

April 19th, 2009

POLICY RESEARCH ORGANISATIONS
PROJECTING SUCCESSFUL PERFORMANCE IN THE SOUTH ASIAN CONTEXT
AN ANALYSIS OF ANNUAL REPORTS AND WEBSITES

Anuradha Bhasin
and
Mubashira Zaidi

Abstract

This paper is a part of a far larger study to understand the nature of policy research organisations (PROs) and the policy research environment in South Asia. It focuses on a specific aspect of the policy research environment, on what PROs in South Asia view as successful achievement, by looking at how they 'project' themselves in the public space. While best practices have been put forward for PROs in other countries, such an analysis has not so far been done in South Asia. The annual reports of PROs and their websites provide a good starting point for this exercise as PROs increasingly use these avenues to highlight their achievements, especially in a climate of dwindling assured financing. Annual reports also add to other aspects of our understanding of the research environment in the subcontinent.

I. Introduction

It would be a meaningless exercise to analyse best practices or successful performance as perceived by PROs without understanding the context within which these organizations operate. The interaction between a country's socio-political environment and the historical development of PROs determines the policy research environment in a country.

The next section (II) describes briefly the historical background to the establishment of research organisations in the subcontinent, which is inevitably linked with economic and political developments. While there are various categories of organisations engaged in policy research, this study focuses on research organisations which function outside a university or government department, and typically claim autonomy from them.¹ Section III gives a brief description of why annual reports and websites have been used as indicators of best practices within these organisations, and the next two sections (IV and V) examine the

¹ The Indian Council of Social Science Research has identified other categories of research organisations as the university, non-governmental organisations and government organisations (ICSSR 2007).

literature on best management practices derived for think tanks in other parts of the world, including the various indicators of the policy influence of a PRO. The applicability of these best practices to South Asian PROs is examined in Section VI, along with what the annual reports and websites reveal as indicators of success. Finally, the last section (VII) examines what else can be derived from these annual reports about the policy research environment in the region.

II. The Historical Context of Policy Research Organisations

In the Anglo-American context think tanks or policy research organisations (PROs) are 'relatively autonomous organisations with a separate legal identity that engage in the analysis of policy issues independently of government, political parties and pressure groups' (Stone 2005). However, as PROs have begun proliferating in other parts of the world they have blended with the research and policy contexts of those regions, and their goals and ways of functioning have acquired different and more diverse shades. In the post-Soviet Eastern European economies, for example, PROs have been modelled along the independent American think tank model, but 'there are examples in the region of think tanks aligned with political parties or unions of industrialists along the "European model"' (Struyk 2000). The historical context in which these organisations were set up as well as the socio-political environment in which they operate are important factors in understanding the policy research context of a region.

PROs, or think tanks, were largely an Anglo-American phenomenon before 1950, and their global spread has occurred in spurts ever since. In the Asian context, initial support in the development of PROs can be attributed to the state, both in Southeast Asia and in South Asia. The primary interest of the state in maintaining these organisations was to obtain specialised information and analysis to support economic and social development in the country. Even today, in almost all the South Asian countries, PROs continue to receive funding from their states, either through an endowment or recurring grants.

In the aftermath of Independence, two PROs were set up in the subcontinent, the National Council for Applied Economic Research (NCAER) in India in 1956 and the Pakistan Institute of Development Economics (PIDE) with help from the Ford Foundation in 1957. Their main role was to provide support to their respective young economies, the NCAER by carrying out surveys and studies that would contribute to developmental planning, and PIDE by conducting research in economics and demography and giving 'policy-relevant' advice to the government (Zaidi 2002).

In the 1970s, PROs began proliferating in the subcontinent as data gathering and policy research began to shift from within the government framework into government-supported research institutes. With the establishment of the Indian Council for Social Science Research (ICSSR) in 1969, whose mandate was to promote independent socio-economic research in

different parts of India funded by central and state governments, there was a spurt in the number of organisations across the country.²

In the 25 years after Pakistan's creation, social science research was constrained by the "dearth of institutions and was largely restricted to the universities. It was also limited to the fields of demography, politics, history and economics" (Zaidi 2002). Underlining Pakistan's strong leanings towards the West in the decades after Independence, some policy research institutes were set up with funding from North American and European sources. The UNDP, for example, funds the Mahbub ul Haq Human Development Centre, and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) funds the Social Policy and Development Centre in Karachi and the Sustainable Development Policy Institute in Islamabad (Zaidi 2002).

