 706, but by 2007 China outpaced India twofold. The available data also reveals that only nineteen institutions of higher learning, including universities, published fifty or more papers. They accounted for 28.39 per cent of the total publications during the 1996–2007 period (Gupta et al., 2009).

It is surprising that despite such a large base of students, faculty and institutions in the social sciences, only a small number of institutions could make their presence felt at the international level through their research publications.\(^4\) This

---

2. These are, for example, the Indian Council of Agricultural Research, the Indian Council of Medical Research, the Institute of Applied Manpower Research, the National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, the National Institute of Health Administration, the National Centre for Agricultural Economics, the Indian Institute of Public Administration, and the National Institute of Science, Technology and Development Studies.


4. The quantum of research conducted in languages other than English is not much and there is very little published work available in other languages, as there are hardly any journals of repute in languages other than English.
quantitative insight into the status of social science research can be interpreted in various ways, but it seems to suggest that social sciences in India are characterized by a ‘sea of mediocrity with islands of excellence and visibility’. There is, in fact, a double-bind institutional and intellectual crisis in social sciences. As the ICSSR Report (2007, p. 20) observes:

While the scale and range of social science research in the country have been expanding, the nature, scope and quality of research output, as well as its contribution to a better understanding of socio-economic processes and shaping public policy is widely perceived to have fallen short of expectations and also not commensurate with the resources spent on them.\(^5\)

A crisis in Indian social science?
According to Guha (2008, p. 35), ‘the term [crisis] is well merited, for the crisis of Indian social science’. Leading scholars agree on at least three problematic features of the growth of Indian social sciences, which have also been underscored by two review committee reports.\(^6\) These are:

1. There has been no significant growth in the number of public research institutions. Since the 1969 founding of the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR), which houses twenty-seven research institutes, there has been no major expansion of public research institutions. Many of these institutions have recently come under critical public scrutiny and evaluation. As Partha Chatterjee (2008, p. 39) notes, ‘only half dozen or so ICSSR institutes are today genuinely viable as research and training institutions in the advanced academic disciplines of the social sciences’. Of the 400 national universities, only a small proportion, 15 to 20 per cent, are teaching and research-based universities, while 80 per cent can be regarded as teaching universities only.\(^7\) Unlike what can be seen in science and technology, the relative stagnation of research universities has severely constrained the prospect of social science research growth.\(^8\) As a part of its tenth five-year plan, the UGC has created a window of competitive funding for infrastructure and centres of advanced studies in social sciences. But the amount of funding available has remained quite limited and it is mostly confined to urban-based universities. Social sciences accounted for a mere 8 per cent of India’s national science and technology research budget in 2005–06. The current eleventh five-year plan has, however, planned a substantial increase in budgetary allocations for higher education and research. Its impact will only be visible in future.

2. The second issue relates to the emergence of the rapidly growing private and business enterprise sectors, creating a new demand for social science research for business management, commerce, marketing, media and other fields. This has had a negative impact on the conventional social science fields. New actors such as corporations, industrial associations, NGOs, and private trusts entering the research field to conduct specific goal- and mission-oriented research attract the ‘cream’ in social sciences and contribute to an ‘internal brain drain’. These new actors and networks, emerging at both the local and global level, complement the research carried out by universities but also provide social scientists with better opportunities and wean them away from the university system. The external brain drain problem, once restricted to the sciences and engineering, now also concerns the social sciences and humanities (Guha, 2008, p. 35).

3. The third issue is autonomy from political interference. Objectivity is problematic in social science research, and ideological rivalries are not necessarily based on intellectual and methodological quarrels. Major research projects on, and funding for, politically loaded subjects such as religion, caste and ethnicity both become subject to political steering. Scholars generally agree on the need to delink the ICSSR in particular, and social science research in general, from political interference.

Status of researchers
Barring some centres of excellence in India, social sciences as a whole are accorded low priority in the whole South Asian region. This leads to social scientists having a low status and limited career opportunities. Social sciences by and large – whether in research or in government – are not perceived to be very lucrative compared with business and management subjects. A general apathy on the part of social scientists, and their lack of interest and expertise, accentuate the prevalent notion that the social sciences are irrelevant, with the exception of economics. Economics is generally regarded as the most prestigious and lucrative

---

5. The role of economists is an exception to this general view.
7. This is our assessment, which some educationists in Delhi endorse.
8. Research universities undertake both teaching and research, striving to uphold the Humboldian ideals of teaching and research excellence. They draw relatively more funding than teaching universities, which also undertake research, but only to a very marginal extent.
discipline, providing the best career opportunities. Conversely, limited career opportunities have led to a recent decline in students studying disciplines such as history, geography and political science at a higher education level in the region. Sociology, a relatively new discipline compared with others, offers better opportunities due to the NGO sector’s rapid growth.

On the whole, social science researchers’ career opportunities are very limited and social scientists form a substantial part of the unemployed educated population. This is particularly true in underdeveloped and backward areas of the region where university education standards are low and research quality is substandard.

**Pakistan**

Social science research in Pakistan was a low priority for the state until the early 1980s, and the relevance of social science subjects was not recognized (Inayatullah and Tahir, 2005). Unlike engineering, medicine and other natural sciences, they did not offer direct solutions to the problems confronting the society. There were, however, specialized research institutions, such as the Applied Economics Research Centre (AERC) established at the University of Karachi in 1973. In the 1980s and 1990s, AERC was recognized as one of the country’s leading research institutions. New and vibrant institutions have since emerged, but they operate more on a consultancy basis. Despite quantitative expansion, little research work has emerged from the universities and social science departments of Pakistan.

