Evaluation of Norwegian Development Research

Report commissioned by the Research Council of Norway

August 2007

Contents

Executive summary

The objective of this evaluation – initiated by the Research Council of Norway (RCN) – is to provide a basis for strengthening Norwegian development research. The Terms of Reference state that the purpose is to contribute to improved quality, relevance, internationalisation and focus/identity.

The evaluation was performed by an international evaluation committee and based on multiple data sources. To gain an overview of the research units active in development research in Norway and to identify the research units to be reviewed, a questionnaire was sent to 158 units/institutions expected to have relevant research activities. According to the survey, Norwegian development research is distributed across 76 different units – the majority of these (60 percent) are located at universities. Twenty-eight of these research units were selected to participate in the evaluation. The selection was considerably more inclusive than in previous RCN field evaluations, as several of the selected units have only one permanent senior staff member who devotes more than half of his/her research time to development research.[1]

The data for the evaluation included a review of selected publications, citation analysis, interviews with selected users and researchers, and self-assessment reports from the 28 research units included in the evaluation.

The research topics of the evaluated units are categorised into four thematic areas: (A) Resource Management; (B) Rights, Security and Democracy; (C) Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction; (D) Culture, Education and Gender.

Personnel and funding in Norwegian development research

- The general observation of the Evaluation Committee is that Norwegian development research is well funded and adequately staffed.
- The total volume of Norwegian development research is large – there are many units and substantial resources. However, there are large variations in funding and staffing among the units.
- In total, the reviewed research units reported 320 staff members who devote more than half of their research time to development research. Of these, 265 were employed in their main position at the research unit. Personnel resources vary considerably among the research units – from 0 to 35 "main position" staff members in the field. Independent institutes and centres/interdisciplinary units at universities seem best endowed with researchers. There are few regular university departments among the largest units.

[1] A minimum of 5-6 senior-level staff members have normally been required for inclusion in RCN's regular field evaluations.

- With regard to funding sources, it is notable that the share of funding from foreign sources is considerably higher than for Norwegian social sciences in general.

Research quality

- The general impression is that Norwegian development research provides high quality. The publications reviewed in this study score quite high on originality, solidity and scholarly relevance. However, there is considerable variation in terms of academic quality among individuals and research units. There is also room for improvement from a comparative international perspective.
- The research units above a certain minimum size – in terms of numbers of senior-level staff members who devote more than half of their time to development research – on average obtain better scores than the smaller units. Summarised by thematic areas, there are only small differences in average scores, but the basis for good research seems to vary somewhat among the thematic areas. Whereas research in development economics is best conducted in academic economics departments, much of the other research seems to profit from being conducted in larger and broader groups/units devoted to development research.

Publications and citations

- Overall, the Evaluation Committee considers that the number of Norwegian articles in good outlets has increased substantially. This means that Norwegian development researchers have become more competitive and that their visibility has been enhanced.
- A very high proportion of the scholarly publications in the field are written in English (90 percent). This is taken as an indication that Norwegian development researchers largely relate to development research as an international research field. In addition to most of the research being published internationally, many articles are published in the highly ranked international journals. There is still room for more publications in peer-reviewed international journals.
- When looking at the publication outlet rating by thematic area, some notable differences are observed. Whereas as much as 33 percent of the journal articles within "Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction" appear in journals rated as the most important in their field, only 15 percent of the journal articles within "Resource Management" are in such highly rated journals (based on the publication outlet scores of the budgeting model for Norwegian higher education institutions).
- In the citation analysis, the area of "Rights, Security and Democracy" was found to have the highest average citation rate. The papers with Norwegian author-addresses in this area are cited on average 5.2 times. It should be noted, however, that distributions of citations are quite skewed, and with small samples as in this case, averages may say little about the research in general. The majority of the articles included in the study have obtained a moderate amount of citations (1-9) or no citations at all. Seven percent of the papers are cited 10 times or more.

Research scope

- The scope of Norwegian development research is wide, but there are still some research areas which receive more emphasis than others, notably governance, natural resource management, marginalisation of people, and gender issues.
- More specifically, Norwegian development researchers excel in research on human rights, armed conflict, the displacement of people, and natural resource issues. The Committee also notes that several individual researchers in anthropology, economics and political science have brought international recognition and visibility to their respective disciplines.
- Areas that may be regarded as overlooked, given their prominence as policy problems, include the informalisation of the urban economies in Africa and Latin America, the full and varied effects of globalisation, as well as an independent research on critical aid issues.

Relevance and use

- Norwegian development research has policy relevance, as well as wider relevance for civil society and developing countries. The clearest evidence for knowledge utilisation is found in the close interconnections between research expertise and policy processes.
- In general, it seems that a high proportion of the research is directed in some way at user needs. The research results are communicated to a broad set of users, and the work of Norwegian development researchers seems to be relevant and used in several different contexts. Moreover, the research units state that they are concerned with a wide variety of relevance aspects. For instance, they seek to contribute to general knowledge production, play a role in the articulation of an alternative and independent research agenda, provide research support to activist groups and civil society organisations, and undertake long-term assignments aimed at local competence building.
- The users who were interviewed perceive Norwegian development researchers to be readily available for commissioned research, and in most cases they conduct the type of research requested. On the other hand, the users also perceive "user-group communication" to be the researchers' third priority after scholarly journals and the general media, which is corroborated in part by information from the researchers.

Major challenges

On the overall level, the Norwegian research system seems to be well supplied with funds for development research. The share allocated to independent researcher-initiated research, however, seems to be quite low. The most important challenges for Norwegian development research relates to combining relevance with quality, attracting and maintaining competence in a fragmented research structure, expanding the scope of independent researcher-initiated research and the availability of long-term funding:

- Development research in Norway is spread out among quite a large number of institutions. This fragmented structure makes attracting and building competence more

difficult. Adding to this problem is the lack of *long-term* funding to ensure capacity building for high-quality development research, an inadequate balance between programme calls and open calls for grants for development research, and scarce core funding of the institute sector.

- The problem of combining quality with relevance relates foremost to the independence of research. Important reservations were expressed regarding the ability to ensure that quality is the prime criterion in the RCN grant selection procedures. RCN procedures and structures also seem to lack transparency and legitimacy. Moreover, direct funding (commissions) entails a high degree of dependence, formally and informally. Conclusions that are at cross with the official policy preferences, or that are too bold and revealing as to political processes, might be subdued or delivered with an uneasy eye to future funding. Norwegian development research needs to loosen its close association with Norwegian development policy and be free to redefine development research to be more in tune with the larger issues of globalisation and sustainable development.

Recommendations

The Terms of Reference ask for advice on how to improve quality, relevance, internationalisation and focus/identity in Norwegian development research, and how to strengthen the role played by development research in Norwegian research policy. Section 8.2 presents the recommendations of the Evaluation Committee. The following is a summary of these recommendations.

- *Reconsider the research agenda and boundaries:* The boundaries and agenda of development research need to be reconsidered. The research agenda should be broadened to include issues raised by globalisation that link the North and the South, the East and the West in new ways. Moreover, there is a need for a clearer acceptance of research on development issues as part of the mainstream social sciences. This does not necessarily imply an abandonment of interdisciplinarity, but it does involve recasting the research agenda in such a way that it becomes more comparative and addresses issues of interest to those in the mainstream disciplines.
- *Researcher-user relations:* The scope for undertaking independent critical research is vital to ensuring high quality. An arm-length's distance between development research and Norwegian authorities should be better ensured. Supportive conditions for independent critical research and broader relevance should be ensured, relationships characterised by dependency should be avoided, and research units should take care to maintain a critical distance from Norwegian aid authorities. On the other hand, there is a need for better structures for input to policy formulation, and researchers and policy makers should meet in arenas other than the funding arenas. In cooperation with the research community, national authorities and the central aid organisations should try to develop more efficient channels for the communication of research to users groups, thus enhancing user competence and improving the basis for the use of research results.
- *Funding structures:* A larger share of the resources should be allocated through open calls for proposals and be based on academic quality criteria only. This implies that

open calls, rather than programme calls, for research proposals should be the main funding alternative offered by RCN. Also, the role of government officials on programme boards should be reconsidered. Moreover, the ability of researchers to maintain a long-term focus on development research needs to be improved. Future policy making needs to take into account that capacity building, and long-term money securing capacity building, represent the bottleneck in Norwegian development research, not the overall amount of resources available.

1 Introduction

This evaluation was initiated by the Research Council of Norway (RCN) in autumn 2005. Integrating multiple purposes and interests, the board of the Division for Strategic Priorities – the body currently in charge of RCN's policies for development research – formulated its Terms of Reference. Key issues constituting the background and challenges of the evaluation include:

- The field of "development research" is difficult to define, and there is no satisfactory overview of the research or the research units in the field.
- "Development research" is conducted within several disciplinary areas and is sponsored by several interdisciplinary RCN programmes as well as a number of other sources.
- The main sponsor of Norwegian development research (Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)/Norad) had requested an overall evaluation. Evaluating research fields is a central task of RCN (a task assigned by the Norwegian government). The present evaluation, however, is the first RCN commissioned, expert group evaluation of an interdisciplinary field.
- The objective of the evaluation – as defined in the Terms of Reference – is to "strengthen Norwegian development research via recommendations on strategic aims, priorities, organisation and resources. Its purpose is to contribute to improved quality, relevance, internationalisation and focus/identity. The evaluation also aims to strengthen the role that research on developing countries and development issues plays in Norwegian research policy".

The appointed international Evaluation Committee started its work in March 2006. In the following sections, the operationalisation of the Terms of Reference, the evaluation process and the data sources are presented.

1.1 The Evaluation Committee and the evaluation process

The appointed Evaluation Committee consisted of:

- Eva Birkeland, Statistics Norway (SSB), Norway (chair)
- Arne Bigsten, Department of Economics, Göteborg University, Sweden
- Göran Hydén, Department of Political Science, University of Florida, USA
- Henrik Secher Marcussen, Department of Society and Globalisation, Roskilde University, Denmark
- Inger Koch-Nielsen, Denmark (previously of the Danish National Institute of Social Research, now retired)
- Anette Markan Reenberg, Department of Geography, Copenhagen University, Denmark
- Diane Stone, Politics and International Studies, University of Warwick, UK/Center for Policy Studies, Central European University, Budapest
- Øyvind Østerud, Department of Political Science, University of Oslo, Norway

The evaluation is based on written documentation and hearings with a selection of researcher and user representatives. Liv Langfeldt at NIFU STEP served as secretary for the Evaluation Committee. Inger-Ann Ulstein (RCN) coordinated the project on behalf of the Research Council. Elin Vikane (RCN) and Mona Renolen (RCN) also assisted with the work. The Committee held 7 meetings (4 one-day meetings and 3 two-day meetings). Before the publication of the report, a draft version was sent the 28 units in this evaluation for comments.

The data sources are described in Section 1.3 below.

1.2 The evaluation tasks

The Terms of Reference for the evaluation include *eight questions/topics to be addressed.* This section presents the Evaluation Committee's operationalisation of these tasks and gives an overview of where in the report the various topics are dealt with. (The complete Terms of References are attached as Appendix 2.)

1. ***Quality*** assessed on the basis of international standards on a representative selection of publications. The evaluation will also assess the relationship and balance between basic research, applied research and more assignment-oriented research.

Quality has been assessed on the basis of reviews of selected publications by external referees and committee members (Chapter 5). The balance between basic, applied and commissioned research has been studied on the basis of the self-assessment reports from 28 selected research institutions/units and interviews with selected users and researchers (Chapters 3.2 and 6).

2. ***Funding and resources*****:** Do the institutes have sufficient resources (human and financial) to conduct competence-building activities and maintain a basic level of expertise? What is the number of scientific and popular-scientific publications, researcher resources and the like compared to other research areas? Is there adequate expertise at the senior level in the specific discipline?

Human and financial resources have been studied on the basis of data from the selected units' self-assessment reports (Sections 3.1 and 3.2). Publication profiles have been studied based on publication lists provided by the 28 research institutions/units included in this evaluation (Chapter 4).

3. ***Relevance*** (1) in relation to prioritised areas and issues in Norwegian development policy and objectives established by international institutions, (2) in relation to the key challenges in development policy as determined by the evaluation group, and (3) in relation to the needs of other public authorities and the trade and industry sector for knowledge about developing countries and transition processes (see the definition of development research).

The relevance of the research in relation to policy challenges, needs and objectives is analysed in the context of central Norwegian policy documents and based on input from

the self-assessments, the publication lists and interviews with a selection of users and researchers (Chapter 6).

4. ***Dissemination, communication and use of research results*:** What is the situation regarding dissemination of research results to the public at large, communication within the research process and dissemination of results to decision makers? Are research results and researcher expertise utilised? This applies both in Norway and internationally (including in relation to countries and users in the South).

Dissemination, communication and use have been analysed on the basis of the publication lists, reports on other dissemination activities (mass media contributions and talks) and the user interviews. Use by the research community has also been evaluated on the basis of citation analysis (Chapter 6).

5. ***Cooperation*** between institutes and between the institute sector and university sector in Norway.

Cooperation has been studied on the basis of the self-assessment reports and interviews (Section 2.4).

6. ***International*** research cooperation and networks; participation in international committees and large-scale research programmes; participation in conferences; presentations, speeches and lectures; the profile and focus of the international activities as well as cooperation with and positioning in relation to international institutions; participation in processes that set the international research agenda. Activities and partners in Norway as well as the South are relevant in this context, assessed in relation to strategic assessments, the desire for competence transfer, and identification of the knowledge arena.

International research cooperation, networks and communication have been studied on the basis of the self-assessment reports and interviews as well as citation analysis (Sections 3.3 and 6.2.5 and Chapter 4).

7. ***Management and organisation*:** Relationship between funding source (Research Council, The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norad, international organisation, etc.), the institute and researcher group; strategic management of research; institutional foundation and institutional focus of the development research.

Input from the self-assessment reports and interviews were used to evaluate the challenges related to the management and organisation of Norwegian development research (Chapter 7).

8. ***Cross-disciplinarity and multi-disciplinarity*:** To what degree has the cross-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary orientation been maintained within development research and in relation to other research areas such as culture, welfare, working life and the environment?

Interdisciplinary orientation was a topic in the self-assessments reports and in the interviews, and is addressed in Section 2.4.

Delimitation of research to be evaluated

The Terms of Reference refer to different types of evaluation "objects": both Norwegian development research in general and research units involved in such research. In order to

map the research activities of the relevant communities and to be able to select the units for inclusion in the evaluation, a questionnaire was sent to units that had applied for funding from the RCN development research programmes or had obtained funding for development research from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) or Norad in previous years, as well as some other research units that the Evaluation Committee expected might be relevant (in total 158 research units).

The questionnaire requested figures for total expenses for development research during the past five years and for the number of senior researchers involved in such research, as well as their thematic areas within development research. All units found to conduct a minimum amount of development research were invited to participate in the evaluation (see Section 1.3 and 2.2 on the selection).

In deciding the thematic limits of development research, the Evaluation Committee has applied the RCN definition and elaborations on the definitions provided by RCN:

> *Development research is "research which is relevant for understanding the interlinkages and transition processes on global, regional and local levels and which can make an important contribution with this knowledge to poverty reduction, expansion of human rights and sustainable development."(RCN, 2003)*
>
> *The reference to sustainable development does not imply that sustainable development in the developed countries is included. In principle all research in Norway should contribute to sustainable development. In our context "sustainable development" is related to: poverty reduction and expansion of human rights, either on the global, the regional or the local level.*
>
> *The wording "interlinkages and transition processes" is, unfortunately not explicitly written, relations through societal mechanisms. Although a technologist or a pharmacist makes tremendous contributions to poverty reduction by improving technology and medicines, it is only regarded as "development research" if it in addition contributes to the understanding of societal processes. Otherwise this kind of very valuable research is called "research for development", and is not studying "development" as such. (The last two paragraphs are from a RCN note to the Evaluation Committee, March 2006)*

The first part of the elaboration is understood to indicate that only research which in some way deals with or is specifically relevant for developing countries should be included in the evaluation and that research on development in areas such as Eastern Europe lies outside the scope of the evaluation.

Furthermore, the definition is interpreted so that, for instance, regular natural or medical research perspectives are not included, even when such research is vital for changing social conditions. The study of *how* such research (may) change social structures or contribute to development would, however, be defined as development research. This, of course, is a difficult distinction, and interpretations may vary from person to person depending on how "societal processes" are defined, as well as the degree of *centrality* of societal processes that is perceived required for obtaining the label development research.

The Evaluation Committee has tried nonetheless to be as consistent as possible when deciding what to include and what not to include in the evaluation. Put somewhat simplistically, the implication of the selection process is that predominantly research with some connection to the social sciences has been included, and research not explicitly dealing with developing countries has in most cases been excluded. For instance, plant research that deals with biological rather than sociological aspects has not been included (e.g. forest research in the Himalayas that does not explicitly deal with how it affects the human population and its use of the resources).

It should be added that the problems related to the RCN definition – as well as more general problems related to defining development research – has been a recurrent issue throughout the evaluation process, and we return to the question of the role of this definition in Chapter 8. Also note that some public health research relevant to the evaluation might have been excluded, not because of the topical delimitation set by the definition given us, but because the Evaluation Committee did not receive the information needed to include it (see Section 1.4).

Categories of research to be evaluated

The Terms of Reference ask for differentiations and comparisons along several dimensions: Focus areas within development research, disciplines, funding methods, and type of research institution.

Focus areas: In order to be able to evaluate the research according to "focus areas of development research", we set up four different thematic categories and asked for the research units' own thematic descriptions of their research. The research units were also asked to categorise their publication lists according to these thematic areas (see Section 2.3).

Disciplines: Where relevant, the research under review is discussed according to different social science disciplines and in terms of interdisciplinarity.

Institutions: The evaluation distinguishes between research conducted at universities/university colleges and at independent research institutes.

Funding methods: The evaluation differentiates between various funding sources and between various funding methods for research (see Section 3.2). When relevant, the evaluation also distinguishes between basic and applied research, regardless of funding.

1.3 Data sources

The evaluation is based on a broad set of data sources:

- *A survey mapping Norwegian institutions and units that conduct development research:* A questionnaire (web-based electronic survey) was sent to 158 relevant institutions/research units, of which 123 replied and 28 were selected to be included in

the evaluation. The selected units include all units that replied to the survey and seemed to have a minimum level of activity (in terms of funding and staffing) within development research as defined in the Terms of Reference for the evaluation. Several of the selected units have only one permanent senior-level staff member who devotes more than half of his/her research time to development research. This means that this evaluation has been considerably more "liberal" than previous RCN's field evaluations when selecting the units to be reviewed, as a minimum of 5-6 senior staff members have normally been required for inclusion in these evaluations.

- *Self-assessment reports* from the 28 research units included in the evaluation (covering the period 2001-2005). There was, however, wide variation in the quality and completeness of the data delivered.
    a) Lists of publications related to development research (also including figures for oral dissemination of research, mass media contributions, etc.)
    b) Financial resources and funding sources
    c) R&D personnel
    d) Competence-building activities: PhD students, PhD theses and other relevant activities, as well as contributions to higher education development studies
    e) User groups (research-commissioning institutions and other users), participation in policy processes (both domestic and in LDCs) and the use/impact of research
    f) Research collaborators (domestic, LDC and others) in terms of project collaboration, co-authorship and formal collaboration agreements
    g) Scholarly honours and tasks (esteem indicators: international committees and boards, editorial and review tasks, awards, etc.)
    h) Research orientation: Research areas, research orientation and interdisciplinarity
    i) Major challenges: Research and policy challenges, funding, applied/basic research, etc.
    j) Annual report and plans related to development research during the past five years

- *Interviews with selected users and researchers:* The Evaluation Committee performed group interviews with three representatives from Norad, one from Norwegian People's Aid, and four directors, four senior-level scholars and three junior-level[2] scholars from the research units evaluated in this report. MFA, Norsk Hydro, Save the Children Norway, Red Cross, Norwegian Church Aid and Norwegian Refugee Council were also invited, but for various reasons did not attend the meetings (see Section 1.4). The Evaluation Committee also held a meeting with three representatives from the Norwegian Association for Development Research (NFU). Moreover, one committee member interviewed contact persons at the Norwegian embassies in Tanzania and Mozambique.
- *Review of selected publications:* The Evaluation Committee selected 2-12 publications from each of the research units in this evaluation (selection was based on their

[2] Post-doctoral fellows and PhD students

submitted publication lists, the number of selected publications depended on the size of the research unit). The publications of each research unit were sent to two or three external reviewers, who were asked to fill in a review form giving their assessment of the unit (the form is attached as Appendix 4). The review process was managed by RCN. Please refer to the introduction to Chapter 5 for further details.