The fact that better qualified students from East Pakistan in pre-1972 Pakistan were drawn to academics and research, compared to their compatriots from the western part of the country, made it relatively easy for Bangladesh to set up a research institute almost as soon as it came into existence. The Bangladesh Institute of Development Economics was hived off from PIDE and set up in 1971 soon after Bangladesh became an independent country, and reconstituted and renamed the Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies (BIDS) in 1974. As part of PIDE, the research focus was industry and trade, but after becoming the pioneer PRO for Bangladesh, the research agenda at BIDS has focussed more on development issues, such as poverty, rural development, gender, human development and so on.

Sri Lanka's Marga Institute was founded by liberalists in 1972 in response to the insurrection of 1971 and the counterinsurgency, and the focus of the institute's research is on human development. This was followed by the Institute of Policy Studies (IPS) being set up in 1988. One of the most recently established institutes in this study is the Centre for Policy Alternatives (CPA) is an independent organisation which focuses primarily on issues of governance and conflict resolution.

There are few independent research institutes in Nepal, and the few that conduct research in the social sciences are largely supported by foreign funders.³ 'The post-1990 period witnessed the establishment of several private research centres in the form of NGOs' (Hachhethu 2000). The Institute of Integrated Development Studies which started as a consultancy and action-research based institute has recently entered into field of academic

² "In the first two decades of its existence, the ICSSR...was able to attract into its fold or help set up a range of high-quality research centres. The Institute of Economic Growth, Centre for the Study Of Developing Societies, Centre for Policy Research, Centre for Women's Development Studies (all in Delhi), CDS, Trivandrum, MIDS, Chennai, Sardar Patel Institute, Ahmedabad, Giri Institute, Lucknow, A N Sinha Institute, Patna, CSSS, Calcutta – just to name a few – all came up during this period. This was a phase when many leading academics, finding the university environment stifling, set up institutions to engage in both theoretical and problem-oriented research" (Sethi 2000).

³ The research institute Integrated Development Systems set up in 1979 was the first in the country, but was dissolved subsequently "following the changes in the political system following a referendum and introduction of a more open political system in the country" (from the website of Institute for Integrated Development Studies, Nepal, <http://www.iids.org.np/about.htm>).

research. Similarly, ForestAction (previously called Forest Resources Study and Action Team) began as a civil society organization working to protect forestry, environments and livelihoods, and has over time, through its links with several international and national funding agencies, expanded its research output.

III. Measuring Successful Performance: Annual Reports and Websites

The literature on best practices and performance for think tanks largely emanates from North America and Europe, although some studies have been done on think tanks in the former Soviet Bloc, and parts of East and South East Asia. The present literature does not cover South Asia which is the subject of study for this paper.

Why Annual Reports and Websites?

As a starting point, the annual reports of PROs contain some indication of what these organisations consider successful achievements or their 'best practices.' Apart from the mandatory publication of their annual financials, these reports are increasingly being used by PROs to highlight their annual achievements. They have become more elaborate in recent years, and more money, time and effort is being expended in making them more focused, well-written and presentable to readers. In a climate of declining public funding, the need to diversify sources of funding has created an impetus for these institutes to 'sell' themselves and their activities to prospective donors. And so, by introducing some degree of transparency into the functioning of an organisation, they help establish its credibility, which in turn could increase resources from other sources (Murray Culshaw).

In India, annual reports of research institutes have been used to analyse research output: while noting 'the difficulties in interpreting the reports (p. 83),⁴ the most recent review of ICSSR institutes has used these to evaluate research output from these organisations.

Interestingly, apart from Sri Lanka and India, the other South Asian countries do not appear to have the same compulsion to bring out annual reports, relying on newsletters or 'brochures' to highlight their achievements during the year. The Pakistani institutes publish their annual accounts in prominent daily newspapers at the end of their financial year.

By virtue of their design, websites are capable of displaying a vast amount of detail and can afford to be less focused, although more current with their information. On the other hand, unlike annual reports which are at least current for the reporting year, websites are often not updated even on an annual basis, and it is difficult to gauge whether this is because of negligence, or because no activity took place in the interim.

IV: BEST PRACTICES OR INDICATORS OF SUCCESSFUL PERFORMANCE

Yardsticks of best practices have been developed for other regions which could serve as a framework to analyse the indicators of success derived from annual reports and websites of the South Asian institutes.