The state’s neglect of social sciences has meant that no strong, rational social science tradition could be established. Consequently the research carried out at both the theoretical and empirical levels is inadequate and of poor quality. A number of scholars, including Inayatullah and Tahir (2005) and Ul Haque (2007), lament this state of affairs. Unlike in India, Pakistan’s Council of Social Sciences took a long time to emerge. Only in 1983 did the University Grants Commission establish the Centre of Social Sciences and Humanities (COSS). It was aimed at promoting and improving education and research in social sciences in higher education institutions, and introduced the concept of the social sciences into Pakistani academic discourse for the first time. But at a practical level, COSS did not have much impact on the development of these subjects. Eminent scholars made various attempts (in 1993, 1998 and 1999) to set up a council of social sciences, but failed on the issue of autonomy, as they did not support a council located in the state sector. Finally, a group of social scientists succeeded in registering the Council of Social Sciences (COSS) as an autonomous organization in 2000. This is an important milestone in the development of social science research in Pakistan. Since its emergence, COSS has produced a number of publications highlighting the relevance of social science research to a better understanding of Pakistani society’s social fabric and its implications for the development process.

**Sri Lanka**

In Sri Lanka too, the government has not prioritized social science research. The Grants Commission, the main body of the university system, was established in 1978. Its primary function is to plan and coordinate university education and allocate funds to higher education institutions. These are primarily teaching universities and their research output is very limited in quantity and quality. Many are state universities and are unable to attract highly qualified staff.

Besides universities, some government agencies are engaged in generating and interpreting data in specific sectors with a view to implementing the ministries’ development agenda. One of the autonomous institutions engaged in social science research is the Institute of Policy Studies (IPS) funded by the Netherlands Government and the Government of Sri Lanka. This is a policy think-tank engaged in research on various socio-economic issues. The past few decades have witnessed a significant growth in the NGO sector conducting social science research. However, no data is available on the number of agencies and social scientists engaged in this sector.

**Bangladesh**

In recognition of the importance of social science research for a poor and developing country, the Bangladesh Social Science Research Council (BSSRC) was founded in 1976. It is the main body responsible for the promotion and development of social science research in the country. It is also responsible for coordinating the activities and programmes of organizations engaged in social science research. Other faculties and departments are also recognized for the quality and range of their research. There are also a few independent, non-profit, non-government institutes. However, social science research has been a low priority for the Bangladesh Government. The BSSRC has not really impacted the promotion of research significantly, nor are working conditions for social scientists generally

9. In India but also in Pakistan and Bangladesh.
10. All these are research institutes and attract funding from international sources and, to a lesser extent, from government sources.
problems in the region. Economics is the most affected discipline, as some of the most talented Indian and Pakistani economists work in foreign countries. Serious policy attention is needed to arrest the brain drain and attract the best students to social sciences.

Knowledge production is very unevenly distributed in the region. There is a wide knowledge gap between India and the smaller countries. Unlike these countries, India, with its large pool of intellectual capital, its institutional structures and its government support for social sciences, has been able to produce a mass of empirical knowledge, which has contributed to a better understanding of its society and culture. To some extent this knowledge has also been used by policy-makers for developmental purposes and to create a more just and participatory society. In comparison, social science research in Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka is still trying to establish a professional footprint. The bulk of research relating to these countries’ societal issues is undertaken by foreigners or by local scholars who have settled in the West. Thus, the nodal points from which knowledge is produced are located outside the countries, research is externally sponsored and the research agendas are imposed from abroad. This raises the issue of how far knowledge produced in this way can cater for local needs.

Governments in the region are slowly recognizing the importance of the social sciences in dealing with a multitude of socio-economic problems. They are taking measures that include increasing budgetary allocations for higher education, particularly in India. Creating an infrastructure and a research climate will require a massive effort and an infusion of adequate funding in social science institutions. India could play a significant role in promoting social science research in the South Asian region. The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation in Social Sciences should be activated as a platform for catalysing regional cooperation and development in the social sciences.

Conclusion and prospects

There seems to be consensus among social scientists that, with a few exceptions, the quality of both teaching and research in social sciences is declining in South Asia. The accountability factor is virtually absent and peer evaluation systems are weak in publicly funded research institutions and universities. Social scientists and eminent scholars are seriously concerned, and via various forums, they have actively tried to draw policy-makers’ and the academic community’s attention to this neglect.

Compared with science and technology, the funding of social science research is marginal in the region as a whole. Within the region, India has the longest and strongest tradition of public funding for social science research. Nevertheless, even this has not been as high as desired in recent years. In the absence of adequate governmental support for social science research in Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and to a lesser extent India, foreign agencies are increasingly playing a crucial role in funding, but also in determining the content and direction of research. The donor-driven shift towards Mode 2 knowledge production is causing social scientists in the region considerable concern. This calls for a serious commitment to increased public funding to encourage independent, objective research that could contribute to a better understanding of socio-economic and political trends in the region.

The declining status of research, poor funding and poor career options have combined to produce brain drain effective. There is a national register of social scientists by 2004, there was no further information on this in 2009.
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The status of social sciences in Europe

Luk van Langenhove

Over the past twenty years, the organization of social sciences research in Europe has undergone serious reforms. Perhaps one of the unique features of social sciences in Europe today is that they are organized at both the level of individual states and at the European supranational level. Another major change is the increasing role that funding mechanisms play in steering research.

Europe can be regarded as the cradle of the social sciences. The concept itself first emerged in the French language in the 1790s, while the origin of social sciences can be traced back to a number of European developments such as the French Revolution, the rise of capitalism and the emergence of the modern sovereign states (Van Langenhove, 2007). Today, social sciences in Europe are firmly institutionalized in universities along the disciplinary model. Here we cover western and Central Europe, while the situation in The Russian Federation is described in another article.¹

Over the past twenty years, the organization of social sciences research in Europe has undergone serious reforms. Perhaps one of the unique features of social sciences in Europe today is that they are organized at both the level of individual states and the European supranational level. Another major change is the increasing role that funding mechanisms play in steering research. Funding agencies have been set up in parallel to research organizations, and allocate funds on the basis of projects at the national as well as regional European level. Besides different national funding schemes, Europe counts a growing number of regional (supranational) funding schemes, which also define priority themes to be studied. Amongst them are the programmes of the European Research Council (CERC), the COST Programme² and the Framework Programmes of the European Commission. As a result, the social science research agenda in Europe (or at least the EU-27) is driven by both national and EU concerns.

