

THE IMPACT OF IDRC FUNDING ON THE THREE  
CANADIAN AREA SPECIFIC LEARNED SOCIETIES

A report submitted in compliance with a contract between the International  
Development Research Centre and Thomas C. Bruneau dated 25 May 1983 (3-A-83-4044).

17 August 1983

**54.**

The Impact of IDRC Funding on the Three Canadian  
Area Specific Learned Societies

The views expressed in this document are those of the consultant. They do not necessarily represent the views of IDRC. Fourteen Appendices are included in the consultant's report to IDRC. Because of the length of the appendices, only two of the appendices are reproduced in this document. The remaining appendices are available on request from the Office of Planning & Evaluation, IDRC.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background.....	1
1. The Societies and their Activities.....	11
2. The Activities of the Societies and their Members in Relationship to IDRC Funding.....	31
3. The Nature and Extent of Linkages with Third World Researchers.....	45
4. Alternative Funding Sources and Implications of IDRC Withdrawal of Support.....	55
5. Recommendations Pertaining to the Three Societies.....	59
6. Possible Areas for Further Linkages and Collaboration.....	64

## Tables and Chart

Table 1 - IDRC Funding for Three Societies, 1974-1982.....	5
Table 2 - Membership of Three Societies, 1979-1983.....	11
Table 3 - Membership in Other Societies.....	13
Table 4 - Membership in Other Societies (in Canada).....	14
Table 5 - Membership in Other Societies (in United States).....	14
Table 6 - Degree of Involvement in Society.....	15
Table 7 - Academic Status of Members of the Three Societies.....	16
Table 8 - Registration Figures, 1979-1983.....	21
Table 9 - Principal Benefits Derived from Membership in Society.....	30
Table 10 - Books Authored by Members of the Three Societies in Comparison in Non-Members.....	33
Table 11 - Books Edited by Members of the Three Societies in Comparison in Non-Members.....	34
Table 12 - Involvement in a Research Project in the Last Three Years by Membership.....	35
Table 13 - Development Orientation of Members of the Three Societies.....	36
Table 14 - Impact of Policy of Previous or Current Work.....	37
Table 15 - Attendance at Seminar or Workshop given by Third World Scholar Organized by Society.....	39
Table 16 - Research Collaboration with Colleague in Third World.....	47
Table 17 - Publication Collaboration with Colleagues in Third World.....	47
Table 18 - The Extent to Which the Society Facilitated the Collaboration in Research and Publishing.....	48
Table 19 - Society Facilitated Collaboration.....	49
Chart 1 - Forms of Linkages and Collaboration Between the Societies and Third World Scholars.....	51

## Appendices

- Appendix I - Interviews in Canada
- Appendix II - Interviews in Africa, Asia, and Latin America
- Appendix III - Questionnaire, Information Fields and Selected Statistics from Canadian Register of Research and Researchers in the Social Sciences of the University of Western Ontario.
- Appendix IV - Consultant's questionnaire, cover letters, and discussion of the sampling
- Appendix V - Program of Aid to Associations of SSHRCC
- Appendix VI - The Bruk Report and CASA Revue
- Appendix VII - Summary of the IDRC's rationale for funding association.
- Appendix VIII - Constitutions of CAAS, CALACS, CASA
- Appendix IX - Document resulting from Professor Liisa North's visit to Latin America in 1978
- Appendix X - FLACSO documents
- Appendix XI - CASA publications list
- Appendix XII - Information on ALADAA
- Appendix XIII - Statement on PISPAL
- Appendix XIV - ILADES documents

THE IMPACT OF IDRC FUNDING ON THE THREE  
CANADIAN AREA SPECIFIC LEARNED SOCIETIES

Background

The Terms of Reference for this evaluation study state very clearly the background for the analysis which is provided in the report. For this reason much of pages 2-4 will be reproduced here.

On March 9, 1973, the Centre convened a meeting with the representatives of three Canadian Area Specific Learned Societies (Canadian Association of African Studies, Canadian Society for Asian Studies, and the Canadian Association of Latin American Studies) in Ottawa. The meeting was arranged to explore the appropriateness and feasibility of Centre assistance to the work of these Societies and as well, to consider the nature and magnitude of such assistance if it was given. During the meeting, it was stated that the Centre had the mandate to foster cooperation in research on development between the developed and developing regions for their mutual benefit, and it was in light of this aspect of the Centre's mandate that the meeting was arranged between representatives of the Area Specific Learned Societies and Centre staff. Following the meeting, the representatives of the Learned Societies were invited to submit detailed proposals including an itemized budget for Centre consideration. Requests for support were received from the three Learned Societies, and for the first phase of the project, grants were provided by the Centre to the Canadian Association of Latin American Studies in January 1974; to the Canadian Association of African Studies in February 1974; and jointly to the Canadian Society for South Asian Studies and the Canadian Society for East Asian Studies in June 1975.

The basis of these grants was to promote viable Canadian area studies associations which would be capable of establishing effective relationships with their colleagues in the developing countries. It was perceived that the effectiveness of these Learned Societies was limited by their lack of resources. Thus, it was decided that the Centre would support the establishment and maintenance of a national secretariat for each Learned Society, certain programmes, publications, seminars, and invitations of these Societies to Third World scholars. The grant support would strengthen the Learned Societies and increase their abilities to serve Canadian scholars and researchers which in turn would allow them to establish linkages with their colleagues and institutions in the Third World. It was felt that this would be of considerable benefit to the teaching and research communities in the South.

Initially, support to these Learned Societies was for two years with a five year budget projection. The seed grants would be renewed after two years, if the support seemed justified and the Societies were achieving the objectives of the grants. At that time, the Centre anticipated that even if the Learned Societies did not become totally self-supporting after the five year period of seed grants, the period of support provided by the Centre would allow agencies of the Canadian Government, such as Canada Council, CIDA, Secretary of State, and the Department of External Affairs, to establish a firm policy of support to the Learned Societies in Canada.

The specific purposes and objectives of the I phase of support to the Learned Societies consisted of:

- 1) Provision of funds for the maintenance of a National Secretariat which included allocations for secretarial help, office space rental, office furnishings, typewriters, photostat machines, etc., and travel expenses for executive meetings of the societies.
- 2) The Centre supported the facilitation of information exchange through the provision of funds for journals and newsletter publications.

- 3) Support was provided to certain programme activities of the Societies such as academic exchanges between scholars from the South and Canadian universities (travel support), specialized seminars, and conferences.
- 4) The promotion and cooperation in Asian studies among the universities across Canada and the maximization of established capacities and resources was supported by the Centre.

For the II phase of the project, the objectives and purposes stated in phase I were continued with some additional inclusions:

- 1) In the case of the Asian Studies National Secretariat, funding was provided for the publication and distribution of the Directory for Asian studies.
- 2) Provision of more time to the Canadian Association of African Studies and the Canadian Association of Latin American Studies, in this second phase of grants to seek alternate funding sources for their operations, and decentralization of some aspects of the Associations operations.

In the III phase of the project, it was emphasized again that the Centre intended to discontinue core support to the societies. A reduction in the provision of funds for administration costs of the National Secretariat was indicated in the project summary. For this III phase, grants were provided for a set of specific activities:

- 1) Travel support was provided for Third World scholars and researchers.
- 2) Funds were available for Third World students in Canada to attend the annual meetings of the Learned Societies.
- 3) Support for the publication of a newsletter was provided in the budget allocation.

- 4) The Centre provided funds for the distribution of Canadian journals in the Third World reporting the research of Canadian scholars.

For phase IV of the project, the objectives pursued in phase III were continued with some minor deviations:

- 1) In the case of the Canadian Association of Latin and Caribbean Studies (CALACS), the Centre supported CALACS to pursue its institutional collaboration, with the Facultad latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO).
- 2) Support was given to CALACS to undertake the exchange of graduate students between Latin America and the Caribbean and Canada.

For the phases of the project, the Learned Societies invited scholars from the South for specialized seminars, conference attendance and supported the participation of Third World graduate students studying in Canada at their annual meetings. Newsletters were published and distributed among its members, and Canadian journals were distributed to the Third World institutions. Permanent National Secretariats were established in Ottawa.

On October 22, 1982, the Board of Governors of the Centre approved phase V of the grant support to the Learned Societies. As well, the Centre indicated that further phases of the project would be renewed only after an evaluation of this program of support has been undertaken. In this V phase, the objectives for the Canadian Association of African Studies were the same as those outlined in phase IV.

The extent of International Development Research Centre support for the three societies can be found in Table 1 below.

Table 1

## IDRC Funding for Three Societies, 1974-1982

	<u>CAAS</u>	<u>CALACS</u>	<u>CASA</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1974	\$ 31 500	\$ 18 198	\$ n/a	\$ 49 698
1975	24 500	16 485	20 000	60 985
1976	25 000	18 569	22 200	65 769
1977	22 900	19 001	35 000	76 901
1978	27 980	14 098	40 000	82 078
1979	23 400	19 800	22 800	66 000
1980	19 860	15 000	19 140	54 000
1981	30 900	28 800	32 000	91 700
1982	33 600	28 800	32 000	94 400
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	\$239 640	\$178 751	\$223 140	\$641 531
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

The sum of \$641,531 compares to a total of \$281,967 for the same period from a variety of donors including Canada Council, SSHRCC, CIDA, Department of External Affairs, Secretary of State, Social Science Federation of Canada, etc. It also compares to a total of \$63,371 for membership dues during the same period. In phase V, 1983-1984, the totals of IDRC support are \$104,800 for CAAS, or an increase of 62% over the previous two years; \$75,000 for CALACS, or an increase of 30% over the previous two years; and \$70,800 for CASA, or an increase of 11% over the previous two years. The average increase for phase V, over the previous two years, is 35%. Obviously IDRC support has been substantial. In 1982 IDRC support constituted the bulk of total funds for each of the Societies which also included administrative grants from the SSHRCC, travel grants to the annual general meetings from the SSHRCC distributed by the Social Science Federation of Canada,

membership fees, and minor grants and contracts. The percentages are as follows for IDRC support in comparison to all other support: CAAS - 73%, CALACS - 61%, and CASA - 58%. (If grants from the SSHRCC for the journals of CAAS and CALACS are included the percentages drop to 51% for the former and 48% for the latter Society.)

The goals in this analysis are fourfold as detailed in the consultant's proposal to the IDRC:

1. To assess the effectiveness of IDRC funding of the three Learned Societies in accord with the objectives for which funding was provided. Data to be considered include the following:-

- the research and publishing productivity of members in comparison to non-members in similar fields of activity.
- the fields of activity of members in relationship to the IDRC's objectives.
- the level of interest in development and problems of the Third World generated by the Societies in Canada.
- the publications of the Societies including journals, newsletters, directories, and research guides.
- the changing objectives of the Societies.

