capítulo 5

Who Sets the Intellectual Agenda? Foreign Funding and Social Science in Peru

Kelly Bay, Cecilia Perla, and Richard Snyder[1]
Brown University

Abstract

This article explores the political economy of social science research in the Global South by analyzing new bibliometric and survey data on Peru, a lower-middle income country with weak domestic funding and institutional support for scholarship. The results of the analysis show that although research in Peru is heavily dependent on foreign funding, the multiplicity of funding institutions gives scholars a surprising degree of autonomy. Still, dependence on foreign funding produces conditions with potentially harmful consequences for the quality and impact of research. Five conditions are considered: multiple institutional affiliations, hyperproductivity, forced interdisciplinarity, parochialism, and a weak national community of scholars.

Introduction

During the last half century, social science has emerged as a truly global enterprise. Fifty years ago, professional social science existed in just a handful of rich countries. Today, it exists across the world, including in many poor countries, where financial and institutional support for research are weak. The globalisation of the social sciences raises questions about how international inequalities in research capacity affect the production of knowledge. How does the limited funding and institutional support for social science in poor countries influence the content and scope of research? Do resource constraints generate dependence on foreign funding and, if so, do foreign sponsors have the power to determine the intellectual agenda? What strategies do researchers in poor countries adopt to cope with scarce funding and how do these strategies affect the quality and impact of their research.

[1] We thank Erika Cuba and Maria Luisa Vásquez Rossi for their assistance with data collection. We appreciate comments and suggestions from Juan Manuel Abal Medina, Cristóbal Aljovín, Arturo Alvarado, Peter Andreas, Mark Blyth, Melani Cammett, Sikina Jinnah, Jennifer Lawless, Abraham Lowenthal, Raul Madrid, Gerardo L. Munck, David O'Brien, Aldo Panfichi, Guillermo Rochabrún, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, Cynthia Sanborn, Pablo Sandoval, Saika Uno, Alberto Vergara, and participants in seminars at Brown University and the Institute for Peruvian Studies (IEP).

To address these questions about social science in poor countries, this article analyzes new bibliometric and survey data on research in Peru, a lower-middle income country that produces a substantial amount of scholarship.[2] We find that social science in Peru depends heavily on foreign support: without it, most of the knowledge produced by the social sciences in Peru would probably not exist. Still, despite the dominant role of foreign funding, there is little evidence of foreign control over the intellectual agenda. A surprisingly plural and diverse array of institutions located across 16 countries provide financial support to Peruvian scholars, and this multiplicity of international funding sources gives Peruvian researchers a degree of intellectual autonomy even in the face of tight domestic resource constraints. Although scarce domestic funding for research does not lead to foreign control over the intellectual agenda, it is nevertheless associated with a set of conditions that may have a negative impact on the quality and impact of research. Because the challenges of social science research in Peru are rooted in scarcity of resources, they are likely to exist in other low income countries in Latin America and beyond. The analysis of the Peruvian case thus has broader relevance for understanding the political economy of research in developing countries.

The next section provides an overview of the context of social science research in Peru, highlighting the lack of domestic financial and institutional support. The focus then shifts to an analysis of foreign funding, exploring both the sources of funding and its impact on the substance and scope of research in Peru. The following section considers five key conditions of research that are associated with the tight resource constraints under which Peruvian scholars labour: multiple institutional affiliations, hyperproductivity, forced interdisciplinarity, parochialism, and a weak national community of scholars. A concluding section summarizes the findings and poses questions for future research.

Social Science in Peru

Science is a challenging enterprise laden with uncertainty and risk. For researchers in many developing countries, however, the vagaries of scientific inquiry are just a small part of the challenge. Weak institutional support and limited funding for research pose further, extra-*scientific* obstacles to the advancement of knowledge.

As in many developing countries, higher education and social science research are not a leading concern in Peru, and scholars produce and publish in an adverse environment. Public and private funding for research is scarce. Moreover, there are few research institutions to support the production of knowledge, publishing houses and bookshops to disseminate research, or consumers of academic books to provide a strong market for social science publications.

[2] The bibliometric data are drawn from the Snyder Data Set on Social Science Research in Peru. The data set codes 168 books published between 2000-2006 by five of the most important social science publishers in Peru: Centro de Estudios de Promoción y Desarrollo (DESCO); Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (IEP); Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (PUCP); Universidad del Pacífico; and Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos (UNMSM). All books published in anthropology, economics, political science, and sociology were coded on 18 variables. The data set does not include all social science books published in Peru during 2000-2006, nor does it include all books published by these five institutions during this period. Still, the data set encompasses a large sample of the output of the major social science publishing houses in Peru. We chose to focus on books rather than journal articles because the former provide far richer information about the crucial matter of how the research was funded.
The survey, consisting of 47 questions, was designed by Richard Snyder and administered by him in Lima, Peru in August 2007, with the assistance of Erika Cuba and Maria Luisa Vásquez Rossi. Questionnaires were distributed to all the approximately 200 social scientists affiliated with the five institutions included in the bibliometric data set. 52 completed surveys were received.

Social science research is not a budgetary priority in Peru. Government support for the sciences is weak, and the few funds available are skewed toward hard sciences and technology. In 2007, the government agency in charge of promoting science and technology, CONCYTEC (Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología [National Council for Science and Technology]), was allocated a meagre 0.01% of GDP, whereas the average budget for this type of institution in Latin America was 0.74% of GDP, and the Brazilian government devoted 1.3% of GDP to its Ministry of Science and Technology – highlighting the far stronger institutional and material support for research in the neighbouring country.[3] Private support for research in Peru is also weak in comparison to Brazil and Mexico, the leading producers of social science in Latin America. Peru lacks private publishing houses comparable to Mexico's Fondo de Cultura Económica, and it has failed to attract subsidiaries of international publishing houses like Siglo XXI. The combination of weak public and private support for social science likely contributes to the very low rate of book production in Peru. Falling from an already low 0.17 books per capita in 1996, Peru's book production in 2001 was 0.12 per capita, just 5% of the per capita book production in Brazil in the same year.[4]

Apart from limited public and private support for research, Peru lacks a strong academic civil society. Professional associations are a recent phenomenon and have low levels of institutionalisation. The Colegio de Sociólogos del Perú (Association of Sociologists of Peru), established in 1989, is probably the most institutionalized: it organizes annual colloquia, has regional branches, publishes newsletters and even celebrates Sociologist's Day.[5] Economists have a national association with a few regional chapters, yet it lacks a functioning website, one sign of a low level of institutionalization.[6] Reflecting even lower levels of professional institutionalization, anthropologists and political scientists have yet to establish disciplinary associations.[7] Hence, it is not surprising that 40% of respondents in our survey of Peruvian social scientists report that they do not belong to a national professional association.

A number of journals and periodicals serve as outlets for academic research in Peru, including *Debates en Sociología* and *Anthropologica*, published by the Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (PUCP), and *Apuntes*, by Universidad del Pacífico. According to our survey, 58% of researchers are satisfied with the number of journals. Still, the weakness of academic civil society suggests a shortage of public spaces where researchers can exchange opinions, debate, meet potential collaborators, pool scarce resources, and, in general, tackle collectively the daunting challenges of producing scientific knowledge in the face of scarce resources.