⁴ ICSSR 2007

One of the most commonly used frameworks is the best management practices compiled for think tanks by Raymond J. Struyk in the context of post-communist economies (2002). These are:

- Motivating staff for improved productivity and retention;
- Ensuring standards through quality control;
- Innovation and organisational renewal;
- Appointing research managers;
- Corporate governance – getting the most from the board;
- Structuring research staff around teams;
- Financial integrity; and
- Bridging research and policy – communicating results

The remainder of this section applies Struyks' principles to the indicators of successful performance as derived from annual reports and websites of the South Asian PROs. The applicability of these principles to the South-East Asian context has been analysed by Diane Stone (2005) and the discussion below includes her conclusions.

Motivating Staff: Much as in other organisations, staff motivation is a major factor in promoting efficiency and productivity. Motivation in PROs works through a combination of physical environment and emotional factors. The former includes attractive work content and a well-provided work environment including access to databases and international journals, well-stocked libraries, internet-based libraries, and IT hardware. However, as noted by Diane Stone (2005): “Equally important in creating conditions for higher productivity and innovation from researchers are: (i) recognition of individual achievements and their authorship of reports; (ii) clear career grades and opportunities for development; (iii) competitive salaries, compensation and rewards, “ or, in other words, the emotional motivational factors.

How much of this is part of the functioning of South Asian PROs? Most annual reports and websites document the infrastructural facilities related to IT, and the number of books and journals received in the libraries. Information on salaries and remuneration is not available, but given that in most countries (apart perhaps from Sri Lanka), these PROs are still state-supported, salary structures probably cannot compete with private consultancy firms, but they compensate staff though providing security of employment and direct contacts to government and other academics.

The annual reports and websites provide no pointers on work culture, performance appraisals, etc., and except for IGIDR, MIDS, and CSS, staff training and capacity building was usually not mentioned as a separate activity. Research staff participation in seminars, conferences and workshops was listed in some detail. Staff qualifications were invariably listed, as were their contribution to research in the detailed listing of research studies and publications. Highlighting media coverage on websites was also a sign of recognition of not only the institute but also individual/staff achievements.

Quality Control: Regarding the quality of products and services, Struyk (2002) exhorts that “analysis should be factually correct, logically consistent, methodologically sound, grounded in current and historical literature, objective, and written in a way that will be useful to the primary audience”. Stone highlights the importance of employing the expertise of highly qualified researchers to ensure research is relevant to policy analysis, and using peer reviews both internally (through seminars, the research director) and externally (anonymous reviewers) to ensure quality in research outputs.

There are no clues within the annual reports and websites on quality control measures that may be in place. The trend is clearly to employ staff with PhDs and work experience in higher posts, or as team leaders. Some degree of interaction through joint seminars and conferences among some of the institutes may inject some quality control, but in general the quality of research output is poor in most South Asian countries.⁵

Organisational Innovation: ‘Civil society think tanks are under constant competitive pressure to innovate, renew their work program and develop both new products and new clients’ (Stone 2005). There seems to be little evidence of organisational innovation among PROs in South Asia. Some of the larger institutes have developed new research proposals and agendas in tune with new clients in an effort to diversify sources of funding. The strategic planning involved in developing these new research agendas are internal decisions not shared on websites or annual reports. Some small indication of organisational innovation could be derived from the extent of diversity in sources of funding.

Research Managers: Struyk (2002) cites international experience which has shown that consultative, participatory research processes are more productive; these processes are put in place by team leaders who coordinate the project work and its marketing, and ensure a positive work environment. The authoritarian leadership style followed by PROs in Asia is apparently a feature that holds back effective functioning of the organisation.

Projects listed in annual reports and websites indicate that research is usually conducted in teams, with a research ‘manager’. However, these team leaders tend to be chosen for their experience, seniority and substantive knowledge of area of research. For Stone, this is not enough, and selection of these managers ‘should’ also be based on “their interpersonal skills, initiative and sensitivity to client needs; and organizational and management skills” (Stone 2005), none of which were discernable from the limited information in the annual reports and websites.