2. To assess the effectiveness of IDRC funding on the Societies' and their members' impact on research development problems in the Third World. Data to be considered include the following:-

- the extent and type of collaborative research involving members of the Societies and researchers in the Third World, and whether this research was facilitated by the

## Societies.

- the nature of institutional linkages between the Societies and institutions in the Third World (FLACSO and CEESTEM, for example).
  - the distribution of the Societies' publications in the Third World.
3. To ascertain the possibilities for diversification of the Societies' funding and the efforts made by them to decrease their dependence on IDRC support.
  4. To recommend various strategies for funding, including IDRC funding, in light of the IDRC's relationships with the Canadian academic community.

The research for this report was initiated on 25 May 1983 and concluded on 28 July 1983. Writing of the report took up the week of 1-5 August. The data base for the report is varied and extensive. Sixty interviews were conducted by the consultant in Canada with the executives and members of the three Societies, with non-members sharing similar area and research interests, with university administrators, with government officials in Ottawa in such entities as CIDA and External Affairs, and with members of several research and coordinating bodies. (A list of those interviewed can be found in Appendix I). Four background interviews were also conducted by the consultant at the IDRC itself for initial orientation. The consultant attended the 1981 Annual General Meeting of CALACS as it was held at the Centre where he was Director and attended the 1983 Annual General Meeting of CASA in Vancouver in early June. He was unfortunately unable to attend the Annual General Meeting of CAAS held in

Quebec City in mid-May due to a confusion of dates and places. He has, however, discussed this meeting extensively with professors and students who did attend and has reviewed the conference programme. The consultant spent the last week of June and most of July visiting research centres and academic institutions in eight cities in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. The institutions were identified by the consultant through interviews in Canada and through a review of the documentation prepared by the three Societies. The purpose of the field research in the Third World was to ascertain the nature of the linkages between the Societies and their members in Canada and Third World researchers as well as the attitudes of these latter researchers to present and future collaboration. (A list of those interviewed can be found in Appendix II). The consultant himself thus conducted a total of 87 interviews in Canada and the Third World.

In order to build the report on the widest possible sources of data two more quantitative data bases were also employed. One was a Custom Search of the Canadian Register of Research and Researchers in the Social Sciences of the University of Western Ontario. The register contains data on 219 members of the three Societies and provides information whereby these members can be compared to non-members with similar area and research interests. (The Questionnaire, Information Fields, and Selected Statistics can be found in Appendix III). The other was a questionnaire which the consultant designed and sent to a random sample of 330 members of the three Societies. The purpose of the questionnaire was to ascertain the relationship between members and the

Societies as well as the extent of collaborative work between members and Third World colleagues. Despite the fact that the questionnaire was sent out after Summer holidays began in the universities (on 9 June) and the last that could be included was received on 27 July, an incredible 169 were received and prepared for computer analysis. (The French and English questionnaires are included in Appendix IV as well as a brief description of the sampling strategy. It should be noted that questionnaires from Canada and abroad are still being received). With these two broader data bases much can be said about members in comparison to non-members as well as the relationships of members of the Societies. I am indebted to Mr. Henry Rono for his assistance in the analysis of these quantitative data.

Extensive documentation was also employed in the preparation of this report. In order to ascertain the extent of collaboration with Third World colleagues we reviewed the newsletters of the three Societies and the journals of CAAS and CALACS. We also selected a random sample of 20 members of each Society and consulted the Social Science Citation Index, the Public Affairs Information Service, and the Economic Abstracts International. Other documentation included not only a general review of the newsletters but also the statements and proposals to the IDRC, applications for administrative grants to the SSHRCC, proceedings, directories, and the like. There is also extensive documentation on many of the research institutes and academic institutions visited in the Third World and this can be provided to the IDRC. The various types of data will be interwoven in the text rather than being dealt with in separate

sections.

The format of the report is as follows: First, the Societies and their main activities will be discussed so that it will be possible to understand the nature of these organizations. Second, the funding and mandate of the IDRC will be related to the activities of the Societies and a summary made of the impact of IDRC funding. Third, the nature and extent of linkages and collaboration with colleagues in the Third World will be described and the results from the trip by the consultant to Latin America, Africa, and Southeast Asia discussed. Fourth, the implications of the IDRC cutting back on its funding to the Societies will be described in the light of other possible funding sources. And fifth, possible areas for other linkages and collaboration between Canadian researchers and Third World colleagues will be noted.

## 1. The Societies and their Activities

The three Area Specific Learned Societies are in fact learned societies of academics, are interdisciplinary, and are Canadian. Their membership can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2

### Membership of Three Societies, 1979-1983

	<u>CAAS</u>	<u>CALACS</u>	<u>CASA</u>
1979	222	214	412
1980	235	333	499
1981	217	336	580
1982	221	374	616
1983	214	401	548

(Obs: the data on membership varies depending on time of year obtained as for CAAS and CALACS these figures include only those who have paid their dues and this increases after the Annual General Meeting and the mailing of the newsletters. For CASA the number who had paid their dues by 10 May 1983, one month before the Annual General Meeting, was 281. The numbers also vary depending on whether the sources are from the dues lists or the mailing lists. The percentage of student membership varies among the Societies. Most recent figures indicate the following: CAAS 43 students or 19% of total membership; CALACS 200 students or 49%; and CASA 70 or 25%. These numbers compare to an average of 850 members per Learned Society of a sample of fifteen affiliated with the Social Science Federation of Canada (to which none of these three belong). However, the figures for these fifteen are inflated by the very large Canadian Psychological Association with 2740 members and other large societies such as the Canadian Historical Association with 1584. In general the discipline societies are large and those which are more interdisciplinary such as the CPREA with 104 members and the CRSA with 202 are small.

The Canadian characteristic is obvious in that the 'pool' is much smaller here than in the United States where the counterpart societies have the following memberships: African Studies

Association - 2,100 members; Latin American Studies Association - 2,400 members; and the Association for Asian Studies - 5,300 members. It is important to keep the size of this 'pool' in mind when considering the viability of any interdisciplinary, and some discipline, learned societies in Canada. For example, the minimum membership for a society which hopes to receive support from the SSHRCC is now 200. (See Appendix V - Program of Aid to Associations of the SSHRCC).

The interdisciplinary characteristic is obvious from a review of the departments of the members, the publications, and the very fact that they are area specific. Most members belong to other learned societies as well, as indicated in Tables 3, 4, and 5, and my interviews indicate that these always include a discipline society.

Table 3

## Membership in Other Societies

Membership in Societies	Associations		
	<u>CAAS</u>	<u>CALACS</u>	<u>CASA</u>
0	11%	21%	21%
1	39	41	39
2	35	18	22
3	15	13	11
4	0	8	8
	(n=46)	(n=39)	(n=134)

(Source: Canadian Register of Research and Researchers in the Social Sciences).

From this source it is obvious that most members of the three Societies belong to more than the one society and in many cases to many more. In the case of the members of CAAS, for example, 50% belong to two other societies.

Table 4

## Membership in Other Societies (in Canada)

<u>Membership in</u> <u>Societies</u>	<u>The Three Area Specific Learned Societies</u>
--	--

0	13	10%
1	65	51
2	32	25
3*	18	15
	(n=128)	100%

(missing: non-resident in Canada  
or n.r. 41 (24%)).  
(Total n=169)

(Source: our questionnaire).

Table 5

## Membership in Other Societies (in United States)

<u>Membership in</u> <u>Societies</u>	<u>The Three Area Specific Learned Societies</u>
--	--

0	15	14%
1	43	39
2	32	29
3+	19	18
	(n=109)	100%

(missing: non-resident in Canada  
or n.r. 60 (36%)).  
(Total n=169)

(Source: our questionnaire)

What seems obvious from the data is that the members of these three Societies are 'joiners'. Very few belong to only these Societies, 40% in our survey belong to two or more other societies, and fully 94 or 55% of the whole sample belong to one or more Learned Societies in the United States.

Multiple membership suggests, the interdisciplinary nature of these Societies. It does not imply, however, a lack of involvement with the learned society. The high response rate is of course an indication of this fact but so is the response to a question concerning the degree of involvement in the Society as shown in Table 6.

Table 6

## Degree of Involvement in the Society

Involvement	Association		
	<u>CAAS</u>	<u>CALACS</u>	<u>CASA</u>
Intense	16%	7%	4%
Moderate	38	41	50
Slight	45	52	46
(Total n=167)	(n=72)	(n=47)	(n=48)

(Source: our questionnaire).

The comparisons among the three Societies are suggestive of their different natures to which we will refer very shortly.

These Societies have as members primarily academics who are

at the Associate or Full Professor rank as can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7

Academic Status of Members of the Three Societies

Student	12%
Assistant Professor	15
Associate & Full Professor	65
Employed by government, business, and other	8

(n=169)

(Source: our questionnaire).

In sum, the memberships of the three Societies are mainly professors (80%), belong to more than just the one Society, and, with substantial variations, have moderate or slight involvement with the Societies. It is in the nature of these Learned Societies not to produce high involvement and to their different characteristics we shall now turn.

The different area foci, and indeed the Societies themselves, have had different histories in Canada. Undoubtedly the newest area of focus of the three is Latin America which began to receive attention in this country only after 1968. The Society was founded in 1969 as CALAS and expanded in 1980 to include the Caribbean, thereby becoming CALACS. The Society has seen substantial changes over the years with those who were most active in the early years, the humanists, becoming less prominent by the late 1970's. There has been a good deal of turnover in

the executive, including the secretariat, and in June of 1983 the secretariat moved to Carleton University. The Society has a separate chapter in British Columbia which was founded in 1980 with seed money from the national office. Today this chapter produces a newsletter and hosts conferences, at times in collaboration with the national office. There is talk now of founding a chapter in the Maritimes as well. Language is generally not an issue as most Latin Americanists master Spanish or Portuguese and communicate in one of these if they are unable to communicate in the other official language. Clearly one of the defining characteristics of CALACS is the large number of Latin Americans residing in Canada, either nationalized or as landed immigrants, who are active in the Society. This is somewhat less the case with scholars from the Caribbean and relates to the nature of regimes which have been established in many Latin American countries during the past decade. (For further information on the Society and the field see H. Konrad, "CALAS/ACELA: A View of its First Decade," in J. Nef, ed. Repression and Liberation in Latin America (Ottawa: CALACS/ACELAC, OCPLACS CERLAC, 1981; and, Jorge Nef, "Latin America and Caribbean Studies in Canada: A Developmental Perspective," Canadian Journal of Development Studies, III, no. 1 1982, pp. 177-197).

