REPORT OF THE EVALUATION OF SEAPRAP

April 14 to June 14, 1977

GERARD RIXHON

This report is the result of a two-month evaluation of the Southeast Asian Population Research Award Program (SEAPRAP), a joint Program of IDRC and The Ford Foundation. It is organized around three major points:

1) SEAPRAP's Objectives
2) SEAPRAP Mechanisms
3) Suggestions and Conclusions.

Suggestions for the improvement of the present Program are made wherever appropriate within the text of 1) and 2).

SEAPRAP is governed by a Program Committee composed of five Southeast Asian social scientists representing each one of the five ASEAN countries. Their functions are to formulate the program policies, evaluate its progress, screen, select and judge applications, allocate the funds available to the awardees, provide technical assistance to them when needed. Added to these are also the providing of contacts and publicity in their own country.

Implementing all these and administering the Program as its executive officer is the Project Coordinator, Dr. Pedro V. Flores, who also doubles presently as the IDRC Regional Education Officer.

1. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

SEAPRAP's three objectives were outlined and approved by the Program Committee (at the time called "Consultants' Group") on May 21-23, 1974. The initial discussion for this had started much earlier in 1972-1973 by Lyle Saunders, John Friesen and Ozzie Simmons, the "god-fathers" of the Program. They selected the five Southeast Asian social scientists who in turn, very conscientiously, came prepared to the meeting where the objectives were arrived at. Before these objectives are looked into one by one, it should be entered into the record that this was the beginning of a South-east Asian undertaking and collaboration that prove to be still very fruitful not only on the part of the Committee members but also of the representatives of the donor agencies. It is to the credit of all concerned that workable and far reaching objectives were arrived at.

1.1. The First Objective

This objective is to strengthen the research capabilities of young Asian social scientists and to provide them with the necessary financial and technical support. It is one that elicits a unanimous vote of confidence in the Program. In fact, all interviewees, without any single exception, are agreed that his objective makes SEAPRAP unique in the region and, hence, a worthwhile program. As pointed out by the respondents, there is no other award program to assist technically and financially young inexperienced Southeast Asian social science researchers. All other institutions operating at the regional level make their awards to senior researchers and to middle level ones who have begun making a name for themselves. Only SEAPRAP dares take the "gamble" (as one respondent puts it) to seek out solely the "junior" level in order to give them the competence and confidence needed to launch them solidly on a research career.

It is interesting to note in this respect that out of 53 awardees (as of December 31, 1976), all except three (as far as I know: the Coordinator's Evaluation will show the exact figure; this means a 5.7% of failures) have remained in the population field (research and/or training) and/or are pursuing graduate

studies in this field, an excellent average of 94.3%. The three who so far have given up a research career did so for personal reasons such as marriage (abroad), religious commitment with station abroad (possibly not a permanent one) and moving onto a better remunerating job outside of social science research (but still involved in part-time teaching). The fact that several of awardees who have completed their SEAPRAP award and following it have been given a promotion to a higher post in their own institution is an encouraging sign too.

Permanence, graduate training and promotion are better gauges of the success of the program than the awardees' own perceptions (naturally biased in favor of the program). Yet beyond the latter which I may call a "self-serving" perception of SEAPRAP, there is an unquantifiable element which should be mentioned, even at the risk of being branded "impressionistic". That is the lively, enthusiastic interest in good research manifested through various subtle ways by the awardees, unsuccessful applicants (with one exception in Thailand) and hopeful applicants. This interest manifested itself in the tone and climate of the conversations and meetings held here and there. This was expressed more formally by one Filipina who admitted that she had been a research assistant for years, handling coding work, project after project; her award made it possible for her "to find out that there was a future in research" as she thus got her chance of handling a research project from A to Z. In this, she voiced what was subtly manifested by many others that SEAPRAP had afforded junior researchers a chance to beef up the slowly growing ranks of qualified researchers. Dr. Flores, I think, will second me on this as his visits must have given him too a glimpse of the great expectations for research professionalism which SEAPRAP has helped develop in the region along with other research developments (research stations in Indonesia, better training in academic institutions, more opportunities for graduate training).

In order to assess this objective further, it is necessary to examine it in relation to several requirements of the program and to the skills gained. The following will then be considered successfully:

1.1.1. Academic background;

1.1.2. Extent of research experience;

1.1.3. Age Limit;

1.1.4. Letters of Recommendation (with emphasis on the applicants' qualifications and commitment to research);

1.1.5. Geographic spread; and

1.1.6. A brief assessment of the awardees' skills gain.

1.1.1. Academic Background

The quality of the academic background of the awardees varies greatly from country to country in the region and within each country between the top metropolitan universities and the provincial institutions. Another level of quality is also obtaining for the graduates or graduate students of foreign universities. This naturally is reflected in the uneven quality of the applications. Although not a major determining factor in the awards' selection, the academic background is looked into as an indicator of a basic minimum of research qualifications or expertise in one of the social sciences and of a general intellectual ability. Unfortunately, the information received in the applications is often very meager.

In order to gather more information about the professional preparedness of the applicants, it might be wise for the Committee to look into the type of courses the applicants have taken such as statistics, research methodology, etc. The transcript of records of the applicant would be the source for this. In the case of research assistants who have received on-the-job training, a certification and evaluation of their research abilities from the director of their research institute would help. This is important particularly in the case of applicants who come from provincial universities or colleges in Indonesia and the Philippines where there is much to desire in research training. This would also help in determining the type of technical assistance needed in the event of a good proponent deserves an award.

1.1.2. Extent of Research Experience

Generally, the graduate students from the better local and foreign universities go into the field with at least a relatively good theoretical and methodological background. They are usually supervised closely by an institutional adviser and there does not seem to be much of a problem even if they lack actual research experience. The applicants who come from the better established research institutions (UPPI, RIMCU, San Carlos and Silliman University in the Philippines, Chulalongkorn and Mahidol University in Thailand, Lembaga Demografi at University Indonesia and Gadjah Mada University in Indonesia) usually have enough research experience and available expert backing. They present no serious difficulties.

The problem comes with applicants having had only minimal research experience in the past, at the most as interviewers, enumerators or coders. Generally, their lack of research experience, especially in Indonesia, is shown in the lack of conceptualization and knowledge of research design (including a very weak methodology). Usually if the applicant shows some promise as a professional researcher, he is assigned an adviser by the Committee. This practice has been in effect rewarding for the recipient. However, two young Indonesian researchers (Banda Aceh) have candidly suggested that, although the award has helped them, the process was so painfully slow that the award should have been made to them only after they had already gained some satisfactory research experience. Since their awards are still on-going, it is difficult to assess their statements as these might have covered a (possibly wrong) perception of their capabilities and/or of their work. Whatever, at this stage of their research they marked by lacked confidence in themselves and their remarks should be considered as a problem which, though not widespread, might recur. In examining new proposals from poorly trained applicants located in provincial areas or with a government agency, more information will be needed from an impartial referee concerning:

(a) the level of past involvement in research work;
(b) the capability of the applicant to work closely with and learn from an adviser; and

(c) the applicant's resourcefulness and confidence (usually subsumed under "maturity").

1.1.3. Age Limit

Since the Program is designed for young researchers the age limit of the applicants was set at about age 35. It is only in the last two rounds of awards that this rule was strictly enforced. This rule clearly now spells out the objective as set ("young researchers") and serves as well as convenient cut-off point whenever there is a large number of applicants.

The majority of interviewed administrators of academic research institutions concur with most of the awardees and resource persons in their support for this age limit. However, a few, two administrators in Thailand and three in Indonesia, find this rule unrealistic due to their bureaucratic system where seniority still plays a prevalent role. They claim that in their institutions, the research personnel cannot expect to direct their own project until later in life after they have moved up the bureaucratic ladder. Junior staff members have to give way to their seniors. They suggest to move the age limit up to at least 40. Clearly a minority voice, it should nevertheless be brought to the attention of the Committee for their information. If the Program rightly seeks a multiplier effect, it should continue to favor the younger applicants with a long future ahead of them and age 35 should be kept as the age limit.

Since the brochure is silent about the age limit, I suggest that a word be said about it to avoid giving false hopes and economize on work and energy.

1.1.4. Letters of Recommendation (Applicants' Qualification and Commitment)

This item was discussed only with several advisers. In a few cases (in Indonesia and the Philippines), it has been noted that some of the recommendation letters come from friends of the applicants or from administrators with very little knowledge of

their necessary research qualifications.

At times some administrators feel obliged to write favorable comments either because of social pressures or for fear (unfounded in SEAPRAP's case) that negative comments would find their way back to the applicant. In fact, it is not unusual in some places (Philippines and Indonesia) for a Dean or Department Head to show the recommendation letter (or a copy) to the applicant directly or through the secretary (it enhances his power and keeps his people happy). This practice is on the wane, but it still is not uncommon. Although this is not much of a problem in the case of bad applications, in borderline cases such an "irresponsible" letter might badly affect the Committee's decision.

Two aspects of the letters of recommendation are very crucial in this regard:

(1) the applicant's qualifications to do research in population problems,

(2) the promise of professional success (which also implies the assurance of the applicant's commitment to population research/teaching in the foreseeable future).

Both are extremely important and are usually looked into carefully. It is suggested that in the event of a possible marginal case coming up with possibly biased letter(s) of recommendation, the Coordinator seeks the opinion of an impartial and knowledgeable referee from the present network of resource persons and advisers SEAPRAP has in the specific country of the applicant.

The question of the applicant's qualifications for research in <u>population</u> problems - if this is the case - has to be looked into more carefully if the applicant does not have any background in this specialization (in the case of economists, political scientists, anthropologists among others). Five resource persons (in Singapore, the Philippines and Malaysia) pointed out that they knew several applicants who had bent their proposals to fit this requirement of the program although their background and interests did not lie in that direction. But one reliable adviser also admitted that one specific applicant, his

student, was such a case and that he nevertheless knew the applicant's capabilities. The granting of the award did not prove him right as it further developed his protegee's nascent interest in population work.

It is also suggested that the poor quality of some of the reports thus far published might be the result of this lack of preparedness for population research. The danger remains as long as the program's focus is perceived in a narrow demographic terms by some of the applicants. What scares me most in this is that several young hopeful researchers are so keen in a research career without any positive interest in population research that they might bend their integrity as social scientists just to obtain the funds, then drop population "interest" as soon as the report is finished. Yet one cannot discount the possibility hinted at earlier that an award might also be the push an awardee is looking to develop a career in population research. In both cases, the applicant's character is the key to this development. An impartial referee who knows the applicant and who is sought by the Coordinator independently from the applicant's choice should be confidentially queried on the matter.

The question of commitment to a professional career ("promise of professional success") in his native country should continue to be carefully examined especially in the cases of MA and PhD candidates (both in local and foreign universities). The basic lure for a degree or the attraction for a good remunerating job locally (outside of research) or abroad are facts of life in the region. There is internal brain drain as well as the international one where graduates leave the local field of research for "greener" pastures abroad or in non-social science ventures. To assist in the development of local research capabilities, the Program Committee is concerned about this problem. In this outside assistance is sought. The university adviser may or may not be of help (the latter is probably more true with foreign university advisers), but again someone in SEAPRAP's network of resource persons in the applicant's country could be tapped by the Coordinator to shed light on the (student) applicant's future as a researcher locally and commitment. In all these cases, as in the past, the local Committee member can assist the Coordinator.