[3] Official Budget Statistics for Peru can be accessed at the website of the Ministry of Economics, at http://transparencia-economica.mef.gob.pe. RICYT – Red de Indicadores de Ciencia y Tecnología. Comparative Indicators. http://www.ricyt.edu.ar/interior/interior.asp?Nivel1=1&Nivel2=2& Idioma=.

[4] Camara Peruana del Libro, "Análisis de la Industria Editorial en el Perú" (CPL 2002), p. 18.

[5] http://www.colegiosociologosperu.org/index.php

[6] Peruvian economists do have an important meeting space in the Consorcio de Investigación Económica y Social (CIES), an organization formed by more than thirty academic institutions that promotes the development of a strong policy-oriented research community.

[7] The lack of a disciplinary association is less surprising in political science, which was only recently established as an independent discipline in Peru, than in anthropology, which has a long tradition in Peruvian social sciences. See Panfichi, ed., 2009.

Together, the lack of support for research from government and private sources, a weak domestic market for the consumption of social science, and a feeble academic civil society, pose formidable obstacles to the production of knowledge in Peru. Still, a handful of key institutions manage to operate successfully in this challenging landscape, producing a considerable amount of research. Most of these institutions were created during the 1960s, when the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and other international institutions were actively promoting the spread of social sciences around the world.[8] This study focuses on five research institutions – two think tanks, one devoted mainly to applied research and the other to more academic research, and three universities, including a large public university and two elite private institutions. These institutions were selected because they encompass the range of different types of institutions that produce social science in Peru, from think tanks to public universities to private universities. Moreover, they are among the biggest and most prominent in the country, and house a large share of the research community.[9] Because we focus on leading institutions based in the capital city, Lima, our findings may not be generalizable to "lower-tier" NGOs and universities in and beyond Lima that also carry out research and, where, for example, there may be less access to foreign funding. Still, a focus on these five key institutions provides important insights about the political economy of social science in Peru. We focus on bibliometric data from a large sample of books published by the five institutions because books, in contrast to journal articles and working papers, are a richer source of information about authors and especially about funding for research. To gain a stronger understanding of the behaviour and motives of researchers, as well as the constraints under which they labour, we supplement our bibliometric data with survey data drawn from a questionnaire administered to researchers at all five institutions included in the study.

– Think Tanks: IEP and DESCO

In Peru, as in many Latin American countries, think tanks are major hubs for social science research.[10] The two think tanks included in this study - The Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (IEP) and Centro de Estudios de Promoción y Desarrollo (DESCO) - are both based in Lima. The IEP was established in 1964 as a private social science research centre, and during the last forty years has positioned itself mainly as an academic institution, although some of its members also have consulting and advisory positions.[11] DESCO was established in 1965 as a non-profit organization promoting social and economic development. Although its role as an academic institution is secondary to its character as a developmental NGO, DESCO has become a key site for the analysis of contemporary politics and economics. Despite their distinct profiles, with IEP focusing more on "armchair reflection" and DESCO more on "applied research", the two institutes converge in that, unlike universities, their main sources of revenue are the research projects they are able to secure and, to a lesser extent, the profits earned by selling their publications. Reliance on income from research projects differentiates many of the scholars at these think tanks from university-

[8] See Finnemore, 1993; Garretón et.al., 2005; Mejía, 2005. In fact, UNESCO directly financed the creation of the Department of Sociology at the Universidad de San Marcos in 1961, as mentioned by Mejía, p.9. On the development of the social sciences in Peru, in addition to Mejía, see also Lynch, 2000; Tanaka, 2005; Rochabrún, 2007 and n.d.

[9] Ortiz de Zevallos, 2000; Sherwood, 2000; and Vega Centeno, 2003.

[10] Sherwood, 2000.

[11] Ortiz de Zevallos, 2000

based researchers, who have teaching obligations and thus earn a salary, however meagre, that is independent of their ability to secure funding for projects.[12]

– Universities: San Marcos, Católica, and Pacífico

The other three institutions analyzed in this study are universities in Lima. Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos (UNMSM) is a large, public institution typical of "national universities" in many Latin American countries, such as the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM). Although it is an important intellectual centre, San Marcos suffers from the inefficiencies and lack of resources characteristic of public sector institutions. Because it forms part of the public network of Peruvian universities, San Marcos is the only one of the five institutions in our sample with a guaranteed annual public budget, although these resources do not cover all operating costs – almost half the annual budget comes from internal resources. [13] Social science research is carried out within the various departments, although most publications are produced by the university press – Fondo Editorial UNMSM.

The Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (PUCP) is one of the largest private universities in the country. As a private Catholic institution, it forms part of ODUCAL (Organization of Latin American Catholic Universities) and has counterparts in countries such as Chile, Argentina, and Brazil. The social science research centre of Universidad Católica – the Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas, Económicas, Políticas y Antropológicas (CISEPA) – hosts faculty and their research projects. CISEPA publishes working papers, journals, magazines, and some books, although most of the latter are produced by the Universidad Católica's press – Fondo Editorial PUC.

The third university is Universidad del Pacífico, a private university established in 1962 that forms part of AUSJAL – the Latin American Association of Jesuit Universities – together with Universidad Javeriana in Colombia, and Universidad Alberto Hurtado in Chile, among others. The Centro de Investigaciones de la Universidad del Pacífico (CIUP) is the official research centre, and it serves as the main outlet for the publication of books, journals and periodicals. Although the research developed and published by CIUP cuts across disciplines and themes, it has an especially strong emphasis on economics.

Scholars based in universities have the advantage of a steady salary independent of their research projects. Still, hours dedicated to teaching and administrative tasks may also pose a hindrance to research: when asked what could be done to improve their ability to carry out research, 19% of the survey respondents stated that a reduction in the amount of time devoted to teaching and administrative responsibilities would be especially helpful.

The next section explores how these five institutions, and the people linked to them, manage the challenges of doing social science research in the face of scarce domestic resources.

[12] McGann and Weaver, eds., 2000. Many member of the IEP and some of the members of DESCO are also university-based researchers and teachers.

[13] See http://www.unmsm.edu.pe/rector/editorial122.htm

Who Sets the Agenda? Foreign Funding and Social Science in Peru

Research requires money. Without funding either directly to scholars or to institutions that pay their salaries, research is not possible. Disseminating the results of research through publications, especially books, is a costly activity that also requires financial support. Yet reliance on funding raises questions about academic autonomy and even integrity. This is reflected in the conflict of interest policies that are standard at universities in the United States obliging faculty to divulge financial support from outside sources, especially business and industry. The potential for extra-university funding to undercut the autonomy and integrity of research is exacerbated in poor countries, where limited resources and low salaries may increase the vulnerability of researchers to the agendas of moneyed interests outside the academy. Moreover, because much funding for scientific research comes from abroad, the dearth of domestic resources in many developing countries raises thorny issues of national sovereignty.