As areas of research parts of both Africa and Asia, being included within the Commonwealth, have long histories in Canada. The histories of the two Learned Societies, however, are very different. Undoubtedly CAAS has been the most stable, consistent, and 'established'. (On African studies in Canada see

D.R.F. Taylor, "African Studies in Canada," supplement to CAAS Newsletter, 8, April 1978; Anthony Kirk-Greene, "An Impressive Breadth," supplement to CAAS Newsletter, 9, October 1978; and, Anthony Kirk-Greene, "The Development of African Studies: A Survey 1929-1979, part 2," supplement to CAAS Newsletter, 16, April 1982.). Members of CAAS are able to identify five generations of Africanists in Canada, and one senses a certain establishment here which may well precede the founding of the Society in 1970. There is turnover in the executive with the president's term of office being only one year (although the vice president does become the president thereby providing for in effect two years). The term of office of the secretary treasurer is two years but the incumbent has been re-elected to the position since the founding of the Society and the Secretariat is at Carleton University. Unlike the pattern in the other two Societies the Africanists, residing in Canada who hold academic positions, and who were born in Africa are very low in number. Language is more of a problem for the CAAS than CALACS, even though many of the executives are bilingual, due to a division in Africa between the ex-French and ex-British colonies which interacts with a similar division here in Canada. Due to the concern over membership figures in the CAAS (where membership slipped to 168 in May 1982) there are recent proposals to expand membership categories to allow employees of government and non-government organizations to become members as well as to explore possible joint meetings and other activities with the CALACS. So far the CALACS has reservations about this proposal.

CASA is an umbrella organization which resulted from a

merger of the Canadian Society for Asian Studies and the Canadian Association for South Asian Studies in 1980. The Southeast Asia Council, CCSEAS, preceded this amalgamation and was by and large free of the bitter conflicts which characterized relations between, and even in some cases within, the other two organizations. It should be noted that the IDRC played a role in this merger. The constitution, which is clearly the result of a great deal of thought and negotiation, allows for study groups as well. The result is that today the CASA includes three regional councils (East Asia-China and Japan; South Asia; and Southeast Asia) which each keep 60% of the dues collected from their members, and two study groups (Asian Canadian Forum and Canadian Association of Sanskrit and Related Studies) with the Hindu Literary Society to join in the near future. Possibly due to the recent history of conflict a number of prominent scholars of Asia are not members of the Society, although the executive feels that as problems are worked out they will join or in some cases rejoin. It is difficult to know if language is a problem both because of the federal nature of the organization and the fact that there are so many oriental languages spoken by the members. The federal principle applies to the executive which includes the heads of the regional councils and the presidency rotates among the councils. The secretariat is now located at Carleton University although the current secretary treasurer teaches in Kingston. While varying according to council and study group, it is obvious that more of the Asianists are originally from Asia than the Latin Americanists from Latin America let alone the Africanists from Africa. Ethnicity does play a role in the

dynamics of the Society and the executive seeks to moderate possible tensions and conflicts.

There are five main activities which the three Societies promote and all of them require a central secretariat. At present all three are located at the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs at Carleton University. None of the executives receive a stipend or honorarium from the Society and day to day administration is carried on by a part-time secretary or administrative assistant. Virtually all of the executives indicated that the demands of the national secretariat required more than the general one half-time assistant. The secretariat is supported in all cases by an administration grant from the SSHRCC which in 1982 was \$3,600 for CAAS, \$5,500 for CALACS, and \$5,300 for CASA. (It should be noted, however, that this grant may be used for more than salaries in that it has also been applied to travel, special projects, and miscellaneous.). Of particular significance is the 20% provided by the IDRC for administration. For the 1983-1984, phase V, this amounts to \$17,663 for CAAS, \$12,500 for CALACS, and \$11,800 for CASA. It is unclear to this consultant why the SSHRCC principle of increasing funds for increasing membership should be reversed by the IDRC. Normally the study of budgeting indicates the very large role history, and thus earlier budgets, play in allocations. There would seem to be no other principle beyond this for the discrepancy.

The first activity promoted by the three Societies, as indeed by learned societies in general, is the Annual General Meeting or AGM. CASA meets with the Learned in the late Spring

of each year although the CCSEAS also holds a separate conference in the Fall. CAAS and CALACS also meet annually but not with the Learneds and at varying times depending on the year and the discussions in the executive. There are arguments which can, and have, been made concerning when to hold the AGM and there is no single and simple solution which this consultant can offer. CAAS has tended to move the AGM about the country far more than CALACS but the Western criticism of Ontario and Quebec domination were identical for both. Quite possibly the founding of the BC chapter of CALACS decreased what might have been more serious criticism.

The registration figures for the three Societies vary substantially from year to year as can be seen in Table 8.

Table 8

## Registration Figures, 1979-1983

Year	Association		
	<u>CAAS</u>	<u>CALACS</u>	<u>CASA</u>
1979	177	85	98
1980	169	98	168
1981	155	109	119
1982	250	167	108
1983	270	---(in Oct.)	154

It should be noted that registration is not the same as attendance and the Societies vary concerning procedures for registration, counting, and general involvement.

One of the programmes supported by the IDRC grant is to assist in the travel and subsistence of Third World students attending the AGMs. However, the Societies vary tremendously in their utilization of this programme. In 1982 CAAS supported 39 African students attending the AGM, CALACS 17, and CASA 6. This is reflected in the budgets for 1983-1984, phase V, where the item is \$26,015 for CAAS, \$4,000 for CALACS, and \$5,000 for CASA. It is not clear to this consultant why the Societies give such tremendously different budgetary emphasis to the attendance of Third World students at the AGM. All three Societies encourage graduate students, including those from the Third World, to present papers at the AGM but CAAS is clearly much more eager than the other two Societies to support the visa students' attendance. Indeed, CAAS has established a system, much in line with its greater 'establishment' and continuity in general, to nominate African students to attend the AGM. There is a system of regional representatives throughout the country which presently total some 31 professors. This system is a good idea but there are criticisms by the newsletter editor that only 30% of the regional representatives provided him with information for number 16 in 1982. Also, I noted in my interviews that several of the regional representatives are not even members of the Society and the newsletter editor has expressed concern about this fact as well.

A second activity of the Societies, and supported by the IDRC, is the preparation and distribution of a newsletter. In CAAS the regional representatives provide much of the material which is edited by a professor in the West who has been doing

this for a number of years, and is then produced at the national secretariat. This newsletter, as with the other two Societies, is produced three times a year. The CAAS newsletter, again in line with the continuity of the Society, is clearly the best-prepared and most useful. The Revue, of CASA, is also prepared by a newsletter editor but I heard a number of criticisms concerning its utility, style, and delays in distribution. Again, this is in line with the past conflict-ridden past of the Society. The weakest newsletter is that produced by CALACS which since 1981 does not have a newsletter editor and is done by the secretary treasurer and the administrative assistant. It is probably too much to expect that a secretariat can give the attention necessary for a first class newsletter. The newsletter budget item for 1983-1984, phase V, is most unusual. The figure for CAAS is \$4,730, for CALACS it is \$4,500, and for CASA it is \$15,000. This last item reads "Newsletter, Journal Subscriptions and Distribution of Important Research Papers". However, the other two Societies also distribute research papers with the newsletter and it makes no sense to have journal subscriptions. Therefore, this item should be reviewed carefully to bring it in line with the other newsletters.

A third activity, supported in part by the IDRC, is the production and distribution of a journal or conference proceedings. CAAS produces a first rate journal, the Canadian Journal of African Studies/Revue Canadienne des Etudes Africaines, which preceded the founding of the Society itself by four years. This is clearly one of the best journals in the

field, is bilingual, interdisciplinary, and extremely competitive in that there is a ratio of 10 to 1 for articles submitted to be published. The journal has three academic editors as well as the administrative assistant of CAAS who works half-time for the journal. Its circulation in 1982 included the 222 members of the Society, 656 subscriptions, and 36 unpaid subscriptions. It received a publications grant from the SSHRCC of \$20,190; \$4,100 of \$5,035 dues in 1981 went to the journal; and the IDRC paid for the distribution of 200 free subscriptions in Africa. It is obvious that the journal is the defining activity of the CAAS as it is referred to in most of the interviews and looms large in the documentation provided by the Society. Indeed, in the Constitution of the Society under Objects we can read "the facilitation of scholarly and scientific exchange and the provision of a link between the Canadian and African scholarly and scientific communities in particular by the publication of the Canadian Journal of African Studies/Revue canadienne des études africaines." (p. 1). The budget item for 1983-1984, phase V, is \$15,000 for 250 subscriptions at \$30 each.

The journal of CALACS is not in the same class as that of the CAAS. North/South, Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies, was founded in 1976 and has yet to define itself. At the present it has but one editor and no administrative assistant and the task of preparation is a onerous task for the editor who also teaches full time. Its circulation is 500 which of course matches the membership of the Society with an additional 100 or so which are purchased by the IDRC for free distribution in Latin America and the Caribbean. In phase V this

amounts to \$4,500. In 1982 the SSHRCC provided a publishing grant of \$12,775 and one-half of the \$7,902 dues went to support the journal. A particularly serious lack in the journal has been the paucity of book reviews, but that should now be remedied with a book review editor. It is unclear, however, who will take over the journal when the present editor gives up the position later this year. Another problem is the language of publication in that now it publishes in English, French, Spanish and Portuguese with the distribution being 60%, 20%, and 20% respectively. This variety, in the view of many of those I interviewed, decreased the impact of the journal. It should be noted that the journal has published papers presented at the AGM as well as regional meetings, apparently without the extremely rigorous refereeing process followed by the CAAS journal.

The CASA does not publish a journal. However, this Society as indeed CALACS and even in one instance CAAS, do publish conference proceedings. The most recent CASA proceedings are the Southeast Asian Exocus: From Tradition to Resettlement edited by Elliot L. Tepper (Ottawa: CASA, 1980) and The Southeast Asian Environment edited by Douglas R. Webster for the CCSEAS (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1983). The most recent CALACS publication is Repression and Liberation in Latin America edited by Jorge Nef which is from the 1980 CALACS conference (Ottawa; CALACS/ACELAC, OCPLACs, CERLAC, 1981). Both CASA and CALACS plan to continue publishing conference proceedings and CAAS does not.