- *Citation analysis:* NIFU STEP performed a citation analysis based on a number of international journals relevant to development research. For this task ISI data (ISI/Thompson National Citation Report for Norway) was used. This analysis comprised all articles by Norwegian authors, not only authors at the 28 units in this evaluation.
- *Previous studies:* Several previous evaluations were made available to the Evaluation Committee and used as background information. These include a previous evaluation of Norwegian development research (”Norsk utviklingsforskning – utviklingstrekk og utfordringer”, Oslo: RCN 2001) and a review of Norwegian foreign policy research institutes (”Utenriks- og sikkerhetspolitiske institutter – En gjennomgang”, Oslo: RCN 2006). Moreover, evaluations of Danish International Development Assistance (Danida, 2001) and Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida, 2006) research programmes were used as a comparative reference.
- A separate evaluation of the Chr. Michelsen Institute ran parallel to that of Norwegian development research for the whole of 2006. Its final report was issued in December 2006 and provided reference to specific issues that the NDR team also considered before issuing its own report. The overlap in membership on the two committees – one member of the NDR team served as chair of the CMI evaluation – facilitated this cross-fertilisation.

1.4 Data limitations

In 2001 a previous review of Norwegian development research found it difficult to provide an overview of Norwegian development research and noted that there is not even a comprehensive overview of the development research funded by RCN.[3] The situation had not changed much for the present evaluation. Contrary to regular scholarly disciplines, development research is not a category in any official statistics. This gives the present evaluation a different quantitative basis than the regular RCN field evaluations. First of all, this applies to the selection of units to be included in the evaluation. Moreover, the analyses of resources and personnel in the field have been based on the selected research units’ self-assessment reports and not on official databases. There are also limitations to the scope of users groups that have provided input to the evaluation. (The reasons for this are more complex than merely the fact that development research is not a category in the statistics, see below.)

[3] ”Norsk utviklingsforskning – utviklingstrekk og utfordringer” Oslo, 2001: RCN, page 3.

Selection of research units

As noted in Section 1.3, the selection of research units for inclusion in the evaluation was based on a survey sent to 158 relevant institutions/research units, and has been considerably more inclusive than previous RCN field evaluations. Still, due to a lack of information, we cannot be sure that our selection is fully adequate. Development researchers or development research units are not categories for which we can search in the official databases, and several relevant units might have been left out of the initial mapping survey – or for various reasons units might not have replied even if they had relevant activities to report.

In hindsight, the Evaluation Committee believes that better preparatory work could have been carried out before the start-up of the evaluation and that the Norwegian research community should have been more involved in identifying the units relevant for the evaluation. This would have given the evaluation a better starting point, and the delimitation work of the Evaluation Committee would have been less complicated and time-consuming. After the start-up of the evaluation, the Committee learnt that at least one university unit with a major focus on development research had been omitted from the initial mapping, and consequently, it had not been considered for inclusion in the evaluation.[4] It should be noted that the list of units for the initial mapping was based primarily on the list of applicants to RCN's development programmes during the past five years. This source had two major weaknesses. First, in several cases the list did not identify the applicant department/centre/unit at the institution, only the university or school responsible for the application. Second, units that conduct development research do not necessarily apply to the RCN development programmes – as shown below (Section 3.2), a large part of development research at higher education institutions is conducted without any external funding. These problems stress the need for improving the overview of the Norwegian activities related to development research.

The Committee is confident nonetheless that it has included the major Norwegian research units in the field.

Funding resources and personnel

Whereas official statistics provide substantial input to the analysis of funding resources and personnel in RCN's regular field evaluations, the present analyses of resources and personnel in development research have been based on the selected research units' self-assessment reports and not on the official databases. This implies that the data are restricted to the units selected for review and, in some cases, are incomplete. Also, the figures presented are not fully comparable to those provided in evaluations of other fields. Difficulties in data prevail, such as in the substantial incongruence found when measuring the size of the units by funding versus personnel (Chapter 3).

---

4 Centre for International Health at UiB.

Moreover, Norad has not been able to provide overview figures for Norad's/MFA's funding of development research. The Evaluation Committee regrets that such figures have not been available.

Limited input from users

Due to problems with obtaining input from the users, some of the issues raised in the Terms of Reference have not been fully analysed. Only sparse data was acquired on the needs of the various user groups and on their opinions about, and use of, Norwegian development research. The input obtained from users is discussed in Section 6.2.4. The users who were reached and those who were not are listed in Section 1.3. The Committee is disappointed that obtaining input from a wide variety of users proved to be so difficult, but it believes nonetheless that it has been able to respond satisfactorily to the Terms of Reference.

The problems with obtaining input from users relate to several factors, including limited resources available for the task, inadequate strategies for approaching the users, as well as some specific user characteristics. In part, users had difficulties with the dates and time for the interviews; partly they did not give the evaluation sufficient priority. Moreover, the Committee's attempt to obtain written answers to the interview guide did not yield any substantial input. A more effective strategy to reach the users might have been to make separate interview appointments with each of them, but neither time nor resources allowed for this.

The replies received when trying to get written input from the users who did not attend the interviews, illustrate the difficulties of obtaining input from this group – in particular through written communication. In two cases the informants stated that they had nothing to contribute; in another case the request was continuously "forwarded" within the organisation and no reply was ever given. Several replies cited uncertainties and reservations about the term "development research". Only one reply of substance was received, which stated that the informant's organisation was involved in a great deal of research and had a particular interest in research-based evaluations. In short, under these circumstances it proved to be quite difficult to truly benefit from user perspectives on development research.

2 The landscape of Norwegian development research

In this chapter we first present the major funding sources and terms for Norwegian development research. In Section 2.2, the results of the survey mapping relevant research units and the basis for selection of the units included in this evaluation are presented. Section 2.3 deals with thematic areas and disciplines involved in development research. Section 2.4 deals with interactions in Norwegian development research in terms of interdisciplinary and cross-institutional collaboration.

2.1 Major funding sources for Norwegian development research

Norwegian development research is funded by several different sources. According to the self-assessment reports, institutional core funding (state appropriations) is the largest source (32 percent in 2005). Grants from Norwegian public funding sources account for 46 percent – of which RCN accounts for 21 percentage points. Foreign sources account for about 18 percent (all are 2005 figures, see Table 3.13). This section provides an overview of two of the major sources, describing the aims and focuses of RCN programmes and Norad funding.

RCN funding

RCN has received a yearly allocation of about NOK 60 million from Norad/MFA, which is earmarked for different research programmes relevant to development (from 2007 the amount is NOK 120 million. In addition, about NOK 27 million is allocated by the Ministry of Education and Research for open calls within development and environment research (the *FRIMUF* programme, of which only about NOK 7 million goes to development research). Some smaller amounts earmarked for development research are also allocated by other ministries.

The currently active, major RCN programme for development research is *Poverty and Peace.* (There are also some programmes not directly linked to the RCN definition of development research, e.g. *Global Health Research* and *Vaccination Research*, see table 2.1.) The success rates of applications to the relevant RCN programmes are generally low, although this varies somewhat among the programmes.[5] When comparing the open calls

[5] 15.2 percent of the FRIMUF applications for 2007 were funded (7 of 46 applications, including projects on both development and the environment). For UTISØR, 17.7 percent of the applications were funded (including the total programme period 1998-2005), and for Poverty and Peace 14.2 percent of the applications were funded (16 of 113 applications for 2006), whereas about 30 percent of the applications to the South Africa Programme were funded (39 of 129 applications in total for the two calls for which we have information).

for proposals (FRIMUF) to the amounts allocated through programme calls, the share of funding available for independent researcher-initiated projects seems quite small.

Table 2.1 gives an overview of the relevant RCN programmes and their size in terms of budgets and number of projects.

Table 2.1 RCN programmes and priorities for development research, 1991-2007

Program/priority	Period	# Projects funded as of January 2007	Average NOK mill per project	Programme budget NOK mill
*FRIMUF (Open calls in environment and development research)	2002-2007			62,0
CGIAR I (International Agricultural Research)	2000-2006	13	0,7	10,3
GLOBHEL (Global health research)	2003-2010	14	2,1	88,0
MULTI (The multilateral system in the field of development) I	1994-1998			16,0
MULTI (The multilateral system in the field of development) II	1998-2004	19	1,5	30,0
NUHH (Norwegian History of Development)	1997-2003	3	3,8	12,0
POVPEACE (Poverty and Peace)	2005-2013	12	1,7	140,0
UFISK (Fisheries in Developing Countries)	1996-2002	21	1,2	28,4
UTISØR (Development Paths in the South)	1998-2005	111	1,3	150,0
Vaccination research	2006-2011	9	7,6	300,0
South Africa Programme I	2001-2006	46	0,3	33,0
South Africa Programme II	2006-2010			51,0
Some other programs with partial relevance to development research				
Central and Eastern Europe	1997-2001			60,0
EU Candidate Countries	2001-2005			35,0
Russia	2002-2006			44,0
West Balkan Programme I	2000-2004			65,0
West Balkan Programme II	2006-2009			60,0

Source: RCN

Note: The table also includes programmes and priorities only partly relevant to the present evaluation. In some cases, only parts of the budgets included pertain to development research projects.
*108 FRIMUF projects have been funded 1994-2007.The table only includes the development projects during the programme period 2002-2007: In total, about NOK 62 million was allocated by RCN to FRIMUF development research projects during the past six years (FRIMUF projects with start-up 2002-2007; there are some projects running until 2009).

Table 2.2 gives an overview of the geographical and institutional allocation of funds from four selected RCN programmes in the period 1995-2005. Bergen and Oslo are the major recipients of grants from these programmes. Both the higher education institution and the independent research institute that have received the largest amount of funding from these programmes are located in Bergen (University of Bergen and Chr. Michelsen Institute).

Table 2.2 Development research programmes: Number of projects and sums allocated by sector and institution, from a selection of RCN programs 1995-2005

Institution	MULTI 1997-2003	REK-NUFU 1996-2003	U-FISK 1995-1998	UTISØR 1997-2005	Sum Projects	Sum NOK
UiB	3	9	2	20	34	47 287 705
UiO	3	2	1	27	33	45 890 753
NTNU		4		17	21	24 253 520
UMB		1		8	9	17 999 986
UiT		3	4	3	10	7 724 668
NVH		1			1	2 170 000
HiO				1	1	2 074 870
Diakonhjemmet University College				1	1	70 000
MF Norwegian School of Theology				1	1	63 473
Total higher education institutions	**6**	**20**	**7**	**78**	**111**	**147 534 975**
CMI	2		2	4	8	17 578 500
NUPI	5			4	9	14 805 750
SNF - Institute for Research in Economics and Business Administration	3		2	1	6	9 006 000
IMR Institute of Marine Research			5		5	6 799 066
PRIO	1			4	5	6 069 016
NIBR			1	3	4	5 394 408
FNI	1			1	2	3 500 000
Ragnar Frisch Centre for Economic Research	1			2	3	3 050 000
NIVA				2	2	2 874 000
CICERO				3	3	2 815 200
Nordland Research Institute			1		1	1 650 970
NOVA				1	1	1 172 721
Agder Research				1	1	1 072 000
Fafo				1	1	621 152
Nansen Environmental and Remote Sensing Center				1	1	500 000
Total institute sector	**13**		**11**	**28**	**52**	**76 908 783**
Total projects other recipients		**1**	**1**	**5**	**7**	**6 247 928**
Total all sectors	**19**	**21**	**19**	**111**	**170**	**230 691 686**

Source: Project lists provided by RCN for the following programmes and periods: MULTI 1997-2003 (the multilateral system in the field of development); REKNUFU 1996-2003 (Magne Lerheim Fellowships); U-FISK 1995-1998 (Fisheries in Developing Countries); UTISØR 1997-2005 (Development Paths in the South).

Note: "Other recipients" include 2 hospital units, the Office of the Auditor General of Norway, the Norwegian Academy of Technological Sciences (NTVA), and 3 personal fellowships with no registered institution.

NORAD funding

In addition to the funding allocated through RCN, Norad commissions applied research, evaluations and consultancy work directly from research institutions. A reorganisation a couple of years ago changed Norad's primary role into a competence centre for development issues.[6] In order to effectively provide the embassies and MFA with studies, analysis, evaluations and other kinds of assistance, Norad has entered into three-year framework agreements with a number of research institutions (as well as with other government agencies and consultancy groups). The research institutions win these contracts through tender procedures (the contract contents vary). The following research institutions have obtained framework agreements for the period 2005-2007:

[6] Before the reorganisation, Norad was more directly involved in project funding. Much of the funding responsibility has now been decentralised and placed with the embassies.

Table 2.3 Research institutions with Norad framework agreements 2005-2007

- CMI - Chr. Michelsen Institute*
- HiO: Centre for International Education (LINS)*
- IMR - Institute of Marine Research*
- NIBR - Norsk Institutt for By- og Regionforskning*
- NUPI - Norwegian Institute for International Affairs*
- SSB - Statistics Norway*
- UiB: Centre for International Health*
- UiO: Centre for Human Rights*
- UMB: Noragric - Department of International Environment and Development Studies*
- AFI - Work Research Institute
- NGI - Norwegian Geotechnical Institute
- NIKU - Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research
- NINA - Norwegian Institute for Nature Research
- NIVA - Norwegian Institute for Water Research
- PRIO - International Peace Research Institute Oslo
- UiO: Institutt for Medier og Kommunikasjon
- University of Birmingham: IDD - International Development Department

Source: "NORAD framework agreements for consultancies and technical services", NORAD April 2005.
Note: The list includes both main contractors* and partners in the agreements.

Table 2.4 Expenditures under the Norad framework agreements, by research institution 2003-2005, in NOK 1000

Institution	2003	2004	2005	2003-05
CMI	4 019	3 560	6 358	13 937
HESO/CMI/UiB: Centre for International Health	4 288	2 928	4 649	11 865
HiO: LINS	4 236	2 625	3 800	10 661
UMB: Noragric	2 799	2 682	4 254	9 735
IMR - Institute of Marine Research/ Ministry of Fishery	1 863	2 765	3 208	7 836
NIBR	1 855	557	1 281	3 693
UiT: Norwegian College of Fishery Science	604	1 617	1 427	3 648
SSB – Statistics Norway	1 345	791	1 401	3 537
UiO: NCHR	1 634	1 173	543	3 350
NUPI			709	709
Agder Research	367			367
Total	**23 010**	**18 698**	**27 630**	**69 338**

Source: Norad: "Etatsrapport" 2003, 2004 and 2005.
Notes: Only allocations under the framework agreements with research institutions are included in the table. The exception is the agreement with HESO, which is included because it also includes two research institutions (CMI and the Centre for International Health at UiB) as main contractors. Including all the various types of institutions, NOK 102.7 million was allocated under the framework agreements in 2003-2005 (whereas this table shows that NOK 69.3 million of this was related to research institutions). All allocations are included in the figures for the main contractor (as we do not have information about the shares spent by subcontractors/partners in the agreements).

In addition to the RCN programmes and commissioned studies, Norad also sponsors the *Norwegian Programme for Development, Research and Education* (NUFU). NUFU seeks to enhance capacity and competence building in research and research-based education at universities in the South. The programme supports independent academic cooperation based on initiatives from researchers and institutions in the South and their partners in Norway (higher education institutions only). Eligible project activities include joint research projects, the education of master's and Ph.D. candidates, development of master's or Ph.D. programmes in the South, training of technical and administrative staff and the publication and dissemination of research results. The total budget for the programme period 2007-2011 is NOK 300 million. (The total budget in 2001-2006 was NOK 370 million, Source: the NUFU website at http://siu.no/en). Previously (until 2003) NORAD also had an institute sector scheme for research collaboration and capacity building in the South.

Moreover, Norad sponsors development research in several other contexts. Examples include several research projects funded outside RCN (e.g. "Training for Peace"), and

accompanying research in the South in which Norwegian researchers are heavily involved (including Bangladesh, Zambia, Sri Lanka and Nepal). There is also a separate fund for research on social exclusion and nation building in Nepal which is linked to several Norwegian research units. In addition, several research institutions in the South that receive Norad support collaborate with Norwegian research units. (The funding for Norwegian development research is difficult to estimate in this case.) It should also be added that MFA sponsors several programmes through multilateral channels, e.g. CGIAR, WHO, UNRISD and WIDER – of which some funds end up at Norwegian research units. In sum, there is a variety of bilateral and multilateral funding from which Norwegian researchers might benefit. Much of this research, however, is expected to fall outside the focus of development research as defined for this evaluation.

To summarise, Norad plays three different roles in relation to development research: providing the Ministry and the embassies with policy relevant knowledge and information, contributing to more long-term competence building and research in the field by sponsoring RCN programmes, and contributing to competence building for research in LDCs by sponsoring the NUFU programme. RCN, on the other hand, supports independent researcher-initiated projects within the field as well as more relevance-driven thematic programmes.

Unfortunately the Evaluation Committee has not been able to obtain any key figures for Norad's and MFA's involvement in development research. However, the Committee has been informed that Norad is presently evaluating its funding measures, including the framework agreements, and that a project giving some overall figures for Norad's research activities is said to be published shortly.

2.2 Overview of the Norwegian research communities and selection of units for review

The mapping survey

In order to obtain a broad, initial overview of the research units, personnel and disciplines involved with development research in Norway, and to be able to select units to participate in the evaluation, a questionnaire was sent to 158 research units that could have relevant research activities. (The questionnaire is found in Appendix 3; see below for how the list of respondents was compiled.)

Main findings

- According to the survey, Norwegian development research is conducted at 76 different units – the majority of these (60 percent) are located at universities.
- The amount of development research at these units varies from under NOK 1 million to over NOK 100 million during the period 2001-2005 (in total for the period).

- Measured in terms of personnel, the amount varies from 0 to 25 permanent, senior-level staff members who devote a substantial part of their research time to development research. In total, 64 research units report having such senior-level staff members. On average, these units each have 4.4 permanent, senior-level staff members in the field (15 units have more than 5). In total, the units reported 283 permanent and 98 temporary senior-level staff members who devote a substantial part of their research time to development research.
- The correlation between the amount of financial resources and staff size is low, indicating that the amount of development research is difficult to measure.
- The research is funded by a diverse set of sources, including institutional core funding, grants from research agencies/programmes, and commissioned research with or without tender competitions.
- Of those reporting some external funding, 30 percent have received funding from UN agencies, 26 from the World Bank and 26 from the EU Framework Programme. In total, 90 percent reported some kind of external funding.
- When indicating the scholarly disciplines involved, the majority of units list social sciences or a combination of social sciences and other disciplinary areas.

Results in more detail

Of the158 research units invited to participate in the survey to map Norwegian development research, 123 replied (Table 2.5). In total, 76 units replied that they "perform research aimed at understanding development for less developed countries" (Table 2.6).

Table 2.5 Mapping survey: Response rates by sector/type of unit, percentages

Sector	No reply	Replied*	N
University	19.0	81.0	84
State university college	27.8	72.2	18
Specialised university institution	28.6	71.4	7
Research institute	26.8	73.2	41
Other	12.5	87.5	8
All units, percent	24.1	75.9	158
All units, counts	35	**123**	158

Notes: In addition to the first e-mail with information about the evaluation and link to the survey, two reminders were sent the units.
*Including partially completed questionnaires

Table 2.6 Mapping survey: Does your institution/unit perform research aimed at understanding development for less developed countries? Replies by sector, frequencies

Sector	Yes	No	No answer	Total
University	46	18	4	68
State university college	5	8	0	13
Specialised university institution	3	2	0	5
Research institute	19	10	1	30
Other	3	3	1	7
Total	76	41	6	123

Source: Survey sent to 158 Norwegian research units, of which 123 responded and 117 replied to this question.

Table 2.7 shows the replies to the question about research aimed at understanding development for LDCs in combination with the answer to the question about total expenses on "development research" during the past five years. There are some inconsistencies in the replies. Five units claim not to conduct research aimed at understanding development for LDCs, but still have expenses on "development research" above NOK 1 million. This may indicate that the terms "development research" and "research aimed at understanding development for LDCs" by some respondents were interpreted differently.

Table 2.7 Consistency in replies to mapping survey: Performance of research aimed at understanding development for LDCs by total expenses on "development research". Frequencies

Total expenses on "development research" estimated total 2001-2005:	Does your institution/unit perform research aimed at understanding development for LDCs?			
	Yes	No	No answer	Total
Under NOK 1 million	9	8		17
NOK 1 to 4 million	24	4	2	30
NOK 5 to 9 million	19		1	20
NOK 10 to 19 million	13			13
NOK 20 to 49 million	6			6
Over NOK 100 million	5	1		6
No answer		28	3	31
Total	76	41	6	123

Source: Survey sent to 158 Norwegian research units, of which 123 responded. As shown in the table, 3 of the 123 units did not reply to either of the two questions in the table.

Table 2.8 shows the funding sources for the respondents' "development research". In total, 70 percent of the respondents reported that they have institutional core funding, 84 percent have grants from research agencies, 49 percent have commissioned research without tender competitions, 22 percent have commissioned research obtained through tender competitions, and 10 percent have funding from other sources (e.g. donations).