In general, one can say that the current organization of social sciences and humanities research in Europe is gradually turning away from their previous models of organization. These had numerous differences but shared certain common features such as:

- relatively stable research careers
- the hegemony of tenured positions (in public or private universities as well as in state research organizations)
- a concentration of research within publicly funded universities, academies and research centres
- a frequent overlap between teaching and research
- the relative autonomy of academia
- the organization of research along strict disciplinary lines.

The European Commission’s approach to research involves defining thematic priorities and emphasizing interdisciplinary work. In response, research systems in Europe are slowly moving towards a model in which research is project-driven, reactive to external incentives and characterized by the growing role of external and mixed-mode funding, which involves public, private and charitable funding. It is more interdisciplinary and involves more public–private initiatives, more cross-sectoral collaboration, more reference to users,

¹ This article borrows heavily from chapter 1 of the report ‘Emerging Trends in Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities in Europe’, delivered in 2009 by an expert group set up by the European Commission and chaired by Poul Holm (Metris Report, 2009). Members of this group were Poul Holm (chair), Nicolas Guilhot (rapporteur), Dalina Dumitrescu, Gabriele Griffin, Arne Jarrick, Istvan Rév, Guhara Roll, Daniel Smilov, Piotr Sztompka, Françoise Thys-Clement, Panos Tsakloglou, Luk Van Langenhove and Gerhard Wolf. The full report can be downloaded at http://ec.europa.eu/research/social-sciences/pdf/metris-report_en.pdf (Accessed 4 March 2010.)

² COST: European Cooperation in Science and Technology.
stakeholders and research beneficiaries, and increasing internationalization.

When these changes were implemented at the policy level, they were in part meant to remedy the shortcomings of a previous system characterized by low levels of accountability and innovation.

This article will explore the changes in the institutional structure of social science research in Europe and the possible tension between national and supranational organizations.

The weight of social sciences and humanities in European research

There are major national variations in the importance of the social sciences and humanities across Europe. During the late 1990s, the share of the social sciences and humanities of overall spending on R&D across all sectors (including government, higher education, non-profit and corporate) varied from around 4 per cent to as much as 25 per cent in some exceptional cases. In Germany, for instance, it was around 8 per cent of total R&D spending. For most European countries, the figure would have been somewhat below 15 per cent. Germany and the UK together accounted for half of the public European funding for the social sciences.

In terms of output, according to Scopus and SSCI publication data, the EU-27 Member States, together with the USA, are the world’s largest social science producers (2007 statistics in Annex I to this Report).

Funding and agenda-setting

In terms of both R&D expenditure and the number of researchers, the social sciences and humanities in the EU-27 are mostly located within the higher education system. Universities remain of great importance for the training, career progression, housing and proper functioning of research communities. Some countries nevertheless have important public research administrations and centres that are separate from universities.

Each European country has its own organizational structure for setting priorities and distributing public funds. In most cases, there is a social science research council, or a social science division within a broader, integrated research council, that acts as the major agenda-setting body.

Since 2007, there has also been a European Research Council focused solely on fundamental research. But this is a funding body, not an agenda-setting body. As was mentioned above, a major change is the increased role played by funding agencies, which may possibly influence the research agenda. Most European countries now have established agencies that fund external research. Only a few, such as Italy, Spain and Greece, do not yet have such steering institutions. The importance of these institutions, and particularly their possible influence on the research agenda, should be assessed. The separation which they bring about between research-performing institutions and research-funding agencies introduces a certain distance between research practice and research steering. How this distance affects the research process is a question that is still in need of thorough answers. A crucial issue of control over the research agenda is whether funding agencies operate in a responsive mode, where they react to proposals from the scientific community, or in a programme mode, which allows them to define the broad orientation of national research efforts themselves.

Another striking aspect of knowledge institutions’ evolution over the past decades has been the increasing role of mixed-mode funding. This role is unevenly developed across the various European countries. Its development relates to the different ways in which new forms of university governance have taken hold, involving other public-sector, industry and private-sector stakeholders, and increasing accountability requirements in the public research sector.

Unlike in the USA, private donations play a relatively minor role in research funding in Europe. But with public research funding in relative decline, research institutions and researchers across Europe are increasingly encouraged or obliged to seek external funding or Drittmittel (third-party funding) to secure their research, and in many instances their jobs. This has the effect of linking education and research more closely to the labour market and research to the demands of industry and the charitable sector.

As mixed-mode funding becomes more common in European social sciences and humanities research, foundations play a growing role in the organization and funding of research, as well as in scientific agenda-setting. Existing foundations like the Volkswagen Stiftung in Germany, and Leverhulme and Rowntree in the UK, continue to support research projects that dovetail with their funding priorities. These foundations wish to loosen the legal framework in which they operate.

There has also been a proliferation of entities funded for research purposes. At the national level, funders now support
Together this results in a very diverse and layered research funding landscape for the social sciences and humanities in Europe.

Some consequences of the funding reform

The reform of research funding in different European countries led to tension between traditional academic research, based on a long-term vision, secured status and relative autonomy, and the project-based and output-driven model characterized by short-term objectives and more external constraints, including reporting requirements and the proprietary status of results. This form of organization is also held responsible for the casualization of academic work. Here, significant intra-European differences can be observed in the two models’ respective importance. In countries with strong academic institutions, the two logics coexist, but resources that went directly to academic institutions are increasingly shifted to funding agencies. An example is the newly created Agence Nationale de la Recherche in France. In eastern Europe, on the other hand, the situation is less favourable. Universities are characterized by a shortage of resources, hierarchism, poor pay and difficult working conditions. So externally funded institutions and think-tanks capable of mobilizing important resources have generated an internal as well as an external brain drain. Many English-speaking academics found new professional outlets in the non-academic research sector or abroad. These created a challenge to traditional institutions, such as the old academies of science which held sway prior to 1989 and continue to be influential to varying degrees.

