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Chapter presentation

Several papers in Chapter 2 referred to a decline in the quality of teaching and research in social sciences that has occurred in some countries in recent years; several also mentioned that there are large inequalities between countries and between institutions in the nature and quality of the social science research they carry out and the knowledge they produce. Knowledge production as measured by the number of publications in peer-reviewed journals is also very unevenly distributed across countries and regions (Chapter 4). Disparities in the volume, quality and visibility of social science research, and the continued supremacy of American–European social sciences, result in large part from disparities in research capacities. But how can capacities in social sciences be developed and improved? Governments, regional organizations and international agencies, UNESCO included, have been engaging with this issue for years. Strategies have been developed and attempts made to redress the divides, with varying degrees of success. Chapter 3 comes back to these issues, assesses some of these experiences, and addresses the challenges raised by the divide in social science research capacities.

Section 3.1 examines the social science research capacities at three levels – the individual, the organizational and the system levels – and argues that overcoming the limitations of research capacities calls for coordinated action at each of these levels. Section 3.2 examines the dramatic impact in some countries of consulting firms, private research institutes and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on research capacity in social sciences. Section 3.3 discusses the effects of brain flows on these capacities. The last section reviews the experiences of countries that have improved their research capacities, and examines promising practices such as networks in social sciences.

Drivers such as differing levels of capacity, the privatization of research, brain flows and national strategies for the improvement of research are not specific to social sciences, and they are not limited to the global South. One problem facing anyone working on these issues, as the following articles repeatedly show, is the scarcity of data needed for the comparison of research capacities and for the assessment of strategies in different parts of the world, especially in the social sciences. There is an urgent need for data-gathering to support these comparisons and analyses.

3.1 Dimensions of capacities in social sciences

Introduction

Understanding what research capacities in social sciences are, and what limits them, is crucial for the development of an appropriate strategy for their improvement. Governments often equate building research capacities with training. To improve research capacities in social sciences, they establish graduate and postgraduate courses in social sciences, send students abroad, and in some cases facilitate international exchanges, through twinning programmes with first-rank international universities. These efforts focus on reinforcing the methodological and theoretical skills of individual social scientists, and providing better access to international research. But training large numbers of social scientists does not in itself suffice to improve research capacities at the national level. The production of knowledge supposes adequate institutional infrastructures, access to funding, and integration into scientific communities. This points to the existence of three levels of capacity: the individual level, the organization level and the overall system level. The degree of coordination between these three dimensions of research capacity determines the scope for capacity improvement of social science research systems.

Identifying and addressing knowledge deficits in social sciences research capacity is a priority for regional social science associations and councils, such as the Arab Council
Assessing research capacity in social sciences: a template

What are the main components of research capacity? How can it be strengthened?
What are the main challenges that will become priorities for action? This template was sent to ISSC partners as a background document for their own assessment of existing research capacity in their region.

International development agencies such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the World Bank have long been concerned with the development of country capacities, without which sustainable development cannot take place. They analyse the problem at three levels: the individual, the organizational and the system level. This distinction applies as well to the issue of research capacities. When assessing national or regional capacities to conduct social science research, it may be useful to separate the three levels.

The individual level
Have enough researchers the necessary education and professional skills to conduct research, using quantitative or qualitative research methods? Do they have the ability to identify research themes that are relevant to society, and to develop research questions? Increasingly also, researchers are requested to develop research proposals: do the researchers have the necessary skills to do this? Can they lead research teams, and can they communicate research results to improve public understanding, inform debate and advise policy?

An assessment of capacity development challenges at this level would look at the number of researchers, how they have been trained, their roles and the quality of the research they produce, the definition of which depends on the type of research promoted.

The organizational level
Well-trained researchers cannot do research unless there is demand for their skills, and unless they work in reasonably resourced organizations. Are there enough...
research positions available to form a critical mass or a community of researchers in one or more institutions? How many and which institutions are sufficiently well funded to offer adequate infrastructure and an enriching research environment? The infrastructure necessary to do research in the social sciences is not as elaborate or as expensive as in the natural sciences but it includes computers, internet access, library and access to databases, journals and books. Is funding sufficient to allow fieldwork, recruitment of assistants, attendance at conferences and workshops, spending time abroad, and publishing?

The assessment of challenges at this level would look at issues like the type of research organizations (universities versus research centres and institutes), their status (are they centres of excellence, are they considered world-class or not?), their track record in terms of managing research programmes and publishing, their staff (are they stable, committed and available in sufficient numbers?), the quality of the infrastructure, the way they are financed, and last but not least, the opportunities they provide to publish and to collaborate and exchange information with other researchers at national, regional or international level.

Funding is a central issue, and needs to be considered from several angles. Do researchers bid for grants from national funding agencies? How dependent are they on funds from international agencies? How accessible are such funds? Is the level of financing sufficiently stable to allow research projects to be carried out over several years? What mechanisms of peer review and accountability are employed, and how does this impinge on capacity development?

The research system level and the overall national and regional contexts
Of concern here are the broader policy framework and socio-political context within which social science research operates. An assessment of capacity development problems and challenges at this level would need to consider four specific elements.

The first element concerns research policy. Is there a national policy that defines priority areas? Are there any indications of genuine interest in research on the part of the authorities or wider society?

The second element concerns the working conditions of researchers and their salary levels. The latter are generally linked to the salaries of the overall civil service, and cannot be modified by a single organization or even ministry. Do researchers have sufficient incentives to continue carrying out research rather than joining the private sector, or leaving their country? These include monetary incentives but not only. Are salaries sufficient for people to work full-time instead of looking for consultancies, moonlighting and working in other institutions, or leaving research to join the private sector or go abroad? Another series of questions relates to the incentives that may exist to encourage researchers to publish.

The third element concerns the country’s overall level of stability and security.

The fourth element concerns the degree of academic freedom: freedom to teach, freedom to publish and freedom of the press. What tradition of academic freedom does the country have, if any?

Unsatisfactory conditions in any of these areas may reduce the scientific production, and may tempt academics to leave the country. When designing strategies to build capacity, certain negative conditions are easier to overcome than others. It is easier to train individuals than it is to retain them, and easier to create an institution than to create a community of researchers, or to maintain an enabling environment. But for success, all the elements have to be addressed...
Capacity development challenges in the Arab states

Seteney Shami and Moushira Elgeziri for the Arab Council for the Social Sciences (ACSS) www.arab-council.org

Current challenges in the Arab region require a concerted and wide mobilization of resources as well as the thoughtful identification of capacity-building modalities to respond to various needs. Major capacity-building targets ought to include the enabling of learning and the exchange of experiences within the region and the coordination of scientific and research policy across the region, as well as focused interventions for specific needs in different localities.

The Arab Human Development Report (UNDP, 2009) describes the Arab region as suffering from a ‘knowledge deficit’. This is true but is also too broad a criticism, subsuming a number of complex deficiencies at the individual, institutional and systemic levels. The challenges are too big for small and fragmented regional research programmes to redress. They require a concerted and wide mobilization of resources as well as the thoughtful identification of capacity-building modalities to respond to various needs. Addressing the development of capacity regionwide means taking into account the huge disparities between the size and quality of the social science communities of the countries in the Arab region. It must also heed disparities in financial resources and allocations to social science education and research. Major capacity-building targets ought to include the enabling of learning and the exchange of experiences within the region and the coordination of scientific and research policy across the region, as well as focused interventions for specific needs in different localities.

Existing interventions have oscillated between capacity building for individual disadvantaged but promising researchers, and enhancing the capacities of highly specialized centres. This has been done by promoting new mechanisms for training and career opportunities, and by providing incentives for further education, field research and publication. A few endeavours have also targeted advanced graduate students to help them with dissertation writing and completion. On the other hand, little has been done in the past decade to either enhance existing institutions’ capacity, or to create new ones specifically geared towards excellence in the social sciences or one of its branches. There are, however, an increasing number of networks that bring researchers together as individuals on a regional Arab level across the Mediterranean or in the Euro–Arab space, and globally to address specific, usually developmental, issues.

Despite the diversity of the region, Arab countries generally share certain common features. These include:

- Poor quality of education, particularly in the social sciences. Governments have given priority over the years to educational quantity at the expense of quality.
- Limited attention to, and marginalization of, the social science disciplines, while giving priority to natural, professional, and business and management studies, which are identified with modernity and development. Private higher education institutions barely pay attention to the social sciences.
- As a result of these factors, social sciences have a diminishing role in response to societal problems and public interest, and only a modest role in informing policies and effecting social change.

These three features are a consistent challenge to the development of the social sciences, whether in countries with established educational traditions but modest resources or in wealthy countries with a limited history of higher education. It is along these main axes that the newly established Arab Council for the Social Sciences seeks to make itself visible and effective.

At the individual level, much needs to be done to redress the shortcomings in social sciences training. This means addressing ‘pipeline’ issues (ensuring the supply of talented students into the social sciences) and curriculum and pedagogy weaknesses at university departments, especially given the increasing difficulties in accessing graduate training outside the region. Second, there
is a need to bolster scholars’ sense of themselves as a research community by promoting collaborative research and scholarly exchanges. This community encompasses researchers within the region, but extends too to scholars in the diaspora, who contribute invaluable expertise and resources and wish to reconnect to their homeland and re-engage with its problems.

Arab researchers undoubtedly recognize the main challenges facing Arab societies, but are hampered by serious deficiencies in methodological training and by isolation from international debates and knowledge production. This applies most notably to the younger generation, who have suffered most from the deterioration in education. To redress these problems, it will be necessary to work on several fronts at the same time: training to increase skills, research and publications to produce knowledge, and networking to enhance the visibility and empower the voice of the region. The challenge is to carry out these tasks while not losing sight of, and promoting, established centres of social science teaching and research.

On the institutional level, we should recognize the diversity of institutions engaged in social sciences, including universities, research centres and research-oriented NGOs. These have differing research capacities and access to resources. Furthermore, the obstacles they face may not only be financial, but also infrastructural and related to building a beneficial research environment. NGOs tend to receive much of the international funding for research, but given the pace and burdens of contract research, issues such as research ethics, methodology, critical discussion and publication are neglected. Finally, the research community across the region suffers from a lack of access to information, including both official information, such as statistical surveys, archival materials and documentation, and ‘private’ information and grey literature collected by consulting firms and contract research organizations. Researchers abroad often have better access to such sources than researchers within the region.

Finally, Arab elites and states generally share a distrust of research and a desire to manipulate it. An important challenge is to build trust with policy-makers, especially those who might positively influence research policy and resources for higher education, while at the same time maintaining the independence and integrity of research and freeing researchers from the control of Arab governments. It is also crucial for the public to understand the social sciences’ role in analysing their problems and improving their lives. If they fail to identify themselves with the public interest and public good, the social sciences in the Arab region risk reinforcing the image of research as an unnecessary luxury.

Seteney Shami and Moushira Elgeziri
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Social science research capacity in Asia

John Beaton for the Association of Asian Social Science Research Councils (AASSREC) www.aassrec.org

The Association of Asian Social Science Research Councils (AASSREC) comprises fifteen member nations that enjoy differing degrees of social science research capacity. Some rapidly developing countries such as India and China have very large and well-funded social science resources, while others are developing capacity as their circumstances allow. Besides grossly inadequate funding, their comparative isolation from regional peers and wider-world associations also impedes the progress of some Asian nations in the social sciences.

For the purposes of this discussion, AASSREC and other Asia Pacific nations’ social science research capacity (which includes its impact capacity) can be regarded as the sum of the following elements:

- **Human capital**: the numbers of educated, trained and employed social scientists plus the postgraduate and undergraduate social science student population who will provide a sustained national research effort.

- **Infrastructure and research funding**: the buildings, facilities, archives and libraries, support staff and information technology that provide researchers with space and facilities. Here infrastructure includes direct or indirect financial support from governmental or other agencies.

