

h 9

Report Of The Second Review Committee

AUGUST 1978

Σ:m.2,xN7:3.N77t
L8
175761

INDIAN COUNCIL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH
NEW DELHI

**REPORT OF
THE SECOND REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**INDIAN COUNCIL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH
NEW DELHI**

AUGUST 1978

Published by the Second Review Committee, ICSSR c/o Centre for Policy Research,
6-Commercial Area, Paschimi Marg, Vasant Vihar, New Delhi-110057 and Printed at
the Indraprastha Press (C.B.T.), 4, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002.

August 5, 1978

**Second
Review
Committee**
Indian Council of Social Science Research
C-6, Commercial Area, Paschimi Marg,
Vasant Vihar, New Delhi-110057

Prof. Rajni Kothari,
Chairman,
Indian Council of Social Science Research,
IIPA Hostel, Indraprastha Estate,
New Delhi 110 002

Dear Prof Rajni Kothari,

I have pleasure to submit herewith the report of the Second Review Committee which is unanimous.

You will see that only four of us have actually signed the report. The fifth member, namely, Dr Samuel Paul could not sign as he is presently abroad. But he has seen and approved the draft and has agreed to put his signature. I am arranging to send him a copy of the report and secure his signature.

The work of this Committee has given us some idea of the burden that you will be bearing. I hope our recommendations will help make this burden somewhat more bearable and meaningful.

With regards,

Yours sincerely,



(V. M. Dandekar)
Chairman

CONTENTS

<i>Chapter</i>		<i>Pages</i>
I. Introductory	...	1-3
II. Establishment of the Indian Council of Social Science Research, its policies and programmes	...	4-9
III. Research Grants	...	10-22
IV. Fellowship	...	23-32
V. Research Institutes	...	33-37
VI. Training in Research Methodology	...	38-41
VII. Area Studies, International Collaboration and Foreign Assistance	...	42-46
VIII. Regional and State Centres	...	47-50
IX. Publication, Documentation and Data Archives	...	51-60
X. Structure, Organisation and Finances	...	61-73
XI. Autonomy	...	74-79
XII. Overview and Recommendations	...	80-101
Annexures	...	102-113

I INTRODUCTORY

1.1 The Indian Council of Social Science Research constituted in August 1977 the Second Review Committee consisting of the following:

Prof. V. M. Dandekar	Chairman
Dr. Ramkrishna Mukherjee	Member
Dr. Samuel Paul	Member
Dr. G. Ram Reddy	Member
Dr. V. A. Pai Panandiker	Member-Secretary

1.2 The following were the terms of reference of the Committee:—

- (i) to review the work of the ICSSR during the last 10 years and especially during the Fifth Five-Year Plan; and
- (ii) to make proposals for the development of the work and programmes of the ICSSR over the next 10 years and especially during the Sixth Five-Year Plan.

1.3 The procedure to be followed by the Committee were left to be decided by it and the report was expected to be submitted by 31st March, 1978.

1.4 At the first Meeting held on 8th November, 1977, the Review Committee broadly surveyed the entire range of activities of the ICSSR which need to be reviewed and discussed, at length, the procedure to be followed and programme of its work. In view of the range of activities which need to be studied and the social scientists to be met and the workload involved, the Committee felt that more time, atleast three more months, would be required to submit its report.

1.5 In order to secure the assessment of a wide circle of social science personnel, a questionnaire (Annexure I) was prepared by the Committee and circulated to about 7000 individuals and institutions. These included the following:—

(i) All colleges	3,155
(ii) Vice Chancellors of all Universities and deemed Universities	118

(iii) Persons on ICSSR's Mailing List for News Letters and other nonpriced publications	143
(iv) Professional Organisations/Associations in India	95
(v) Social Science Research Institutes in India	359
(vi) All Heads of Departments of Universities	490
(vii) Miscellaneous ..	894
(viii) Directors of Research Institutes ..	15
(ix) All Members of the ICSSR ..	26
(x) Researchers whose Research Projects had been approved by the ICSSR ..	588*
(xi) Researchers whose Research Projects had not been approved by the ICSSR ..	1,057*
	6,940

1.6 The questionnaire was also published in the issue of the Economic and Political Weekly dated 7th January, 1978, for giving wide publicity.

1.7 Response to the questionnaire was moderate. In all, 667 replies were received of which 390 individuals had no comments to offer. Of the 277 who sent in their comments, 60 individuals at their instance were invited to meet the Review Committee.

1.8 The number of persons who were thus invited and those who met the Committee are given below:—

<i>Centre</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>No. of persons who were called</i>	<i>No. of persons who attended</i>
(i) Delhi	19-4-78	23	15
(ii) Bombay	24-4-78	14	12
(iii) Hyderabad	26-4-78	10	4
(iv) Calcutta	22-5-78	13	9
		60	40

Names of the persons who met the Committee are given in Annexure II.

*The Project Directors whose more than one project had been approved/ had not been approved have been counted only once.

1.9 The Secretariat of the ICSSR had prepared a number of review notes of the major developments in the past 8/9 years from the stand-point of ICSSR's perception of its own role and the evolution of its research policies and programmes. This has proved greatly useful to us. We had also the benefit of listening to the opinions expressed by the members of the Council when the review notes were discussed at the meeting of the Council, held on 20th and 21st January 1978.

1.10 The Committee met Shri J P Naik, the then Member-Secretary of ICSSR, on 8th November, 1977, and Prof. Rajni Kothari, Chairman of the ICSSR, on 21st March 1978. The Committee met the senior officers of the ICSSR in the morning of 20th April, 1978, when the Chairman and the Member-Secretary designate were also present. The Committee met the Junior Officers in the afternoon of the same day. The junior staff of the ICSSR met the Chairman of the Committee on 10th May, 1978, to discuss their problems.

1.11 The Committee had an opportunity of a very useful meeting with the Chairman of the University Grants Commission, Dr. Satish Chandra, and the Secretary of the UGC, Shri R.K. Chhabra on 7th July, 1978.

1.12 In all, the Review Committee held fourteen meetings. Of these, three meetings were held at the Regional Centres at Bombay, Hyderabad and Calcutta where the Committee also met the local scholars in the region who had expressed a desire to meet the Committee in person.

1.13 We take this opportunity to record our appreciation of the excellent support provided to the Review Committee by Shri P S Dhotrekar, Officer on Special Duty, and Staff of the Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi; in particular Sarvashri Y L Nangia, Kamaljit Kumar, Trimbak Rao, P K Yagneswaran, and K L Narula.

V M DANDEKAR
RAMKRISHNA MUKHERJEE
SAMUEL PAUL
G RAM REDDY
V A PAI PANANDIKER

II ESTABLISHMENT OF THE INDIAN COUNCIL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, ITS POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES

2.1 The development of social science research in India before independence occurred largely along with the growth of the Indian Universities and the establishment of a large number of research institutions, many of which were privately founded. The government did not play much active role.

2.2 The first initiative on the part of the government came in the wake of the establishment of the Planning Commission in 1950. The Commission felt the need for social science research on topics of relevance and significance for its own work. In 1953, the Research Programmes Committee (RPC) of the Planning Commission was established to work out and administer suitable schemes of research and investigation into social, economic and administrative problems relating to national development, in consultation with universities and other institutions. In the First Five-Year Plan, a provision of Rs. 50 lakhs was made for this purpose. The first meeting of the RPC was held in August 1953. Grants-in-aid were made institution based and the Project Directors worked in an honorary capacity. Research studies were classified in seven groups and for each group a technical Committee was set up for advising the Research Programmes Committee on identifying relevant research proposals and for formulating appropriate research methods for the same. The Research Programmes Committee had also organised Regional Committees which met twice a year. During the period 1953 to 1969, the Research Programmes Committee financed about 400 research studies on various socio-economic problems.

2.3 Though the RPC functioned satisfactorily, it was thought that an independent organisation for promoting social science research would be desirable. The Planning Commission set up a Committee on Social Science Research in August 1965 under the Chairmanship of Prof. V.K.R.V. Rao. The basic terms of reference of the Committee were: "To survey the current situation in relation to research in Social Sciences in India and make

recommendations regarding their future line of development, including the organisational steps necessary for the same." The Committee submitted its report in 1967. One of the key recommendations of the Committee, which the government accepted, was the establishment of an Indian Council of Social Science Research for promoting research in Social Sciences.

2.4 The Indian Council of Social Science Research was set up by the Government of India on 15th April, 1969. It was subsequently registered as a society under the Societies Registration Act of 1860. The first meeting of the ICSSR was held on 12th May, 1969. Forty-five on-going research projects of RPC were transferred to the ICSSR and the future research sponsoring activity of the RPC was confined to problems having a direct bearing on plan formulation and implementation.

2.5 The main objects of the Council, as given in its Memorandum of Association, are as follows:

- (a) To review the progress of social science research and to give advice to its users in Government or outside;
- (b) To sponsor social science research programmes as well as research projects, and administer grants to institutions and individuals for research in social sciences and to give financial support to learned associations, standard journals and institutions or organisations engaged in the conduct or sponsoring of social science research;
- (c) To provide technical assistance for the formulation of social science research programmes and designing of research projects by individuals or institutions, and to organise and support institutional arrangements for training in research methodology;
- (d) To indicate periodically areas and topics on which social science research is to be promoted and to adopt special measures for the development of research in neglected or new areas;
- (e) To coordinate research activities in the field of social sciences and to encourage programmes of inter-disciplinary research;
- (f) To develop and support centres for documentation, service maintenance and supply of data, inventory of

current social science research and preparation of a national register of social scientists;

- (g) To organise, sponsor and finance seminars, workshops, study circles, working groups/parties, and conferences for promoting research or utilisation of social science research;
- (h) To give grants for publication of social science research work and to undertake publication of digests, periodicals and journals devoted to such research;
- (i) To institute and administer scholarships, fellowships and awards for social science research by students, teachers and other research workers in India or outside, and, in particular, to award senior fellowships for research in social science that will enable workers in universities to complete their research work for publication or undertake wholtime research for a definite period on topics in which they are specially interested and for doing research on which they are specially qualified;
- (j) To advise the Government of India on all such matters pertaining to social science research as may be referred to it from time to time, including collaborative arrangements in social science research with foreign agencies; and
- (k) To undertake, on an agency basis, such other functions as may be entrusted to it by Government under terms and conditions which may be mutually agreed upon.
- (l) Generally to take all such measures as may be found necessary from time to time to promote social science research and its utilisation in the country.

2.6 In the fifth year of its working, in January 1973, the ICSSR appointed the first Review Committee under the Chairmanship of Dr. M. S. Adiseshiah to evaluate its work in the past five years and to indicate lines on which it should develop during the Fifth Five Year Plan period. The Report of the Committee is published in two volumes under the title: *A Report of Social Sciences in India; Retrospective and Prospective*. This was discussed in detail by the ICSSR and its committees; and in the light of the decisions, its Fifth Five Year Plan was prepared and its policies were re-

formulated. These decisions as well as the Fifth Five Year Plan of the ICSSR are published separately (Occasional Monograph No. X).

2.7 The present programmes and activities of the ICSSR are as under:

(1) Research Promotion

This category includes:

- (a) Financial support to research proposals received from Social Scientists and Institutions under the programme of research grants for teacher's awards, research projects and programmes; major projects; and sponsored research programmes on selected themes of significance and relevance;
- (b) Fellowship (e.g. national fellowships, senior fellowships; fellowships for young social scientists), Assistance to post-doctoral and doctoral students (including study grants);
- (c) Training in Research Methodology;
- (d) Area Studies and International Collaboration;
- (e) Development of Research Institutes which work in close collaboration with the university system on the one hand and the policy formulating and implementing agencies on the other.
- (f) Collaboration with other agencies such as the Planning Commission, Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, Indian Council of Medical Research, Indian Council of Historical Research and National Labour Institute.

(2) Publications

- (a) Research Surveys;
- (b) Publication of research reports, subsidy for doctoral theses, books and journals (including non-priced publications); and
- (c) Sales, Distribution, and Exchange.

(3) Supporting Services

These include:

- (a) Inter-Library Resources Centres;
- (b) Regional and State Centres;
- (c) Bibliographical and Documentation Service;
- (d) Data Archives; and
- (e) National Bibliographical and Documentation Centre in Foreign Languages (other than English).

(4) Utilization of Knowledge

This includes programmes such as feed back into teaching, underpinning and support for policy formulation and implementation, educating public opinion, training of a new social and political leadership, and influencing social and individual behaviour.

(5) Other Programmes

These include:

- (a) Assistance to Professional Organisations of social scientists;
- (b) Teaching and Research in Social Sciences in Agricultural, Engineering and Medical Education;
- (c) Conferences, Seminars and Workshops;
- (d) Lectures and Awards;
- (e) Tax-exemption under Section 35(i) (iii) of the Income-tax Act, 1961 for Social Science Research; and
- (f) Advisory Role on the academic aspects of research proposals of overseas social scientists desiring to do research in India, and of a promotional agency.

2.8 The relative importance of these several programmes and activities might be judged by the annual expenditure on them. In the following is given the expenditure incurred during 1976-77.

Expenditure of the ICSSR in 1976-77

<i>Head of Account</i>	<i>Rs. in Lakhs</i>	<i>Percentage to total</i>
A. Administration	9.93	6.14
B. Research Grant	31.20	19.28
C. Research Fellowship	16.48	10.18
D. Training	1.32	0.82
E. Study Grant	0.99	0.61
F. Regional Centres	10.72	6.62
G. Documentation Centres	10.14	6.27
H. Data Archives	1.41	0.87
I. Publications	6.91	4.27
J. Maintenance and Development Grants to Research Institutions	54.33	33.57
K. Other Programmes	11.76	7.27
L. Loans to Staff	}	2.26
M. Deposits and Advances		
N. Public Account Provident Fund etc.		
O. Capital Expenditure, Land & Building		
P. Furniture and Equipment		
Q. Library Books	4.38	2.71
R. Vehicles		
Total	161.83	100.00

III RESEARCH GRANTS

3.1 The promotion of research is the most important activity of the ICSSR. For this purpose, it has two instruments.

(1) Research grants, i.e. direct financial support to research projects taken up by social scientists in addition to their normal duties and in an honorary capacity; and

(2) Award of fellowships to enable social scientists to pursue their research interests on a whole-time basis. In this chapter, we shall review the performance of the ICSSR in the matter of research grants.

3.2 In the matter of research grants, as also in fellowships, the ICSSR's role is both responsive and promotional. The responsive role of the ICSSR consists of provision of grants-in-aid to individuals to pursue their own research interests, irrespective of whether they fall or not in the priority areas as defined by the ICSSR from time to time. This takes the following three forms: (a) Research projects, (b) Research programmes (this has not become operational) and (c) Teachers' Awards.

3.3 The promotional role of the ICSSR consists of sponsoring certain research proposals, that is to say, the initiative comes not from an individual or an institution, but from the ICSSR itself, which defines priority areas, identifies individuals and institutions and requests them to take up studies in a priority area. As a rule a sum of about Rs. 10 lakhs is set aside for a priority area defined as such by the ICSSR. All instruments of the ICSSR such as teachers' awards, research projects and fellow-ships of all categories are used to further this objective. The programme includes a special category called 'major projects', which are defined as research projects costing Rs. 5 lakhs or more and which can therefore be implemented only under a sponsored programme. The sponsored programmes have assumed considerable importance since the Fifth Plan, presumably because of the emphasis placed on them by the First Review Committee. At present, the sponsored programmes use a larger proportion of the funds available to the ICSSR than the research grants the

ICSSR gives in response to requests from individuals and institutions.

3.4 The Research Project is the most extensively used instrument of the ICSSR. The Teachers' Award is really a small research project whose total cost is Rs. 7,500 or less and it differs from the Research Project only in the sense that a simpler and quicker procedure is adopted for sanctioning it. These two categories are therefore dealt with together. A total of 708 Research Projects and Teachers' Awards were sanctioned between 1969-70 and 1976-77.

3.5 The following Table gives the number of applications received from year to year and the number sanctioned:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Total No. of Research Proposals</i>	
	<i>Received</i>	<i>Sanctioned</i>
Projects transferred from the Planning Commission	—	45
1969-70	155	13
1970-71	300	74
1971-72	415	103
1972-73	320	104
1973-74	261	88
1974-75	236	69
1975-76	304	105
1976-77	314	107
Total	2,305	708

- N.B.*— (1) Some of the research proposals received in a given year cannot often be sanctioned in that year. These are then carried over to the next year.
- (2) The sanctioned research proposals include, not only the proposals sanctioned as responses to applications received but also the sponsored research proposals.

3.6 In view of the fact that a large number of research proposals were not sanctioned, it will be useful to mention the procedure adopted by the ICSSR for screening and sanctioning of the proposals. Briefly, they are as under:—

- (i) Proposals costing less than Rs. 5,000/- are scrutinised and

sanctioned by the Committee of Directors and thereafter these cases are reported to the Research Committee;

(ii) Teachers' Awards costing less than Rs. 7,500/- are referred to one consultant and thereafter proposals are sent to the Research Committee;

(iii) Research Projects costing less than Rs. 50,000/- are referred to two or three consultants and then the proposals are sent to the Research Committee for final decision; and

(iv) Special Committees are constituted for scrutinizing major projects, generally costing Rs. 5 lakhs or more.

3.7 It is instructive to look at the rejected proposals. Out of the total of 1642 rejected proposals, 1417 were merely 'recorded' that is they did not even come up to the stage of referring to the consultant. A number of them were rejected by the Secretariat because, in its opinion, they did not qualify for further consideration. A number of others were referred back to their authors with queries or suggestions for revision. The authors did not respond. When we examined the levels of these researchers, we found that most of them were senior scholars and hence it was not as if these applications were by junior social scientists who did not know how to present their proposals to the ICSSR.

3.8 Of the balance 225 rejected proposals, the analysis shows the following:

No. of proposals rejected by

(i) Secretariat	..	79
(ii) One Consultant	..	28
(iii) Two Consultants	..	103
(iv) Three Consultants	..	15
		225

Further analysis, as supplied by the ICSSR Secretariat, is given in the following Tables.

Reasons for rejecting the proposals

Total rejected proposals	..	225
Rejected at the first instance	..	151
Rejected after revision	..	74
A. Rejected at the first instance		151
<i>I—By the ICSSR Secretariat</i>		
a. Excessive budget, inadequately formulated, low priority	..	35
b. No research element	..	9
c. Submitted by individuals without institutional affiliation	..	8
d. Grant for Ph.D., D. Litt and Book		5
e. No research utility/outdated	..	4
f. Have other sources	..	2
g. Outside the scope of ICSSR		2
h. Reasons not given	..	14
<i>II—Sent to one consultant only</i>		
a. Poorly formulated	..	15
b. Consultant approved, Committee rejected on grounds that number of studies already available		1
<i>III—Sent to two consultants</i>		
a. Rejected by both—badly formulated, poor methodology, not worthwhile..		35
b. Approved by one rejected by the other		7
c. Approved by the consultants rejected by the Committee		1
<i>IV—Referred to a third consultant who rejected</i>		
a. Poor design	..	12
b. Did not fall under purview of ICSSR		1

B. Rejected after revision

a. Revised proposal rejected by the consultants	34
b. Both consultants asked to revise it—was rejected by the Committee as suggestions were not incorporated	21
c. Sent to one consultant who rejected	11
d. One approved and one rejected—rejected by the Committee	5
e. All three rejected	2
f. Consultant approved but committee rejected	1

3.9 There has been much criticism of the procedure. First of all, the procedure of appointing the consultants has proved to be both cumbersome and unsatisfactory. The ICSSR's Secretariat first writes to the consultants requesting their willingness to undertake evaluation of a proposal. Thereafter the proposal is sent to the consultant who has to send in his report within a month. In several cases, this does not happen and in some cases the consultants take several months to send in their evaluation. Most important of all there does not appear to be any well-defined procedure for appointment of consultants.

3.10 We understand that the Research Committee not only examines each research project but also the procedure adopted and time taken to take a decision; that decisions are taken as expeditiously as possible and the cases remaining undecided for more than six months are periodically reviewed and their progress watched. Nevertheless, several cases were brought to our notice where apparently that had not happened.

3.11 Let us now turn to the 708 approved research proposals. In the following Tables we present their classification (1) by Discipline (2) by Estimated Expenditure (3) by Status of Project Director (4) by States and Union Territories and finally (5) by Institutions. It will be noticed that two-third of all approved proposals belong to the three major social science disciplines, namely, Economics, Political Science and Sociology, and that between these three they are nearly equally divided. On the whole, it seems that the distribution of the approved proposals over the several disciplines is satisfactory.