Funding agencies’ overall impact on research performance, on scientific quality, and on the wider ecology of knowledge in social sciences and humanities, is a question that still requires extensive and comparative research.

Career prospects are fundamental for the maintenance of healthy research communities. The pressures of just-in-time research, the need for flexibility in academic recruitment and the changing economics of university management have contributed to a significant transformation of the academic labour market. One of the most striking aspects of this transformation is the relative decline of tenured positions for academic staff, combined with the exponential growth of contingent academic labour, while the total number of academic or research staff is increasing. In the UK, for instance, 44.8 per cent of university contracts were fixed-term in 2003, as opposed to 39 per cent in 1994. In France, contingent personnel in the higher education and

Table 2.5 > European Union. Social Sciences and Humanities Framework Programmes (FP) budgets 1998–2013 (in € million)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Overall budget</th>
<th>SSH budget</th>
<th>SSH budget share, percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP7 2007–2013</td>
<td>50.521</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP6 2002–2006</td>
<td>17.883</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP5 1998–2002</td>
<td>14.960</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FP: Framework Programme of the European Community for research, technological development and demonstration activities

EU research programmes are not the only transnational social sciences and humanities initiatives in Europe. Other, smaller initiatives exist as well. One is NORFACE, a network founded in 2004 to foster transnational cooperation between twelve Nordic and UK research social sciences councils.

3. New Opportunities for Research Funding Agency Cooperation in Europe.
Trends in research evaluation

The audit and accounting culture, which has come to dominate publicly funded research in many European countries, has fostered the development of new evaluation practices. In a more flexible research environment where access to funding is key and where prior achievements (and the social networks they produce) are constantly mobilized to secure funding, evaluation has become a key mechanism for selecting research proposals, channelling funds and adjudicating scientific authority. This has resulted in a significant increase in the research environment’s competitive nature. The implicit rationale is that competition will deliver excellence and better research. Whether it does this remains to be demonstrated.

The pervasiveness of evaluation practices in European countries and at the EU level is matched by their diversification in terms of benchmarking practices, bibliometrics, assessment standards, rankings, impact factors and citation indices. Although they are sometimes contested, these evaluation criteria are now important to hiring decisions, the choice of publication outlets, remuneration, funding and career advancement. Perhaps the main challenge for the social sciences in Europe will be how to combine the disciplinary approach, which is used to evaluate researchers, with the multidisciplinary approach of many fields prioritized for EU funding. There seems to be a growing distance between disciplinary paradigms and multidisciplinary projects in the social sciences in Europe.

Conclusions

These trends in the organization and funding of the social sciences in Europe will undoubtedly continue to influence both agenda-setting in these disciplines and their wider impact. Meanwhile, there are ongoing changes in what policy-makers and social scientists regard as important topics for study. In 2009, the European Commission set up a High-Level Expert Group to review emerging trends in society and their implications (Chapter 2 of the Metris Report). The experts pointed out that European societies are currently being redefined by changes in their demography, the evolution of their systems of governance, technological advances, and new approaches to their self-understanding, all of which translate into changes experienced in everyday life. The experts used conceptual mapping to identify a number of priority themes that call for coordinated European funding. They are welfare, migration, innovation, the post-carbon society, the crises of value and valuation, space and landscape, time and memory, the technologization of the social sciences, the

research sectors have increased at a rate of 2.76 per cent per year since 1999. While these figures cover all subjects, the same tendencies certainly apply to the social sciences. These developments contribute to the general deregulation of academic work, as contingent employment is generally dependent on local rules. The multiplication of ill-defined and precarious positions that take up an increasing – if invisible – share of academic work bears witness to this transformation.

While these transformations are mostly justified because they make knowledge production more flexible, their real effects on the quality of research are not well known and should be scrutinized. The increase in contract-based research performed by a contingent workforce and the concomitant reduction in tenured positions do not only change the status of the researcher, they also alter the time-frame of research, the constraints – financial and otherwise – under which it is conducted, the capacity for independent inquiry and the diffusion of the results.

New accountability requirements in higher education and research have resulted in an output-driven culture, dominated by performance evaluations in increasingly quantifiable terms. These favour results-driven research, whereas project-based research tends to be ad hoc, limited in time to specific ‘deliverables’ stipulated in advance. Resources of personnel, instrumentation, funds and so on are aggregated to pursue these objectives, increasing the importance of entrepreneurial skills in the research environment.

The ascendancy of the project as a dominant form of social science research organization, and of output-driven research more generally, is an aspect of the tendency towards ever-greater degrees of responsiveness, flexibility and external mobilization of research capacities. This has important consequences for the nature of scientific inquiry and for the general production of knowledge. As flexible knowledge production becomes a significant model for academic work, the cycle of research results tends to be shorter. The shift towards project-based research tends to generate greater discontinuity in the research process, since some questions or new perspectives that emerge in the course of research are not explored beyond the terms and timeframe of the initial project. The trend towards ‘problem-driven’ or ‘output-driven’ research is not only a question of format and organization, as it affects the nature of the questions that can be addressed. The organization of research into ‘projects’ prioritizes certain types of inquiry over others, thus transforming the overall ecology of knowledge production.
iconosphere, governance and regulation and, finally, the future of democracy in a globalized world.

The expert group’s overall conclusion was that today, the role of the social sciences and humanities has moved from the old agenda of social engineering and national identity-building to a wider set of contributions to society. But, as noted by Pohoryles and Schadauer (2009), the challenge is to find ways of integrating the available existing knowledge, which is often generated in isolated ways, into an overarching framework that fosters our understanding of society and contributes to its transformation.