There is some variation among the different types of institutions. All the state university colleges and specialised university institutions have institutional core funding for their development research, whereas only 44 percent of the research institutes and 76 percent of the university units have institutional core funding for such research. Moreover, a lower

proportion of the state university colleges and specialised university institutions have RCN grants for this research. Thirty-three percent of the specialised university institutions and 50 percent of the state university colleges reported that they have grants from research agencies, whereas 93 percent of the university units and 83 percent of the research institutes reported having such grants. (Note that very few state university colleges and specialised university institutions replied to the survey.)

Table 2.8 Mapping survey: Funding sources for "development research", by type of research unit. Percentages of the units that reply that their research is funded by the various sources.

Funding source	University	State university college	Specialised university institution	Research institute	Other	Total
Institutional core funding	75.6	100.0	100.0	44.4	66.7	69.9
Grants from research agencies (domestic or foreign research councils/programmes)	93.3	50.0	33.3	83.3	33.3	83.6
Commissioned research without tender competitions	46.7	25.0		72.2	33.3	49.3
Commissioned research obtained through tender competitions	15.6	25.0		38.9	33.3	21.9
Other sources (e.g. donations)	11.1	50.0				9.6
N	45	4	3	18	3	73

Source: Survey to 158 Norwegian research units. The question about funding sources was posed to the 73 units that answered that they do conduct "research aimed at understanding development for less developed countries" (and to the six units that did not reply to this question) and reported total expenses for "development research" during 2001-2005 over NOK 1 million (or left this question open). All 73 units answered this question.

Table 2.9 shows the specific external funding sources. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents with external sources reported that they have RCN grants, 77 percent have funding from Norad, 44 percent have funding from MFA, 30 percent have funding from UN agencies, 26 percent have funding from the EU Framework Programme, 26 percent have funding from the World Bank, and 30 percent reported funding from other external sources.[7]

[7] Including: Areopagos; Chinese Research Academy of Environmental Sciences; Ford Foundation; Swiss government; Canadian government; the International Labour Organization (ILO); Social Science Research Council, USA; Rockefeller; World Food Program; FORUT - Campaign for Development and Solidarity; Nye Kripos; International Social Science Council; the Dutch Foreign Office; Danish International Development Assistance (Danida); Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida); Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ); European Science Foundation (ESF); Fritt Ord; Norsk Hydro; Statoil; Ministry of Education; Ministry of Agriculture and Food; Ministry of Health, Ministry of Justice; Ministry of Environment; China State Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA); Norwegian Programme for Development, Research and Education (NUFU); The Soros-Tifa Foundation, South Africa Research Council; the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and CGIAR institutions such as CIFOR, ICRAF and ILRI.

Table 2.9 Mapping survey: External funding sources for "development research" by type of research unit. Percentages of the units that reply that their research is funded by the various sources.

Funding source	University	State university college	Specialised university institution	Research institute	Other	Total
The Research Council of Norway	88.4	100.0	100.0	83.3	100.0	87.9
The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs	37.2	66.7		55.6	100.0	43.9
Norad	74.4	100.0		83.3	100.0	77.3
The EU Framework Programme	27.9			27.8		25.8
UN agencies	25.6			44.4	100.0	30.3
The World Bank	16.3			50.0	100.0	25.8
Other external sources	30.2		100.0	33.3		30.3
N	43	3	1	18	1	66

Source: Survey to 158 Norwegian research units. The question about external funding sources was posed to the 66 units who answered that they do conduct "research aimed at understanding development for less developed countries" (and to the six units who did not reply to this question) and reported total expenses for "development research" during 2001-2005 over NOK 1 million (or left this question open), and responded that they have some non-core funding for their development research (Table 2.8). All 66 units answered this question.

Table 2.6 shows that there is a large number of researchers who spend a substantial part of their research time on development research. In total, the units reported that they employ 283 permanent staff members and 98 non-permanent staff members with doctoral level competence who conduct such research. A large majority are employed at universities (154 permanent and 82 temporary).

Table 2.10 Mapping survey: Senior-level staff members who spend a substantial part of their research time on development research. Survey replies by type of institution.

Unit category		Permanent senior staff	Temporary senior staff
University	Sum	154	82
	Mean	3,6	2,8
	N	43	29
State university college	Sum	10	2
	Mean	3,3	1,0
	N	3	2
Specialised university institution	Sum	4	1
	Mean	2,0	0,5
	N	2	2
Research institute	Sum	97	12
	Mean	5,7	1,2
	N	17	10
Other	Sum	18	1
	Mean	9,0	1,0
	N	2	1
Total	**Sum**	**283**	**98**
	Mean	**4,2**	**2,2**
	N	**67**	**44**

Source: Survey to 158 Norwegian research units. The questions about senior-level staff were posed to the 73 units who answered that they do conduct "research aimed at understanding development for less developed countries" (and to the six units who did not reply to this question) and reported total expenses for "development research" during 2001-2005 over NOK 1 million (or left this question open). 67 of the 73 units answered the question about permanent staff and 44 answered the question about temporary staff. "No replies" are not included in the calculations, whereas responses that the unit has no staff in the category are included in the calculations.

The units were asked to indicate the most important thematic areas of their development research (up to three areas) and, if applicable, the scholarly disciplines involved. A wide

rage of thematic areas was indicated, e.g.: democratisation, conflict resolution, foreign investment and industrial development, ethics, climate, environment, energy, agriculture, fisheries, health and education.

When indicating the scholarly disciplines involved, most research units listed social sciences. Thirty of the 52 units that replied to this question listed social sciences only (Table 2.7). Seven units listed natural and/or medical sciences, whereas 6 listed a combination of social and natural sciences.

Table 2.11 Scholarly disciplines involved in development research. Research units' replies to mapping survey, counts.

Disciplinary areas	University	State university college	Specialised university institution	Research institute	Other	Total
Social sciences	18	2	1	8	1	30
Humanities	1	0	0	0	0	1
Natural and medical sciences	7	0	0	0	0	7
Social sciences and humanities	3	0	0	0	0	3
Social and natural /medical sciences	4	0	0	2	0	6
Social sciences, humanities and natural/medical sciences	2	0	0	0	0	2
Other	1	0	1	1	0	3
Total	**36**	**2**	**2**	**11**	**1**	**52**

Source: Survey to 158 Norwegian research units. The question about scholarly disciplines involved in the units' development research was posed to the 73 units who answered that they do conduct "research aimed at understanding development for less developed countries" (and to the six units who did not reply to this question) and reported total expenses for "development research" during 2001-2005 over NOK 1 million (or left this question open).

Note: The table shows the number of research units in each category. In total, 52 units replied to the question.

The selected research units

RCN had suggested an evaluation of units with total expenses for development research over NOK 1 million during the period 2001-2005. Table 2.12 shows that six of the units responded that they spend more than NOK 1 million on such research, but that they have no senior researchers who spend a substantial part of their time on development research. It would therefore not be meaningful to evaluate these as research units with development research as a substantial activity. Moreover, the low correlation between expenses and number of researchers (Table 2.12) indicates that the amount of development research is difficult to measure and that both expenses and number of researchers need to be taken into account when assessing a units' amount of development research. One of the units with total expenses between NOK 5 and 9 million has more than 15 researchers in the area; another unit in this category has no researchers in the area.

Table 2.12 Answers to mapping survey: Relationship between expenses on "development research" and number of senior researchers in development research

Total expenses for "development research"	Total number of senior researchers in the area*					Total
	0	1-4	5-9	10-15	Over 15	
NOK 1 to 4 million	5	15	4	0	0	24
NOK 5 to 9 million	1	11	7	0	1	20
NOK 10 to 19 million	0	3	6	4	0	13
NOK 20 to 49 million	0	2	1	3	0	6
Over NOK 100 million	0	0	0	3	2	5
Total	6	31	18	10	3	68

Source: Survey to 158 Norwegian research units. The questions about senior-level staff were posed to the 73 units who answered that they do conduct "research aimed at understanding development for less developed countries" (and to the six units who did not reply to this question) and reported total expenses for "development research" during 2001-2005 over NOK 1 million (or left this question open).

Notes: The table shows the number of research units in each category. In total, 68 of the 73 units replied to the question. *Sum of permanent and temporary researchers with doctoral level competence.

The final decision about which units to include was left to the discretion of the Evaluation Committee, and the units' research orientation in relation to the RCN definition of development research (as restricted by the Terms of Reference) was one of the major criteria. The evaluation includes all units that replied to the survey and seemed to have a minimum amount of activity (in terms of funding and staffing) within development research as defined in the Terms of Reference. In all, 28 units (Table 2.13) were invited to participate in the evaluation by filling in a self-assessment report. These reports were submitted by all of the invited units, although some of the reports were only partially completed.

Table 2.13 Research units included in the evaluation

Departments/research units at universities and university colleges
NTNU: Department of Geography
NTNU: Department of Economics
UiB: Comparative Research Programme on Poverty
UiB: Department of Comparative Politics
UiB: Department of Social Anthropology
UiB: Centre for Development Studies*
UiO: Department of Archaeology, Conservation and Historical Studies
UiO: Department of Sociology and Human Geography
UiO: Department of Political Science
UiO: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights
UiO: Institute for Educational Research
UiO: Department of Social Anthropology
UiO: The Centre for Development and the Environment
UiO: Department of Economics
UiS: Department of Media, Culture and Social Sciences
UiT: Department of Social Anthropology
UiT: Department of Sociology
UMB: Department of Economics and Resource Management
UMB: Noragric
HiAgder: Dept. of Economics and Business Administration/Institute of Development Studies
NHH - Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration
Independent research institutes
CMI - Chr. Michelsen Institute
Fafo Institute for Applied International Studies
FNI - Fridtjof Nansen Institute
NIBR - Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research
NINA - Norwegian Institute for Nature Research
NUPI - Norwegian Institute of International Affairs
PRIO - International Peace Research Institute

* The activities of the (former) Centre for Development Studies has been reorganised, and as of January 2007 is part of Unifob global.

The amount of, and focus on, development research at the selected units varies substantially. Several of the units have only one permanent senior-level staff member who devotes more than half of his/her research time to development research, whereas the largest unit (CMI) has 28 such senior-level staff members (see Table 3.6, size in terms of funding is shown in Table 3.11). This means that this evaluation has been considerably more inclusive than previous RCN field evaluations when selecting the units to be reviewed. The reason for this is related to the special features of this evaluation: it is the first "non-disciplinary" field evaluation conducted by RCN; there was no prior overview of the development research performed in Norway; development research is conducted by many different research communities and research disciplines; there are many "part-time workers" in the field; and to be able to address the tasks of the Terms of Reference, a broad overview of the field was needed.

Are any major research units not included?

As explained in Section 1.4, there are some uncertainties related to the identification of units with substantial activity within development research. In a further attempt to identify any major units that were not included, the Committee also tried to gain an overview of the Norwegian research units' publishing activity in international development research journals. Sixty-three ISI-indexed journals that publish research relevant to development were identified, and articles with Norwegian author-addresses were found in 47 of these (in

the period 1991-2005, see Table 6.2). When comparing the main institutions/units that prevail in the analysis with the units selected for the evaluation, we find that the selected units also emerge as the major units when measured by publications in international development research journals (see Table 2.14). It should be kept in mind that the sample covers a limited selection of journals and that a significant amount of development research is published in other journals, (see Box 6.1).

There are still six units not included in the evaluation that have published more than five articles in the development research journals that were examined for the period 1991-2005:

- SSB - Statistics Norway (14)
- SNF - Institute for Research in Economics and Business Administration (11)
- CICERO (6)
- Dept. of Ecology and Natural Resource Management at UMB (6)
- Dept. of Sociology and Political Science at NTNU (8)
- Dept. of Economics at UiB (6)

Moreover, some of the research units included in the evaluation have published very few articles in the journals examined. (Because exact institutional affiliation is not registered for some of the articles from the higher education institutions, exact numbers are not available, cf. the "unspecified address" category in the table below.) However, all six units listed above were included in the initial mapping survey, and based on their answers their activities were found to be less relevant for the evaluation than the activities of the selected units. Moreover, all the units that did not reply negatively[8] to the question of whether their unit conducted research aimed at understanding development for less developed countries were *sent an additional request* – a letter from RCN asking them to list their major researchers who conduct development research and their major publications within the field during the past five years (up to 10 researchers and 3 publications per researcher). This request yielded no response, which should indicate that the institutions not selected for this evaluation conduct little research in the field.

[8] That is, replied "yes" or left the question open.

Table 2.14 Articles with Norwegian author-addresses in a selection of development related ISI-indexed journals 1991-2005, number of articles by author institution

Research unit	1991-1995	1996-2000	2001-2005	1991-2005
Included units at universities and university colleges				
UMB: Department of Economics and Resource Management**	0	6	15	21
NHH - Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration	7	3	5	15
NTNU: Department of Economics	1	2	9	12
UMB: Noragric	0	2	9	11
UiO: Department of Economics	0	5	6	11
UiO: The Centre for Development and the Environment	2	5	4	11
UiO: Department of Sociology and Human Geography	1	2	7	10
UiO: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights	1	4	2	7
UiO: Department of Political Science	0	2	4	6
UiO: Department of Social Anthropology	0	0	3	3
UiO: Institute for Educational Research	1	1	1	3
UiB: Department of Social Anthropology	2	0	0	2
NTNU: Department of Geography	0	0	1	1
UiB: Comparative Research Programme on Poverty	0	0	1	1
UiB: Centre for Development Studies	0	0	1	1
UiB: Department of Comparative Politics	0	1	0	1
Unspecified units at included universities and university colleges*				
UiO: Unspecified address	2	5	3	10
UMB Unspecified address	0	3	5	8
NTNU: Unspecified address	0	3	4	7
UiT: Unspecified address	2	0	1	3
UiS: Unspecified address	0	0	2	2
HiAgder: Unspecified address	0	1	1	2
UiB Unspecified address	0	1	0	1
Omitted units at universities and university colleges				
UiO: Omitted units (11 with less than 5 reg articles)	7	3	8	18
UMB: Omitted units (8 with less than 7 reg articles)	1	1	15	17
NTNU: Dept. of Sociology and Political Science	0	3	5	8
UiB: Dept. of Economics	1	2	3	6
UiB: Other omitted units (6 with less than 3 reg articles)	2	0	4	6
HiOslo	0	2	3	5
UiT: Other omitted units (3 with less than 3 reg articles)	1	1	2	4
NTNU Other omitted units (3 with less than 3 reg articles)	2	1	1	4
UiT: Dept. of Economics	0	0	2	2
UiS: Omitted unit	0	0	1	1
Other Omitted institutions (3 with less than 4 reg articles)	0	2	5	7
Included institutes				
CMI - Chr. Michelsen Institute	7	6	10	23
PRIO - International Peace Research Institute	1	4	17	22
NINA - Norwegian Institute for Nature Research	0	2	4	6
FNI - Fridtjof Nansen Institute	2	3	1	6
NUPI - Norwegian Institute of International Affairs	1	0	4	5
Fafo	0	1	2	3
NIBR - Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research	0	0	1	1
Omitted institutes				
SSB - Statistics Norway	0	11	3	14
SNF - Institute for Research in Economics and Business Administration	0	4	7	11
CICERO	0	2	4	6
Other omitted institutes (15 institutes with less than 4 reg articles)	0	8	16	24
Other sectors				
Government units and humanitarian organisations (5 units)	2	1	2	5
Private/commercial sector (ECON, Interconsult Int. and Prevista)	0	0	4	4
Total	**46**	**103**	**208**	**357**

Notes: Articles, notes and review articles in development related journals are included (list of journals in Appendix 5). Articles with authors from multiple Norwegian institutions are counted once for each registered institution. Not including co-authorships, the number of articles is 288, not 357.
* "Unspecified" implies that these articles may come from any unit at the institution.
**For this unit we have also included articles with the author address "Dept Econ & Social Sci" after checking that this name did not correspond with any official unit name at UMB and that the articles had author names which appeared on the personnel list we received from the Department of Economics and Resource Management.

2.3 The thematic areas and disciplines involved

One of the items in the self-assessment report dealt with the thematic orientation of the units' development research. The respondents were presented with four thematic areas and asked to identify in which of these areas their research could be placed (see Table 2.15). The responses to this question comprise the main basis of this section. The specificity of the answers provided differed, although the majority offered helpful information. There are two problems with the data. One is that some institutions reported broad programmatic orientations while others listed individual projects. The other problem is that the boundaries between the four categories are inevitably arbitrary, and some respondents had difficulty placing their research activities into just one box. This is almost inevitable since a great deal of development research is interdisciplinary and thus tends to transcend boundaries not only between individual academic disciplines but also between broader thematic boundaries such as those used here.

In order to deal with these problems, it has been necessary to check the information provided in response to this question against additional information listed in the self-assessment reports, e.g. lists of publications. It has also been necessary to do some editing in order to clarify obscurities. With these checks in place, the following picture of the respondents' main research orientations emerges:

Table 2.15 Number of respondents active in the various thematic areas

Thematic Area	Number of research units
Resource Management (Natural Resource Management; Global and Regional Governance for Sustainable Development; Environmental Values and Social Change; Agricultural Development & Livelihood Security, and similar topics)	17
Rights, Security and Democracy (Rights, Conflicts & Resources; Rights and Development; Security and Peace Studies; Governance; Democratisation; Decentralisation, and similar topics)	19
Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction (Development Economics and Development Geography including: Rural-urban Relations, Small Town Development; Technology and Entrepreneurship; Small Business Development, and similar topics)	17
Culture and Gender (Cultural Studies; Gender and Development; Indigenous Peoples; Internal Displacement and Migration, and similar topics)	16
Other topics in development research	9*

Source: Self-assessment reports from the 25 research units which answered this question.
Note: *This figure includes 9 units that filled in projects under this heading in the self-assessment report. We found that all the projects listed could be related to one or more of the above categories. The next table shows the Evaluation Committee's categorisation of the projects without the "Other" category.

With the exception of a slightly stronger concentration in the area of "Rights, Security and Democracy", the development research conducted by the evaluated units is quite evenly distributed among the four themes.

Of the 28 respondents in the self-assessment survey, seven are independent research institutes, four are centres or programmes at universities, and 17 are regular academic departments. The departments of economics and political science are generally more specialized than the departments of sociology and geography. Anthropology is mixed.

Even among the institutes there is variation. The Fridtjof Nansen Institute and the Norwegian Institute of Nature Research (NINA) are quite focused on one thematic area, while the other five independent institutes are extensively involved in at least three of the four areas.

Many of the programmes or projects listed in the self-assessment reports include the words "poverty" or "peace". Since 2005, poverty and peace have been the focus of a major research funding programme at RCN, but the interest in these two important development research themes predates the new programme. A more detailed list of all the research activities under each thematic heading is presented in the table below.

Table 2.16 Research topics of the research units/institutions reviewed

A. Resource Management

I. Biodiversity
- Conservation
- "Peoples and parks"
- Bioprospecting
- Intellectual property rights

II. Climate Change
- Alternatives to the Kyoto Protocol
- Climate change and poverty
- Clean Development Mechanism
- Shifting impacts of El Nino

III. Land, Water and People
- Relationship between water and poverty
- River basin management
- Fisheries (freshwater, marine)
- Drylands
- Forest management

IV. Environmental Governance
- Role of the United Nations
- Adaptation strategies of local peoples
- Natural resources, conflict and economic growth

B. Rights, Security and Democracy

I. Democratisation
- Corruption, governance and development aid
- Taxation, aid and democracy
- Human rights, democracy and legitimacy
- Democratisation processes
- Social movements
- Global trade union strategies
- Minorities in a globalised world
- Human rights in China

II. Role of the State
- Poverty, human rights and the state
- Corruption, crime and political reforms
- State formation and the politics of regime survival
- State failure
- Decentralisation and local governments
- Human rights and citizenship
- Role of courts
- Role of ICT in national development
- Role of international development assistance
- History of Norwegian Development Assistance
- Global child programme
- HIV/AIDS programmes and decentralised governance

III. Conflict and Peace
- Globalisation and marginalisation
- Forced migration and displacement of people
- Conflict resolution
- Peace building
- Geography of armed conflicts
- Health effects of civil wars
- Human rights in conflicts – the role of civil society

C. Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction

I. Trade and Finance
- Trade and industrialisation
- Regional economic integration
- Effects of economic liberalisation on agriculture and industry
- Role of multilateral lending
- Trade policy
- World Trade Organisation
- Micro credit
- Women in border trade

II. Poverty
- Demography of poverty
- Land markets and poverty
- Globalisation and inequality
- Effects of global food trade on poverty
- Politics of poverty
- Best practices in poverty reduction
- Poverty production
- Impact of infectious diseases on poverty
- Forest income and poverty
- Child malnutrition

III. Urbanisation
- Urbanisation and development
- Entrepreneurship and business development
- Role of small towns in development
- Migration and entrepreneurs
- Slum dwellers in India
- Remittances and development
- Internal migration

D. Culture, Education and Gender

I. Indigenous Peoples
- Poverty and indigenous people
- Marginalisation of indigenous people
- Indigenous organisations
- Local knowledge systems
- Rights of minorities and indigenous peoples
- Indian Ocean Programme

II. Gender
- Reconceptualising gender in a globalised world
- Gender and rights
- Women's land rights
- Human trafficking
- Female and child soldiers
- Women in international peacekeeping
- Urbanisation and gender
- Gender perspectives on political participation and leadership

III. Cultural Identity and Education
- Politics, identity and culture
- Education and Languages
- Honour, respect, and self-respect in South Indian villages

Source: Answers from the 25 research units which listed projects in their self-assessment reports.