Classification of the Approved Research Proposals by Disciplines

<i>Discipline</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent to Total</i>
Anthropology	32	4.52
Commerce	15	2.12
Demography	7	0.99
Economics	181	25.56
Education	21	2.97
Geography	20	2.82
History	14	1.98
Linguistics	4	0.56
Management	6	0.85
Political Science	152	21.47
Psychology	61	8.61
Public Administration	29	4.10
Sociology	142	20.06
Social Work	7	0.99
Law	9	1.27
Others	8	1.13
Total	708	100.00

Classification of the Approved Research Proposals by Estimated Expenditure

<i>Cost of the Proposal Rs.</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent to Total</i>
7,500 or less	198	27.97
7,500 to 10,000	23	3.25
10,001 to 15,000	59	8.33
15,001 to 20,000	72	10.17
20,001 to 25,000	51	7.20
25,001 to 30,000	48	6.78
30,001 to 40,000	86	12.15
40,001 to 50,000	100	14.12
50,001 to 75,000	54	7.63
75,001 to 100,000	10	1.41
100,001 to 200,000	4	0.57
200,001 to 300,000	1	0.14
300,001 to 500,000	1	0.14
500,001 to 1,000,000	—	—
More than 1,000,000	1	0.14
Total	708	100.00

Classification of the Approved Research Proposals by Status of Project Directors

<i>Status of Project Directors</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent to Total</i>
University Departments and Research Institutes		
Professors	292	41.24
Readers	157	22.18
Lecturers	145	20.48
College Teachers	56	7.91
Others	58	8.19
Total	708	100.00

Classification of the Approved Research Proposals by States and Union Territories

<i>States Union Territories</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent to Total</i>
Andhra Pradesh	37	5.23
Assam	7	0.99
Bihar	46	6.50
Gujarat	51	7.20
Kerala	13	1.84
Madhya Pradesh	17	2.40
Tamil Nadu	24	3.38
Maharashtra	76	10.73
Karnataka	21	2.97
Orissa	10	1.41
Punjab	6	0.85
Rajasthan	48	6.78
Uttar Pradesh	80	11.30
West Bengal	60	8.47
Haryana	12	1.70
Himachal Pradesh	7	0.99
Jammu and Kashmir	7	0.99
Delhi	165	23.31
Chandigarh	11	1.55
Manipur	2	0.28
Nagaland	1	0.14
Other Areas	7	0.99
Total	708	100.00

Classification of the Approved Research Proposals by Institutions

<i>Name of the Institution</i>	<i>No. of research proposals sanctioned.</i>
Jawaharlal Nehru University	48
Delhi University	39
Rajasthan University	22
A.N. Sinha Institute of Social Studies	17
Calcutta University	17
Bombay University	14
Lucknow University	14
Punjab University, Chandigarh	13
I.I.M., Ahmedabad	13
I.I.P.A., New Delhi	13
Osmania University	11
Tata Institute of Social Sciences	10
Centre for Study of Developing Societies, Delhi	10
Poona University	10
Andhra University	9
Gandhian Institute of Studies, Varanasi	9
Sardar Patel Institute of Economics and Social Research, Ahmedabad	9
Patna University	9
Kurukshetra University	8
Aligarh Muslim University	7
Kerala University	7
Banaras University	7
Centre for Social Studies, Surat	7
Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Pune.	6
Ravi Shankar University	6
Udaipur University	6
Gujarat University	6
Nagpur University	6
Madras Institute of Development Studies	6
I.S.I., Calcutta	6
I.I.M., Calcutta	6
Saugar University	6
Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi	5
Administrative Staff College of India	5
I.C.S.S.R.	5
M.S. University, Baroda	5
Allahabad University	5
Indian Institute of Advanced Studies, Simla	4
Utkal University	4
Karnataka University	4
Meerut University	4
North Bengal University	4
Indian Institute of Social Sciences, Bangalore	4
Gorakhpur University	4

Bhagalpur University	4
Deccan College, Pune	4
Ranchi University	4
Sri Ram Centre for Industrial Relations	4
Jodhpur University	4
Marathwada University	4
Bangalore University	3
Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore	3
Council for Social Development	3
Madras University	3
National Instt. of Health Admn., & Education, Delhi	3
National Labour Institute, Delhi	3
Xavier Labour Research Instt., Jamshedpur	3
Kalyani University	3
Srivenkateswara University	3
Vidya Bhavan Rural Instt., Udaipur	3
National Instt. of Community Development, Hyderabad	3
Rohtak University	2
Gauhati University	2
Kashmir University	2
Centre for the Study of Social Sciences, Calcutta	2
Madras Christian College, Madras	2
I.I.T., New Delhi	2
Shankar Brahma Samaj Vigyan Granthalaya, Pune	2
Mysore University	2
I.S.I., New Delhi	2
Revenshaw College, Cuttack	2
Centre for Development Studies, Trivandrum	2
Kurnarappa Instt. of Gram Swaraj, Jaipur	2
Gujarat Instt. of Area Planning, Ahmedabad	2
Centre for Study of Social Change, Bombay	2
Gandhian Rural Institute, Madurai	2
Jadavpur University	2
Viswa Bharati Shantiniketan	2
D.M. College, Imphal	2
Christian Medical College, Vellore	2
Kashi Vidya Peeth, Varanasi	2
Punjab Agricultural University	2
T.R.S. College, Reva	2
Guru Nanak University, Amritsar	2
Indore Christian College	2
M.B. College, Udaipur	2
A.R.S.D. College, Delhi	2
S.B. College of Arts, Gulbarga	2
Haryana Agricultural University	2
Number of Institutes which received only one project	165
Total	708

3.12 Looking at the distribution of approved research proposals by estimated expenditure, it will be noticed that 28 per cent of them have an estimated expenditure of Rs. 7,500 and less. These are mostly the cases of Teachers' Awards. Under this scheme the teachers are able to undertake a modest piece of research involving library or field work, data processing, or completion of a research project which had already been initiated without assistance from any other source or finalisation of a book (other than a text-book) with a high research content. However, the work of a teacher for doctoral or any other degree is not insisted. The scheme is sound and we feel that its potential should be better utilised to develop the wider talent available for social science in the country

3.13 Research Projects are located in Institutions and their scales of pay, allowances, etc. are adopted for estimating the cost of the projects. Although the ICSSR has prescribed certain norms for staffing and their emoluments, yet costs have not been standardised. In recent years, the ICSSR has tried to place a ceiling of Rs. 50,000/- for a single project. Consequently, it will be seen that only about 10 per cent of the approved proposals exceed this ceiling.

3.14 The ceiling of Rs. 50,000/- prescribed for any single project has been found to be too restrictive. The idea behind the ceiling was perhaps justifiable since the ICSSR wanted to spread its limited funds more widely and maintaining a tighter control over the expenditure. However, in recent years the costs of research projects, especially those involving field work have gone up considerably. Besides, as the experience has shown, more and more projects tend to hit the ceiling and some times there has been a tendency to split projects into two or more to bypass the ceiling. This could not be the intent of the ICSSR and we feel that some changes in the policy may have to be made.

3.15 There are at present six major projects supported by the ICSSR with estimated expenditure ranging between Rs. 2.5 and Rs. 12.5 lakhs. Some of them were approved in 1977-78 and hence they do not appear in the group of approved projects discussed above. The six major projects are:

(1) Population Studies (J. N. University: Rs. 12.5 lakhs)

- | | |
|--|--|
| (2) Agrarian Structure, Tensions, Movements and Peasant Organisation | (National Labour Institute: Rs. 2.5 lakhs) |
| (3) Review of the Indian Economy since Independence | (Indian School of Political Economy: Rs. 7 lakhs) |
| (4) Historical Statistics | (Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics: Rs. 5 lakhs) |
| (5) Alternatives in Development | (ICSSR: Rs. 10 lakhs) |
| (6) Social Indicators, Social Statistics and Social Trend. | (ICSSR: No estimates) |

The first four proposals were initiated by senior social scientists in the respective institutions. The last two are initiated by the ICSSR on its own. The normal procedure for processing the major projects is for the ICSSR to appoint a Visiting Committee which examines the merits of the proposal and makes a recommendation. Obviously the Visiting Committee should not consist of those social scientists who are also involved in the formulation of the proposals and/or execution of the projects. We understand, that this care was not taken in all cases.

3.16 The remaining three classifications of the approved research projects reveal one of the most disturbing features of the functioning of the ICSSR and, in a sense of the social science research situation in the country. Almost 600 out of the 708 approved projects were in the charge of the faculty members of university departments and research institutions and only half of the balance were in the charge of teachers working in affiliated colleges. Almost one-fourth of the approved projects were located in the Union Territory of Delhi, and out of this, as many as 48 projects were located in the Jawaharlal Nehru University and another 39 in the Delhi University. Such a concentration of ICSSR assistance, whatever the reasons, is neither desirable nor justifiable. It has led to an inevitable and perhaps justifiable criticism that the ICSSR is a body of and for the elite located in Delhi. Corrective action on this front is, therefore, urgently needed.

3.17 The sponsored research programme grew out of the ICSSR's concern with the need for developing priorities for

research. The issue of priorities was much discussed and debated in the ICSSR and strong views were expressed both for and against any framework of priorities by the ICSSR. The ICSSR has been trying to define what is meant by priority. Some of the criteria adopted for this purpose as stated in the ICSSR documents are (a) Relevance in view of significant additions to knowledge or major contributions to methodology; (b) Relevance to understanding of social reality and to improvement of quality of life; (c) Relevance to solving the basic problems which the nation is facing; (d) Relevance to policy formulation; (e) Unresearched or comparatively less researched areas.

3.18 The priorities for research were also listed in the various surveys of research sponsored by the ICSSR. But the ICSSR considered them as "indicative" until the Report of the First Review Committee. The First Review Committee stated that "The Council should henceforth give higher priority to its promotional than to its responsive role. The promotional role should be geared to selected disciplinary and inter-disciplinary programmes in general and to the objectives of the Fifth Five-Year Plan in particular."

3.19 In reacting to the First Review Committee, the ICSSR felt that while there should be no change in the basic policy that suggested priorities are merely 'indicative' and no proposal should be rejected on grounds that it does not come within the priority, the ICSSR should be free to sponsor research programmes in some selected areas. The ICSSR ultimately listed fifteen such sponsored research programmes but for some reason or the other only seven of them were taken up and are now at various stages of development. They are: (1) Poverty and Unemployment; (2) Public Distribution System; (3) Rural Development; (4) Government Systems and Development; (5) Urban Studies; (6) Area Studies; (7) Problems and Status of Women.

3.20 Each sponsored research programme is administered by an Advisory Committee headed generally by an eminent social scientist either as its Chairman or Convener. The Advisory Committee, in consultation with distinguished academicians from different disciplines working in the field, prepares a list of research projects and then approaches individual scholars to prepare research proposals. The practice varies between different

programmes. In general, the proposal is reviewed by members of the Advisory Committee and upon unanimous recommendation, forwarded to the ICSSR for approval. In case a member of the Advisory Committee seeks support under this programme, the proposal is referred by the Council to outside consultants, as per its general procedure and upon their recommendations placed before the Advisory Committee and then sent to the Council for approval and sanction.

3.21 The main advantage of the sponsored research programme has been that for the first time the ICSSR has been able to mount an inter-disciplinary programme with scholars from different fields coming together for undertaking work on a common theme. This is indeed a major achievement. On the other hand, the sponsored research programmes have been widely criticised for being somewhat elitist and selectively so. They have also been accused of diluted standards and lesser control over their expenditures. Lastly, that they have led to further concentration of ICSSR funds in a few institutions and scholars. The Review Committee has considered the matter very carefully and is of the opinion that the policy regarding the Sponsored Research Programme needs a careful reconsideration. We make our recommendations later.

3.22 Several problems regarding the timeliness of completion and of the quality of the final output have cropped up. The first problem, it seems to us arises largely due to under-estimate of time taken for most projects, especially those involving field work. The second is due to perhaps the Project Directors over-stretching themselves by undertaking too many commitments at a time.

IV FELLOWSHIP

4.1 The ICSSR offers the following types of fellowships:

1. National Fellowships
2. Senior Fellowships
3. Fellowships for young Social Scientists
4. Post-Doctoral Fellowships
5. Doctoral Fellowships and other forms of assistance to doctoral students.

4.2 The size of the programme may be judged by the expenditure incurred in the three years 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77.

Research Fellowships

<i>Head of Account</i>	1974-75 Rs	1975-76 Rs	1976-77 Rs
National Fellowships	1,11,337	1,61,174	22,800
ICSSR Senior Fellowships	3,03,647	4,12,598	3,48,278
ICSSR Junior Fellowships	20,880	40,990	40,720
Doctoral Fellowships	7,51,172	9,56,259	10,55,075
Contingent Grant	62,665	1,45,302	1,73,269
Housewife Fellowships	—	12,483	8,350
Total	12,49,701	17,28,806	16,48,492

4.3 The Scheme of National Fellowships was initiated in 1970-71 with the idea that the ICSSR would invite outstanding social scientists to work on some important problems of research. The scheme did not place age or any other bars. The proposals for National Fellowships are initiated by members of the Council and considered by a high level Committee. No case is openly discussed in a meeting but only individually with members of the ICSSR and an award is made only when there is an unanimous agreement on a name. Generally, the number of such fellowships at any given time is restricted to six. Since inception only ten awards have been made, that is, just about one per year.

4.4 The national fellow is given a maximum basic remuneration of Rs 2,500 p.m. The exact amount is fixed in each case on its merits. Recently, a proposal has been made to raise the maximum basic remuneration to Rs 3,000 p.m. and the matter is pending consideration and decision of the ICSSR. In addition, a national fellow is entitled to a research assistant, if necessary, and a contingency grant of Rs 5,000 per annum. The fellowship is tenable for a period of three years.

4.5 The scheme is basically sound and is considered an instrument of providing recognition to social scientists of outstanding merit. Some changes may, however, be useful in the light of experience viz. increase in the contingency grant from Rs 5,000 per annum to Rs 10,000 per annum, in addition to the research assistance whenever necessary. Recently the ICSSR has decided that such fellowship proposals should be supported by a detailed bio-data of the social scientist and of the grounds on which the national fellowship is recommended. These are appropriate modifications and we support them.

4.6 Senior fellowships are of four kinds, viz. (1) For Indians working abroad, (2) For non-Indians to work in India, (3) For Indian social scientists to work in India, and (4) For Indians to work abroad.

4.7 The first scheme has enabled a small, nine so far, number of Indian scholars working abroad to do research in India. While there is a general appreciation of the scheme, its main problem is that the ICSSR has little control over the output. Some of the scholars have not even cared to send in their reports.

4.8 The second scheme is for non-Indian social scientists to work in India. This scheme has also not been too popular largely because of low emoluments and difficulties of getting local accommodation. If the idea is to attract Asian, African and perhaps Latin American social scientists to come to India, the terms and conditions of the scheme will have to be made more liberal.

4.9 The most important senior fellowship instituted is the scheme for senior Indian social scientists. The basic objective was to enable such scholars to undertake wholtime research by "buying" their time from other responsibilities. They are therefore not open to retired or "unemployed" persons. The

fellowship does not carry any financial incentive but only protects the actual salary and other benefits of the scholar. The fellowship is tenable for a period of 1-4 years. The usual procedure followed is that the social scientist sends in a formal proposal which is referred to three consultants. The rest of the procedures is standard.

4.10 Over the eight years of the ICSSR's working, 44 senior fellowships have been awarded and utilised. Four were converted into research projects and five scholars could not join for some reason or the other. The ICSSR had hoped, when the scheme was begun, to award about 20 fellowships a year. The actual experience has been that not more than 8 have been awarded on an average suggesting that the scheme has not been as popular as expected. Various explanations have been given including that there are other more attractive fellowships such as the Nehru Fellowship, etc. However, the number of such fellowships outside the ICSSR is not very large and therefore the argument does not seem very plausible.

4.11 There are, however, some practical problems. Most of the universities have tedious procedures for study leave. It also involves loss of increments when a teacher goes on such a fellowship. If the scholar has to move out of his place, housing is another very serious difficulty. The contingency grant is also inadequate to meet the research costs. The absence of adequate research assistance also often proves to be a serious handicap.

4.12 There are some structural problems as well. The tradition of such fellowships is not sufficiently developed in the country. Nor are there many institutions which encourage outside scholars to work with them so that the academic community could benefit from such exchanges. Housing in most of the institutions is also difficult.

4.13 While all these problems cannot be solved immediately, the ICSSR must make the fellowships as attractive and as free from such handicaps as possible.

4.14 The Fourth scheme of senior fellowships is for Indians to work abroad. This is more complicated and financially burdensome. So far the ICSSR has granted only one such fellowship. Even this was made possible because of free ticket provided by

Air India and the salary of the scholar being borne by another academic institution. The ICSSR sanctioned only the allowances abroad in foreign exchange. Though the scheme has some potential, because of the cost implications, some alternatives may have to be tried. One way to promote the scheme may be to establish inter-institutional linkages outside the country and operate under the cultural exchange programme. The ICSSR could also consider making partial grants. Thus, an Indian scholar who was already in receipt of a research award abroad could be provided with travel cost and vice-versa. In addition, the scholar may be permitted to receive additional emoluments from other sources provided the ICSSR is kept informed about such arrangements.

4.15 In general, we find that the scheme does not have commensurate benefits and it is far too expensive to operate. While we might take as much advantage as possible of cultural exchange agreements with other countries, specially of Asia and Africa, we need not place any special emphasis on this scheme.

4.16 There has been considerable debate regarding the disqualification of unemployed and retired persons for senior fellowships of the ICSSR. Recently the ICSSR has modified this rule enabling the unemployed persons to apply for fellowships though the bar against retired persons continues. We suggest that the experience of this new policy should be observed for a while and evaluated again after a couple of years specially from the point of view whether really worthwhile applications come from unemployed social scientists.

4.17 It has been brought to our notice that some persons have taken one fellowship after another for a number of years while others were refused a fellowship on grounds that they had received one in the past five years. We suggest that the ICSSR should carefully examine the desirability of laying down any such condition and, in any case, apply the principle uniformly and not selectively.

4.18 With a view to encouraging younger social scientists, a new scheme was introduced from 1977-78 with 10 awards per year. These fellowships are meant for persons who have completed their doctoral work or have done academic research of merit and are below the age of 35 years. They must work at an approved

research project at an institution recognised by the ICSSR under the guidance of or in collaboration with a senior social scientist. The rest of the conditions of these fellowships are similar to those for the senior fellowships. So far six scholars have been awarded such research fellowships out of a total of 21 applications. It is too early to evaluate the scheme and we suggest that it should be continued for some time before its utility is judged.

4.19 Post-doctoral fellowships are open to almost any person qualified under the scheme including unemployed persons as well as housewives. The word "post-doctoral" is a misnomer since Ph.D. is not necessarily a precondition for such an award. It may be designated simply as "Fellowship" to distinguish it from senior fellowship. Under this fellowship a person is eligible to receive Rs 600 per month with a contingency grant of Rs 2,000/- per year. The fellowship is free from income-tax. The various rules of doctoral fellowships of the ICSSR also apply to the post-doctoral fellowships.

4.20 The experience has shown that quite often the scheme has been used as a stop gap arrangement for a student who has done his Ph.D. and is awaiting a job. Consequently, quite often, the scholar resigns as soon as he gets a job and the work remains incomplete. We suggest that while the scheme may be continued, the qualifications of the applicant should be more rigorously examined.

4.21 ICSSR assistance to doctoral students takes a variety of forms. In the main they are of the following types:

(i) *Regular Doctoral Fellowships with salary protection*

The scheme is meant mostly for college teachers—the salary and allowances of the scholar are protected subject to a ceiling. The scheme has been fairly popular, and between 1970-71 and 1976-77 as many as 87 fellowships of this kind were awarded.

(ii) *Short-term Fellowships*

These fellowships are intended for those doctoral students who have completed most of their work and want to write a thesis on full time basis for a period of not more than 12 months. The scheme has been fairly popular; in 1975-76 and 1976-77, 12

and 11 students availed themselves of this fellowship respectively.

(iii) *Contingency Grants*

These grants are meant for doctoral students who do not have a fellowship. The ceiling is placed at Rs 5,000 for approved items. Between 1970-71 and 1976-77 as many as 235 scholars availed of this facility. In 1976-77 alone as many as 91 scholars received awards under this scheme.