Our data highlight the overwhelming dependence of social science in Peru on foreign funding[14]; only one fifth (18.5%) of books do not receive foreign funding. Still, we find little evidence that dependence on external funding results in foreign control over the intellectual agenda. Funding for social science research in Peru is characterized by *fragmented pluralism*, with a diverse array of 143 domestic and foreign institutions providing support for the 168 books in the sample, yielding a ratio of nearly one different funding institution per book. In turn, the great variety of funding sources gives Peruvian researchers a degree of autonomy over their research agendas even in the face of strong resource constraints.

– Fragmented Pluralism: Patterns of Funding for Research in Peru

As seen in Table 1, foreign funding plays a crucial role supporting social science in Peru. Foreign funding comes mostly from a handful of donor countries, with more than half (55.5%) of books receiving support from just six countries: the United States, the Netherlands, Canada, Germany, Switzerland and Spain. Funding from sources in the United States plays a major role, nearly equivalent in weight to all Peruvian funding.

Table 1. Total Number of Books Funded, by Country

	Books funded, by country (percentage)	Books exclusively funded, by country (percentage)
Peru	34.5	18.5
United States	31	17.9
The Netherlands	7.7	4.2
Canada	6	2.4
Germany	5.4	2.4
Switzerland	3	0.6
Spain	2.4	0.6
Other Countries	12.5	4.2
International Organizations	11.3	3.6

Note: The total number of books is 168. All books with total or partial funding from a country are considered. Some books are funded by more than one country, so the left column adds to more than 100%. Funding institutions are coded as located in Peru based strictly on the location of their headquarters there, even though many of these institutions are recipients of foreign funding. Books that are funded by an equal number of domestic (i.e. Peruvian) and foreign sources are coded as funded by Peru. The category other countries includes Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Britain, Ecuador, Finland, France, Japan, Mexico, and Sweden.

[14] The actual percentage of books produced without foreign funding is likely to be even less than 18.5%. First, some books produced with external support may not acknowledge it; second, books published by domestic institutions may be funded indirectly by foreign sources, because domestic institutions are often themselves recipients of large amounts of foreign funding.

As seen in Table 2, domestic (i.e., Peruvian) funding concentrates on culture and economy, with very little support for work on politics, society, and transnational relations. In these subject areas, the importance of foreign funding is striking, with the Netherlands and the United States providing the most support for the study of Peruvian politics and society.[15] Table 3, which shows the weight of funding from each country across themes, reveals that almost half of all research on "political order" (45.8%) and on "political actors, institutions, and processes" (41.4%) is funded from the United States. Likewise, almost half (44.1%) of the work on "societal actors, institutions, and processes" is funded by the United States. Put starkly, without funding from the United States, half the book-based knowledge generated by Peruvian social science about Peruvian politics and society would probably not exist.

Table 2. Distribution of Funding Across Themes, by Funding Source
(% of books on each theme relative to all books funded by each country)

	Culture and Identity	Economic Processes and Policy	Societal Actors, Institutions and Processes	Political Actors, Institutions and Processes	Political Order and Disorder	Transnational Relations and Processes
Theme: Total (% Books per Theme)	23.7	32.4	13.4	11.5	9.5	9.5
Peru	37.5	30.6	9.7	8.3	4.2	9.7
United States	15.1	24.7	20.5	16.4	15.1	8.2
The Netherlands	25	30	15	20	10	0
Canada	9.1	81.8	0	0	0	9.1
Germany	28.6	21.4	28.6	0	21.4	0
Switzerland	12.5	50	25	12.5	0	0
Spain	25	75	0	0	0	0
Other Countries	28	20	4	16	12	20
International Organizations	11.5	46.2	7.7	7.7	7.7	19.2

Note: All books with partial or total funding from a funding source are considered for each country. The sample includes 168 books, but some books address multiple themes, hence there are a total of 253 themes funded. The percentages are calculated on the basis of total themes funded. The category other countries includes Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Britain, Ecuador, Finland, France, Japan, Mexico, and Sweden.

Table 3. Relative Weight of Country Funding, by Theme
(% of all books on each theme that are funded by each country)

	Culture and Identity	Economic Processes and Policy	Societal Actors, Institutions and Processes	Political Actors, Institutions and Processes	Political Order and Disorder	Transnational Relations and Processes
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Peru	45	26.8	20.6	20.7	12.5	29.2
United States	18.3	22	44.1	41.4	45.8	25
The Netherlands	8.3	7.3	8.8	13.8	8.3	0
Canada	1.7	11	0	0	0	4.2
Germany	6.7	3.7	11.8	0	12.5	0
Switzerland	1.7	4.9	5.9	3.4	0	0
Spain	1.7	3.7	0	0	0	0
Other Countries	11.7	6.1	2.9	13.8	12.5	20.8
International Organizations	5	14.6	5.9	6.9	8.3	20.8

Note: All books with partial or total support from a funding source are considered for each funding source. The sample includes 168 books, but some books address multiple themes, hence there are a total of 253 themes funded. The percentages are calculated on the basis of total themes funded. The category other countries includes Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Britain, Ecuador, Finland, France, Japan, Mexico, and Sweden.

[15] Because less than 15% of books in the sample look at countries other than Peru, we assume that the thematic coverage reported in Tables 2 and 3 pertains mainly to Peru.

In sum, with the exception of the study of culture, where half (45.0%) the research receives domestic funding, foreign funding is critical to the production of social science in Peru.

Shifting the Focus: From Countries to Institutions. An exclusive focus on foreign countries, however, offers a misleading picture of external control over the research agenda. After all, foreign institutions, not countries per se, fund research in Peru. Moreover, heavy reliance on external funding by itself is not a good indicator of foreign control over the intellectual agenda: the variety and number of funding sources are more important in assessing possibilities for defining an autonomous intellectual agenda than is the location (i.e., foreign versus domestic) of funding sources.

A shift in focus to the institutions that fund research in Peru reveals striking diversity. 115 foreign institutions located across 16 countries fund the 168 books in the sample, yielding an overall ratio of 0.68 foreign funding sources per book.[16] Table 4 shows that these institutions vary along key dimensions and include government agencies, public and private universities, secular and non-secular foundations, and other types of NGOs. Moreover, as seen in Table 5, no foreign (or domestic) funding source seems capable of wielding a dominant influence: no institution funds more than 12% of books published in Peru. The vast majority of funding institutions (90%) fund just one or two books, and this support is often given in conjunction with other funding institutions: 31% of books receive support from multiple sources, thus further weakening the influence of particular funding institutions on the intellectual agenda.

Table 4. Characteristics of Institutions that Fund Social Science in Peru
(% of funding institutions)

	Public	Private	University	Non-University	Secular	Non-Secular	Domestic	Foreign
Foreign	59.5	40.5	19.8	80.2	90.1	9.9	0	100
All	54.1	45.9	19.5	80.5	89	11	18.9	81.1

Note: N = 143 institutions, 115 foreign institutions.