- **Connectivity**: social science research is an important part of enhancing the public good, and research results must be made public through dissemination in publications or by other means. Connectivity also includes direct and unimpeded access to collaboration with government agencies, public institutions, industry, private individuals and organizations, international peers and professional bodies for the purpose of sharing ideas and information.

**The research capacity divide in Asia**

By the research capacity divide, we mean the distance between the aspirations of social science practitioners and administrators, and the actual conditions under which they attempt to contribute to the national good. It can be thought of as the degree of disjunction in the three points above, particularly how infrastructure and connectivity consistently lag behind human capital irrespective of the degree of national economic development. Asian nations vary widely in this regard. Some enjoy relatively large and well-developed support for social science research capacity from government, industry and an international network of collaborators. These tend to be large nations with strong economies. Others have very limited resources. But in all cases, the infrastructure and other support available to social science researchers are a fraction of those provided to scientific and technological researchers in spite of the various and very evident human and social problems facing these governments. While the research capacity of the combined AASSREC nations is marked, their governments’ grasp of emerging issues is not. Social scientists in developed and developing nations are equally frustrated that their knowledge is not quickly translated into improved well-being for their people. Social scientists in small, less developed nations may struggle to have any effect at all.

**Challenges in developing research capacity in Asia**

The nature of the research capacity divide in the various Asia Pacific nations is varied, complex, and in some cases currently difficult to deal with. Considering the three general elements contributing to overall capacity – human, infrastructure and funding, and connectivity – it should be possible to conceive a simple but informative matrix for the AASSREC nations. Such a matrix would convey a capacity assessment of each country at the individual, organizational and research system levels. Some nations have exceptional scholars who suffer from pitiable infrastructure support and little connectivity. Other nations may have numerous researchers and sufficient infrastructure support, but lack the connectivity to remain informed about sophisticated research methodologies and advances in their international colleagues’ thinking. India, China, New Zealand, Australia and Japan have well-developed social science linkages with Europe and the Americas. Yet social scientists in most other AASSREC nations mostly have impermanent individual relationships.
or weak institutional arrangements overseas. A couple of AASSREC nations have almost no connections beyond their own borders.

The individual level
Higher education must provide young minds with informed and stimulating mentoring. There is a threshold size for a viable research community, whose members can only be provided by higher education institutions, or by government research units. Opportunities for employment and promotion in Asia correlate with a nation’s population size and research infrastructure investment, thus disadvantaging smaller nations.

The organizational level
Organizations must provide social scientists with infrastructure and also with opportunities to make their contribution to the national interest. Research systems in Asia are improving the connectivity that researchers require to engage internally and internationally with others, through information technology but also by face-to-face meetings at which efficient and meaningful understanding is achieved. A rare good news story is that thanks to the information revolution, researchers will now have the opportunity to leapfrog the previous infrastructural limitations. This will particularly benefit those in small countries who have suffered a lack of research support materials. Ready electronic access to research communications, including current debates, publication opportunities and research findings, will be a watershed in capacity development. This advantage will greatly enhance opportunities for all social scientists in AASSREC nations and others, especially the previously disadvantaged smaller countries.

The research system level
It is in the interests of regions, as well as countries, to support a well-networked system of collaborating scholars and practitioners in the social sciences. Economic, political, ethnic and other social issues are rarely, if ever, unique to a single country. In a globalizing world, issues and potential difficulties can spread across national boundaries with exceptional ease and speed. To some degree, all social scientists in Asian nations suffer from an inability to share, compare and analyse their data, experiences and thoughts with their peers. Connecting organizations, such as AASSREC, provide nations with developing social science research capacity with the best opportunity to engage with their regional colleagues.

The challenge of understanding the bewildering complexity and interaction of social, economic and political systems in an ever-changing world has inspired social scientists in Asia and elsewhere to embrace the promising, but challenging, guiding principle that large-scale problems demand multi- and cross-disciplinary social science approaches. Furthermore, these problems require approaches that cross sectoral boundaries to the natural and physical sciences, engineering and the humanities.

India and China invest very significantly in publicly funded social research, while most other developing Asia Pacific nations are slowly improving their research capacities and are not well connected to international trends and developments in social science disciplines. Census and other macro-scale data is not generally well-supported and researchers may have limited access to data banks. This means that inter-regional comparative analyses suffer. Collaborative approaches by social scientists need greater and stronger opportunities to provide the knowledge that institutions and governments can use to help resolve difficult issues.

Most, but not all, Asia Pacific nations have peak associations for individual social science disciplines and collective organizations, such as social science research councils. Learned academies or discipline-based societies are numerous but not universal. A persistent problem in the region is the lack of meeting opportunities. The fifteen-member AASSREC convenes biennial conferences to promote mutuality and information exchange. These conferences reveal a commonality of social science issues, many of which focus on building harmonious societies characterized by equity, trust in institutions, meaningful employment, educational opportunities and access to health and social services. These issues are universal and there are opportunities for collaboration between Asia Pacific researchers and the developed social science institutions of Europe, the Americas and elsewhere.

John Beaton
Is Executive Director of the Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia and secretary general of AASSREC.
Social science capacity-building in Latin America

Alberto D. Cimadamore for the Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO) www.clacso.org

Promoting a way of thinking that is capable of relating social sciences to urgent social problems in Latin America requires an appropriate regional institutional environment. This goal has been one of the greatest challenges taken up by CLACSO over the past forty years. One of CLACSO’s central priorities is to empower centres from relatively less developed countries and areas by ensuring their social scientists’ participation in the network, which itself contributes to capacity development.

Building capacity in social science can be an extended process. It involves the establishment, expansion and strengthening of institutional, operational and organizational resources capable of generating relevant knowledge for society at the local, national, regional and international level. This process tends to produce a greater understanding of the main problems that society or groups within it face by developing actions or policies to address them.

One of today’s greatest challenges is to link social sciences and action. This need was explicitly acknowledged by UNESCO at its 2006 International Forum on the Social Science-Policy Nexus, which scientists and policy-makers from more than eighty countries attended. One of the main outcomes of the so-called Buenos Aires Forum was a call for the redefinition of the relationship (‘nexus’) between social science and action, which could be considered the primary goal of evaluating Latin American social sciences’ capacity development. The question, still current, is: how is that goal to be achieved?

CLACSO was an active participant at the Forum. In striving to answer the question above, CLACSO aims at a redefinition of research design in social sciences. One aim of such a redefinition is to permit translatable results to be turned into policies serving the needs of progress and social change. In this regard, CLACSO’s unchanging critical thought can be considered a crucial tool in the capacity-building process. This type of scientific thinking, which to some extent applies the critical theory approach, is intended partly to help understand or explain social reality, but also to identify the areas for improvement and the means to achieve it.

Promoting a way of thinking which is capable of relating social sciences to urgent social problems in Latin America requires an appropriate regional institutional environment. This goal has been one of the greatest challenges taken up by CLACSO over the past forty years. It has done so by forming the largest network of social science research institutes in the region. This network brings together 259 research and higher education centres from 25 countries, including the largest and best-known regional state universities and NGOs devoted to social science research. These knowledge production and dissemination centres operate in historically and geographically heterogeneous environments which shape their actions. So one of the network’s central priorities is to empower centres from relatively less-developed countries and areas by ensuring their social scientists’ participation in the network, which itself contributes to capacity development.

The capacity-building core includes a group of interrelated activities geared towards:

- financing social science research with a critical thinking approach
- linking such research to postgraduate education at the regional level
- facilitating information and scientific research availability and dissemination by means of new technologies
- promoting actions targeted at relatively less-developed social sciences areas in order to ensure full participation in the network of regional scientists.

These actions focus on social, economic and political interest issues. They address the major problems facing Latin American societies, such as inequality, poverty, education, culture, democracy, environment, social movements, labour, social conflict, development and regional integration. Specifically, a regional programme of
poverty and inequality research studies addresses the most important social, economic, political and ethical problems afflicting Latin American and the Caribbean countries. While it is true that this is a regional programme, it focuses on relatively less-developed countries and offers research funding for these issues by organizing international seminars and postgraduate courses, both face-to-face and by distance teaching, in which the participation of young scholars, social representatives and decision-makers is promoted.

Alberto D. Cimadamore

Has a Ph.D. in international relations. He is Professor at the School of Social Sciences at the University of Buenos Aires and a researcher for the National Council of Scientific and Technological Research, Argentina. He is CLACSO’s Coordinator of International Relations.
Why Kenyan academics do not publish in international refereed journals

Maureen Mweru

An examination of most of the highly ranked journals reveals that few, if any, articles are published by academics from sub-Saharan African universities. This is the case even when the article’s main topic directly relates to issues relevant to sub-Saharan Africa. The study outlined here aimed at explaining why African, and specifically Kenyan, academics do not publish in international refereed journals, and at taking into account academics’ own viewpoints on how to increase their number of publications in such journals.

Although publishing in international peer-reviewed journals can be viewed as a source of credibility and authority in an area of specialization, an examination of most of the highly ranked journals reveals that few, if any, articles are published by academics from sub-Saharan African universities. This is the case even when the article’s main topic directly relates to issues relevant to sub-Saharan Africa. So it seemed appropriate to investigate this matter. Kenya was chosen as the country for our investigation. The study aimed at explaining why Kenyan academics do not publish in international refereed journals, taking into account academics’ own viewpoints on how to increase their number of publications in international refereed journals.

The study site was one of Kenya’s main public universities, located in Nairobi. In-depth interviews and focus group discussions were organized to collect data from faculty members who had not yet published a journal article or who had only published one article in the past three years. There were five focus group discussions which brought together twenty-five faculty members teaching in five different university departments. Each focus group discussion consisted of five individuals, ranging in rank from tutorial fellow to professor. Interviews were also conducted with the five chairpersons of the five university departments. The notes made during the interviews were transcribed and transferred on to a document summary sheet. This information was then analysed according to themes.

Factors involved in limited publications
The following factors stand out in the data:
- lack of time and low salaries
- difficulties in obtaining recent and relevant books and journal articles
- negative reviews of submissions to journals
- the attitude of the university’s administrative services
- the attitude of faculty.

Participants noted that the lack of time was a major contributing factor to the limited number of publications. Overcrowded lecture halls, an excessive number of exams to grade, numerous university meetings, and serving on various university committees were all cited as taking up any extra time that could otherwise have been used to write journal articles. Furthermore, senior faculty members complained about having to supervise up to twenty Masters’ and doctoral students’ projects and theses. Limited time was left for research and publishing. In addition, those interviewed stated that if they did find some extra time, it was spent on teaching extra classes in private universities or colleges to supplement their incomes. Low faculty wages were therefore seen as a major hindrance to research and publication.

Low salaries were also mentioned in connection with research and fieldwork. In the absence of research funding and grants, academics use their own personal resources, which often results in less research time and thus fewer research findings to publish. Low salaries also mean that academics cannot afford journal access fees. They accused some journals of charging such exorbitant publishing fees – including for online access – that they could not keep up to date with current literature and research findings. A number of academics were unsure whether their research areas had already been covered, or of the latest research findings in their field.

In addition, the interviewed academics related the discouraging comments that they received from journal reviewers. In certain cases, reviewers suggested such major changes on the submitted articles that their authors simply did not take the trouble to resubmit them. Reviewers also called on the authors to read further and include more current literature, and as we have just seen, limited resources made it particularly difficult to do so. Certain participants also felt that the underlying reasons behind these reviews lay in a negative attitude towards sub-
Saharan-based scholars and their research, and a disregard for the issues that were addressed in the articles that were submitted. This is particularly interesting in view of the supposedly anonymous nature of articles when they are presented to reviewers.

University administrative services were accused of not doing enough to encourage publishing by faculty members. Academics who published in international journals, for instance, were not rewarded. Academics also felt that the administration did not place enough emphasis on the importance of publishing. Individuals needed to have published only three articles within a space of three years to be eligible for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer. Many faculty members did not feel the need to do the extra work involved in publishing, and therefore stopped writing articles from the moment that they had published the necessary number of articles for promotion. A few of them argued that they were content and were not really interested in promotion, since the university employed them on a permanent basis. This air of resignation or fatalism could also be witnessed among junior faculty members, who pointed out that they had never been taught or guided on how to write journal articles.