(iv) *Study Grants*

The objective of the study grant is to enable the doctoral student to visit a centre or centres where he can have access to research materials he needs. Since the research facilities in the country are highly concentrated in some limited parts of the country, the scheme has obvious merits. College teachers in rural areas and in smaller towns who have poor library facilities have found the scheme very useful. In recent years, the scheme has been linked with the ICSSR Regional Centres which also provides them with hostel facilities and guidance if necessary. Between 1970-71 and 1977-78 as many as 850 study grants were made throughout India involving a sum of Rs 3.74 lakhs.

(v) *Doctoral Fellowships*

The doctoral fellowships have been one of the major items of ICSSR's expenditure in recent years. As mentioned earlier, in 1976-77 alone more than Rs 10 lakhs were spent on this programme. In the following Table, we give the number of doctoral fellowships awarded and accepted since 1971-72.

Year-wise distribution of Doctoral Fellowships

<i>Year</i>	<i>Number of fellowships awarded</i>	<i>Number of fellowships accepted</i>
1971-72	18	18
1972-73	58	55
1973-74	118	88
1974-75	58	51
1975-76	63	58
1976-77	86	53*
Total	401	323

* Position as on 31.12.1976.

4.22 While we generally favour the several forms of assistance to doctoral students, we have some doubts about the last mentioned straight doctoral fellowships. This is mainly because we think that, within its limited resources, the ICSSR should not accept this almost unlimited responsibility. Besides, this is essentially a responsibility of the UGC. We understand that the UGC is expanding the number of doctoral fellowships. Presumably, the UGC will also be able to ensure their fair distribution between disciplines and universities.

4.23 We regret to note that this has not happened in the case of the doctoral fellowships of the ICSSR. In the following Tables, we give a distribution of the 323 ICSSR doctoral fellowships awarded and accepted from 1971-72 to 1976-77.

Distribution of Doctoral Fellowships by Disciplines

<i>Subjects</i>	<i>Number of fellowships</i>	<i>Percent to total</i>
Anthropology/Social Anthropology	16	4.9
Economics	85	26.3
Education	11	3.4
Geography	32	9.9
History	6	1.9
International Relations/Politics	14	4.3
Linguistics	5	1.5
Political Science	59	18.3
Psychology	30	9.3
Public Administration	9	2.8
Sociology	47	14.6
Others (Law, Commerce, Criminology, Defence Studies, Demography, Engineering, Social Work)	9	2.8
	Total	323
		100.0

Distribution of Doctoral Fellowships by States, Union Territory Etc.

<i>State</i>	<i>Number of Fellowships</i>	<i>Percent to total</i>
Andhra Pradesh	18	5.6
Assam	4	1.2
Bihar	10	3.1
Delhi	158	48.9
Gujarat	8	2.5
Haryana	1	0.3
Himachal Pradesh	1	0.3
Kerala	7	2.2
Karnataka	10	3.1
Maharashtra	15	4.6
Madhya Pradesh	16	5.0
Orissa	4	1.2
Punjab	9	2.8
Rajasthan	12	3.7
Tamil Nadu	3	0.9
Uttar Pradesh	35	10.8
West Bengal	5	1.5
Foreign Universities	3	0.9
No Information	4	1.2
Total	323	100.0

Distribution of Doctoral Fellowships by Universities

<i>University</i>	<i>No. of Fellowships</i>	<i>University</i>	<i>No. of Fellowships</i>
A.P.S. (Rewa)	1	Agra	1
Aligarh	8	Allahabad	5
Andhra	11	Annamalai	2
B.H.U.	2	Bangalore	1
Berhampur	2	Bombay	7
Calcutta	3	Delhi	46
Gauhati	2	Gorakhpur	2
Gujarat	5	Gurunanak	1
Indore	1	Jabalpur	1
J.N.U.	106	Jodhpur	2
Nagpur	1	Osmania	6
Punjab	7	Patna	3
Patna	3	Rajasthan	5
Ranchi	7	Ravishankar	1
Sambalpur	1	Saugar	13
S.V.U. (Tirupati)	1	Udaipur	5
Utkal	1	Jamia Milia	1
T.I.S.S.	2	I.I.T. (Delhi)	1
I.I.T. (Kanpur)	1	I.S.I. (Delhi)	3
A.I.I.M.S. (Delhi)	1	Kalyani	2
Kanpur	1	Karnataka	2
Kerala	7	Kurukshetra	1
Lucknow	8	Madras	1
M.S. (Baroda)	3	Meerut	5
Mysore	7	N.E.H.U. (Shillong)	1
Foreign	3	Varanasi Sanskrit	
H.A.U. (Hissar)	1	Mahavidyalaya	2
		H.P.	1

It will be noticed that the distribution of the fellowships between the several disciplines has followed the same pattern as that of the distribution of research grants except for a little more concentration in Economics. Hence, if the distribution of the research grant between disciplines is considered reasonable, the distribution of doctoral fellowships between disciplines may also be considered reasonably satisfactory.

4.24 Regarding the distribution of research grants between States/Union Territories and between Universities/research institutions, we have already commented on the excessive concentration in Delhi and within Delhi, in the Jawaharlal Nehru University. This is all the more true of the doctoral fellowships. It will be noticed that out of the 323 awarded and accepted fellowships, 158 are in Delhi and that, within Delhi, as many as 106 are in the Jawaharlal Nehru University. It is true that the advantage is taken by students coming from different regions but the fact of high concentration of available facilities in a few places remains. As we are recommending, for independent reasons, discontinuance of ICSSR doctoral fellowships, the point need not be stressed further. But, it is a sad commentary on the past performance of the ICSSR in the field of one of its major activities, viz. research fellowships, that such glaringly inequitable distribution of resources occurred and was allowed.

V RESEARCH INSTITUTES

5.1 The development and support of the research institutes was first discussed by the Committee on Social Science Research which felt that the ICSSR should supplement the work of the UGC in one important way, namely, that it should support the growing number of research institutes which do not come within the purview of the University Grants Commission. The Committee recommended that ICSSR should give both development and maintenance grants to research institutes in social sciences that are not either affiliated or constituent institutions of statutory universities in India.

5.2 The then Education Minister, Government of India, while inaugurating the ICSSR on 12th May 1969 had also suggested provision of maintenance grant for such institutes. He pointed out that since these institutes are not able to draw upon the financial support of the UGC the ICSSR should step in to provide financial assistance to them. He suggested that while the ICSSR grants to university institutions may be mainly project-oriented, the ICSSR should give maintenance grants to non-university institutions in addition to project grants.

5.3 The ICSSR was requested to take over the scheme at the end of the Fourth Five-Year Plan. A Committee was appointed under the Chairmanship of Prof. M.S. Gore to formulate the basic policy of the ICSSR. In essence, the Gore Committee said that while the development of the institutional base for social science research should be mainly the responsibility of the university system, there was a need for a few research institutes in social sciences which may be outside the university system. The Gore Committee, however, emphasised that all such research institutes should work in close collaboration with the university system each strengthening and supplementing the other.

5.4 The Gore Committee also endorsed some of the principles suggested by the Chakravarty Committee which was appointed for the establishment of the G.B. Pant Institute of Social Sciences at Allahabad by the Ministry of Education, Government of India.

The Committee suggested that social science research institutes supported by the Government of India must function as national institutes in the sense that the staff should be recruited on an all-India basis and the admission of students to them should be open to candidates from all parts of the country. Secondly, the institutes should ensure high standards and quality of core faculty and the right kind of leadership. Thirdly, the institutes should not be gigantic. Ordinarily their budgets should be limited to about Rs 10 lakhs a year, of which not more than Rs 5 lakhs should come from the Central funds. This was, of course, exclusive of any project-oriented support they may receive from the ICSSR or other sources. Fourthly, not all the posts on the staff of the institutes should be filled by permanent incumbents. A certain portion, preferably about a third, should be filled by offering visiting fellowships to teachers from universities and scholarships from other research institutes. Fifthly, these research institutes should work in close collaboration with the university system. The ICSSR should play a useful role in functioning as a clearing house and coordinating the work of the research institutes with that of the universities so that the entire national programme of research in social sciences is strengthened.

5.5 Following the acceptance of the Gore Committee Report, the ICSSR has set up a Research Institutes Committee to administer the programme. The Committee has all the powers for the purpose. In 1976-77 there were fifteen research institutes under the scheme with a total budget of Rs. 50.58 lakhs.

5.6 The general policy of the ICSSR has been that this should not be a very large scheme and that the total number of research institutes to be supported should be small and that there should be a ceiling to the assistance to be given to a research institute. The present limit sanctioned is Rs. 7.5 lakhs per annum. Secondly, every new institute admitted to the scheme should be assisted only on the basis of 50 per cent of its total expenditure. Thirdly, the ICSSR should seek dispersal of talent and therefore to develop research institutes outside Delhi and especially in areas where social science research is relatively underdeveloped. Fourthly, as far as possible, the State Governments should be involved in the programme. They should be requested to support the establishment of at least one good research institute and to provide 50

per cent of the funds from their budgets. Where the State has already established a research institute, the Centre should share only 50 per cent of the increase in expenditure beyond the datum expenditure, i.e., the net expenditure incurred by the State prior to the date this institute was brought under the scheme. Lastly, each research institute should be multi-disciplinary and should have a definite focus in its work.

5.7 Several important academic, administrative and financial issues regarding the research institutes Scheme have emerged. By far the most fundamental of these issues is the relationship of the research institutes with the ICSSR and the financial limit of grants from the ICSSR to an individual institute.

5.8 On the question of the relationship of the ICSSR with the research institutes, we are of the view that the ICSSR should do nothing to infringe upon the autonomy of these research institutes to develop their programmes. However, the ICSSR being an important partner, albeit on behalf of the Government of India, in the development of these institutes, it should be able to maintain a close watch on these institutes to make sure that they do have a very well conceived programme of research, a competent leadership and an effective administration. The present practice of having a Visiting Committee of the ICSSR for each of the research institutes is a useful one and should be continued. However, we are of the view that those Committees' mandate should be largely to examine the overall plan of the concerned research institutes in the light of the evaluation of their performance which may be entrusted to suitably constituted committees. We would suggest that the Governing Board of these institutes should be asked to appoint their own evaluation committee or groups to examine performance of the concerned institute in detail.

5.9 On the financial side, the ICSSR has generally followed the policy of providing only 50 per cent of the funds from its budget subject to a ceiling of Rs. 7.5 lakhs per annum. For historical reasons, there are two exceptions, namely, the Institute of Economic Growth and the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies. While the issue regarding these institutes can be taken up separately, we agree that the present ceiling of Rs. 7.5 lakhs need not be changed during the Sixth Five-Year Plan period.

5.10 An issue of some importance for the research institutes is acceptance of non-plan expenditure at the end of the plan-period. The budget of the ICSSR is prepared in two parts i.e. Plan and Non-Plan. The research institutes are given a grant-in-aid out of the Plan Budget for the Plan period. At present even the committed expenditures of these institutes are required to be met out of the Plan funds. As the grant-in-aid to a research institute for a particular Plan period is likely to undergo a change during the next Plan period, these institutes cannot undertake any expansion programme. As most of the research institutes aided by the ICSSR have completed more than three years, a certain percentage of the average recurring expenditure for the last three years may be treated as Non-Plan expenditure. This would enable the institutes to prepare plans for future expansion and also for undertaking new projects.

5.11 Apart from these basic issues, there are some important administrative issues regarding the appointment of professional staff, their scales of pay, the status of Director, service conditions etc. in these institutes.

5.12 We are of the view that the ICSSR should not take any rigid positions in this regard. In so far as pay scales, etc. are concerned, those normally prescribed by the UGC for academic staff are appropriate and should be the basic pattern for the research institutes as well.

5.13 In so far as the appointment of the Director is concerned, while it may be a good policy to have a rotation, the matter should be left to the Governing Boards of the respective institutes. The pay scale of the Director should be generally slightly above the scale of a Professor. Here again, the matter should be left flexible enough for a decision by its Governing Board.

5.14 As regards the ICSSR's administration of the research institutes, it may be useful to have one or two members appointed to the Governing Board by the ICSSR. However, they should not be considered a superior authority in the Governing Board of the research institutes.

5.15 Apart from these issues, there are important problems regarding coordination between the research institutes, the university system, the ICSSR and between themselves. As regards the coordination with the university system, the ICSSR should

be in touch with the UGC to enable a closer coordination between the two systems. In the ultimate analysis, the exact relationship of the research institutes with a university would depend upon a mutual relationship and this should be encouraged in every possible way. It will have to be recognised that some research institutes will have interest and focus which may not be of equal interest to the university system. Here again, therefore, a proper relationship should be worked out on the basis of mutuality of interest between the two institutes.

5.16 Finally we would like to bring into discussion the role of the research institutes in promoting social science research in the country. Since the research institutes are basically involved in research rather than in teaching and have a high level of competence, they should be assigned a special responsibility for the development of research competence in the country. In particular, they should be enjoined to train younger social scientists and to help the weaker and inexperienced researchers in formulating their research proposals as well as to supervise such work. The research institutes should also be asked to hold seminars for the benefit of local college teachers, younger social scientists, etc. in their respective fields, about the research project undertaken by them. This will help the development of better consciousness and skills among such younger scholars, etc. about the problems of research design, methodology, and education. We attach highest importance to this role and would like to suggest to the ICSSR that this matter be discussed with the Directors of the research institutes under its assistance.

5.17 An important matter affecting the research institutes is the invidious distinction made by the Central Board of Direct Taxes, Union Ministry of Finance, between the research institutes and educational institutes for purposes of Section 10(22) of the Income Tax Act, 1961. The benefits of Section 10(22) are not admissible to the research institutes even though the Ministry of Education has taken the stand that institutes on the grant-in-aid list of the ICSSR are "Educational" institutions. We strongly urge the Government of India to reconsider the matter and declare all research institutes certified as educational institutions by the ICSSR eligible for the benefits of Section 10 (22) of the Income Tax Act, 1961.

VI TRAINING IN RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

6.1 One of the problems facing social science research has been that of inadequate research skills. The ICSSR recognised the problem right from its beginning. Accordingly, in 1970, a Committee on Training was constituted under the Chairmanship of Prof. M.S. Gore, Director of the Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Bombay. The Committee in its report expressed concern with the *ad hoc* and unsatisfactory training given to researchers, especially to the Ph.D. students. While noting that the problem had to be ultimately tackled by the universities, the Committee suggested that the ICSSR should play an active role in conducting some training programmes in research methodology in different centres in the country.

6.2 As a result of the recommendations of the Gore Committee, a series of programmes were organised between 1971-72 to 1973-74. In the main they were of three types:

- (a) General Programme of 8 weeks duration organised at different centres in the country;
- (b) Specialised Training Programmes built either for a discipline or around a research technique; and
- (c) Training Programme for teachers in the form of workshops or seminars of 3/4 weeks duration.

6.3 Generally, the condition for admission to these courses was that the candidate should have registered for the doctoral degree and should be in the initial stages of his research. Besides, lecturers in colleges and universities intending to do research, including those registered for the Ph.D. degrees, were also admitted to the relevant programmes.

6.4 The training programmes were reviewed comprehensively through a triennial review in 1974-75. Several suggestions were received from the participants as well as the Course Directors. In the light of these, the whole programme was reorganised along the following lines:—

6.5 *Courses*—The ICSSR would organise four types of short-term courses in research methodology, viz.,

- (a) Foundation Courses,
- (b) Discipline-Specific Courses,
- (c) Technique-Specific Courses, and
- (d) Workshops in Research Methodology.

The content of all the courses was thoroughly reviewed in the light of the experience of the previous years.

6.6 *Institutes*—The general policy was that this was an actively sponsored programme of the ICSSR in which the ICSSR itself identified and requested certain institutes to conduct such courses. Besides, institutes desiring to conduct a training course in research methodology could approach the ICSSR and such requests would be considered on merits.

6.7 *Selection of Participants*—The qualifications necessary for participation in the various courses were prescribed and the Course Directors were given maximum latitude to select candidates. The reservation of seats for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes and other backward classes was also provided for.

6.8 *Funding*—The scheme of grant-in-aid as well as guidelines for conducting the courses were revised so that the institutes organising the courses had adequate financial resources for the proper conduct of the courses. In particular, care was taken to see that each Course Director was assisted by a core faculty which was remunerated according to the rules of the ICSSR.

6.9 *Evaluation of the Courses*—At the end of each course, the Course Director was required to send his report to the ICSSR. A representative of the ICSSR also visited the course and gave his report. All these reports were placed before the ICSSR's Committee on Training.

6.10 On the basis of the revised policy, a series of programmes have been organised since 1975-76. The ICSSR also undertook the production of literature for training in research methodology and appointed an Expert Committee to work on this problem. Amongst the programmes now sponsored by the Committee is the preparation of text-books, manuals for survey research, and papers on special topics which could be published as occasional monographs.

6.11 In 1976-77, the ICSSR appointed a special Review Com-

mittee on Training Programme in Research Methodology. In its interim report, the Committee recommended that high priority should be given to training in survey research methods and data processing. This was an area in which the ICSSR has played and should continue to play an important role. The Committee also recommended that these programmes which need considerable equipment and highly trained personnel should be properly institutionalised.

6.12 In accordance with the recommendations of the Review Committee, the ICSSR decided to set up four training centres in the country; *viz.*

- (1) Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Bombay, at which the infra-structure needed for the course would be set up jointly by the ICSSR and the UGC.
- (2) Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta.
- (3) A collaborative programme by the Council for Social Development, Osmania University and the Southern Regional Centre of the ICSSR.
- (4) A collaborative programme between the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies and the Council for Social Development.

6.13 The Committee on Training set up a series of working groups in the following social science disciplines to identify their respective training needs in research methodology:— (1) Economics, (2) Political Science, (3) Psychology, (4) Sociology and Social Anthropology, (5) Public Administration, (6) Geography, and (7) Demography. The working group reports have since been submitted. These reports are comprehensive and make important recommendations regarding specific requirements of the disciplines.

6.14 One of the important recommendations of almost all the working groups is the need for discipline-specific courses. It has been increasingly found that training in research methodology in general serves only a limited purpose of introducing a researcher to the various research methods. It does not equip him adequately for the type of research problem he faces in his discipline.

6.15 The problem of discipline-specific courses however is a

complicated one. Firstly, the course content for each discipline has to be identified. Secondly, some institutes which have the competence for conducting such courses have to be identified. Thirdly, the costs of such programmes are likely to be very high.

6.16 Recently, the introduction of the M.Phil. courses at the instance of the UGC in several of the Indian Universities has provided an increasing discipline orientation, at least at the conceptual level, in research methodology training for the post-graduate students. While it will take some time to evaluate the impact of these courses on the development of research capability in the several disciplines, there is no doubt that this is an important step in the desired direction.

6.17 In view of this development, the problem of training in research methodology before the ICSSR has to be examined afresh. The ICSSR should consider more carefully the recommendations of the various working groups on the individual disciplines and see how these could be implemented within the M.Phil. programmes of the universities and the extent and manner in which ICSSR's assistance might be useful. It seems to us that, as the universities make progress in training in research methodology for the post-graduate and Ph.D. students, the ICSSR should promote less formal and more loosely structured short duration courses or workshops in research methodology built around specific research projects in progress or recently completed.

6.18 The development of appropriate research methodologies in different disciplines requires coming together of senior researchers in each discipline from time to time around specific problems of research methodology. The ICSSR should fund one such well prepared seminar of 15/20 senior researchers in each discipline once a year with wide publicity given to its deliberations and conclusions.

6.19 We recognize that the financial costs of training in research methodology are large. But, if the ICSSR could undertake this programme jointly with the universities, specially those initiating the M.Phil. programme, considerable saving in cost could be achieved and the limited funds of the ICSSR could go much further.

VII AREA STUDIES, INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION AND FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

A. Area Studies

7.1 The ICSSR initiated in 1971-72, a programme of area studies meaning thereby studies of other countries of the world in which the highest emphasis was placed on the neighbouring countries. The intention appears to be to encourage a greater degree of interest and interaction between the Indian scholars with their counterparts in the region.

7.2 The area studies are, by their very nature, inter-disciplinary in character and include comparative studies within and between the regions. The limited resources of the ICSSR were intended for use largely around the following priorities.

7.3 Regions

- (1) The highest priority has been given to Asia. Within Asia, a further specification of the countries and the region was described as follows:
 - (a) South Asia including Afghanistan and China.
 - (b) South East Asia with special emphasis on Indonesia, Malaysia, Viet Nam, Thailand and Burma.
 - (c) The Indian Ocean and Gulf Countries.
 - (d) East Asia excluding China.
- (2) Africa with special emphasis on East and West Africa.
- (3) West Asia and Arab Africa
- (4) U.S.S.R.
- (5) Latin America
- (6) Eastern Europe
- (7) Western Europe including Ireland, U.K. and North America.