Table 5. Top Funding Institutions

Institution	Books funded, by institution (% all books published)	Country
Ford Foundation	12	United States
Universidad Católica	12	Peru
Universidad de San Marcos	11	Peru
Rockefeller Foundation	5	United States
Cordaid	4	The Netherlands
International Development Research Center (IDRC)	4	Canada
Universidad del Pacífico	4	Peru
IEP	2	Peru
Inter-American Foundation (IAF)	2	United States
The Japan Center for Area Studies	2	Japan
The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation	2	United States
MISEREOR: German Catholic Bishops' Organization for Development Cooperation	2	Germany
Social Science Research Council (SSRC)	2	United States
US Agency for International Development (USAID)	2	United States
US Department of Education Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship	2	United States

Note: The table lists all 15 of the 143 institutions that fund three or more books. The entries for the four publishing institutions – i.e., Universidad Católica, Universidad de San Marcos, Universidad del Pacífico, and IEP – reflect self-financing, that is, books published and also funded partly or completely by these institutes. DESCO does not report any self-financing.

[16] The overall ratio of funding sources, both domestic and foreign, per book in the full sample is 0.85.

The fragmented pluralism and diversity characterizing funding for social science research suggests that, even in the face of tight domestic resource constraints and, hence, heavy dependence on foreign support, Peruvian researchers still have a degree of freedom to set their own agendas. This inference is supported by the results of our survey of Peruvian social scientists. Table 6 shows that the majority of respondents (55.7%) say they usually select and define their research projects first and then seek funding. And most respondents (76.9%) state that they rarely work on a research project they would not otherwise pursue just because funding is available for it. Concerning whether researchers tailor their projects to increase the chances of getting funding, the survey provides mixed evidence: although the most frequent response (44.3%) among respondents was "rarely," half the respondents said "sometimes" or "usually." Likewise, the survey provides mixed evidence regarding efforts by funding institutions to control research: 30.8% of respondents report that foundations usually attach conditions to grants, whereas 38.5% state that foundations rarely attach conditions to grants. The fact that only a small percentage of respondents (13.5%) state that foundations usually provide comments on funding proposals suggests that most funding institutions make few overt efforts to control the research agenda.

Table 6: Autonomy of Peruvian Researchers in Relation to Funding Institutions

Proposition	Responses (%)			Mea	Std. dev.	N
	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely			
Define research projects prior to seeking funding	55.7	21.2	11.6	2.4	1	46
Tailor research projects to get funding	19.2	30.8	44.3	3.5	1.2	49
Choose research projects because funding available	5.7	9.6	76.9	4.1	0.9	48
Foundations attach conditions to grants	30.8	11.5	38.5	3.1	1.4	42
Foundations make suggestions on grant proposals	13.5	17.3	51.9	2.7	1	43

Note: The propositions read: "I choose my own research projects and then I find funding for the project that I have defined"; "I tailor my research projects in order to increase my chances of finding funding for my work"; "I work on research projects that I would otherwise not pursue, because funding is available for these projects"; "The foundations from which I receive funding always attach conditions to the grants that I receive". One item was posed as a question: "How often do you receive comments and suggestions on your grant proposal from the foundations from which you receive funding?" The values shown are percentages calculated on the basis of collapsing a five-point response set (e.g., "always" and "almost always" responses are combined). Totals across the three columns do not add to 100% because of missing responses. The means and standard deviations are derived from the uncollapsed distributions (ranging from one to five).

Research Institutions: Strategies for Retaining Autonomy. Together, the survey results and the diverse array of funding sources highlighted by the bibliometric data suggest that social scientists in Peru enjoy some autonomy in setting their research agendas. This inference is strengthened by disaggregating across *research institutions*. In addition to offering further evidence of the limited control that any single funding institution has over research in Peru, a disaggregated perspective highlights distinct strategies for coping with resource constraints.

In principle, there are two ways research institutions in poor countries can try to keep control over their agendas: (1) self-financing, and (2) diversifying their external sources of support. Institutions with independent sources of revenue, for example, from selling their books, providing consultancy services, and organizing conferences with inscription fees, may be able to generate the income needed to do research on topics they consider important or on which they have expertise. However, such *self-financed autonomy* may be hard to achieve in poor countries, because the possibilities for research institutions to generate revenue are often limited. A second strategy, one that may be as much an effort simply to survive in the face of scarce resources as an attempt to maintain autonomy, is to *diversify the sources of external funding.* Getting money from multiple sources reduces the leverage of any single sponsor. This is a less attractive strategy than self-financed autonomy. First, autonomy may be achieved at the expense of fragmentation of the research agenda, because the institution has to manage a multiplicity of funding sources with varied and potentially conflicting preferences.[17] Moreover, it may entail high transaction and grant administration costs as a result of having to negotiate with a slew of distinct

[17] Self-financing may also foster fragmentation of the research agenda.

sponsors from different countries. Still, this strategy is probably the most feasible option for research institutions in poor countries.

Table 7 suggests that Peruvian research institutions achieve autonomy through either self-financing or diversification of their external funding sources. Two ratios are compared across institutions: the level of self-financing, i.e., how much institutions draw on their own resources to fund publications, and the degree of diversification, i.e., the ratio of the number of funding sources to the number of books. At one extreme, Universidad Católica and Universidad de San Marcos self-finance a large share of their output: more than half the books published by these two universities are funded with internal resources (58.8% for Universidad Católica and 51.4% for Universidad de San Marcos).[18] By contrast, the two think tanks (DESCO and IEP) depend minimally on self-funding, with DESCO reporting no such funding at all. Instead, the think tanks rely mainly on external support, making them vulnerable to the agendas of their sponsors. However, even in the face of little or no self-financing, a high degree of diversification among external funding sources appears to offer an alternative route to autonomy for DESCO, which has a ratio of 1.75 funding sources per book.

The other think tank, IEP, resolves the trade-off between autonomy and fragmentation of the intellectual agenda in a different way: although the IEP has a low diversification score (0.67), thereby mitigating the problem of fragmentation, it seems to enjoy less autonomy than DESCO, because it is heavily dependent on a single external funding source, the Ford Foundation, which funds nearly one third (30.8%) of IEP's output.[19]

Table 7. Strategies for Retaining Autonomy: Self-financing and Diversification, by Research Institution

	Books Published	Number of funders	Self-financing (% books published with internal funding)	Diversification (ratio of total number of funding institutions to total books published)
Universidad Católica	34	28	58.8	0.82
Universidad del Pacífico	24	23	25	0.96
Universidad de San Marcos	35	24	51.4	0.69
DESCO	24	42	0	1.75
IEP	52	35	7.7	0.67

Note: The total number of books exceeds 168 because one book was published jointly by IEP and Universidad Católica.

Either through self-financing their projects or diversifying external sources of funding, research institutions may be able to retain autonomy. However, of the two paths to autonomy, diversification is less efficient and more risky, because it increases administrative overhead costs and can lead to fragmentation of the research agenda. Unfortunately, this may be the only option available to most research institutions in low-income countries, where self-financing is rarely feasible.

Conditions of Research in Peru

How do tight domestic resource constraints coupled with heavy dependence on foreign funding affect social science research? To address this question, we explore five key conditions of research in Peru highlighted by the bibliometric and survey data: multiple institutional affiliations, hyperproductivity,

[18] Two important caveats bear emphasis: the data rely on self-reporting of financial support, and foreign funding may be hidden behind institutional imprimaturs, that is, research institutions may receive foreign funding for publications without publicly acknowledging it.