Boards and Governance: External oversight from members of a board of trustees could strengthen governance of an institute, apart from enhancing its image in the world at large. Here, Stone comments that ‘for independent institutes, the board is the essential decision-making body to ensure accountability ... and to ensure that the institute maintains its public role’ (2005). Annual reports and the websites do not seem to accord the same role to the board of governors or trustees. Members of the board certainly influence the vision and

⁵ On the quality of research in India see ICSSR 2007; for Pakistan, Zaidi 2002; and for Nepal see Hachhethu 2002

mission of the organisation, especially in the initial stages of its functioning. To the extent that board members are listed, and their accomplishments, affiliations past and present, and 'honors and awards' detailed in reports and sometimes on websites, they are considered important in enhancing the organisation's prestige. But from the annual reports and websites, board members essentially play an advisory role in the organisation.

Structuring Research Staff: Depending on the type of research – whether it is individual research or conducted in teams – an organisation has to have the requisite staffing pattern to ensure it remains productive and competitive. “Due to the vicissitudes of funding, many transition state think tanks rely on a core of full-time residential staff but draw in associate researchers on a project basis. Generally, there are high fixed costs with maintaining a large number of residential research staff. Such arrangements are usually found in state-supported institutes...or older mainstream think tanks with sizeable endowments” (Stone 2005).

Most PROs in South Asia appear to take on commissioned research projects involving work carried out by teams of people. In any case, many of the PROs being 'state-supported', they tend to have a large contingent of in-house staff. However, the large number of contractual and permanent staff in research institute like NCAER in Delhi and SDPI in Islamabad (Table 4), could mean they face some difficulty in downsizing, and have to additionally hire staff with the requisite knowledge or qualifications for the projects commissioned.

Financial Management: This refers to financial accountability. Judging from the accounts presented in the annual reports, the organisations under consideration are financially accountable in that their accounts conform to national accounting standards. The website of some Pakistan institutes noted the date and newspaper in which the annual accounts of the institute had been published according to the national norms.

Communication and Dissemination of Results. From the annual reports and the websites, research can be considered to be disseminated through seminars and workshops and research papers published in academic journals and books. Several institutes also bring out working papers, discussion papers, proceedings of seminars, and so on. Websites play an important role in enabling free access to many such reports and papers, and some institutes have periodic newsletters which briefly describe completed research projects.

However, these tend to be academic in nature, mainly meant for other researchers in the field. As Stone comments, “Too often the research process ends with the completion of a written document that ends up gathering dust on the bookshelf. Little thought is given to the mechanisms of how to communicate research results to those who would find the information useful, and little consideration is given to packaging the research in different formats so as to have better impact and visibility in policy circles. Research results need to be timely, comprehensible and written in an engaging style.” Thus the research-policy linkage could be strengthened if research outputs were more accessible to the lay person, something that South Asian PROs do not appear to stress.

V: BEST PRACTICES IN A WIDER POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CONTEXT: POLICY INFLUENCE AND AUTONOMY

While Struyk's principles focus on management issues within PROs, they cannot be universally applied without taking into account the political and economic context within which PROs have developed. "...There are a host of legal, political and economic reasons peculiar to the history and institutional make-up of a nation as to why there is no one best model or trajectory for think tank development" (Stone 2005).

This is especially true in the case of the crucial issue of policy influence of PROs, which can be interpreted variously, depending on the type of influence one is measuring and or stressing (see box 1).

Box 1: Range of Indicators of Policy Influence of an Organisation

Gauging the policy influence of research is open to interpretation, as different groups emphasise different indicators of success. Thus it may be useful to develop "a range of indicators of 'influence' or 'policy relevance' as given below:

Politico-Bureaucratic

- impact on legislation; drafting of bills; writing speeches
- ***appointment of institute staff to official committees***
- political patrons and connections
- ***international organisation patronage and co-option of think tank staff***

Societal

- ***media recognition and coverage***
- number of commissioned research projects from business
- stakeholder engagement and participatory research
- ***network membership and affiliations***

Organisational

- ***Publication record***
- ***Qualifications and experience of staff***
- Policy training capacity
- ***External funds raised***
- Content, navigability and sophistication of web-site"

While it is difficult to gauge the direct policy impact of projects undertaken by PROs, the range of indicators above can be used to estimate research influence; some of these indicators (those indicated in bold italics) are highlighted in the South Asian PROs' annual reports and websites.

Further, Stone also de-emphasises the importance that the Western think tank model gives to independence and autonomy of PROs. “The notion that a think tank requires independence from the state in order to be ‘free-thinking’ is an Anglo-American norm that does not translate well into other political cultures.”