**Luk van Langenhove**
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**Flash**

**Direction for European social science – the need for a strategy**

There is an urgent need for European institutions to work together to develop a strategy with ambitious goals for social science and to invest in the means – particularly the training of future generations of scholars and computing infrastructure – to deliver those goals.

European social science is a product of its history and of the heterogeneity of Europe. It is also adapting to the new reality of Europe and the questions to which that gives rise. The diversity of Europe makes it a splendid laboratory for the social sciences, and there are encouraging signs, within individual countries and in the European Union, of social science’s impact on policy formation. Demand from students for courses in social science is strong and growing. But there is need for even more fundamental and ‘joined-up’ thought about the needs of societies coping with information technology, climate change and the democratic deficit afflicting many European nations.

In contrast with the field in the USA, European social sciences are strongly rooted in the humanities, and emphasize the historical roots of economic and social development. There are more social scientists at work in universities in Europe than in the USA, and their record in research and publication is strong. National schools exist in a number of disciplines. There are particular strengths in social and political theory and in historical approaches to subjects such as sociology. Marxism as a political ideology has been widely rejected, but the influence of its emphasis on class and power relationships within society lives on. European scholars have been particularly influential in measuring income and wealth inequality, and in exploring the consequences of inequality on health and other social outcomes. Quantitative approaches have gained ground, but their value is still sometimes questioned and training in such methods still lags. However, Europe has been particularly successful in developing survey methodologies – exemplified by the European Social Survey – and in the collection and analysis of longitudinal data sets.

Nationally through research councils, and through the Framework Programmes of the European Union, increasing emphasis has been placed on social science as an aid to the solution of political and economic problems. While this realization of the potential of social science is a welcome change from the earlier emphasis on technological solutions, basic research – and in particular interdisciplinary inquiry drawing on recent advances in other fields such as biology and neuroscience, or research in social and political theory – may not receive sufficient attention. It is, however, appreciated that the European Union’s investment in social science research is increasing and that three social science projects are being proposed as components of the overall European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures (ESFRI). CESSDA (www.nsd.uib.no/cessda) links together the social science data archives of Europe, the European Social Survey (ESS – www.europeansocialsurvey.org) ensures that we have comparable data on social and political attitudes across Europe, while SHARE (www.share-project.org) provides valuable data on health, ageing and retirement. But their full potential will only be developed through rigorous training of the next generation of scholars.

The US National Science Foundation has recently set out an ambitious research programme in brain function, complexity science and the genetic and environmental factors shaping identity and diversity, which are all seen as the domain of social science. This will require large investment in infrastructure to enable social and natural scientists, working together, to ‘link cells to society’. Although individual European scholars are expert in such fields, and psychology in particular is strong in Europe, no equivalent programme is currently envisaged and the mechanisms to develop one are lacking. There is an urgent need for institutions such as the
European Science Foundation, national research councils, the European Research Council and the European Union to work together to develop a strategy with ambitious goals for social science and to invest in the means – particularly the training of future generations of scholars and computing infrastructure – to deliver those goals.
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The status of social sciences in the Russian Federation

Liudmila Pipiya

The revival of the domestic social sciences and humanities will, to a large extent, depend on human resources and an appropriate government science policy. There is currently a need for wider understanding of their position as one of the main intellectual resources needed to help solve the state and society’s problems. The government still underestimates the role of the social sciences and the humanities, while official science and technology policy does not assign any special importance to them in terms of state programmes and support mechanisms.

This paper presents a brief overview of the current status of the social sciences and humanities in the Russian Federation. It sheds some light on Russian capacity in the social sciences and humanities, and outlines the most challenging issues for these disciplines in the Russian Federation.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Russian Federation inherited a large scientific and technological potential as well as an advanced position in basic science and in a number of priority areas for applied research and development. The Russian Federation is also traditionally strong in the humanities, but for a long time social studies were only interpreted from the point of view of Marxist ideology. Consequently the development of social studies diverged from that in the countries of Western Europe. Since the collapse of the USSR, a great number of unresolved problems demanding urgent solutions have accumulated in the Russian science and technology system during the years of reform.

The social sciences showed the first signs of transformation almost twenty-five years ago, during the perestroika period. This was a liberalization of the dominating Marxist–Leninist system rather than a radical change, but sociology was finally acknowledged then as a separate field of science. This liberalization, which allowed access to the diversity of world social science theories and concepts, laid the foundation for the 1992 transformations after the historical disintegration of the Soviet State.

In the 1980s, the social sciences in the Russian Federation included psychology, economics, education, sociology, legal studies and political sciences. In the mid-1990s, social geography and information sciences were added to this list. The humanities comprised basically the same subjects as before. But it must be emphasized that the social sciences and humanities have experienced a dramatic transformation in their disciplinary structure. Disciplines such as scientific communism and scientific atheism disappeared completely, reappearing as political science and religious studies. Historical materialism and Marxist–Leninist dialectics changed from dominant ideological frameworks to mere philosophical concepts.

The institutional landscape of Russian social sciences and humanities

Although there is no special policy for the social sciences and humanities, the following organizations and bodies, which tend to influence overall science and technology
policy, are common to both the social sciences and humanities and the natural sciences (Zavarukhin and Pipiya, 2007):

- Ministries, agencies and bodies defining and coordinating state policy. These include the President’s Council on Science, Technology and Education; the Ministry for Education and Science of the Russian Federation; the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of the Russian Federation; various Russian state academies of sciences, of which the Russian Academy of Sciences (RAS) is the most important; and various interagency and government commissions and working groups.

- Funding agencies. Most government support for Russian science and technology is directly allocated to public research organizations in the form of subsidies to cover basic capital and recurrent expenditures. The rest of the state R&D budget is assigned to research organizations on a competitive basis through agencies such as the Russian Federal Agency on Science and Innovation, the Russian Agency for Education, the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR), the Russian Foundation for Humanities (RFH), and other federal and regional bodies.¹

- Regulatory agencies. The Federal Supervision Service in Education and Science regulates and develops the legislative base that applies to sciences and education.