7.4 The major themes of research which have been pursued so far, are the following:

- (1) Internal political and economic organisation and nation building.

- (2) International relations, including economic relations and foreign policies.
- (3) Comparative studies of changes in patterns of social stratifications, rural transformation, other problems and institutions including administrative systems.
- (4) Overseas Indian communities and their inter-sections with other indigenous societies.

7.5 The ICSSR has supported between 1971-1972 to 1976-1977 23 research projects in area studies. In addition, 2 national fellows and 19 senior fellows worked on problems in this field. During the last six years as many as 53 Doctoral Fellowships were also awarded to work in this area. The ICSSR also financed 5 post-doctoral fellowships and 7 field trips for senior social scientists under this programme. 13 doctoral students were also awarded grants for field trips. Finally, the ICSSR sanctioned 40 grants for publishing doctoral theses in Area studies.

7.6 Apart from these activities, the ICSSR has started the Indian Journal of Asian Studies, the first issue of which has already been published. The ICSSR has taken initiative in establishing an Indian Association of Asian Studies and has also planned an International Seminar on China.

7.7 While appreciating the need for special attention and focus of research on the neighbouring countries, and countries from other developing countries, we are unable to see justification for the ICSSR setting up an independent area studies programme. There is a clear need to promote interest amongst academic scholars in India, and possibly, in other developing countries, to undertake research in issues and problems of common interest. But, in our opinion, this would best be served by encouraging all social scientists, not necessarily specialised in a particular region, to undertake comparative studies in their respective fields of interests. Thus, an Indian specialist in Agricultural Economics, rather than an area specialist in the region, would be in a better position to do a comparative study of agricultural development in other South Asian countries, or South East Asian countries.

7.8 We are, therefore, of the opinion that while every effort should be made by the ICSSR to encourage research in other countries, specially those in our neighbourhood, there need not

be a special programme on area studies as such. The ICSSR may, from time to time, enable Indian scholars with interest in such studies, possibly in collaboration with their counterparts in the neighbouring countries, to meet and exchange, as well as to explore possible avenues of research of comparative nature.

B. International Collaboration

7.9 The general policy of the ICSSR has been to promote contacts between Indian social scientists and those in other countries with a view to developing major programme of international collaboration. A special Committee on International Collaboration has also been appointed with the following tasks:

- (a) to identify certain areas/countries with which the ICSSR should develop contacts in the next decade,
- (b) to work out a programme of cooperation at various levels in promoting such an effort.
- (c) to develop the ICSSR's relations with international social science research organisations.

7.10 In developing and identifying certain areas and studies for special attention, the three main considerations were—

- (a) countries in which India has long ties of history, culture, commerce or shared ideals, goals, etc.
- (b) countries which have developed social science techniques and are known for high quality of social science research; and
- (c) countries which are more or less representative of the area/regions in which they are located.

7.11 The development of the programme of international collaboration has taken different forms. In the main, it has involved (a) assistance to Indian social scientists, for participation in international conferences or extended stay abroad; (b) invitations to distinguished foreign social scientists to visit India; (c) participation in cultural exchange programmes between India and other countries; (d) deputation of ICSSR's members and staff, and (e) joint commissions with countries like the Soviet Union and the United States.

7.12 While the ICSSR has prescribed various criteria, rules and

regulations for implementation of the programme of international collaboration, it has been one of the major sources of criticism of the ICSSR. The international collaboration programmes have been accused of (a) patronage in favour of a limited number of scholars, who are all too frequently "air-borne"; and (b) a systematic bias in favour of Europe and North America. Both these criticisms are not without basis. When we examined the grants given by the ICSSR for this purpose, we found that out of the 92 grantees (a few names occurring too frequently), 61 went to U.K. and North America. Only three to South Asia and ten to South East Asia. Out of the ten to South East Asia, seven went to Singapore and Hong Kong.

7.13 Of the 40 foreign social scientists invited by the ICSSR between 1969-70 and 1976-77, 24 came from the Western countries. Only six came from Asia including Japan.

7.14 These facts clearly show that the programme has been mostly skewed in favour of the Western world, despite the intentions of the ICSSR. Clearly, corrective action is immediately necessary so that the focus may shift to the countries intended to be covered by the ICSSR. The priority should be around building closer relations with the community of social scientists in Asia, particularly South and South East Asia.

7.15 The forms through which this type of collaboration should take place, would naturally vary. It could be, as is the policy of the ICSSR, through fellowships, collaborative research projects, well prepared seminars and other means of exchange. Special effort should be made for bringing together social scientists, especially of the region, around urgent problems in the economic, social and political fields.

7.16 In so far as exchange with the Western world is concerned, the ICSSR should, as we have suggested earlier, use much more systematically the cultural exchange agreements between India and the countries of the region. This would be the only way of meeting the very high cost of exchanges with the countries of the West as well as of the socialist countries.

7.17 The development of relationship between ICSSR and the various international bodies in social science research is worthy of support. However, many of these bodies in the neighbouring

regions are not sufficiently developed to make such collaboration very effective or productive. Nonetheless, given our long term objective, this is an area where ICSSR, as one of the more organised social science research councils in the region, should play an active role.

7.18 While we are on this whole question of international collaboration, we should say a word about funding this activity. Thus far, most of the finances for this purpose have come from the Ford Foundation Grant to the ICSSR. This has indeed given the ICSSR considerable latitude in funding several of its activities in this field. While we find this support from the Ford Foundation very valuable, specially since it is given to the ICSSR to be used entirely at its discretion, we do feel that the funds could be effectively used only if they are focussed around the priorities already laid down by the ICSSR, viz., of building closer relationship between the Indian social scientists with their counterparts in the South, South East, West Asia and Africa.

7.19 This brings us to a question of wider import. It concerns how foreign funds may flow into different social science institutes and the manner in which the funds may be regulated. At present, the research institutes approach the foreign funding agencies directly. The ICSSR comes in largely in its advisory capacity on behalf of the Government of India. There is considerable concern amongst social scientists about the direct approach by institutes to foreign funding agencies. It is sometimes suggested that all foreign funds for social science research should be channelled through a single agency such as the ICSSR which should then allocate them to applicant institutes according to appropriate policies in this regard. While we appreciate the underlying concern, we are not sure that the concentration of such large funds and accompanying patronage in the hands of the ICSSR will be desirable for its own healthy functioning. We suggest that, if necessary, the Government may examine the question in its totality.

VIII REGIONAL AND STATE CENTRES

8.1 The idea of the Regional and State Centres was developed around the need for decentralisation of the ICSSR's activities and for the establishment of Centres as close as possible to the research scholars in the far-flung corners of the country. It was also felt that with the increasing use of regional languages in social sciences for the purpose of teaching, research and utilisation of knowledge, there would be need for developing ICSSR Centres in different regions so that material in regional languages could be collected and made available to the social scientists. Lastly such a net-work would be an effective instrument to promote better relationship of social science community with the ICSSR, as well as to promote better national integration.

8.2 The ICSSR has established six regional centres and proposes to set up twelve State Centres as below:—

Regional Centres

- (i) The Southern Regional Centre, located at Hyderabad on the campus of Osmania University.
- (ii) Western Regional Centre, located at Vidyanagari campus of Bombay University.
- (iii) North Western Regional Centre, located at Chandigarh at the campus of Punjab University.
- (iv) Northern Regional Centre, located in New Delhi on the campus of the Jawaharlal Nehru University.
- (v) Eastern Regional Centre, located at the Centre for Social Science Research in Calcutta.
- (vi) North-Eastern Regional Centre in Shillong, located on the campus of North-Eastern Hill University.

State Centres

The State Centres were proposed for the following States and were intended to supplement the Regional Centres.

- (a) Jammu & Kashmir;
- (b) Karnataka;
- (c) Kerala;

- (d) Tamil Nadu;
- (e) Gujarat;
- (f) Rajasthan;
- (g) Madhya Pradesh;
- (h) Uttar Pradesh;
- (i) Bihar;
- (j) Orissa;
- (k) Himachal Pradesh; and
- (l) Assam.

8.3 The main functions of the Regional and State Centres are—

- (a) to act as an agent of the ICSSR in the region and as a Centre of information regarding programmes of the ICSSR in the region;
- (b) to act as the representative of the social scientists within the region and to bring their ideas and problems to the notice of the ICSSR for possible action;
- (c) to provide a forum for the social scientists of the region to come together for promotion of social science research in the region; and
- (d) to serve as a link between the social scientists of the region and the national and international community of social scientists at large.

8.4 In terms of the activities, the main programme of the Regional and State Centres has been to provide library, reference, and documentation services, particularly in the regional languages, and hostel facilities for the visiting social scientists; also to provide facilities for seminars and conferences and consultancy and guidance services for the promotion of social science research. One of the important activities of the Regional Centres is to operate the scheme of Study Grants in the regions.

8.5 Regional Centres also assist in the organisation of the national programme of the ICSSR such as training courses in research methodology, and visits of overseas social scientists.

8.6 The programme of Regional Centres is intended to work in collaboration with the State Governments which are expected

to provide half of the maintenance funds, the other half being incurred by the ICSSR from its own funds.

8.7 Of the six Regional Centres, namely, Southern, Western, North-Western, Northern, Eastern, and North-Eastern, only two, namely, the Western Regional Centre and the Southern Regional Centre have been effectively organised. From all accounts, these Centres have played a useful role and have been utilized a great deal by the social scientists especially younger ones and teachers of affiliated colleges. The other Regional Centres are still at various stages of development and have yet to establish themselves.

8.8 It seems to us that the Regional Centres have as yet not fully developed the regional concept. Most of them are in effect operating as State Centres. We give in Annexure III the year-wise distribution of funds and the sources of the various Regional Centres.

8.9 We have already voiced earlier our concern about the communication gap between the ICSSR and the social scientists in the country. We feel that the Regional Centres, along with the University Information Centres we wish to propose, should bridge this gap.

8.10 We would, however, like at this stage to develop a concept of promotion of research in Regional Centres by the ICSSR. As the university system moves closer towards teaching and research in regional languages, it is but essential that the ICSSR plays its own role in development of research in the regional languages. The ICSSR by its very organisation and character cannot promote and help development of research in regional languages. This can best be done only by a fuller development of the concept of the Regional and State Centres over the years. In our view, this calls for a basic departure in the present policy and administration of the ICSSR. In the main, it would mean a larger decentralisation of the funds and activities of the ICSSR to the Regional Centres. For instance, smaller research proposals say upto Rs. 7,500/- could be dealt with by the Regional Centres by establishing proper academic committees to scrutinise such proposals. The Regional Centres could also process larger research proposals in regional languages which could then be

forwarded to the ICSSR, with an English translation, for final decision.

8.11 In addition, we feel that the Regional Centres should be given larger funds to collect research literature in regional languages and to translate and publish in regional languages important research studies and literature in social sciences which are at present available only in English. This we consider, is an extremely important activity, especially as the English research studies may not become available to a large number of scholars who operate only through the regional languages.

IX PUBLICATION, DOCUMENTATION AND DATA ARCHIVES

Publication

9.1 The Publication Division of the ICSSR operates essentially through three sections:

- (1) Research Survey Section
- (2) Publication Section and
- (3) Sales and Distribution Section

Research Survey Section

9.2 The ICSSR initiated in 1970, a programme of carrying out surveys of research in different social science disciplines in order to take stock, identify gaps and indicate research priorities in each discipline.

9.3 Over the years, the ICSSR has completed and published a series of surveys of research in different social science disciplines as of 1970. It is now decided to update the surveys every five years. The work on the second set of surveys has already begun.

Publication Section

9.4 The ICSSR also runs directly under its own auspices 4 special journals. They are: (a) Newsletter, (b) Indian dissertation abstracts, (c) ICSSR Research Abstract Quarterly, (d) Indian Journal of Asian Studies. Besides, it brings out a large number of non-priced publications from time to time for the benefit of the social scientists. Many of these relate to ICSSR's own schemes, such as research grants, fellowships, etc.

9.5 In addition, the ICSSR has a programme of supporting research journals in different social sciences. This scheme has three aspects, viz.

- (a) Creation of an endowment of Rs. 1 lakh for a journal of social science in each field.
- (b) Providing annual grants of Rs. 5,000 to at least one or two journals in each social science discipline.

- (c) Promoting journals of reviews and abstracts in each social science discipline.

9.6 Thus far the ICSSR has succeeded in creating an endowment fund of Rs. 1 lakh for 9 journals. It is also giving assistance to 5 journals at the rate of Rs. 5,000 a year for a period of five years. Under the scheme of supporting journals or abstracts or reviews, so far, 10 disciplines have been aided. All these are published by different institutions.

9.7 The ICSSR has also a policy of publishing on its own outstanding research studies funded by itself. One of the basic problems that has arisen relates to the pricing of these books, specially because the Council has been subsidising prices of many of these books.

Publication Grants

9.8 The ICSSR has been operating a publication grant which is given essentially for doctoral dissertations and for a few books for which the ICSSR has been approached for assistance by individual scholars. The present scheme of the Council is to provide a grant of Rs. 20 per page or Rs. 3,000 whichever is less to a doctoral dissertation. The grant is raised upto Rs. 5,000 in the case of other publications. While several doctoral publications have benefited from this scheme, the academic quality of several of these publications has been questioned by many. Besides, there have been reported cases of malpractices by some publishers. More recently, because of increasing pressure for such grants, the ICSSR decided to provide grants only to outstanding dissertations and books. We recommend that direct publication grants of this kind may be stopped altogether. We have, however, an alternative suggestion which we make later.

Sales and Distribution Section

9.9 The third section deals with the sales and distribution. From the data made available to us on the major publications, we find that there are several distribution problems including sales problems. In our view, the publication division of the ICSSR has an important role to play in terms of its basic objective of dissemination of information regarding its activities as also

on the status and the results of its approved research projects. However, it seems, that the information regarding the activities of the ICSSR and the projects supported by it does not reach the social science community at large. We also find that a large number of publications have not sold sufficient copies, as a result of which the ICSSR has accumulated large stocks of unsold books etc. In our view, better marketing arrangements will have to be made.

9.10 One of the best ways of doing so, is to arrange with publishers and distributors of repute to undertake publication and sales. If necessary, the ICSSR could, as a part of its contract, buy a certain number of books from the publishers for distribution to a select group of individuals and institutions to whom such publications should reach.

9.11 One other important alternative is for the ICSSR to undertake publication of select social science books through regular publishers and to buy a substantial number of copies slightly above the cost price and distribute them at such a price to major institutions, libraries etc, who are willing to enter into agreement with the ICSSR for purchase of such books.

9.12 In so far as non-priced publications relating to the activities of the ICSSR are concerned, we suggest that the university information centres which we have proposed and the existing regional centres should be used far more extensively. This would be the most efficacious way of disseminating information about the various schemes and activities of the ICSSR. The existing policy of the ICSSR to support journals in social science discipline is basically sound and we recommend its continuation.

9.13 We have serious doubts about the ICSSR itself initiating any specialised journals such as the Journal of Asian Studies. By its very nature, the ICSSR is not equipped for undertaking such tasks, nor should it, in our view, undertake academic activities directly under its auspices. We, therefore, suggest that while the ICSSR may take an active role in promoting and financially assisting such journals, they should be located at a suitable institution.

9.14 On the organisational side of the Division, we find that no adequate attention has been paid to the technical and other

supporting services necessary for maintaining the level of activity involved in distribution. In the light of our suggestions above, necessary organisational changes as well as in staffing should be made.

Documentation

9.15 Because of demand from the social science community, a special division was created in the ICSSR from the very beginning to handle Documentation and Bibliographical Services. Several programmes have been developed under this field including major projects undertaken by the ICSSR directly or in collaboration with selected institutions and also projects assisted by the ICSSR under its grants-in-aid scheme. These services are also provided at the Regional Centres of the ICSSR which are expected to play an important role in providing documentation services in the regional languages.

9.16 For reasons not known to us, the major projects so far undertaken by the ICSSR are as follows:

- (1) Union Catalogue of Social Science Serials
- (2) Annotated Bibliography of Indian Economic History (1500—1947)
- (3) Retrospective Cumulative Index to Social Science
- (4) Mahatma Gandhi Bibliography.

9.17 The Union Catalogue project was undertaken in 1970 and formally completed in 1976. The Union Catalogue could be of books, periodicals and other serials, manuscripts, microfilms, etc. The project covered 535 libraries in 17 different States of India and presented holdings of a total of 31,125 titles of significance to social science research. While 31 professional staff worked at Delhi, 17 project directors and 70 assistants helped in gathering the data from libraries in the States, the project involved nearly 800 persons engaged in the libraries working in the country. The total expenditure on the project was Rs. 7.70 lakhs.

9.18 The Annotated Bibliography of Indian Economic History (1500—1947) was done by the ICSSR in collaboration with the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Pune. The ICSSR

provided the entire financial support and the responsibility of academic aspects of the problem was taken up by the Institute where the project was actually located. The project is in four volumes of which the first three volumes have already been published and the fourth volume is expected to be published in 1978. The project cost is approximately Rs. 13 lakhs.

9.19 Retrospective Cumulative Index to Social Science Periodicals was begun in January 1977. Its main feature is that a list of about 240 Indian social science periodicals has been prepared for inclusion in the project. The period covered by the serials is divided into (a) Pre-1920, (b) 1920-1947 and (c) 1947-1970. The Index is expected to be prepared over five years' period.

9.20 Mahatma Gandhi Bibliography was started in 1968, at the National Library, Calcutta and was subsequently transferred by the Ministry of Education to the ICSSR. The first volume of this Bibliography covering monographs in English language which are wholly and directly on Mahatma Gandhi and which were published before 1972 was released in October, 1974.

9.21 The ICSSR has assisted preparation of indexes and bibliographies by grants-in-aid to several institutions. Twelve projects fall under this category. They are: (1) Index of Articles on Agricultural Economics prepared by the Indian Society of Agricultural Economics, (2) Bibliography on Jammu and Kashmir, being prepared by the University of Jammu, (3) Asian Social Science Bibliography being prepared by the Institute of Economic Growth, (4) Directory of Behavioural Science Research in India, prepared by Udai Pareek, (5) An Index to Behavioural Science Research Abroad, also by Udai Pareek, (6) Documentation on Asia being prepared by the Indian Council of World Affairs, (7) Documents on African History, undertaken by the Indian Council for Africa, (8) A Bibliography of Writings on the Indian Constitution by M.S. Rana, Deputy Librarian of the Meerut University, (9) An Index to Marathi Periodicals prepared by the Mumbai Marathi Granth Sangrahalaya, (10) A Bibliography of South Asian Linguistics, prepared by the Linguistic Society of India, (11) Students Registered for Doctor Degrees in Social Sciences undertaken by the ICSSR, but subsequently abandoned and (12) Students Awarded Doctoral Degrees in Social Sciences,

earlier also prepared by the ICSSR but now being pursued by the Association of Indian Universities.

9.22 An important activity of the ICSSR with respect to Documentation and Bibliographical Services is the inter-library resources centre. The ICSSR has undertaken a major programme of establishing such centres in some of the important cities of India. The first of these centres has been set up in collaboration with the Jawaharlal Nehru University at 35 Feroze Shah Road, New Delhi. Twenty-five important libraries in Delhi participate in this scheme. This scheme is being used extensively by the Ph.D. students in social sciences specially those who receive the ICSSR's study grants.

9.23 One of the useful services rendered by the Inter-Library Resources Centre is the reprographic service, so that photo-copies of the required articles from periodicals or reasonable extracts from other sources are supplied on actual cost basis to local as well as outside scholars. From all accounts, this has been a very popular service.

9.24 The Inter-Library Resources Centre has acquired so far, more than 30,000 periodical volumes, 12,000 serial volumes, 2,651 newspapers either directly or on deposit or as gift. It also receives more than 1,200 journals, a large number of which are received free or in exchange, and some are subscribed.

9.25 The total financial outlay of the ICSSR on the Documentation and Bibliographical Services is about Rs. 10.14 lakhs in 1976-77.

9.26 The services of this Division are essentially used by the doctoral students, especially those on study grants from the ICSSR. A large number of social scientists do not seem to be sufficiently aware of its activities and services. Secondly, we also notice that some of its very laborious efforts in developing the Union Catalogue has been hardly used. In fact, many of the libraries, perhaps due to cost factor, have not even been able to purchase copies of the Union Catalogue which the Documentation Division has brought out. Thirdly, we also notice that the Documentation Services are as yet relatively underdeveloped and a great deal more could be achieved by providing documentation on many important themes in various fields. Unfortunately,

there appears to be inadequate appreciation of the need for documentation by the social science community in the country.