[19] Universidad del Pacífico falls between the poles of self-reliance and diversification, with intermediate levels of self-funding and diversification.

forced interdisciplinarity, parochialism, and a weak national community of scholars. These conditions are generated largely by scarce resources for scholarship and are thus likely to exist across other developing countries in Latin America and beyond.[20] It is therefore important to understand the consequences of these conditions for the production of scientific knowledge.

– *Multiple Institutional Affiliations*

Because of the low and unstable flow of funding for many research institutions in developing countries, affiliating with a single institution may not provide sufficient resources to carry out research. Researchers are thus driven to affiliate with multiple institutions. Indeed, Table 8 shows that authors working in resource-poor contexts are almost twice as likely to hold multiple affiliations as authors in resource-rich environments (24% versus 13%).

Table 8. Resources and Number of Institutional Affiliations
(% of funding institutions)

	Number of Institutional Affiliations		
	One	Two or More	Total
Authors producing in resource-poor contexts	59	19	78
	76%	24%	100%
Authors producing in resource-rich contexts	13	2	15
	87%	13%	100%

79% of survey respondents see *advantages* to holding multiple affiliations. By making formal connections with a variety of research centres and universities, scholars can build a diversified portfolio of associations to hedge against risk and potentially increase their access to funding and publishing opportunities. In addition to hedging against financial risk, many respondents state that affiliating with multiple institutions improves the quality of research by broadening their professional and informational networks, increases opportunities to publish, and enhances their capacity to influence public policy. One respondent writes, "Yes [there are advantages to holding multiple affiliations], especially if these are different kinds of affiliations (academic, business or public administration), you can make direct connections between theory and practice, and also, which is the most important thing in my case, influence public policy". Other advantages to holding multiple affiliations noted by respondents include, "to be able to present a project through various channels, to have varied options for publishing one's work", and "the direct exchange of research; invitations to events; joint development of research; financing".

Still, 61% of respondents noted *disadvantages* to holding multiple affiliations. These include time constraints, conflicting institutional loyalties, and dispersion of the research agenda. According to one respondent, "the principal problem is time, especially if one is involved in public administration, where the pressure to resolve immediate, conjunctural problems makes it difficult to carry out the orderly planning required for academic research". Another respondent noted, "a great disadvantage [of holding multiple affiliations] is that you have to run from one place to the other. This is also disadvantageous for [research] institutions, especially when they are in competition with each other".

Despite these disadvantages, we hypothesize that scholars in low-income countries are driven to seek multiple affiliations in order to survive. Foreign institutions, because they are likely to be wealthier, should be especially desirable affiliations. Although many researchers might hope to affiliate with

[20] On scientific research in developing countries, see Hall, 1978; Arnove, 1980; Altbach, 2004; Samoff, 2005; Meyer et. al., 2006; and Altbach and Balán, eds. 2007.

foreign institutions, not all will succeed. What determines the chances of affiliating with a foreign institution? The data show that holding a foreign degree increases the likelihood that researchers have access to the resources of foreign institutions: Among the Peruvian authors in the sample, those with foreign degrees are far more likely to be affiliated with foreign institutions than those with just a Peruvian degree.[21] A foreign degree may facilitate insertion in scholarly networks in other countries, either because authors keep the personal and institutional relationships forged while studying abroad, or because it is a proxy for skills that help establish connections abroad, such as fluency in a foreign language, capacity to navigate the administrative and scholarly environments in other countries, or the range and depth of a researcher's professional network. The survey data suggest that foreign-trained Peruvian researchers value their professional ties to colleagues in the countries where they study: more than half of the respondents (53.8%) reported interacting often or very often with foreign colleagues in the country where they earned their highest academic degree.

By holding multiple institutional affiliations, social scientists in Peru try to manage the obstacles posed by scarce resources. The survey data indicate that, besides providing a hedge against the uncertainties of relying on funding from a single source, holding multiple affiliations may enhance the impact and even the quality of research by broadening scholars' professional networks and horizons. Still, the data also suggest that holding multiple affiliations involves important disadvantages, including time constraints, fragmented research agendas, and weak and divided institutional loyalties that may have a negative effect on the quality of research.

– *Hyperproductivity*

Another way scholars try to cope with resource constraints is by producing research more rapidly in an effort to increase the amount of funding they can potentially receive. Although high productivity is not necessarily a cause for concern, publishing several books in just a few years raises questions about the quality of research: It may be quite difficult to carry out careful research and synthesize the results into a well-crafted book in such a short amount of time.

20.3% of authors in the sample published more than one book between 2000 and 2006, and 6.6% published more than two books.[22] Still, authoring multiple books in a five-year span does not necessarily indicate hyperproductivity. For example, the books could be edited volumes to which the author contributes only a chapter. Alternatively, the books could be single-authored, thus requiring far more time and effort. To operationalize labour and effort better, we distinguish between single-authored and multi-authored books and then code non-edited and edited books within each of these two categories. This yields a four-fold ranking, running from most to least labour-intensive: single-authored, non-edited; single-authored, edited; multi-authored, non-edited; multi-authored, edited. More than one third (35%) of authors who publish more than one book are situated at the most labour-intensive end of the spectrum (i.e., single-authored, non-edited books).

What explains variation in productivity among researchers? Compared to the rest of the sample, the most prolific authors hold a far greater proportion of PhD's. As seen in Table 9, among authors who published more than one book (i.e., "prolific authors"), 49.5% hold PhDs, whereas only 37% of all other authors hold PhDs. While this could be taken as evidence that more investment in human capital (i.e., earning a PhD) generates higher returns in funding and, hence, publications, the set of prolific authors also has a higher proportion of BAs (25% versus 13% among all other authors).[23] Consequently, there is no clear relationship between number of years invested in education and levels of productivity. This may indicate that all researchers, regardless of their level of education, face similar pressures stemming from resource constraints to publish multiple books in a short amount of time.

[21] We code the location of each author's highest degree – BA, MA or PhD.
[22] There are a total of 197 authors.
[23] The difference between proportions of Ph.D.'s and B.A.'s among the prolific authors and all other authors is statistically significant at the 99% confidence level using a two-tailed population proportion test.

On the other hand, it may be the location, not the level, of the degree that is associated with higher productivity. Scholars who hold degrees from rich countries in the Global North may be better able to obtain funding, especially foreign funding, than those with degrees from poor countries. Better access to funding would lead to higher productivity among northern degree holders. Alternatively, scholars trained in the North may adhere to higher standards of scholarship and thus take longer to produce research. This would lead to lower productivity among scholars with degrees from the North. Table 9 shows that among authors who published more than one book, exactly the same number hold degrees from the North as the South (47.5%). By contrast, among all other authors, slightly more received degrees in the North than in the South (33% versus 27%).[24] Although these figures suggest that holding a degree from the North may lead to lower productivity, missing data make it difficult to reach firm conclusions.[25]

Table 9: Level and Location of Highest Degree

	Prolific Authors			
	Global North	Global South	Unknown	Total
Ph.D.	35%	12.50%	2%	49.50%
M.A.	10%	5%	3%	18%
B.A.	0%	25%	0%	25%
Unknown	2.50%	5%	0%	7.50%
Total	47.50%	47.50%	5%	100%
	All Other Authors			
	Global North	Global South	Unknown	Total
Ph.D.	28%	5%	4%	37.00%
M.A.	4%	10%	0%	14%
B.A.	1%	12%	0%	13%
Unknown	0%	0%	36%	36.00%
Total	33%	27%	40%	100%

Note: Prolific authors are researchers who published more than one book in Peru in 2000-2006.