### How to increase the number of publications

A number of those interviewed felt that the university administration could support the effort needed for publishing by moderating class sizes as well as teaching and non-teaching assignments. Two suggestions were made in order to increase the quality and quantity of output: greater recognition for prolific academics, and a requirement that all faculty members publish at least one journal article per academic year.

Salary increases and the provision of research funds were regarded as potentially positive measures. They would mean that academics would no longer have to teach extra classes to increase their income. They could then spend a greater amount of time on research and publication. In addition, higher salaries would allow them to afford the publication fees demanded by certain journals. Differentiated journal access fees were also mentioned as a way of supporting and encouraging African and developing-country scholars, improving their access to current literature and existing research. Junior faculty members who gained greater access to peer-reviewed articles would get a clearer picture of what a ‘well-written’ journal article looks like. Junior faculty members also pointed out that they needed better guidance from their superiors on how to write for scientific journals, notably by getting them involved in research projects and writing up research findings.

### Concluding remarks

Several measures need to be taken in order for the number of publications to increase. The creation of a positive climate for research (as mentioned by Proctor, 1996) is one of them. Research has to be valued, and greater time and effort must be devoted to it. Universities in sub-Saharan Africa, including Kenya, ought to provide greater support to their faculty staff. Although many universities in resource-poor countries such as Kenya might not possess the necessary funds to subscribe to international journals, they could support their faculty by identifying and subscribing to a few key journals.

Research funding also represents a critical factor. It has been widely acknowledged that without funding, research cannot proceed adequately (Proctor, 1996). However, in the current context of global recession, academics in developing countries are not always able to rely on developed countries in order to gain access to the funds they need. Perhaps it is time for sub-Saharan-based scholars to seek alternative sources of funding for their research. Faculty members also need to take steps to help themselves and each other, for instance through self-help groups in which they can exchange advice and guidance, including feedback on drafts of articles. This could also reduce the number of harsh reports they receive from reviewers. Self-help groups have been found to increase scholarly outputs in countries such as the USA (Pottick, Adams and Faulkner, 1986).

If Kenya, and sub-Saharan Africa more generally, are to become active members of the global intellectual or scholarly community, they will have to take note of the findings reported here. I would therefore insist on the need to encourage more research and publications by academics from developing countries by outlining the positive and lasting impacts their research findings could have on society. Senior faculty members must fulfill their responsibilities as role models to their junior colleagues and students. In other words, they have to produce quality research and publish their findings in international, peer-reviewed journals.

---
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3.2 Marketization of research

Introduction

The case of Kenya presented above highlighted how low incomes induce scholars to combine teaching at university and ‘moonlighting’, thus drastically diminishing their time for academic research and endangering the quality of their teaching. Funding scarcities in Africa and elsewhere often lead scholars to work as consultants and to stockpile short-term research contracts. Social sciences have gained visibility and some popular legitimacy as a result of these developments. But consultant-led research can nevertheless be problematic in problem-rich and resource-poor environments. Traditional university and institution-led research has various mechanisms in place to check the quality of the work produced. In contrast, consultancies are mainly responsive to the market and a specific client base. Quality control is often absent. Financial incentives encourage researchers to shift rapidly from one topic to another, a practice which increases the atomization of knowledge rather than thorough understanding of entire problematics (Richter and de Kadt).

In some regions, donor agencies have become the main source of research funding, with decisive outcomes for the kind of research undertaken. In the Arab East, for example, agencies finance research centres outside universities (such as NGOs and consultancy firms), in conformity with conceptions stressing the need to develop and empower civil society (Hanafi; Shami and Elgeziri). This has led to the formation of new elites, NGO leaders enjoying easier access to funding agencies. Again in line with international priorities, new research themes, such as gender, poverty, democracy and governance, have mobilized researchers. The research financed by agencies favours the collection of large data sets, privileging the production of quantitative indicators over qualitative and critical analyses, and over any understanding of the root causes of poverty (Hanafi).

The mushrooming of consultancy firms and NGOs drawing on a large number of social scientists amounts to an internal brain drain, which is no less problematic than the external brain drain, even if it is less talked about. How widespread these practices are, and how they impact on research, needs further attention. The first, paradoxical indications we have, however, suggest that the growth of these bodies does not result in as big an improvement of knowledge as might be expected. Instead of boosting research capacity and orienting quality knowledge production toward relevant policy issues, funding practices by agencies deplete them, by privileging short-term studies which do not facilitate the accumulation of knowledge and theorization.
Social science has certainly gained enormous visibility and popular legitimacy as a result of these developments, making findings more acceptable and the field more attractive to graduates. But the growing role of consultants creates problems at the same time, particularly regarding quality control and the development of a reliable body of knowledge. In order to become influential in universities and research institutions, researchers need doctoral degrees and multiple, peer-reviewed publications, criteria that help build skills and ensure quality. In contrast consultants, particularly in the African context, are not necessarily equipped with the training or inclination to review existing literature thoroughly and build on existing work. Peer review is not required, and consultants frequently move between topics, resulting in the atomization of knowledge. Finally, the growth of consultancy is primarily constrained by market responsiveness. If a consultant’s work is valued by a client, additional and increasingly well-paid assignments are likely to follow. These incentives differ significantly from those that promote excellence in a traditional academic environment.

The combination of the practices and pressures shaping consultant-led research, its high visibility and its public legitimacy, all mean that it is particularly vulnerable to the generation and repetition of ill-formed and even incorrect ideas, often with substantial implications for policy and practice. This has been particularly well illustrated by the emergence and concentration of global attention on the ‘AIDS orphan crisis’.

Paediatric HIV cases were documented in the earliest days of the epidemic, although it was only in the late 1980s that the care needs of children infected with or affected by the virus began to receive serious attention (Gurdin and
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Anderson, 1987; Beer, Rose and Touk, 1988). The focus shifted in 1997, when estimates suggested that there were millions of AIDS orphans (Hunter and Williamson, 1997; UNAIDS, UNICEF and USAID, 2002). As ideas evolved through the grey literature, such as meeting reports and consultancy reviews, the discussion of the impact of HIV and AIDS on children narrowed to an almost exclusive focus on orphans, understood as children who had lost their parents and were dependent on a charitable world for assistance. The interventions envisaged in response were mostly limited to the provision of psychosocial support for the affected children.

In retrospect, it is perplexing that a complex, long-term and global phenomenon, with multiple ramifications for children and families, could be reduced to such simplistic ideas. Children will obviously be affected by adult illness in the home long before the death of their parents, and by asset loss and destitution after it. Children are also affected by ambient conditions, such as poverty, dislocation and conflict. However, these complexities were lost in the sheer size of the projected orphan numbers. Data were recycled through reports, primarily produced by consultants, and concerns about child-headed households and skip-generation families flourished. These developments occurred within a context of dramatically increased financial resources. International funding for HIV/AIDS, excluding increasing resources specifically for research, shot up from US$1.2 billion in 2002 to US$7.7 billion in 2008, a great deal of it directed to the worst-affected countries in southern Africa (Kates and Lief, 2009). The very success of the AIDS orphan image in fundraising and advocacy, together with the near absence of stringent, discipline-informed research, resulted in increasingly rigid perceptions and practices. The idea of AIDS orphans as the primary face of the epidemic’s impact on children, shaping the use of so much of this funding, became increasingly difficult to challenge.

It took nearly twenty years for these simplistic ideas to be questioned by systematic reviews of academic work (for example, Bray, 2003), critical appraisal of predicted outcomes (for instance, Meintjes and Giese, 2006), and careful re-examination of oft-quoted data (for example, Richter, 2008). This re-evaluation originated in academic contexts, and guided substantial revisions of the ideas that had long shaped policy, programmes and research on children affected by HIV and AIDS. It is now clear that children are affected in multiple ways by their experiences of HIV/AIDS, and by the impoverishing effects of the epidemic on their families and communities. We have also learned that children who lose parents are unlikely to become unsocialized threats to society. Furthermore, the vast majority of so-called AIDS orphans actually have a surviving parent. Therefore, to be effective, assistance needs to reach not only orphans, but many other affected children. Interventions need to target vulnerable families and address the poverty that lies at the heart of the deprivation associated with HIV and AIDS.

While the work of consultants helped bring children and AIDS into the public view, generating widespread interest and support, it also led to the acceptance of underdeveloped ideas and data, and caused resistance to change in response to new evidence.
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Consultancies and NGO-based research in the Arab East: challenges arising from the new donor agendas

Sari Hanafi

Since the Washington consensus in 1989 and its recommendations for the support of civil society, the international community has contributed to the creation and subsidizing of research in centres outside national universities. The production of social-scientific knowledge in the Arab East (Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, the Palestinian territory and the Syrian Arab Republic) cannot be understood without reference to the genesis of social sciences in this region since the colonial era and the political economy of the aid system.

The growth of the number of research centres in the Arab East is related to the proliferation of NGOs. Within this area, almost 122 centres involved in research activities emerged in the context of the political transition in the Palestinian territory and Lebanon and the economic transition of Egypt and Jordan. This abundance of NGOs is not specific to this region, but is also found in any developing country where the international community provides aid for promoting local civil society.

This contribution focuses on the region’s research structure and production. I raise the following questions: Why have consultancies and NGO-based research developed? What impact do they have on the quality of the produced research and knowledge?

Aid system and the emerging NGO research centres

In the region, research centres off university campuses – whether private profit-making consultancy firms or NGOs – are flourishing. There are two specific reasons for this: the promotion and implementation of the peace processes in Lebanon (after the 1989 Taif Agreement) and the Palestinian territory (after the 1993 Oslo Accords), and the advocating and monitoring of economic liberalization in Jordan and Egypt. The donor community’s keyword in these processes was the ‘empowerment’ of civil society.

This transformation of the donor agenda was linked to three complex processes. First, since the early 1990s, a fundamental shift in favour of NGOs has occurred in the political economy of aid. Internationally, this moment coincided with the 1991 Gulf War and the onset of the Madrid peace talks, which reconfigured Palestine’s geopolitical status and recast the West Bank and Gaza Strip as sites of ‘peace-making’.

Second, the new political economy of aid in favour of NGOs created new internal forms of social and political capital in the region. This led to the nurturing and founding of research centres at the expense of aid to universities, which were perceived as public institutions rather than as part of civil society. Although the international actors recognized the institutional pitfalls of moving research outside universities, they highlighted the benefits of supporting research within small-scale units which were unhampered by university bureaucracy and therefore more flexible and efficient. In respect of the Palestinian territory, they argued that these units could also sustain research when universities closed down as a result of internal political conflicts and curfews imposed by the Israeli occupation forces.

Third, local NGOs’ entry into the aid channels led to the formation of a new elite. These were NGO leaders who positioned themselves locally within development channels and networked globally to become what Hanafi and Tabar (2005) call a ‘globalized elite’ who are familiar with the world of aid agencies. Intellectual entrepreneurs, expert sociologists and consultants emerged, becoming part of the donor agencies’ networks and familiar with the cognitive code of donor agencies in the research field (Kabanji, 2005). Their actions were essentially based on debates, development paradigms and international standards not bound to their local context.

This new situation was marked by changes in aid policy, the emergence of NGO-funded research centres, and a three-dimensional crisis for national research systems.
(financial, institutional and one of self-confidence) (Waast, 1996). New forms of knowledge production emerged. The consultancy firms and NGO research centres cherished by donors readily accepted the transfer of new activities and methodologies. They were supported by project funding, rather than by the long-term funding of coherent research programmes. This trend had serious negative consequences for the accumulation of knowledge and specialization, which is necessary to ensure good research.