To gauge commitment is very difficult because of its personal nature. There is a good number of awardees who have had an institutional base for years and they appear secure in it. An award usually anchors them further in a research career and its successful completion is more often than not a factor in receiving a promotion or in obtaining a raise in salary. That one may drop out of the population research or teaching circuit cannot always be detected at selection time.

In this connection, it is appropriate to discuss the three known (so far) cases of failure, Soebandi (Malang, Indonesia), Trocki (Thailand) and Castro (Philippines). The first, Soebandi, after the completion of his award, continued for a while, until this year, to do research and teach at the Malang (UnBra) Lembaga Demografi. But recently for financial reasons, he took on a consultant job as accountant with a plywood firm in Surabaya. Since then, he has ceased being active at the Institute. He comes to Malang only on Saturday to teach an accountancy course. He is then lost to population studies, at least for the time being and the foreseeable future. The other case is that of Mrs. Trocki, whose report is not completely finished and who left for the United States to join her husband. The third failure is that of Nilda Castro who, after getting her MA in Demography at the University of the Philippines' Population Institute, moved to De La Salle University for a while as a researcher. A member of an Italian-based religious lay institute, Foccolare, she decided to leave for Rome for further religious training, apparently (according to Dr. Mercedes Concepcion) giving up a research career. In these three cases, there was no hint at the time of selection that this would happen. This also indicates the difficulty of assessing properly the applicant's firm commitment to research and underlines the necessity of carefully investigating this factor before an award is made. The many SEAPRAP advisers and resource persons interviewed throughout the region strongly encourage the Program Committee and the Coordinator to continue looking carefully into this factor of research commitment and offer their help whenever appropriate.

A minor problem has arisen in an early round of awards

which should be mentioned here. It is that of a proposal "pirated" from another research without his previous knowledge. To forestall the likely recurrence of such dishonesty, an independent referee with a good knowledge of the local research situation should be sought. It might not be a bad idea to notify the local institutions of the proposals received with titles and names asking them to post publicly this information.

It has also happened in the past that a senior researcher submitted proposals which was returned because he was either overqualified or over-age. It was suggested to him that he modify the proposal in such a way that a young assistant become the main proponent and the senior researcher revert to an adviser status. This might be fine if the young assistant was already involved in the elaboration of the first proposal. Yet the danger is that the young researcher might remain completely in the shadow of the senior man, making it difficult for the new proponent to develop the confidence necessary to establish himself as a competent researcher, as the project is not really "his own". The situation may vary from case to case, but great caution should be exercised in examining the letter of recommendation sent by the adviser and an independent opinion should be sought from a reliable referee who know the local situation.

1.1.5. Geographical Spread

As stated in the prospectus the Program invites applications from nationals from the five ASEAN countries, Burma, the Khmer Republic, Laos and Vietnam. One award was made to a Vietnamese researcher in the first round but was not activated. Because of political events or restrictions, the Program has so far dealt with the five ASEAN countries, with the hope that the climate for research in the other countries might improve in the future.

The SEAPRAP Committee has wisely decided that the spread of awards should extend geographically to the major areas of each of the five ASEAN countries and to the provincial areas where new research institutions are badly in need of trained researchers, as much as possible outside the

metropolitian cities. It should be added, nevertheless, that the proposals' quality and the applicants' qualifications were always ascertained before the geographical location of the proponent and the research needs of his area were looked into.

Indonesia as a country has the best geographical spread of SEAPRAP awards which extends from Banda Aceh in North Sumatra to Jayapura in Irian Jaya (after the recent round of awards: in 17 provincial centers). This ideal spread is due to the multiplicity of educational and research-state institutions through the breadth and the length of Indonesia. It is also due, in my own view, to Dr. Iskandar's toils in training a good number of junior demographers now scattered throughout the country and located at many new Institutes of Demography at most universities and to the three research stations (two supported by the Ford Foundation and one by IDRC) which draw trainees from provincial areas. Through all these institutions, information on SEAPRAP was easily available to interested researchers.

In the cases of the Philippines, Thailand and Malaysia, there is a much larger concentration of awardees in the metropolitan cities where most of the population research institutions are located. So it is expected that the better applications would come from them. This also explains why no applications have come from East Malaysia and Brunei and a few, in the Philippines, from Northern and Southern Luzon, Panay and Leyte, and some areas of Mindanao, where a good number of small universities are located. In Thailand, there does not seem to be much yet outside of Bangkok, Chiangmai and Songkhla.

Singapore has only two awardees. The number seems about right. Nevertheless one is surprised at finding hardly any applicants from the city state -- despite the quality (for the region) of social science institution. Reasons advanced in the interviews are: the availability locally of funds for population research from various sources, for others the shying away from research opportunities coupled with the rush to graduate made more urgent by 2 years of military service (faculty members give this as the reason for their difficulties in getting senior students to assist them in research projects where usually they would be attracted to research and possibly

a research career), and finally the poor dissemination of information on SEAPRAP (passed on only to a few).

Looking at this geographical spread, a remark originating from Indonesia has to be made: most of the Indonesian awardees located in the provinces find themselves isolated and often insulated. In a sense, this is another gap but of a different nature which raises the question of a follow-up aspect of the Program of which more below.

No quota per country was ever set and most respondents wish that it remains this way with the quality of the proposals and the promise of professional success as the basic criteria. A few in Indonesia would want more awards going to their own country on the basis of population size and greater needs, but they are satisfied with the present number of awards to Indonesians and they gamely accept the overarching importance of quality over quantity.

At the end of the 8th round in May 1978, there should be at most some 90 awards divided among the five countries. Out of this number a maximum of 30 will possibly to Indonesia, a possible 3(over) to Singapore; the rest, or about 56, will be divided among Malaysia, Thailand and the Philippines. Looking at the needs of these countries in terms of developing research capabilities, the estimated number of awards (by May 1978) indicates to me that geographically SEAPRAP has made a good start but a start only. More could still be done through an extension of the program for three to four more years, if only to strengthen what has been initiated. In this connection, the remarks from Indonesia in the isolation and insulation just mentioned are pertinent.

At this time in history, it is difficult to say anything about the future of the Program in the cases of Burma, Laos, the Khmer Republic and Vietnam, but there is the possibility that Burma might open up to research ventures faster than the other three countries. It is recommended that contacts be established with Burmese universities for disseminating information on SEAPRAP. As for the other countries, I am afraid not much can be done presently except wait for happier developments concerning research.

1.1.6. Skills Gained

To assess the gain of skills acquired through an award would demand much time as this means the examination of each awardee's proposal file, reports, and past and present performances. In my case there was simply no time for this as my job was to conduct numerous interviews throughout the five ASEAN countries. Per force this assessment relies on comments made by the awardees and more heavily on those made by the advisers. The comments were uneven. On one hand there were candid comments such as those from the Aceh awardees mentioned above. Twenty awardees claim having become more secure and more professional in their research work. On the other hand, it was difficult to get anything more substantial from the rest (15) than a statement of "having benefited much from the program". In five of these cases(3 in Kuala Lumpur and 2 in Bangkok) I was certainly more to blame in not getting better information because of the little time I had with them. Nevertheless, the picture that emerges from this aspect of my interviews is mostly contributed by the advisers' comments. This should be more empirically supported by Dr. Flores' own evaluation based on the analysis of the awardees' records and questionnaires.

In general, there is real satisfaction in the fact that the awards have enabled the recipients to learn the ropes of research at all its stages, especially in the area of research design, the painstaking work for a tighter methodology, data organization and analysis and report writing.

For those involved in field work (the majority of awardees), most of them from the middle class, there also has been a rewarding exposure to the poorer people (urban or rural) with their own specific problems. In this regard, twenty-six awardees have been exposed in varying degrees to rural and, in rare cases, urban poor, an exposure which has made them aware of the necessity for better communication skills with their respondents by shifting away from a somewhat technical or academic vocabulary to a more simple and

better understood one. This awareness is a necessary step for better communication skills and for better research, and that the awardees have moved to both is a credit to them and to the Program.

Since in the area of the awardees' professional growth the results vary according to their training background it is best in this report to separate them accordingly:

1.1.6.1. the awardees located in provincial institutions and without any sophisticated research training, and

1.1.6.2. those with a PhD/MA degree or completing the research needed for their dissertation/thesis with a more sophisticated academic/research background.

1.1.6.1. To me, based on my interviews and observations this is where there has been an interesting -- if not dramatic and not always apparent -- gain in research skills. This goes generally across the board but is more evident in the learning process which has been going on among the majority of them especially in the areas of learning how to work satisfactorily with and learn from an appointed adviser, write an acceptable research proposal, painstakingly go through a better conceptualization process (apparently the more difficult work for most in this category because they are ill-prepared academically for it), tighten up a working methodology and particularly refine their instruments. These are the areas most notable in skill learning in this group. Field work -- except for some communication problems briefly discussed above -- has not been much of a problem. There have been in a few instances some problems of data organization but the advisers' assistance has helped. Data analysis seems to have been weak in more cases and report writing is reported to be a hurdle for some. Some admittedly could have done better in the latter area. In this category, Agus Salim (now doing graduate work in Brussels) has an unsatisfactory report. Two other

awardees are described as disappointing for not consulting satisfactorily with their advisers in the last stages on analysis and report writing. Their increase in research skills was more evident up to the field-work phase and seems to have petered out at the end, although they claimed that they had learned a lot in the last phase of the project.

The more satisfactory progress in research proficiency in this category is evident among the awardees who are attached to the better research institutions such as in Thailand, the Philippines and Universitas Indonesia. But in the provinical Indonesian institutions where professional resources are very meager (in some cases, nil), the increase in skills, though not dramatic at all, is no less real. Compared to professionally better off awardees, it is at the best a modest gain. But (I should hasten to say) seen within the context of the relatively poor academic environment in which they live, there is an undeniable, real gain in research skills. The reader should be reminded that the training in statistics and research methodology is, in some of the provincial institutions in Indonesia and the Philippines (though less so) inadequate. So are their libraries. The research training stations in Aceh and Ujung Pandang in Indonesia have improved training in research methodology, but up to now have no training in quantitative techniques. The coming of SEAPRAP awards has made possible the learning of these skills through the assignment of an adviser. This state of affairs is fortunately remedied through an effort at improving this training at the local institutional level in Indonesia because of their desire to come up to SEAPRAP's requirements. This should be recognized as one of the Program's multiplier effects.