Notes: The table provides a map of the general distribution of research topics according to the principal categories used in this evaluation. The "coding" is done by the Evaluation Committee based on the information provided by the various institutions – this information was sometimes general rather than specific, making it difficult to understand the full content of a programme or project. Moreover, it should be noted that lists like this are never complete, but change as researchers embark on new projects and complete others. However, the list should be fairly representative of the major topics listed in the self-assessment reports.

A closer look at this long and varied list of research topics and themes suggests that there is a concentration on issues that relate to *governance* (corruption, decentralisation, courts, human rights and related institutional issues), *marginalisation* (forced migration and displacement of people, exploitation of indigenous peoples, effects of global trade, rights of minorities), *natural resources* (relationship between land, water and people, management of natural resources, and local responses to environmental vulnerabilities) and *gender* (rights issues, effects of involvement in conflicts, women's political participation). The Committee notes that global health issues will be researched in greater detail in the future.

Changes and balances

The units in this evaluation were also asked to comment on possible changes in their research orientation. On the one hand, such changes may be affected by struggling to obtain a balance between researcher-initiated research and commissioned research. On the other hand, changes in orientation may be affected by ambitions and difficulties concerning interdisciplinary research.[9] It is difficult to extract general conclusions/information from these parts of the self-assessment reports. In most cases, these items have been left blank, or only sporadically filled in, possibly indicating only limited interest in these topics. This seems to be more often the case for the smaller units or those units with only a limited amount of development research to report on. In general, however, it may be concluded that the issues raised by these questions are not regarded as the most serious problems, and if problems do arise, the institutions are generally able to handle them. This conclusion contrasts somewhat with interviews conducted with some of the stakeholders (see Chapter 7 for further elaboration on this point).

Commissioned research is not seen as a threat, as most institutions report that they primarily conduct researcher-initiated research, or that when they undertake commissioned research, this is accepted as fitting into a longer term researcher agenda. Exceptions to this situation are found at the institutions that are more or less obliged to generate income from commissioned research, such as Noragric, CMI (and to a lesser extent SUM). Changes in research themes and/or directions in research seem to occur more as a result of changing international scenarios and priorities, new opportunities that arise, or simply through the recruitment of new researchers to the units. Commissioned research per se is not a problem. Rather, it may provide insights and data that are otherwise difficult to access. With regard to problems associated with inter-disciplinarity these are generally not seen as pushing researchers into a new and unwanted research orientation, rather to the contrary.

---

[9] Questions in the self-assessment reports concerning interdisciplinarity are dealt with in Section 2.4, and questions on funding are addressed in Section 3.2.

2.4 Interactions: Interdisciplinary and cross-institutional collaboration

Interdisciplinarity[10]

Most institutions do recognise the importance of interdisciplinarity in development research, or at least that development issues need to be addressed beyond the boundaries of a single discipline. However, conducting interdisciplinary development research is reported to be more demanding on institutions, particularly those which have interdisciplinarity as an explicit ambition or priority or which regard interdisciplinarity as their comparative advantage. Such demands include:

- *Individual issues and the disciplinary backgrounds of individuals:* Problems of motivation and personal ambition
- *Institutional or organisational requirements:* Interdisciplinary research requires conscious and specific organisational arrangements, such as theme-based research groups
- *Aspects related to methodology:* Difficulties in handling various methodologies and traditions

In one case, problems associated with interdisciplinarity had led to abandoning interdisciplinarity as a stated ambition, and instead focused on "cross-disciplinarity", e.g. the interaction/communication/collaboration across disciplines – but with more emphasis on interaction than close cooperation, such as in teams that conduct field work together.

Generally, conducting interdisciplinary research is demanding in terms of time and other resources, and it requires a committed and devoted effort. In some cases, researchers may fear that their academic careers are at risk or more generally perceive that interdisciplinary research entails low professional recognition, but this was not seen as a widespread danger.

When asked about the potential challenge of gaining acceptance from mainstream disciplinary researchers, no general concern about being the "outsiders" appears, although some of the institutes voiced some frustration in this regard.

It was emphasised that interdisciplinarity builds on, rather than serves as a substitute for, solid disciplinary training/disciplinary backgrounds. A typical view within the academic institutions was that one should prevent development research from becoming separate from the traditional disciplines, which is also important from a methodological standpoint. It was noted that a sound disciplinary-based foundation remains a fundamental precondition for sound participation in "multidisciplinary" research.

---

[10] For the purposes of the present report, we have seen no reason to distinguish between different kinds of multi- and interdisciplinary research (nor do we have data for such distinctions), and the term interdisciplinary research here denotes research activities that involve more than one discipline or to varying degrees transcend disciplinary boundaries. That is, research that in the literature may be defined

Cross-institutional collaboration

The units in this evaluation were also asked about cooperation between the universities, university colleges, and independent research institutes. It seems to be a common view that the research community is fragmented and consists of many small milieus. Moreover, there is a problematic relationship between strong, discipline-based milieus at the universities and the institute sector. One comment was that there are too many "one-man shows" (i.e. small research groups below the viability level) in too many different locations. At least the academic institutions felt that there was a need for more basic university research rather than applied research. It was also felt that the funding structure does not encourage collaboration and that the research groups compete instead for the same pot of money. However, some also felt that such competition was positive and natural. There are some examples of functioning collaboration, e.g. in Bergen, but this is hard to replicate on a national basis. It was noted that it was easy to obtain network funding but difficult to obtain funding for joint projects. It was felt that it is of some importance to avoid overlap, but that international contacts are still more important than national collaboration.

When asked to list their research collaborators and competitors, a somewhat different picture emerged. Most of the academic units (higher education sector) report to have project collaboration or co-authorship with at least one independent institute, and most of the institutes report to have such collaboration with at least one academic unit. On average, the academic units report to collaborate with 1.9 domestic academic units and 1.3 institutes. The institutes, on the other hand, report to collaborate with 1.3 domestic academic units and 1.5 institutes.

When using other data sources, we find a notable amount of collaboration as well. Of the ISI-indexed articles within development research, 28 percent of the institute sector's contributions are co-authored with universities, and 17 percent of the universities' contributions are co-authored with the institute sector.[11]

This should indicate that the "sector divide" is not a major hindrance to collaboration. Nor does it seem to be an obstacle to competition. When listing their main competitors for research grants, qualified staff, commissioned research and consultancy work, the academic units listed on average 1.8 academic units and 2 institutes. The institutes listed on average 1 academic unit and 2.2 institutes. (They could list up to five.) This should indicate that the competition is somewhat greater within the institute sector. On the other hand, competition does not seem to be a major, impenetrable obstacle to cooperation. Most of the

---

as multi-disciplinary, cross-disciplinary, inter-disciplinary or trans-disciplinary, is here all denoted interdisciplinary.

[11] These also include some contributions from authors with institutional affiliations in both sectors. The correct notion would be: articles with an author address at a Norwegian higher education institution which also have one or more author-addresses at a Norwegian independent institute, and vice versa. Note that the figures include all "Norwegian" articles – regardless of whether or not an author at one of the research units selected for this evaluation contributed. For explication of the data, see Box 6.1 (Chapter 6).

respondents reported that they collaborate with their competitors. Only two units (both of them within the higher education sector) reported that they do not collaborate with any of their most important competitors. It should be noted, however, that only 14 of the 28 units answered the question about competitors.

It should also be noted that the general picture that emerges from the lists of collaborators is that Norwegian development research engages more often in international rather than domestic project collaboration (Section 3.3). On the other hand, very few respondents mentioned any foreign institutions when listing their five most important competitors – indicating that they mainly compete for domestic staff and domestically sponsored projects.

2.5 Summary of main observations

Major funding sources for Norwegian development research

- RCN programmes and Norad funding are the major domestic funding sources for Norwegian development research.
- Norad holds three different roles in relation to development research: providing the Ministry and embassies with policy-relevant knowledge and information, contributing to more long-term competence building and research in the field by sponsoring RCN programmes, and contributing to competence building for research in LDCs by sponsoring the NUFU programme. RCN, on the other hand, supports independent researcher-initiated projects within the field as well as more relevance-driven thematic programmes.
- When comparing the RCN open calls for proposals (FRIMUF) to the amounts allocated through RCN's programme calls, the share of funding available for independent researcher-initiated projects seems quite small.
- Based on those RCN programmes for which we have data, institutions in Bergen and Oslo are the major recipients of grants.

Mapping of Norwegian research communities

- To gain an overview of the research units active in development research in Norway, and to select research units for the evaluation, a questionnaire was sent to 158 presumably relevant research units.
- According to the survey, Norwegian development research is conducted at 76 different units – the majority of these (60 percent) are located at universities. The amount of development research varies from under NOK 1 million to over NOK 100 million per unit for the (total) period 2001-2005. However, the correlation between the amount of financial resources and staff size is low, and the amount of development research is difficult to measure. One of the units with total expenses between NOK 5 and 9 million has more than 15 researchers in the area; another unit in this category has no researchers in the area.

- In total, 64 research units reported having permanent senior-level staff members who devote a substantial part of their research time to development research. On average, these units each have 4.4 permanent, senior-level staff members in the field. Fifteen units have more than 5 senior-level staff members.

The thematic areas and disciplines

- The research topics of the units in this evaluation are quite evenly distributed among four overall thematic areas (with a slightly stronger representation of area B):
  - A: Resource Management
  - B: Rights, Security and Democracy
  - C: Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction
  - D: Culture, Education and Gender
- Research themes change as a result of changing international scenarios and priorities, new opportunities that arise, or simply through the recruitment of new researchers. Commissioned research does not foster such changes, according to the units reviewed.

Interdisciplinary and cross-institutional collaboration

- A typical view within the academic institutions was that development research should be prevented from becoming separate from the traditional disciplines. It was noted that a sound disciplinary-based foundation remains a fundamental precondition for sound participation in interdisciplinary research. When asked about the potential challenge of gaining acceptance from mainstream disciplinary researchers, no general concern about being the "outsiders" was reported, although some of the institutes voiced some frustration in this regard. Development economists, on the other hand, felt that they were *part of* the mainstream.
- When asked to list their research collaborators and competitors, the academic units on average reported that they collaborate with 1.9 domestic academic units and 1.3 institutes. The institutes, on the other hand, reported engaging in collaboration with 1.3 domestic academic units and 1.5 institutes on average. This should indicate that the "sector divide" is not a major hindrance to collaboration. Moreover, competition does not seem to be an impenetrable obstacle to cooperation. Most of the respondents reported that they collaborate with their competitors.

3 Resources and framework conditions

This chapter is based on information provided in the self-assessment reports from the 28 selected research units/institutions. Section 3.1 analyses the characteristics of the research personnel, and Section 3.2 analyses the research funding. Section 3.3 examines international networks and resources, whereas Section 3.4 addresses competence building activities.

3.1 Personnel in development research

In total, 492 researchers were listed in the self-assessment reports, distributed on sectors as shown in Table 3.1. Of these, 320 researchers were reported to conduct more than half of their research within development research. Moreover, an additional 32 researchers were reported to spend about 40-50 percent of their research time on development research. Ninety-four researchers were reported to conduct less than half of their research within development research. Information is lacking for 46 of the 492 researchers.

Table 3.1 Personnel within development research, number of researchers in evaluated units by sector and involvement in development research

Degree of involvement in development research and affiliation to the reviewed unit	Higher education sector	Institute sector	Total
Number of researchers listed who conduct more than half of their research within development research:			
No information provided	45	1	46
"No" (less than half within development research)	57	37	94
40-50 percent within development research	21	11	32
"Yes" (more than half within development research)	178	142	320
Total number of researchers listed in the self-assessment reports	301	191	492
Of "Yes":			
Personnel whose main position is located at the unit under review	150	115	265
Personnel employed in a main position at the unit under review for at least 3 of the 5 years during 2001-2005	106	82	188

Source: The research units' self-assessment reports.
Notes: "Main position" includes persons who work at least 60 percent of a full-time position at the unit.
Missing information: We lack information about full-time/part-time positions for 3 of the researchers who conduct more than half of their research within development research. These 3 are not included in the figures in the two bottom lines. Some units omitted information about employment years in their self-assessment reports. In these cases, we have assumed that the researchers listed had been employed at least 3 years.

When the numbers are restricted to those researchers who work at least 60 percent of a full-time position at the units included in this evaluation, we find 265 researchers who can be said to be employed in a 'main position' and conduct the majority of their research within development research (second bottom line in Table 3.1). Most of this section focuses on an analysis of these 265 researchers. The bottom line in Table 3.1 shows that 71 percent of these 265 researchers were employed at the relevant research unit at least three of the five years under review.

In terms of the number of staff members engaged in development research, the size of the reviewed units varies considerably. 196 of the 265 researchers in a main position and with the majority of their research within development research are affiliated with seven of the

units. That is, the seven largest units account for 64 percent of these researchers, with an average of 24 researchers at each unit. The remaining 21 research units account for 36 percent of these researchers, with an average of five researchers at each unit (Table 3.2).[12] It should also be noted that whereas four of the seven largest units in this respect are research institutes and three are university units, the majority of the development researchers are affiliated with the higher education sector (150 versus 115 at the research institutes).

[12] A standard criterion for inclusion in the RCN research area evaluations has been 5-6 senior-level staff members in the research area with a primary affiliation to the research unit. In our sample, 8 of the 28 units have at least 5 'main position' senior-level staff members in the research area (with no restrictions on employment period). See Table 3.6 for the number of senior-level personnel at the units.

Table 3.2 Personnel within development research, number of researchers by unit

Research unit	Total researchers listed	More than half of research within development research				Of "Yes": Main Position at the unit	Of "Yes": Employed at the unit >2 years 2001-2005
		No info	"No"	40-50 percent	"Yes"		
NTNU: Department of Geography	27	0	1	1	25	20	12
NTNU: Department of Economics	10	0	0	0	10	8	7
UiB: Comparative Research Programme on Poverty	3	0	0	0	3	2	2
UiB: Department of Comparative Politics	7	5	0	0	2	2	2
UiB: Department of Social Anthropology	16	14	0	0	2	2	1
UiB: Centre for Development Studies	12	0	2	2	8	4	3
UiO: Department of Archaeology, Conservation and Historical Studies	5	0	1	0	4	4	2
UiO: Department of Sociology and Human Geography	13	0	0	1	12	12	7
UiO: Department of Political Science	50	0	42	7	1	1	1
UiO: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights	14	0	2	6	6	6	3
UiO: Institute for Educational Research	14	0	1	0	13	10	7
UiO: Department of Social Anthropology	16	16	0	0	0		
UiO: The Centre for Development and the Environment	28	0	4	0	24	18	14
UiO: Department of Economics	10	0	1	1	8	8	3
UiS: Department of Media, Culture and Social Sciences					0	0	0
UiT: Department of Social Anthropology	6	0	0	1	5	5	4
UiT: Department of Sociology	3	0	2	1	0	0	
UMB: Department of Economics and Resource Management	7	0	1	0	6	6	4
UMB: Noragric	42	2	0	0	40	33	26
HiAgder: Dept. of Economics and Business Administration/Institute of Development Studies	6	0	0	1	5	5	4
NHH - Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration	12	8	0	0	4	4	4
CMI - Chr. Michelsen Institute	49	0	0	2	47	35	31
Fafo: Fafo Institute for Applied International Studies	25	0	0	0	25	23	11
FNI - Fridtjof Nansen Institute	6	0	1	0	5	5	4
NIBR - Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research	12	0	0	1	11	10	8
NINA - Norwegian Institute for Nature Research	13	1	4	5	3	2	1
NUPI - Norwegian Institute of International Affairs	26	0	1	3	22	22	18
PRIO - International Peace Research Institute Oslo	60	0	31	0	29	18	9
Total number of researchers	492	46	94	32	320	265	188

Source: The research units' self-assessment reports.

Notes: "Main position" includes persons who work at least 60 percent of a full-time position at the unit. Those for which we lack information about full-time/part-time positions are not included in the two last columns. "Employed at the unit >2 years" includes only researchers who conduct more than half of their research within development research, who work at least 60 percent of a full-time position at the unit and who have been employed at the unit at least 3 of the 5 years during the period under review (2001-2005). Some units omitted information about employment years in their self-assessment reports. In these cases, we have assumed that the researchers listed had been employed at least 3 years.

When interpreting Table 3.2, it should be noted that the units filled in information about their scholarly personnel very differently. The Department of Media, Culture and Social Sciences at the University of Stavanger (UiS) did not list their researchers, but commented that very few of their staff members work on issues relevant to development research and that none have development research as more than a minor activity. Consequently, none of their staff members qualify as "development researchers". (UiS is therefore included in Table 3.2 with zero staff members who devote more than half of their time to development research). The Department of Political Science at UiO, on the other hand, listed close to all their staff members and an estimated percentage of development research for each of them. (Of the 50 researchers listed, they end up with only one "development researcher".) These

examples illustrate that the amount of information provided by the research units varies considerably.

As mentioned above, we included in the further analysis only those 265 researchers who conduct more than half of their research within development research and who are employed in a main position at one of the units included in the evaluation. In this way, the data should be comparable across units. By not including those researchers who hold part-time or secondary positions, more comparable data are obtained, and counting the same person twice is avoided.[13]

Even under these conditions, the data are somewhat incomplete. For the Department of Social Anthropology at the University of Oslo, information is lacking as to whether the 16 researchers listed conduct a major part of their research within development research (Table 3.2). Consequently, the personnel at this unit are not included in the analysis.

When examining the type of positions held by the development researchers, we find that 12 percent are professors, 11 percent are associate professors, 43 percent hold researcher positions and 28 percent hold recruit positions (PhD student/fellow or post-doctorate, Table 3.3). A substantially higher percentage of males than females hold professorships and other senior-level positions, whereas a higher percentage of females hold non-senior-level positions.

Table 3.3 Personnel within development research by position and gender, percent

Scholarly Position	Female	Male	Total
Director/Deputy Director/Head of Research	0.9	2.6	1.9
Professor	6.3	16.3	12.1
Associate Professor	9.8	11.8	10.9
Senior Researcher/Associate	16.1	24.8	21.1
Researcher	30.4	16.3	22.3
Post-doctorate	2.7	2.0	2.3
Research fellow/PhD student	29.5	22.9	25.7
Other (research assistant/adviser/teacher)	3.6	0.0	1.5
Missing information	0.9	3.3	2.3
N	**112**	**153**	**265**

Source: The research units' self-assessment reports. Figures only include scholarly personnel who conduct more than half of their research within development research and whose main position is located at one of the included units.

To examine this gender difference, the data was divided by sector – since higher education institutions and independent research institutes offer different positions – and percentages were calculated within the position categories (as opposed to percentages within gender as in the table above).

[13] 29 persons were listed by two different units, and 1 by 3 units – either because they had a secondary affiliation with one of the other units in this evaluation, or because of mobility between the units in the period under review. When restricting the analysis to the 265 researchers who conduct more than half of their research within development research and are employed in a main position at one of the included units, we only count 5 persons twice. (All five moved between full-time positions at the included units during 2001-2005.)

Table 3.4 Personnel within development research by sector, position and gender, percent

	Higher Education Sector			Institute Sector		
Position	**Female**	**Male**	**N**	**Female**	**Male**	**N**
Director/Deputy Director/Head of Research	50.0	50.0	2		100.0	3
Professor	23.3	76.7	30		100.0	2
Associate Professor	37.9	62.1	29			
Senior Researcher/Associate				32.1	67.9	56
Researcher	42.9	57.1	21	65.8	34.7	38
Research fellow/PhD student	52.5	47.5	61	14.3	85.7	7
Post-doctorate	50,0	50,0	6			
Other (research assistant/adviser/teacher)				100,0		4
Missing information		100.0	1	20.0	80.0	5
Totals (counts)	63	87	150	49	66	115

Source: The research units' self-assessment reports. Figures only include scholarly personnel who conduct more than half of their research within development research and whose main position is located at one of the included units.

Table 3.4 confirms the gender differences found in Table 3.3. A majority of the professors, associate professors and senior researchers are male. The percentage of female professors is still considerably higher than in Norwegian higher education in general. The highest percentage of females is found among non-senior researchers in the institute sector (66 percent of these are female).

From Table 3.5 we see that 85 percent of the senior-level personnel hold a doctoral degree (and all the senior-level females), whereas 29 percent of the non-senior-level personnel have obtained a doctoral degree.