– *Forced Interdisciplinarity*

Interdisciplinarity is often celebrated as a way to promote fruitful collaboration across disciplines and thus generate a stronger understanding of the world. Interdisciplinary research is also seen as an audacious choice that reflects a high level of academic freedom and autonomy, because it challenges the status quo of sciences and fields organized around discrete disciplines. However, in resource poor contexts, interdisciplinarity may be driven less by choice than by necessity.

In Peru, many scholars carry out interdisciplinary research: 64% of the survey respondents consider themselves producers of interdisciplinary work. Moreover, the themes authors address often do not

[24] WThe difference between proportions of authors who received their highest degree in the North and South is statistically significant at the 99% confidence level using a two-tailed population proportion test, both between prolific and all other authors, as well as between prolific and all authors.

[25] We lack information about the location of degree for 67 of the 197 authors in the sample. Moreover, the data are more likely to capture accurately the total book output of authors with degrees from the South, because the set of authors with degrees from the North probably includes more foreign-based authors, who, in turn, are more likely to publish outside Peru. Hence, the data likely undercount the productivity of scholars with northern degrees.at the 99% confidence level using a two-tailed population proportion test.

reflect their disciplinary training. Table 10 shows the distribution of authors' output across themes. Political scientists spend approximately 39% of their effort studying themes related to economics, whereas sociologists spend a similar amount (41%) publishing on politics. Economists, by contrast, are far less likely to publish outside their field, with 69% of their output focused on economic issues.

Table 10. Interdisciplinarity

	Disciplinary Training			
	Anthropology	Economics	Sociology	Political Science
Number of Authors	22	17	21	6
Themes of Books Culture and Identity	32%	4%	23%	0%
Economic Processes and Policy	22%	69%	9%	39%
Societal Actors, Institutions and Processes	15%	11%	21%	15%
Political Actors, Institutions and Processes; Political Order and Disorder	19%	8%	41%	31%
Transnational Relations and Processes	12%	8%	6%	15%

Note: The table only includes disciplines that could be matched directly with overarching themes. Hence, history and philosophy were excluded. The relative concentration of themes across books is the number of instances of a book containing or referring to a theme. Books may address multiple themes. The table includes only single-authored books. N = 106 books.

What explains interdisciplinarity in Peru? The data suggest it is driven partly by supply and demand. Because political science is the youngest of the social science disciplines in Peru, the supply of political scientists is small, amounting to only 11% of all authors. Yet the demand for research on politics is high, with 23% of books focusing on politics. Because demand exceeds supply, scholars from other disciplines, especially sociology, fill the gap.

Though only 2% of survey respondents noted gaining access to funding over other considerations (i.e., intellectual reasons, research quality, or academic training) as the primary motivation for carrying out interdisciplinary research, we hypothesize that resource constraints weaken the incentives for building strong disciplinary institutions, such as professional organizations, journals, and colloquia. If getting access to foreign funding requires authors to be flexible about working outside their own disciplines, what are the rewards for deepening institutional divisions between disciplines and forming networks of discipline-based experts? The institutionalization of disciplines would likely raise barriers to working outside one's field, thus hindering the ability of researchers to respond flexibly to the needs of foreign sponsors, which, in turn, could make it harder to get funding. This situation does not bode well for the construction of strong disciplinary institutions in Peru.

– Parochialism

Most social science research in Peru is about Peru. Less than 15% of books focus on other countries, and fewer than half of these "comparative" studies consider cases drawn from outside Latin America.[26] Moreover, all the comparative books are "small-N" studies, with nearly two thirds (65.4%) focusing on three or fewer countries, and none encompassing more than twelve. Overall, social science research in Peru has a narrow comparative scope.

[26] We use the term comparative in a broad sense here, referring to works that cover multiple countries, or even just a single foreign country (i.e., not Peru). These works do not necessarily employ the comparative method as conventionally understood.

This parochialism limits the impact of research published in Peru. The lack of comparative studies makes it harder for Peruvian social scientists to reach a broad, international audience. Parochialism also means that the external validity beyond Peru of findings by Peruvian social scientists is rarely tested, at least by Peruvian scholars. Because there is little effort to test the cross-national generalizability of findings and ideas produced by Peruvian scholars, the potential impact of their work in the international social science community is reduced. Moreover, comparative research plays a key role in theory-building; hence, the dearth of comparative studies makes it harder for Peruvian researchers to produce new theoretical contributions. Finally, a vibrant social science community may require a mix of scholars doing both domestic and cross-national, comparative studies, yet this mix is lacking in Peru.

What explains the parochial scope of research? The lack of comparative studies may be a further consequence of scarce resources, because comparative studies are often more expensive, especially when they require travel to a foreign country. Dependence on foreign funding could also help explain the dearth of comparative research. From the standpoint of a foreign funding agency, the comparative advantage of scholars in poor countries is their "local knowledge". Hence, foreign sponsors may be unlikely to pay a scholar based in Peru to do a study of Argentina, and vice-versa —researchers in poor countries are paid to study *their countries*. With regard to domestic funding, in an overall context of scarce resources for research, "inward-looking" studies are likely to have priority over "outward-looking" comparative ones, especially given the material advantages that richer countries have in producing comparative research. Thus, a series of *supply-side* factors involving both international and domestic funding may explain the lack of comparative research.

The parochial scope of research may also be *demand-driven*, that is, it may reflect the preferences of Peruvian scholars, rather than any anti-comparative bias of foreign or domestic funding institutions. Funding agencies could, in fact, have no aversion to supporting comparative research, yet they may receive few proposals from Peruvian scholars for comparative studies. The "comparative horizons" of researchers may vary according to the *location of their training*, with foreign-trained scholars having a more cosmopolitan outlook and, hence, a stronger propensity for comparative studies. Likewise, preferences for comparative research may reflect an author's discipline, with anthropologists perhaps less likely than sociologists or political scientists to do comparative research, because anthropology has traditionally been a more place-specific, single-site discipline.[27]

The data allow us to test these various hypotheses about the determinants of parochialism. Resource constraints appear to pose an important barrier to comparative research: The author of a comparative study is 50% more likely than the author of a non-comparative study to work in a resource-rich environment.[28] Moreover, survey respondents pointed most often to lack of resources, not lack of interest, as the reason for not doing comparative research. Concerning how dependence on foreign funding affects the empirical scope of research, comparative books are *more* likely to rely on foreign funding than books that focus just on Peru, with 64% of comparative books receiving foreign funding, whereas only 44% of non-comparative books receive foreign funding.[29] In the absence of foreign funding, two thirds of the comparative research published

[27] Degregori, 2000.

[28] 21.6% of authors of comparative books work in resource-rich settings, whereas only 14% of authors of non-comparative books work in resource-rich settings. Authors affiliated mainly or exclusively with domestic institutions are coded as producing in resource-poor contexts. Authors affiliated mainly or exclusively with foreign institutions are coded as producing in resource-rich contexts. When authors are equally affiliated with domestic and foreign institutions, they are counted as domestic. Authors' affiliations often change from publication to publication, so each case refers to an instance of publication.