1.1.6.2. The second category of awardees, those with a high degree and those working for a degree thesis, covers "debutant" researchers who are better prepared professionally than their peers of the first

category. The awardees doing research for their thesis have a thesis adviser who follows them up more closely than in the first group. Because of these higher standards of research are expected and more sophisticated skills sought. In general, the picture looks very good if varied from case to case, again depending on the professional or academic background of the individuals. For instance, better work and higher sophistication in research skills are obtained in the case of awardees with a PhD from abroad as in the cases of Dr. Fong and Dr. Penporn among others, than, say the work of awardees with a good local MA degree. The results, at this level, are also on par with the awardees background. But at both of these levels (foreign -- and local trained grantees), the results are very good. Admittedly their progress has been so at all the levels of the research process. This is not always reflected in their final reports as in the case of Dr. Suwanlee Piampiti. Her report is thin and not well developed. Her colleagues recognize that the award has been beneficial to her but admit that it was written hurriedly to meet the deadline at a time when her health was poor. Despite this, the over-all evaluation in this category deserves to give it a high mark.

I have attempted to summarize somewhat conservatively the progress of research skills obtained through this program looking at it from three levels and lumping together the awardees from the two categories (See Table 1). Although this is admittedly more impressionistic than mathematical, it attempts to give a realistic picture of what has been accomplished by SEAPRAP. This is furthermore done within the context of SEAPRAP's first objective, whose target is the region. Although, the Program's aim is to eventually bring Southeast Asian social researchers to the level of international social science research, it is not its proximate aim. To judge the awardees' progress according to international standards would be

both unrealistic and unfair to the Program and awardees. Nevertheless, I should add that a few awardees in Malaysia and Thailand are already approaching this goal very fast. What SEAPRAP is certainly doing is to provide the technical and financial to bring young Southeast Asian researchers in population work little by little to an international level of research sophistication.

TABLE 1

Increase of skills at / Countries	Local Level	National Level	Regional Level
INDONESIA	Good	Good	Satis-factory
SINGAPORE	-	V.Good	Good
MALAYSIA	V.Good	V.Good	V.Good
THAILAND	V.Good	Good	Good
PHILIPPINES	V.Good	Good	Good

1.2. The Second Objective

This objective aims at increasing the quantity and quality of social research on population problems in Southeast Asia. Three aspects of this objective will be examined separately:

1.2.1. the program's focus (population),
1.2.2. the increase of quality and
1.2.3. quantity of social research in this field.

1.2.1. SEAPRAP has population as its focus for research. The SEAPRAP Guidelines (approved on May 21-23, 1974) and the prospectus circulated around the region do not give a conceptual definition of what the Program Committee understands as "population". Rather it gives examples of various research areas "that could fall within the general focus of the Program". The Committee merely describes population as "broad" and leaves it at that. That a more satisfactory definition of the population

concept and a better demarcation of whats falls under and outside this focus are to be agreed upon and publicized has now become imperative for the Committee's and the Program consumers' benefits.

The Committee members have been divided between those who at one round or the other would circumscribe population problems around a demographic view, and those who would broaden it more along larger socio-economic lines. Listening to the tapes of the selection meetings in the first five rounds one may even detect an occasional fluctuation between the two tendencies within an individual member. In this the Committee members reflect the difficulties felt throughout the years in the population field. As remarked by Dr. Fawcett, up to 1975, population studies boundaries were much clearer as population research dealt mostly with fertility, KAP studies, and migration. In recent years, more specially since the 1975 Bucharest population meeting, the interaction between population and development issues has become a major concern, a good direction if any, but one that makes for a focus much more diffuse.

There is no doubt then that a well thought out definition of the population focus of SEAPRAP will facilitate the Committee's work. This definition could revolve around the three population component suggested by Dr. O. Simmons (in the last round of awards): growth (and change), distribution and composition. As each variable is carefully explained, the boundaries of each could then easily be set. Consequently, this should be reflected in the prospectus through a list of clear-cut guidelines for or examples of the research areas encompassed within each component. In this connection it might be a good idea in order to facilitate the Committee's work if, before the September 1977 meeting, each Committee member were to attempt such a work (definition and boundaries of population research under SEAPRAP) and circulate it around. The discussion that will follow will then be well prepared, less time-consuming and well-worth it.

This naturally also will help the Program's Consumers: the applicants. Past and present applicants are divided in their reading and perception of what is subsumed under

"population". The majority (about 65%) of those interviewed among the awardees and applicants, think that the Program focuses basically on fertility, KAP and possibly migration studies. The prospectus is read as dealing mostly with fertility and family planning issues. The rest of the interviewees in this category (35%) insist that they understand the program's focus as very broad on the basis of the prospectus' words, that is, "...a wide variety of research problems relating to population but (which) excludes reproductive biology". Their reading of the prospectus' list examples is selective dwelling mostly on the 2nd and 4th paragraphs ("population variables" was taken by them in a very broad sense). This is even further misunderstood in the case of one applicant as "any population-related research outside of biology concerns". A good many in this last group often confuse "population-related research" with "population research".

The request coming from them, that these terms be more tightly defined should then be well taken. After all it meets the desire of the Committee members to resolve the matter once and for all.

As for the advisers and resource persons, their views match those of the committee members. The five representatives of Family Planning organizations in Malaysia, Thailand and Indonesia and PCF (Philippines) find the number of research projects focusing on Family Planning, Fertility and KAP studies quite significant (they form a majority bloc among the SEAPRAP awards) and satisfactory. This group express very little patience for the other topics and recommend population policy and action program-oriented (including population education) projects as the only focus of SEAPRAP.

Ten out of twenty-seven Indonesia-based advisers and resource persons favor a strictly demographic orientation while twelve would like to see population in its broad sense be the basic focus of the research projects. The latter are satisfied with the present orientation of the projects studying broader population problems with a strong demographic component

included. The rest, or five, find the great number of demography-oriented projects sufficient for the present and advocate a broadening of the scope with a development component added to that of population (see Table 2).

Taking the advisers and resource persons from Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand and the Philippines together (the FPO and PCF representatives mentioned earlier are excluded from this sample), the following picture can be drawn. All are agreed that up to the present finished and on-going projects as gleaned from the prospectus (separate sheet) listing have been in line with the concerns of the times. Out of 40 respondents in these four countries only six support the idea that the demographic-orientation taken by the majority of the projects is right and should be maintained. Ten respondents would keep a population focus and broaden it. Twenty suggest that a population focus, though relatively satisfactory (that is, complaining that there are "too many" fertility and FP studies), should give way in the future to a "development and population"concern. Four respondents did not know enough about SEAPRAP to comment on its focus, but they nevertheless expressed an interest in seeing the focus broadened to include a development study component.

Summarizing the preferences of advisers, resource persons and other contacts regarding the focus of the program for the future (if any), the picture that emerages on my screen is the following:

TABLE 2

Focus Desired / Advisers & Resource Persons	Population	Population & Development
FPO representatives	5 (demographic sense)	-
Indonesia respondents	10 (demographic sense)	-
Indonesia respondents	12 (broad sense)	5
Thailand/Singapore/ Malaysia/Philippines respondents	6 (demographic sense) 10 (broad sense)	24
	43	29

This means that the great majority, 43 out of 72, or roughly 60% vote for the maintenance of a population focus the understanding of which varies, (of this majority 49% favor a demographic project approach, 51% a broader science one). Abotu 40% of the respondents would broaden the focus considerably.

In my opinion, since the Committee members have always seen the population focus connected to existing development patterns, the population focus should remain provided it is more satisfactorily defined and clearly delineated. By officially adding the development component side by side with population, they would make the focus more diffuse and, hence the Program more difficult to handle. After all this is a small program with limited means. Population research, still badly needed, also serves as a good cut off point.

1.2.2. The increase of the quality of social research in the region has been a major concern of the Program. It is rather difficult to give a fair evaluation of this as mentioned earlier (1.1.6.). More reliance in this report is again placed on the advisers' and resource persons' comments while not totally ignoring the awardees'. Furthermore in this regard much has already been said in a previous section (see 1.1.6.).

Although a few in Indonesia -- probably due to their lack of exposure to high quality of population research elsewhere -- find the research reports of high quality and higher than is usual in their country. There is an agreement that the quality of the products is uneven. Yet all note that the Program's products should not be judged according to international social science standards but rather on these 3 bases: the professional growth of the awardees from the pre- to the post-SEAPRAP period, the level of training and status of social research in a given country, the target clientele of the Program that is, young inexperienced social researchers.

The first would have to be examined cumulatively throughout the five countries which at this stage is not possible here.

But, relying on our senior interviewees whose statements are looked at globally, one must acknowledge a modest, yet encouraging gain in quality, with good potentials for the future. Across the five countries, there is a consensus that the SEAPRAP awards have further strengthened the existing attempts at a higher level of quality of research. This was best summed up by Dr. Mary Hollnsteiner who remarked that SEAPRAP has given an impetus to the developlment of better empirical work through a strong support for quantitative analysis. According to her there is now the beginning of an empirical tradition which hardly existed in the region a few years back. In areas where this is still weak, such as in Indonesia, steps are taken to remedy research training deficiencies (research design, methodology, analysis) to respond better to the exigencies of research expected under SEAPRAP (this was spurred by the higher number of application rejections). This is a very healthy step forward and a guarantee for higher quality work.

Where the quality of research was fairly low, SEAPRAP has done what no one else had ever attempted by giving a chance to promising researchers to rework their proposals with the technical assistance of an adviser assigned to them for the purpose. By being responsive to the research needs and flexible in its operations, the Program has gone out of the beaten path of foundations by making the award conditional to producing a largely improved proposal and better methodology. The interesting result of this is the improvement in these awardees' work as witnessed by the marked improvement in most reworked products and a beneficial interaction of most awardees with their appointed advisers. Everybody is aware that quality is acquired step by step. All the Program aims to do is for young people to make the first important step without which the other steps cannot be taken. In this, it is the consensus of all that SEAPRAP is uniquely responsible in the region for doing it.

1.2.3. The increase of quantity of social research. Much of the information in this area will come from the Coordinator's progress reports and from the evaluation which he is conducting from the SEAPRAP office. This is also an aspect

that was touched upon when the geographical spread of awards was discussed (1.1.5.). The interviewees also fully realize that the present increase of awards to 65 awardees (as May 1977) has tremendously increased the number of social research projects on population in the region, especially in the provincial areas where not much would have happened if it had not been for SEAPRAP's assistance.

Another development should be cited here as it enhances the growth of an interest in population research and has become a spur for more and better applications. It is the informal network of advisers and resource persons which the SEAPRAP committee members and Project Coordinator have developed during the past three years throughout the five ASEAN countries. They were chosen on the basis of their expertise in population and social science research and their integrity. Most of them were known to the Committee members and the Project Coordinator and a few were referred to them by this circle of advisers mostly during the Coordinator's visit to the various research centers. They readily accept to advise new awardees whenever they are invited to. They do not receive any honorarium for this, although when asked to travel their transportation expenses and per diems are taken care of by SEAPRAP. These people follow their advisees very closely. They make it possible for SEAPRAP cofidently spread its awards to provincial areas and hence to increase the quantity of social research in the region. Were it not for these advisers, it would hardly be possible for the Program to make more awards. In this connection, the Project Coordinator successfully handles the Program's relations with them.