9.27 The despatch section of the ICSSR and the Documentation Division are housed together on ground of availability of space. This has led to considerable distortion both of the Division's work as well as of the despatch section. Not only is there no functional relationship between the two activities, but they also suffer in the performance of their activities.

Data Archives

9.28 The idea of establishing Data Archives was suggested by the Committee on Social Science Research itself. It had recommended that one of the important functions of the ICSSR should be "to develop and support Centres for the maintenance and supply of data".

9.29 In the early years of the ICSSR, the plans for the development of data archives were rather ambitious. The first Working Group established for the data archives by the ICSSR in 1970 recommended the establishment of a network of data centres, housed in active social science research institutes with a record of data utilisation under a dual system of control through a local advisory committee and a central coordination committee. The Working Group visualised that over a period of five to ten years, the data centres should become self-supporting through membership dues and charges for the work done.

9.30 Though the ICSSR accepted the recommendations of the working group, it decided to make a modest beginning by establishing data archives under its direct control. Competent social scientists were sent abroad, specially to the U.S.A., for training.

9.31 The work done by the ICSSR so far includes the establishment of a Standing Committee on Data Archives and data archives unit which has been charged with the following functions:

(a) To acquire, organise and maintain social science data set in machine-readable form and make them available to interested social scientists for re-use.

(b) To support suitable research institutions in different parts of the country to develop similar data archives.

(c) To develop and maintain a computer library to handle the data management and retrieval problems of the data archives as well as data processing and analysis problems of social scientists.

(d) To organise training courses in data processing and analysis with emphasis on the use of computer and mechanical devices.

(e) To arrange for guidance and consultancy services for social scientists requiring assistance in data processing and analysis.

(f) To act as liaison between official data producing agencies and social scientists.

(g) To establish collaborative relations with social science data archives abroad.

(h) To compile a National Register of Social Scientists and to revise it periodically.

9.32 The data archives unit has, with the assistance of the Ford Foundation, assembled the minimum essential equipment. It includes IBM Key Punch, Verifier, Counter Sorter, Card Collator, Accounting Machine, Reproducing Punch and a Photocopying machine. Some important software facilities have also been developed as also programme for data clearing and contingency checkings.

9.33 The unit has acquired a number of data sets; 18 in 1974-75; 20 in 1975-76 and 4 in 1976-77 from the Reserve Bank of India, and the various project directors etc. Negotiations for acquiring more data sets are in progress.

9.34 The budget of the unit has been around Rs. 2 lakhs per annum in 1976-77.

9.35 The data archives unit has started a programme for providing guidance and consultancy services to social scientists to tackle their problems in data recording, processing and analysis with the help of mechanical devices. In order to make these services available to social scientists as close to their present work as possible, the following six institutions have been identified:

- (1) Indian Institute of Management, Calcutta.
- (2) Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi.

- (3) Sardar Patel Institute of Economics and Social Research, Ahmedabad.
- (4) Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Pune.
- (5) Centre for Development Studies, Trivandrum.
- (6) Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Bombay.

9.36 In order to run this programme on behalf of the ICSSR, a sum of Rs. 10,000/- per annum was decided to be placed at the disposal of each of the selected centres to cover the T.A. and D.A. costs of social scientists who visit these centres and some honorarium to be paid to the consultants for providing these services.

9.37 The Unit has developed relationship and exchange of information with some of the institutions abroad specially Inter Consortium for Political & Social Research at Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A. and Zentralarchiv at Cologne, Germany.

9.38 Recently the data archives unit has agreed to accept membership on the Steering Committee of International Association for Social Science Information Service and Technology. It will also act as the Asian Secretariat.

9.39 The unit took up the programme of compiling a National Register of Social Scientists early in 1976. The main purpose of compiling this register was to fill a void in the important area of basic and comprehensive information on Indian social scientists about their background, research interests and contributions made by them towards the development of social sciences. It was decided that every social scientist who has demonstrated his ability to contribute, through teaching and research to the development of social sciences, shall be included in the register. The Unit approached approximately 300 heads of research institutions, 700 heads of university departments and nearly 5,000 principals of colleges. In all about 25,000 individual social scientists have been approached. However, only about 8,000 replies from individual social scientists have been received so far. The work on the National Register is still going on at the time of this review.

9.40 The establishment of data archives by the ICSSR has been beset with many problems. The most serious problem has been

that the development of data archives by the ICSSR has preceded a demand for such services by Indian social scientists. The entire system of data archives has developed in many advanced countries in the context of a persistent demand by social scientists for such data base in order to pursue further their research interests. Somehow the Indian social scientists have as yet to appreciate the utility of such services. As a result the demands made upon the data archives unit have been minimal, which is no doubt a great source of discouragement to it.

9.41 The second difficulty has been the paucity of resources available. The size of data in India especially with organisations which have been in this field for a long time, like the National Sample Survey Organisation, the Registrar General of India, the Reserve Bank of India, etc., is enormous. These organisations have shown willingness to transfer considerable amounts of the data to the ICSSR's data archives. However, the scale of finances required for building such data archives is so large that the ICSSR could exhaust all its funds and not touch the fringe of these resources.

9.42 It seems to us, therefore, that instead of placing the cart before the horse, it would be far more advisable for the ICSSR to be more selective in the development of this programme of data archives. Above all, a consciousness needs to be developed among Indian social scientists about the role and utility of data archives.

9.43 We suggest the following:

- (a) In respect of data collected in Censuses and Surveys by large organisations such as RG and NSSO, the ICSSR should acquire tabulations made but not published because of volume of printing involved.
- (b) In respect of research projects financed by the ICSSR involving collection of field data, there should be a built-in provision for either (i) storing the data on computer-tape or (ii) preparing certain tables for keeping with ICSSR Data Archives.

9.44 In our view time is not yet ripe for too ambitious a programme in this field and therefore the limited steps suggested above should be sufficient for the Sixth Plan period.

X STRUCTURE, ORGANIZATION & FINANCES

10.1 ICSSR is a Central Society registered under the Societies Registration Act of 1860. According to its charter, the Council of the ICSSR consists of 26 members including the Chairman and the Member-Secretary. All the members of the Council, including the Chairman, are appointed by the Government of India and the Member-Secretary, who is the Chief Executive of the ICSSR, is also appointed by the Government of India.

10.2 Of the 24 members, excluding the Chairman and the Member-Secretary, 18 are social scientists, nominated by the Government of India, one-third of whom retire every year. The other six members, all nominated by the Government of India, include one representative each from the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare and Ministry of Finance.

10.3 The Chairman of the ICSSR is an eminent social scientist and is only part-time although he has several executive responsibilities in operational matters. The full-time Chief Executive, as mentioned earlier, is the Member-Secretary.

10.4 The ICSSR operates essentially through a series of statutory committees. They are:

- (i) Research Committee;
- (ii) Policy, Planning and Administration Committee;
- (iii) Research Institutes Committee;
- (iv) Training Committee;
- (v) Committee on Documentation Services and Research Information;
- (vi) Area Study Committee;
- (vii) Committee on International Collaboration; and
- (viii) Committee on Data Archives.

Besides these statutory committees, there are a large number of Advisory Committees of the ICSSR. The practice is to appoint Advisory Committees for all major programmes and for *ad hoc* activities of the ICSSR.

10.5 At the Secretariat level, the ICSSR is organised in eleven

Divisions; Programme Divisions headed by a Director or a Joint Director or a Deputy Director as the case may be and Service Divisions headed by the respective functional heads. One of the Directors is, by rotation, designated as the Executive Director and in the absence of the Member-Secretary, he is in charge of the Secretariat.

10.6 Within each Programme Division, the professional hierarchy of the ICSSR staff is led by a Director followed by a Joint Director, Deputy Director, and one Assistant Director. Below this level, are Research Assistants and the clerical staff.

10.7 According to the data provided by the ICSSR Secretariat, there are nine Programme Divisions and two Service Divisions as given below:—

A : Programme Divisions.

- Programme I : Social Indicators, Fellowships
(Headed by a Director)
- Programme II : Research in Economics and Rural
Development.
(Headed by a Director)
- Programme III : Research Grants: General
(Headed by a Director)
- Programme IV : Women's Programmes, Research Institutions
and Regional and State Centres.
(Headed by a Director)
- Programme V : Publications
(Headed by a Director)
- Programme VI : Area Studies and International Collaboration
(Headed by a Deputy Director)
- Programme VII : Documentation
(Headed by a Deputy Director)
- Programme VIII : Data Archives
(Headed by a Deputy Director)
- Programme IX : Alternatives in Development
(Looked after by an Honorary Director).

B : Service Divisions.

- Administration : Headed by Administrative Officer

Finance : Headed by Financial Adviser and
Chief Accounts Officer.

10.8 The total number of posts in the ICSSR today is 175 of which 111 are on regular basis, 15 are on deputation, one is re-employed and 34 are on an *ad hoc* basis. Fourteen posts are currently vacant. The total expenditure on the staff of the ICSSR in 1976-77 was about Rs. 12.5 lakhs.

10.9 For a proper functioning of the ICSSR, vital issues relate to its internal structure, organisation and management. These need to be carefully considered. all the more so, as there are persistent complaints from social scientists of delays in handling their cases and requests. Our own discussions with the staff revealed that a great deal of bureaucratic administration has permeated the working of the ICSSR. Some of these problems did not become major issues because of the extra-ordinary personality of the last Member-Secretary. This, in our opinion, is not an organisational solution; normal institutional arrangements need to be made for normal functioning of the ICSSR.

10.10 We wish to emphasise that the ICSSR is an academic body and must maintain academic character both in its internal organisation and style of operation. In fact, it should set an example for others in the academic field with respect to organisation and management of its affairs.

10.11 We have given a great deal of thought to the internal organisation of the ICSSR Secretariat. We are somewhat unhappy to find that the base of the organisation at the Assistant Director's level is still heavily structured on the lines of the Sections in the Government. In an academic institution such as the ICSSR, it is essentially the quality of academic personnel and the style of management which should create the necessary administrative culture. From this point of view, it will be desirable to organise a competent senior level Secretariat with a small supporting staff in the various Divisions. The exact number of these Divisions could be left open to meet the needs of administration from time to time.

10.12 As already mentioned, at present, the Secretariat of the ICSSR is organised in nine Programme Divisions headed by

Directors or Deputy Director and two Service Divisions, one headed by an Administrative Officer and another by a Financial Adviser and Chief Accounts Officer. Presumably, the heads of all Divisions, whether Directors, Deputy Directors or A.O. or F.A. & C.A.O. deal directly with the Member-Secretary. In our opinion, this places too great an administrative burden on the Member-Secretary, and that therefore he needs the support and assistance of two senior persons above the Directors of Divisions. We recommend that the present nine Divisions may be reorganised into two departments, each in charge of a full-time senior academic executive.

10.13 We recommend that these senior academic executives should be designated Executive Directors of the ICSSR immediately below the Member-Secretary. They should be selected from senior academic community on the basis of their academic and administrative competence and should be placed in the scale of pay of Rs. 2,000-2,500 p.m. plus other benefits including suitable housing for which they should not pay more than ten per cent of their salary.

10.14 We suggest the following two Departments:—

Department of Research Grants and Fellowships.

- Division I* : Grants and Fellowships:
Economics (including Commerce)
Management (including Business
Administration)
- Division II* : Grants and Fellowships:
Political Science (including International
Relations)
Public Administration
Law
- Division III* : Grants and Fellowships:
Sociology (including Criminology and Social
Work)
Education, Psychology, Anthropology,
Demography, History, Geography, Linguistics
- Division IV* : International Collaboration.

Department of Research Institutes and other Programmes.

Division V : Research Institutes and Regional/State/University Centres.

Division VI : Publications.

Division VII : Documentation.

Division VIII : Data Archives.

10.15 We suggest that in each of the departments, each Division may be placed under a Director/Deputy Director as required. Steps should be taken to reduce the 'Research' staff below the level of the Deputy Director. In this matter, the needs of different divisions will be different and these will have to be taken into account. Such re-organisation will, of course, have to be done gradually. The two service divisions of Administration and Finance need not be changed and they should report directly to the Member-Secretary.

10.16 For effective internal organisation and management of the affairs of the ICSSR, we suggest the creation of an Internal Management Committee consisting of the Member-Secretary, the two Executive Directors and the Directors/Dy. Directors of the several Divisions. All major matters involving the ICSSR's internal administration and those of delegation by the Council should be decided by the Internal Management Committee. The Committee should meet regularly, preferably once a week, with a formal agenda and decide all important matters delegated to the Secretariat. The decisions should be duly recorded and reported to the relevant Statutory Committees.

10.17 An important question with regard to internal organisation of the ICSSR is now to attract the requisite quality of personnel in its higher echelons especially at the Director and Executive Director level. We recommend that most of such senior staff should be brought in from academic institutions and universities on deputation for a period of generally not less than three years and not more than five years. This will ensure a proper interchange between the ICSSR and the academic community. Towards this purpose, the ICSSR must give high priority to the provision of accommodation to such scholars for this is the single most important impediment to an effective interchange

between the ICSSR and the academic community. From this point of view, the building of the Campus, with which we deal later, is a matter of great urgency.

Finances of the ICSSR

10.18 When the Committee on Social Science Research had recommended establishment of the ICSSR, it had visualised that the Council would begin with an allocation of about rupees one crore a year by the Government and that these resources would be substantially increased from time to time. Given the initial time lag for evolution of the ICSSR's activities, the total budget allocation in the first year was only about Rs. 10 lakhs.

10.19 This figure has gone up substantially over the years and had reached a figure of over Rs. 1.70 crores by 1977-78. The following Table shows the total resources available in the Council from 1969-70 to 1977-78:—

(Rs. in Lakhs)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Plan allocation</i>	<i>Research institutions</i>	<i>Non-Plan</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Other sources ICSSR</i>	<i>Ford Foundation grant</i>	<i>Grand Total</i>
1969-70	9.69	—	—	9.69	—	—	9.69
1970-71	27.22	—	—	27.22	8.12	—	27.34
1971-72	45.66	—	—	45.66	0.41	—	46.07
1972-73	69.00	—	—	69.00	1.49	—	70.49
1973-74	55.50	—	—	55.50	7.23	11.19	73.92
Total IVth Plan	207.07	—	—	207.07	9.25	11.19	227.51
1974-75	41.00	41.28	29.20	111.48	2.74	13.75	127.97
1975-76	59.51	35.66	32.45	127.62	6.09	9.27	142.98
1976-77	60.00	54.33	33.75	148.08	3.16	10.59	161.83
1977-78	65.00	55.00	34.48	154.48	5.57	10.45	170.50
Budget							
Total Vth Plan	225.51	186.27	129.88	541.66	17.56	44.06	603.28
Grand Total	432.58	186.27	129.88	748.73	26.81	55.25	830.79

10.20 It needs to be stressed, however, that during the Fourth Plan period, the ICSSR was given a total plan allocation of Rs. 250 lakhs by the Central Government. However, this was not

maintained and the ICSSR received only Rs. 207 lakhs during the Plan period. 1973-74 was a specially bad year and though the allocation of the ICSSR was expected to rise to about Rs. 90 lakhs during the year, it actually fell below the allocation of the previous years to only Rs. 55 lakhs.

10.21 The Fifth Plan saw the transfer of research institutions to the ICSSR as a result of which there was an immediate apparent increase in the funds available with the ICSSR.

10.22 During the Fifth Plan, however, as against a revised plan allocation of Rs. 9 crores sought by the ICSSR, for both the research activities as well as for funding research institutions, the actual allocation was only Rs. 6.34 crores. This included Rs. 3.00 crores for the ICSSR and Rs. 2.48 crores for the research institutes; the actual receipt for the first four years of the Fifth Plan has, however, been only Rs. 4.11 crores.

10.23 In other words, not only was the allocation made by the Government to the ICSSR lower than its requirements, but the actual disbursement fell below the allocation. This is distressing, especially in view of the commitment of the country to research and the enormous support the Government provides to research in physical and natural sciences. It needs hardly to be emphasized that research in social science is no less important for the political, social and economic development of the country. In this perspective, the performance during the Fourth and Fifth Plans of the Government has indeed been disappointing.

10.24 In order to broaden the base and diversify its financial resource base, the ICSSR on its own has tried to involve other agencies, especially the State Governments and also to secure assistance from the Ford Foundation.

10.25 The State support for social science research has now come from 10 States, *viz.* Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and West Bengal.

10.26 The State's support has taken two forms. One is to provide half of the recurring and non-recurring expenditure of institutions of social science research. The second has been to provide a matching maintenance grant of Rs 1 lakh to the regional centres

as well as giving *ad hoc* non-recurring grant for such centres.

10.27 The other sources of the ICSSR's income represent the sale of publications, royalties, etc. and some miscellaneous grants.

10.28 With respect to ICSSR's finance, one important question that arises is the distribution of its expenditure. Where do the funds of the ICSSR go? The analysis of its expenditure budget reveals that the single most important component of expenditure is the research programme. This covers the grants-in-aid given for projects submitted to the ICSSR as well as for sponsored research fellowships of all kinds, training in research methodology, study grants, grants to research institutions and finally, for publication. From a level of expenditure of Rs. 6.23 lakhs in 1969-70, or 64.2 per cent of the total expenditure, the figure rose to Rs. 111.23 lakhs, or 71.75 per cent of the total expenditure in 1976-77. The details of this expenditure are given in Annexure IV.

10.29 The second important charge on the expenditure of the ICSSR is the various supporting services including maintenance of regional centres, documentation and bibliographical services and data archives. The expenditure on these services increased from Rs. 0.87 lakhs or nearly 9 per cent of the total expenditure in 1969-70 to Rs. 22.27 lakhs or 13.76 per cent in 1976-77.

10.30 The third item of expenditure has been the administration, the expenditure on which increased from Rs. 1.37 lakhs in 1969-70 to Rs. 9.93 lakhs in 1976-77. If we put together all expenditure on administration including those in research programmes and supporting services, the amount of expenditure on administration would be seen to be even higher. In our view, this needs some attention and we feel that recommendations we have made earlier, with regard to internal organisations of the ICSSR would help in reducing the administrative expenditure.

10.31 The fourth major charge on the budget of the ICSSR is the Other Programmes. These include grants to professional organisations of social scientists, various seminars, etc. visits of Indian social scientists abroad and overseas social scientists in India, etc. The expenditure on these activities increased from about Rs. 0.30 lakhs or 3.10 per cent of the total expenditure in 1969-70 to Rs. 11.76 lakhs or 7.27 per cent of the total in 1976-77.

This increase was made largely possible by the Ford Foundation grant.

10.32 The last item of expenditure is a miscellaneous one. This is fairly small and deals with loans to staff, provident fund, furniture and equipment, transport vehicles, etc.

10.33 One of the important principles in the management of the ICSSR's funds is that, except in the areas of research institutes which is a scheme operated by the ICSSR on behalf of the Government, all other funds do not have any permanent commitments. Because of the absence of permanent recurring liabilities, it is possible for the ICSSR to utilize bulk of its funds for new projects, ideas, etc. and thus be in a position to promote and support research in new ways and areas.

10.34 From whatever we have examined, the management of financial administration of the ICSSR has been generally sound. However, we notice that the ICSSR, despite being an autonomous institution, has borrowed wholesale all the financial rules and regulations from the Government of India. As stated earlier, we feel that the entire financial system of the ICSSR needs a thorough revamping. Admittedly this cannot be done without the concurrence of the Government of India, especially the Ministry of Finance. It is, therefore, premature for us to suggest any specific system of financial administration for the ICSSR, until the matter is discussed with the Government of India. We suggest that this should be done as early as possible and we trust the Government would see the merit in freeing the ICSSR from the yoke of these antiquated rules.

10.35 While on the question of finance, we would like to make a mention of grant of U.S. \$ one million made by the Ford Foundation to the ICSSR. The first instalment of U.S. \$ 450 thousand was sanctioned and used between 1973-74 and 1975-76. It covered international training and travel for the Staff of the ICSSR in documentation centre and data archives as well as for Indian and foreign social scientists and equipment for documentation centre and data archives, acquisition of materials and publications. The Ford Foundation has extended a supplementary grant of an equal amount for three years between 1976-77 to 1978-79 largely for similar purposes. We have not evaluated in detail the

expenditure incurred on the various items listed. However, we have elsewhere made our comments regarding use of these funds, especially in relation to the travel of Indian social scientists abroad and overseas social scientists to India. We hope our suggestions in this regard would be carefully considered.