VI: SOUTH ASIAN PROS: BEST PRACTICES FROM THE ANNUAL REPORTS AND WEBSITES

What then can be gathered from the annual reports and websites about what South Asian organisations consider indicators of their success? Like many PROs in Canada and the Asia-Pacific region, “Many, though not all, of the think tanks are closely identified with their **leaders**, and those leaders with good connections to the bureaucracy and/or the political realm clearly have an edge when it comes to wielding influence or attracting funds” (Plumptre and Laskin 2003). This is borne out by evidence from the annual reports and websites, where the South Asian PROs tend to highlight the achievements and connections of their directors, heads (and founders), emphasising academic qualifications (especially if they are from a prestigious university), prior work with well-regarded institutes, multilaterals or government committees, and prior and current government affiliations.

Almost equal emphasis appears to be placed on **linkages** that faculty and board members have with the government, academia, international institutions and so on. Members of the Boards of PROs are well-connected, often top-ranking bureaucrats or academicians (sometimes retired), who lend prestige and credibility to the organization, and could help link it to funders and government research projects and grants. Research consultants are often hired based on positions held with the government, either currently or in the past, and prior research work. Research staff memberships of government committees, expert groups, task forces, state boards, and other consultative and policy-related appointments are stressed. Apart from domestic alliances with other research and academic institutes, international alliances via linkages with international research institutes, or networks are highlighted, and so are faculty appointments on international boards or visits to international research institutes.

Not surprisingly, PROs that function as civil service organisations (such as ForestAction Nepal) place a great deal of stress on “networking and alliance building” which they do through their field-level work rather than through a well-connected board or leadership (its annual report unlike the other PROs does not highlight board members’ past achievements or connections).

Research output and engagement is also stressed, as all publications emanating from the institute are listed, along with faculty involvement in different projects and activities. This in fact seems to form the major part of the annual report of most of the smaller organisations, although as mentioned above there is no discussion of the quality of research, nor are there any internal or external reviews to ascertain this.

Media visibility often regarded as a major indicator of success, is also highlighted in the websites: quotations from the daily and financial newspapers that mention the PRO are listed on the websites. Further, staff publications listed in the annual reports often detail their contributions to the press.

VII: OTHER FINDINGS FROM THE ANNUAL REPORTS AND WEBSITES

Annual reports and websites of 24 research organisations in South Asia were analysed: 2 of these were from Bangladesh, 13 were from India, 2 from Nepal, 4 from Pakistan and 3 from Sri Lanka (the methodology has been given in the Annexure).⁶ The policy research industry in South Asia is as diverse as elsewhere, in which PROs are a mixed group of organisations difficult to define in absolute terms. However, there was surprising uniformity in the broad areas of information in their annual reports and websites. All reported on objectives, broad research areas, ongoing projects, staff strength, board members, seminars held at the institute, seminars attended by staff, and staff publications. There was a paucity of information on the length of projects and studies, or the 'deliverables' from research projects, the dissemination strategy if any, and other details related to research.

All the South Asian PROs emphasise their autonomy and not-for-profit character. Even though they are partly funded by public funds, and almost all receive multilateral project funding, they claim autonomy and independence from the influence of the state or business corporations in research and analysis. A few of them overtly stated public policy as an objective, while other institutes implied they carried out policy analysis while emphasising academic research. The description of research projects suggests the strong influence of economics as an approach as well as a field of study.

Drawing from the present literature, and observations made from annual reports, South Asian PROs have the following attributes:

Year of Establishment: The year of establishment of PROs in South Asia (table 1) can be linked to political and economic developments within the countries.⁷ India and Pakistan with their relatively larger populations and geographic areas felt the need for setting up a research institute outside the government almost immediately after Independence, and NCAER, India and PIDE, Pakistan are the two oldest institutes in the subcontinent. Their role was to support government efforts in the planning process. Sri Lanka in contrast waited till 1972 to set up its first research institute, and the Marga Institute was founded by liberalists in response to the questions raised by the insurrection of 1971 and the counterinsurgency. Realising the importance of an 'autonomous' policy institute, Bangladesh's BIDS, which was hived off from Pakistan's PIDE, came into being almost

⁶ The Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies (BIDS) only produced biennial reports, and their most recent one was for 2004-06.