[29] The difference between proportions of foreign funding among comparative and non-comparative books is statistically significant at the 99% confidence level using a two-tailed population proportion test.

in Peru would probably not exist. Foreign funding thus contributes to cosmopolitanism, not parochialism.

Turning to the attributes of authors, the proportion of foreign authors is far higher among books with a cross-national scope. The author of a comparative book is three times more likely than the author of a non-comparative book to be a foreigner.[30] Hence, both foreigners and foreign funding play a crucial role in the production of comparative research.

Foreign training also affects the amount of comparative research. Peruvian authors of comparative studies are far more likely to hold foreign degrees than are Peruvian authors of studies that focus only on Peru: Nearly two thirds (61.5%) of the Peruvian authors of comparative studies earned their highest degrees abroad, whereas only one third (39.6%) of the Peruvian authors of non-comparative studies hold foreign highest degrees.[31]

Finally, the disciplinary training of Peruvian authors of comparative research merits consideration: 38.5% are anthropologists, 23% sociologists, 15.4% historians, 7.8% economists, 7.8% philosophers, and 7.8% political scientists. The dominant position of anthropologists among the comparativists is surprising, because anthropology is conventionally seen as the least comparative of the social science disciplines. The surprisingly large number of anthropologists among the producers of comparative research may be a result of "forced interdisciplinarity" in the face of resource constraints: from this standpoint, Peruvian anthropologists are driven by lack of funding to carry out a type of research, cross-national analysis, that does not fit the traditional parameters of their discipline and training.

– A Weak Community of Scholars

Dependence on funding from the Global North appears to pose barriers to building a strong community of scholars, both inside Peru and across Latin America. Collaborative authorship between Peruvian scholars and colleagues in the Global North is far more common than collaboration between scholars based at different Peruvian universities: Scholars affiliated with the three universities in our sample (Universidad Católica, Universidad del Pacífico, and Universidad de San Marcos) are nearly twice as likely to collaborate with a foreign colleague in the Global North as with a local colleague at one of the other Peruvian universities.[32] Moreover, there is little evidence that Peruvian social scientists are integrated into a cross-national community of Latin American scholars: Only 5.4% of books receive funding from sources in other Latin American countries, whereas 31% of books receive funding from the United States alone. And Peruvian scholars are four times more likely to collaborate with colleagues in the Global North than with colleagues in Latin America.[33]

A key incentive for Peruvian scholars to participate in North-South collaboration is likely the access to foreign funding generated by these ties. Indeed, 100% of the books involving North-South

[30] 44% of the authors of comparative books are foreigners, whereas only 13.7% of the authors of non-comparative books are foreigners The difference between proportions of foreign authors of comparative books and foreign authors of non-comparative books is statistically significant at the 99% confidence level using a two-tailed population proportion test.

[31] The difference between proportions of Peruvian authors of comparative studies who obtained their degrees abroad (61.5%) and Peruvian authors of non-comparative research with foreign degrees (39.6%) is statistically significant at the 99% confidence level using a two-tailed population proportion test.books is statistically significant at the 99% confidence level using a two-tailed population proportion test.

[32] Of the books with multiple authors, 6.5% involve collaboration among authors located at more than one of the three Peruvian universities, whereas 11.6% involve collaboration between authors located at one of the three universities and foreign scholars at institutions in the Global North. The majority (72%) of books with multiple authors are written by scholars based in Peru, though few are the product of collaboration among scholars located at different Peruvian universities.

[33] Only 4.3% of books with multiple authors involve collaboration between scholars based in Peru and scholars in other Latin American countries, whereas 18.6% involve collaboration between scholars in Peru and authors in the North. The difference in collaboration rates is statistically significant at the 99% confidence level using a two-tailed population proportion test.

collaboration receive all their funding from foreign institutions, whereas only 42.3% of books in the total sample receive all their funding from abroad. The importance of transnational collaboration as a source of funding for Peruvian scholars is highlighted by a comparison with patterns of transnational collaboration among US-based authors. When US-based authors in the field of comparative politics collaborate, they do so with foreign-based authors only 4% of the time.[34] By contrast, when Peruvian researchers collaborate, they are nearly *six times* more likely (23.3%) to do so with foreign-based colleagues.[35]

Although there are some interesting initiatives to strengthen collaboration across Peruvian research institutions, such as the seminars and publications of the Seminario Permanente de Investigación Agraria (SEPIA) and the research grants awarded by the Consorcio de Investigación Económica y Social (CIES), dependence on funding from the Global North still seems to deflect Peruvian scholars away from building more collaborative ties either with foreign colleagues in other Latin American countries or with local colleagues at other Peruvian institutions. This fosters disarticulation and weakening of the community of scholars in Peru.

Conclusions

This article analyzes social science in Peru, a lower-middle income country with weak funding and institutional support for scholarship. We find that research in Peru is highly dependent on foreign support: without foreign funding, the vast majority of books in the social sciences would not exist. Still, there is little evidence that dependence on foreign support generates foreign control over the intellectual agenda. A multiplicity of diverse institutions fund research, and this fragmented pluralism gives Peruvian scholars a degree of autonomy even in the face of tight resource constraints.

Although resource constraints do not lead to foreign control over the intellectual agenda, they are nevertheless associated with a set of conditions that may have negative consequences for the quality and impact of research: multiple institutional affiliations, hyperproductivity, forced interdisciplinarity, parochialism, and a weak national community of scholars. Dependence on foreign funding, in turn, has a mixed effect on these conditions. It exacerbates the problem of a weak community of scholars, because the quest for support from abroad drives Peruvian scholars to collaborate more often with colleagues in the Global North than with colleagues in Peru. By contrast, foreign funding attenuates parochialism by fostering studies that set Peru in comparative perspective, which, in turn, may strengthen the impact of research.

This article poses several challenges for future work on the political economy of research in developing countries. One task involves collecting more and better data about social science in the Global South, including developing ways to assess in a rigorous manner the quality and impact of research. We have mainly analyzed bibliometric data generated through content analysis of academic publications. Besides making it possible to produce a systematic map of the complex transnational field of funding institutions in which the social science enterprise in developing countries like Peru is embedded, bibliometric data offer further advantages for studying the political economy of research: they are drawn from accessible, public sources (i.e., books) and, hence, studies employing these data can be replicated with relative ease; books, in contrast to journal articles or working papers, contain richer information about the authors and especially about the funding that supported the research; moreover, bibliometric data lend themselves to large-N statistical analysis. Still, like all types of data, bibliometric data have limitations: in addition to relying on self-reporting by authors and publishing houses, they offer only an indirect means of assessing key issues such as the work habits and professional strategies of researchers and the motives and agendas of funding institutions. To get beyond these limitations, we supplement the bibliometric analysis with survey data on the attitudes, behaviour, and strategies

[34] Munck and Snyder, 2007, p. 341.

[35] The data from the two studies are not directly comparable. First, the data from Munck and Snyder, 2007, pertain to authors of articles, not books. Second, the figures for Peru include all the social sciences, not just the field of comparative politics.

of researchers in Peru. Other kinds of data that shed light on the motives of funding institutions, for example interviews with their staffs and analyses of documents from their archives, would provide an even stronger foundation for understanding how foreign funding affects social science.