10.36 We attach the highest importance to the finances of the ICSSR because in our opinion the autonomy of the ICSSR would, in the ultimate analysis, depend on its ability to raise funds in addition to its present sources. We shall pursue the point in the following chapters.

10.37 Lastly we come to the important question relating to the Campus of the ICSSR. The present arrangements in the Hostel of the Indian Institute of Public Administration are on every count entirely unsatisfactory. The ICSSR's office does not present either a good image or an atmosphere conducive to the nature of its functions and activities. The provision of a suitable accommodation for the office is, therefore, urgent. We would, however, urge that the question of the office of the ICSSR and the other accommodation needs, such as housing for the senior staff, a hostel for social scientists, etc. should be viewed together and as a matter of urgent importance.

10.38 We have been informed that the ICSSR has negotiated a 15-acre plot presently housing the Russian Centre of the Nehru University in South Delhi on certain basis. This offer is, apparently, still open. It is of utmost importance that the Council proceeds forthwith to complete this arrangement with the Nehru University as the shifting of the Russian Centre from the present site will easily take about two years. The 15-acre plot will provide the ICSSR ample opportunities for building a first-rate Campus to house several of its offices, accommodation for its senior staff and finally a hostel for the social scientists.

10.39 We wish to emphasise specially the importance of the hostel. The lack of proper accommodation for the visiting social scientists, including those invited by the ICSSR, has been a very serious handicap in recent years. A well-designed and commodious hostel for about fifty scholars will not only meet this urgent need but will offer considerable opportunities to a large number of social scientists to inter-act with each other in a central place

at the ICSSR. We consider this matter to be of vital importance and strongly recommend the ICSSR to move in this direction at the earliest opportunity.

Discrimination between Natural and Social Sciences

10.40 In India, the need to promote the natural sciences (including agricultural and health sciences) was recognised much earlier. The CSIR was the first to be established; then came the ICAR and ICMR; and the ICSSR came last on scene in 1969. In the official, as well as perhaps in public mind, the natural sciences are considered to be the more important and significant than social sciences—a position which in a democratic polity is indeed undesirable. This situation leads to a good deal of discrimination between the natural and social sciences. Some instances of this are given below. We suggest that the ICSSR should take them with the Government of India and seek an early redress.

10.41 *Definition of Scientific Research*—In Section 43 of the Income Tax Act, 1961, “Scientific Research” has been defined as “any activity for the extension of knowledge in the fields of natural or applied science including agriculture, animal husbandry or fisheries”. The phrase “other natural or applied sciences” has not been defined in the Income Tax Act, 1961, but it has been held by competent authorities that disciplines of social sciences do not fall under the category of natural and applied sciences. We feel that this is both incorrect and unfair and we suggest remedial action by the Government immediately.

10.42 *Donations*—Section 35 (i) (ii) relates to donations given to universities, colleges and other institutions for scientific research (except in social sciences which is not covered by the definition of scientific research). It exempts *all* such donations on a 100 per cent basis. Moreover, such exemptions are given on an automatic basis under Section 10 (21) of the Act. The prescribed authority for approving any association, university, college or institution for the purpose of Section 35 (i) (ii) are the Department of Science and Technology in the areas of “other natural or applied sciences”, the ICAR in the area of agriculture, animal husbandry and fisheries, and ICMR in the area of medical research.

10.43 As regards donations for social science research, Section 35 (i) (iii) is relevant. This sub-section also provides for deduction from income of any sum paid by a donor for research in social sciences to a body approved by the prescribed authority (which in this case is the ICSSR) which implies 100 per cent exemption. But it suffers from a restriction in that the research in social sciences undertaken therewith must be related to class of business carried on by the donor. Such a restriction does not apply to donations given for scientific research and exempted under Section 35 (i) (ii) of the Income Tax Act. Moreover, such exemption is not automatic in the case of social sciences. We suggest that this exemption should be made automatic.

10.44 There is another discrimination from which the social sciences research suffers *vis-a-vis* scientific research. This is on account of the provision contained in Sub-Section 2(A) of Section 35 of the Income Tax Act. This section provides that where a donor pays any sum to an approved scientific research association, etc. to be used for scientific research undertaken under a programme approved by the prescribed authority, (Department of Science & Technology, ICAR or ICMR, as the case may be) a deduction of sum equal to one and one-third times the sum so paid shall be allowed. Since this provision is only for scientific research, the donors for social science research cannot benefit from the weighted relief. We strongly recommend that this anomaly be rectified.

10.45 *Customs Exemption*—Under Notification No. 109/67 dated 26th September 1969, the Central Government has exempted all scientific and technical instruments, apparatus and equipment imported by or against the order of such educational and research institutions as may be approved in this behalf by the Central Government. In practice, exemptions under this order have been given only to Departments of Natural Sciences or research institutions in Natural Sciences (recently, research institutions or departments of agriculture or medicine have also been given this concession), but no concession is given to Departments of Social Sciences or institutions doing research in social sciences. We urge the Government to extend this facility of customs exemption to social sciences as well.

10.46 *Exemption from Travel Tax*—Persons going abroad have

to pay a travel tax of 10 per cent over economy class fare and 15 per cent over first class fare. The tax is exempted in case of scientists going abroad. In practice, this expression is interpreted to mean only natural scientists. Now medical and agricultural scientists have also been included, but social scientists have not yet been given the concession inspite of the fact that the ICSSR has made representations in this behalf. We request the Government to consider the case of the social scientists on the lines of the natural scientists.

10.47 *Exemption under Supplementary Rule 12*—SR 12 provides that unless the President by special order otherwise directs, one-third of any fee in excess of Rs. 400/- or if a recurring fee, of Rs. 250/- a year, paid to a Government servant shall be credited to General Revenues. In the Ministry of Finance, Department of Expenditure O.M. No. 11(1)/E.II(B) dated 25th June, 1970, orders were issued in relaxation of the provisions of SR 12 that scientists working under the Central Government who, in the overall interest of research and development, were permitted by the Government to take full time assignments either in foreign countries or within the country as visiting professors, etc. in universities or scientific/medical institutions, may be allowed to retain in *toto* the remuneration received by them subject to certain conditions. This concession, however, has not been extended to social scientists. We urge the Government of India to do so at an early date.

XI AUTONOMY

11.1 By far the most important question relates to the autonomy of the ICSSR. Under the present constitution of the ICSSR, the Government of India has, by virtue of Article 8 (a) of the Memorandum of Association and Rules, the right to "give directives to the Council in respect of its policies and programmes". The Government also has all powers to decide on its composition etc. There are several areas where the autonomy issue is an important one.

Relationship with the Government

11.2 The relationship of the ICSSR with the Government of India is by far the most complicated one. The establishment of the ICSSR has been essentially at the instance of the Government of India. The Government of India has also played an extremely important role in nurturing and developing the ICSSR over almost a decade now. Without the financial support provided by the Government, the ICSSR could not have achieved what it has done over these years. It is indeed to the credit of the Government of India that it has seen the ICSSR through the most difficult phase of establishment and development.

11.3 However, in our view, the ICSSR has now come of age and in the interest of its future and the Government's own objective of providing full freedom to the social science community, the time has come to review this relationship in many of its dimensions.

11.4 The Government of India has not only the statutory authority to give directives to the ICSSR but also has the right to appoint (a) the Chairman of the ICSSR, (b) all the members, and (c) the Member-Secretary of the ICSSR. The operating finances of the ICSSR also come almost exclusively from the Government of India. By virtue of these facts, the formal control of the ICSSR by the Government of India, is almost, total.

11.5 We are of the view that, although the Government has in the past used its legal authority on the ICSSR with considerable

discretion, this relationship now needs to be recast on sounder lines. While we are making specific suggestions for this purpose, our basic position is that this relationship should be built on the basis of an open system in which important decisions are widely discussed and accepted by the academic community.

11.6 We are strongly of the view that the powers given by the constitution of the ICSSR to the Government to issue "directives to the Council in respect of its policies and programmes" should be withdrawn as these powers detract from the real autonomy of the ICSSR.

11.7 The Chairman of the ICSSR is presently appointed by the Government on the basis of a panel prepared for the purpose. Though the final choice for appointment of the Chairman will lie with the Government of India, at least for some time to come, we think that it will be a step in the right direction if the ICSSR is given a voice in the preparation of the panel. Specifically, we suggest that a Selection Committee consisting of a nominee of the ICSSR, a nominee of the UGC, and a nominee of the Government of India should prepare a panel of three eminent social scientists for consideration of the Government. Government should select one of the three for appointment as the Chairman of the ICSSR.

11.8 As already noted, the ICSSR consists of 26 members, including 18 social scientists. All members are nominated by the Government of India and have a three-year term. We feel that the appointment of the 18 social scientist members by the Government also requires some modifications. We suggest the following: Every year, 6 out of the 18 social scientist members retire and have to be replaced. For this purpose, each one of the 18 sitting members may communicate, in confidence, one name, to the Chairman. The Chairman may then put these names together and indicate against each his discipline and region. If, in the opinion of the Chairman, the list is inadequate in the sense that if the choice of the six to replace the retiring six members is confined to this list, some disciplines/regions may not be adequately represented on the ICSSR, he may say so and, in consultation with the Member-Secretary, may suggest additional names. The names thus suggested by the Chairman should be shown separately on the

list. Taking into account the discipline/region composition of the six retiring members, the Government should then select six from the list to replace the retiring six members.

11.9 Out of the other six members to be nominated by the Government, Government may nominate, as at present, three Secretaries from the Ministry of Finance, the Department of Education and the Department of Social Welfare. However, these individuals should not be represented in the ICSSR by their nominees. The other three members may be nominated, in rotation by the University Grants Commission, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, Indian Council of Medical Research, Indian Council of Historical Research, Council of Scientific and Industrial Research and the Registrar General of India. This will ensure adequate representation of relevant disciplines and interests on the Council of the ICSSR. We wish to make clear that these persons should be nominated in their personal capacities and no substitutes should be allowed to represent them in the meetings of the Council.

11.10 Of crucial importance in the management of the affairs of the ICSSR is the manner of selection and appointment of the Member-Secretary. Presently, the appointment is made by the Government on the advice of a Selection Committee established by the ICSSR which includes a representative of the Government. This practice is sound although in the past there have been instances where the panel suggested by the Selection Committee has not been acceptable to the Government. In our view, to protect the autonomy of the ICSSR the appointment of the Member-Secretary who is the chief executive should be left entirely to the ICSSR. A Selection Committee consisting of a nominee of the ICSSR, a nominee of the UGC and a nominee of the Government should prepare a panel of three out of which the ICSSR should select one for the appointment of its Member-Secretary.

11.11 The status and pay of the Member-Secretary as the Chief Executive of the ICSSR, also deserves careful consideration. Until the revision of the university pay scales in 1973, the pay and status of the Member-Secretary of the ICSSR was placed above that of a full Professor in a university. Since then, the

academic scales for professors and other staff have been upgraded considerably and there is now an anomalous position wherein the Member-Secretary's maximum pay is the same as that of a full Professor. Thus, the post has been effectively downgraded.

11.12 To provide proper recognition to the nature of the responsibilities of the Member-Secretary and to lend proper status to the ICSSR itself we feel it is essential that the post of the Member-Secretary should be equated to that of a Vice-Chancellor of a University. All status and financial benefits flowing from the position of a Vice-chancellor should be assigned to the post of the Member-Secretary. This will enable the ICSSR and its Member-Secretary to operate effectively with Government as well as with academic institutions and universities in the country.

Financial and Administrative Powers

11.13 With respect to the financial and administrative powers also the Council is not entirely free to decide its procedures. Under the present regulations, "The Council shall have powers to frame and amend regulations, not inconsistent with the Memorandum of Association and the rules, for the administration and management of its affairs" only "with the previous approval of the Government of India". We understand that at the instance of the Government of India, the ICSSR has adopted the financial rules and regulations of the Government. The relevance of the system of financial rules and regulations of the Government of India even for its own purposes has been repeatedly questioned by a large number of Governmental agencies, Commissions and Committees. In any case, these financial rules and regulations have little relevance to the needs of the ICSSR. While we agree that the ICSSR's financial rules and regulations need to be carefully devised with a view to keeping them within the norms of academic institutions and of proper accountability, we urge that this question should be, with due consultation with the Government, re-examined so that the ICSSR may have a set of financial rules and regulations appropriate to its needs and character.

11.14 We recommend specifically that once the Government has approved the overall budget of the ICSSR, the latter should

be left entirely free to operate within the broad framework of its policies, rules and regulations.

11.15 The situation is not dissimilar with regard to administrative powers. The present system requires approval by the Government of "the procedure, terms and tenure of appointment, emoluments, allowances, rules of discipline and other conditions of service of the officers and staff of the Council" which has, in effect, resulted in the Government not accepting pay scales, housing, creation of posts, etc. in the ICSSR which are not in full conformity with that of the Government. If the ICSSR has to be built on academic lines, the carryover of the Governmental personnel system, into the ICSSR is neither conducive to the ICSSR's needs nor to its effective functioning.

11.16 This problem has come up seriously in relation to the senior posts in the ICSSR. For instance, the Government of India has rejected the ICSSR's demand for University pay scales for its senior staff. Instead, the Government has insisted on giving "replacement scales" which are below those now prescribed for the University teachers. The consequences of these are highly deleterious to the ICSSR. In effect, it means that for the key posts such as Directors of the Divisions, the ICSSR will not be able to get any one of requisite status from the universities. This will indeed create serious difficulties for the relationship of the ICSSR with senior academic community in the country. Nor will the ICSSR be able to recruit senior staff of sufficient quality it urgently requires in its secretariat to undertake the type of work which is required.

11.17 Therefore, we strongly urge the Government to reconsider the position and to give all necessary administrative and financial powers to the ICSSR suitable to its needs. We feel that in the long run such operational powers in financial and administrative matters would only contribute to the effective functioning of the ICSSR.

Financial Autonomy

11.18 Finally we come to the vital question of financial autonomy of the ICSSR. The question of financial autonomy of the ICSSR is indeed a difficult one. At present, the financial alloca-

tions to the ICSSR are made as part of the budget of the Ministry of Education. Given the scale of its operations, it is not easy for the ICSSR to raise the quantum of funds from outside the Government of India. However, excessive financial dependence on a single source is neither in the interest of the ICSSR nor of the social science community at large.

11.19 Hence, it is necessary to diversify the sources of the ICSSR's funding. We would suggest that the ICSSR should explore first of all other Central resources including other Ministries and Departments of the Government of India. Secondly, it should explore the possibilities of support from the various State Governments. Thirdly, it should explore avenues for raising funds from public and private sector corporations, and if possible, from foreign funding agencies. However, we suggest that such contributions from corporations and foreign funding agencies should go only into an endowment fund. In order to move towards financial autonomy, the ICSSR should give highest priority to create an endowment fund of Rs. 10 crores or so over the next five years. This alone will be a major safeguard against any major interference in its affairs.

11.20 In our view, the autonomy of the ICSSR is fundamental to the successful and effective discharge of its functions and, therefore, recommend that these suggestions should be pursued vigorously.

XII OVERVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

12.1 The establishment of the Indian Council of Social Science Research is, clearly, one of the important landmarks in the development of social sciences in India. Its work in the past nine years has fully justified its establishment. Its functioning during this period has been on the whole satisfactory and in our opinion it has made a significant contribution to the development of social science research in the country. Above all, it has created a forum for the social scientists in the country to meet, communicate, and address themselves to their social responsibilities. In the course of our review, we have examined various aspects of its working, naturally focussing attention on where, in our opinion, review, revision, and reorganisation are needed. We shall now bring such points together and present our suggestions and comments in the form of specific recommendations.

Need to broaden the base of Social Science Research

12.2 As we have noted, before independence the development of social science research in India occurred along with the growth of the Indian universities and the establishment of a number of research institutes, most of which were privately founded. The government did not play much active role. Since independence, there has occurred a large expansion in the number of universities, number of colleges affiliated to them and number of social science teachers working in them. But there did not occur a corresponding expansion either in centres for social science research or number of social science research workers engaged in research. By and large, social science research in the country has remained concentrated in a few established university departments, a few established research centres, and a relatively small number of research workers. Social science research did not percolate below these levels, in particular to affiliated colleges and to social science teachers working in them. In consequence, it failed to broaden its base.

12.3 With the establishment of the Research Programmes Committee of the Planning Commission in 1953, substantial funds

for social science research became available but the base remained narrow as before. In the period of 16 years since its establishment in 1953 and the establishment of the ICSSR in 1969, the Research Programmes Committee financed about 400 research projects in social sciences. We do not have a distribution of these projects as between different centres or persons. But we suppose, it remained very narrowly based.

12.4 The establishment of the ICSSR in 1969 and its functioning in the past 9 years has not made much change in this respect. As we have already noted, out of the 708 research projects financed by the ICSSR between 1969 and 1977, almost 600 have gone to the established university departments and research institutes and barely 56 to teachers in affiliated colleges. Nearly a quarter of the research projects are located in Delhi. It is true that the university training of a large majority of social science teachers in affiliated colleges, and of many in a number of university departments and even of research institutes, is not adequate for them to undertake research. It will be unrealistic and unfair to the ICSSR not to recognise this fact. But, at the same time, to let this majority remain outside the mainstream of social science research is undesirable and will undoubtedly prove detrimental to the development of social sciences in the country. The ICSSR must wake up to this danger.

12.5 In our opinion, this constitutes a major gap in the research promotional policies of the ICSSR. In fairness, we should say that the failure is not solely of the ICSSR; in a sense, it is a failure of the total social science community in the country. For instance, this aspect of its responsibility does not receive even a mention in the functions of the ICSSR as laid down in its Memorandum of Association, nor much serious attention since then. Consequently it has remained neglected. The ICSSR must now take urgent notice of this aspect of its responsibility and take active steps to broaden the base of social science research in the country by promoting participation and involvement of the large social science community outside the established university departments and research institutes.

12.6 A major difficulty, it seems, is the absence of channels of communication between the ICSSR and this vast majority of

the social science community. We should mention that until now the ICSSR assistance did not reach the social science teachers in affiliated colleges not because their research proposals were found inadequate or unsatisfactory—this might have happened in a few cases—but because a large majority of them did not know even the existence of the ICSSR or the assistance to social science research it offers. Hence, the first step necessary is to establish lines or a network of communication which will reach these persons effectively.

12.7 The Newsletter of the ICSSR is one such instrument. We understand that the ICSSR distributes it very widely. In our discussion with the Chairman, University Grants Commission, the Chairman offered to give space for ICSSR information in the UGC Newsletter. This should be pursued. But, evidently, the culture of seeking information through Newsletters or other written communications is not yet developed. Until it develops, spoken word appears necessary. The Regional Centres of the ICSSR are providing useful services but they are too few for this purpose. To multiply their number at the present level of financing is not feasible. Hence, after careful deliberation, we have come to the conclusion that, for a minimum effective communication between the ICSSR and the social science teachers in the affiliated colleges, it is necessary to establish an ICSSR Information Centre in each university. Many teachers from the affiliated colleges visit their respective university headquarters frequently for various purposes and an Information Centre located there will, in our judgement, greatly help to establish communication between them and the ICSSR.

12.8 We recommend that the ICSSR should take immediate steps to establish ICSSR Information Centres in all the universities. Such a Centre has to be run necessarily in collaboration with the university. We suggest the following minimum collaboration. The university should agree to spare a room, preferably in its Administration Building or in the Social Science Building, appropriately furnished and serviced. The university should also agree to depute one of the social science teachers, if necessary in rotation, who will be available at the Information Centre at least one hour every working day. The ICSSR should agree to pay such a teacher an honorarium of Rs 100/- p.m. and give the

Centre one typist-cum-clerk equipped with one typewriter (in the employ of the ICSSR either directly recruited or taken on deputation from the university). The minimum service to be provided by the Centre is to maintain a library of all publications of the ICSSR and a ready reference to all programmes and schemes of assistance of the ICSSR. The ICSSR's each direct expenditure should be limited to Rs 10,000/- per annum. The university may be persuaded to make an equal cash contribution. Depending upon the availability of funds and the enthusiasm of the social science teacher deputed to supervise the Centre, the Centre may offer many other services to the social science teachers visiting the Centre to seek information. The ICSSR should agree to open its Information Centres at all the universities which may agree to provide even the minimum facilities mentioned above without insisting on matching financial contribution.