The Russian Federation still benefits from a substantial science base and a well-developed education system. Overall, the Russian science system remains relatively strong despite the ageing of its researchers and the brain drain, which was particularly severe during the 1990s.² According to state statistical data, 3,957 organizations were involved in research and development in 2007. Of these, 53 per cent were public-sector organizations and include state higher education institutions.³ The latter constitute 29 per cent of all public organizations undertaking R&D (ISS RAS, 2009a; 2009b). No data is available on the number of government research organizations, particularly institutions of higher learning, involved in the social sciences and humanities. But of the 471 institutes of the Russian Academy of Science (RAS), 95 were engaged in research on social sciences in 2007. They employed 25.4 per cent of all social science researchers (ISS RAS, 2009a). The other three-quarters were mainly employed in the higher education sector.

There were 1,108 higher education institutions in the Russian Federation in 2007, 658 state and 450 private ones (ROSSTAT, 2009); 4 64 per cent of the students in public institutions specialized in the social sciences and humanities, and almost 98 per cent of students at private higher education institutions were studying social science and humanities disciplines (Pipiya, 2007).

NGOs engaged in social science and humanities research are a new phenomenon in the post-Soviet era. Data on them are contradictory. On the one hand, there has been a blossoming of centres engaged in a number of sociohumanitarian disciplines, mostly in economics and political science. According to Yurevich (2004), more than 100 sociological centres and more than 300 political science research centres have emerged in recent years. On the other hand, standard statistics reveal a negligible number of NGOs undertaking R&D. NGOs tend to be small, flexible organizations, which respond quickly to market demand for research, but they do not – and are hardly able to – undertake in-depth research that thoroughly analyses trends and developments in modern societies. On average they employ five to ten people, compared with several hundred in a typical public research organization. Although they have limited research capacities, they do develop new forms and methods of research management and contribute to research diversity in the social sciences and humanities.

R&D personnel

The Russian Federation had some 23,200 social science and humanities researchers in 2007: 13,740 (59 per cent) in the social sciences and 9,489 (41 per cent) in the humanities (Table 2.6). Women constituted about half of these. Economists made up half of the social science community. In recent years, there has been an increase in the number of researchers in pedagogy, a trend stimulated by the presidential initiative that turned education into a national

---

1. As a result of changes in governmental structure in March 2010, competitive funding functions were handed over to the Ministry for Education and Science.

2. The Russian Federation has suffered a reduction in its number of R&D personnel. In 2007, the number of researchers was half of what it had been in the early 1990s. Usually, analysts mean the emigration of professionals to other countries when they use the term ‘brain drain’. However, science and technology suffered their most dramatic losses by researchers and technicians leaving for other economic sectors. Between 1991 and 1999, the number of researchers decreased by 458,500, and technicians by 128,200, of whom only 18,200 emigrated.

3. Here, the public sector means the government sector and state higher education institutions (mainly universities) undertaking R&D.

4. However, a considerable part of teaching staff in private HE institutions (31.1 per cent) comprises individuals with multiple contracts who do their main work at state universities.
priority in 2006. With this project, the government invested considerable funds to improve the overall situation in primary and secondary education. The enhanced prestige of teachers and the wage-push in education have had a positive impact on research on education.

The number of political scientists doubled from 1999 to 2007, but this cannot be attributed to government policy. It is more the result of a greater demand for political science research.

An issue of particular concern is the ageing of the R&D personnel, a phenomenon that poses the danger of losing continuity in science. This is probably due to the difficulties of attracting young talent. This issue deserves continuing attention.

**Table 2.6** Researchers by SSH field, Russian Federation, headcounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences – total</td>
<td>13,534</td>
<td>12,565</td>
<td>13,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>7,818</td>
<td>7,282</td>
<td>6,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>2,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political science</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other social sciences</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities – total</td>
<td>7,884</td>
<td>8,187</td>
<td>9,489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ISS RAS S&T database.

**The state of social science research in the Russian Federation**

Russian social science communities are dynamic, but are not as well developed as their Western counterparts. They are often driven to produce superficial analyses under pressure for quick results. Those who pay the costs of research often control the research agenda. On the whole, there is a lack of well-grounded and argued research and reflections on society’s most acute problems. These include regional disparities, the increasing gap between the rich minority and the poor majority, migration and migrant assimilation, the marginalization of and extremism among youngsters, and crime and drug addiction. A lack of independent funding sources not connected to the establishment hinders the emergence of diverse concepts, models, and logical frameworks that could provide the scientific underpinnings to address topical problems.

When the Iron Curtain fell at the beginning of the 1990s, Russian social scientists were exposed to the social science research experience accumulated in Western countries by the translation of many influential books banned during the Soviet period. Foreign foundations that established offices in post-Soviet Russia and offered their programmes to Russian researchers also contributed to enlarging the scope of Russian social science. Knowledge developed in the West and applied to Russian social practice in turn led to a reformulation of the original Western theories and hypotheses.

During the 1990s, the Russian Federation was largely a supplier of scientific raw material (survey data, the results of expeditions, new archival materials and so on), while the scientific end product was produced in the USA or Western Europe. Even now, Russian participation in international projects in the social sciences and humanities has not reached a level that would allow it to be said that Russian social sciences have been successfully integrated into the international research community.

The social science community’s secondary role can be explained partly by a severe shortage of domestic funds for these subjects, but also by the dramatic loss of prestige suffered in Russian society by both research and researchers. The financial shortage in the social sciences and humanities is no longer as acute as it was ten years ago, but there are very few signs of a recovery and an increase in social scientists’ status. Other factors, including the lack of English among many social scientists, the ageing of research personnel, and the weak institutional support for networking, also hamper the integration of Russian social science and humanities into the international system.