A fourth activity, generally not supported by the IDRC grant, is the production and distribution of directories. The CAAS is the weakest of the three Societies in this regard. The

last directory (Resources for African Studies in Canada edited by R.A. Bullock and G.D. Killam) was produced in 1976. There is a recognized need for an updated directory but the secretary treasurer was unclear why a new directory had not been produced. He indicated that questionnaires had been sent out, only 30% were returned, and there was a shortage of funds. However, judging from the return on our questionnaire from the members of the CAAS (44% of the total received), the system of the regional representatives and newsletter, and the substantial IDRC funds for the secretariat there is in our opinion no justification for not producing a new directory. CALACS produced a directory (Directory of Canadian Scholars and Universities Interested in Latin American Studies, third edition) in 1979 and the data has been updated in the Newsletters of May 1982 and February 1983, nos. 41 and 42. Even with this updated material there is a need to produce one readily available directory to facilitate reference. The IDRC, through its support for the Newsletter, has also subsidized some part of this directory. CALACS has also produced the Directory of Canadian Theses on Latin American and Caribbean Topics: 1927-1980 edited by Denise F. Brown and Herman W. Konrad (Ottawa: CALACS, 1982). The IDRC in the phase V budget is providing \$1,000 for distribution of this directory. The CASA directory, The Directory of Asian Studies in Canada compiled by S.P. Chong and D.A. Seelemann (Ottawa: Canadian Society for Asian Studies, 1978) or DASIC I is now out of date. The Society, with the assistance of Heath Chamberlain of Pacific Affairs is presently compiling a directory with some 750 entries. With this directory the CASA will have the most useful directory

of any of the three Societies.

The fifth and last major activity of these Societies is one which is supported heavily by the IDRC and distinguishes these Societies from most other learned societies in Canada. This concerns the bringing to Canada of scholars from the Third World (although in the case of CALACS it also includes travel for Canadian professors and students going to Latin America as well as Latin American and Caribbean studies visiting Canada). This programme has varied over time for each Society and varies among the Societies today. At one time it meant mainly bringing Third World scholars to participate in the AGM. Presently the programmes are as follows: For CAAS it means travel support and subsistence for two African scholars for three months in Canada where they would conduct their own research and possibly collaborate with colleagues. They will also visit Latin America at some stage of the trip. They will not necessarily participate in the AGM but would probably visit other institutions in Canada. In the previous phase the period was three weeks and visits were arranged for CEESTEM in Mexico. The selection is made by the executive on the nomination of CAAS members. The IDRC budget for 1983-1984, phase V, is \$41,670 for travel and subsistence. For CALACS there is a greater variety of activities and plans. As noted above the item, which in 1983-1984, phase V, totals some \$48,500 with \$28,500 specifically for Latin American and Caribbean scholars visiting Canada, includes travel in both directions for professors and students, Canadians and others. Some of the Latin American and Caribbean scholars and students will participate in the AGM and others will not, and the travel

funds have been used for research collaboration, publicity for situations in Latin America such as human rights and revolution, as well as the presenting of papers at the AGM. For CASA the present programme, which is a continuation of phase IV, provides for a trip by three Asian scholars through Canada with the final destination being the AGM which meets with the Learneds in the Spring. The three are nominated by the three councils which means one is from East Asia, another from South Asia, and another from Southeast Asia. They spend a month going across the country and give joint talks to groups which are organized by members of CASA at a variety of institutions. A problem with this programme has been the timing in that if they are to complete the tour in June at the AGM then it means the universities are already through with the Spring term when the visitors make their presentations. There is discussion as to changing the date of the visits with their completion being at the CCSEAS which meets in October. This budget item for 1983-1984, phase V, is \$39,000.

This programme of travel, mainly for Third World scholars to visit Canada, is substantial and at \$129,170 is some 52% of the total budget of the IDRC for these three Societies in 1983-1984, phase V. Its significance can be further appreciated if we compare it, for 1982, to the travel grants provided by the SSHRCC through the Social Science Federation of Canada, to learned societies for travel to the AGMs. In the case of these three the grants, which are generally what others societies receive, are approximately 30% of the IDRC grant for travel (CAAS - 20%, CALACS - 41%, and CASA 30%). With the new SSHRCC rules on administrative grants and travel it is likely, in light of the

substantial increase in IDRC funding for phase V of an average of 35%, that this percentage will decrease.

These, then, are the main activities promoted by the three Learned Societies. In the mail questionnaire we asked a number of questions concerning the utilization of, and benefits derived from, Societies' activities. The main activities are related to conferences and seminars. Some 32% of the 169 respondents had received a travel grant to attend the AGM during the last five years and 34% had attended a seminar or workshop given by a Third World scholar which was organized by the Society. On the other hand, 8% had participated in publishing activity beyond the journal or conference proceedings, only 4% had received a travel grant for research purposes, and but 3%, or five people, had participated in a research project in which the Society had played a role. These factual data are in line with the attitudinal resulting from the responses to an open question on the principal benefits derived from membership in the Society. These results can be seen in Table 9.

Table 9

## Principal Benefits Derived from Membership in Society

1. Contacts	35%
2. Exchange of information	16
3. Receive journal	15
4. Receive newsletter	11
5. Annual conference	11
6. Interdisciplinary emphasis	5
7. Information on research	4
	---
	(n=138)

(Missing 31; Total n=169)

(Source: our survey).

It must be remembered that this was an open ended question; the respondent wrote that which seemed most important as a benefit derived from membership in the Society. Virtually all put contacts, exchange, meetings, and information as the principal benefit. The Societies provide the means whereby scholars can meet, learn about developments in their area of research, and exchange information. It is significant in our view that only 4%, six people, reported specifically information on research as a principal benefit. This should be seen in light of the data above indicating that only 3% had participated in a research project in which the society played a role. To reiterate, these are academic societies. They are not research groups, let alone centres, and we must hold this in mind when discussing linkages and research collaboration with Third World colleagues below.

## 2. The Activities of the Societies and their Members in Relationship to IDRC Funding.

The funding provided by the IDRC for the three Learned Societies is substantial and constitutes, as indicated above, 75% of total CAAS funding, 61% of CALACS funding, and 58% of CASA funding. What is more, IDRC funding has increased on an average of 35% for phase V in comparison with phase IV. Of necessity, then, IDRC funding must have an impact on the Societies. It is important to note that whereas the executives of the three Societies are keenly aware of the importance of IDRC funding, the membership, not to speak of the academic community in Canada in general, are not aware of the magnitude of this support either in absolute terms or as a percentage of overall funding. The Societies have not hidden the sources of this support which has been reported on in the newsletters of CALACS and CASA, but there does not exist a general appreciation of the overall funding. Indeed, when I mentioned the categories of IDRC support for the Societies, members were surprised particularly with regard to the support for journal distribution in the Third World, the travel funds for Third World scholars, and the 20% administration.

It is difficult to discuss the innovativeness of the Societies' proposals if we hold in mind the nature of the IDRC. The IDRC is clearly a very interactive funding agency. The programme officers play a role not only in the formulation of research proposals by Third World scholars but also within Canada itself. It is not possible, therefore, to know precisely the degree of innovativeness of a Society in relationship to the role of the IDRC. From the interviews with past and present members

of the executives of the three Societies we would conclude that innovation takes place within categories already established by the societies in interaction with the IDRC. This innovation would include the following: The link with CEESTEM and the CAAS in 1981, the book prize for the best paper presented to the AGM by a visa student, and the modification of the visits by African scholars from just the AGM to longer stays with more intense involvement. For CALACS the major innovations include the inclusion of the Caribbean in 1980, the agreement with FLACSO in 1980, and the visit by Perez Esquivel in 1981 and Dr. Ulloa in 1982. The last mentioned visited some 17 institutions coast to coast and attracted a great deal of attention to the situation in El Salvador and the Society in general. The major innovation for CASA was the elaboration of the federal arrangement by 1980 and the month-long visit by three Asian scholars as a team in the Spring of each year. Again, from interviews with IDRC staff and executives of the Societies it is not possible to attribute all of the innovation to the Societies. The magnitude of the IDRC's funding and its nature as an interactive organization suggests a very large role for the IDRC staff.

In terms of the activities of the Societies and their impact there are at least eight areas that must be examined. First, as noted above, the membership of the Societies, with the exception of CAAS, is increasing. CALACS has doubled and the CASA has grown by a third, despite conflicts, in five years. (Note, however that almost 50% had not paid their dues by May 1983). The percentages compare favorably to membership rates in similar societies in the United States.

Second, the members of the Societies are somewhat more productive than non-members in terms of publications and similar in terms of ongoing research. Table 10 and Table 11 concern the publications and Table 12 the research.

Table 10

Books Authored by Members of the Three Societies in  
Comparison to Non-Members

<u>Books Authored</u>	<u>Non-Members</u>	<u>Members</u>	<u>% Difference</u>
No book	62%	43%	- 19
One book	19	27	+ 8
Two books	9	13	+ 4
Three books	5	9	+ 4
Four of more books	6	8	+ 2
	(n=327)	(n=216)	

(Chi square = 22.96, df=4, P<.01)

(Source: Canadian Register of Research and Researchers in the Social Sciences).

Table 11

Books Edited by Members of the Three Societies  
in Comparison to Non-Members

<u>Books Edited</u>	<u>Non-Members</u>	<u>Members</u>	<u>% Difference</u>
No book	79%	69%	- 10
One book	10	16	+ 6
Two books	6	8	+ 2
Three books	2	5	+ 3
Four or more	3	2	- 1
	(n=327)	(n=216)	

(Chi square = 18.73, df=4, p.<.01)

(Source: Canadian Register of Research and Researchers in the Social Sciences).

The members are consistently more productive than non-members in publishing. The Chi square statistic indicates that the difference does not occur by chance alone and the difference is significant at  $P < .01$ .

Table 12

Involvement in a Research Project in the Last  
Three Years by Membership

<u>Projects</u>	<u>Non-Members</u>	<u>Members</u>	<u>% Difference</u>
Yes	88%	91%	- 3
No	12	9	+ 3
	(n=330)	(n=219)	

(Source: Canadian Register of Research and Researchers in the Social Sciences).

The differences in Table 12 are not important, but it should be noted that for both the involvement in research projects is very high.

Third, the data indicate that the members of the Societies generally are within discipline foci which the IDRC encourages. In the Register the orientation to development was constructed through a search strategy in which members were classified on the basis of reference to development in their substantive area of specialization. This included references to publications or research projects in various sectors of development such as agriculture, technology, nutritional, social or economic development in the Third World. It is a composite variable. Table 13 indicates that while varying among the Societies they are characterized by a development orientation.

Table 13

## Development Orientation of Members of the Three Societies

<u>Development Orientation</u>	<u>CAAS</u>	<u>CALACS</u>	<u>CASA</u>
Yes	87%	77%	65%
No	13	23	35
	(n=46)	(n=39)	(n=134)

(Source: Canadian Register of Research and Researchers in the Social Sciences).

In the survey we found that 71% of the respondents are in the Social Sciences, 22% in the Humanities, and 4% in Sciences, with 3% being classified as other. Generally, then the disciplines and orientation of the members are not out of line from the IDRC's objectives. It must be emphasized, however, that these Societies bring together mainly social scientists and not specialists in the 'harder sciences'. In the Register there is data on the impact on policy of research and publications. We see in Table 14 these data.