These advisers are very happy with the Program and their limited role has been a real contribution. As they admit, their reward is to see good research multiply in the region. They also are responsible for some refereeing and do much scouting around for good applicants.

Since SEAPRAP has no money for this, it might worthwhile for a donor agency to sponsor a gathering of these advisers to discuss SEAPRAP, the problems encountered, guidelines for better adviser-advisee relationship, the state of population research

in the area, etc. over a period at 2 to 3 days. This meeting would be held with the Committee members, SEAPRAP administration and representative of various donor agencies. Much benefit would come of it in terms of future increase of the quality and quantity of population research in the area.

The best gauge of the increase of research in the region is found in the activities of the awardees themselves. Out of the 37 interviewed all but one (Soebandi mentioned in 1.1.4.) are still involved in population work and/or research.

Those who have completed their award have moved on to other research work within their institution or, in the case of some people who got their degree, outside, in another institution. In many cases they do teach on a part-time basis. These admit that they make use of their research findings and methodology to expose their students to population problems. They are also called, often informally, by other graduate students or young researchers to advise them in some of their research problems. In the Philippines, Brigida Jayme has moved to the Population Center Foundation where she looks at research utilization, but also is frequently approached for consultation; de Guzman does this at UPPI -- and so elsewhere in each country.

1.2.4. To sum up, on the whole SEAPRAP has gone quite a long way to give the necessary impetus to more and better population research in the region particularly in the remote areas and small provincial research institutions. Yet looking at the five countries as a whole and individually, the number is still small. It is the general consensus of the interviewees that more awards will be needed throughout to establish a solid core of population and social science researchers. Another problem remains to be tackled, and it is that of a follow-up program to strengthen what has been achieved and to help the young awardees in small research centers to move up to a higher step of research sophistication. This will be touched upon in the third section of this report (3.).

1.3. The Third Objective

SEAPRAP aims finally "to facilitate the flow of information about population research developed in the Program as well as its implications for policy and planning" in Southeast Asia.

So far 9 reports have been published in mimeographed form by SEAPRAP and distributed free of charge throughout the region to advisers, awardees, and research institutions selected by the Coordinator. Not everybody receives all the reports and the rationale for this will be explained in the Coordinator's report. Several advisers have commented in writing on them and this will be reflected in the same report. What is the reaction from the field?

The most uncritical comments come from the awardees who find the reports "good" and "stimulating", except for four (one Malaysian, one Thai and two Filipinos) who felt that the quality was uneven. The latter comment is also the advisers' and resource persons' judgement. But sad to say, only a handful admitted having read the reports carefully. One reason advanced for this is that the reports have only appeared fairly recently throughout 1976 (2 of them were published in 1975) and this gave most of the reports recipients little time to read them.

Although it is the only case of this I encountered, one resource person in Manila, Dr. Lourdes Quisumbing, mentioned using Philippine reports, those of Castro, Jayme and Junsay, in her methodology and family life classes at the graduate school level. In this she uses them as "neat methodological cases" and as sources for illustrative data. UPPI, Manila, IPC Manila and the Population Institute of Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok have them as references in their libraries.

Three informants from Family Planning agencies (or Boards) in Malaysia and Thailand, all administrators, could not make use of the reports as they complained that the approach and language

were too technical for them.[1] Because of this the reports are of potential rather than actual utility to them. On the whole satisfaction is expressed that there now is a body of data on fertility and family planning available but awaiting to be translated in a layman's language. Since they are busy people they seldom bother going beyond the first pages and hence miss the pages on policy implications. It is suggested that each report begins with a two-page abstract written for the use of agency administrators.

Most awardees also complain that outside of the few reports published so far they hardly know about other SEAPRAP awardees and their research. They strongly suggest that a listing of all the SEAPRAP awardees with the title of their research and complete address be circulated among them. They believe that this information could initiate some communications between people having common or related research interests. This would really be one good channel for better dissemination. I found that in larger cities such as Kuala Lumpur, Bangkok and Manila awardees did not even know of each other within the city and in one case (Mahidol University) within the university (in this case, I was able to be helped by getting them acquainted with each other).

At the local level, in Bangkok, Kuala Lumpur, Manila, Cagayan de Oro, Jember and Ujung Pandang, individual awardees have organized seminars or meetings where they shared their findings and conclusions with their university colleagues. In Kuala Lumpur, Bangkok, Jakarta and Surabaya, several awardees have also met with representatives of family planning organizations, an experience which proved satisfactory for both sides.

Footnote (1) : When a social scientist writes about his own people everyone expects to understand the results. But this often is not so as social scientists are trained to speak to one another in a language peculiar to their social science discipline. If they have an obligation to share their findings with the academic community, they also have an obligation to the public, and more so when they deal with problems and findings which bear on public policies or programs. But they should do so in a language that reports these findings both accurately and intelligibly.

Many awardees have also expressed the desire for meetings with each other. I have strongly suggested to them that such initiative is strongly encouraged and is also left entirely to them as the Program has no resources for the purpose.

The implementation of this objective has suffered in limited publications. Basically the problem has been one of logistics and finances. Much time is needed for the translation phase (for the Indonesian reports), consultations by mail with the writers, the editing of the manuscripts and financing is needed for the mimeographing and mailing of the copies.

Since long reports are expensive to publish and circulate in the region, it might be wise for the Committee and Coordinator to consider shorter versions or article length papers going to specialists and research institutions and short abstracts going to administrators and policy makers.

For better information and dissemination in the region, the Program could also consider making use, through the Coordinator, of national and regional publication (newspapers articles a la Depth News or articles in Asia Week, Far Eastern Economic Review) popularizing (without betraying) the findings and conclusions of recent reports. These could in turn be translated in Indonesia (for Tempo or other news magazines) or Thai. In fact, the latter should be done locally by the awardee himself.

In conclusion, the rating on the implementation of this objective would have to be low. There are problems which the Program Committee members are aware of and are working on. Since this objective is not as high in priority as the others, a more modest and manageable approach to dissemination should be looked into.

1.4. To summarize what has been said in this section, the Program's objectives have been realistic and well implemented. There is naturally room for improvements or changes (minor) especially in the dissemination of the reports (possibly in shorter form) and of information. The Program's focus on population still bears a closer look so as to clarify certain issues. Fortunately, this is in the

Committee's hands and should be soon settled. Even before looking at the Program's mechanisms and on the basis of my evaluation of the objectives as implemented, I should like to state that SEAPRAP ranks very high in the regional social science scene as a worthwhile and unique Program.

2. SEAPRAP MECHANISMS

Under this category several aspects of the Program are examined:

2.1. Administration
2.2. The Program Committee
2.3. The Project Coordinator
2.4. The Adviser-Advisee Relationship
2.5. and The Applicant's and Awardees' use their national language.

A special section on assumptions and possibilities is not included here as most of the opinions called are entered in appropriate sub-sections throughout the report and briefly in section 3.

2.1. Administration

From my past experiences in the last 15 years with new organizations and programs (mostly Philippine and a few Southeast Asian in character) what makes a few tick and a good many flounder out is in the quality or its absence of a certain type of leadership obtaining in the governing committee which combines expertise, efficiency, ability to work with one another and to inspire others. All these aspects of leadership further generate a high degree of credibility necessary to have and relate to a clientiele. But they, in turn, would be fruitless if the work is not faithfully and innovatively carried out by an executive officer. This in a nutshell makes for a successful program and in outlining it I have described what basically (although not wholly as the awardees and their advisers also play a great role) makes SEAPRAP a success. This is also the opinion of all the interviewees who are close to the Program. I am almost tempted to let it go at that and stop here. However, as in anything human there is always room for improvement. The remarks that follow will then dwell more selectively on suggestions for the betterment of the present program rather than go unnecessarily into every detail.

Before moving on, a word should be said about the budget of the administration of SEAPRAP. There is a concern among a few people who belong to the circle of donor agencies that the overhead in this Program as in similar programs elsewhere tend to be very high. On one hand, it is admitted that any program worth its salt has to be administer properly and that means paying the price for it. On the other hand, it remains that administrators have to watch out for an overhead that might be construed to perpetuate a given bureaucracy for its own sake at the expense of the Program itself and of its actual and potential clientiele in the field. Fortunately, this is not the case for SEAPRAP, as the Committee and the agencies are sensitive to the problem. In its September meeting, the Committee might consider discussing possible alternatives to the present administration scheme and its overhead in order to cut down on administrative expenses and see more money go to awards.

The location of SEAPRAP at IDRC, Singapore, goes back to the Program's inception in 1974 when no local nor regional institution proved ready to take on its administration. Because of this location and IDRC's financial backing along with Ford's the Program has been identified with IDRC. The effect has been that IDRC's prestige in the region was attached to SEAPRAP, or at least it is perceived as such by most. As SEAPRAP developed its own image "as a good and successful Program" it in turn helped increase IDRC's stock in the region. SEAPRAP's stature and credibility are not only due to its location at IDRC but also to the efficient and satisfactory manner the Program has been administered. This is an important factor which would have to be seriously considered in the event other plans for SEAPRAP's location are studied.

But the other side of the coin is rather unfortunate. The Advisers close to the Program excepted, hardly anyone in the region is aware that the Program is governed by a Program Committee made up of Southeast Asian social scientists and administered by a Southeast Asian Officer. The prospectus that publicizes the Program is responsible for this as the Committee's mention is only in connection with the selection of the awardees. To correct this more emphasis should be given to the Southeast Asian character of the Program and its Committee (acknowledging in passing the financial support of IDRC and the Ford Foundation).

2.2. The Program Committee

The Committee is composed of five Southeast Asian social scientists chosen on the basis of their expertise in Southeast Asia social science and population research. Each member also represents one of the five ASEAN countries. They were originally appointed for a two-year term but at the request of the donor agencies this was extended until the end of the present Program.

For the past three years the Committee has functioned extremely well. Each member as expected is different in personality, culture, academic background and ideas, yet throughout the years they have successfully managed these differences to form a spirited team working very smoothly together. Listening to a random sampling of taped meetings, I was greatly impressed by their deliberations, hard work (they come to the meetings very well prepared), and judicious decisions. Rather than to put decisions through a vote, they usually arrive at them through consensus, a very Southeast Asian approach to decision-making. Of note also in this context is the able and balanced leadership of the Program Committee's Chairman, Professor Kernial Sandhu.

Since the beginning the Committee has been involved in formulating the program policies, but it also has kept tab on the program's progress. This has enabled them to refine certain criteria and worked on the problem of the SEAPRAP's population focus reflecting in this difficulties of today's population experts (see 1.2.1.). Over the six rounds this difficulty questions has taken much of their attention and is hopefully about to be resolved in the coming September meeting. The other difficulty, that of the award priority to applicants from provincial institutions over degree seeking ones was satisfactorily resolved in the last round of awards. In this case, the decision favored the provincial researchers from outside metropolitan areas over the urban ones, with the degree seeking researchers from abroad being last in priority. If this has been a somewhat slow process, one should remember that the Program's concern to seek inexperienced but promising researchers is unique and one for which there is no precedent to fall back on.