New methods and areas of research
Since the 1990s, gender has become an important lens through which societies are studied in the Arab East, as in the rest of the world. Funding supports specifically favoured themes related to gender, such as the democratization of the Arab world, school curricula, the oral history of women’s experience, and, more abstractly, patriarchal and semi-patriarchal domination. However, most of this research was not developed by undertaking a ‘mainstream gender analysis’, which is typical of research in the North and some parts of the South. Hence it remained somewhat superficial.

Funding organizations favoured fact-finding research projects based on unambiguous quantitative indicators. This ‘fetishism of the quantitative’ has been devoid of critical analysis and interpretation.

Eight research centres in the Palestinian territory and five in Jordan, for example, have been asked to centre their activities on the production of opinion polls on political issues and sample surveys on social issues. This is linked to the new notion of satisfying differentiated ‘publics’. Citizens need to be satisfied with the government’s actions and with donor interventions in the social and political spheres. Surveys and polls are used as scientific tools to measure and monitor the introduction of systems defined on the basis of preconceived models which are, in turn, based on experiences tested elsewhere, as well as to legitimize interventions (Bocco et al., 2006). NGOs’ research centres in the region claim that the new citizens accept these monitoring, assessment and evaluation methods, thereby indicating the superiority of their analysis over universities’ in-depth comparative analysis.

The study of poverty is another example. Poverty studies conducted in the Palestinian territory and Egypt have been directed towards surveying the ‘poor’, identifying where they live, so-called ‘poverty mapping’, and suggesting different measures of ‘poverty alleviation’. Having discovered that the poor occupy certain neighbourhoods, specific interventions were proposed without examining why the poor live in these neighbourhoods or assessing the root causes of poverty, such as the role of the state in the distribution of resources and the negative impact of structural adjustment policies. Many of these studies have been carried out, sponsored and published by UN agencies, leading to action research and interventions that NGOs later implement. The sponsoring organizations often emphasize the collection of demographic data. The surveys that they sponsor are therefore descriptive in nature, based on assessing consumption and income levels, life expectancy, child mortality and literacy levels. A thorough analysis of this raw data and its interpretation on the basis of broader sociological, anthropological and historical studies is usually not on the agenda.

Conclusion
This paper has attempted to discuss the problematic development of research in the social sciences in the Arab East as carried out with external funding in research centres outside universities. It is argued that even though social research has recently flourished in the region, the studies tend to lack critical depth. This kind of donor-driven research (in the sense of Bourdieu) is developed and carried out by competing research entrepreneurs seeking contracts, rather than being structured by researchers reflecting different sensibilities in terms of historical analysis, social class or ideology. Many such projects are nothing but a succession of one-year initiatives meant to produce policy research. These research projects lead to too much quantitative research, including opinion polls, and aimed at identifying research questions that are often conceived without theories to support them. Such research does not enable its readers, and other citizens, to be critical of their society.

The most salient issue in the changes discussed above is the kind of funding available to research. The scarcity of public funds, the lack of financial support from the (sometimes) wealthy local community and the exclusive reliance on foreign funding hinder the research centres’ ability to accomplish long-term planning and to hire suitable personnel. The atomization of research sites makes them vulnerable to attacks by political and security authorities as well as by different political and religious groups.
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3.3 Brain drain or brain circulation?

Introduction

Brain drain is the term for the long-lasting migration of highly skilled people from a less to a more developed country. More than 5 million people cross a border every year to come and live in a more developed country (UNDP, 2009); what share of this number is made up of social scientists looking for better research capacities and incomes is unknown. Many smaller and poorer countries, although the phenomenon is not limited to them, express deep concern that their investments in educating and training social scientists benefit other countries instead. Africa is particularly concerned, as a high proportion of well-trained African scholars, including many of the best-known, have left their country (Olukoshi). Brain drain, like any migration, occurs mainly for economic and political reasons. It is exacerbated by students completing graduate and postgraduate degrees abroad, and integrating into research institutions there rather than returning home. How serious is the phenomenon as far as social scientists are concerned? Is the effect of brain drain essentially negative or can it have some positive effects?

The phenomenon of brain drain can be analysed from a historical point of view. European brain drains contributed largely to reshaping the social sciences in the USA and granting them a definite pre-eminence over other academic disciplines (Jeanpierre); a similar process occurred, though to a smaller extent, in Latin America (Didou Aupetit). It was again troubled political situations – dictatorships in the Southern Cone – that later led to the migration of Latin American social scientists (Vessuri and Sonsiré López in Chapter 2).

The migration of scientists can be analysed from the perspective of the receiving countries (brain gain) or of the sending countries (brain drain). Large numbers of researchers are still leaving their country every year, attracted by better working opportunities, income and research conditions. On the other side, competition exists to attract students and researchers from neighbouring or developing countries. Beside the USA – the largest receiving country today – and Europe, other poles of attraction have developed, and have resulted in new North/North, or South/South movements, as well as in circular flows (Jeanpierre).

Measuring brain drain and brain circulation is complex. Are social scientists migrating more or less than natural scientists? According to the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS), students in social sciences are less mobile than students in other disciplines, and tend to return home in larger numbers (Jeanpierre). On the other hand, there are students who move out of social sciences to study business or management studies because they expect to increase their chances of finding a position abroad (Khadria).

Several countries are trying to reduce the negative impacts of brain drain, and put in place incentives to stimulate graduates to come back after they receive their degree in a foreign university. Such incentives can include the guarantee of a position (for example, China, Mexico), or the establishment of international networks and collaborations with national researchers working abroad (Argentina, Colombia, China, the Philippines). But the efficiency of these measures remains limited as long as working conditions do not improve significantly in the sending countries (Didou Aupetit).

The discussion over brain drains and their effects has shifted recently, from a perspective stressing their negative impacts for sending countries to one identifying positive outcomes. An increasing number of researchers and agencies speak of brain gain and brain circulation to underscore the positive outcomes of brain migrations for sending countries. The Philippines is one country that has known constant migration flows of professionals and scholars since the mid-1960s, but the effect of this migration is not considered negative. The diaspora is central in building cooperation with scholars in their country of origin, thus helping their integration into international research networks (Miralao). Brain circulation is in fact a component of the broader circulation of ideas (Didou Aupetit).

The following papers all stress either explicitly or implicitly how thin the databases are that could allow international comparisons of professional migrations in social sciences, and their outcomes in different countries. International data on brain drain and brain circulation in social sciences need further development.
The international migration of social scientists

Laurent Jeanpierre

This paper describes recent efforts by national administrations, NGOs and international organizations to capture accurately the international mobility of students, scientists, engineers and highly skilled workers, and shows that the data vary considerably between regions and are not in an appropriate format for social science researchers. It also looks at some policies and initiatives developed to overcome the negative outcomes of brain drain.

It is estimated that between the 1960s and the 1990s, around 1 million scholars and students moved from developing countries to Western centres (Kallen, 1994). Global flows of scientists and highly skilled workers have since increased. In 2001, nearly one in ten tertiary educated adults in the developing world lived permanently in North America, Western Europe or Australia (Lowell, Findlay and Stewart, 2004). The figure is several times higher for some countries in Latin America, Africa and the Caribbean, as well as for the developing world’s population of people trained in science and technology: 30 to 50 per cent of them live in the West (Meyer and Brown, 1999; Barré, 2003). In 2007, there were approximately 2.8 million international students studying abroad and, in principle, intending to return to their country of origin after completing their degrees. All these international migrations of highly skilled workers, researchers and students play an important role in the distribution of national research capacity. Under specific social conditions, they may also contribute to the internationalization of scientific disciplines. Nevertheless, given the current lack of consistent and comparable national and international data, it is impossible to weigh these two types of consequences and describe the overall flows of social scientists around the world.

Reasons for migrating are diverse. Scientists may flee political upheavals and wars in their home countries, or may be part of voluntary migration flows. Most of the scientific literature on the topic of scientific migration flows is concentrated on these human capital push and pull factors, and on their consequences for ‘receiving’ and ‘sending’ countries. This literature often offers more policy-oriented and normative, rather than descriptive, information, since keeping and attracting researchers and skilled workers have become an essential element of national economic policies.

Two patterns of migrations within a highly asymmetrical global structure

The history of the social sciences, however, gives us some indication of the international migration patterns of social scientists (Heilbronn, Guilhot and Jeanpierre, 2008). Two directions are apparent in these transnational flows. Social scientists migrate from the main academic centres to the periphery in order to teach, export their skills, or do research and gather data. Franz Boas, who had left Germany for the USA in 1899, contributed to creating the first institutions of anthropological research in Mexico. French social scientists, like the historian Fernand Braudel, had some impact on the development of the social sciences in Brazil through their positions at the University of São Paulo during the interwar years. Favouring the entrance of foreign academics after 1954 helped Germany reintegrate with the international scientific community and become an important source of international co-authorship for the USA (Jöns, 2009).

In the opposite direction, talented young social scientists tend to leave a peripheral position for academic centres in order to be trained or work with the most eminent scholars. In anthropology, Bronislaw Malinowski left Poland for London in 1910, and in 1938 left the London School of
Economics for Yale University. In the past, imperial and colonial political structures provided a highly asymmetrical framework for such voluntary migrations, reinforcing the scientific creativity and productivity of the centre at the expense of the periphery (Brisson, 2008). Yet these migrations are not always voluntary. They may also depend on the social and economic conditions of researchers, on the status of academic and research positions, and on political constraints on scientists’ freedom of speech. After the 1960s, intellectual migrations of social scientists to the USA had more critical consequences. The new legitimacy of cultural studies, the renewed development of area studies, and current interest in transnational topics are doubtless an effect of some transnational trajectories of prominent intellectual exiles in the USA (such as Arjun Appadurai, Homi Bhabha and Edward Said).

Some academic centres in the social sciences also attract scholars on a regional scale, as is often the case with the most prestigious South African, Indian, Japanese and Mexican universities today. There is an important intraregional migration of the highly skilled in Europe, the Americas and Asia. However, transnational disciplinary spaces of exchange show a highly asymmetrical structure, where Western countries, primarily the USA, generally hold a hegemonic position.

The scientific hierarchy of academic centres and national traditions is not the only explanation for the direction of transnational migration. During the twentieth century, most of the migration flows of scholars from Europe to North America reflected the US job market’s relative openness to productive foreign social scientists.

Since it often resulted in a long-lasting integration abroad, forced migration contributed more than the voluntary form to the world geography of social science research capacities in the twentieth century. The most important of these migrations took place after 1933, with the exile of professors and researchers – a majority of them Jewish – from Germany and occupied countries in Europe. Several hundred scholars who already were or eventually became professional social scientists emigrated from Europe to the USA between 1933 and 1942. Their intellectual impact has profoundly reshaped and ‘denationalized’ North American social science, and was an important factor in consolidating its long-lasting global supremacy in the twentieth century (Fleck, 2007).

The expression ‘brain drain’, that is, the long-lasting migration of highly trained people from some countries to wealthier ones, was coined in the early 1960s to describe the rapidly increasing numbers of scientists emigrating from Europe and from developing or ‘emerging’ countries to the USA. It has increased significantly over the past two or three decades (World Bank, 2006), and the differences between voluntary migrations and forced migrations are sometimes blurred. In Turkey, Morocco, Central America, a number of African countries and the Caribbean, one-third to two-thirds of university-educated citizens have left their home countries. More African scientists and engineers work in the USA than in their home continent. The leading countries of the so-called global knowledge society draw on human resources worldwide. This is, however, no longer a North/South phenomenon; it also alters North/North and South/South relations.

The contemporary migration of students
The international migration of students is one of the most important issues in the current international competition for human capital. The number of international students has doubled in the past twenty years and is still increasing rapidly. Their international migration is partly due to wider access to higher education worldwide but also to a voluntary policy of international exchanges, especially in Europe. It is related to bad or worsening working conditions for scholars and students in their home countries, a lack of university places, and their perceptions of better career opportunities. With 595,900 overseas students, 25 per cent of them from China and India (in 2005), the USA is the largest recipient country. The UK, Germany, France and Australia are the next most attractive countries for foreign students. It should be noted that countries in which English is not spoken but which still offer low tuition fees continue to play an important role as recipient countries. China, India, the Republic of Korea and Germany are the most important sending countries. The main destinations of Chinese overseas students are the UK, the USA, Australia, Germany, Canada, France, Japan and the Russian Federation. Asian students represent 45 per cent of the overseas students in OECD countries. Intra-European flows of students are the second largest in the world after the flows from Asia to the USA.