A task-oriented and long-term policy for these areas is therefore needed to change the situation.

On a more positive note, Russian social sciences and humanities have kept their originality, which is based on the nuances of the Russian people’s national social features and mentality. With the exception of political economy, most social science disciplines appeared in the Russian Federation much later than in most European countries. The most topical social and humanistic problems of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century society appeared in Russian novels and stories long before Russian scientists studied them. These features are specifically reflected in the approaches

5. There are four national priority projects: Health Care, Education, Habitation, and Development of the Agricultural Sector. They are aimed at the solution of socio-economic problems in the socially most important sectors of the economy. They started in 2005, but the main activities within the projects began in 2006.
used by Russian social sciences and humanities, in their subjects, and in their basic theories and methodologies.

Resources and funding for science research
The Russian Federation spends more on knowledge creation processes than most countries with similar levels of gross domestic product (GDP) per capita. Total R&D spending is approximately 1.1 per cent of GDP. About 62 per cent of Russian R&D is financed by the state (ISS RAS, 2009b).

Two budgetary foundations run the main competitive grant systems for R&D projects: the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR) and the Russian Foundation for Humanities (RFH). Initially the RFH was a subdivision of the RFBR responsible for supporting social sciences and humanities. Some of the RFBR grants – normally for hard sciences – were also distributed to interdisciplinary projects, which could include social sciences and the humanities. Since 1994, the RFH has operated as an independent foundation on the same principles as the RFBR. Its budget is 1 per cent of the federal budget appropriations for civil R&D. The RFH faces the same problems as the RFBR: a small budget spread over too many projects. The result of grant distribution per region shows that the main scientific centres (the Moscow and St Petersburg regions) receive the greatest number of grants and projects.

More competitive allocation of funds and project funding should help increase the quality and relevance of research. This would, however, require a more diversified institutional network to distribute funds, as well as clearly established procedures. Nevertheless, practice is changing slowly. Both foundations face the challenge of improving the transparency and openness of competition. There is a great deal of variety in the evaluation methods used, the criteria for selecting experts, and the financial decision-making systems.

However, it should be stressed that with the establishment of these foundations, a new culture has started to develop in the Russian research community. Like similar agencies in Western countries, their distinctive features are open competition for funds, a bottom-up approach to establishing research projects, and accountability. These features are not always applicable to other funding instruments.

As we mentioned above, the Russian Federation has received an essential share of its financial and organizational support for the social sciences and humanities from abroad. Foreign foundations and organizations were extremely important in the 1990s and at the beginning of the 2000s. Western approaches to scientific systems and to capacity evaluation also became known in the Russian Federation in the 1990s, for example through the activities of the International Science Foundation (ISF), also known as the Soros Foundation. This has had a long-term impact on Russian science.

There is currently uncertainty in Russian science and technology policy about which approach would work best. The government should undertake targeted and weighted interventions with regular and rigorous evaluations and reviews, dropping initiatives that fail to produce results. This initiative should cover all federal programmes, which comprise a large part of Russian R&D, and should use independent expertise when evaluating the efficiency of programmes. At the moment, the evaluation of government initiatives, which involve considerable financial resources, remains the prerogative of state officials, and is not delegated to independent expert groups.

At least two federal target programmes should be mentioned with respect to the social sciences and humanities. They are: ‘R&D in Priorities for the Russian S&T Complex in 2007–2012’ and ‘Research and Education Personnel in Innovative Russia in 2009–2013’. Other government initiatives relate to the development of the federal universities and the national research universities framework. The development of federal and national research universities will stimulate the integration of science and education in different forms (research universities, base faculties, joint laboratories, science and education complexes and so on). This development aims at improving the quality and efficiency of research and teaching as professional occupations, and enhancing their prestige to attract bright youngsters to these professions. When scientific organizations and institutions of higher learning are integrated, it is easier for them to attract talented youth, to solve their social problems, and to develop programmes for financial support.

Social science production and outputs
Monographs, books of collected articles and papers in scientific journals dominate the presentation and dissemination of research results in the social sciences and humanities. According to the available statistics, the overall published output in 2003 included 8,221 monographs, 9,154 books of collected articles, 24,538 textbooks and 29,108 scientific papers (Mindeli and Kasantsev, 2005, p. 207). These statistics show that the Russian social science and humanities community has shown a strong ability to self-organize over the past two decades.
Hundreds of projects on different scales, ranging from the creation of students’ discussion clubs to massive scientific and educational programmes, have been undertaken and completed, with support from international and Russian funds and from regional sources. A number of electronic networks and professional associations have been established, for example the Russian Philosophy Society, the Russian Society of Sociologists and the Russian Association of Political Science.

There is a need for a system that could objectively evaluate the results of scientific activities in order to make effective administrative decisions regarding Russian science and education. It might involve a citation index based on Russian scientific journals rather than on the ISI Science Citation Index, which is widely applied in the anglophone world. Some steps have been taken in this direction, but much remains to be done. Many Russian journals, including reviews, which are well known in the Russian scientific community, are not included in the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI). The SSCI is basically oriented to English-speaking journals, or at least journals providing a bibliography and summaries in English. Language is the main barrier that still isolates the Russian social science and humanities community from the rest of the world. To acquaint researchers in other countries with Russian research will require considerable effort, and focused shifts in Russian science policy. However, this does not seem to be the priority of Russian policy-makers for the near future.

The current reform of Russian science is basically aimed at increasing the efficiency of science, technology and innovation, emphasizing developments that could have a positive economic effect in the long term. The social sciences and humanities are not priorities and it seems that they are not in line with the government’s focus on innovation and economic achievement.