Much of the Committee members' work has been spent on the screening, selecting and judging applications. Despite their heavy load of work and responsibilities, they have come to the selection meetings well prepared after each had given their own rating for each of the proposals submitted for a specific round of awards. The selection meetings themselves are characterized by serious interaction, at a very high professional level, with its share of agreements and disagreements, and above parochial interests. In brief, I find the meetings a model of "team work" too rarely seen among professionals of such a caliber.

Beside these activities, the members also help the Coordinator in providing contacts and facilitating his movements when visiting each country. They also contact advisers and consultants whenever needed and some of them even take on the role of advisers when requested in special cases following the Committee's approval. One of the minor functions of the Committee members is to provide publicity for the Program in their respective country. This is done usually through press release in the specific national or official language. To do more than this would be difficult as their workload is very heavy.

The Program Committee has done an excellent job in the past three and a half years and everything indicates that they will continue to do so.

2.3. The Project Coordinator and His Staff

The Project Coordinator, Dr. Pedro V. Flores, was appointed to be the executive officer of the Program in 1974. He is assisted in this by an assistant and a secretary. As an administrator, he has performed excellently. He has worked very well with the Program Committee translating their policies, desiderata and suggestions in an intelligent and innovative manner. His suggestions and ideas have also been well received by the Committee, an indication of the high level of confidence achieved through more than three years of interaction. Although an education specialist (with a sociological background), he has developed through this program an expertise of his own in the field of population studies in the region. This also

helps in his relations with advisers and resource persons throughout the five ASEAN countries. All of them recognize the high quality of the work performed by the Project Coordinator as SEAPRAP's executive officer and his keen understanding of population problems as well as the specific situational difficulties of the local institutions.

The awardees themselves are very happy with the way the Program has been administered. Letters are answered very promptly. If Dr. Flores is absent, his Program Assistant, Ms. Julie Hui, answers the mail very promptly and competently. In this, incidentally, she has developed a very keen sense in assessing the administrative problems presented by the awardees and in suggesting intelligent solution. Both have also handled the grant's disbursements in a very expeditious way to the full satisfaction of the awardees. In the future, more reliance in administrative matters will be placed in Ms. Julie Hui so as to allow more time for Dr. Flores to handle more professional matters.

In the first two years of the Program, Dr. Flores has visited all relevant (to population and social science research) institutions of the region for purposes of encouraging applications and publicizing the Program. He has done this once a year in most cases, in other cases twice a year depending on the business at hand. This has enabled him to also assess each institution's potential for population and social science research. After the first awards were made he has kept tab on the awardees' need of help, particularly in Indonesia, have found these visits not only encouraging but also very helpful in solving some of their problems.

In the third year of the Program, the number of visits has decreased. This is due to the Coordinator's added duties at IDRC which have increased his work load considerably. Fortunately, the Program has on the whole not suffered. This has allowed him to rearrange his schedule accordingly and to obtain the continued help of a competent assistant. But I suggest that the visits to awardees and relevant institutions be continued on a once a year basis. This is very important to the awardees and this fits very well with the first objective of the Program whose target is the "young", inexperienced researcher who needs more support than other more senior specialists. This is particularly true of the awardees in

provincial institutions without a readily available adviser. The Coordinator should continue to look very closely into the adviser-advisee interaction for better results. In this context he could pay less attention to the awardees who have a strong professional well acquainted with SEAPRAP, the publicizing aspect of his work can be done routinely from the office. Nevertheless, he should remain on the look out for new advisers through his network of resource persons. Traveling throughout the region (as I have experiencedin six short weeks) is a very often exhausting (though satisfying it can be professionally) venture which is not always appreciated. But Dr. Flores has done it well.

The Project Coordinator reads carefully each application and prepares short comments which in turn are sent to the Committee members for their own rating and evaluation. In cases where the proposals need improvements and if there is enough time, he corresponds with the applicants suggesting a re-write of the proposal. This takes time and it is a responsibility which demands professional attention which he cannot delegate. Then when the selection meeting is held he participates in the screening of the applications without decision power. So far he has performed very well in all the aspects of this work.

Reports on the progress of the Program have been sent regularly to IDRC and to the Committee members. As for the dissemination of the awardees research reports, as mentioned earlier (1.3.), there is a problem of logistics which the Committee should discuss.

On the basis of this, a very high mark should go to the performance of the Project Coordinator and his staff.

2.4. Adviser-Advisee Relationship

An innovative feature of this Program is the recruitment on an ad-hoc basis of an adviser for an awardee from a provincial or regional institution. Often the award is made conditionally on this basis. The adviser is a professional researcher selected among the network by the Program throughout the past three years. He is a person chosen for his competence, reliability, availability and accessibility to the awardee. The relationship is purely on

a voluntary and "as-the-need-arises" basis. Whatever expenses occur (transportation and travel perdiems) are underwritten under the specific project.

The relationship varies on a case to case pattern. Because of this it would be too lengthy to review each case. At this stage it is sufficient to note as was done elsewhere, the general satisfaction of the awardees on their part of the deal.

The advisers themselves generally also express satisfaction with their involvement in the projects. In Indonesia, advisers from Gadjah Mada and Syiah Kuala Universities would like a closer interaction with their advisees with themselves more time in background literature at the center library. They would invite more consultation in the later stages of the projects as they feel that their advisees tend to rush through the analysis and report writing stages in order "to get it over with" their projects. This relationship has worked well in the early phases of the concerned projects. How to improve the continued relationship in the later phases has elicited some suggestions. One is to work out a time-table of consultations with the provision that the awardee does not proceed beyond one phase without prior consultation with his adviser's permission; this would be formalized in a document approved by the Project Coordinator. Another suggestion is to have a meeting at the national/provincial level with the advisers, the Coordinator and the national Committee member to discuss how to improve this type of relationship. The latter suggestion should be favorably considered by the Committee.

This feature of the Program should be maintained at all costs and further improved.

2.5. Language

Another unique feature of this Program is that it gives the applicants the option of submitting their proposals and the awardees their reports either in English or in their own national language. This is particularly relevant to Indonesia and Thailand where English is not used as a language of instruction or as an official medium of communication. A large number of applicants and awardees from Indonesia take advantage of this to write their proposals and reports

in Indonesian. The Thais on the whole have been shy to use Thai in this regard.

The Indonesian awardees interviewed expressed their satisfaction at being able to do so. They all were well aware of this language provision. To most of the Thais, the information seemed to be a surprise as they admitted not to have paid attention to the notice on the prospectus and in the application forms. And those who did preferred to use English as they thought (wrongly) that a proposal in Thai would not be considered favorably by the Committee. It is very possible, though I have no evidence of it, that those who claimed not to be aware of this language provision had the latter in mind too and might have been embarrassed to admit it. To all of them it was a relief that the used of a specific language without prejudice to them did not matter at all.

These applications submitted thus are in turn translated into English for the benefit of the Coordinator and the Program Committee. This is where some complaints are registered. Several people have noted that in some cases the translation into English has not been faithful particularly in the rendering of certain concepts and ideas.

Most of the translation work has been left to language specialists who have had hardly any serious acquaintance with social science concepts. So their rendition of certain terms is loose. To remedy this situation, the interviewees concur in strongly suggesting that the translation be rechecked by a population specialist or a good social scientist fluent in both languages.

All are agreed further that the reports or publications based on them be circulated in the country of origin in the national language which would make them more available especially to officials of local population and welfare agencies in terms understood by them (as was mentioned earlier).

There is also a consensus among most Indonesians that as their work is done in their national language, this SEAPRAP policy encourages the further development of research in their own country. The Program in recognizing Bahasa Indonesia in proposals and reports has increased its prestige locally.

2.6. To summarize

Assessing SEAPRAP's mechanisms to implement the Program's objectives, I am happy to report that they have indeed worked very well. There is a fine and dynamic working relationship between the Committee members and the Project Coordinator. Their ability, in turn, to develop an informal network of advisers and resource persons, elicit applications from and grant awards to promising young researchers in the field of population and their monitoring of the latter has made this Program a very successful one. In doing this SEAPRAP has gone a long way toward the growth of social science research in the five ASEAN countries.

3. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

The conclusions offered here (3.1.) underline several of the points made previously and are concerned with the conduct of the current Program (under which the last round of awards will be made in May 1978). The suggestions that follow (3.2.) brings together the interviewees' desiderata concerning the future of SEAPRAP in the event its life is prolonged or extended.

3.1. Conclusions

As it stands now, SEAPRAP still has two more rounds of awards to go until May 1978. This means that after the last awards will be made and granting that the Program runs its normal course, the administration of these last awards and the winding up phase will eventually bring SEAPRAP's life to an end by December 1979. This interim evaluation as of this June 1977 then stands at a little more than half-way of the Program's administrative life and at a time when 75 per cent of the awards have been made (6 out of 8 rounds of awards). On the basis of this evaluation which looked into all the aspects of the Program, it is gratifying to report that it is a well-charted venture from the beginning with good built-in mechanisms to keep it straight on course as its objectives have been well laid out, always referred to in the meetings and dynamically implemented. A strong Program Committee is firmly in

charge and their directions are faithfully and imaginatively followed and developed by the Project Coordinator. Everything remaining as is, the donor agencies reach its destination with flying colors.

The Program's strengths lie in its ability to reach and help develop young researchers, strengthen research capabilities in population studies throughout the five ASEAN countries, and, through its informal network of advisers, lay down the foundations for better regional cooperation among social scientists which could possibly emerge later in a more institutionalized manner. Behind these are two important mechanisms: a cohesive Program Committee and an effective Project Coordinator. The problems that have developed have been satisfactorily met or solved. The Committee is still working on a more workable delineation of the population focus.

A better form for report dissemination, possibly in article or abstract form, and a listing of research information among SEAPRAP awardees could still be worked out as ways to implement more adequately the third (and secondary) objective of the Program. But these needed improvements do not in any way detract from the quality already reached.

In a nutshell, SEAPRAP is a very good Program that justifies fully the trust put by the donor agencies in it.

This being said, the observer of the social science research training scene in this region cannot but raise the question of follow-up to such a program, a question which is not within the present program's scope, yet one which is vital to the achievement of the first objective. This deals with the mechanisms needed to sustain the initial momentum given by SEAPRAP. A modest number of young population researchers particularly in the provincial institutions have been given the chance of gaining a certain degree of research expertise. But who is going to assist them in further developing quality work and moving up to a higher degree of research sophistication? For those located in small places where the logistics for such growth are absent there is the problem of professional

isolation and insulation which eventually could lead to intellectual stagnation or mediocrity. The problem is real and in the following suggestions some solution to the follow-up problem might lead toward an adequate solution.

3.2. Suggestions for SEAPRAP's future

Since several suggestions are made in the body of the report this section will limit itself to those concerning the future of SEAPRAP beyond the final phase of 1978-1979. The question of a future for SEAPRAP after this Program runs its appointed course stems from the need for a follow-up to what has been accomplished in the present program and from the unanimous clamor coming from the field.

In this regards several suggestions -- some not applicable -- were made since there is some overlapping and for economy (time and space), I took the liberty of lumping them without credit. They are the results of field interviews. Whenever appropriate, I offer my own remarks.