Table 14

## Impact on Policy of Previous or Current Work

Impact	Associations		
	<u>CAAS</u>	<u>CALACS</u>	<u>CASA</u>
No relevance	18%	18%	28%
General significance	28	21	33
Indirect influence on specific policy	15	36	16
Potential direct influence	35	24	16
Immediate direct impact	5	0	6
	(n=40)	(n=33)	(n=118)

(Source: Canadian Register of Research and Researchers in the Social Sciences).

While we see that there are variations among the Societies, only 18% for two and 28% for one do not claim some kind of policy relevance for their work. We cannot draw many conclusions from these data but at the minimum the respondents to the Register's questionnaire consider that their work is relevant for policy.

Fourth, the registration figures at the AGM indicate (Table 8), except possibly for CASA, an increasing interest in the areas dealt with by the Societies. The conferences are open to the public and thus the interest can be more broadly disseminated.

Fifth, CALACS founded its journal in 1976 and there are now 400 copies sent out to members and subscribers, and through the IDRC funding, another 100 copies are sent to Latin America and the Caribbean. Even though it is not a first class journal it does call attention to the area and to Latin American studies in Canada. The CAAS journal is first rate and subscriptions (not including CAAS members) have increased from 367 in 1973 to 656 in 1982 or an increase of 76%. There is no doubt but that this journal does call attention to the area and to the high quality of research on the area conducted by members of the CAAS as well as other scholars. It might be worth noting that from our questionnaire we found that whereas 50% of the respondents do not publish in the Societies' journals or conference proceedings during the last five years 23% had published one article and another 17% had published two or more articles.

Sixth, the visits by Third World scholars do not in general serve to call attention in an effective manner to the areas. We can see in Table 15 that only a minority of the Societies' members have attended a seminar or workshop given by a Third World scholar organized by the Societies. If the members who returned the questionnaire have not attended such a seminar then what of the general public?

Table 15

Attendance at Seminar or Workshop given by Third World  
Scholar Organized by Society

<u>Attend</u>	<u>CAAS</u>	<u>CALACS</u>	<u>CASA</u>
Yes	30%	38%	35%
No	70	62	65
	(n=73)	(n=47)	(n=48)

(Total n=169)

(Source: our survey).

In recent years CAAS has brought African scholars to an institution and has not emphasized travel and lectures in a number of institutions. This is clear from the documentation provided by the Society, was obvious from my interviews across Canada, and is stated in the call for nominations in the CAAS Newsletter of April 1983 where we read "It [the three month stay] need not be at a single university, but a lecture tour should take up only a small part of the visitor's time in Canada." (p. 3). In discussing the visitors programme with CAAS regional representatives not only in the West but even in Ontario, they were either not aware that there had been visitors, or, if there were, who they might have been. Further, from reviewing the CAAS documentation one of the visitors apparently visited the Centre where this consultant was Director and I have no recollection of his visit. He also got the name of the Centre wrong. The visits by the African scholars may be useful for their own research, but they are not effective in calling attention to the area. The CASA programme is intended to do precisely this but because of

the timing of the visits and the difficulty of coordinating a month-long visit by three foreign scholars there seems to be less of an impact than anticipated. It is interesting that only 35% of the CASA respondents had attended a seminar or workshop given by an Asian scholar. However, it must be noted that a study group of the Society, the Asian Canadian Forum, does have a high profile with media events and publications. It deals, however, with but one aspect of the Society. Most of the visitors brought by the CALACS present papers to the AGM and/or work out collaborative research plans with colleagues here. During the past two years, however, the Society has increased its prominence by assisting in bringing Perez Esquivel to Halifax where he received a great deal of attention and in bringing Dr. Ulloa of El Salvador from Mexico for a coast to coast public speaking engagement at 17 institutions with probably an average of 100 in the audience at each of these institutions. The book collection at each institution has brought forth literally thousands of books which are to be sent to the University of El Salvador. This particular case indicates that it is possible to arrange public speaking tours for relatively little funding (the local costs were covered by the institutions visited). So far the Societies, with the exception of a study group in CASA and the past two years with CALACS, have not been concerned with public events. Again, they are first and foremost learned societies of academics.

Seventh, there is no convincing evidence that the three Societies have had an impact on the general public beyond the two recent events promoted by the CALACS. In our interviews with the

executives none of them indicated this as a particularly high priority for Societies. However, members of the executives of the CAAS and CASA lamented the fact that the scholars gathered in their Societies were generally ignored by the media and particularly by such television programmes as W5 and The Journal which used American commentators rather than Canadians. The Societies, except for one study group of CASA, are not set up to make an impact in the media. The executives and members may send letters to the media and attempt to call attention to particular issue, as indeed CAAS has done, but they lack on-going links with the media. Many of those we interviewed simply did not see this as an important function of the Societies.

Eighth, and last, the Societies lack influence in the government and in non-governmental organizations. Obviously since the associations have as members scholars working on the Third World who have colleagues and ex-students who have gone into government and ngos there must be some individual influence. There is not, however, influence by the Societies themselves. It should be noted that the Societies do not belong to the Social Science Federation of Canada let alone the Humanities Federation who work to some degree as pressure groups. In our interviews with government officials, researchers in government offices, and with officials in the ngos there was unanimity in the fact that the Societies have very little contact with decision making and pressure groups. Further, the executives of the Societies are aware of this as well but there is also the realization that an impact requires greater integration and unanimity than would probably exist in any of the Societies. Thus on potentially

polemical issues, which seems to be characteristic of most Third World issues, there would have to be a mechanism for rapid consultation, beyond the AGM, to take a position. The Societies simply do not do this. Again, these are not pressure groups but learned societies. The pressure groups and single cause groups at times involve members of the Societies but are peripheral to the Societies themselves.

There is, however, an area where one would expect influence and this is through the provision of research and expertise for policy formulation. There is no special evidence that CAAS has been ignored in this regard but there is also no evidence to the contrary. In the case of the CALACS it might well have played a role in the recent study done by the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defense of the House on "Canada's Relations with Latin America and the Caribbean". The staff member responsible for the background research on this study indicated that he did not find the CALACS useful on the topic and he simply by-passed the Society although finally commissioning studies by members of the Society. A vice president of the society did testify but the Society as such did not present a brief, did not take a position, and was peripheral to the whole process. The staff anticipated more activity from the Society on this issue of obvious concern to members of CALACS. If anything, the situation with CASA is worse. While some members of the Society participated in meetings leading up to the report by John Bruk on the Asia Pacific Foundation, in the final report the Society is ignored: there is no mention or any recognition at all of the CASA and its role in bringing together scholars on

Asia. (See Appendix VI - the Bruk report and Newsletter V, no. 3 of April 1983 lamenting the neglect of the society). The same applies in two other recent initiatives concerning Asia where CASA has also been ignored. The first concerns the commitment by CIDA to aid in the transfer of modern technology to China which has involved a series of language and orientation programmes. The Society did not play a role in this process or in the programmes. And, probably most telling, the International Development Office of the AUCC, with support from the Department of External Affairs, has appointed Professor Martin Singer of Concordia University to propose an effective mechanism to co-ordinate exchanges with China and then to investigate the state of Asian studies in Canada. Professor Singer may well be duplicating some of the contents of the soon to be published DASIC II and has not been meeting with the CASA, its executives, and more active members. Thus in areas where the expertise and contacts of the two Societies - CALACS and CASA - are relevant they have been bypassed by government and other entities. I have no reason to believe the situation would be any different with CAAS should an issue arise. It must be noted that CASA is now fighting a rearguard action to attract attention to its role but this consultant is not sanguine that it, as a Society, will have any greater influence in the future than in the past.

In sum, the three Societies have as their members scholars who are somewhat more productive than non-members, they are generally within the fields relating to the IDRC's objectives, publish, and hold conferences and workshops. However, they are not effective at calling attention to their areas of expertise

let alone providing this expertise to those who might be able to use it; they do not influence policy making. They are ignored, and know they are ignored, and while for CASA this is lamentable for CALACS it is less so and for CAAS it is largely an academic issue.

IDRC funding has been extremely important in allowing the three Societies to maintain their secretariats and diversify their activities beyond those of most other learned societies in Canada. The particular mix of activities has been developed by the Societies in interaction with the IDRC and it is thus difficult to conclude as to the innovativeness of the Societies. The effectiveness of IDRC funding has been mixed. The Societies, with substantial variations as indicated above, work well enough as learned societies of academics. They are weak, however, in calling attention to their regional areas of interest and in providing information and expertise to non-members who might be concerned with these areas. They are undoubtedly weakest, however, in precisely that area which has been used in justifying, at least internally, IDRC funding for these three Societies.

### 3. The Nature and Extent of Linkages with Third World Researchers.

Given the mandate of the IDRC, the rationale for funding learned societies in Canada has been in terms of benefits accruing to scholars in the Third World. Presumably, through linkages, collaboration, and the like, which could be achieved only by viable societies in Canada, the Third World scholar would become less isolated, would become aware of more scholarship and resources, and his research would benefit. In reviewing the documentation at the IDRC there have been changing emphases on this general theme but it remains the single most important rationale for funding the Societies. If not this rationale then why do these three Societies receive substantial resources that other Canadian learned societies do not receive? The terms of reference for this study give particular attention to this theme of linkages and collaboration. (See Appendix VII for a summary of the IDRC's rationale).

The very strong emphasis given by the IDRC to this rationale is not duplicated in the three Societies. The constitutions of the Societies, in the sections on goals or objectives, refer to "exchange, links, and contacts" but these phrases and terms do not have the emphasis given by the IDRC. (See Appendix VIII for the three constitutions). In our interviews with the executives of the Societies these matters of 'linkages and collaboration' simply did not loom large in their priorities. On insisting we did receive some indications of linkages, but these were clearly not foremost in their minds as goals of the Societies. As the issue of linkages and collaboration is so central to the

rationale for funding, and thus for this evaluation, we utilized a variety of data in order to come to a conclusion. First, we took a sample of 20 cases at random from the lists of each of the three Societies. We then consulted the Social Science Citation Index, the Public Affairs Information Service, and the Economic Abstracts International to see if any of the 60 had published with a colleague from the Third World. We found no instances of joint publication. We did find, however, collaboration in publishing among professors in the same university in Canada so joint publishing does in fact occur in one form at least. Second, we reviewed the journals and newsletters of the Societies and found again that joint publishing with colleagues from the Third World was not cited. But, we did find other forms of collaboration which included collaboration in the collection of data, organization of seminars and conferences, and the utilization of the journals. There will be more on this topic later. Third, we included questions in our questionnaire on collaborative research and publication with colleagues in the Third World. Tables 16 and 17 display these data.