Host countries benefit from these inflows as stay rates are often high. In 2003, more than half of the temporary visa holders who had received science and engineering (S&E) doctorates from US universities in 1998 were still working in the USA (Finn, 2005). Stay rates depend on country of origin. Between 1990 and 1999, the average stay rates of foreign S&E Ph.D. graduates in the USA were high among students from China (87 per cent), India (82 per cent) and the UK (79 per cent) (OECD, 2002). European Ph.Ds have a much higher stay rate than their counterparts from the
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Of the immigrant scientists and engineers in the USA, 14.2 per cent arrive with their highest degree in the social and related sciences, compared with 21.6 per cent from the engineering sciences (Johnson and Regets, 1998). Between 1993 and 1999, the most important sending countries for students graduating in the USA with a highest degree in the social sciences were India (with almost 27,000 graduates), Germany, Canada, the UK, China, Mexico, the Republic of Korea and Japan (with a little more than 12,000 graduates).

Table 3.1 shows that foreign-born social science Ph.Ds from US universities are also less numerous than those from other fields. According to China’s Ministry of Education, 24.7 per cent of the 700,000 students and scholars who left the country between 1978 and 2003 returned. Within this general picture, stay rates in any country are generally lower for graduates in economics and other social sciences than in any other disciplines.

It also appears that social sciences are not the most attractive disciplines for mobile students (see Figure 3.1).

Less numerous among the mobile students, future social science degree holders are also more numerous among those returning to their home country. The use of natural instead of formal languages in the social sciences may partly explain the lower rate of international migration in these fields. In any case, it is fair to assume that the brain drain is less important in social sciences than it is in physical and life sciences, business and engineering. A closer analysis of the case of the USA seems to support this result.

The case of the USA

The USA is the first country of destination for mobile students and scholars, but is also the country whose researchers and students are the least mobile internationally. It is the only country with a positive (temporary and permanent), migration balance with all other countries. For all these reasons, it is the centre of today’s world system of scientific migration. It is thus interesting to focus more specifically on its foreign social scientists, since there are specific data on this knowledge domain.

Of the immigrant scientists and engineers in the USA, 14.2 per cent arrive with their highest degree in the social and related sciences, compared with 21.6 per cent from the engineering sciences (Johnson and Regets, 1998). Between 1993 and 1999, the most important sending countries for students graduating in the USA with a highest degree in the social sciences were India (with almost 27,000 graduates), Germany, Canada, the UK, China, Mexico, the Republic of Korea and Japan (with a little more than 12,000 graduates).

Table 3.1 shows that foreign-born social science Ph.Ds from US universities are also less numerous than those from other fields.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All fields</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political science</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology/anthropology</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These figures are underestimates.

Source: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resource Statistics, Scientists and Engineers Statistical Data System (SESTAT), (2003). The data presented in this section came from NSF’s SESTAT Integrated File database, which contains the results of three surveys conducted among people with college or graduate degrees living as permanent residents in the USA. http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/seind06/c5/c5s2.htm
Among them, holders of doctorates in economics and political science are more often foreign than those from other social science disciplines.

**Overcoming the brain drain: some policy responses**

Despite this general structure of scientific migration flows, all is not lost for origin countries; in some cases, there are positive side-effects of the brain drain (Gaillard and Gaillard, 1997; Meyer, Kaplan and Charum, 2001; Barré, 2003). Scientific socialization in one of the world centres has sometimes contributed to the reinforcement of national scholarship in the migrant’s country of origin. For example, Florian Znaniecki was one of the pioneers of academic sociology in the USA but also one of the founders of sociology in his home country, Poland. The emigration of the highly skilled may also create an incentive for education in the sending country, and it may enhance international scientific collaboration. There is a positive correlation between the presence of foreign-born US Ph.Ds in the USA and the level of internationally co-authored articles with the USA (Reglets, 2007). Indian diasporic scholars in the humanities and the social sciences have played an important role in the development of postcolonial studies, with positive effects for the humanities and the social sciences in their home country (Assayag and Bénéli, 2004). In the case of the Republic of Korea, the brain drain has been transformed into a ‘brain gain’. In contrast, in countries where education policies favour techno-scientific knowledge over social-scientific knowledge, return rates are low among social science researchers.

In a number of countries, policies have been designed to improve the return rates of students and scientists (such as Austria, China, Germany, Finland, Canada, India, Japan and Singapore), or to promote immigrant and diasporic networks (for instance, in Colombia and South Africa). Policies have also been formulated to foster information flows between host and donor countries, and to build transnational intellectual networks. In 1999, 41 knowledge expatriate networks were identified (Meyer and Brown, 1999), their sizes varying from a few hundred to 2,000 members. NGOs and international organizations are also involved in similar initiatives (for example, the RQAN programme developed by the IOM to help African professionals to return to their home countries).

Whether these policies and initiatives will have the desired effect on the asymmetrical structure of national research capacities, and transform the directions and the importance of the flows of researchers and students in the social sciences, remains an open question.
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From brain drain to the attraction of knowledge in Latin American social sciences

Sylvie Didou Aupetit

The heterogeneity of qualitative analyses of the brain drain from Latin America suggests that coherent information on this subject is hard to find. There is no consensus when it comes to defining the phenomenon: should it include graduates who have jobs in a different country from their place of origin? Should it only concern those who have a Ph.D.? In this paper, we consider the latter. We shall try to demonstrate that, in the case of the Latin American scientific elites, the move abroad is just one aspect of a much larger phenomenon of international mobility.

Latin American and Caribbean academics in the United States of America: the invisible migration

Even though the flows of qualified migrants have diversified in terms of their actors and destinations, in Latin America they remain primarily oriented towards the USA. The USA offers numerous job opportunities, competitive wages, a high-quality research system and a good work environment. The existence of close-knit communities facilitates the integration of first-time arrivals. At the regional level, the USA is the most attractive centre for higher learning and graduation. In 2007, a total of 229 Mexicans, 180 Brazilians, 141 Argentinians and 121 Colombians obtained their Ph.D. in the USA.

The data also indicates that apart from Brazil, the doctoral apprenticeships of Latin American elites continue to be characterized by a high degree of international and bilateral dependence, in spite of the consolidation of national opportunities. This situation is particularly irritating for the countries of origin, because learning opportunities abroad tend to facilitate professional integration in the country of arrival. In addition, a number of those who work abroad have pursued their entire education in their country of origin. Governments in the global South increasingly feel that investment in the higher education system has been partially ineffective. This feeling is exacerbated by the fact that immigration rules are less restrictive for qualified individuals who wish to work in the most developed economies.

In 2003, naturalized and non-resident individuals constituted 19 per cent of the doctors and engineers employed in the USA and 16.7 per cent of those in the social sciences (Tsapogas, 2006). In the USA in 2001, 494,000 scientists and engineers of Latin American origin represented 15 per cent of the foreigners employed in the science and technology sector, including the social sciences. But among qualified migrants, proportionally more Latin Americans hold a Ph.D. or occupy research positions in the social sciences than is the case for international migrants as a whole. In the USA the social sciences, as a space of learning and professionalization, attract more Latin Americans than other nationals even though in certain disciplines, the USA competes with other developed countries (with France in sociology, for instance).

In the absence of more detailed data, it is difficult to answer two crucial questions regarding social legitimization and academic evaluation in the social sciences: have they a strong international component or do they continue to be closely anchored in their local territory? And has the brain drain altered their structures and agendas by encouraging deterritorialized research and foreign collaborations?

The internationalization of the social sciences in Latin America: from politicization to professionalization

In the twentieth century, Latin American universities attracted political refugees: Spanish Republicans, Jews from Germany and Eastern Europe, anti-Nazis, American victims of McCarthyism, and refugees fleeing military dictatorships in the Southern Cone. These new arrivals have contributed to the exchange of ideas and the advancement of knowledge. Today, these universities depend on the permanent or temporary return of researchers who have gone abroad, and on the transfer of knowledge through structured or informal networks. If we take into account the wider context (insecurity, violence, poverty) as well as the low university wages, poor working conditions and
heavy bureaucracy, it is no wonder that few people (in either the research community or government) believe in their capacities of attracting ‘grey matter’ into the region, especially in a context of increasing global competition (OECD, 2008).

In the 1990s, programmes aimed at encouraging the return of competencies were developed and strengthened through a series of complementary and targeted actions.¹ Systematic evaluations of the costs and benefits of these measures by country and by discipline are necessary. These evaluations will probably only produce significant changes if they are accompanied by a re-evaluation of research positions and better working conditions. This can be obtained through bilateral policies of research and staff capacity reinforcement, and by the simplification of project funding, management and evaluation procedures. The risk, if nothing is done, is of seeing the brain drain process continuing and getting worse.

Elite researchers in the social sciences in Mexico: from political exile to professionalization strategies

We do not know how many Latin American social science researchers are currently working abroad. In Mexico, the National Council for Science and Technology (CONACYT) has estimated that between 1980 and 1991, approximately 12 per cent of students with diplomas in the social sciences and humanities and 5 per cent of those benefiting from a Master’s or doctoral fellowship were studying abroad. These tentative statistics, however, have not been updated since (Remedi, 2009).

However, CONACYT’s National System of Research (SNI) database makes it possible to measure the number of diplomas that have been obtained overseas in the overall current structure of academic elites. For 2009, for instance, the data shows that there was a double dynamic of mobility, which echoes past policies at the intra-regional and extra-regional levels. Mexico has had a long tradition of open doors to political refugees at the regional level. It has also had a policy of sending students abroad with fairly long-term scholarships, to countries such as the USA, the UK, Spain, France and Germany. In the social sciences, 41.2 per cent of Mexican or foreign members of the SNI obtained their most advanced diplomas abroad (the systemwide average is 36 per cent). The choice of universities or research institutes often reflects historic trends. For example, a large proportion of social science professors at the Autonomous Metropolitan University traditionally attend the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (EHESS) in Paris.

We also notice that while only 35.7 per cent of researchers obtained their higher-level degrees abroad in the lowest category of the SNI, the proportion reaches 57.5 per cent in the highest category. When it comes to the internationalization of elite learning in the South, a similar tendency can be observed both in terms of destinations and of the similarities between research areas (Didou Aupetit and Gérard, 2009).

Conclusions

While Mexico is not representative of Latin America, an analysis of models of academic mobility there points to a growth in the number of short- and long-term multidirectional movements in the social sciences, and in other domains as well. The social sciences do not have irreducible particularities. As in other research areas, brain drain in the social sciences is just one aspect of a wider process that is characterized by a generalization of exchanges both physical and virtual. In order to understand this process, more multidisciplinary comparative and qualitative research will be necessary at the continental level.

¹. Guatemala, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama and Peru among others have set up repatriation and reintegration programmes for qualified individuals. Argentina, Colombia, Mexico, Uruguay and Venezuela have developed networks for talented individuals.
Brain drain and brain circulation in South Asia

Binod Khadria

Neither the debate nor the literature on brain drain and brain circulation has paid much attention to the question of how the shift from source-country determinants of migration to destination-country determinants impacts on social science research capability in South Asian countries. There is not enough data available. However, one significant point worth considering is how the shifts in the global labour market have distorted the educational and career choices of tertiary-level students in South Asian countries.