⁷ For a more detailed discussion on this see Section II of this paper (The Historical Context of Policy Research Organisations)

simultaneously with the birth of the new nation, while Nepal lagged somewhat in setting up its first research institute only in 1979, which was dissolved through political pressure.⁸

Areas of Research: Among the institutes in the study, it is clear that economics has dominated the research agenda, with the exception of Nepal, where history as a line of research was first developed by foreign and Nepali researchers, and has dominated. Foreign anthropologists took particular interest in the diverse ethnic and cultural realities of Nepal. Subsequently studies were also carried out in political science and economics.

Human development, agrarian issues and civil society and corporate governance emerged as most popular areas of research in most of the South Asian institutes, studied apart from those in Nepal, where environmental issues dominated (table 2). International trade, gender, demographics, health and family welfare and macro and fiscal issues are other areas which dominate policy research in India.

Research in most of the non-ICSSR institutes in India (NCAER, NIPFP, IGIDR, ICRIER) tend to be more economic-centric compared to the ICSSR institutes which also engage in social-political and historical research. Not surprisingly, the ICSSR institutes outside the capital conduct a fair amount of state or region-centric research, compared to the non-ICSSR institutes, as this was the objective of their being established.

In Pakistan, all the institutes in this study engaged in human development, labour and livelihood issues, and a majority on macroeconomic, fiscal studies, trade and industry, regional studies, gender, education, ethnic and religious studies and civil society and state and corporate governance.

Both Bangladeshi research institutes under study researched subjects related to trade and industry, human development and livelihood studies, sustainable development, poverty, and civil society and governance. While macroeconomics, human development, health and family welfare, and civil society and governance were areas of research of all three Sri Lankan PROs included in this study, their research included areas that Bangladesh institutes did not. Research on human rights was conducted by only one of the South Asian PROs under study.

IIDS in Nepal and ForestAction Nepal are two of the very few institutes engaging in independent policy research and academic research in the country, but differ from most other PROs in this study. Their focus was on agrarian/rural development issues, environment and natural resource management, and areas related to human development. This could be the outcome of their origins as civil society and advocacy organisations.

Dissemination in the Form of Publications: The most common form of publication for the institutes under study in India are research articles published in journals and in books (table

⁸ From the website of the Institute for Integrated Development Studies, Nepal, <http://www.iids.org.np/about.htm>.

3).⁹ All institutes also published books: in 2006-07, both CDS and IGIDR published the most (12 each), followed by MIDS with 6 books for the same year, and NIPFP and CESS with 5 each for 2007-08. ICRIER brought out most of its research in the form of working papers, while IGIDR faculty contributed to several books. Articles in journals were the most popular form of publication among researchers in ICSSR institutes. Among the institutes under study, NIPFP has published the highest number of articles in the *Economic and Political Weekly*. The quality of research however cannot be determined from the limited information available in the annual reports.

In other parts of South Asia, most PROs bring out their own journals and periodicals. Often study reports are published in book form, especially by BCAS, Bangladesh, IIDS Nepal, IPS Pakistan. IPS Sri Lanka publishes papers under different series such as international economic series, pension series, policy series, working paper series and reports on the state of the economy. It also contributes monthly columns on contemporary economic issues to financial newspapers and dailies.

English is taken as the language of publication for social science research in South Asia. However, a few institutes in India, and some in Pakistan and Bangladesh publish in regional languages. CSS, in India for instance has listed publications in Gujarati as well, whereas almost all institutes in Pakistan have publications in Urdu. In Bangladesh the medium of instruction for social science university education is Bangla, and many of the publications are in Bangla.

⁹ Only Indian institutes were included in this table, as it was difficult to glean from websites the date of publication.

Table 1: South Asian PROs: Year of Establishment

Name of the Institute	Year of Establishment
Bangladesh	
BIDS (part of PIDE before 1971)	1971
BCAS	1986
India	
NCAER	1956
CSS, Surat	1969
CDS, Thiruvananthapuram	1970
GIDR, Ahmedabad	1970
MIDS	1971
CSSS, Kolkata	1973
NIPFP	1976
CRRID, Chandigarh	1978
ISST, Delhi	1980
CESS, Hyderabad	1980
ICRIER	1981
IGIDR	1987
OKD, Guwahati	1989
Nepal	
Integrated Development System	1979 (dissolved later)
Institute of Integrated Development Studies – Nepal	1990
Forest Resource Action and Study Team	2000
Sri Lanka	
Marga – Sri Lanka	1972
IPS-Sri Lanka	1988
Centre for Policy Alternatives – Sri Lanka	1996
Pakistan	
PIDE- Pakistan	1957
AERC – Pakistan	1973
IPS – Pakistan	1979
SDPI - Pakistan	1992