12.9 The ICSSR Information Centres in the universities will serve a useful but limited purpose. More active steps will be necessary to develop research competence in a recognisable number of social science teachers in the affiliated colleges and help them establish a tradition of social science research in their respective colleges. The ICSSR has tried to organise training in Social Science Research Methodology. These have not proved greatly useful. With formal courses, it seems Research Methodology tends to develop into a science in itself rather than a tool of research. Moreover, an M. Phil. degree is soon likely to be a necessary qualification for all university/college teachers and the M.Phil. degree courses will, in almost all universities, include a course in Research Methodology. When this materialises, the ICSSR should turn to somewhat non-formal or loosely structured method of developing and improving the research competence among social science teachers.

12.10 In this, the ICSSR will have to enlist active collaboration of research institutes and university departments. There are a number of well-established research institutes and departments in the country. Some of the institutes, lying outside the university system, are directly funded by the ICSSR. The ICSSR proposes to establish few such institutes in regions where research base is weak. We welcome this. We also welcome the ICSSR concept of developing them into 'centres of excellence' provided it does

not preclude them from recognising their social obligation towards the less fortunately placed colleagues in affiliated colleges. Let the ICSSR call upon all research institutes, whether within the university system or the ICSSR system, and university departments, to join in the task of broad-basing the social science research in the country by extending it to the social science teachers in affiliated colleges.

12.11 Specifically, we recommend the following:

(a) In the case of institutes financed by the ICSSR, it should be a requirement built into the ICSSR grant that these institutes conduct every year a given number of seminars or workshops for teachers in affiliated colleges in their neighbourhood in which the faculty of the research institutes will present the research methods adopted in their on-going research and the results of the recently completed research.

(b) ICSSR should request all other research institutes (not financed by the ICSSR) to organise similar seminars/workshops and provide necessary funds for the purpose.

(c) Whenever the ICSSR approves and finances a research project from any established university department or research institute, there should be provision for organising similar seminars/workshops around the research project built into the research grant.

(d) ICSSR should welcome and support all proposals from university departments and research institutes whereby they may extend their research facilities, consultation and guidance to social science teachers in the affiliated colleges and young research workers in the neighbourhood. In particular, ICSSR should encourage and welcome research proposals which offer opportunity to the college teachers and young research workers to actively participate.

These are illustrative of the lines along which the facilities of the university departments and research institutes may be utilised. Several other propositions may be conceived and tried.

12.12 Social science teachers/located in isolated colleges lacking adequate library facilities, and uninitiated in research, need guidance as to what is research, what are the areas to be re-

searched and what are the appropriate research methods. The Surveys of research in different disciplines completed by the ICSSR, which are now being updated, and the listing of gaps in research in various areas have been a useful activity of the ICSSR. If possible, the ICSSR may periodically appoint committees to review the research proposals being currently submitted, not only to the ICSSR but also to the UGC and other funding agencies, and point out gaps and imbalances in the current research. They may indicate, what in their opinion, should be the priorities. More importantly, they may outline the scope of, and appropriate research methods for, each theme so identified. This is a service badly needed by the vast majority of social science teachers who must be drawn into the research activity.

12.13 Research proposals coming from the new entrants should be supported even if they do not fall in the priority areas identified as mentioned above. But proposals coming from established university departments and institutes should be checked for priority. But, beyond this, we do not think that the ICSSR should actively sponsor research in one priority area or another. In particular, we do not think it advisable for the ICSSR to have Standing Advisory Committees to promote and sponsor particular themes of research or to have Programme Divisions to nurse such research through the instrument of established scholars, university departments and institutes. The experience of the Sponsored Research of the ICSSR has not been altogether satisfactory. In spite of liberal funding, it has not been always possible to promote the sponsored programmes. Leading scholars, departments and institutes are either too busy with several other commitments or they do not see the priorities where the ICSSR sees them. Hence, they have often to be persuaded to participate in the sponsored programmes of the ICSSR. This has strengthened the already existing tendency of the ICSSR research funds flowing into a few well-established channels of university departments, institutes and individuals. We are also afraid that such high pressure promotion of sponsored programme may result in disproportionate allocation of funds depending upon the promotional abilities of one group of research workers or another. Because of these several considerations, we recommend that the Sponsored Research Programmes of the ICSSR, in its present

form, should be discontinued or withdrawn. The present commitments should, of course, be fulfilled.

Role of Established University Departments and Research Institutes

12.14 It is not our intention to suggest that the ICSSR funding of the established university departments and research institutes should be drastically curtailed. Far from it, we recognise that these departments and institutes have an important role to play in broadening the base of, as well as, deepening the content of social science research in the country. Hence, to avoid misunderstanding, we wish to clarify our position more specifically. Firstly, we suggest that proposals of research on familiar lines should be preferred if they come from new entrants. Indeed we would suggest that such proposals coming from established university departments and institutes should be considered only if they involve active participation of social science teachers from affiliated colleges and young research workers. For instance, a large majority of the research proposals involve empirical, fact-finding survey research. Such research provides useful training for young research workers or new entrants. We suggest that the ICSSR should prefer such proposals if they come from or at least actively involve new entrants. In our opinion, there is no justification in supporting such proposals if they are exclusively located in established university departments or institutes. Secondly, we suggest that the ICSSR should expect the established university departments and institutes, with large research facilities and personnel, to submit proposals of research which either have a high priority or which require considerable library and other facilities and a team of research workers who can devote, if not full time, at least a substantial part of their working time to research. When such proposals are submitted, the ICSSR should examine them and, though considerable academic latitude must be left to the established departments and institutes, the ICSSR should insist on a time-bound programme of its execution which may spread over two or three or even more years. In all such cases, the ICSSR should carefully examine the estimates of cost but should relax normal financial ceilings on single proposals.

12.15 Besides research in the priority areas which the ICSSR may identify through its committees, we have in mind two types

of research which, in our view, the ICSSR should particularly support in the established university departments and institutes. As already mentioned, a large part of current social science research is empirical, fact-finding survey research. This is a welcome development. However, because of the mechanics of such research, the amount of time it takes to complete the field work and to process the data, such research has tended to be self-contained. As a consequence, the kind of research which uses secondary data, serial, massive, or fragmentary, and collates such data within a framework of social science analysis of broad dimensions, has been neglected. Such research requires mature and patient scholarship and its results may not always have immediate policy implications and hence may not often be judged of high priority. We do not want to call such research 'fundamental' and juxtapose it with the other to be called 'applied' because such labelling can be misleading. But we wish to emphasise that only a substantial body of research of this kind can deepen the content of social science research and inspire and attract younger talent. Indeed, it is research of this kind which constitutes a genuine and lasting advance of social sciences. In our opinion, this is the responsibility of the established university departments and institutes. Some of the research projects which the ICSSR has approved and are called 'Major Projects' probably belong to this category. It will not be fair for us to comment on the merits of the particular projects. Hence, without implying a blanket approval of the particular projects, their budgeted costs or the procedures by which they were approved, we wish to record that we approve the concept of Major Projects if they will cover the type of research projects we have referred to above. Such projects will require large costs and longer periods to complete. Hence, the ICSSR should examine them carefully before they are approved and arrange for a periodic review of their progress after they are sanctioned. But if they are the proposals coming from mature scholars of proven ability and with institutional support necessary for their timely and orderly execution, they deserve to be considered generously. Narrow considerations and overcaution are not always justified.

12.16 There is yet another type of research which has remained neglected and which in our opinion is essential for the develop-

ment of social science in the country. It is also eminently suitable for locating in established university departments and institutes. We have in mind the social science literature presently available to the students and research workers in this country. The bulk of this literature is of western origin and for our purposes is available in English language. The major part of all worthwhile writing in social sciences by Indian scholars is also in English. All this literature is not accessible to a large majority of the growing body of students, teachers and research workers. There are two reasons. Firstly, the library facilities have not expanded in proportion to the expansion in the number of students and the number of colleges. Secondly, because of the shift to regional languages in undergraduate classes, and sometimes even in post-graduate classes, the students' preparation in English is often inadequate for them to be able to read the literature in the original. This is a serious situation and in our opinion deserves urgent attention from the ICSSR. We recommend that a programme of selection of relevant social science literature, its editing, translation into major regional languages and publication in cheap editions should receive a high priority in the ICSSR programme. This has often been neglected on grounds that this does not constitute proper research. Without wanting to enter into the semantics, we emphasise that, whether or not it is research, the activity is not easy and can only be undertaken by senior mature scholarship in the country and that this needs active promotion and support. Established university departments and institutes should play their part. We understand that the UGC has a similar programme in operation. We suggest that the ICSSR should explore the possibility of developing a joint programme with the UGC.

12.17 Thus, it will be clear that it is not our intention to exclude established university departments and research institutes from the ICSSR assistance. On the contrary, we envisage for them a very important role in the development of social sciences in the country. To the extent they accept the corresponding social responsibility and offer to play their part, we recommend that the ICSSR should give them full and liberal financial support. Established departments and institutes have remained far too self-contained and senior scholars far too self-centred in the past. The development of social sciences and promotion of social

science research have often been identified with the development of a few what are called 'centres of excellence'. This is a dangerous illusion and must be given up before it is too late.

Research Grants

12.18 We have a few minor suggestions to make pertaining to the administration of research grants. They are as under:

- (i) The ceiling of Rs 50,000 for any single project should be raised to Rs 75,000 and in exceptional cases upto Rs 100,000.
- (ii) The procedure for appointment of consultants should be streamlined. We recommend two lines of action. One, the ICSSR should prepare a panel of eminent social scientists to act as consultants for projects in each discipline. In addition, the Project Director of each proposal should be asked to recommend, if he so desires, a list of six possible consultants who may evaluate his proposal. This should receive due consideration. The final selection of the consultants should be made by a Committee consisting of the Chairman, the Member-Secretary, the Executive Director of the Department of Research Grants and Fellowships, and the Director of the relevant Division of Research Grants. We also suggest that the names of consultants who after accepting the assignment do not make their report on time on more than two or three occasions should be brought before a meeting of the ICSSR and, if considered fair and appropriate, their names dropped from the panel.
- (iii) In order to ensure timeliness of completion of a project, the consultants should be asked to comment in detail about the time budget.
- (iv) For the same reason, a Project Director should be asked about his existing research and other commitments to ensure that he does not overstretch himself.

Fellowships

12.19 Next to research grants, fellowships remain the most

important activity of the ICSSR. Our main recommendations are the following:

National Fellowships

12.20 The National Fellowships should be continued as at present except that the ceiling on the amount of fellowship may be raised to Rs. 3,000/- per month. Besides, the national fellows should be given a higher contingency grant of Rs 10,000 per annum and research assistance wherever necessary. We support the recent decision of the ICSSR that each proposal for such a fellowship should be accompanied by a detailed bio-data of the social scientist and of the grounds on which the national fellowship is recommended. However, we do not approve the present concept of the National Fellowship being purely an honour or a recognition bestowed on the scholar. If it is only a matter of bestowing an honour, there are more appropriate ways of doing it. For instance, the ICSSR may offer to bring together and publish the collected works of the scholar. Or, the ICSSR may arrange to bring out a volume of essays in his honour contributed by senior social scientists. We believe that the fellowship must have a quid pro quo and, therefore, while offering the National Fellowship, the ICSSR should make it clear that a substantial work is expected and evolve a modus operandi whereby the progress is periodically reported.

Senior Fellowships

12.21 The ICSSR offers four types of Senior Fellowships: (a) For Indians working abroad to work in India; (b) For non-Indians to work in India; (c) For Indian social scientists to work in India; and (d) For Indians to work abroad. In relation to (a), though the experience is not entirely satisfactory, we suggest that no major changes need be made since the experience is limited. In relation to (b) the scheme has to be made more liberal if it is to attract Asian, African, and perhaps Latin American social scientists. Specifically, we suggest: (i) The visiting scholar should be given maximum Indian salary of his academic status; (ii) he should be given free, furnished accommodation appropriate to his academic status; (iii) in special cases, a conveyance allowance not exceeding Rs 500/- p.m. may be given; and (iv) he may be per-

mitted to receive additional emoluments, at home or in India, from his employer or home government, but from no other source.

12.22 In relation to (c), namely, senior fellowships for Indian social scientists to work in India, we recommend that the financial liberalisation we have suggested in the case of National Fellowship should also apply here. Evidently, there are also certain practical and procedural problems concerning these fellowships. We recommend that the ICSSR should discuss them with the University Grants Commission and the universities. In relation to (d), namely, senior fellowships for Indians to work abroad, we have noted that the scheme is too expensive to continue on any scale. However, whenever such facilities can be provided through other means such as the Cultural Exchange Agreements, we emphasise that the ICSSR should try to secure terms and conditions for Indian scholars similar to those we have recommended for foreign scholars under scheme (b). In particular, in addition to the fellowship the Indian scholar may have secured abroad, he should be permitted to draw part or whole of his normal emoluments, at home, from his employer. Indeed, we recommend that, in case his employer is unable to pay even part of his normal emoluments, the ICSSR should give him a fellowship equal to his basic salary as family allowance at home.

Fellowship for Young Social Scientists

12.23 Since this is a new scheme and there is no adequate experience, we do not wish to make any changes therein and suggest that the experience should be evaluated after some time. We do, however, feel that this scheme has considerable potential.

Post-Doctoral Fellowship

12.24 The Post-Doctoral Fellowships could be redesignated simply as fellowships to differentiate them from the senior fellowships. The selection to these fellowships should be made more rigorous and the ICSSR should ensure that the fellowship is not used as a mere stop gap arrangement by the social scientist concerned.

Assistance to Doctoral Students

12.25 With regard to the scheme relating to salary protection,

short-term fellowships, contingency grants and study grants, we do not recommend any changes. We, however, feel that the scheme of doctoral fellowships is too big a charge on the budget of the ICSSR and that, in any case, the number is too large for the ICSSR to do anything meaningful. Besides, this is properly a responsibility of the UGC and the UGC is expanding the number of such fellowships. Hence, we recommend that the ICSSR should discontinue this scheme except the existing commitment. This would free more than Rs 10 lakhs per year to work out other activities which we consider important.

Research Institutes

12.26 In relation to the Research Institutes maintained or supported by the ICSSR, our principal recommendations are as follows:

(i) On the question of ceiling for grants-in-aid to the research institutes by the ICSSR, we recommend that the present ceilings of Rs 7.5 lakhs for recurring and Rs 25 lakhs for non-recurring should remain in the Sixth Plan period.

(ii) The ICSSR at present insists on a matching provision of 50 per cent to be raised by the research institutes. While this principle is sound, we would like to suggest that project funds raised by a research institute should be treated as a contribution of the research institute towards its share. For purposes of annual allocations, previous year's performance of the research institute in raising project money should be considered.

(iii) We do not, however, share the view that the ICSSR grants should be given on a 100 per cent basis. Two exceptions have so far been made in this respect. We suggest that, in the two cases, any additional grants from the ICSSR over and above the present commitments, should be subject to matching contribution by the institutes.

(iv) The practice of block grants to the research institutes is basically sound and we do not think it would be appropriate for the ICSSR to tie the grant to specific items.

(v) The most important question, however, is regarding the relationship of the ICSSR with the research institutes suppor-

ted by itself. We are of the opinion that, just as the autonomy of the ICSSR itself should be treated with utmost respect, the same principle should extend to the research institutes. The ICSSR's direct control over these should therefore be minimal. However, the ICSSR should ensure that each Research Institute's Governing Board exercises proper planning, direction and control over the research institute concerned. Such a relationship alone, in our view, would be appropriate for building the nature of future linkages between the ICSSR and the research institutes supported by it.

(vi) We understand that there is a proposal to reserve 1/3 or 1/4 of senior posts in institutes supported by the ICSSR for visiting fellows coming from other institutes or universities. We think this will be useful. However, this should be kept as an objective and not made a rigid formula. We feel that, in the short run, because of housing and other problems, it would not be easy to create the facilities necessary for visiting fellows to come from other institutes and universities.

(vii) We consider the matter of relationship between the research institutes and university system to be of considerable importance. It would be in the interest both of the universities as well as research institutes to provide for a better interface between them. The ICSSR should take initiative to bring together the research institutes and the local universities and discuss the manner in which this relationship should be developed. In particular, possibilities of the faculty of the research institutes participating in the university post-graduate teaching and research guidance should be explored and encouraged. Similarly, the ICSSR supported research institutes should actively offer facilities to university teachers to visit and use their facilities.

(viii) The question of proliferation of research institutes is an important one. While the country as vast as India can legitimately claim the need for large number of research institutes, we are of the view that multiplication of institutes without building a critical minimum faculty size is not in the interest either of the country, the ICSSR or social science research. We, therefore, recommend that the existing research institutes should first be enabled to develop properly before new ones are promoted or

established, except in regions which do not have sufficient social science research base, such as Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and Assam. We would recommend establishment of new research institutes or strengthening of existing selected institutes in these areas.

(ix) We strongly feel that the role of research institutes in developing younger social science research talents in the country should be explicitly recognised and, if necessary, made mandatory as a condition for receiving grants from the ICSSR. We have already made our detailed recommendation on this point in the above. These recommendations, if implemented, will help a great deal in the development of the social science research institutes under the auspices of the ICSSR and the overall objective of developing social science research in India.

Training in Research Methodology

12.27 In view of the fact that formal courses in research methodology for social science research are likely to be incorporated in the M.Phil. courses now being instituted in all the universities, we suggest that the ICSSR should provide for less formal and less structured courses in research methodology linked to the research projects in operation. We believe that the established university departments and research institutes, supported by the ICSSR as well as others, have a major responsibility in the matter. We have already made our detailed recommendations.

Area Studies

12.28 In consonance with our general recommendation that the ICSSR should not have special Programme Divisions, to promote researches in particular subjects or areas, we recommend that the present Programme Division for Area Studies and International Collaboration should be abolished and the Statutory Committee for Area Studies may be designated Committee for International Collaboration. This does not mean that Area Studies should be discontinued. Research proposals in Area Studies, particularly in neighbouring countries, should be examined like other research proposals and if found suitable, should be approved for necessary financial support. In certain cases the normal financial ceiling on single projects may have to be relaxed.

International Collaboration

12.29 The international collaboration programme of the ICSSR has been mostly skewed in favour of the western world, despite the intentions of the ICSSR. We suggest that the ICSSR should take immediate corrective action to shift the focus to Asia, particularly South and South-East Asia, Africa, and the Arab countries.

12.30 The development of relationship between the ICSSR and the various international bodies in social science research is desirable and we recommend that the ICSSR should continue to play an active role.

12.31 There is considerable concern amongst the social scientists about the direct approach by institutes to foreign funding agencies. It is sometimes suggested that all foreign funds should be channelled through the ICSSR which should then allocate them to applicant institutes according to appropriate policies in this regard. While we appreciate the underlying concern, we are not sure that the concentration of such large funds and accompanying patronage in the hands of the ICSSR will be desirable for its own healthy functioning. We suggest that, if necessary, the Government may examine the question in its totality.

Regional and State Centres

12.32 The Regional Centres are playing a useful role. But, it seems to us, they have as yet not fully developed the regional concept. This, together with the fact that a number of activities of the ICSSR will in due course have to be extended into regional languages, makes it necessary that the ICSSR develops the State Centres to supplement the Regional Centres. The ICSSR has already a plan to establish the State Centres. We recommend that the ICSSR should take up the matter with the respective State Governments and establish such centres wherever the co-operation of the State Governments is forthcoming.

12.33 We suggest that the ICSSR should decentralise some of its functions to the Regional/State Centres. In particular, approval and sanction of smaller research proposals costing upto Rs 7,500/- as also preliminary scrutiny of research proposals received in

regional languages may be delegated to the Regional/State Centres.

12.34 We attach great importance to the production of social science literature in the regional languages. We recommend that for this purpose the ICSSR should develop a programme jointly with the UGC and operate it through its Regional/State Centres.

Publications

12.35 It seems that the Publication Division of the ICSSR is suffering from many problems of distribution and sales. We recommend that early steps should be taken to distribute as fast as possible, if necessary, at subsidised prices, the publications of the ICSSR.

12.36 We recommend that the ICSSR should not give any direct publication grants for the publication of theses, books, etc. Instead, in deserving cases, the ICSSR should agree to buy, at cost, a certain number of copies of a publication and distribute them, at cost, to universities, colleges, institutes and other libraries which are willing to enter into agreement with the ICSSR for purchase of such books. We recommend that the ICSSR should work out an appropriate scheme for this purpose, give it the widest publicity and a trial for a period of five years.

12.37 We do not appreciate the ICSSR itself undertaking publication of specialised journals such as the Journal of Asian Studies. We recommend that the possibility of locating the Journal of Asian Studies at a suitable institution should be explored, failing which the journal may be discontinued.

Documentation

12.38 We recognise that documentation is an essential function of the ICSSR. However, it seems to us that much documentation effort of the ICSSR has not been sufficiently used except by the Ph.D. students. We recommend that the ICSSR be more selective in further documentation in the next few years with wider publicity given to these services.