A little over forty years ago, the International Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences (1968) carried an entry on ‘migration’ by Brinley Thomas. He wrote, ‘The political, economic, and racial configuration of the US today is very much the outcome of three transoceanic migrations – the Pilgrim Fathers and their successors, the slaves from Africa, and European masses in the twentieth century.’ Immediately thereafter, following the 1968 implementation of the landmark 1965 Amendments to the US Immigration and Nationality Act, a fourth wave of developing-country-born ‘knowledge workers’ began, which was the brain drain of the late twentieth century.

India, the largest country of the Indian subcontinent, which comprises the whole of South Asia, has contributed noticeably to the migration of social scientists – supposedly led by economists – to the USA. The following passage by Bryant Robey, cited in the Immigration and Naturalization Service Yearbook 1990, bears testimony to this:

America’s immigrants… are not what they used to be. The farmers and laborers from Ireland and Italy who flocked to the shores early in the century have grown old. In their wake are physicians from the Philippines, economists from India, and entrepreneurs from Korea.

By the end of the twentieth century even this picture became passé. These immigrants were replaced by a fifth wave of migrants from India: the IT professionals endowed with generic information technology skills. The high-skill exodus from India and also from Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka (the other major South Asian source countries) to the OECD countries is undergoing a silent change. Although 80 per cent of highly qualified migrants from India have continued to choose the USA as their ultimate destination for more than a decade – as have most migrants from Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka – Canada is the second choice in North America and a route to the USA. The post-9/11 restrictions on immigration to the USA have made a few EU countries preferred destinations, with the UK regaining some of its lost ground. Australia and New Zealand attract South Asians to the Pacific region.

At the turn of the twenty-first century, hordes of Indian IT professionals returned home when the IT bubble burst in the wake of the American recession. They were eventually absorbed by the emergence of business process outsourcing (BPO), which triggered a wave of return migration. However, unexpected events such as the present global meltdown, which caused a panic of layoffs in the BPO sector in India, bring into question the sustainability of return migration to India. The financial crisis of 2008 onwards could even trigger aspirations that might drive fresh waves of emigration from South Asia.

Underlying these transitions and counter-transitions, there has been a consistent shift from source-country determinants of migration to destination-country determinants. In the twenty-first century, migration flows could become compellingly demand-driven and worker-seeking due to the OECD’s requirement for workers. This contrasts with South Asia’s oversupply of workers during most of the twentieth century, which made its migration supply-driven and work-seeking. As a result, the migration of the highly skilled from these South Asian countries tends to be thought of as a one-sided game of loss or gain. It is seen as an exodus in the twentieth century which is later transformed into brain circulation when the migrants return
grouped the strategic variables into three generic types: Age, Wage and Vintage.

The first, Age, involves neutralizing changes in age structure. This is being achieved in destination countries by attracting younger cohorts of temporary migrants, who replace the older cohorts that are sent back home.

Wage refers to the comparative advantage gained or lost by the country of destination or origin through the younger migrants being more cost-effective as they receive lower wages, perks and pensions, while the older returnees add to the cost of production.

Vintage implies the accumulation or loss of state-of-the-art know-how and skills occurring in the countries of destination or origin respectively. These skills are embodied in the younger generations of tertiary-level student migrants with their access to the latest curricula.

Given these emerging scenarios, there could be an interesting array of social science research in South Asia on the subject. Surveys on various Indian Institutes of Technology suggest that the opportunity of jobs or study abroad influences the kind of studies that people undertake at the undergraduate level. This may affect social science research in South Asia up to the doctoral level, given that 65 per cent of the costs of tertiary education abroad that families bear need to be recouped once the students enter the labour market after their graduation.

Practically speaking, innovations in South–South co-operation can also further the overall social science research capacity of South Asian countries. Intra-South Asian cooperation in social science research can be fostered by migration and dual citizenship for South Asians in other Southern countries such as Brazil, China and South Africa. One prerequisite for such innovation would be for the countries to abandon their ‘stereotype cocoons of sovereignty’ and think about alternative forms of transnationality. The outcome of the 2009 G-20 summit at Pittsburgh could be indicative of progress in this area.
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Rethinking the brain drain in the Philippines

Virginia A. Miralao

It was in the mid-1960s that brain drain came to be regarded as costly for the Philippines. It was seen to be draining human resources at a critical stage in the country’s development, and wasting precious public investment in education and in citizens’ skills formation. But evidence on the brain drain shows that it was less important, and for the social sciences in particular, than the public’s perception of the phenomenon might suggest.

Concerns about the brain drain in the Philippines grew from the mid-1960s under the joint impact of new immigration policies in countries such as the USA, Canada and Australia, which opened their doors to highly skilled immigrants, and the imposition of martial law in the Philippines in 1972. The term ‘Philippine diaspora’ is used to describe the resulting outflow, estimated to stand presently at 8 to 9 million workers (or some 10 percent of the overall population) spread across more than 190 countries on all the continents.

Early concerns over brain drain

It was in the mid-1960s that brain drain came to be regarded as costly for the Philippines. It was seen to be draining human resources at a critical stage in the country’s development, and wasting precious public investment in education and in citizens’ skills formation. But evidence on the brain drain in the 1960s and in the next two or three decades shows that the brain drain was less important for the country as a whole, and for the Philippine social sciences in particular, than the public’s perception of the phenomenon might suggest. Data is scarce on the number of experts living abroad. A 1967 study by the Institute of Philippine Culture concluded that the brain drain represented less than 18 percent of college graduates who went abroad to study, and was not causing a ‘critical loss of personnel’. There are reasons to believe that at that time, the brain drain in the social sciences may have been even lower than these overall national estimates.

A 1987 paper by the Research Institute for Mindanao Culture identified the main constraints on the development of the social sciences as lying in insufficient capacity, low salaries, and inadequate libraries and research facilities, particularly in universities outside Metro Manila.

In the following decades, the shift in global labour market demand towards higher skilled and talented workers meant an increase in what is conventionally thought of as the brain drain, including in the social sciences. Although the statistics maintained by various government agencies do not provide sufficient information on the qualifications of migrants and do not allow good estimates of recent brain flows, many developments in the country’s migration environment tend to negate the basic assumptions and interpretations of the brain drain.

Reinterpretation of brain drain in the 1990s

The first such development is the temporary nature of much contemporary migration. Most foreign fellowship programmes employ moral persuasion, or require a return-service contract, which helps ensure that foreign study fellowships lead to a ‘brain gain’. A second development has to do with the responsiveness of Philippine colleges and universities to the demands of the global labour market. They are skilled at producing precisely the graduates whom other countries need. A third, related development has been the absence of a large domestic employment demand for the country’s university graduates, and the role of the state in brokering their hiring and employment in countries where the demand for professional labour is high. Critics of government may find the state policy tantamount to encouraging a brain drain, but other groups may regard it as sound in terms of higher remittances and the possible transfers of knowledge via Filipinos returning from abroad. A fourth development has to do with the late return of known scholars who were studying abroad during the declaration of martial
To conclude: contrary to the earlier talk of the Philippines’ brain drain losses due to emigration, there is increasing reference today to the country’s ‘diasporic dividends’, from remittances as well as from brain drain and gains. However, attempts to analyse and understand the evolving nature and consequences of Philippine social scientists’ overseas migration are hampered by a lack of data. Filipino social scientists can lend their expertise to efforts to improve the country’s migration databases and to research the many different impacts that the migration of highly skilled scientists, and specifically social scientists, have on research and development.

Virginia A. Miralao

Is a sociologist and fellow of the Philippine Social Science Council (PSSC), currently working on Philippine migration and education issues. She was PSSC Executive Director from 1996 to 2009 and Secretary-General of the Association of Asian Social Science Research Councils (AASSREC) from 1996 to 2005.
3.4 Overcoming the capacity divide

Introduction

This section analyses strategies developed to overcome the capacity divide in large as well as in smaller countries. Different countries have used different strategies to build research capacity. Some common features include sending students abroad while capacity is built locally in selected universities, and providing support for institutions and researchers through a range of different networks.

If growing numbers of departments, Ph.D. graduates and publications are meaningful indicators of research capacity, Brazil and China are two cases of large countries that have succeeded in bolstering research capacity in social sciences. A comprehensive and well-resourced long-term policy, involving the implementation of postgraduate degrees in top-level universities, scholarships for studying abroad, programmes aiming at repatriating students with a degree from a foreign university, international fellowships allowing professors to spend sabbatical leave in foreign universities, as well as incentives to publish in international peer-reviewed journals, has been crucial in achieving this success in Brazil (Gusmão). In China a comparable voluntaristic policy was associated with a late 1970s change in economic policy in response to the social challenges then developing.

But small countries can also develop and sustain research capacity. Palestinian capacity in social science was built by training students abroad in some of the best universities and maintaining a vibrant community of researchers around the world. The diasporas and the internationalization of social science production explain the quality of Palestinian universities and research centres.

Other strategies, which are not referred to in the following papers, have to do with the new forms of distance education, such as e-learning and collaborative tools in digital social sciences. One such initiative built on new web technologies is provided by New Zealand’s Building Research Capability in the Social Sciences (BRCSS) project, which is designed to increase inter-university collaboration by the use of audio-visual technologies (Peace, in Chapter 2).

Networking is another crucial component in developing capacity in social sciences. Several regional networks aim at promoting research and disseminating knowledge, drawing on some regional traditions of scholarship (Olukoshi; see also Shami and Elgeziri; Cimadamore; Beaton). Different networks of this kind exist in Africa, supported by international agencies. Regional initiatives aimed at improving research capacities in social sciences range from training and mentoring programmes to the production of joint teaching materials, enhancing connectivity and collaborations involving diaspora and local social scientists. Networks in the European Union play a similar role in enhancing collaboration between social scientists from Europe and other regions. National, regional or international disciplinary associations contribute similarly to the circulation of ideas and knowledge.

As Olukoshi makes clear, such networks and initiatives can only be successful if universities are strengthened. 📖
Development of research capacities in the social sciences in Brazil

Regina Gusmão

The number of students in Masters and doctoral programmes at Brazilian universities has increased more than tenfold and the number of Masters and doctoral degrees granted per year nearly tripled in the past 10 years. Whereas the number of doctorates conferred in Brazil in the late 1980s had only been 3 per cent of those conferred in the USA, in 2005 Brazil was among the top ten countries in the world with regard to the number of Ph.Ds conferred.

The current structure of the Brazilian science, technology and innovation (ST&I) system is relatively new. Most of the higher education and research institutes now in existence, as well as most of the funding agencies, have emerged since the 1950s. Only in the mid-1980s did a complex, multi-institutional, consolidated structure begin to take shape; one capable of performing the tasks of coordinating, implementing and promoting government activities in the sphere of ST&I.

The systematic financing of ST&I dates back to 1951 and the creation of two federal agencies: the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) and the Ministry of Education’s executive agency for higher education training (Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior, CAPES) dedicated respectively to fostering scientific and technological research and to preparing human resources to undertake such research. In 1967, the National ST&I System was consolidated into the National Innovation Agency (FINEP), which stimulates innovation in both the academic and the productive sector and currently serves as the executive organ of the National Fund for Scientific & Technological Development (FNDCT).

In Brazil, the public sector has historically been the primary source of financing for ST&I. Since their foundation, CNPq, CAPES and FINEP have played key roles in creating and maintaining the country’s research infrastructure. All three federal agencies work in close cooperation with the Ministry of Science and Technology (MCT), which is responsible for defining national policy in conjunction with other ministries. These federal efforts are complemented by state efforts, especially in the more developed regions of South-east and southern Brazil, which have come to assume an increasingly important role in financing the sector (Landi and Gusmão, 2005).

Within this context over the past two decades, the stock of human ST&I resources has risen dramatically. The number of students in Masters and doctoral programmes at Brazilian universities has increased more than tenfold and the number of Masters and doctoral degrees granted per year nearly tripled in the past ten years, with a total of 33,360 M.As and 10,711 Ph.Ds conferred in all disciplines in 2008. Whereas the number of doctorates conferred in Brazil in the late 1980s had only been 3 per cent of those conferred in the USA – the world leader in this respect – this figure had risen to 21 per cent in 2005. In that year Brazil was among the ten top countries in the world with regard to the number of Ph.Ds conferred (Viotti, 2008).