There is an invisible border that isolates the social science and humanities community from the government, policymakers and other political elites in this country. This does not mean that top Russian decision- and policy-makers do not need advice and advisers on a variety of societal issues. The reality is, however, that they prefer to recruit their advisers from people who are politically or economically influential or have a certain reputation, without considering their professional background. The only explanation for this situation is that the social science and humanities community does not currently have a strong voice. Furthermore, the ‘great expertise’ of the past, represented by the inherited scientific establishment such as the Russian Academy of Sciences, has lost its influence. The domination of the individuals concerned faded because of their advisory positions during the communist era and because of the failure of the economic reforms of the late 1980s.

It should be recognized that at the beginning of the twenty-first century, Russian society appears unable to formulate answers that adequately encompass the scale of the problems it faces: creating an economy capable of producing all that is necessary for a ‘big society’; forming a political system adequate for an effective economy; and developing the required critical mass of an elite with high intellectual and moral qualities. This is a task of enormous proportions for any society.

Conclusion
Under the totalitarian Soviet regime, the social sciences and the humanities suffered more than the hard and natural sciences. The revival of the domestic social sciences and humanities will, to a large extent, depend on human resources and an appropriate government science policy. There is currently a need for wider understanding of their position as one of the main intellectual resources needed to help solve the state and society’s problems. The government still underestimates the role of the social sciences and the humanities, while official science and technology policy does not assign any special importance to them in terms of state programmes and support mechanisms.
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Social sciences in Aotearoa/New Zealand and the Pacific region

Robin Peace

This report, focused on change in the last decade, is structured in relation to four emergent trends: new epistemological and methodological perspectives and practices from indigenous Māori, Pasifika, New Settler and new policy scholarship; improvements to research infrastructure; greater international visibility and dissemination; and increased interdisciplinary and intersectoral collaboration.

Introduction

Social scientists in Aotearoa/New Zealand and the Pacific region are working on researcher-initiated and policy-relevant research via a wide range of agencies. Consolidation in the sector through new initiatives and funding reflects the emergence of new leadership within the social science community and increased cooperation between academic and policy interests. In Aotearoa/New Zealand, funding for social science research emanates from a variety of sources, directly through and within the eight universities, and from other sources such as Crown Research Institutes, government departments, the Health Research Council and the Ministry of Research, Science and Technology (MoRST).

Perspectives and practices

Aotearoa/New Zealand is one of the larger island groups in the Pacific and was colonized by the UK through a Treaty negotiation with indigenous Māori in 1840. It is now also home to large numbers of newer Pacific migrants who began arriving in significant numbers from the 1950s, largely in response to demands for labour and to subsequent family reunifications. Te tino rangatiratanga (Māori self-determination or sovereignty), supported by the Treaty of Waitangi, has created ontological spaces within which Māori knowledge and research practices are influentially articulated (Durie, 2003; Smith, 2005). These spaces have been paralleled by the development of Pasifika research perspectives that reflect culturally informed rather than Western knowledge models (Smith, 2004). Kaupapa Māori research (research by and for Māori using Māori worldviews) challenges conventional epistemologies through its emphasis on synthesis, the interweaving of multiple strands, and differently conceived relationships between people and their environments (Durie, 2004).

Māori and Pasifika research praxis is now more widespread both in Aotearoa/New Zealand and in Pacific-based institutions than in the previous decade. Indigenous ethical perspectives have emerged in government-sponsored guidelines (Ministry of Social Development, 2008) and the Toafamamao Statement from UNESCO (2007). Applied work in public policy and public health is evident in the growing numbers of publicly funded Māori and Pasifika graduate students in expanding Māori and Pacific health and education research programmes. At least six content themes are emerging:

- youth voice and connectedness
- the practices and meanings of culture
- domestic violence and child abuse
- migration and urbanization
- gender issues
- the social, cultural, economic, political and demographic significance of these populations in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

---

1. With substantive input from Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, Tim McCraenor, Helen Moewaka Barnes, Cluny Macpherson, Charles Crothers, David Thorns and Richard Bedford.
2. The original Treaty, signed on 6 February 1840, between the British Crown and about 540 Māori rangatira (chiefs), continues to influence government decision-making, but lacking constitutional ratification, government positioning in relation to the treaty is ambiguous and poorly defined. See Humphage and Fleras (2001).
3. The six largest groups of Pacific peoples in New Zealand are Samoan, Cook Island, Tongan, Niuean, Fijian and Tokelauan, but there are also settlers from at least twenty-two other Pacific nations. See Macpherson (2008); also Bedford (2007).
In Aotearoa/New Zealand social science, the most frequently used methods and techniques are face-to-face surveys and interviews, the analysis of secondary sources, statistical analysis, textual analysis, and analysis of official statistics. But there is evidence of other, less familiar methods being explored and developed alongside kaupapa Māori approaches. These include Talanoa, Q methodology, visual methodologies, qualitative syntheses, and developmental evaluation approaches.

Enabling infrastructure

New institutional actors in social science research are shaping research funding and inter-university collaborations. Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga is one of Aotearoa/New Zealand’s seven officially recognized Centres of Research Excellence. It has established support and made advances in research excellence, generating benefits for the Māori and society at large. Māori universities, Te Wānanga o Raukawa, Te Wānanga o Awanuiārangi and Te Wānanga o Aotearoa, a number of university-based Māori studies departments, iwi (tribal) authorities’ research units and numerous private Māori research providers have been established. The Māori Association of Social Scientists (MASS) has been created to foster and develop Māori social science research capability and capacity.

A national project for building e-research communities has been established and a government-funded initiative, Building Research Capability in the Social Sciences (BRCSS), provides a platform for inter-university collaboration via advanced audiovisual communications. A New Settler forum, a Māori network and an Emerging Researchers Network operate via this system and actively engage postgraduates. In the period from 2000 to 2009, while increased numbers of Pacific students resident in New Zealand have been gaining qualifications in the social sciences, greater numbers of Pacific students have also been trained in social sciences in the University of the South Pacific, the University of Papua New Guinea, the National University of Samoa and the University of Hawaii.
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