Source: Annual Reports and Websites

Table 2: Areas of Research

Area of Research	India (out of 13 institutes)	Pakistan (4)	Bangladesh (2)	Sri Lanka (3)	Nepal (2)	Total
Macroeconomic, Monetary Economics, Fiscal Studies	6	3	1	3	-	12
International Trade and Industry	7	3	2	1	-	10
Human Development, Labour and Livelihood	6	4	2	3	1	13
Regional Studies, International cooperation and Globalisation	4	3	1	1	-	8
Sustainable Development Poverty	1	2	2	-	-	5
Gender, Children	3	2	2	2	1	9
Agrarian Issues, Rural Development	7	3	1	1	1	11
Urban Issues and urbanisation	9	2	1	3	2	14
Health and Family Welfare	3	-	-	-	-	3
Population/ demographic Education	6	2	-	3	1	10
Environment and Natural Resource Management	6	1	1	2	1	9
Civil Society and State and Corporate Governance	5	3	-	1	-	9
Peace, security and conflict	6	2	1	1	2	9
Ethnic/Religion studies	7	3	2	3	1	16
Social movements and transformation	2	2	-	2	-	6
History	3	3	-	1	-	7
Culture, literature	3	1	-	-	-	4
IT	1					1
Human rights	2	1		1		2
						1

Source: Annual Reports and Websites

Other areas include Knowledge-Based Industry, Migration, Innovation Systems, Economic Reforms, Physical Infrastructure, Intellectual Property Rights,

Table 3: Publications# of Selected Indian Institutes

	Date of Annual Report	Working Papers	Disc Papers	Journal Articles	Of which EPW	Chapters in Books	Books	Newspaper Articles	Policy briefs	Misc (articles in series, reports)	No of Authors
B'DESH											
BIDS*	2004-06	21		15	3	32	2	1			28
INDIA											
CRRID	2007- 08			18			2	2			13
CSSS		1		45	4	27	3			5	24
MIDS	2006-07	5	2	27	9	8	6	17			16
CSS	2007-08	1		11		7	1	6		3	10
OKD	2006-07	1				5	4			2	9
NCAER	2007-08		2	21	3	5	2			2	14
NIPFP	2007-08	8	1	18	11	20	5	58	1	18	23
ICRIER	2006-07	12		1		5	2	1			13
IGIDR	2006-07	11		29	9	41	12			14	25
ISST	2007-08	1		1		1	1	1	1	5	3
CDS	2006-07	3		23	7	23	12	3			
GIDR	2007-08	10		16	3	10	2				
CESS Hyderabad	2007-08	8	11	31		30	5	10			
Total											

Note: # - Only publications in English are listed; only publications in annual reports are listed, as it sometimes difficult to glean year of publication from websites.

* - BIDS – the numbers are for two years, as the Institute only publishes biannual reports; all the working papers, policy briefs, discussion papers are listed under “Working Papers”

Source: Annual Reports, Biannual Reports

Table 4: Academic Staff: Permanent and Contractual

	Year	Staff Strength	Contractual Staff
Bangladesh			
BIDS	website	51	
BCAS*	website	Over 100? 16 in website	
India			
CRRID	2006-07	30	
CSSS	2006-07	23	
MIDS	2006	20	
CSS	2006	11	
OKD	2006	6	
NCAER	2007-08	74	37 (1-3 years)
NIPFP	2007-08	31	43
ICRIER	2006-07	40	
IGIDR	2006-07	30	
ISST			
Pakistan			
PIDE	website	56	
SDPI	June 2006-07	45	50
AERC		33	13
IPS	June 2007-08	19	
Sri Lanka			
IPS	Jan-Dec 2007	28	
CPS	website	15	