The social sciences currently account for 33 per cent of students working towards their Master’s degrees and 26 per cent of those studying for doctoral degrees. The number of doctorates granted in these areas had climbed to 2,730 by 2008; this is more than three times the 1998 figure. Among the social science disciplines, education stands out (with about 660 Ph.Ds, or 24 per cent of the total), distantly followed by history, psychology, sociology and law (approximately 270 doctorates each). In the same period, the number of university professors at the postgraduate level in Brazil nearly doubled, reaching

1. In accordance with the source consulted, the social sciences are taken to include the so-called applied social sciences (administration, architecture and urbanism, urban planning, information sciences, communications, law, demography, economics, social services and tourism) and the humanities (anthropology, archaeology, political science, education, philosophy, geography, history, psychology, sociology and theology). Note that languages, literature and the arts are not included in the universe covered by the analysis (CAPES, Higher Education Information System. See: http://www.capes.gov.br/estatisticas).
47,500² in 2008; of these, 25 per cent (approximately 12,000) were in the social sciences.

In sum, thanks to the government having strengthened its efforts and investments in human resource development, the number of researchers in the social sciences nearly tripled in the 2000s. They now represent approximately 32 per cent of the researchers engaged in the national higher education and research system, or 37,500 from a total of 118,000.³

**Evolution of Brazilian policy for the training of human resources and the enhancement of research capacity in the social sciences**

The nationalistic ideal of turning Brazil into a world power – widely supported at the height of the military regime in the early 1970s – led the government to align its efforts with those of the scientific community to modernize the Brazilian university system and the national scientific and technological sector. The result was the definition of policies that had transformational effects. The large volume of resources made available through the new government funding agencies (CAPES, CNPq and FINEP) made it possible to professionalize the university system by allowing the full-time, exclusive dedication of teaching staff, as well as the implementation of a consistent postgraduate policy. The evolution of this policy is directly associated with the development of the National Postgraduate Programmes (PNPG) adopted in 1974 (Hostins, 2006).⁴

The objective of the First PNPG (for the period 1975–1979), which was linked to the First National Development Plan, was to structure the national postgraduate system and institutionalize it within the sphere of the university system, thus guaranteeing stable financing. Its outstanding features included the training of university professors, and an increase in the number of Masters and doctoral programmes and in the number of places on these programmes. In the Second PNPG (1982–1985), the emphasis was on the quality of higher education. The expansionist goals of the first plan gave way to the institutionalization of the system, which provided a framework for monitoring and evaluating programmes. Only in the Third PNPG (1986–1989) were postgraduate programmes first considered as being integrally linked to academic research activities. The Third PNPG therefore contained measures aimed at strengthening the ties between the academic community, the national ST&I system and the productive sector. During the preparation of the Fourth PNPG, which for various reasons was never published (Hostins, 2006), discussion was focused on the need to diversify the model and incorporate professional training courses. Finally, the Fifth PNPG (2005–2010) proposes expansion of the system along four lines:

- the training of teachers for all educational levels, including basic education
- the training of staff and specialized professionals for non-academic markets
- networking to offset regional disequilibria in the supply of postgraduate courses and to meet the demands of new areas of knowledge
- stimulating universities to cooperate at the international level, including capturing resources from international agencies (CAPES, 2004).

In brief, the Brazilian postgraduate policy was from the outset based on an effective medium and long-term policy and planning guided by a strategic perspective and maintained by different governments. This approach appears to have been fruitful, as indicated by the results presented in the sections that follow.

**Creation and expansion of postgraduate programmes**

Whereas there were only 57 doctoral programmes in Brazil in 1970, there were more than 300 in 1985, in addition to approximately 800 at the Masters level. By 2008, the total number of Masters and doctoral programmes had risen to 2,568,⁵ of which 54 per cent were federal, 26 per cent were state or municipal and 20 per cent were private. In social science, the number of postgraduate programmes has risen to 692, a figure 2.4 times higher than in 1998. However, 70 per cent are still offered at universities in the south and south-east of the country. At the doctoral level, this regional concentration is even more evident, with 53 per cent of the current 295 programmes in social science offered at universities located in only three of the 27 Brazilian states, all of which are in the south-east: São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro and Minas Gerais.

Recently, efforts have been made to decentralize postgraduate education in the direction of the less-favoured regions of the country. These efforts have proven effective:

---

² Including permanent, visiting and contributing professors.
³ Data from CNPQ, Diretório Grupos de Pesquisa-Censo 2008 (see http://dgp.CNPQ.br/censos).
⁴ Hostins (2006) presents an interesting and complete analysis of the various plans formulated since the mid-1970s, as well as of their impact on the Brazilian postgraduate system.
⁵ This figure includes Masters, professional Masters and doctoral programmes in all disciplines. Data from CAPES, GeoCapes Portal (see http://www.capes.gov.br/estatisticas).
whereas more than 90 per cent of the Ph.Ds were granted in the south-east in 1998, the figure, though still high, had dropped to 69 per cent by 2008.

In Brazil, as in most Latin American countries, the postgraduate system remains essentially public. However, the number of programmes at private universities (mainly at the Masters level) has risen sharply in recent years. In the social sciences, these institutions now grant 35 per cent of all the Masters and doctoral degrees, with a significant concentration in three areas: administration, law and education.

Since the 1980s, Brazil has systematically evaluated the postgraduate programmes offered in the country. This has significantly contributed to raising the quality of the courses offered and strengthening the institutions involved. In addition, this evaluation has provided inputs for the selection of candidates and the distribution of postgraduate grants. Programme evaluations – rated on a scale from 1 to 7 – are conducted every three years according to the system set up and operated by CAPES. Furthermore, the evaluations are based primarily on the scientific output of the programmes’ teaching staff, researchers and students. Programmes assigned ratings of 6 or 7 offer doctorates of excellent quality, equal to the degrees conferred by the most important centres of learning and research in the world, and are characterized by high levels of insertion into the international community. Conversely, programmes attributed ratings of 1 or 2 perform poorly, failing to meet the minimum standards required. Under the terms of the legislation now in effect, programmes assigned ratings of 3 or higher will continue to be officially recognized by the National Council of Education for the next three-year period, but those receiving lower ratings will not.

In 2008, 17 per cent of the doctoral programmes in the social sciences received ratings of 6 or higher, and 58 per cent received ratings of 5 or higher. At the other end of the scale, only 2 per cent were assigned ratings of 3 or lower, whereas 10 per cent had been assigned such ratings in 1998.

The outcomes of a bold grant policy
The social sciences have traditionally received less funding from the federal agencies than other subjects. However, the situation regarding postgraduate grants, which are offered directly to the approved candidates, began to change in the late 1970s and was wholly revised in the years that followed.

Of the grants for postgraduate studies offered by CNPQ in 1980, the social sciences received only 11 per cent for Masters studies and 13 per cent for doctoral studies. By 1991, the corresponding figures had risen to 34 and 25 per cent respectively. The other agency, CAPES, already directed 39 per cent of its grants for Masters studies and 32 per cent for doctoral studies to social science in the period 1980 to 1984 (Velho, 1997).

From 1998 to 2008, the number of grants offered by the two agencies for Masters, doctoral and postdoctoral studies in all areas increased by an average of 82 per cent (from approximately 33,000 to around 60,000 per year). With respect to the social sciences, the number rose by 40 per cent over the brief period 2003 to 2008 to approximately 13,000 per year, 22 per cent of the total for all areas.

Sending students and professors abroad
The Brazilian policy on funding for research capacity development does not limit training to domestic programmes. Since the 1980s, major efforts have been made to send students abroad to study at different academic levels and in numerous fields of knowledge. During the 2000s, the number of grants the two agencies offer for postgraduate studies abroad rose by 75 per cent, from 2,100 in 1998 to 3,700 in 2008, with increasing emphasis on the postdoctoral level in recent years. In 2008 alone, 1,100 grants were granted to study social sciences abroad, mainly in France, the USA, Spain and the UK.

In the late 1990s, the scholarship grants for doctoral studies abroad also took the form of a sandwich programme, which allowed Brazilian Ph.D. students to take advantage of a more comprehensive cross-fertilization. These grants lasted from four to twelve months, with mandatory periods in Brazil before and after the period abroad, hence the ‘sandwich’. The grantees have the status of visiting research scholars under the supervision of local researchers. Since 2005, the number of grants offered in sandwich programmes is higher than the number of full Ph.D. grants, and the gap is widening. Opportunities for sabbatical leave abroad for professors supported financially by the government were also developed.

6. Programmes rated 5 have a ‘high level of performance’, which is the highest rating for programmes that offer only Masters degrees. A rating of 4 indicates that the programme has a ‘good performance’, while a rating of 3 means it has an ‘average performance’, or meets the minimum standards required.

7. Data from Ministry of Science and Technology (MCT), Indicadores Nacionais de Ciência e Tecnologia (see http://www.mct.gov.br).
Impact of the new policy on the organization and productivity of research in the social sciences

This growing investment in research infrastructure and research-oriented human resources in various fields of knowledge has had a strong impact on the organization, development and dissemination of research in the country. According to the biannual survey conducted by CNPq, the number of active research groups in Brazil has increased fivefold over the fifteen years to 2008.\textsuperscript{8} Between 2000 and 2008, the number in the social sciences alone rose from 2,600 to nearly 7,000, which is 31 per cent of the total. Of all the social sciences, education, with its 1,710 research groups – more than twice the number surveyed in any of the other areas – has the leading position.

The expansion and diversification of the active research groups, as well as the incentives associated with a good rating, are among the factors that have contributed to the progressive rise in Brazilian researchers’ productivity. Within a ten-year period, Brazil has become one of the countries in the world with the most scientific publications. According to the Thomson ISI database, the country moved from twenty-third position in 1999 to fifteenth in 2008. This is an increase of 8 per cent per year (Bound, 2008).

The Brazilian publications in the World of Science database are concentrated in the areas of agriculture, biology, Earth sciences and space sciences. In contrast, articles concerning the social sciences represented only 3 per cent of the national output between 1997 and 2006. Since approximately 32 per cent of the researchers in the country are in the social sciences, it can be concluded (as have various authors) that unlike their counterparts in the hard sciences, Brazilian social scientists have yet to follow the world trend of publishing articles in English in internationally indexed periodicals. They continue to disseminate the greater part of their works in the form of theses or books written in Portuguese, which are not included in the ISI database. Indeed according to national databases (CNPq, 2008), social sciences articles represented 27 per cent of all the articles published in national specialized periodicals in 2008, but only 4 per cent of those published in periodicals with an international circulation. Social sciences did, however, account for 49 per cent of the academic books and 41 per cent of the book chapters produced in Brazil. In absolute terms, social sciences output has evolved quite positively, and articles in both national and international periodicals increased more than fourfold between 2000 and 2008.

New context, new challenges

Brazilian postgraduate policy has successfully contributed to the formation of a great number of well-qualified professionals in a wider range of fields than before. However, this expansion was not guided by a real appreciation of the labour market’s demands – in terms of neither specialization nor the academic level demanded. In the past, the postgraduate programmes themselves absorbed almost all of the newly formed professionals, but this is no longer true.

A full understanding is yet to be gained of the employability of those who hold an M.A. or Ph.D. A recent pioneering study charts the key employment characteristics of those who received Ph.Ds in Brazil between 1996 and 2003 (Viotti, 2008). It shows on a preliminary basis that in 2004, 66 per cent of those who received Ph.Ds were employed at educational institutions, while another 18 per cent were in public administration, national defence or social security. Only 1.2 per cent were employed by the manufacturing industries. The study shows that holders of doctorates in the so-called ‘applied social sciences’ had higher rates of formal employment, as well as higher average wages than the others. According to Viotti (2008), this may indicate that the labour market most values individuals with doctorates in law, administration and economics. These are among the fields in which postgraduate programmes in Brazil, especially in private universities, have expanded most rapidly in recent years.