The first part of this sub-section deals with suggestions for a follow-up Program (3.2.1.), the second with the Program's possible location (3.2.2.) and finally with some concluding remarks (3.2.3.).

3.2.1. In order to maximize the present Program's achievements it is suggested that a follow-up two-phase Program run concomitantly for four more years. In this, one yearly round of awards (instead of two before) would continue the present type of awards from December 1978 to December 1981 while the other round of awards from May 1979 to May 1982 would be reserved for another type of awards this time to former awardees. In the latter, former awardees from provincial institutions would compete for awards involving a higher degree of research sophistication, thus giving them a chance to grow professionally.

Another variant of this suggested program differs in the matter of years with two more years only for the extension of the present Program while they would keep

the new phase of the program to former awardees for four years. Others, as mentioned much earlier, (second half of 1.2.1) would want to see either phase or both with a combined "Population and Development" focus.

To my mind the first plan looks better but it does not entirely solve the follow-up problem as there will always be a need for more professionalism and better intellectual support in the field of research. Better linkages should be established and the advisers' or resource persons' roles should be strengthened and possibly institutionalized. Since there are attempts at this in Jakarta, Yogyakarta and there are possibilities for this in other areas, I strongly suggest that a donor agency be approached to consider a grant for a meeting of key SEAPRAP advisers with the Program Committee members to study the matter and develop a viable plan for a realistic follow-up Program. Beside considering this along with the above suggestions on the "two-phase" program, they could also study the possibility of organizing themselves into a more formal population research advisers network.

3.2.2. Only three out of 28 resource persons interviewed have suggested that the administration of SEAPRAP be located at a local social science research institution in one of the five ASEAN countries. Their rationale stems from their desire to see a Southeast Asian Program based in a Southeast Asian center rather than at IDRC which they consider "alien". It should be added that they have no quarrel with IDRC's efficiency in the handling of the Program. It is also true that their objection against the location at IDRC weakened considerably when they learned that the Program is governed by a Southeast Asian Program Committee which decide solely on the Program and that the present location is just a matter of convenience without any control from IDRC on the running of the Program itself.

Queried on this suggestion, the majority of the interviewees reacted in a very luke-warm fashion. Some pointed out that, outside of the Institute of Southeast

Asian Studies (ISEAS) there is no social science research institution with a truly "Southeast Asian outlook". Others said that no other institution has the administrative capability and the wide range of contacts needed to run such a Program. A few also mentioned that although ISEAS could possibly be the only regional institution capable of administering the Program, in the minds of many it is too dependent on the Singaporean Government and the University of Singapore to have the necessary credibility for such an undertaking. Again this objection weakened the objectors against ISEAS were told that there is a large difference between location of and governing a Program.

These comments have to be mentioned as they are indicative (on the part of some vocal scholars) of a difficulty in freeing themselves of the sequels of colonialism. Professor Sandhu put it well when he commented that the greatest obstacles to overcome with regards to trusting local institutions are the lack of confidence social scientists have in their own institution and the suspicion of favoritism (that administrators ill favor their own countrymates or close friends). These are unfortunately facts of life which should not be overlooked. As mentioned earlier (2.1.) if ever the location problem is seriously considered, care should be taken to insure the Program's continuing credibility and efficiency. If the Program ends by 1979, there is no need to even examine this problem. If an extension is considered, then I would leave it to the Program Committee to discuss all possible alternatives with the concerned donor agencies. In this event, I should add that personally I would favor a Southeast Asian move provided the two conditions of credibility and efficiency are met by the best Southeast Asian institution considered. This in itself would really tap the local manpower resources available in the region and educate the doubting Thomases around. One should also remember that whatever decision is made will always be met by criticisms one way or the other. Admittedly, there is much to chew here.

3.2.3. Concluding Remarks

The interim evaluation of SEAPRAP I am now concluding has been a richly educative experience. It is also a happy one as the Program is really a success story. Everywhere I went to, the reception was warm and very positive. But it is also was a very tiring one with some 120 interviews in five countries over a six-week period. For the future, I would suggest that the final evaluation be less extensive or more in depth with a smaller selective sampling of key interviewees.

I would like to thank the SEAPRAP Project Coordinator and his staff and the Program Committee members for so graciously helping me do my evaluation work freely, move about efficiently and avail myself of their expertise, and for being patient with me. More power to SEAPRAP!

****

GERARD RIXHON
The Ford Foundation
Makati, Rizal
PHILIPPINES

GR:jt

APPENDIX (A)

The following people were interviewed in connection with the SEAPRAP evaluation:

I. Awardees (37)

Singapore:
1. Mrs. Stella Quah
2. Mrs. Pavala Gopinathan

Malaysia:
3. Dr. Fong Chan Onn (twice an awardee)
4. Miss Sarojini Singham
5. Miss Yew Yeok Kim
6. Mr. Tan Keng Sooi
7. Miss Ooi Giok Ling
8. Mr. Jomo Sundaram
9. Dr. Fong Kwok Yuen

(Miss Young Mei Ling was abroad for PhD Studies)

Thailand:
10. Mr. Kanoksak Kewthep
11. Mr. Charoon Vitiprod
12. Dr. Penporn Tirasawat
13. Mr. Thiravet Pramuanratkarn
14. Dr. Prapapen Suwan
15. Dr. Suwanlee Piampiti
16. Mr. Peerasit Kamnuansilpa
17. Mr. Apichat Chamratrithirong
18. Mr. Promboon Panitchpakdi
19. Mr. Sanit Wongprasert
20. Mr. Chamnong Boonchoo

Philippines:
21. Mr. Eliseo de Guzman
22. Mrs. Sherry Jane Marbella
23. Mrs. Brigida Jayme
24. Mrs. Alma Junsay
25. Miss Lori Taclob
26. Mrs. Magdalena Cabaraban
27. Mr. Jimmy Balacuit
28. Miss Antonieta Zablan

(Mr. Abduljim Hassan was away in the field;
Miss Nilda Castro abroad in Rome)

Indonesia:

29. Drs. Mas'ud Hiliry
30. Mr. Adnan Abdullah
31. Drs. Firman Pelawi
32. Drs. Sunarto Hs.
33. Mr. Soeharsono Soemantri
34. Drs. Soebandi
35. Drs. Murdiyanto Purbangkoro
36. Drs. Hasan Mangunrai
37. Miss Bernadette Setiadi

(Drs. Agus Salim was abroad for PhD Studies; Mohammad Sumbudi could not be located on the day I was to see him).

II. Committee Members (5)

38. Dr. Kernial Sandhu
39. Prof. Yip Yat Hoong
40. Prof. Amphon Namatra
41. Dr. Rodolfo Bulatao
42. Dr. Nathanael Iskandar

III. IDRC/Ford Foundation officials (8)

43. Dr. Jingjai Hanchanlash
44. Dr. Pedro V. Flores
45. Dr. Jacques Amyot
46. Miss Julie Hui
47. Dr. Ozzie Simmons (FF Manila)
48. Mr. Brent Ashabranner (FF Jakarta)
49. Dr. Peter Weldon (FF Jakarta; also an adviser)
50. Dr. David Pfanner (FF Bangkok)

IV. SEAPRAP Advisers (19)

51. Dr. Peter Chen (U. of Singapore)
52. Dr. Aline Wong (" " ")
53. Dr. Terry Rambo (U of Malaya)
54. Dr. Mercedes Concepcion (UPPI, Manila)
55. Dr. Mary Hollnsteiner (IPC, Quezon City)
56. Dr. Francis Madigan (RIMCU, Cagayan de Oro)
57. Dr. Alejandro Herrin (RIMCU, Cagayan de Oro)
58. Dr. Wilhelm Flieger (USC, Cebu City)

IV. SEAPRAP Advisers (cont'd)

59. Dr. John McKinnon (TRC, Chiangmai)
60. Mr. Prasert Bhandhachat (U of Chiangmai)
61. Dr. Visid Prachuabmoh (Chulalongkorn U, Bangkok)
62. Dr. Suchart Prasithrasint (Mahidol U, Bangkok)
63. Dr. Boonlert Leoprapai (Mahidol U, Bangkok)
64. Dr. Somsak Varakmin (Ministry of Public Health, Bangkok)
65. Dr. Lance Castles (U Syiah Kuala, Banda Aceh)
66. Dr. Valerie Hull (U Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta)
67. Dr. Terence Hull (" " " ")
68. Dr. Masri Singarimbun (" " " ")
69. Dr. Peter Goethals (U. Hasanuddin, U.P.)

V. Resource Persons (and other referees) (28)

70. Dr. Niew Shang Tong (Dept of Geography, Nanyang U, Singapore)
71. Dr. James Fawcett (Population Council, Singapore)
72. Prof. Mokhzani Abdul Rahim (Dep. Vice-Chancellor, U of Malaya, K.L.)
73. Dr. Cheong Kee Cheok (Dean, FEA, U of Malaya)
74. Dr. Peter Pirie (Visiting Prof. U of Malaya)
75. Mr. Tan Boon Ann (National FP Board, KL)
76. Dr. Hairi Abdullah (Dean, Fac. of Social Sciences, UKM, KL)
77. Dr. Ansori Nawawi (Dean, Sch. of Comp. Social Sciences, USM, Penang)
78. Mr. Michael Cooke (Visiting Lecturer, USM)
79. Prof. Patya Saihoo (CUSSRI, Chulalongkorn U)
80. Mr. Wanat Bhruksasri (Director, TRC Chiangmai)
81. Prof. Kasem Burakasikorn (Sociology & Anthropology, Chiangmai U)
82. Dean Phoon Phon Asanachinta (Fac. of Social Sciences Chiangmai U)
83. Dr. Rosario Alberto (Pop Ed, Dept of Education, Manila)
84. Dr. Lourdes Quisumbing (Dean, Graduate School, De La Salle U, Manila)
85. Dr. Peter Gowing (Darussalam Res. Center, Marawi City, Indonesia)
86. Dr. de Fiero, Jr. (RIMCU, Cagayan de Oro)

V. Resources Persons (cont'd)

87. Mrs. Aurora S. Go. (Director, PDD, Pop. Center Foundation, Makati)

88. Prof. A.T. Barus (U. Sumatera Utara, Medan)

89. Rector Dr. Ibrahim Hassan (U Syiah Kuala, B. Aceh)

90. Drs. Ibrahim Alfian (Div. Research Station, B.Aceh)

91. Dr. Pardoko (Director, Center for Research and Development of Health Sciences)

92. Drs. Mohammad Salleh (U. of Brawijaya, Malang)

93. Drs. Hasan Walinono (Dean, Fac. of Social Sciences U. Hassanuddin, Ujung Pandang; followed by a long meeting with his staff)