Table 16

## Research Collaboration with Colleague in Third World

<u>Research</u>	<u>Society</u>		
	<u>CAAS</u>	<u>CALACS</u>	<u>CASA</u>
Yes	56%	45%	40%
No	44	55	60
	(n=73)	(n=47)	(n=48)

(1 missing; N=169)

Chi square = 3.494, df=2, p<.20  
(Source: our survey).

Table 17

## Publication Collaboration with Colleagues in Third World

<u>Publication</u>	<u>Society</u>		
	<u>CAAS</u>	<u>CALACS</u>	<u>CASA</u>
Yes	33%	26%	25%
No	67	74	75
	(n=73)	(n=47)	(n=48)

(1 missing; N=169)

Chi square = 1.12, df=2, p<.60  
(Source: our survey).

We then asked to what degree the Society facilitated this collaboration and the results are found in Table 18.

Table 18

The Extent to Which the Society Facilitated the Collaboration  
in Research and Publishing

Facilitated	Society		
	<u>CAAS</u>	<u>CALACS</u>	<u>CASA</u>
Yes	15%	13%	8%
No	85	87	92
	(n=73)	(n=47)	(n=48)

(1 missing; N=169)

Chi square = 1.21, df=2,  $p < .60$

(Source: our survey).

Clearly, the Societies have not been particularly important in facilitating collaboration in research and publishing with Third World colleagues.\* We then asked an open-ended question for those 12.4%, or 21 people, as to how the Society facilitated the collaboration and the results are found in Table 19.

\*The chi square statistic for Tables 16, 17 and 18 are not significant at either the traditional .01 or .05 probability level as the respective probability levels are  $p < .20$ ,  $p < .60$  and  $p < .60$ .

Table 19

## Society Facilitated Collaboration

Facilitated by:

1. Contacts	32%
2. Conferences	16
3. Exchange of Information	12
4. Grants and Funds	12
5. Increased Credibility	6
6. Published Papers	6
7. The Journal	16
Missing	129

(Source: our survey).

In sum, the survey data do indicate that there is some form of collaboration although the percentages in Tables 16 and 17 must be seen in the light of an indefinite time period and no evaluation as to the nature of this collaboration in research and publication. The Societies have facilitated this collaboration for a small minority and the nature of this facilitation is mainly in terms of contacts and exchanges, 59%. Again, this is what learned societies generally are expected to do. These data pertain overwhelmingly (95%) to questionnaires from Canada and thus indicate the Canadian side of collaboration.

In order to evaluate the Third World side of linkages and collaboration the consultant interviewed 27 scholars at 15 research centres and institutions in eight cities in Latin America, Africa, and Southeast Asia. The initial indications of collaboration were obtained from documentation provided by the three Societies as well as interviews with the executives and members of the Societies. What emerged from the interviews with

the Third World scholars was a series of possible forms of linkages and collaboration, but in fact very little content in most cases. After describing the possible forms in the following chart observations will be made on the main points.

## Chart 1

Forms of Linkages and Collaboration Between the Societies  
and Third World Scholars

Forms	Societies			
	<u>CAAS</u>	<u>CALACS</u>	<u>CASA</u>	<u>CCSEAS</u>
1. Distribution of journal, proceedings, or newsletter in Third World	x	x	x	x
2. Support for Third World scholars at AGM and seminars or workshops in Canada	x	x	x	x
3. Organizing and helping to fund conferences and seminars or workshops in Third World	x(*)	x(*)		x
4. Promoting joint publishing between scholars in Canada and Third World	x(*)	x(*)		x
5. Elaborating protocols, agreements, and similar documents for exchanges, research, etc. ...	x(**)	x(***)		
6. Collaborating in seeking funding for further exchange and research		x(*)		x
7. Conducting joint research		x(*)		

The \* for CAAS indicates the very high profile of one scholar, affiliated with an African research centre in Canada, who organizes conferences and publishes with colleagues mainly in Nigeria. This is not, it must be emphasized, the overall

orientation of the Society where no further examples of this degree of linkage and collaboration could be cited. The \*\* for CAAS refers to an 'understanding' with CEESTEM in Mexico whereby scholars from Africa will visit CEESTEM to give a series of lectures. In my interviews at CEESTEM and elsewhere in Mexico City, it became clear that this is, in the terms of my informant, "a gentleman's agreement" and now that he has left CEESTEM he felt there would be little future for it. In sum, CAAS is very strong on points 1 and 2, given the quality of the journal and the commitment of a great deal of funds for African scholars to visit Canada for a term and for students to participate in the AGM. As an organization, however, it is weak on the other five points although one or two individuals have utilized some of the Society's resources in working out point 3 and maybe even 4. Maybe most indicative of the lack of ongoing links with Third World scholars were the indications by the secretary treasurer of the Society to speak with people first at CEESTEM and then in Nairobi who have left the institution and the country respectively one year earlier. If this is exchange or collaboration it leaves something to be desired.

The \* for the CALACS indicates the prominence of a group of scholars at the one Latin American research centre to work through CALACS to promote linkages and collaboration with colleagues in Latin America. They hold workshops in Latin America, publish jointly, seek funding together, and conduct joint research. The role of CALACS is to provide some funding and coordination and in turn the organization receives attention as well as visiting speakers for the AGM and cross-country

speaking tours. Generally CALACS does not initiate the exchanges but has responded reasonably well and has benefited. The \*\*\* indicates a protocol between CALACS and FLACSO for a series of linkages. This protocol grew out of the above-mentioned centre as well as the interest of the president of CALACS at the time. (Probably the main impetus to linkages grew out of a trip to Latin America by Professor Liisa North in 1978 when she visited research institutes in a number of countries to show that there were options to a particular arrangement CIDA was then funding in Brazil. See Appendix IX for the document arising from this visit). It is an agreement whereby much content can be developed and there are indications that this is now happening. CALACS has gone further than the other two Societies in linkages and collaboration but there is some question as to whether the above-mentioned centre really needs the organization. Now it provides some resources and a conduit whereby CALACS probably benefits more than the centre. Much more can grow out of the protocol and the linkages as indicated by the FLACSO documents in Appendix X.

CASA is an umbrella organization. Except for the CCSEAS there is little to be said beyond point 2. There might be an example or two under point 4 - publishing - but from what we can determine the bulk of the publications come from the CCSEAS. (See Appendix XII). For the China experts it has been difficult so far to elaborate linkages and collaborate. There should be no similar problems in South Asia but the scholars with whom I spoke simply did not consider this as a priority. The CCSEAS is an organization which preceded the CASA, is relatively small, and

has its own identity. The activities so far are exchange of information, discussion of joint research proposals, and plans for further work in the near future. There has not been a follow up to the joint CCSEAS-ISEAS conference held in Singapore in 1982 although there are plans to hold another conference in Manila in 1985. The plans are tentative so far but there are sufficient links and exchange of information whereby points 5 and 7 may be achieved.

What we found in all cases of linkage or collaboration beyond point 2 is the prominence of one or a few individuals who seek to work through the Society to promote some activity in cooperation with Third World counterparts. The identification with the organization is strongest with the CCSEAS and weakest with the CAAS. It is worth noting that in all of the cases of activity beyond point 2 these individuals are affiliated with research centres at their own universities. Thus has the IDRC funding led to linkages and collaboration between the three societies and scholars in the Third World? Yes, but of a variety of types and degrees. The documents furnished by the Societies and interviews with their executives demonstrated that this is not a high priority as it may be for the IDRC with its mandate. The questionnaire data indicate that the Societies have not been important in facilitating collaboration although this can indeed grow out of the normal activities of these Learned Societies. There are instances in all three Societies of collaboration and in the case of CALACS in particular and CEESEAS somewhat less this can grow substantially provided that funding is available.

#### 4. Alternative Funding Sources and Implications of IDRC Withdrawal of Support

What began as 'seed grants' in the early 1970's have turned into major commitments of funds by the IDRC to the three Societies. As we noted above, the percentage of IDRC support to all sources of funds is 73% for CAAS, 61% for CALACS, and 58% for CASA. We also noted that the size and variety of the IDRC support for the Societies is not widely appreciated. However, if the IDRC were to eliminate this funding it is our opinion that it would reflect very badly on the IDRC as at that time the members would indeed come to recognize the significance of such funding as programmes would be eliminated and the Societies seriously weakened. The evidence we have for this includes the very high response rate for the questionnaire, the fact that approximately one half of each Society is intensely or moderately involved with the Society, and my interviews with executives and members of the three Societies. What came through most clearly in these interviews was the value the members, and more so the executives, give to their involvement with and the activities of the Societies. In at least 75% of the interviews the consultant conducted with these members in Canada the message was emphatically that the Society must be maintained. Maybe the Society is inefficient, does not completely live up to its objectives, and the like but it is after all a learned society, in Canada, and serves a function.

There are no readily identifiable sources of funding to replace a major cut by the IDRC. Fees have been increased this year by all of the Societies in line with SSHRCC guidelines that

\$15 be the minimum fee aside from journal subscriptions, with the result that the fees are for CAAS \$35, for CALACS \$25, and for CASA \$25. All have different schedules for student, associate, and institutional members but the overwhelming majority are regular members. It is likely that CAAS can increase its membership by 20% or so, CALACS by 10%, and CASA should be able to collect fees from most of the 600 or so formal members. In the case of CASA we must remember that the fees are split, as of 1983, half and half between the secretariat and the regional councils. A rough calculation indicates that if these membership increases were achieved, at the present \$15 minimum prescribed by the SSHRCC, CAAS would receive \$3,600 in fees, CALACS \$6,600, and CASA \$9,000. This is more than before but not terribly significant. If one were to suggest raising the fees substantially we must remember that most members also belong to discipline learned societies. The executives are aware that raising the fees could well discourage membership which would then adversely affect the administration grants from the SSHRCC.

Under the new SSHRCC guidelines the administration grants, which is a prerequisite for the travel grants, are decided in a competition. The minimum number of members is 200 and the formula allocates \$10 per member. This means that the administration grants for CAAS and CALACS will decrease and for CASA probably remain about the same. For the administration then, the SSHRCC does not provide a viable alternative to the IDRC grants. However, the SSHRCC does provide for up to \$5,000 for one year and a two year maximum of \$10,000 for projects. The Societies could feasibly apply for these project grants to

improve the research and organization capacity of the Society and its membership.

External Affairs at the present time is not a likely source of funding for anything more than bringing in one or two visitors from the Third World through the programmes in opinion leaders and post initiatives. This would be helpful for the AGM as well as cross-country lecture programmes. There is no source here, however, for infrastructure support. CIDA can and does support projects such as seminars and travel. The Societies could probably exploit this source better to hold workshops. However, at the present time CIDA is unlikely to provide any infrastructure support although this could be a possibility if the organization were to further evolve in valuing research capability on the Third World here in Canada.