The target of the National Postgraduate Plan 2005–2010 (CAPES, 2004) is to award 16,000 Ph.Ds in 2010. However, for this goal to be achieved and to have truly positive and lasting effects, in-depth knowledge of job characteristics and of the sectoral demand for doctorates would be useful.\textsuperscript{8}
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Building sociology in China

The introduction of sociological studies in China in the late nineteenth century stimulated thinkers in this country to explore groups and society in new terms and with methodologies previously unknown to them. Significant studies were made, but the many wars in the following decades hampered the development of sociology. Then the reorganization of disciplines and faculties three years after the 1949 revolution abolished sociology, deemed ‘erroneous science’. From then until 1978, when the policy of economic reforms led to its reintroduction, research and teaching in sociology vanished from universities.

After that date, however, the chairman of the Communist Party of China, Deng Xiaoping, underscored the necessity to train sociologists again. The new challenges facing Chinese society, such as modernization, rural development, worker migrations and the relations between cities and rural regions, had given rise to a need for studies in social sciences. The rapid creation of the Chinese Association of Sociological Research and of the Institute of Sociology, both headed by senior sociologist Fei Xiaotong, allowed the organization of workshops in sociology. The first three gathered a total of about 100 participants who attended lectures by scholars from the USA and Hong Kong. The new, voluntaristic, policy toward social sciences in the early 1980s also led to the opening of departments of sociology in universities (eleven would be opened by the end of the decade), and some graduate programmes.

Research produced during this phase focused on the challenges facing Chinese society, but suffered from theoretical and scientific deficiencies. These gaps were filled progressively, and sociology in China improved remarkably from the 1990s onward, fostered by international exchanges, the sending abroad of promising graduate students and participation in international scientific dialogue. China’s research capacity in social sciences was expanded to the point that the country counted 159 departments of sociology in higher learning institutions in 2007, with close to 2 million students. Today Chinese sociology enjoys an international reputation of its own. (Peilin, Yuhua, and Shiding, 2008; Roulleau-Berger, 2008)

Developing social science capacity in Palestine

The first research on Palestine was conducted by Palestinian agencies located outside the Palestinian territory. Generally associated with the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), these research centres began operating in the 1960s from Jordan, Lebanon and New York. They were mostly staffed by Palestinian refugees from the diaspora who had no physical access to Palestine. In 1967, the Israeli invasion of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip triggered the foundation of local Palestinian universities in both these territories. Since Palestinian youths could not travel to other Arab universities or have access to Israeli universities, six Palestinian universities were set up in the Occupied Territories in the 1970s.

The first Palestinian social scientists had generally received their secondary education in English during the British Mandate. Their command of English – as well as their relative wealth – enabled them to join US universities in the post-1948 period after the creation of Israel. A number of them were the first to staff social science departments in the newly founded Palestinian universities in the West Bank and Gaza. Subsequent generations of Palestinian social scientists received their secondary education in the Occupied Territories before going on to graduate from foreign, mostly Western, universities. Since none of the Palestinian universities had, and they still do not have, a Ph.D. programme in the social sciences, and since a Ph.D. is mandatory in order to hold a professorship, there has been a noticeable internationalization of Palestinian social scientists.

Ten social science departments or faculties, and numerous other research centres, currently operate within the Occupied Territories. In 2007, they employed 68 Ph.Ds in sociology, political science and anthropology. Of these, 60 hold a Ph.D. from a Western university and only 8 from other Arab countries. These figures point towards an early and resilient dynamic of internationalization within the social sciences thanks to associations with eminent international scientific institutions which have allowed local coercion to be bypassed.
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The contribution of social science networks to capacity development in Africa

Adebayo Olukoshi

The all-round expansion that characterized African higher education in general, and the social sciences in particular, during the 1960s was interrupted at the end of the 1970s as African countries began to slide into a prolonged economic crisis. This crisis, and the responses fashioned to deal with it, led to an unrelenting decline for the higher education system of most African countries which persisted for nearly thirty years. In the face of the multiple problems thus created for the social sciences, the role of social science networks became critical.

Historical retrospective
The first decade of African independence witnessed a massive public resource investment in the development of a higher education system which incorporated universities, polytechnics, and an assortment of specialized research and training institutions. But the pattern of rapid growth and all-round expansion that characterized African higher education in general, and the social sciences in particular, during the 1960s and most of the 1970s was interrupted at the end of the 1970s and in the early 1980s as African countries began to slide into a prolonged economic crisis. This crisis, and the responses fashioned to deal with it, led to an unrelenting decline for the higher education system of most African countries which persisted for nearly thirty years. These decades spanned the years from the early 1980s to date.

Any hope that the cuts which African governments introduced in higher education funding as part of their homegrown economic crisis management strategy would be short-lived was dashed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank’s introduction of stabilization and structural adjustment programmes. The thrust of these programmes was essentially deflationary, which meant that public expenditure continued to be squeezed and the higher education system was to be the worse for it. This was all the more so as the Bank encouraged a policy preference for basic education in Africa. Matters were not helped by acute shortages of foreign exchange, which saw imports of books and equipment virtually dry up. An inflationary spiral also took hold and real incomes collapsed as prices were decontrolled, national currencies were submitted to repeated rounds of devaluation, subsidies were removed and public-sector wages were frozen.

The decline of the African higher education systems
The collapse of African libraries and laboratories threatened the infrastructure of the higher education community, and led to the decay of the environment for learning and research. The decline in the quality of instruction was compounded by the collapse of the tutorial system which, in turn, was a fallout from the collapse of many universities’ internal academic staff development programmes. Student unrest became frequent and increasingly violent. Many universities experienced ‘blank years’ during the course of the 1980s and 1990s, shutting down for prolonged periods, which resulted in the cancellation of entire academic sessions. Associational life on most university campuses and in most countries also suffered a sharp decline when disciplinary networks for staff and students could no longer be sustained. Likewise, local scholarly journals and other scientific outlets fell on bad times. The stage was set for an exodus of qualified personnel from the higher education system. This exodus was further spurred by concurrent outbreaks of political repression and civil war in many African countries at different times between the 1980s and the first few years of the new millennium.

Brain drain hits Africa severely
The brain drain from the African higher education system occurred in waves and consisted of different elements. In the first instance, there was an exodus of senior and mid-career nationals who, unable to cope with the unending crises in the national economy and the higher education system, or the outbreak of political violence and civil war in some countries, exercised a variety of options. A number of them simply left the system in order to enter the local private sector where they felt they could both exercise...
their talents and earn a better income. Many went into the financial services sector, which was experiencing a mini-bubble on the back of the privatization and liberalization measures that governments had introduced as part of the IMF or World Bank market reform programmes. Others opted to remain in the public sector, but left the university system to take up senior political or administrative posts in government, especially against the backdrop of civil service reforms that were being carried out and the restoration of multi-party politics that was underway.

A further component of the brain drain from the higher education system, and perhaps the most serious aspect, comprised the senior and mid-career scholars who left to pursue their careers outside Africa. They took up positions in the USA, Europe, and even the Middle East and Australia. Estimates from a variety of sources have suggested that an average of 20,000 highly qualified professionals left Africa annually from 1990 onwards as part of the brain drain. Nigerian academics working at universities and colleges in the USA alone numbered about 10,000 at the dawn of the new millennium. During the course of the 1990s, it was estimated that 35 out of every 100 Africans sent to study abroad did not return to the continent, and the number was rising (IOM, 2005; Mutume, 2003; UN, 2002; Teferra, 2000).

The difficult conditions with which the academics who remained on the continent – either by deliberate choice or otherwise – had to grapple meant that they had no option but to augment their incomes from outside sources. Such strategies continue to be practised, but they are not always conducive to the pursuit of academic excellence or the development of a longitudinal research interest. Moonlighting and consultancy activities disconnected from scientific endeavour may have provided an income supplement, but they were also energy-sapping and distracting. The licensing of private universities, which had begun in earnest in the 1990s, was rare for the social sciences by the brain drain in the higher education system; universities to generate income through consultancy services and executive degree programmes that did not favour the social sciences and the humanities. In turn, this resulted in higher education administrators deciding to rationalize courses. This saw the closure of some academic departments and the merger of others. Disciplines such as history, archaeology, philosophy, linguistics and classics were endangered in many countries. It was and is still by finding universities where social science and humanities departments have no professorial-level staff and are led by junior researchers, who sometimes only hold a Masters degree or have just obtained a doctorate.

The role of social science research networks

In the face of the multiple problems created for the social sciences by the brain drain in the higher education system, the role of social science networks became critical. This was especially true of those operating on a pan-African scale. The most prominent of these networks are CODESRIA in Dakar, the African Association of Universities (AAU) in Accra, the Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa (OSSREA) in Addis Ababa, and, to a lesser degree, the Kampala-based Centre for Basic Research (CBR), and the Africa–Arab Research Centre in Cairo. The African Association of Political Science (AAPS) in Harare and Pretoria and the Southern Africa Political Economy Series (SAPES) Trust, which were active through the 1980s into the 1990s before they experienced a decline, must be added to these. Most of these networks were established to serve as sites and fora for the production and dissemination of advanced research knowledge, drawing on the best traditions of scholarship available on the African continent.

The regional social science networks also felt the effects of the discipline crises and the dearth of experienced scholars as the brain drain took its toll. The vitality of the regional networks and the kinds of activities they felt they could perform reflected the disciplines’ state of health and the quality and experience of the researchers at the national and campus levels. In the 1980s, with senior and experienced staff leaving the higher education system in increasing numbers and the decline of instruction training, it became clear that these regional networks could not presume that those who participated in their programmes were sufficiently drilled in the basic rules of scholarship to contribute effectively to their missions. This necessitated a revamping of the
The reform of these regional social science networks was designed to achieve a multiplicity of objectives. These centred on the upgrading of the skills of a new and inexperienced generation of scholars graduating from African universities and taking up positions, and were intended to keep the system running against a variety of odds. Embracing this new generation called for new approaches to research networking and knowledge production which took full cognizance of the conditions under which they had been trained and the circumstances in which they tried to work. It was a redefinition of strategy that focused on training in research skills, the creation of networking opportunities, the building of longitudinal research cultures, and the facilitation of interaction within and across various boundaries, whether national, disciplinary, gender, generational or linguistic. These were roles that the social science research networks assumed on an increasing scale from the mid-1980s onwards.

Key roles in capacity development and enhancement which the regional social science research networks have promoted since the mid-1980s have included:

- supporting the mobility of African scholars within and outside their countries and campuses in a period of crisis
- the promotion of multidisciplinary networking among African scholars
- the provision of refresher training, particularly in quantitative, qualitative and comparative research methods and scholarly writing and publishing skills
- the production of refereed journals that offer credible outlets for the publication of research findings
- the financing of senior scholars to produce textbooks that could be used in teaching across the continent
- the organization of a range of mentorship programmes targeted at younger scholars with an interest in remaining in the university system
- the facilitation of scholar exchange programmes and individual fellowships whose recipients could spend dedicated time undertaking research projects or as understudies to an outstanding scholar
- the organization of summer schools on social research themes that cover a range of conceptual and empirical concerns
- the funding of field research and thesis writing for advanced postgraduates in African universities
- the mobilization of diaspora African social scientists in local and regional initiatives designed to mentor and support junior scholars, rebuild library collections, teach core courses in visitors’ programmes, and network senior scholars internationally.

These regional social science networks are critical for the generation of African researchers born and nurtured in the years of economic crisis and decay in the higher education system. And yet, the networks also understand that their role can only be a supportive one, complementing what must remain the duty of the quintessential university: offering high-quality instruction in a stimulating environment that enables students and staff to build and renew and enhance their capacities. This means that the struggle for the restoration of the African universities must continue. They are the essential element in long-term capacity development. It is in the strength and vitality of the universities that the social science networks will ultimately find the energy to make a decisive and targeted difference.
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