A second challenge for future work on the political economy of research concerns empirical testing in other countries. How widespread are the heavy dependence on foreign support and the challenging conditions of research seen in Peru? In countries with even less resources for research, such as Bolivia, Paraguay, and most African countries, the conditions of research observed in Peru may be more extreme. Likewise, these conditions may be less severe in countries with higher levels of domestic support for research, such as Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Mexico. Still, in light of our finding that dependence on foreign funding actually broadens the comparative scope of research, the problem of parochialism could, ironically, turn out to be worse in countries with more resources.[36] And depending on who controls the funding, social science in wealthier countries may be marked by problems not seen in poorer countries. For example, if control over funding for research is concentrated in the hands of just a few private foundations or, alternatively, a hegemonic government agency, this could pose an even stronger threat to the autonomy of scholars than heavy dependence on foreign support.

In its focus on Peru during 2000-2006, this study explores the relationship between foreign funding and social science in a *democracy*. A key task for future research concerns how variation in the type of political regime affects the content, scope, quality and impact of research. In non-democratic countries, instead of posing a threat to the autonomy of researchers, foreign funding may provide an indispensable lifeline for scholarship, as occurred in Argentina, Brazil, and Chile in the face of repressive military dictatorships during the 1960s and 1970s.[37] Comparative studies across different types of political regimes will provide a stronger understanding of how democracy and dictatorship affect social science.

A final issue involves policy measures that could strengthen research capacity in developing countries. This study suggests that, in poor countries, lack of domestic funding is the root cause of key problems of social science research. How can funding for the social sciences be increased? Efforts to expand public funding for research in poor countries face key challenges. International financial institutions, especially the World Bank, advocate channelling public investment away from higher education and toward primary and secondary education.[38] And in the face of widespread poverty and inequality, as well as powerful teachers' unions at the primary and secondary levels, it may be politically infeasible to make public spending on social science research a priority. Moreover, the availability of foreign funding for research in poor countries likely reduces the pressure for the public sector to play a greater role. An alternative way to improve research capacity in developing countries involves strengthening private philanthropy by, for example, reforming the tax code so that wealthy citizens and corporations have stronger incentives to support research. However, such reforms will likely prove difficult or ineffective in many developing countries, where the state's tax capacity is low and tax evasion is high. A recent study of corporate philanthropy in Peru thus concludes that "most large corporations do not want to place the tax issue on the agenda since it may reveal their tax evasion".[39]

Because of these formidable barriers to increasing either public or private domestic support for research, dependence on foreign funding is probably the most feasible option for social scientists across much of the Global South.

[36] This is arguably the case in the social sciences in the United States.

[37] See, for example, Truitt, 2000; and Heine, 2006.

[38] Hunter and Brown, 2000.

[39] Durand, 2005, p. 217. On philanthropy in Latin America, see the rest of the articles in Sanborn and Portocarrero, eds., 2005. Sanborn finds little evidence that tax incentives to promote private giving in education have succeeded.

References

Altbach, Philip G. (2004). "Globalisation and the University: Myths and Realities in an Unequal World". *Tertiary Education and Management,* vol. 1, p.1-20.

Altbach, Philip G., and Jorge Balán, eds. (2007). *World Class Worldwide: Transforming Research Universities in Asia and Latin America*. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Arnove, Robert F. (1980) "Comparative Education and World-Systems Analysis". *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 24, n° 1, p. 48-62.

Degregori, Carlos Iván, ed. (2000). N*o hay país más diverso. Compendio de Antropología Peruana*. Lima, Red para el Desarrollo de las Ciencias Sociales en el Perú.

Durand, Francisco (2005). "Business and Corporate Social Responsibility: The Peruvian Case". In Cynthia A. Sanborn and Felipe Portocarrero, eds., Philanthropy and Social Change in Latin America. David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies.

Finnemore, Martha (1993). "International Organizations as Teachers of Norms: The United Nations' Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and Science Policy". *International Organization* 47 (4).

Garretón, Manuel Antonio, et.al. (2005). "Social Sciences in Latin America: a Comparative Perspective: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Uruguay". *Social Science Information*, vol. 44, n° 2 and 3, p. 575-577.

Hall, Budd L. (1978). "Knowledge as Commodity: The Inequalities of Knowledge Creation". Paper presented at "Conversations in the Disciplines: Universities and the New International Order". State University of New York, Buffalo., March 24-26.

Heine, Jorge (2006). "Democracy, Dictatorship, and the Making of Modern Political Science: Huntington's Thesis and Pinochet's Chile". PS: *Political Science & Politics,* April, p. 273-280.

Hunter, Wendy, and David S. Brown (2000). "World Bank Directives, Domestic Interests, and the Politics of Human Capital Investment in Latin America". *Comparative Political Studies,* February, p. 113-143.

Lynch, Nicolás (200). "La sociología y el estudio de la política en el Perú". Unpubl. ms.

McGann, James G., and R. Kent Weaver, eds. (2000). *Think tanks and Civil Societies: Catalysts for Ideas and Action.* New Jersey, Transaction Publishers.

Mejía Navarrete, Julio (2005). "El desarrollo de la sociología en el Perú. Notas introductorias". *Sociologia*, vol 7, n° 14, p. 302-337.

Meyer, John W. et.al., "Higher Education as an Institution". Working Paper n° 57. Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law.

Munck, Gerardo L., and Richard Snyder (2007). "Who Publishes in Comparative Politics? Studying the World from the United States". PS: *Political Science & Politics*, April.

Ortiz de Zevallos, Gabriel (2000). "Instituto APOYO". In James G. McGann and R. Kent Weaver, eds., *Think Tanks and Civil Societies: Catalysts for Ideas and Action*. New Jersey, Transaction Publishers, p. 551-566.

Panfichi, Aldo ed. (2009). *La ciencia política en el Perú de hoy.* Lima, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.

Rochabrún, Guillermo (2007). *Batallas por la teoría. En torno a Marx y el Perú*. Lima, Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

(n/d) *Sociología y pensamiento social en el Perú*, 1896-1970. Unpublished ms.

Samoff, Joel (2005). "The Pursuit of Effective External Support and Persisting External Influence: Direct, Indirect, and Negotiated". In Nuffic Conference 'A Changing Landscape'. The Hague, May.

Sanborn, Cynthia, and Felipe Portocarrero, eds. (2005). *Philanthropy and Social Change in Latin America.* David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies.

Tanaka, Martín (2005). "Los estudios políticos en Perú: ausencias, desconexión de la realidad y la necesidad de la ciencia política como disciplina". *Revista de Ciencia Política*, vol. 25, n° 1, p. 222-231.

Truitt, Nancy (2000). "Think Tanks in Latin America". in James G. McGann and R. Kent Weaver, eds., *Think Tanks and Civil Societies: Catalysts For Ideas and Action*. New Jersey, Transaction Publishers, p. 529-549.

Vega Centeno, Maximo (2003). "Capacidades de Investigacion e Innovacion en Ciencias Sociales". Lima, CONCYTEC.