Source: Annual reports and websites

References

- Chatterjee, P (2002) "Institutional Context of Social Science Research in South Asia," *Economic and Political Weekly*, August 31, 3604-12.
- Hachhethu, Krishna, (2002) "Social Science Research in Nepal," *Economic and Political Weekly*, August 31, No. 35
- ICSSR (2007) 'Restructuring the Indian Council of Social Science Research: Report of the Fourth Review Committee' New Delhi: ICSSR
- Mathur, N and Mathur K (2007) "Policy Analysis in India: Research Bases and Discursive Practices," in F. Fischer et al (eds), *Handbook of Public Policy and Analysis*, CRC Press.
- Murray Culshaw: Building Credibility III: Annual Reports (CD Rom)
- Plumptre, T and B. Laskin (2001) *Think Tanks & Policy Institutes: An Overview of Issues, Challenges and Successes in Canada and other Jurisdictions*, Institute on Governance Ottawa, Canada
- Sethi, Harsh (2000) "Social Science Research: Dark Days Ahead", Commentary in *Economic and Political Weekly*, September 30
- Stone, D, (2005) *Think Tanks and Policy Advice in Countries in Transition*, for Asian Development Bank Institute Symposium: "How to Strengthen Policy- Oriented Research and Training in Vietnam, August.
- Stone, Diane: "Getting Research into Policy?"
- Struyk, R, *Sustaining Think Tanks in the former Soviet Bloc*, International Journal of voluntary and Non profit Organizations, Vol. 11, No 3, 277-289, 2000
- Zaidi, S Akbar: "Dismal State of Social Sciences in Pakistan," *Economic and Political Weekly*, August 31, No. 35

Annexure 1: Methodology for the Study

A combination of quantitative and qualitative techniques was used to derive information from the annual reports of research institutes received.

- The objective was to analyse 15 annual reports in all, 10 from India and 5 from the other South Asian countries, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal and Sri Lanka.
- In India, 14 institutes were asked to participate in the study. Sampling of the institutes was based on including institutes which have multiple focus areas for research, and some regional representation, as well as a mix of ICSSR and non-ICSSR institutes. Institutes were asked to send their annual reports (ARs) for the past three years. Ten institutes send us their ARs (see annexure II).
- Of the three Sri Lankan institutes, two sent in their annual reports
- Of the Pakistani institutes contacted, only one brought out annual reports, for the rest we relied on website information
- Information for the Bangladeshi and Nepali institutes was from their websites

Appendix II. Organisations in the Study and Most Recent Annual Report

Bangladesh

1. Bangladesh Centre for Advanced Studies, Dhaka (website: www.bcas.net)
2. Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies, Dhaka (website: <http://www.bids-bd.org/>) and Biennial Report (2004-06)

India

1. Centre for Research in Rural and Industrial Development (CRRID), Chandigarh (2007-08)
2. Centre for Social Studies (CSS), Surat (2007-08)
3. Centre for Studies in Social Sciences (CSSS), Kolkata
4. International Centre for Research (ICRIER), Delhi (2006-07)
5. Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research (IGIDR), Mumbai (2006-07)
6. Indian Social Science Trust (ISST), Delhi (2007-08)
7. Madras Institute of Development Studies (MIDS), Chennai (2006-07)
8. National Council for Applied Economic Research (NCAER), Delhi (2007-08)
9. National Institute of Public Finance and Policy (NIPFP), Delhi ((2007-08)
10. Omeo Kumar Das Institute of Social Change and Development (O.K.D), Guwahati (2006-07)
11. [Centre for Development Studies, \(CDS\) Thiruvananthapuram \(2006-07\)](#)
12. [Gujarat Institute of Development Research \(GIDR\), Gota, Ahmedabad \(2007-08\)](#)
13. [Centre for Economic and Social Studies, \(CESS\), Hyderabad \(2007-08\)](#)

Nepal

1. Institute for Integrated Development Studies, Kathmandu; annual report July 2003-04 (website: <http://www.iids.org.np/about.htm>)
2. ForestAction, Kathmandu, 2007

Pakistan

1. Pakistan Institute of Development Economics (PIDE), Islamabad, (website www.pide.org.pk)
2. Institute of Policy Studies, Islamabad, (IPS) (profile and news letter and website: <http://www.ips-pk.org/>)
3. Sustainable Development Policy Institute, (SDPI), Islamabad, <http://www.sdpi.org/> (annual report)

4. Applied Economics Research Centre (AERC) Pakistan (capability statement)

Sri Lanka

1. Institute of Policy Studies (IPS), Colombo (annual report)
2. Marga Institute, Colombo (pamphlet)
3. Centre for Policy Alternatives (CPA), Colombo (website: www.cpalanka.org/)