In sum, there are minor possibilities with these three official bodies for somewhat increased funding than has been exploited so far by the Societies. None of these can replace the infrastructure or administrative support which the IDRC currently provides and which seems likely to decrease from the SSHRCC. We discussed past and present funding strategies with the executives of the Societies and found that all had considered a number of possibilities but none had achieved any degree of success. These strategies included the following: institutional memberships, endowment drives, sales of books, and approaching the foundations. In our opinion, and supported by the lack of success so far, none of these are likely to bring in large sums to the Societies as they are currently constituted. None of the Societies have succeeded, as organizations, to demonstrate that

they merit large sums from universities (institutional membership), corporations, and foundations. This is not to say that one of them will not be able to convince some foundation executive but in our opinion it is very unlikely. The sale of books is not promising as there are too many North American university presses barely making do.

## 5. Recommendations Pertaining to the Three Societies.

A. Considering the lack of alternative sources of funding and the fact that the Societies provide the main link between the IDRC and the Canadian academic community we recommend that IDRC support to the Societies not be eliminated. This is particularly important when the Cooperative Programs of the IDRC remain poorly understood in the academic community, at least the social science component of it.

We are not clear why the phase V budget increased by the 35% over the previous phase, and from reviewing the Societies' activities it is obvious that some are expensive and vary greatly from one to another Society. Common criteria and funding schedules should be established for the three Societies and these should be attached to numbers of members and numbers of journals. In the case of CASA the membership must be the fee paying membership.

B. The activities which are obviously within the competence of the Societies are the following: 1. Publishing journals and proceedings which should be subsidized as at present by the IDRC for distribution in the Third World. The disparity in the size of the IDRC grant for distribution (CAAS \$15,000 and CALACS \$4,500 in phase V) should be decreased. Consideration should be given to more consistently utilizing North/South, in English or French, as the vehicle for circulating research from Latin America itself. This has been done from time to time and it could conceivably be defined as a journal in these terms. 2. Producing and distributing a newsletter within Canada and abroad is another activity which the IDRC should support. There is,

however, no reason why the CASA newsletter item should be three times that of the other two Societies. CALACS must also have a newsletter editor or find another means to improve the quality of the product. 3. The attendance of Third World students at the AGMs is another important and defining characteristic of these Societies. However, there should be a common formula to avoid the disparity in the number of students and the costs involved in their attendance. In phase V CAAS funds for this purpose are almost three times greater than the other two Societies combined. A formula possibly of some 10% of the previous year's registration should be considered. 4. The Societies, if they are to be more useful to the members and others, must have current directories. There is no need for the IDRC to fund the preparation of directories, however, and two of the Societies have found means to do it on their own. Possibly a SSHRCC project grant would be appropriate. The IDRC, however, may wish to subsidize the distribution of the directories in the Third World. 5. Beyond the SSHRCC administration grants there is no obvious alternative to IDRC funding for the central secretariats. All executives emphasized the need for increased funds for the secretariats without which other activities will be difficult. A formula should be elaborated to continue to assist the secretariats. The formula should remove the discrepancy at present between the phase V item for CAAS of \$17,663 and the \$11,800 for CASA which is a more complex and much larger organization. Quite possibly a grant roughly double the SSHRCC administration grant would be appropriate.

C. The biggest single item in the IDRC grants to these

Societies are the funds to bring Third World scholars to Canada and, in the case of CALACS, to support professor's and student's travel in both directions. In phase V this item is \$129,170 or 52% of the total budget. If the justification for this item is that it somehow leads to linkages and collaboration then it is only partially correct. There is minimal evidence that further linkages and collaboration result from the CAAS program as there is no follow up. With CALACS there is evidence of continuing collaboration, but this is due so far to the decision by a group involved in a research centre to draw on the resources of CALACS and to feed into the 'circuit' the Latin American researchers brought up under this and other programmes. With CASA the visit by the three Asians is, in the words of one informed critic, "a cultural event". There is no evidence that any further linkage or collaboration has resulted from these very expensive trips. Where there are linkages, in the CCSEAS it is, again, because a few scholars have drawn on the resources of the larger umbrella society. One or two of the executives of the Societies suggested that the visits could be better and more effectively coordinated if there were expanded secretariats; to have full-time administrative assistants. We are not convinced this is the most effective strategy, however, as there are so many demands on secretariats and the rationale for these funds have been in terms of linkages and collaboration which is closer to research than to meeting and exchanges.

It is our recommendation that this item be struck from the IDRC's grants to these Learned Societies. Rather, the Cooperative Programs should provide grants in the social sciences

to research centres throughout Canada to promote linkages and collaboration. Centres, not learned societies, have as their goal the promotion of research. In all the instances of linkages and collaboration the individuals involved were affiliated with research centres. The granting by the IDRC, however, should be more flexible than has apparently been the case so far and the process - of collaboration - should be the base rather than the goal - of Canadian expertise. Hopefully, the funding would be at least the \$129,170 given to the societies in phase V.

D. Once the justification for funding is explicitly linkages and collaboration, then the IDRC should provide modest sums to the Societies to facilitate the travel of these visitors to other centres and institutions in Canada. Indeed, the visits to at least a half dozen such institutions must be a requirement of the grant to the research centre. Research collaboration can be promoted and attention called to the area and expertise of the Third World scholar. If recommendation (C.) is seen as a justification for simply cutting the item from the IDRC's grant to the Societies and not matching or even increasing it through funding at research centres little will be accomplished. The combination of support to centres and the visits would seem to maximize the use of the funds.

E. There should be some consideration given to encouraging the secretariats away from Ottawa and locating them at a research centre in order to combine funds and have a full time administrative assistant deal with linkages and collaboration as well as the activities of the Societies. I understand that Carleton University is charging at least CASA and most probably

CALACS for space, and at least as satisfactory an arrangement could be worked out at centres beyond the Norman Paterson School. The Societies have not operated as pressure groups and have little to do with the ngos and federations. There is no obvious reason to have the Societies located in Ottawa, and we might mention that none of the counterpart American societies are located in Washington, D.C.. The Societies might move from one centre to another every three or five years should there be more than one available as in the case of the Asianists and might be for the Latin Americanists and should be for the Africanists. If these recommendations were adopted we would anticipate a two year budget for each of the Societies, independent of grants to the centres, of approximately \$60,000.

## 6. Possible Areas for Further Linkages and Collaboration.

The trip to centres and other institutions in the Third World indicated that the Societies as such do little in terms of linkages and collaborations. However, there were a number of suggestions and ideas which were made by those I interviewed which might be of interest to the IDRC. Some relate to the Societies and others do not but may be of interest to the Social Science Division or the cooperative programs.

1. In Mexico, at UNAM and El Colegio, in Chile at the Academy of Christian Humanism, and in Manila at the Integrated Research Center of De La Salle University scholar-administrators suggested that it would be good to have Canadian professors visit for a term or more in order to strengthen teaching and research programmes. In all these instances there was research material available that the visitor could work with.

2. In Latin America several researchers requested some means whereby their writings can be translated into English and made available more generally. As noted above, North/South could serve this purpose.

3. FLACSO is particularly keen to work with Canadian researchers on what would be an equal basis and hopes that CALACS could serve as a means for linking with these scholars. FLACSO officials will be visiting Canada in the Fall and will contact the IDRC.

4. CAAS, if it is to link in with Latin American institutions would do well to work out an arrangement with the Asociacion Latinoamericana de Estudios Afroasiaticos. (See Appendix XII for information on ALADAA). In general, there is much to recommend greater links between the three Canadian Societies and their counterparts at the national or regional level in the Third World. The CPSA has held joint workshops in India and Africa and in fact the past president of the CASA organized the Indian workshop. The Societies could hold similar workshops.

5. PISPAL, with headquarters at the Colegio de Mexico, is interested in including Canadian research centres in its network. The IDRC already funds PISPAL and some Canadian researchers are known to the organization. (See Appendix XIII for a statement on PISPAL).

6. At FLACSO, Mexico it was suggested that IDRC might be interested in supporting a number of fellowships for masters students in the social sciences. Canadian students can be included in this programme. The cost is approximately \$10,000 for two years.

7. In Chile the IDRC already supports groups within the Academy of Christian Humanism. It may have examined and rejected other organizations such as ILADES and the Instituto Chileno de Estudios Humanisticos. In case the IDRC is not familiar with these organizations some material is included here. (See

Appendix XIV for documents).

8. The IDRC is undoubtedly already very familiar with the IDS and the Diplomat Training Program in Nairobi. CAAS could cooperate with both particularly as the latter seeks to train bilingual diplomats.

9. It may be due to my scattered contacts and the fact that I was talking with only social scientists but if scholars are familiar with the IDRC they are not at all familiar with the Cooperative Programs. More publicity and visits might be made to the more obvious research centres in the Third World. Professor K.S. Sandhu requested in particular that there be more contact between the ISEAS and the IDRC.

For most of these nine points the consultant has available more information and materials in the form of documents and his typed interviews. These will be provided to the IDRC on request.

APPENDIX I

Interviews in Canada

## Appendix I

Professor Heribert ADAM, Sociology, Simon Fraser University

Professor Douglas ANGLIN, Political Science, Carleton University

Professor Timothy ANNA, History, University of Manitoba

Professor Bernardo BERDICHEWSKY, Sociology and Anthropology,  
Simon Fraser University

Professor Bruce BERMAN, Political Science, Queen's University

Professor Heath B. CHAMBERLAIN, Political Science, University of  
British Columbia

Mr. Pierre CHARPONTIER, Director of Academic Relations,  
Department of External Affairs

Professor N.K. CHAUDRY, Economics, University of Toronto

Professor Jerome CHEN, History, York University

Professor Michael CHOSSODOVSKY, Economics, University of Ottawa

Professor Michael CLELAND, Associate Director, Centre for  
Development Projects, Dalhousie University

Dr. Robert DAVIDSON, Acting Executive Director, Social Science  
Federation of Canada

Professor Victor FALKENHEIM, Political Science, University of Toronto

Dr. David FARR, Centre for International Programs, Carleton  
University

Professor Bernard FROLIC, Political Science, York University

Professor John GALATY, Anthropology, McGill University

Professor Beverly GARTELL, Anthropology, Simon Fraser University

Mr. André GINGRAS, Head, Institutional Cooperation and Development  
Services, CIDA

Mr. Steve GOBAN, Director, Research Communication Division, SSHRCC

Mr. Richard GORHAM, Assistant Undersecretary of State for Latin America, Department of External Affairs