Table 3.5 Percentage of personnel within development research holding a doctoral degree, by position and gender

	Senior position			Non-senior position		
	Female	**Male**	**Total**	**Female**	**Male**	**Total**
Percent with doctoral degree	100.0	78.8	85.2	24.3	33.3	28.5
N	37	85	122	74	63	137

Source: The research units' self-assessment reports. Figures only include scholarly personnel who conduct more than half of their research within development research and whose main position is located at one of the units included in the evaluation.

Missing information: We lack information about the scholarly positions of 6 staff members. These are not included in the analysis. However, for the 4 junior-level staff members for whom a scholarly degree was not registered, we assumed that they did not hold a dr.degree and included them in the calculations as such.

Note: Senior-level positions include: Director/Deputy Director/Head of Research; Professor; Associate Professor and Senior Researcher/Associate ("Forsker 1" and "Forsker 2" and the like). Non-senior-level positions include: Researcher ("Forsker 3" and similar); Post-doctorate; Research fellow/PhD student and Other (Research assistant/adviser/teacher).

Table 3.6 shows the number of senior-level and non-senior-level personnel for each of the research units, also sorted by gender. The senior-level positions are equally divided between the higher education sector and the institute sector (61 positions each), whereas there are 39 more non-senior-level development researchers in the higher education sector than in the institute sector. CMI, Noragric and NUPI are the largest units in terms of senior-level staff, whereas several other units have a substantial number of non-senior-

level positions (in particular, the Department of Geography at NTNU, the Centre for Development and the Environment at UiO, Fafo and PRIO).

Table 3.6 Personnel within development research by research unit, position and gender, frequencies

	Senior-level position			Non-senior-level position		
Research unit	**Female**	**Male**	**Total**	**Female**	**Male**	**Total**
NTNU: Department of Geography	2	2	4	7	8	15
NTNU: Department of Economics	1	2	3	3	2	5
UiB: Comparative Research Programme on Poverty	1	0	1	0	1	1
UiB: Department of Comparative Politics	0	2	2			
UiB: Department of Social Anthropology	2	0	2			
UiB: Centre for Development Studies	0	1	1	1	2	3
UiO: Department of Archaeology, Conservation and Historical Studies	2	0	2	2	0	2
UiO: Department of Sociology and Human Geography	3	2	5	5	2	7
UiO: Department of Political Science	0	1	1			
UiO: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights	0	1	1	2	3	5
UiO: Institute for Educational Research	1	0	1	6	3	9
UiO: The Centre for Development and the Environment	1	2	3	8	7	15
UiO: Department of Economics	0	3	3	2	3	5
UiT: Department of Social Anthropology	1	1	2	1	2	3
UMB: Department of Economics and Resource Management	1	4	5	1	0	1
UMB: Noragric	4	13	17	6	10	16
HiAgder: Dept. of Economics and Business Administration/Institute of Development Studies	0	5	5			
NHH - Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration	0	3	3	0	1	1
Sum higher education sector	19	42	61	44	44	88
CMI - Chr. Michelsen Institute	9	19	28	4	2	6
Fafo: Fafo Institute for Applied International Studies	3	3	6	11	2	13
FNI - Fridtjof Nansen Institute	2	1	3	1	1	2
NIBR - Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research	0	1	1	3	6	9
NINA - Norwegian Institute for Nature Research	0	1	1	0	1	1
NUPI - Norwegian Institute of International Affairs	0	15	15	3	4	7
PRIO - International Peace Research Institute Oslo	4	3	7	8	3	11
Sum institute sector	18	43	61	30	19	49
Total	37	85	122	74	63	137

Source: The research units' self-assessment reports. Figures only include scholarly personnel who conduct more than half of their research within development research and whose main position is located at one of the units included in the evaluation.
Missing information: We lack information about the scholarly position of 6 staff members (1 at NTNU/Department of Geography, 1 at CMI and 4 at Fafo). These are not included in the table.
Note: Senior-level positions include: Director/Deputy Director/Head of Research; Professor; Associate Professor and Senior Researcher/Associate. Non-senior positions include: Researcher; Post-doctorate; Research fellow/PhD student and Other (research assistant/adviser/teacher).

The average age of the development researchers is 45 years, varying according to scholarly position. Professors' average age is 54 years, associate professors' and senior researchers' 48, researchers' 43 and PhD students/fellows' 38 (Table 3.7). When interpreting these figures, it is important to take into consideration that they include all personnel[14] employed

[14] More precisely, the figures include all personnel for whom we have information about age among those whose main position is located at the research unit and who conduct more than half of their research within development research. We lack information about 57 of the relevant staff members.

during all or part of the period 2001-2005 and that the calculated average age pertains to 2006. For example, if we calculate the average age in 2005 for those who were employed as PhD students/fellows in 2005, their average is 35 years, not 38.[15] Taking such sources of error into consideration, the average age of Norwegian development researchers seems to be about the same as, or below, the average age for similar research areas in Norway.[16]

Table 3.7 Personnel within development research: Average age in 2006 by position

Scholarly Position	Mean age	Minimum age	Maximum age	N
Director/Deputy Director/Head of Research	57.5	42	72	4
Professor	54.2	41	68	27
Associate Professor	48.4	31	68	24
Senior Researcher/Associate	48.1	33	71	45
Researcher	42.5	27	67	39
Post-doctorate	43.0	32	56	5
Research fellow/PhD student	37.6	26	54	55
Other (Research assistant/adviser/teacher)	35.8	27	45	4
Missing information about position	34.8	22	51	5
***Total**	**44.6**	**22**	**72**	**208**

Source: The research units' self-assessment reports. Figures only include scholarly personnel who conduct more than half of their research within development research and whose main position is located at one of the units included in the evaluation.
Missing information: We lack information about age for 57 of the staff members; these are not included in the calculations.

When studying age by gender and sector (Table 3.8), we find some interesting differences. Whereas Table 3.4 shows that a large percentage of the institute sector's non-senior-level researchers are female and a large percentage of the senior-level researchers in this sector are male, Table 3.8 shows that the females who have obtained a senior-level position in this sector are substantially younger on average than their male colleagues. This should indicate that, despite the numeric gender gap among the senior-level staff members, females have good opportunities for obtaining senior-level positions in the institute sector.

---

[15] Of these, 71 percent were 25-36 years old and 29 percent were 40-53 years old. (Nobody's age fell between these two groups.) Of the 51 staff members employed as PhD students/fellows in 2005, we lack age information on 10 persons. These are not included in the calculations.

[16] The average age of all R&D personnel with a higher degree in economics was 44 years in 2003 (Liv Langfeldt, 2006: *Economics Research in Norway: Institutions, resources, personnel and publishing.* Oslo: NIFU STEP Working paper 24/2006, page 17). The similar average age for history was 47.2 (in 2003 as reported in Vera Schwach, 2006: *Historiefaget – mennesker, steder, strukturer og endringer over tid.* Oslo: NIFU STEP Arbeidsnotat 22/2006, page 26). The previous evaluations of political science and educational sciences showed average ages of 48.4 and 57.7 years, respectively, for the senior-level staff members in this evaluation (political science 48.4 years in 1999 and educational sciences 57.7 years in 2003, as reported in "Statsvitenskaplig forskning i Norge", RCN 2002 and "Norsk pedagogisk forskning", RCN 2004).

Table 3.8 Personnel within development research: Average age in 2006 by sector, position and gender

	Average age higher education sector	Average age institute sector	Total average age	N
Senior position				
Female	51.9	43.2	47.3	32
Male	51.7	51.4	51.6	68
Total	51.8	48.6	50.2	100
Non-senior position				
Female	37.2	37.4	37.3	57
Male	41.8	44.1	42.5	46
Total	39.6	39.7	39.6	103
All				
Female	42.2	39.6	40.9	89
Male	47.1	49.1	47.9	114
Total	45.1	44.5	44.8	203
N	110	93	203	

Source: The research units' self-assessment reports. Figures only include scholarly personnel who conduct more than half of their research within development research and whose main position is located at one of the units included.
Missing information: We lack information about age and/or positions for 62 of the staff members (age for 56, position for 5 and both for 1 of them). These are not included in the calculations.

Table 3.9 shows different disciplinary profiles for the higher education sector and the institute sector. Whereas 24 percent of the researchers/staff in the higher education sector have an educational background in geography or human geography, this is a marginal discipline within the institute sector. Moreover, 17 percent of the researchers/staff in the higher education sector have an educational background in development studies, whereas only 3 percent in the institute sector have such a background. On the other hand, as much as 30 percent of the researchers/staff in the institute sector and only 5 percent of those in the higher education sector have an educational background in political science. Economics is one of the major disciplinary backgrounds for researchers in both sectors. (The disciplines in Table 3.9 are listed by their total shares.)

Table 3.9 Personnel within development research: Educational background by discipline and sector, percentage

Educational background by discipline	Higher education sector%	Institute sector%	Total%	Counts
Economics	14.7	19.1	16.6	44
Political Sciences	5.3	29.6	15.8	42
Social Anthropology	10.0	13.9	11.7	31
Development Studies	17.3	2.6	10.9	29
Geography	13.3	3.5	9.1	24
Human Geography	10.7	1.7	6.8	18
History	6.7	6.1	6.4	17
Other Sciences (Natural, Medical, Agriculture, Engineering)	4.0	4.3	4.2	11
Other/unspecified Social Sciences	3.3	4.3	3.8	10
Multidisciplinary	5.3	0.0	3.0	8
Sociology	0.7	6.1	3.0	8
Humanities (other than History)	1.3	3.5	2.3	6
Missing information about educational discipline	7.3	5.2	6.4	17
N	**150**	**115**	**265**	**265**

Source: The research units' self-assessment reports. Figures only include scholarly personnel who conduct more than half of their research within development research and whose main position is located at one of the units included.

Table 3.10 shows the percentages of junior-level and senior-level development researchers within (i.e. from) the various disciplines. Although a total of 47 percent of the researchers hold senior-level positions, only 7 percent of the researchers with a background in development studies hold senior-level positions – which could be explained by the fact that development studies is a relatively new field of education. Of those with a background in economics or social anthropology, on the other hand, more than 70 percent hold senior-level positions.

Going underneath the figures in Table 3.10, we find that of the 68 research fellows/PhD students reported, the largest percentage have their background in development studies (25 fellows/PhD students). Geography and human geography also account for many of the recruits (10 and 8 fellows/PhD students, respectively). Moreover, there are 6 fellows/PhD students with a background in economics, 4 in history, 3 in social anthropology and 3 in the political sciences.

The post-doctoral fellows, on the other hand, are more evenly distributed. In total, 6 post-doctoral fellows were reported, and none of them have their background in the same discipline.

Table 3.10 Personnel within development research: Educational background by discipline and position, percentage

Educational discipline	Seniors	Non-seniors	N
Economics	72.1	27.9	43
Political Sciences	40.5	59.5	42
Social Anthropology	71.0	29.0	31
Development Studies	6.9	93.1	29
Geography	26.1	73.9	23
Human Geography	44.4	55.6	18
History	41.2	58.8	17
Other Sciences (Natural, Medical, Agriculture, Engineering)	54.5	45.5	11
Other/unspecified Social Sciences	20.0	80.0	10
Multidisciplinary	62.5	37.5	8
Sociology	62.5	37.5	8
Humanities: Other	50.0	50.0	6
Missing information about educational discipline	61.5	38.5	13
Total percent	**47.1**	**52.9**	**259**

Source: The research units' self-assessment reports. Figures only include scholarly personnel who conduct more than half of their research within development research and whose main position is located at one of the units included in the evaluation.

Missing information: We lack information about the scholarly positions of 6 staff members. These are not included in the analysis.

Note: Senior-level positions include: Director/Deputy Director/Head of Research; Professor; Associate Professor and Senior Researcher/Associate ("Forsker 1" and "Forsker 2" and similar). Non-senior-level positions include: Researcher ("Forsker 3" and similar); Post-doctorate; Research fellow/PhD student and Other (research assistant/adviser/teacher).

3.2 Funding of Norwegian development research

In the self-assessment reports, the units were asked to provide funding information for each year from 2001 to 2005 and for their budget for 2006, as well as an estimate of the share of the total expenditures in the period 2001-2005 that was obtained through different modes of funding (core funding; project grants; commissioned projects with and without tender competitions; donations/other sources). Seventeen units were able to fill out the data as requested, including estimates of their expenditures on development research, their funding sources and modes of funding. Of the remaining units, eight provided no data on the funding of their development research, and three provided partial information. It should be noted that the degree to which the institutions have separate budgets for development research varies and that the figures presented are the units' own estimates of their funding spent on development research.

As shown in Table 3.11, when measured by the amount of funding for development research, there are large variations in the "size" of the units reviewed. Five of them had funding of more than NOK 80 million for development research in the period 2001-2006 (with CMI at top with NOK 286 million). Nine most likely had less than NOK 10 million. When comparing the "ranking" shown in Table 3.11 with the number of development researchers as studied in Section 3.1, we find substantial incongruence – except that CMI ranks highest on both lists. Most likely this is due to deficient and incomplete data – there are no standards for defining funds for development research or researchers who devote most of their research time to development research. The units' estimates of both may be based on very diverse premises.

Table 3.11 Research units conducting development research in Norway by amount of funding for development research, in NOK mill (sums for 2001-2006)

Research unit	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Total
CMI - Chr. Michelsen Institute	39.4	40.3	48.0	45.4	54.4	58.9	286.4
UMB: Noragric	33.5	35.2	32.0	35.6	33.8	36.2	206.3
UiO: The Centre for Development and the Environment	19.5	27.2	29.2	26.3	26.5	25.7	154.4
PRIO - International Peace Research Institute, Oslo	14.3	14.9	15.7	11.4	15.7	17.7	89.7
NIBR - Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research	8.2	9.3	8.4	9.3	9.0	11.8	56.1
NTNU: Department of Geography	7.0	7.0	8.0	10.0	11.0	11.0	54.0
UiB: Department of Social Anthropology	7.3	7.5	7.9	8.1	11.5	11.7	54.0
UiO: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights	3.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	3.7	4.3	23.5
NHH - Norwegian School of Economics and Business Adm.	2.8	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	19.5
UMB: Department of Economics and Resource Management	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.8	3.1	3.4	17.9
NTNU: Department of Economics	2.5	2.5	2.7	3.2	2.9	2.6	16.4
UiO: Institute for Educational Research	1.5	2.9	2.3	2.1	1.8	2.5	13.0
UiB: Comparative Research Programme on Poverty	1.4	1.6	2.6	1.7	2.4	2.1	11.8
UiT: Department of Social Anthropology	1.6	1.9	2.5	2.3	1.1	1.7	11.1
UiB: Department of Comparative Politics	0.4	1.0	1.2	1.8	2.4	2.3	9.0
UiO: Department of Economics	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.6	2.0	8.5
UiO: Dept of Archaeology, Conservation and Historical Studies	1.1	1.5	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.5	7.5

Sources: Estimates given in the research units' self-assessment reports.

Units that did not provide estimates in their self-assessment reports, including their estimated total expenses on "development research" as given in the mapping survey:	NOK mill 2001-2005
Fafo: Fafo Institute for Applied International Studies	Over 100
UiB: Centre for Development Studies	20 to 49
UiO: Department of Sociology and Human Geography	10 to 19
NINA - Norwegian Institute for Nature Research	10 to 19
NUPI - Norwegian Institute of International Affairs	10 to 19
UiO: Department of Political Science	5 to 9
UiO: Department of Social Anthropology	5 to 9
UiT: Department of Sociology	5 to 9
FNI - Fridtjof Nansen Institute	5 to 9
UiS: Department of Media, Culture and Social Sciences	1 to 4
HiAgder: Dept. of Economics and Business Administration/Institute of Development Studies	1 to 4

Sources: Estimates given in "mapping survey" (cf. Chapter 2).

Table 3.12 shows average funds by sector. The three institutes that provided data had average funding of NOK 144 million for development research in 2001-2006. The average amount of funds at the university units was less than a third of this (NOK 43 million).

Table 3.12 Funding of Norwegian development research by source, in NOK mill (sums 2001-2006)

	Higher education institutions					Institutes					All sectors				
Source	Mean	N	Sum	Min	Max	Mean	N	Sum	Min	Max	Mean	N	Sum	Min	Max
Core funding	**16.0**	14	224.4	2.3	51.8	**30.1**	3	90.2	11.4	61.0	**18.5**	17	314.6	2,3	61.0
RCN grants	**10.3**	14	143.9	0.0	68.4	**17.7**	2	35.5	15.5	20.0	**11.2**	16	179.4	0,0	68.4
Other Norwegian public sources	**9.0**	14	125.6	0.0	53.9	**32.7**	2	65.3	23.3	42.1	**11.9**	16	191.0	0,0	53.9
Private domestic	**3.0**	15	44.5	0.0	37.1	**1.3**	2	2.6	0.6	2.0	**2.8**	17	47.1	0,0	37.1
Foreign sources	**4.9**	15	73.2	0.0	60.9	**6.6**	2	13.2	5.4	7.8	**5.1**	17	86.4	0,0	60.,9
All sources	**43.4**	14	606.9	7.5	206.3	**144.1**	3	432.2	56.1	286.4	**61.1**	17	1039.0	7,5	286.4

Sources: Estimates given in the research units' self-assessment reports. Only the 17 units that provided data for all years are included in the calculations.

Table 3.13 shows the share of funding from different sources over time (percentages). There is a decrease in Norwegian public sources other than RCN grants and core funding, and an increase in foreign sources. There is also an increase in the share of institutional core funding.

Table 3.13 Funding of Norwegian development research by source, percent 2001-2006

Funding source	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006*
Core funding	28.8	28.8	28.6	30.6	32.2	32.0
RCN grants	21.9	22.2	21.4	20.5	20.7	
Other Norwegian public sources	30.0	30.9	29.6	26.6	24.7	
Private domestic sources	5.5	4.1	5.4	7.5	5.6	
Foreign sources	12.1	12.2	13.5	13.8	17.5	
Sum funds in NOK million*	**147.6**	**164.0**	**173.7**	**169.9**	**185.2**	**198.6**

Sources: Estimates given in the research units' self-assessment reports. Only the 17 units that provided data for all years are included in the calculations (14 within higher education and 3 within the institute sector).
Note: *As some units did not provide their 2006 budget by funding source (except for the core funding), most of the 2006 column is empty.

The typical funding mode for the universities is institutional core funding, whereas in the institute sector core funding is a marginal funding source (on average 57 percent versus 7 percent, but note that the intra-sector differences are substantial, Table 3.14). Some of the university units have no funding for their development research other than core funding, whereas some institutes have no core funding for their development research. On average, the institute sector receives a slightly larger share of their development research funding through project grants (from research councils and similar organisations) as compared with the universities (36 percent versus 30 percent).

Tenders and other commissioned research so far seem to be a marginal funding mode at the university units, whereas this is a substantial funding source for several of the research institutes.

Table 3.14 Funding of Norwegian development research 2001-2005 by funding mode, percentage

Sector		Core funding	Project grants	Direct commissions	Tender	Other modes/ donations
Higher education institutions	**Mean %**	**57**	**30**	**10**	**1**	**2**
	N	15	15	16	16	16
	Minimum%	19	0	0	0	0
	Maximum %	100	78	50	10	29
	Std. Dev.	31	25	16	3	7
Institutes	**Mean %**	**7**	**36**	**23**	**32**	**2**
	N	3	3	3	3	3
	Minimum%	0	13	0	10	0
	Maximum %	22	60	39	65	6
	Std. Dev.	13	24	20	29	3
All sectors	**Mean %**	**49**	**31**	**12**	**6**	**2**
	N	18	18	19	19	19
	Minimum %	0	0	0	0	0
	Maximum%	100	78	50	65	29
	Std. Dev.	34	24	17	15	7

Sources: Estimates given in the research units' self-assessment reports. 18 units that provided data are included in the calculations. Under "Direct commissions", "Tender" and "Other modes/donations", one more unit that reported having no income from any of these sources is also included.

Compared with overall figures for Norwegian social sciences, some differences can be observed. The funding structures of the development research at the three institutes for which we have data do not differ much from the overall funding structure of Norwegian social science institutes, except for a notably higher percentage of funding from foreign sources and an accordingly lower percentage from private domestic sources (Table 3.15).

For the higher education institutions, on the other hand, the differences are considerable. However, some of the large difference in the share of core funding might be due to the use of different bases for the figures rather than factual differences. In the self-assessment reports, the units were asked to fill in their total expenditures for development research by funding source. In principle, these figures should be comparable to the figures estimated by official R&D statistics, but several of the self-assessment reports might have underestimated the core funding expenditures for development research – e.g. not included the general personnel expenditures. It still seems reasonable that development research receives a substantially higher share of its funding from external sources compared with the social sciences in general – but the differences might be substantially smaller than shown in Table 3.15.[17]

With regard to the external funding sources of higher education institutions, there are notable differences between development research and social sciences in general. Development research at the universities/university colleges receives a higher proportion of funding from foreign sources – and probably also a somewhat higher proportion of funding from public sources other than RCN grants – than the amount received by the social sciences in general in this sector.