Data Archives

12.39 With respect to the Data Archives, we find that the

services are ahead of their demand. We suggest that, in the next few years, the ICSSR should confine its efforts in this field to bringing together tabulated data which remain unpublished for want of printing space.

Administrative Structure

12.40 We are sorry to note that the administration of the ICSSR has tended to be bureaucratic both in its structure and procedures. We recommend that early steps should be taken to reorganise it so that it rests with competent senior level academicians with a small supporting staff.

12.41 We think that, considering the numerous activities of the ICSSR and the large number of Divisions into which they have to be organised, the Member-Secretary needs the support and assistance of two senior executives above the Directors of the Divisions. We recommend that the several Divisions should be organised into two Departments in charge of the two Executive Directors.

12.42 Earlier, we have disapproved the administration of the ICSSR being organised into Programme Divisions. We have suggested a certain reorganised structure. We suggest that the ICSSR should examine its convenience and adopt an appropriate reorganisation of the Divisions.

12.43 We recommend that the senior staff of the ICSSR Secretariat should, as far as possible, be brought on deputation for a period of three to five years from academic institutes and universities. In order to facilitate this, the ICSSR must give high priority to provision of accommodation to such senior staff coming on deputation.

Campus

12.44 It is high time that the ICSSR develops a campus of its own which will accommodate its offices, housing for at least the senior staff on deputation, and a hostel for visiting social scientists. We understand that the ICSSR has negotiated a 15-acre plot presently housing the Russian Centre of the Jawaharlal Nehru University in South Delhi. We emphasise that it is of the utmost

importance for the future development of the ICSSR that it proceeds urgently to complete this agreement.

Discrimination between Natural and Social Sciences

12.45 We have noted a number of instances in which the Social Sciences, as compared to Natural Sciences, are discriminated against. We recommend that the ICSSR should take up these matters with the Government of India and ensure that the Social Sciences are treated on par with the Natural Sciences.

Autonomy

12.46 We record our appreciation of the manner in which the Government of India has exercised its control over the ICSSR. However, we feel that the time has now come to relax this control and grant the ICSSR a degree of autonomy.

12.47 We recommend that the ICSSR should request the Government of India that the Government, as a token of its acceptance of the above proposition, should agree to amend the Memorandum of Association of the ICSSR and remove Article 8(a) which states: "The Government of India may give directives to the Council in respect of its policies and programmes." We emphasise that at the very minimum, the ICSSR must be considered fully autonomous at least in respect of its politics and programmes.

Chairman of the ICSSR

12.48 We recommend that the Chairman of the ICSSR should be appointed by the Government of India from among a panel of three prepared by a Selection Committee consisting of a nominee of the ICSSR, a nominee of the UGC and a nominee of the Government.

Social Scientist Members of the ICSSR

12.49 We recommend that every year the six retiring social scientist members should be replaced by the Government from a panel prepared by the sitting Social Scientist members and the Chairman. We have described the procedure in the relevant chapter.

Other Members

12.50 We recommend that the remaining six members should be nominated by name and that they should not be permitted to send their nominees/representatives to the meetings of the ICSSR.

Member-Secretary of the ICSSR

12.51 We recommend that the Member-Secretary of the ICSSR should be appointed by the ICSSR from among a panel of three prepared by a Selection Committee consisting of a nominee of the ICSSR, a nominee of the UGC, and a nominee of the Government of India.

12.52 We recommend that the Member-Secretary of the ICSSR should have the status of the Vice-Chancellor of a University.

Financial and Administrative Powers

12.53 We understand that, at the instance of the Government, the ICSSR has adopted the financial rules and regulations of the Government. In our opinion, these rules and regulations need modifications to meet the requirements of the ICSSR. We recommend that the ICSSR should pursue this matter with the Government.

12.54 We recommend that the ICSSR should have the fullest autonomy to operate within the overall budget approved by the Government and within the broad framework of its policies, rules and regulations.

12.55 At present, 'the procedure, terms and tenure of appointments, emoluments, allowances, rules of discipline and other conditions of service of officers and staff' of the ICSSR require prior approval of the Government of India. We think that this has severely limited the ability of the ICSSR to recruit staff of requisite quality and to function efficiently. We recommend that the ICSSR should be given greater administrative powers.

Financial Autonomy

12.56 In our opinion, for an effective financial autonomy, it is necessary to diversify the financial resources of the ICSSR. We

recommend that the ICSSR should try to secure grants from other Central ministries, besides the Ministry of Education.

12.57 We recommend that the ICSSR should build up an endowment fund of at least Rs 10 crores and, to this purpose, secure donations from public and private sector corporations, trusts and foreign funding agencies. We emphasise that such donations should go exclusively to the endowment fund and not used for any capital or revenue expenditure of the ICSSR.

12.58 In our view, the autonomy of the ICSSR is crucial to the successful and effective discharge of its functions. Hence, we recommend that the ICSSR should pursue the above suggestions vigorously.

12.59 In view of these recommendations we estimate that the ICSSR will need funds of the following order during the Sixth Plan period:

Sixth Plan Outlay

	(Rs. in lakhs)
A. Administration	50
B. Research Grants	200
C. Research Fellowships	50
D. Training	10
E. Study Grants	10
F. Regional/State/University Centres	150
G. Documentation Centres	60
H. Data Archives	10
I. Publications	40
J. Other Programmes	75
K. Loans to Staff, P.F. etc.	20
L. Capital Programme (Campus)	100
M. Equipment, Furniture, Vehicles etc.	10
N. Library Books	5
O. Research Institutes:	
a) Recurring	Rs 425 lakhs
b) Non-recurring	Rs 150 lakhs
	575
Total :	1365

12.60 In conclusion, we might recapitulate the major thrust of our recommendations. They are: Firstly, the ICSSR must take immediate steps to broaden the base of social science research in the country and to this purpose enlist active cooperation of established university departments and institutes. Secondly, the ICSSR should support particularly such research in established university departments and institutes as is likely to deepen the content of social sciences. Thirdly, the ICSSR should develop essentially as a scientific body and should function in that style. This will require a large measure of autonomy which should be explicitly granted to it. Finally, the ICSSR should aim at building up a sizable endowment fund without which it will not be able to secure a degree of financial independence necessary for its long-term development.

ANNEXURE I

Grams: 'CENPOLRES'

Phones: 672774
672207

**INDIAN COUNCIL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH
SECOND REVIEW COMMITTEE**

C/o CENTRE FOR POLICY RESEARCH
C-6, Commercial Area
Paschimi Marg, Vasant Vihar,
New Delhi 110057
January 2, 1978

To

Dear Sir:

You are probably aware that the Indian Council of Social Science Research has appointed the Second Review Committee to look into the work of the Council during the last ten years and to make appropriate recommendations for its programme during the Sixth Plan.

We would be very grateful if you could, in consultation with your colleagues in social sciences, write to us whether you are aware of the various activities of the Council and the support it provides for social science research. If so, please send your comments on the enclosed sheet. If not, please return the attached slip.

We will appreciate your reply by January 31, 1978.
Best regards,

Yours sincerely,
sd/-
V.A. Pai Panandiker
Member-Secretary,
ICSSR Second Review Committee

INDIAN COUNCIL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH SECOND REVIEW COMMITTEE

Dated: January 2, 1978

The Indian Council of Social Science Research has recently appointed the Second Review Committee to (1) review the work of the ICSSR during the last 10 years and especially during the Fifth Five Year Plan, and (2) make proposals for the development of the work and programmes of the ICSSR over the next 10 years and with special reference to the Sixth Five Year Plan. The Members of the Committee are the following:

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|------------------|
| 1. Prof. V.M. Dandekar | — | Chairman |
| 2. Dr. Ramkrishna Mukherjee | — | Member |
| 3. Dr. Samuel Paul | — | Member |
| 4. Dr. G. Ram Reddy | — | Member |
| 5. Dr. V.A. Pai Panandiker | — | Member-Secretary |

The following is a list of subjects, not necessarily complete, which the Committee will have to deliberate upon:

- 1.1 Constitution and autonomy of the ICSSR
- 1.2 Policies, Rules and Procedures
- 1.3 Internal Organisation of the ICSSR
- 2.1 Financial support to research proposals received from individuals and institutions
- 2.2 Research projects and programmes sponsored by the ICSSR
- 2.3 Sponsored seminars
- 3.1 Fellowships e.g. National, Senior, Young Social Scientists, Post Doctoral, Doctoral
- 3.2 Assistance to doctoral and post-doctoral research scholars
- 3.3 Financial support to seminars, symposia etc
- 4.1 Area Studies
- 5.1 Support to research institutes
- 6.1 Training in research methodology
- 7.1 Collaboration with other agencies such as UGC, Planning Commission, CSIR, ICAR and ICMR
- 7.2 International Collaboration

- 8.1 Publication of Research Surveys, Monographs etc. sponsored by the ICSSR
- 8.2 Financial assistance for publication of Research Reports, Doctoral Theses, Books and journals including non-priced publications
- 8.3 Sales, distribution and exchange of publications
- 9.1 ICSSR Regional Centres and State Centres
- 9.2 Inter-Library Resources Centres
- 9.3 Bibliographical and Documentation Services
- 9.4 National Bibliographical and Documentation Centres in Foreign Languages (other than English)
- 9.5 Data Archives

Since the establishment of the ICSSR, you might have been in contact with it in several capacities and you may therefore have valuable comments, criticism and suggestions to make on any one or more aspects of its work. We cordially invite you to communicate your views by January 31, 1978.

Subject of Comment: If you offer comments on more than one subject, please use separate sheet for each. We are enclosing two sheets to facilitate your reply. Please add more sheets if necessary with similar proforma.

Will you also please let us know if you would like to have a personal meeting with the Review Committee.

Kindly mail your communication to:—
The Member-Secretary,
ICSSR 2nd Review Committee,
C/o Centre for Policy Research,
C-6 Commercial Area, Paschimi Marg,
Vasant Vihar,
New Delhi 110 057

Sd/-
V A Pai Panandiker
Member-Secretary
ICSSR 2nd Review Committee

ANNEXURE II

**NAMES OF THE PERSONS WHO HAD MET THE ICSSR
SECOND REVIEW COMMITTEE.**

I At Delhi on the 19th April, 1978

1. Dr. M.K. Premi
Associate Professor
Centre for the Study of Regional Development
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Mehrauli Road
New Delhi-110 057
2. Prof. M.S. Agwani
School of International Studies
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Mehrauli Road
New Delhi-110 057
3. Prof. Biswanath Roy
Reader in Psychology
Department of Edu. Psychology
National Council for Educational Research & Training
Shri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-110 016
4. Shri Raj Narain
Chandra Niwas
C-48, Nirala Nagar
Lucknow-7
5. Prof. O.P. Tayal
Assistant Professor
Department of Humanities & Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology
Kanpur-208 106
6. Prof. Yogeshwar Sharma
Post Graduate Department of Economics
Government College
Kota-324 001

7. Shri Raghunath Safaya
Principal
Government College of Education
Sector 20-D, Chandigarh-160 020
8. Dr. V.P. Sharma
Department of Psychology
Ravishankar University
Raipur-492 001
9. Shri S.M. Tembe
Head of the Department of Geography
Durga Mahavidyalay (Post Graduate)
Raipur-492 001
10. Prof. G.P. Gupta
Professor & Head, Faculty of Commerce
Vikram University (Madhav College)
Ujjain-456 010
11. Dr. G.D. Bhargava
Professor & Head
Department of Library Science
Vikram University, University Campus
Ujjain-456 010
12. Shri Pawan Kumar Malhan
258 W.T. Basti Sheikh
Jullundur-144 002
13. Dr. I.N. Tewary
Senior Research Fellow
Gandhian Institute of Studies
Post Box No. 116, Rajghat
Varanasi-221 001
14. Prof. Vijay Kumar Jain
Head, Economic Administration & Financial Management
Faculty of Commerce
Shree Jain P.G. College
Bikaner
15. Shri K.C. Saxena
48, Jhorkharia
Jhansi-284 002

II At Bombay on the 24th April, 1978

1. Shri P.R. Sathe
Pitru Vandana
(Opp. Mulund Police Station)
Mulund (East), Bombay-400 080
2. Dr. V.A. Gaitonde
36, Shivaji Park
Bombay-400 001
3. Dr. S.C. Jain
Mahatma Gandhi
Department of Rural Studies
South Gujarat University
Athwa Lines, Surat-1
4. Dr. (Mrs.) Usha Khire
Head, Department of Psychological Research & Testing
Dnyana Prabodhini
New 510 Sadashiv Peth
Pune-411 030
5. Shri S.G. Mahajan
Deputy Librarian
University of Poona, Jayakar Library
Ganeshkhind, Pune-411 007
6. Dr. H.R. Trivedi
Secretary, Institute of Cultural & Urban Anthropology
Ahmedabad-7
7. Shri D.N. Basu
Manager, Development & Planning
Operations Research Group
Race Course, Baroda-390 007
8. Prof. B.G. Tamaskar
Topenagar, Camp
Amravati-444 602
9. Dr. N.P. Ayyar
Professor of Geography
Shivaji University
Kolhapur-416 004

10. Dr. J.R. Rele
Director, International Institute for Population Studies
Govandi Station Road, Deonar
Bombay-400 088
11. Dr. (Mrs.) Vatsala Narain
International Institute for Population Studies
Bombay-400 088
12. Dr. S. Mukherji
International Institute for Population Studies
Bombay-400 088

III At Hyderabad on the 26th April, 1978

1. Shri S. Sripathi Naidu
Professor & Head, Department of History
Besant Theosophical College
Madanapalle-517 327 (Distt. Chittoor)
2. Miss Susheila Rhenius
Assistant Professor in Economics
Women's Christian College
Madras-600 006
3. Prof. V. Perumal
Chief Director, Research Project
"Panpagam" Swarnanagar
Robertsonpet, Kolar Gold Field, Pin-563 122
4. Prof. N. Krishnaji
Centre for Development Studies
Trivandrum-695 001

IV At Calcutta on the 22nd May, 1978

1. Dr. M.R. Chaudhuri
Professor & Head, Department of Geography
University of Burdwan
Golapbag, Burdwan (West Bengal)
2. Dr. D.K. Banerjee
26A, A.V.L. Road
Calcutta-700 060

3. **Shri Basudev Panda**
Deputy Collector & Executive Magistrate
Balasore-756 001
4. **Dr. K.P. Singh**
Honorary Director
Kasturba Institute of Rural Studies
Sheikhpura House, Patna-800 023
5. **Shri R.C. Sharma**
Professor & Head, Department of Geography
Dean, School of Environmental Sciences
North Eastern Hill University
Shillong-793 001
6. **Dr. B. Datta Ray**
Secretary
North East India Council for Social Science Research
B.T. Hostel, Shillong-793 003
7. **Dr. D.P. Barooah**
Professor & Head, Department of Political Science
Gauhati University, Gauhati
8. **Dr. B.B. Chatterjee**
Department of Psychology
Utkal University
Bhubaneswar-751 004
9. **Prof. A. Bhattacharya**
Professor & Head, Department of Sociology
University of Kalyani
Kalyani (West Bengal)

**STATEMENT SHOWING YEAR-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS TO THE
ICSSR REGIONAL CENTRES AND BUDGET UPTO 1977-78.**

(Rupees in Lakhs)

S. No.	Name of the Centre	Funds released during					Proposed allocations for 1977-78	Remarks		
		1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77			Total	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	
1.	Western Regional Centre, Bombay.	R.	0.50	1.12	1.35	1.50	2.00	6.47	2.50	Rs 3.728 lakhs con- tributed by Govt. of Maharashtra and re- ceived by ICSSR.
		N.R.	4.40	—	4.00	9.49	1.25	19.14	—	
2.	Southern Regional Centre, Hyderabad.	R.	0.50	2.50	2.53	0.50	2.13	8.16	2.50	Rs 5 lakhs (Rs 1 lakh p.a.) contribut- ed by the Govt. of Andhra Pradesh and given to the Centre.
		N.R.	—	1.00	—	1.97	1.07	4.04	3.00	
3.	Eastern Regional Centre, Calcutta.	R.	0.20	0.90	0.30	0.50	1.06	2.96	2.50	
		N.R.	—	2.00	—	—	1.94	3.94	—	

(1)	(2)		(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
4.	Northern Regional Centre, New Delhi.	R.	—	—	—	—	1.25	1.25	2.50	
		N.R.	—	—	—	3.00	3.50	6.50	9.50	
5.	North Eastern Regional Centre, Shillong.	R.	—	—	—	—	0.15	0.15	0.50	
		N.R.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
6.	North West Regional Centre, Chandigarh.	R.	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.00	
		N.R.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
7.	State Centres	R.	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.50	
		N.R.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
TOTAL			5.60	7.52	8.18	16.96	14.35	52.61	24.50	

R.—Recurring
N.R.—Non-recurring

CHART SHOWING EXPENDITURE ON THE ACTIVITIES OF ICSSR

(In Lakhs of Rupees)

<i>Head of Account</i>	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
A. Administration	1.37 (14.14)	3.82 (12.73)	6.25 (10.07)	7.53 (8.07)	7.91 (8.25)	7.43 (5.81)	8.99 (6.29)	9.93 (6.14)
B. Research Grant	5.24 (55.11)	13.02 (48.02)	10.53 (39.98)	23.90 (34.94)	20.44 (27.27)	22.25 (17.39)	30.16 (21.10)	31.20 (19.28)
C. Research Fellowship	0.36 (2.08)	0.95 (3.11)	3.58 (7.64)	6.29 (7.48)	9.73 (13.18)	12.50 (9.78)	17.29 (12.09)	16.48 (10.18)
D. Training	—	0.09 (0.33)	4.15 (9.01)	3.37 (4.77)	1.62 (2.19)	1.47 (1.15)	2.42 (1.69)	1.32 (0.82)
E. Study Grant	—	—	—	1.13 (1.60)	0.82 (1.11)	0.91 (0.71)	0.91 (0.64)	0.99 (0.61)
F. Regional Centres	—	—	—	7.81 (11.08)	5.27 (7.13)	3.80 (2.94)	17.41 (12.18)	10.72 (6.62)
G. Documentation Centres	0.87 (8.98)	4.14 (15.14)	5.41 (11.74)	6.67 (9.46)	5.67 (7.67)	7.98 (6.24)	9.03 (6.32)	10.14 (6.27)
H. Data Archives	—	—	—	0.16 (0.23)	0.70 (0.95)	1.11 (7.35)	1.41 (0.99)	1.41 (0.87)
I. Publications	0.63 (6.50)	1.92 (7.02)	4.06 (8.81)	2.69 (3.82)	7.52 (10.17)	4.49 (3.51)	6.69 (4.68)	6.91 (4.27)

<i>Head of Account</i>	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
J. Maintenance & Development	—	—	—	—	—	41.28	35.66	54.33
Grants to Research Institutions						(32.26)	(24.93)	(33.57)
K. Other Programmes	0.30	1.85	1.34	4.05	9.28	18.28	10.48	11.76
	(3.10)	(8.01)	(6.77)	(8.77)	(15.38)	(7.80)	(7.33)	(7.27)
L. Loans to staff	0.05	0.06	0.03	0.40	0.17	0.12	0.07	0.07
	(0.52)	(0.22)	(0.07)	(0.57)	(0.23)	(0.09)	(0.05)	(0.04)
M. Deposits & Advances	—	—	0.95	2.90	1.20	0.69	1.02	2.11
			(2.06)	(4.11)	(1.63)	(0.57)	(0.71)	(1.30)
N. Public Account	0.20	0.06	0.14	0.33	0.36	0.27	0.57	0.08
Provident Fund etc.	(0.20)	(0.22)	(0.30)	(0.47)	(0.49)	(0.21)	(0.40)	(0.05)
O. Capital Expenditure	—	—	—	—	1.88	4.00	—	3.27
Land & Building					(2.54)	(3.13)		(2.02)
P. Furniture & Equipment	0.37	0.12	1.03	2.57	0.59	0.99	0.27	0.45
	(5.88)	(4.10)	(2.24)	(3.65)	(0.80)	(0.76)	(0.19)	(0.28)
Q. Library Books	0.07	0.30	0.60	0.69	0.76	0.41	0.47	0.36
	(0.72)	(1.10)	(1.31)	(0.98)	(1.03)	(0.32)	(0.33)	(0.22)
R. Vehicles	0.23	—	—	—	—	—	0.12	0.30
	(2.37)						(0.08)	(0.19)
TOTAL	9.69	27.34	46.07	70.49	73.92	127.98	142.97	161.83