94. Dr. Sudirgo Wibowo (Fak. Psychologi, U.I. Jakarta)

95. Dr. Sidney Goldstein (Pop Studies, Brown U. R.I., U.S.A.; on a visit to Jakarta, also an adviser)

96. Dr. Mely Tan (LEKNAS, LIPI, Jakarta)

97. Dr. Mitsuo Nakamura (Social Research Station, Jakarta)

VI. Other Contacts with interest in SEAPRAP (25)

98. Dr. Sombat Changkorworn (Thammasat U and Executive Secretary, Social Science Assn. of Thailand)

99. Dr. Ricardo Abad (Program Director, IPC, Ateneode Manila Unversity, Quezon City)

100. Mrs. Exaltacion Ramos (Chairman, Dept. of Behavioral Sciences, De La Salle University, Manila)

101. Dr. Gabriel Alvarez (Dept of Business Administration, College of Arts and Sciences, U.P. Diliman has a PhD in Demography from U of Chicago, 1975)

102. Mr. Alfredo Salanga (Davao Information Center and Ateneo de Davao, Davao City)

103. Mr. Carl Gaspar (MSPS, Davao City)

104. Dr. Mohamad Salleh Hood (Faculty of Social Sciences, U. Kebangsaan M, K.L.; Anthropology)

105. Prof. Sartono Kartodidjo (Center for Rural and Regional Studies, Gadjah Mada U, Yogyakarta)

106. Dean Miendrowo Prawirodjoemo (Fakultas Ekonomi, U. Airlangga, Surabaya)

107. Drs. Suroso Zadjuli (Dept of Demography, Fak. Eko. U. Airlangga, Surabaya)

108. Dr. Rahmad Santoso (Dean, Fac. of Medicine)

109. Dr. Soemotro Danusugondo (Research & Community Health Services), (U. Airlangga, Surabaya)

110. Drs. Sunarto (BPP, IKIP-Surabaya, Kampus IKIP-Ketintang, Surabaya)

111. Drs. Subardhy(" " " " ")

VI. Other Contacts with interest in SEAPRAP (cont'd)

112. Drs. M. Umar Burhan (Economic Research Inst. U. Brawijaya, Malang; will leave soon for a PhD at Michigan State U.)

113. Dr. Raka Joni (Director, Evaluasi, IKIP-Malang, Malang, U.S. PhD in Educational Psychology)

114. Dr. Basri Hasanuddin (Program Director of Curriculum Development, U. Hasannuddin, PhD in Economics, U. of the Philippines, 1977)

115. Prof. Dr. D. Dwidjoseputro (Director, Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan, IKIP-Malang)

116. Dr. Pudjo Rahardjo (BKKBN, Jakarta; PhD in Economics and Social Development, U. of Pittsburgh, 1977)

117. Dr. Loreta Maksaiar-Sicat (Executive-Director, Phil. Social Science Council, Quezon City)

118. Prof.Tunku Shamsul Bahrim (Dean, Fac. of Social Sciences, U of Malaya, K.L.)

119. Mrs. Mazidah Zakaria (Acting Head, Dept of Anthropology and Sociology, U Of Malaya)

120. Dr. David Gibbons (Center for Policy Research, USM, Penang; in lieu of Dr. K.J. Ratnam, abroad)

121. Dr. Andrew Gonalez (Academic Vice-President, De La Salle U., Manila)

122. Mrs. Patricia Afable-Thomas (Anthropologist, USM)

VII. Courtesy and Good-Will Visits (Very little business accomplished)

123. Rector of Universitas Negeri Jember, Jember.

124. Rector Amiruddin, U. of Hassannuddin, Ujung Pandang (luncheon with his staff on the new campus).

125. Staff of Bureau of International Relations, LIPI (Ms. Sjamsiah Achmad was abroad and Dr. Didin was at a meeting).

126. Luncheon with Dr. Selo Soemardjan, Dr. Tawfik Abdullah, Dr. Koentjaraningrat, Dr. Mely Tan and others at LEKNAS/LIPI

127. Dr. Kasem, Rector-designate, Chulalongkorn U, Bangkok.

(the bracket indicates that the interviewees were seen together.)

STATUS OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

AWARDEES (Age)	RESEARCH TITLE	TOTAL AMOUNT US$	DATES		REMITTANCES			REPORTS			REMARKS
			START	TERMINATE	1	2	3	1	2	3	
ROUND 1											
Aske Theo Komalig (35), University of Sam Ratulangie Manado, Indonesia	Fertility, Attitude toward Family Planning and its Relation to Socio-Economic Factors in North Sulawesi	3711	1.3.1975	31.7.1975	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Gavin Jones
Luechai Chulasai (28) Faculty of Social Sciences, Chiangmai University, Chiangmai Thailand	The Roles of Husbands and Fathers in Family Planning in Rural Chiengmai	2750	15.1.1975	14.10.1975	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED
Murdiyanto Purbangkoro (31), Faculty of Economics University of Jember Jember, Indonesia	Evaluation of Family Planning Program in East Java	4372	15.3.1975	14.11.1975	*	*	*	*	*	*	COMPLETED Advisers: Jerry Sullivan and Peter McDonald
Fong Kwok Yuen (23) Population Studies Economic Planning Unit, Kuala Lumpur Malaysia	A Micro-Model of Demographic Economic Behavior	4150	15.5.1975	14.12.1975	*			*			COMPLETED
Antonieta Zablan (23) University of San Carlos, Cebu Philippines	Causes and Effects of Rural-Urban Migration: A Study of Cebu City Inmigrants	1708	2.1.1975	31.12.1975	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Wilhelm Flieger
Agus Salim (37) Lembaga Demografi Syiah Kuala University Banda Aceh Indonesia	Fertility and KAP Family Planning in Three Village Types in Aceh Utara	3603	15.3.1975	14.1.1976	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Peter McDonald

STATUS OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

AWARDEES (Age)	RESEARCH TITLE	TOTAL AMOUNT US$	DATES		REMITTANCES			REPORTS			REMARKS
			START	TERMINATE	1	2	3	1	2	3	
Pavala Gopinathan Singapore (25) (MA student with U. of Hong Kong)	Intervention Intensity and Family Planning	3914	1.2.1975	31.1.1976	*	*		*			
Brigida Jayme (26) Population Center Foundation, Manila Philippines	Family Role and Fertility Patterns of Two Generations of Urban Upper Class Filipina Wives and Mothers	3759	1.4.1975	31.3.1976	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Mary Hollnsteiner
S. Trisnamansyah(34) Institute of Teachers Training & Educational Sciences Bandung, Indonesia	The Effects of Socio-Cultural and Socio-Economic Factors on Fertility and Family Planning in the Rural District of W. Java	6314	1.4.1975	31.3.1976	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Peter Weldon
Eliseo de Guzman(33) Population Institute University of the Philippines, Manila Philippines	An Analysis of Social Mobility and Fertility in the Philippines	2786	1.2.1975	31.1.1976	*			*			
Nilda Castro (26) Center for Urban Studies, De La Salle University, Manila Philippines	Marital Social Mobility in the Philippines	4330	1.2.1975	31.1.1976	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: M. Concepcion
Penporn Tirasawat(28) Institute of Population Studies Chulalongkorn U. Bangkok, Thailand	Urbanization and Migrant Adjustment in Thailand	3344	1.2.1975	31.1.1976	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Advisers: Visid Prachuabmoh & Goldstein

STATUS OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

AWARDEES (Age)	RESEARCH TITLE	TOTAL AMOUNT US$	DATES		REMITTANCES			REPORTS			REMARKS
			START	TERMINATE	1	2	3	1	2	3	
Round 2											
Sarojini Singham(27) Dept of OBS/GYN University of Malaya Kuala Lumpur Malaysia	Psychosociological Aspects of Patients Requesting Menstrual Regulations in Kuala Lumpur	3969	16.6.1975	15.6.1976	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Peter Chen
Kanoksak Kewthep(25) Fac of Social Sciences Mahidol University Bangkok, Thailand	Rapid Population Growth and its Impacts on Rural Poverty and Landlessness	3675	1.7.1975	30.6.1976	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Suchart
Suwanlee Piampiti(31) School of Applied Statistics, NIDA Bangkok, Thailand	Effects of Migration on Urban Development in the Southern Region of Thailand	3730	1.7.1975	30.6.1976	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED
Sanit Wongprasert(35) Tribal Research Centre, Chiangmai Thailand	The Sociocultural and Ecological Determinants of the Lahu Population	2700	1.7.1975	30.6.1976	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: John McKinnon
Alma Junsay (30) Research Officer Banana Export Industry Foundation Davao, Philippines	A KAP Survey: Post-Partum Approach	3128	1.8.1975	31.7.1976	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED
Maswida Tanius (35) Faculty of Law Andalas University Padang, Indonesia	The Matriarchal Society and Family Planning: The Minangkabau Case	4470	15.8.1975	31.7.1976	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Hendra Esmar

STATUS OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

AWARDEES (Age)	RESEARCH TITLE	TOTAL AMOUNT US$	DATES		REMITTANCES			REPORTS			REMARKS
			START	TERMINATE	1	2	3	1	2	3	
Fong Chan Onn (31) Fac of Economics & Administration University of Malaya Kuala Lumpur Malaysia	Attitudes of Local Leaders on Fertility Prevention and their Effects on FP Service in West Malaysia	4959	1.9.1975	31.8.1976	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED
Jimmy Balacuit (30) Dept of Sociology Mindanao State U. Marawi, Philippines	Factors Affecting Maranao Attitudes toward FP	3423	1.10.1975	30.9.1976	*	*		*			
Gawi Salampessy (37) Faculty of Teachers Training, Pattimura University, Ambon Indonesia	Urbanization and Density of Population in Ambon	2964	1.11.1975	30.9.1976	*	*	*	*	*	*	COMPLETED Adviser: Alden Speare
Michel Rumbiak (31) Faculty of Teachers Training, Cendera-wasih, Jayapura Indonesia	Urbanization of the People of Genyem in Jayapura	2067	1.11.1975	31.10.1976	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Alden Speare
Bernadette Setiadi (27 Faculty of Psychology University of Indo-nesia, Jakarta Indonesia	Relationship between Several Sociopsychological Variables and Decision to Use Contraceptives available at FP Clinics	2550	1.1.1976	31.12.1976	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Walter Mertens

STATUS OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

AWARDEES (Age)	RESEARCH TITLE	TOTAL AMOUNT US$	DATES		REMITTANCES			REPORTS			REMARKS
			START	TERMINATE	1	2	3	1	2	3	
Round 3											
Soebandi (33) Faculty of Econs Brawijaya U Malang, Indonesia	A Study of Social and Economic Influence on Family Size in the District	3559	15.2.1976	14.12.1976	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Terence Hull
Chamnong Boonchoo (42) Political Science Dept, Chiangmai U Chiangmai, Thailand	Socio-Economic Status, Life Styles and Fertility Difference in Lampoon, Thailand	3650	1.2.1976	31.1.1977	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED
Orrawin Trocki (31) Home Econs Dept Srinakarinwirot U Bangkok, Thailand	Attitude toward Population Education and FP among Students and Teachers	4900	1.2.1976	31.1.1977	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Kowit
Hasan Mangunrai (34) Fac of Social and Political Science Hasanuddin U. Ujung Pandang Indonesia	Evaluation of the Progress of Transmigration in South Sulawesi.	3880	1.3.1976	31.1.1977	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Valerie Hull
Firman Pelawi (37) Population Institute North Sumatra U Medan, Indonesia	A Study of the Several Factors which Assist and Obstruct the FP Program in North Sumatra	6314	15.4.1976	14.4.1977	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Walter Mertens
Mas'ud Hiliry (31) Fac of Economics Syiah Kuala U Banda Aceh Indonesia	The Role of Social and Psychological Factors on Family Size in Aceh	2735	15.4.1976	14.4.1977	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Lance Castles