Table 3.15 Funding of Norwegian development research by source and by sector compared with overall figures for Norwegian social sciences, percentages for 2005

	Higher education institutions		Institute sector	
Funding source	**All social sciences R&D expenditures***	**Development research funding 14 units**	**All funding 28 social science institutes**	**Development research funding 3 institutes**
Core funding	70.1	38.8	23.4	21.9
RCN grants	13.3	21.9	21.9	18.4
Other Norwegian public sources	9.3	19.9	30.6	31.3
Private domestic sources	5.2	6.5	16.7	4.3
Foreign sources	2.1	12.9	7.3	24.1
Sum	100	100	100	100

Sources: For development research: Estimates given in the research units' self-assessment reports. 17 units that provided data are included in the calculations.
For overall Norwegian social sciences figures, see: http://foustat.nifustep.no/

Note: *R&D expenditures are the proportion of the institutions' expenditures estimated by official R&D statistics to have been spent on research activities. In the self-assessment reports, the units were asked to fill in their total expenditures for development research, which in principle should be the same type of figures, but as the units cannot be expected to have calculated their R&D expenditures consistently (e.g. including the research time of the personnel involved), the figures are not directly comparable.

[17] Also note that the units' estimates of the share of core funding for development research for 2001-2005 results in an average of 57 percent for the higher education institutions (Table 3.12), not 39 percent as shown in Table 3.15. (Table 3.15 is based on the units' figures in NOK for 2005, whereas Table 3.13 shows the units' overall estimates in percentages.)

3.3 International networks and resources

In addition to funding and staff, other resources such as international networks, collaborators and users may be important in development research.. As noted in the previous section, the share of international funding for Norwegian development research is increasing. In 2005, 17.5 percent of the development research at the examined units was funded by various international/foreign sources.

Among the international organisations most frequently cited as users were the World Bank and various UN agencies, especially UNDP but also FAO, UNEP and UNESCO. The national development agencies in other countries with which Norwegian researchers interact include Sida, Danida, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Department for International Development (DFID, UK), the International Development Research Centre (IDRC, Canada) and Irish Aid. Other government agencies represented a significant proportion of user organisations. Also prominent were research institutes outside Norway such as the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute and the member institutes of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR).

In general, the diversity of the international organisations that the Norwegian research institutes and university cite as users is remarkable. Within this category, roughly half the interaction takes place in seminars or through the exchange of reports. International organisations are also important commissioners of research, accounting for approximately half of the user organisations cited in this category. Of those Norwegian research institutions commissioned to conduct research, Noragric, NIBR, PRIO, SUM (Centre for Development and Environment at UiO) and CMI are notable recipients.

The international research collaboration is also extensive. The research units were asked to list the institutions with which they had project collaboration or co-authorship in the period 2001-2005 (25 of the 28 units responded). On average, they listed 10 international collaborators each – 5 institutions in developed countries or in international organisations and 5 institutions in LDCs. (The domestic collaborators are reported in Section 2.4.) On average, the higher education sector reported somewhat more collaborators in developed countries and international organisations than in LDCs (4.6 versus 3.9), whereas the institutes reported more collaborators in LDCs (7 in LDCs versus 5.3 in developed countries/international organisations). In addition, quite a few formal collaboration agreements and other types of international scholarly collaborators and networks were listed.

When asked about particular challenges related to their international research, most felt that they had good international contacts, but again, concerns regarding funding were raised. It was noted that the units find it difficult to obtain funding for collaborative research. The general view was that international contacts were relatively well developed, and the units were quite content with their achievements in this area. Some noted that links

with international organisations helped them to build capacity. Collaboration with LDC institutions was sometimes problematic because of their lack of skills and overall lack of resources needed to maintain linkages. (See also figures on international co-authorship in Section 6.2.5.)

3.4 Competence-building activities and study programmes

The institutions in this evaluation were asked to provide quantitative reports of their competence-building activities within development research – the number of staff/fellows at the department/unit who were working on a doctoral thesis, the number of staff/fellows at the department/unit who had completed a doctoral degree in 2001-2005, the number of staff on sabbaticals and other types of competence-building activities (open category). The table below shows some increase in the number of theses in progress, from 95 in 2001 to 123 in 2006. Also, the number of completed doctoral degrees per year in the field increased from 11 in 2001 to 20 in 2005 (and 30 estimated for 2006). For the sabbaticals no clear tendencies are observed.

Table 3.16 Competence-building activities related to development research 2001-2006

Competence-building activities	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
Fellows/staff working on a doctoral thesis						
Total number of staff reported	95	104	110	114	124	123
*Average per HE unit	3.5	4.0	4.5	4.7	5.1	5.4
Average per unit institute sector	4.3	4.0	3.5	3.3	3.7	2.7
Completed doctoral degrees by fellows/staff employed at the unit						
Total number of degrees reported	11	14	17	13	20	30
Average per HE unit	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.8	1.3
Average per unit institute sector	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.7	1.0	1.2
Staff on sabbatical						
Total number of sabbaticals reported	22	27	27	27	36	24
Average per HE unit	1.0	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.5	1.0
**Average per unit institute sector	0.7	0.8	0.8	1.2	1.5	1.6

Source: The research units' self-assessment reports. 26 units replied to these questions. The 2006 figures are estimates as of August 2006.

Note: *In several cases, higher education units reported enrolled doctoral students who were employed elsewhere. Consequently, the figures for the institute sector and the higher education sector are not comparable, and the total number of persons working on a thesis is probably too high – as several will have been reported twice.
**In the institute sector there are no regular sabbaticals. The figures here are mainly a result of the inclusion by PRIO of fieldwork/stays abroad of more than 3 months in its report (4-7 per year). There were also a few cases of sabbaticals reported by NUPI and CMI. The other institutes reported no sabbaticals.

Whereas the mapping survey and the self-assessment reports show that Norwegian development research is conducted at many different locations, the self-assessment reports indicate that most of those working on a doctoral thesis are concentrated in a more limited number of locations. SUM and Noragric are among the most notable locations for thesis work at the universities, as are CMI, PRIO and NUPI in the institute sector. However, the figures for the universities give a somewhat unreliable picture of the location of the doctoral fellows (see note to the table above). Several university units seem to have reported enrolled doctoral students who were employed elsewhere. The Department of Political Science at UiO and the Department of Social Anthropology at UiB, for instance,

reported very high numbers of fellows/staff working on a doctoral thesis within development research (12 and 23, respectively, in 2006), but we expect that several of these are located in the institute sector. Comparisons with the figures resulting from the analysis of the submitted staff lists give some indication of the degree to which fellows employed elsewhere have been reported. In the submitted lists we find a total of 68 research fellows and PhD students whose main position is located at one of the units included in the evaluation, whereas the same units reported a total of 123 fellows/staff working on a doctoral thesis (for 2006).[18]

The institutions were also asked to list their contributions to development studies at higher education institutions – both programmes/studies offered by their own institution and their cooperation agreements with other institutions that involve contributions to education in development studies. A wide variety of Norwegian bachelor's and master's programmes, and courses comprising these degrees, was reported[19], as well as contributions to graduate and undergraduate studies in a broad range of LDCs. Most of the higher education institutions reported such activity. Of the institutes, only PRIO reported involvement with higher education programmes at an "institutional level". (Others reported some staff members involved in such programmes.)

3.5 Summary of main observations

Development research personnel

- In total, the research units in this evaluation reported 320 staff members who devote more than half of their research time to development research. Of these, 265 were employed in their main position at the research unit.
- Personnel resources vary considerably among the research units (from 0 to 35 main position staff members in the field). Independent institutes and university-based centres and interdisciplinary units seem best endowed with researchers. There are few regular university departments among the largest units (in terms of the number of staff members who devote most of their research time to development research).

---

[18] Part of the discrepancy between the two figures may be the result of staff who are employed in positions other than research fellow/PhD student and who are working on a doctoral dissertation. It is also difficult to compare Norwegian figures with other countries' figures. In Sweden, SAREC funded 163 individual PhD projects within development research in the period 2001-2005. (In addition, doctoral dissertations are part of most major SAREC research projects). Here we need to take into consideration that the Swedish statistics are not restricted by a definition that limits development research mainly to the social sciences, but instead include all types of sciences (Olle Edquist 2006: *Sidas U-landsforskningsråd*. Sida Evaluation 06/24, page 16).

[19] Some major examples: Development Studies; Development Economics; Development and Resource Economics; International Economics; International Trade and Economic Geography; Development Geography; Development Management; African Studies; Peace and Conflict Studies; Culture, Environment and Sustainability; Anthropology of Development; Development and Freedom: Notions of Rights-Based Development; Education and Development; Politics of Poverty Reduction; Politics of Sustainable Development; History of Less Developed Areas in the World.

- The senior-level positions are equally divided between the higher education institutions and the institute sector, with 61 positions in each sector.
- The age structure in the field is not a cause for concern. The average age of the senior-level staff is 50, whereas for those holding non-senior-level positions, the average age is 40.
- From an international perspective, economists play an especially prominent role in Norwegian development research, probably more so than in other countries. The field of law, on the other hand, is hardly represented. Moreover, there are notable sectoral differences in educational background. Whereas 24 percent of the researchers/staff in the higher education sector have an educational background in geography or human geography, this is a marginal discipline within the institute sector. On the other hand, as much as 30 percent of the researchers/staff in the institute sector and only 5 percent of those in the higher education sector have an educational background in political science.

Funding structure

- The volume of Norwegian development research is large – there are many units and substantial resources.
- There are large variations in funding among the units in this evaluation. Five of them had funding of over NOK 80 million for development research in the period 2001-2006; nine most likely had funding under NOK 10 million (data is incomplete). CMI and Noragric are the two largest units, both with funding over NOK 200 million.
- The funding structures of development research at the three institutes for which data are available do not differ much from the overall funding structure of Norwegian social science institutes, except for a notably higher percentage of funding from foreign sources (17 percent versus 4 percent) and a correspondingly lower percentage from private domestic sources.
- Also at the universities/university colleges, development research receives a higher proportion of funding from foreign sources as compared with the social sciences in general in this sector. Moreover, the proportion of core funding is lower.

International networks and resources

- Norwegian development research seems to be adept at attracting foreign funding and to be well integrated into the relevant international networks.
- The international users listed are manifold, and international research collaboration is extensive.
- With regard to scholarly collaboration, individually based project collaboration and co-authoring are probably more important than institutional agreements.

Competence-building

- The contributions of the research units to development-related study programmes seem to be extensive. A wide variety of Norwegian bachelor's and master's programmes, as

well as contributions to graduate and undergraduate studies in a broad range of LDCs, was reported.

- The units reported a total of 123 fellows or staff working on a doctoral dissertation in 2006. Thirty staff members/fellows completed a doctoral degree in 2006.
- Most of those working on a dissertation seem to be concentrated in a limited number of locations.

The general observation of the Evaluation Committee is that Norwegian development research is well funded and adequately staffed.

4 Publications and communication of research

Based on information provided by the research units in this evaluation, this chapter presents an analysis of the publication and communication profiles of Norwegian development research. Section 4.1 deals with the scholarly publications, and Sections 4.2-4.4 discuss publications and communication aimed at users and the wider public.

4.1 Publications aimed at the research community

4.1.1 The sample of publications analysed in this section

The research organisations included in this evaluation were asked to submit lists of their scholarly publications within development research. The analysis of the publication lists began with a total of 1,559 publications from 28 units/institutions.[20] When we excluded publications outside the period under review (2001-2005), we were left with 1,428 publications. When we included only those publications that fell into the four categories of scholarly publications requested in the self-assessment reports (i.e. articles in scholarly journals, articles in books, books/monographs and doctoral dissertations)[21], we were left with 1,198 publications. In a final screening of publications with topics outside the remit of the evaluation, 996 publications remained. This section is based on the analysis of these 996 publications.

Appendix 6 gives details on the thematic screening: Table A.1 shows the number of submitted publications in the period 2001-2005 within the four categories of scholarly publications by institution. Table A.2 shows the number of remaining publications after the thematic screening, and Table A.3 shows the share of publications from each institution that was deemed relevant for the evaluation.

It should be noted that several publications were reported by more than one of the research units/institutions – either because they were co-authored by researchers from several institutions or because the author was affiliated with several institutions. As we do not have complete information about author affiliations, we have not been able to allocate such duplicates to only one of the institutions. Instead, all relevant publications have been counted under all units which included them in their publication lists, regardless of author affiliation. (The only cases in which duplicates were excluded from the analysis were those in which the same publication was reported multiple times by the same research unit.) A rough estimate indicates that between 5 and 10 percent of the publications included were

[20] We included the lists' sections for scholarly aimed publications. For the institutions that did not separate their publications lists into different categories, some publications in other categories were also included in the initial analysis/screening.

[21] Excluding book reviews, conference papers, institutional series, etc.

reported by more than one of the research units. This suggests that the total amount of publications is somewhat lower than it appears in the analysis.

4.1.2 Publication profiles of the units under review

In the period 2001-2005, 55 percent of the 996 scholarly publications within development were articles in scholarly journals. Thirty-two percent were articles/chapters in anthologies, 7 percent were books/monographs and 6 percent were doctoral dissertations (Table 4.1). There was some increase in the number of scholarly publications from year to year throughout the period – of which some of this increase is probably due to more complete data for the latter years[22] – but the percentage of publications in the different categories was fairly constant throughout the period.

Table 4.1 Analysis of submitted publication lists 2001-2005: Scholarly articles, books and doctoral dissertations in development research by year, percentage

Publication category	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001-05
Articles in scholarly journals	55.9	65.7	45.8	56.2	53.8	54.8
Articles in books/anthologies	34.2	21.9	33.5	33.8	34.8	32.0
Books	4.6	4.7	11.9	6.5	5.3	6.8
Doctoral dissertations	5.3	7.7	8.8	3.5	6.1	6.3
N	**152**	**169**	**227**	**201**	**247**	**996**

Source: The included units' self-assessment reports. Only publications on topics relevant for the RCN definition of development research are included; see explanations in Section 4.1.1.

It may also be noted that the 55 percent share of scholarly publications published as journal articles is somewhat higher than for other Norwegian social sciences for which we have information. Previous evaluations showed that 39 percent of the scholarly publications within Norwegian political science, and 47 percent within educational sciences, were journal articles.[23]

Dividing the publications by thematic area, "Rights, Security and Democracy" was found to be the largest area with 324 publications, and "Culture, Education and Gender" the smallest area with 172 publications. Further, 255 publications were categorised under "Resource Management" and 218 under "Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction". Of the 996 publications, 27 were considered to cut across the various thematic areas and placed in a separate category (Table 4.2).

---

[22] For one of the research units, *only* publications from the last part of the period were reported. Moreover, the inclusion of the publication score indicator in the performance-based budgeting of higher education institutions (see Box 4.1 below) is likely to have resulted in more complete data for the latter years.

[23] Figures for political science are from 2000, figures for educational sciences from 2000-2002. In political science 39 percent were journal articles, 47 percent were book articles, 9 percent books and 5 percent dr. dissertations (calculated from Table V.5.1 in "Statsvitenskaplig forskning i Norge", RCN 2002). In educational sciences 47 percent of the scholarly publications were journal articles, 39 percent were book articles, 11 percent books and 3 percent dr. dissertations (based on data compiled for "Norsk pedagogisk forskning", RCN 2004).

Table 4.2 Analysis of submitted publications lists 2001-2005: Scholarly articles, books and doctoral dissertations in development research by thematic area, percentage

Publication category	Resource Management	Rights, Security and Democracy	Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction	Culture, Education and Gender	Multiple Areas
Articles in scholarly journals	56.5	52.2	64.7	44.2	59.3
Articles in books/anthologies	34.1	33.0	24.3	38.4	22.2
Books	3.5	10.5	4.1	7.0	14.8
Doctoral dissertations	5.9	4.3	6.9	10.5	3.7
N	**255**	**324**	**218**	**172**	**27**

Source: The included units' self-assessment reports. Only publications on topics relevant for the RCN definition of development research are included; see explanations in Section 4.1.1.

The publication profiles of the thematic areas vary somewhat. The highest proportion of journal articles is found within "Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction" (65 percent), the lowest within "Culture, Education and Gender" (44 percent). "Rights, Security and Democracy" has the highest proportion of books (11 percent), whereas "Culture, Education and Gender" has the highest proportion of doctoral dissertations (11 percent, Table 4.2).

When dividing the publications by research units/institutions and thematic areas, we find that 12 of the 27 units have more than 80 percent of their publications within one thematic area, whereas the remaining units have a substantial share of their publications within two or more areas (Table 4.3). Within the institute sector, 57 percent of the publications are within "Rights, Security and Democracy", whereas within the higher education institutions, "Resource Management" is the largest category with 32 percent of the publications (Table 4.3).

Table 4.3 Analysis of submitted publications lists 2001-2005: Publications in development research by thematic area, sector and research unit, percentage

Research unit	Resource Management	Rights, Security and Democracy	Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction	Culture, Education and Gender	Multiple Areas	N
NTNU: Department of Geography	21.2	12.1	3.0	45.5	18.2	33
NTNU: Department of Economics	16.7	6.7	76.7			30
UiB: Comparative Research Programme on Poverty				57.1	42.9	7
UiB: Department of Comparative Politics		93.8	6.3			16
UiB: Department of Social Anthropology	10.1	26.1		59.4	4.3	69
UiB: Centre for Development Studies	16.7	50.0		33.3		6
UiO: Department of Archaeology, Conservation and Historical Studies		44.4	11.1	33.3	11.1	9
UiO: Department of Sociology and Human Geography	40.0	20.0	40.0			40
UiO: Department of Political Science		90.9	9.1			11
UiO: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights		93.3		6.7		15
UiO: Institute for Educational Research		5.6		88.9	5.6	36
UiO: Department of Social Anthropology		27.3		72.7		11
UiO: The Centre for Development and the Environment	34.1	30.1	22.8	8.9	4.1	123
UiO: Department of Economics		31.8	36.4	31.8		22
UiS: Department of Media, Culture and Social Sciences		100.0				2
UiT: Department of Social Anthropology	13.3	13.3	6.7	66.7		15
UMB: Department of Economics and Resource Management	79.6	8.2	8.2		4.1	49
UMB: Noragric	83.8	4.3	0.9	10.3	0.9	117
HiAgder: Dept. of Economics and Business Administration/ Institute of Development Studies			100.0			24
NHH - Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration			100.0			40
Higher Education	**32.1**	**20.7**	**22.1**	**21.6**	**3.4**	**675**
CMI - Chr. Michelsen Institute	5.8	53.8	32.7	7.7		52
Fafo Institute for Applied International Studies		88.5	11.5			26
FNI - Fridtjof Nansen Institute	100.0					13
NIBR - Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research	40.0	20.0	40.0			5
NINA - Norwegian Institute for Nature Research	100.0					3
NUPI - Norwegian Institute of International Affairs		84.7	10.2	5.1		118
PRIO - International Peace Research Institute	16.3	30.8	33.7	15.4	3.8	104
Institutes	**11.8**	**57.3**	**21.5**	**8.1**	**1.2**	**321**
Total	**25.6**	**32.5**	**21.9**	**17.3**	**2.7**	**996**

Source: The included units' self-assessment reports. Only publications on topics relevant for the RCN definition of development research are included; see explanations in Section 4.1.1.

A very high proportion of the scholarly publications are written in English. Only 7 percent of the publications are in Norwegian or other Scandinavian languages, whereas about 90 percent are in English. There are no clear trends in the language profile in the period under review. In 2005, however, there was a marked increase the percentage of publications in languages other than Scandinavian or English, and a decrease in the percentage of publications in Scandinavian languages (Table 4.4).In any case, the figures reflect that development research is an international research field and that when publishing scholarly work, the Norwegian development researchers mainly use the language of the international research community – which is English. The proportion of publications in English is also substantially higher than in other Norwegian social sciences for which we have data.[24]

[24] In 2000, 58 percent of the scholarly publications within Norwegian political science were in English, 42 percent in Norwegian or other Scandinavian languages. When including only journal articles in the calculations, we still find no more than 57 percent in English. In 2000-2002, 36 percent of the scholarly publications within Norwegian educational sciences were in English, 63 percent in Norwegian or other Scandinavian languages. 52 percent of the journal articles were in English, 48 percent in Norwegian or other Scandinavian languages. In all cases, the figures only include the scholarly publications, that is,

Table 4.4 Analysis of submitted publications lists 2001-2005: Publications in development research by language and year, percentage

Language	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001-05
Scandinavian languages	7.2	11.8	6.6	9.0	3.6	7.3
English	90.8	84.6	92.1	87.6	89.5	89.1
Other languages	2.0	3.6	1.3	3.5	6.9	3.6
N	**152**	**169**	**227**	**201**	**247**	**996**

Source: The included units' self-assessment reports. Only publications on topics relevant for the RCN definition of development research are included; see explanations in Section 4.1.1.