Professor George HAINESWORTH, Economics, University of British Columbia

Mr. Richard HARMSTON, CCIC

Professor Cary HECTOR, Political Science, University of Quebec at Montreal

Dr. Walter HITSCHFELD, Director, McGill International, McGill University

Professor John HOWES, History, University of British Columbia

Professor Hamish ION, History, Royal Military College, Kingston

Professor David JOHNSON, History, University of Alberta

Professor John KIRK, Spanish, Dalhousie University

Professor Martin KLEIN, History, University of Toronto

Professor Peter LANDSTREET, Sociology, York University

Professor Charles LeBLANC, Director, Centre d'études de l'Asie de l'est, University of Montreal

Professor Jayant LELE, Political Science/Sociology, Queen's University

Dr. LeROY, Science Council of Canada

Professor Kurt LEVY, Spanish and Portuguese, University of Toronto

Professor Robert McCORMACK, History, University of Winnipeg

Mr. Robert MILLER, Parliamentary Centre

Professor Claude MORIN, History, University of Montreal

Professor Edward MOULTON, History, University of Manitoba

Professor M.V. NAIDU, Political Science, Brandon University

Professor Liisa NORTH, Political Science, York University

Dr. Michael OLIVER, IDO of AUCC

Professor David POLLOCK, Economics, Carleton University

Professor Cranford PRATT, Political Science, University of Toronto

Professor Joanne C.J. PRINDIVILLE, Anthropology, Memorial University

Professor Berry RIDELL, Geography, Queen's University

Professor Richard SANDBROOK, Political Science, University of Toronto

Mr. Zeno SANTIAGO, Program Evaluation, Special Programs Branch,  
CIDA

Professor John SAUL, Political Science, University of Toronto

Professor Brian SCHWIMMER, Anthropology, University of Manitoba

Professor Tim SHAW, Political Science, Dalhousie University

Professor E. SIGGEL, Economics, Concordia University

Professor Michael STEVENSON, Political Science, York University

Professor Richard STREN, Political Science, University of Toronto

Professor Fraser TAYLOR, Geography, Carleton University

Professor Elliot TEPPER, Political Science, Carleton University

Dr. John TRENT, ex- Executive Director of the Social Science Federation;  
Secretary-Treasurer of IPSA, Political Science, University of Ottawa

Professor K. Victor UJIMOTO, Sociology, Guelph University

Professor Rolf WESCHE, Geography, University of Ottawa

Professor Hugh WILSON, History, University of Alberta

Professor C. YOUNG, History, Queen's University

Dr. Amy ZELMER, International Liaison Officer, Associate Vice-Principal Academic, University of Alberta

## APPENDIX II

Interviews in Africa, Asia, and Latin America

## Appendix II

### Africa

Professor Olajide ALUKO, Dean, Faculty of Administration,  
University of Ife

Professor Jorge Silva CASTILLO, Director, Centro de Estudios de  
Asia Y Africa, El Colegio de Mexico (on CAAS)

Dr. Michael CHEGE, Director, Diplomat Training Program, University  
of Nairobi

Professor Hector CUADRA, Coordinator del Area de  
Relaciones Internacionales, CEESTEM (on CAAS)

Dr. Kenneth KING, Head, African Centre, Edinburgh

Dr. Njuguna NGELTHE, Research Fellow, Institute of Development  
Studies, Nairobi

Professor Emeka NWOKEDI, Department of International Relations, Ife

Dr. B.A. OGOT, Nairobi

Professor Ralph ONWUKA, Department of International Relations,  
University of Ife

Mr. Alfredo RAMIREZ, CEESTEM (on CAAS)

### Latin America

Professor Jose Joaquin BRUNNER, Director, Programa FLACSO-Chile

Professor Enrique D'ETIGNY, Vice-President, Academia de  
Humanismo Cristiano, Chile

Mr. Ayrton FAUSTO, International Cooperation, FLACSO, Santiago

Mr. Humberto Vega FERNANDEZ, Director, Programa de Economia del Trabajo,  
Academia de Humanismo Cristiano, Chile

Dr. Jorge Rodriguez GROSSI, Economista, ILADES

Professor José NUN, Coordinador de Cooperacion Externa, FLACSO,  
Mexico

Dr. Renato POBLETE, Mensaje, Centro Bellarmino, ILADES, Chile

Dr. Rudolfo STAVENHAGEN, Academic Coordinator, Colegio de Mexico

Dr. Claudio STERN, Secretario Ejecutivo, Programa de Investigaciones  
Sociales Sobre Poblacion en America Latina, El Colegio de Mexico

Professor Fabio VILLALOBOS, FLACSO, Quito

South-East Asia

Ms. Rosemary M. AQUINO, Executive Director, Research Centre of  
De La Salle University

Professor Lim Tech GEE, Center for Policy Research, University  
Sains, Penang

Professor D.S. GIBBONS, Center for Policy Research, University  
Sains, Penang

Mr. Jingjai HANCHANLASH, Director, Asia Regional Office, IDRC  
Singapore

Dr. Mahar MANGAHAS, Head, Research for Development Department,  
Development Academy of the Philippines, Manila

Dr. Kamal SALIH, Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic, University  
Sains, Penang

Dr. K.S. SANDHU, Director, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies

# THE IMPACT OF IDRC FUNDING ON THE THREE CANADIAN AREA SPECIFIC LEARNED SOCIETIES

## IDENTIFICATION

### Project

Title: Canadian Area Specific Learned Societies:  
Phases I - V  
Country: Canada with links to various Third World  
nations  
Numbers: not reported  
Division: Social Sciences

### Evaluation

Evaluators: Bruneau, T. (non-Centre)  
DAP: 3-A-83-4044  
Initiator: Social Sciences but undertaken by OPE  
Type: primarily Ex-poste  
Term: May - August 1983  
Centre Budget: Evaluation: \$ 27,145 (4%)  
Projects: \$641,531

## EVALUATION RATIONALE

The Centre has funded three CASL Societies for 9 years. In 1982 SS Division indicated that a evaluation of Centre funded activities would be made before any further requests for support from the Societies would be considered. Hence, apparently the evaluation was proposed to determine what had been accomplished in order to justify any future course of action for the Centre.

## EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

### Description

1. "To assess the effectiveness of IDRC funding of the three Learned Societies in accord with the objectives for which funding was provided,
2. To assess the effectiveness of IDRC funding on the Societies° and their members° impact on research development problems in the Third World,
3. To ascertain the possibilities for diversification of the Societies° funding and the efforts made by them to decrease their dependence on IDRC support,
4. To recommend various strategies for funding, including IDRC funding, in light of the IDRC°s relationships with the Canadian academic community."

### Critique

The objectives are straight-forward and clear. They stress the effectiveness and impact of Centre support plus address future funding prospects. They do not explicitly address efficiency and validity questions--the latter should have been crucial in such an analysis.

## EVALUATION SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

### Description

1. Since the Societies are the main link between the Centre and the Canadian academic community, IDRC support to the Societies should not be eliminated.
2. Common criteria and funding schedules which are consistent from Society to Society should be established should reflect membership and scholarly output, etc.
3. The Centre should support: the publishing of journals and proceedings plus encourage Societies to utilize more fully existing journals; the publishing of a newsletter by each Society; attendance of Third World students at important Society meetings; the distribution of Society directories; the administrative infrastructure of the Societies.
4. Linkages and collaboration between Canadian and Third World scholars and institutions has only been partly encouraged. Travel funds for such purposes should be terminated and the Cooperative Program mechanism be used instead.
5. Societies should be encouraged to re-establish themselves at research centres
6. To further encourage linkages and collaboration between Canadian and Third World scholars, the following might be considered:
  - o Have Canadian professors visit and work at Third World institutions for a term or more
  - o Provide translation facilities so that Spanish research could be given a wider audience
  - o Encourage greater links between the three Canadian Societies and their national and regional counterparts in the Third World
  - o Support several fellowships for masters students in the social sciences for which Canadian and Third World students would be eligible
  - o The Cooperative Program needs to be more widely publicized.
7. The three Societies have as their members scholars who are somewhat more productive than non-members, they are generally within the fields relating to the IDRC's objectives, publish and hold conferences and workshops. They are not effective at calling attention to their areas of expertise let alone providing this expertise to those who might be able to use it; they do not influence policy making. Centre funding has been important in allowing the Societies to maintain their secretariats and diversify their activities beyond those of most other learned societies in Canada.
8. The effectiveness of Centre funding has been mixed. The Societies work well as a grouping of academics but they do not provide information and expertise to non-members and are especially weak in that areas which is used to justify Centre funding--namely effective linkages with the the Third World.

### Critique

1. In some instances, the data is not reflected in the recommendations. There are very few instances where Centre support can be linked with any meaningful outcome. Yet, the report concludes that IDRC should continue supporting the Societies only because, in the evaluators mind, the Societies are "the main link between the Centre and the Canadian academic community". Given the membership figures, this argument is somewhat difficult to believe.
2. Two of the four evaluation objectives focus on assessing alternative funding arrangements. Yet, discussion on these topics is comparatively thin.
3. Unsolicited suggestions on how to foster more linkages was not included in the mandate of the evaluation.
4. Given the financial support provided by the Centre, more attention should have been given to cost-effectiveness.

### EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

#### Description

Apparently an iterative method was adopted. Research tools were varied:

1. Interviews in Canada and the Third World
2. Interviews with Centre staff
3. Observations in meetings
4. File/documentation reviews
5. Search of the Canadian Register of Research and Researchers
6. Mail survey to random sample of Society members

#### Critique

In the summary report no details were given on the interview format, the questionnaire or on any of the data gathering tools. Hence, no comment can be given as to their quality or purpose or to the necessity of using so many tools. A critique of the methodology would be helpful. From the extensiveness of the design, it seems that the number of insights might have been greater.

### PROGRAMMING/POLICY IMPLICATIONS

#### For the Centre

1. It is apparent from the evaluation that the Centre must have a very clear idea of why it supports such institutions. From the analysis, Centre support appears to have had an insignificant effect on the Societies. Furthermore, there has been little payoff to the Centre for its association with the Societies. necessary training and technical back-up services.

#### For the Division

1. Implicit in the evaluation report is the need for the Division to more carefully monitor such projects and not wait for 9 years and until \$640,000 has been spent before realizing that benefits have been minimal.
2. Although the evaluation encourages the Centre to

continue support for the Societies, the Division must re-examine if the justification for such a suggestion is adequate.

For OPE

1. Format guidelines for evaluation reports are needed. For example, the report could have been better if it contained an executive summary, a more concise description (plus a critique) of the methodology, etc.
2. Since OPE administered the analysis, a more critical review of the results would have been warranted. Some reasoning is not convincing; data does not always support the recommendations.
3. Given the extensiveness of the method and the cost of the study, one might expect more.

*Brace  
He did  
not do it*