STATUS OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

AWARDEES (Age)	RESEARCH TITLE	TOTAL AMOUNT US$	DATES		REMITTANCES			REPORTS			REMARKS
			START	TERMINATE	1	2	3	1	2	3	
ROUND 4											
Haris Mudjiman (33) Faculty of Education IKIP Surakarta Indonesia	Study on the Views of the Urban People of Surakarta with respect to FP Communication Materials	2841	15.7.1976	31.12.1976	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Masri Singarimbun
Sherry Marbella (27) Ateneo de Manila U Manila, Philippines	Filipino Women's Entrepreneurship in Small-Scale Manufacturing Industries	1785	1.7.1976	31.3.1977	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED Adviser: Mary Hollnsteiner
Young Mei-Ling (27) Penang, Malaysia (Ph.D. student at ANU)	Internal Migration in Peninsular Malaysia	3613	15.6.1976	14.4.1977	*						
Charoon Vitiprod(28) Dept of Social Sciences, Mahidol U Bangkok, Thailand	Rapid Population Growth, Living Conditions and Fertility Reduction Implications	3345	15.6.1976	14.4.1977	*	*		*			Adviser: Suchart
Rowe Cadelina (32) Research, Extension and Development Div Silliman University Dumaguete City Philippines	Population Characteristics, Production and Land Utilization Practices of Shifting Cultivators in Negros Island, Philippines	4036	1.6.1976	31.5.1977	*	*		*			COMPLETED
Thiravet Pramuan-ratkarn (32) Dept of Socio-Anthro Chulalongkorn U Bangkok, Thailand	Impact of Urbanization on a Peripheral Area of Bangkok, Thailand	3075	1.6.1976	31.5.1977	*	*		*			

STATUS OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

AWARDEES (Age)	RESEARCH TITLE	TOTAL AMOUNT US$	DATES		REMITTANCES			REPORTS			REMARKS
			START	TERMINATE	1	2	3	1	2	3	
Prapapen Suwan (35) Health Education Dept., School of Public Health Bangkok, Thailand	The Study of the Development of Thai Children's Opinions concerning "Family Size Preference"	4261	10.6.1976	9.6.1977	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED
Valaiporn Kangsanant (28) Fac of Management Sciences, Prince of Songkhla U. Haadyai, Thailand	The Role of Migration in the Industrial Manpower Potential of Haadyai, Thailand	3130	15.6.1976	14.6.1977	*	*		*	*		COMPLETED
Promboon Panitchpakdi (24) Family Health Div Min of Public Health Bangkok, Thailand	Evaluation of the Impact of FP Communication Inputs	5300	15.6.1976	14.6.1977	*	*		*			
Yew Yeok-Kim (24) Fac of Economics and Administration U. of Malaya Kuala Lumpur Malaysia	Population Planning in West Malaysia	2875	15.6.1976	14.6.1977	*						
Jomo Sundaram (24) Penang, Malaysia (Ph.D. student at Harvard U)	Peripheral Capitalist Development and Relative Surplus Population: A Theoretical Framework and the Malayan Case	4584	1.7.1976	30.6.1977	*	*		*			

STATUS OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

AWARDEES (Age)	RESEARCH TITLE	TOTAL AMOUNT US$	DATES		REMITTANCES			REPORTS			REMARKS
			START	TERMINATE	1	2	3	1	2	3	
Tan Keng-Sooi (36) Kuala Lumpur Malaysia	The Effects of Population and Ecology in Race Relations: A Study of Three Types of Rural Settlements in W. Malaysia	3454	1.7.1976	30.6.1977	*	*		*			
Magdalena Cabaraban RIMCU, Xavier U. (37) Cagayan de Oro Philippines	A Study of Differentials in IUD Use and its Effect on the Fertility of Women in Rural Barrios of Misas-mis Oriental Province	4097	1.8.1976	31.7.1977	*	*		*			
Ooi Giok-Ling (24) Dept of Geography U. of Malaya Kuala Lumpur Malaysia	Regionalization and Analysis of Socio-Economic Health and Distress in Northwestern Peninsular Malaysia	2917	15.8.1976	14.10.1977	*						
Soeharsono Soemantri (33) Center for Research and Development of Health Services Min of Health Surabaya, Indonesia	Fertility Behavior of the Minority Group (Chinese) in Surabaya Pregnancy History	3535	1.10.1976	30.6.1977	*	*		*			Adviser: Pardoko

STATUS OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

AWARDEES (Age)	RESEARCH TITLE	TOTAL AMOUNT US$	DATES		REMITTANCES			REPORTS			REMARKS
			START	TERMINATE	1	2	3	1	2	3	
Round 5											
Abduljim Hassan (23) College of Arts & Sciences, Mindanao State U, Marawi City Philippines	Characteristics of Back-door Migrants to Sabah, Malaysia from the Philippines: A Case Study of the Two-Island Communities of Tawi-Tawi	2852	15.1.1977	14.9.1977	*						
Apichat Chamratrithirong (28) Institute of Population & Social Research, Mahidol U Bangkok, Thailand	Nuptiality in Thailand: A Cross-Sectional Analysis of the 1970 Census	2500	1.2.1977	30.9.1977	*						
Peerasit Kamnuansilpa (31) Research Center NIDA, Bangkok Thailand	The Socio-Economic and Demographic Analysis of Female Labor Force Participation in Thailand	2500	1.1.1977	31.10.1977	*						
Mohammad Sumhudi (38) Fac of Social Sciences U of Indonesia Jakarta, Indonesia	A Study of the Community Health Center	2801	1.1.1977	31.12.1977	*						Adviser: Drs J.V. Olden
Stella R Quah (30) Dept of Sociology U of Singapore Singapore	Preventive Health Behavior in Singapore: An Analysis of its Causal Factors	6573	15.1.1977	14.1.1978	*						

STATUS OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

AWARDEES (Age)	RESEARCH TITLE	TOTAL AMOUNT US$	DATES		REMITTANCES			REPORTS			REMARKS
			START	TERMINATE	1	2	3	1	2	3	
Sunarto (34) IKIP, Jogjakarta Indonesia	Population Education and Family Planning for the Youth in East Java	3654	1.4.1977	31.1.1978	*						Adviser: Masri Singarimbun
Fong Chan-Onn (32) Fac of Economics and Administration U of Malaya Kuala Lumpur Malaysia	The Socio-Economic Development and Fertility in Peninsular Malaysia	4584	15.1.1977	14.1.1978	*	*		*			
Lori Taclob (23) Davao, Philippines (MA student at Xavier U, Cagayan de Oro City)	Female Labor Force Participation and Fertility Behavior	3584	1.2.1977	31.1.1978	*	*		*			
Adnan Abdullah (34) Fac of Teachers Training, Syiah Kuala U., Banda Aceh Indonesia	Migration, Change in Social, Economic Status and Fertility Rate	3237	1.4.1977	31.3.1978	*						Adviser: Lance Castles
Aspon Rambe (37) Fac of Economics Lambung Mangkurat U Banjarmasin Indonesia	Urbanization of the Alabio People in Banjarmasin: A Study on the Causes and Effects of Urbanization	3260	1.4.1977	31.3.1978	*	*		*			Adviser: Jeanne Sinquefield

STATUS OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

AWARDEES (Age)	RESEARCH TITLE	TOTAL AMOUNT US$	DATES		REMITTANCES			REPORTS			REMARKS
			START	TERMINATE	1	2	3	1	2	3	
Round 6											
Yusmilarso Wiroatmodjo (35) Facultas Sosial-Politik, Diponegoro University, Semarang Indonesia	Psychological and Environmental Factors of FP in the Municipality of Semarang	2492	15.8.1977	14.2.1978							Adviser: Walter Mertens
Syoib Machmud (34) Fac of Economics Sriwidjaya U. Palembang Indonesia	Knowledge, Attitude and Practice of FP of the Community of Chinese Descent in Palembang	2786	15.8.1977	14.2.1978							Adviser: Walter Mertens
Hadi Yunus (31) Faculty of Economics Gadjah Mada U. Jogjakarta Indonesia	Seasonal Migration in Jogjakarta	2904	1.7.1977	30.6.1978	*						Adviser: Masri Singarimbun
Jose Fidel Lim (31) Model City Population Planning Project, Office of the City Mayor, Cagayan de Oro Philippines	The Perceived Role of a FP Motivator-Counselor in the City of Cagayan de Oro	1736	1.7.1977	30.6.1978	*						
Teresa Almonte (34) RIMCU, Xavier U. Cagayan de Oro Philippines	Evaluation of the Reliability of Response to Fertility Surveys	3597	1.7.1977	30.6.1978	*						
Chee Kim-Loy (34) Centre for Policy Research, Universiti Sains Malaysia Penang, Malaysia	Cross-Level Theorizing and Analysis in Fertility Research	2058	1.7.1977	30.6.1978	*						

STATUS OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

AWARDEES (Age)	RESEARCH TITLE	TOTAL AMOUNT US$	DATES		REMITTANCES			REPORTS			REMARKS
			START	TERMINATE	1	2	3	1	2	3	
Sulochana Nair (25) Fac of Economics and Administration U. of Malaya Kuala Lumpur, M'sia	Labour Utilization of Rubber Smallholders in Peninsular Malaysia: A Case Study of Rubber Smallholdings in Ulu Langat	2097	1.7.1977	30.6.1978	*						
Albert Gomes (23) Dept of Socio-Anthro U. of Malaya K.L., Malaysia	Demography and Ecological Adaptation: A Comparative Study of 3 Populations in the Langat River Basin	1188	1.7.1977	30.6.1978	*						
Jamilah Ariffin (30) Fac of Economics and Management U. Kebangsaan Malaya K.L., Malaysia	Rural-Urban Migration and Modernization in Malaysia	4242	15.7.1977	14.7.1978	*						
Praivan Tan (30) Fac of Social Sciences Chiangmai U. Chiangmai, Thailand	A Study of Family Growth and Housing Conditions among Low Income Families	3260	1.8.1977	31.7.1978	*						
Afdol (33) Faculty of Law Airlangga U. Surabaya, Indonesia	Effectiveness of Fixing the Minimum Marriage Age in Bangkalan Regency, Madura	3417	15.8.1977	14.8.1978							Adviser: Walter Mertens
Sidhya Boworнwathana (26) Bangkok, Thailand Ph.D. student at Northern Illinois U)	Policy Implementation of FP Services at the Village Level in Thailand: A Study of the Auxiliary Midwife's Program Performance	3000									