Table 4.5 shows that about 40 percent of the publications are co-authored. The average number of authors per publication is 1.7, the maximum is 9.

Table 4.5 Analysis of submitted publications lists 2001-2005: Publications in development research by co-authorship and year

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001-05
Percent of publications that are co-authored	36.2	33.1	48.9	35.3	45.7	40.8
Average number of authors per publication	1.6	1.6	1.9	1.6	1.8	1.7
Max number of authors per publication	9	9	9	9	7	9
N	**152**	**169**	**227**	**201**	**247**	**996**

Source: The included units' self-assessment reports. Only publications on topics relevant for the RCN definition of development research are included; see explanations in Section 4.1.1.

There are no great differences among the various types of publications regarding the share of co-authorship, except of course that none of the dissertations are co-authored (43 percent of the journal articles, 45 percent of the book-chapters/contributions to anthologies and 47 percent of the books are co-authored). Looking at the thematic areas, on the other hand, there are notable differences. Sixty-three percent of the publications within "Resource Management" are co-authored, whereas only 18 percent of the publications within "Culture, Education and Gender" are co-authored (Table 4.6).

journal articles, book articles, books and dr. dissertations. Sources: "Statsvitenskaplig forskning i Norge" RCN 2002, and "Norsk pedagogisk forskning" RCN 2004.

Table 4.6 Analysis of submitted publications lists 2001-2005: Publications in development research by co-authorship and thematic area

Thematic area	Percent co-authored publications	Number of authors per publication		N
		Average	Max	
Resource Management	63.1	2.3	9	255
Rights, Security and Democracy	34.3	1.6	9	324
Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction	43.1	1.6	5	218
Culture, Education and Gender	18.0	1.3	9	172
Multiple Areas	33.3	1.7	6	27
Total	**40.8**	**1.7**	**9**	**996**

Source: The included units' self-assessment reports. Only publications on topics relevant for the RCN definition of development research are included; see explanations in Section 4.1.1.

We have also studied the publication profile of the research units in this evaluation in terms of the scores they would generate in the newly introduced performance-based budgeting model for Norwegian higher education institutions (referred to as the DBH[25] level in the tables below; see also the separate text box below on performance-based budgeting). We find that the independent institutes score better than the higher education institutions in terms of the proportion of their output published in journals that are rated as most important in their field (Table 4.7). The proportions in the top category for journals were 31 percent at the institutes and 23 percent at the universities/university colleges. Moreover, as much as 54 percent of the institutes' book articles and 32 percent of the university/university colleges' book articles are published by publishing houses rated as the most important in their field. In all categories, the overall percentage of the publications on level 2 is higher than the 20 percent "limit" of the performance-based budgeting model, probably indicating a high international profile of the publications in this field compared to Norwegian publishing in other fields.

[25] DBH is an abbreviation for the Norwegian "Database for statistikk om høgre utdanning", which may be translated to English as "Database for statistics on higher education" cf. http://dbh.nsd.uib.no/kanaler/

Table 4.7 Analysis of submitted publications lists 2001-2005: Scholarly articles and books in development research by co-authorship, DBH level and sector, percentage

		DBH level				
Publication category	**Sector**	**2**	**1**	**Non-scientific***	**Not registered**	**N**
Articles in scholarly journals						
	Higher Education	23.0	65.2		11.9	379
	Institutes	30.5	57.5		12.0	167
	Total	25.3	62.8		11.9	546
Articles in books/anthologies						
	Higher Education	32.4	50.5		17.1	216
	Institutes	54.4	31.1	1.9	12.6	103
	Total	39.5	44.2	0.6	15.7	319
Books						
	Higher Education	31.4	40.0	8.6	20.0	35
	Institutes	30.3	36.4	3.0	30.3	33
	Total	30.9	38.2	5.9	25.0	68

Source: The included units' self-assessment reports. Only publications on topics relevant for the RCN definition of development research are included; see explanations in Section 4.1.1.

DBH level key:

2 = published in a scholarly journal/at a publishing house that UHR has deemed to be among the most important in its field

1 = published in other scholarly journals/at publishing houses that UHR has deemed to be scholarly outlets ("vitenskapelige publiseringskanaler")

Non-scientific = UHR has assessed the publication outlet and not found it to be a scholarly outlet

Not registered = UHR has not assessed the publication outlet/it is not registered in the DBH publication outlet database.

*Articles in journals categorised in DBH as non-scientific were not included in the analysis, and the related cells in the table are consequently empty. On the other hand, all monographs and contributions to anthologies published by publishing house were included, even when these publishing houses were categorised in DBH as non-scientific.

Table 4.8 compares the proportions of different types of output that originate in the university/university college sector and the institute sector. We find that 69 percent of the output in scholarly journals (63 percent of the top category and 72 percent of the remaining output registered as scientific) comes from the higher education sector. With regard to articles in books, 68 percent of the output (56 percent of the top category and 77 percent of the remaining output registered as scientific) originates in the higher education sector. If these numbers are related to our admittedly imprecise numbers of personnel involved (see Table 3.6), we find that the academic output, including output in top scholarly journals per researcher, is slightly higher in the university/university college sector than in the institute sector.[26]

[26] Difficulties in making such comparisons should be noted. There are substantial incongruities between the researchers that appear on the personnel lists and those that appear on the publication lists, indicating that both sets of lists are incomplete. Moreover, the publication figures are not adjusted for co-authorship or duplicates. A more general problem is that development research is not a category in any official statistics, and there is no established understanding about what to include and what not to include in the term. See Section 1.4 and the introduction to Appendix 1.

Table 4.8 Analysis of submitted publications lists 2001-2005: Scholarly articles and books in development research by sector and DBH level, percentage

		DBH level				
Publication category	**Sector**	**2**	**1**	**Non-scientific***	**Not registered**	**Total**
Articles in scholarly journals						
	Higher Education	63.0	72.0		69.2	69.4
	Institutes	37.0	28.0		30.8	30.6
	N	138	343		65	546
Articles in books/anthologies						
	Higher Education	55.6	77.3		74.0	67.7
	Institutes	44.4	22.7	100	26.0	32.3
	N	126	141	2	50	319
Books						
	Higher Education	52.4	53.8	75.0	41.2	51.5
	Institutes	47.6	46.2	25.0	58.8	48.5
	N	21	26	4	17	68

Sources and notes: As for the table above.

The data also indicate some weaknesses in the performance-based budgeting. Looking at the year and sector for which the model was implemented, we find that 15 percent of the publications from the higher education sector in 2005 were in outlets not registered in the DBH publication database. This indicates that a substantial number of researchers have not bothered to have the relevant outlets registered or that other difficulties have occurred in keeping the database updated. (The DBH registration and level as of January 2007 was used for the analysis, so the difficulties seem substantial.) It should be added that the proportion of non-registered publications was no lower in 2005 than in 2001, and no lower for the higher education institutions than for the independent institutes (14.2 percent of the institutes' publications and 14.6 of the universities'/university colleges' publications in the relevant categories are in non-registered outlets) – indicating no evidence of better coverage for the publications relevant for inclusion in the performance-based budgeting by sector or by year.

Box 4.1: Performance-based budgeting of Norwegian higher education institutions

Part of the state core funding of Norwegian higher education institutions is based on performance indicators, comprising both education and research activities. In total, the research component accounts for about 15 percent of the core funding (most of this, but not all, is performance-based). The performance-based education indicators account for about 25 percent of core funding. The research component is the interesting one in our context – and particularly its publication score indicator (first implemented for the budget year 2006). The research component includes four indicators as shown in the table below. In total, 1.8 percent of the core funding in the sector is allocated on the basis of the publication scores (more for the universities and less for the university colleges).

Research indicators and their weighting

Indicator	Weight
Doctoral candidates	0.3
EU research funding	0.2
RCN research funding	0.2
Scholarly publications	0.3

Note: These are the present indicators and weights for the higher education sector. According to plans, a similar model will also be implemented for the institute sector.

The funding formula for publication activity includes two dimensions. First, articles in journals (ISSN-titles), articles in books and books/monographs (ISBN-titles) are given different weights. Moreover, publication outlets are divided into two levels in order to avoid an incentive to productivity only. The outlets given extra weight are those defined to be the leading and most selective international journals, series and publishers (limited to about 20 percent of the publications). The national councils in each discipline or field of research participate annually in determining and revising the highest level under the guidance of the Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions. The table below shows the relative weights given the different types of publications at the two levels.

Publication weights

Publication type	Outlets at normal level	Outlets at high level
Articles in ISSN-titles (journals)	1	3
Articles in ISBN-titles (books)	0.7	1
Books (ISBN-titles)	5	8

Note: Co-authored publications are shared among the participating institutions.

The formula only includes "scholarly publications". Series in which more than two-thirds of the authors are from the same institution, for instance, are not included. There are plans for also including other types of publications and forms of communication, but so far these plans have not been implemented. The definition is that a scholarly publication must:

1. present new insight;
2. be presented in a form that allows the research findings to be verified and/or used in new research activity;
3. be written in a language and have a distribution that makes the publication accessible to most interested researchers;
4. appear in a publication channel (journal, series, book publisher, website) that has routines for external peer review. (Source: "Vekt på forskning" English translation, UHR 2007).

The effects of the new model remain to be studied – to what degree it gives proper incentives or negative side effects. In its first year the model in most cases resulted in only a marginal redistribution of research funds in the higher education sector, but it certainly focused more attention on research performance – and sparked heated debate about the funding model. The greatest effects were seen for UiO and NTNU, with the former emerging as the winner (with a NOK 45 million increase, whereas NTNU had a NOK 43 million decrease).

When looking at publication outlet ratings by thematic area, some notable differences can be observed. Whereas as much as 33 percent of the journal articles within "Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction" are in journals rated as the most important in their field, only 15 percent of the journal articles within "Resource Management" appear in such highly rated journals (Table 4.9).

Table 4.9 Analysis of submitted publications lists 2001-2005: Development research articles in scholarly journals by thematic area and DBH level, percentage

Thematic area	Journal's DBH level*			N
	2	1	Not registered	
Resource Management	14.6	71.5	13.9	144
Rights, Security and Democracy	26.0	58.0	16.0	169
Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction	32.6	61.7	5.7	141
Culture, Education and Gender	30.3	59.2	10.5	76
Multiple Areas	25.0	62.5	12.5	16
Total	**25.3**	**62.8**	**11.9**	**546**

Source: The included units' self-assessment reports. Only publications on topics relevant for the RCN definition of development research are included; see explanations in Section 4.1.1.

*DBH level key:
2 = published in a scholarly journal that UHR has deemed to be among the most important in its field.
1 = published in other scholarly journals that UHR has deemed to be scholarly outlets ("vitenskapelige publiseringskanaler")
Not registered = UHR has not assessed the publication outlet/it is not registered in the DBH publication outlet database.

Table 4.10 provides an overview of the journals most frequently used by the research units/institutions in this evaluation when they publish development research articles. There seem to be few journals that serve as focal points for Norwegian development research. In the five-year period studied, 27 percent of the articles were published in 15 different journals (with 6 to 22 articles in each); the remaining articles were distributed among 269 different journals – with one to five articles in each.

Table 4.10 Analysis of submitted publications lists 2001-2005: Development research articles in scholarly journals by journal, frequencies

Journal	# Articles	DBH level	ISI-indexed
Forum for Development Studies	22	1	No
Norsk geografisk tidsskrift/Norwegian Journal of Geography	13	1	No
European Journal of Development Research	13	1	No
Third World Quarterly*	12	1	Yes
Internasjonal Politikk	11	1	Yes
World Development*	11	2	Yes
Norsk Antropologisk Tidsskrift	9	1	No
Journal of Development Economics*	9	2	Yes
Nordic Journal of Political Economy	8	1	No
Journal of Peace Research	8	2	Yes
Journal of Conflict Resolution*	7	2	Yes
International Peacekeeping	6	1	No
European Economic Review	6	2	Yes
Social Analysis	6	2	No
Environmental Conservation	6	1	Yes
269 journals with 1-5 articles in each	399		
Total articles	**546**		

Source: The included units' self-assessment reports. Only publications on topics relevant for the RCN definition of development research are included; see explanations in Section 4.1.1.
*Journal included in the general citation analysis of Norwegian development research, Section 6.2.4.

In a comparison of the list of journals in Table 4.10 with the list of journals in the general ISI searches for Norwegian articles in development research journals (citation analysis, Table 6.2), we find marginal overlap. The reasons for this lack of overlap are twofold. First,, several of the journals appearing in the submitted publication lists are not ISI-indexed and consequently not included in the citation analysis. Second, some of those

which are ISI-indexed were not included in the citation analysis because they are not mainly devoted to development research (e.g. *Internasjonal Politikk* and *European Economic Review*). The result is that only four of the 15 journals most frequently used by the research units/institutions in this evaluation when they publish development research articles are included in the citation analysis in Chapter 6. The citation analysis therefore covers only a small percentage of Norwegian development research.

It should also be noted that even though Norwegian development research scores well (25 percent of the journal articles on "level 2") and has a very high percentage of scholarly publications in English, several of the most frequently used journals are Norwegian (Table 4.10, e.g. *Forum for Development Studies*, *Norwegian Journal of Geography* and *Internasjonal Politikk*). The central Oslo-based journals in the field are discussed in the next section.

4.1.3 Norwegian journals in the development research field

Two Oslo-based journals published in English – and thus with an outreach beyond Norway – are of special importance in this evaluation. *Journal of Peace Research (JPR)* specialises in conflict research; *Forum for Development Studies (FDS)* is a broader, development studies-oriented journal.

JPR is housed at the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO) and published and distributed by Sage Publications in the United Kingdom. It has an international editorial board and uses a peer review system before accepting articles. It is a journal that is widely respected in its field, ranking at the top in terms of citations. Adding to its prestige among scholars around the world is the work performed on civil or intra-state conflicts by the Centre for the Study of Civil Wars (CSCW), a unit within PRIO. Drawing on the data sets created by CSCW, JPR has become an outlet for information on intra-state conflicts which attracts other researchers around the world. Thus, a study of which international journals devoted to armed conflicts were cited most often between 1996 and 2006 shows that JPR was the third most frequently cited periodical (see http://www.esi-topics.com/armed-conflict). PRIO-based researchers Nils Peter Gleditsch, Håvard Hegre and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch are among the 15 most cited researchers on armed conflicts in the world. It is clear that by virtue of its editorial responsibility for JPR, PRIO and Norway have assumed a place of pride in the research community interested in armed conflicts.

FDS began in 1974 as a forum for information and debate on themes related to development and North-South relations, including development cooperation. Based at the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI), FDS was originally published in Norwegian (*Forum for utviklingsstudier*), but as it continued to attract readers, it became a conventional journal in 1989, published twice a year in cooperation with the Norwegian Association for Development Research. Three years later it made English the sole language of publication. In the past ten years, it has relied on financial support from RCN. It is a multidisciplinary journal that has devoted its pages to a broad range of important

development themes, e.g. conservation and development, individualism and institutionalism, land tenure and property rights, elections and democratisation, taxation, aid and democracy, and development thinking and practice within the United Nations. FDS attracts authors primarily from Norway and the other Scandinavian countries, but it includes a sprinkling of contributors from other countries in Europe, North America, Africa and Australia, and it has become increasingly international: between 1996 and 2000 the number of Norwegian contributors constituted 70 percent of the total; between 2001 and 2006 this figure was 44 percent. Like JPR, FDS uses a peer review system that is increasingly non-Norwegian. In 1998-1999, 65 percent of the reviewers were Norwegian; in 2004-2006 this figure had dropped to 51 percent. FDS has no immediate counterpart elsewhere in Scandinavia and has become a particularly popular outlet for geographers, anthropologists, political scientists and also economists in Denmark, Norway and Sweden. With growing recognition outside Scandinavia, it continues to attract development researchers from other countries and regions of the world as well.

4.2 Publications aimed at users and the wider public

The research units reported a wide variety of publications aimed at different types of users and audiences. There are substantial amounts of research reports – published by the user organisation or the research organisation – both in Norway and abroad. A large share of these are in English (including the publications in the institutional series). Moreover, there are substantial numbers of contributions in journals with a wider audience, both domestic and international (such as Arid Lands Newsletter, Bistandsaktuelt, Development Today, NIASnytt, Verdensmagasinet X), as well as in a broad range of Norwegian newspapers. There are also several foreign newspapers on the lists. It should be noted that some of the institutions have reported contributions to more general scientific journals (including both *Science* and *Nature*) in their list of publications aimed at the wider public.[27]

Some units reported more publications aimed at users and the wider public than scholarly publications. Of those reporting more items targeted towards a wider public rather than the research community, we mostly find research institutes (CMI, Fafo, NIBR and NINA, with Noragric as the "exception" at the universities). This could indicate both that these units have better routines for registering non-scholarly publications and that they conduct research with a clearer user orientation and for application purposes than the university units. Several university units commented that their personnel underreport their non-scholarly activity (both written and oral). The data still seem to indicate that the amount of communication directed at users and the wider public differs substantially among the institutions – and that in general the research institutes seem to be the most active –

[27] Due to time restraints we have unfortunately not been able to check the consistency of journals reported under the wider public category. (Only the lists reported under scholarly publications have been quality assured.)

although some of the differences might be due to different routines for the reporting of publications aimed at the non-scholarly public.

Regardless of weaknesses in the data, in general it seems that considerable effort is spent on dissemination and communication of results to policy makers and a wider public.

4.3 Talks, presentations and media appearances

With regard to oral communication of research, the comprehensiveness of the reporting varied even more than for written communication. A few units provided lists of paper presentations, talks (both domestic and international), interviews and other types of appearances on TV or radio. Some also listed films or videos/DVDs. Others gave summary reports of the types of channels used, whereas some left the question open. As differences in the units' ability to report on oral communication activity were foreseen, the institutions were asked to provide the information that they did have available, which of course did not result in consistency in the reporting.

The presentation of papers at international scholarly meetings and conferences seems to be one of the most common forms of oral dissemination, but again this might be due to better routines for reporting such activities. Talks and presentations aimed at users and policy makers, as well as appearances on radio and TV, also seem widespread. With regard to presentations to non-academics, we find a wide variety of audiences on all continents, including workshops and meetings in LDCs and events arranged by international organisations, as well as presentations to Norwegian aid organisations and Norwegian authorities.

The Evaluation Committee concludes that, in general, it seems that the units in this evaluation are engaged in a substantial amount of oral communication of research targeted towards the research community, commissioning institutions, policy makers and the general public. It should be added, however, that there are some reservations concerning the researcher-user relationship. The researchers who were interviewed also emphasised that they employ a wide variety of dissemination channels and that there is a high demand for communication with users and a general public. This type of dissemination activity seems to be restricted more by the availability of time than by invitations or opportunities. Regarding oral versus written communication, one informant also stated that oral presentations are much better suited for reaching users than the standard research report format and that researchers should focus on publishing academic articles rather than spending time on writing reports that are not read. From the users' perspective, it was stated that researchers do not give high priority to communication with users (see Section 6.2.4). Overall, the data leave us with an impression that the researchers have different attitudes and priorities regarding user communication, which would indicate that the extent and quality of such communication may vary considerably depending on the researchers involved. Relevance and use are discussed further in Chapter 6.

4.4 Website communication

The importance of good websites for communicating research should not be underestimated. The quality of websites varies considerably among the units in this evaluation, and some have the potential to greatly improve communication through their websites. Some seem to have given high priority to developing their websites, while others seem to have neglected them.

The website of a research unit should provide a good overview of publications and projects, as well as the expertise of the scholarly staff. Also, good routines for regular updates are vital for communicating with all kinds of users and should not be left up to the individual researchers. Frequent updates of the websites also help to promote research results and increase the likelihood that the information will be used by and have an impact in the various user groups.

Moreover, it is important to adapt the form of communication to the various user groups. Non-researchers usually prefer relatively short texts that summarise findings and recommendations in a coherent manner or power-point briefings in a more closed setting. There are different ways to meet such demands. The Internet is an efficient medium for posting electronic policy briefs. In addition, websites are well suited for providing downloadable text in various versions – in the form of full text, executive summaries or even briefings or dialogues adapted to meet specific needs.

4.5 Summary of main observations

Scholarly publications

- The *lingua franca* of development research is English, and Norwegian development research reflects this. Only 7 percent of the publications studied are in Norwegian or other Scandinavian languages, whereas about 90 percent are in English. In addition to most of the research being published internationally, many articles also appear in the highly rated international journals. This indicates that Norwegian development researchers largely relate to development research as an international research field.
- The research results are published in a wide variety of journals. In the five-year period studied, 27 percent of the articles were published in 15 different journals (with 6 to 22 articles in each); the remaining articles were distributed among 269 different journals – with one to five articles in each.
- The publication profiles of the thematic areas vary somewhat. The highest proportion of journal articles is found within “Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction” (65 percent), the lowest within “Culture, Education and Gender” (44 percent).

- There are also differences in the frequency of co-authorship. Sixty-three percent of the publications within "Resource Management" are co-authored; only 18 percent of the publications within "Culture, Education and Gender" are co-authored.
- The publication output was also analysed in terms of the scores based on the newly introduced performance-based budgeting model for Norwegian higher education institutions. In all publication categories, the overall percentage of the publications in highly rated outlets is higher than the 20 percent "limit" of the performance-based budgeting model, indicating a high international profile of the publications in this field compared to Norwegian publishing in other fields. The independent institutes scored somewhat better than the higher education institutions in terms of the proportion of their output that is published in highly rated outlets. On the other hand, the majority of the scholarly output comes from the higher education sector.
- Looking at publication outlet ratings by thematic area, there are notable differences. Whereas as much as 33 percent of the journal articles within "Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction" appear in journals rated as the most important in their field, only 15 percent of the journal articles within "Resource Management" are in such highly rated journals.

Publications and communication aimed at users/a wider public

- The units in this evaluation seem to spend considerable effort on the dissemination and communication of results to policy makers and a wider public. However, there are large variations among the units in terms of how well they keep records of their non-scholarly publications and communications.
- Norwegian development researchers are good at writing for a wider public. They are more active in the public sphere than their colleagues in neighbouring countries, and there is a more lively public debate about development issues.
- Nevertheless, the data leave us with an impression that the researchers have different attitudes and priorities regarding user communication, which would indicate that the extent and quality of such communication may vary considerably depending on the researchers involved.
- Good websites are important for communicating research. The quality of websites varies considerably among the units in this evaluation, and some have the potential to greatly improve communication through their websites.

Overall, the Evaluation Committee considers that the number of Norwegian articles in good outlets has increased substantially. This indicates that Norwegian development researchers have become more competitive and that their visibility and recognition have been enhanced.

5 Quality and scope of the research

What is the international standing and quality of Norwegian development research? To answer this question, a selection of the scholarly publications was reviewed. The Evaluation Committee selected 2 to 12 publications from each of the research units – depending on the size of the unit. In total, 157 publications were reviewed. The major concerns when selecting these publications were to include articles by the major researchers and in the major journals, as well as articles by a variety of researchers and research topics at each institution. Some institutions had listed only a few articles in scholarly journals or anthologies, and consequently, there were little to choose between.[28] It should be noted that the selection is most likely biased towards the better publications, as the Committee took care to include publications by the key researchers and from the major development journals.

The publications of each research unit were reviewed by two to three external referees – for 23 of the publications, however, only one referee report was obtained. The referees were selected by the Evaluation Committee with input from RCN. In total, 20 experts outside the Evaluation Committee were used, none of them Norwegian. The referees were asked to comment on specific questions regarding originality, methods/solidity, scholarly relevance, publication profile and research impact and to rate the publications on a scale from "Poor" to "Exceptionally Good" (see Appendix 4 for the review form used).

Below we first give an account of the results of the publication review by thematic area and by type of institution. At the end of the chapter, the general conclusions are summarised. It should be added that within all areas, the reviewers expressed different opinions and there were also different interpretations of the rating scale. When presenting the scores, we have used the aggregated averages to outweigh these differences in assessments and interpretations. The intention is to provide a good overall picture of the strengths and weaknesses of the research under review – not to assess the various research units.

5.1 Thematic areas

Table 5.1 shows the average scores resulting from the publication review. Summarised by thematic areas, the average scores for the different aspects evaluated vary between "Good" (4) and "Very Good" (5). There are only small differences between the various thematic areas reviewed.

---

[28] The publication categories deemed relevant and feasible for the external review were articles in scholarly journals and in anthologies. In one case, the self-assessment report (Dept. of Sociology at UiT) contained no relevant scholarly articles, and the unit was consequently not included in the publication review.

Table 5.1 Review of selected development research publications, average scores by thematic area

Thematic Area	# Publications reviewed	Average score			
		Originality	Methods	Scholarly relevance	Publication profile
Resource Management	28	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.8
Rights, Security and Democracy	27	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.2
Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction	33	4.5	4.8	4.6	4.6
Culture, Education and Gender	17	4.7	4.3	4.8	4.0
Multiple areas	52	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.8

Reviewers were asked to rate the publications on a scale consisting of seven levels: Poor (1), Weak (2), Fair (3), Good (4), Very Good (5), Excellent (6), Exceptionally Good (7).

Resource Management

According to our definition, "Resource Management" comprises research related to resources and environments with a societal or policy-oriented perspective and with a particular relevance to LDCs. Central topics are: Biodiversity, Land, water and people, Climate change and Environmental governance.

The quality of the publications assessed is generally quite high. They are technically and methodologically competent, and published in good international journals. The publications and research results are often highly relevant to policy makers as well the research community. It should also be noted that much of the work is based on good quality survey data – which is also an important quality dimension – and clearly motivated by a good understanding of data and policy issues.

Taking deforestation as an example, we find both original theoretical work and some original empirical analyses. The articles produced within this area are considered to make an important contribution to the literature and also to provide important policy conclusions. Smallholder analysis is another example. Some of this research is said to have its strength in the development of bio-economic models and its ability to simulate the impact of different types of interventions. In both cases, the research is based on the application of best practice methodology rather than on the development of new theory as such.

Some of the research shows great breadth in the application of methods and theoretical approaches, ranging from quantitative to qualitative, ecological to social-scientific. One characteristic of many of the research articles is that they combine themes within the broader spectrum of development research. Their theoretical and methodological approaches are built upon lines of thought that are already developed within the respective research fields, but the work is very solid, and they generally reflect a very high level of competence in data collection and analysis. The research is fully conversant with the latest conceptual, methodological and empirical discussions and makes original contributions to the field.

In many cases, the research is published in highly visible international journals of a good standard. In general, the research is of particular interest to scholars working on natural resources and environment in developing countries, but will also be of interest to policy makers, decision makers and environmental managers from around the world, especially in Asia and Africa.

Some of the articles in this category that achieved the best scores on originality are those which combine good empirical work with theory-building, being both at the theoretical and methodological forefront. Political and ecological perspectives are often combined. Some articles, however, are said to be original contributions to the literature and have wider relevance to methods and analysis, but not able to derive policy relevance. Among the articles receiving more modest scores are those that are interesting to a relatively small scientific audience, and neither would be perceived as useful for policy makers.

There are notable differences in the ratings given by the various reviewers. In the most extreme cases, the scores for the same article vary from 'Fair' to 'Excellent' – which also defines the part of the rating scale applied in this group. (No articles were given a score lower than 'Fair' or higher than 'Excellent'.) On the other hand, when rating the units, in most cases each reviewer gave the same scores on all four criteria. However, there are a few cases of higher scores on methods, thus contributing to a slightly higher average score on this criterion.

The general impression is that the strength of this thematic area is that it offers some very good examples of research efforts which combine themes within the broader spectrum of development research in an interdisciplinary effort. However, it also presents research which emerges from relatively small research groups hosted by institutions where development-related research is a minor part of the overall activities, and this situation may not provide optimal conditions for the creation of a strong research environment.

Rights, Security and Democracy

This thematic category covers a wide range of topics such as governance, democratisation, the role of the state, human rights, security, conflict and peace in relation to LDCs. It also contains different types of interdisciplinary work. For instance, some of the research articles reviewed sought to make important contributions by providing analytical syntheses of different fields, e.g. archaeology, anthropology, sociology and disaster management.

Some of the research relating to peace and conflict was rated very high – the only case of a reviewer giving the highest score on the rating scale was found in this field. The publications are said to identify interesting research questions and generate original research focusing on "big questions". Moreover, the scholars show a strong awareness of the relevant conceptual, theoretical and empirical literature.

This category also contains research aimed at understanding the social, cultural and political dimensions of human rights. On the whole, the research was assessed as providing an important theoretical framework for analysis. Moreover, its impulse toward multi-disciplinary dialogue on human rights issues is seen as novel and valuable. In other cases, it was commented that the main quality of the research lies in dealing with sensitive issues, hence the requirement for careful design of research tactics and further innovation in researchers accessing some very hazardous environments and marginalised communities. The research underpinning these publications was considered highly professional and competent.

Whereas some of the research within this group is mainly theoretical and addresses a given scholarly debate, other contributions are primarily descriptive and have their primary value in addressing new and previously under-investigated questions or in being relevant to a wider audience. The empirically oriented research also comprises social surveys and statistics for which Norway has developed a strong and well-reputed research profile.

Of the publications given lower scores, we find some "state of the art" articles that are said to have only limited relevance for a scholarly debate, but might have more relevance for policy makers.

The units that tended to score well across the four review criteria tended to be the more specialised research institutions. Units with a broader research profile outside development research tended to fare less well in the evaluations, albeit all units were seen as meeting acceptable international standards.

Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction

The research topics in this thematic category range from poverty to trade and finance and urbanisation. Many of the publications reviewed fall within the area of development economics.

Many of the articles reviewed within this thematic area are innovative and provide new theoretical insights. They are motivated by empirical observations and develop theoretical frameworks that help to explain the observations. The best work is at the international research frontier. It is generally theoretically strong, while the empirical analysis is of more varied depth. The best researchers in development economics clearly possess a high level of theoretical and analytical expertise, and they manage to publish much of their work in top development journals or in high quality general journals. In several cases, the external reviewers characterise the publication profile as excellent. Some of the articles are widely cited, which shows that they have had a significant scientific impact. One may note that several of the best articles are the result of joint work between researchers from two of the units in this evaluation.

As in the other thematic areas, there is a considerable range of quality between the researchers who produce the best work and those who do not. The external reviewers had question-marks with regard to studies by some less well-published researchers, in which the level of quantitative analysis sometimes was weak, the research had limited scholarly relevance, and it did not provide much of policy implications. Still, most of the research produced by the best development economics researchers was found to be highly relevant.

The top quality work within development economics in Norway is concentrated in a few places. The fact that the best environments for research in this group are all academic departments is perhaps not a coincidence. In a broad research environment, one can also draw on the expertise of colleagues outside the narrow field of development research. Norwegian development economists are also well connected with the rest of the discipline of economics, which is important for the scientific quality of the work.

Culture, Education and Gender

This thematic category comprises topics such as cultural identity, education, language, gender and indigenous peoples. Some of the items ranked highest in terms of generating new insights in this thematic category are publications based on original ethnographic research and fieldwork. The contribution to the understanding of contemporary social, cultural and economic change here mainly derives from anthropology, and is judged to be valuable and relevant. Examples of research receiving the best scores under this heading are publications which provide important contributions and insight to that part of anthropological research dealing with concepts of indigenousness and identity. These articles draw on anthropological methods and long-term qualitative research in developing countries and demonstrate the way in which such explicit empirical field knowledge can feed into broader analysis. The publications indicate work of good scholarly relevance to development research, and at the same time form part of mainstream anthropology, and have high potential relevance for NGOs, governments and inter-governmental organisations.

Moreover, a dominance of ‘gender sensitive’ areas of research is commented on as a positive feature by external reviewers. Other strengths of the research reviewed under this heading include the use of an historical approach, which is seen by external reviewers to be an important and often underemphasized component of international development research. Some weaknesses, on the other hand, are somewhat related to this approach, as it sometimes implies highly descriptive and less analytical forms of argumentation. Also, there is sometimes an overall dearth of any critical perspective on the topics under study. There are also cases in which the scholarly relevance is said to be confined to rather narrow boundaries both in terms of theory as well as empirically (locally based case studies). Occasionally there are also gaps in the interaction with the larger body of international literature that deals with the pertinent research issues.

It should also be noted that some of the research is criticised in the external reviews for being ideological – too strongly biased against globalisation – and 'look for imperialism under the bed'. This issue is said to be addressed in simplistic, narrow terms rather than by demonstrating good knowledge of the literature. Most of the research, however, is still judged to be good empirical and solid evidential work.

Summing up, the strength of the research reviewed within this thematic group is its solid anchoring in fieldwork and the use of anthropological methods. A weakness may be identified as an inability of the research to go sufficiently beyond the local perspective and addressing or scaling up research results in a wider perspective.

Research in multiple areas

For several of the units under review, the research spans several of the thematic categories. The publications of 9 of the 27 units are placed under this heading, including several of the larger units. The most frequent combination is "Rights, Security and Democracy" with "Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction". For four of the units, publications in both these two fields have been reviewed.

In most cases, the research underpinning the publications within this category is considered to be highly professional and competent. They reveal a good grasp of the material at an international level of competence. Publications tend to be based on either detailed field ethnographies or thorough local field research. In both cases, they demonstrate a high level of expertise in research methods. Some articles are viewed as demonstrating a strong grasp of the international literature, reflecting long engagement in the relevant fields as well as showing the value of extensive fieldwork and research situated in developing countries. Among the research obtaining the best scores in this category are also publications that engage in critique of conventional wisdoms in the fields, adding value to existing knowledge by offering new insights at both theoretical and empirical levels, as well as contributing to an understanding of the underlying social and economic processes that shape the study and practice of international development. Other contributions noted as important – and with strong international relevance – were engaged in methodological critiques of development practice and methodology.

Comments on the various units were generally positive. For one research unit it was commented that although the subjects covered are quite varied, the publications reveal an effort to maintain development studies as a critical scholarly field. The publications in this case were said to be strong and technically competent, drawing on a variety of methods – also showing an excellent knowledge of the international literature and of a broader range of academic disciplines. In the case of another, publications were described as being in the forefront of interdisciplinary social science and being able to combine research issues from different disciplines so that the result is relevant for university education in many faculties.

There were also some critical comments. In one case it was commented that whereas the research was executed with competence and brought valuable and original empirical data from regions where empirical data is less readily available, more general reflections of the implications of the findings for broader research and development were missing. Other publications were assessed to deal with established topics that do not especially address cutting-edge issues or theories, and providing overviews rather than new thinking.

Most of the research was given quite high scores on publication profile, but in a few cases it was commented that there is potential for improvement. For instance, the international resonance could be much higher if the papers were published in top journals or by major publishing houses. In one case it was commented that clearer connections to the research frontier were also missing.

With regard to the more applied research, it is worth noting that some of the research grouped under this heading by the reviewers was still said to demonstrate a high level of theoretical awareness and appropriate attention to the relevant methodological and conceptual problems, to appear to be well integrated into relevant international communities, and to provide insights relevant for further development of theory. However, there were also comments saying that the output from some institutions was more policy advice than research.

In many cases, the research was considered to be of interest to both an academic and a policy audience. Publications which have relevance to the international scholarly literature and debate and holding a wider recognition by being strongly referenced outside Norway, were also said to be of interest to policy makers – whether NGOs, national government aid ministries or multilateral agencies.

Some publications were said to have their value not in setting new agendas or contributing to the latest debate, but in putting issues into perspective, serving as excellent teaching material, and probably also being more useful to a policy audience than to an academic audience. In one case it was commented that the results could have been better targeted and edited to be of interest to scientists as well as policy makers. It should also be noted that in one case the reviewer commented that some of the publications had virtually nothing to do with development research.

On balance, it is fair to conclude that in comparison the reviewed papers that span more than one category fare quite as well as those that tend to focus more on a single category.

5.2 Different institutional settings

In order to investigate possible differences in research quality related to institutional settings, average scores were calculated by sector and by size of the research groups/units. Measuring research quality can be done in different ways, none of which is easy or

definitive. The Committee found that conclusions will differ based on the approach taken. As Table 5.2 shows, based on the scores provided by the external reviewers, there is a slight advantage in favour of the independent research institutes. Although an input-output analysis could not be performed due to lack of information, a simple analysis of the number of scholarly articles per researcher nonetheless indicates an advantage for university departments (cf. notes to Table 4.8).

Table 5.2 Review of selected development research publications, average scores by type of institution

Kind of unit	# Units reviewed	Average score			
		Originality	Methods	Scholarly relevance	Publication profile
University/u.college: departments	16	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.3
University/u.college: centres and programmes	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4
Independent research institutes	7	4.9	4.9	4.8	5.0
Total	27	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.5

Reviewers were asked to rate the publications on a scale on a seven graded scale: Poor (1), Weak (2), Fair (3), Good (4), Very Good (5), Excellent (6), Exceptionally Good (7).

To study the importance of group size, average scores were calculated according to three different measures of size. All measures were related to the number of researchers at the units who spend more than half of their research time on development research (Table 5.3). The differences in scores are most notable when the number of senior-level staff members are included in the calculations. Units with five or more senior-level staff members in the field score on average 0.4 better on originality and methods, 0.5 higher on scholarly relevance and 1.1 higher on publication profile when compared with units with fewer senior-level staff members. Setting a limit of three senior-level staff members combined with a total size of at least eight researchers yields about the same results. On the other hand, when measuring size by the number of researchers only (not distinguishing among junior-level and senior-level) less distinct differences are found (Table 5.3).

Table 5.3 Review of selected development research publications, average scores by size of research unit

Size of unit	# Units reviewed	Average score			
		Originality	Methods	Scholarly relevance	Publication profile
By number of seniors					
5 or more senior development researchers	8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.3
4 or less senior development researchers	19	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.2
By number of seniors and total size					
At least 3 seniors and a total of at least 8 development researchers	10	4.9	4.9	5.1	5.4
Less than 3 seniors or a total of less than 8 development researchers	17	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.0
By total size					
10 or more development researchers	11	4.7	4.8	4.9	5.1
9 or less development researchers	16	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.2

Notes: "Development researchers" include scholarly personnel who spend more than half of their research time on development research. See Section 3.1 for further details, including the definition of "senior-level staff". In one case there was no information in the submitted personnel list about the amount of time the listed researchers spent on "development research". In this case, we assumed that several of the listed researchers did not spend more than half of their research time on "development research", and included the units among the "small" units in the table.
See note to the table above for explanations of the scores.

5.3 Scope of development research

As indicated in the overview (Section 2.3), Norwegian development research is quite widely distributed across themes. Although the scope is wide-ranging, some research areas receive more emphasis than others, notably governance, natural resource management, the marginalisation of people, and gender issues. More specifically, Norwegian development researchers excel in research on human rights, armed conflict, the displacement of people and natural resource issues. Areas that may be regarded as overlooked, given their prominence as policy problems, include the informalisation of the urban economies in Africa and Latin America, the full and varied effects of globalisation, as well as an independent research on critical aid issues. The Committee also notes that several individual researchers in anthropology, economics and political science have brought international recognition and visibility to their respective disciplines..

Moreover, the Evaluation Committee formed the impression that Norwegian development researchers have built up particular expertise in research on certain regions of the world, such as the African region and countries as well as other countries that have been traditional aid recipients. Domains of less extensive focus have been Latin America and Central Asia (cf. Table 6.5.). This scope is not considered a matter of concern but rather a reflection of research strengths and concentrations developed over time within the research community. However, the pressures of globalisation entail a problematisation of the 'space' or 'location' of development and bring the challenges of development to the doorstep of the OECD countries. In tandem, this complicates the conceptual scope of development research beyond an area or country focus (see Section 6.3 and Box 6.2).

5.4 Summary of main observations

- Summarised by thematic areas, there are only small differences in average scores for the publications reviewed in this evaluation. The comments from reviewers can be used to point out some different concerns:
  - *Resource Management:* The general impression is that the strength of this thematic area is that it offers some very good examples of research efforts which combine themes within the broader spectrum of development research in an interdisciplinary effort. However, it also presents research which emerges from relatively small research groups hosted by institutions where development-related research is a minor part of the overall activities.
  - *Rights, Security and Democracy:* The more specialised research institutions tended to score best within this thematic area. Units with a broader research profile outside development research tended to fare less well in the evaluations, albeit all units were seen as meeting acceptable international standards.
  - *Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction:* The top quality work within development economics in Norway is concentrated in a few places, all of which are academic departments. Norwegian development economists are also well connected with the rest of the discipline of economics, which is important for the scientific quality of the work.
  - *Culture, Education and Gender:* The strength of the research reviewed within this thematic group is the solid anchoring in fieldwork and the use of anthropological methods. One weakness may be identified as not sufficiently being able to go beyond the localised, and addressing or scaling up research results in a wider perspective.
  - *Research in multiple areas:*[29] The reviewed development research that spans more than one category fared quite well in comparison with those that tend to be more focused on a single category – and especially the larger units within this group score well. This indicates some merit of the larger units in trying to have a broad perspective on development, a larger group of senior-level staff in the field and possible cross-fertilisation of studies in different areas of development research.
  - In conclusion, the basis for good research varies somewhat among the thematic areas. Whereas research in development economics is best conducted in university economics departments, much of the other research seems to profit from being conducted in larger, more broad-based groups/units devoted to development research.
- There is merit in trying to conduct inter-disciplinary research, especially in fields such as resource management, because it often broadens the perspective on a given issue, it allows for an examination of underlying factors in development, and it hones conceptual, theoretical, and methodological skills.

[29] See Section 5.1 for what is included in this category.

- The research units above a certain minimum size – in terms of the number of senior-level staff members who devote more than half of their time to development research – on average obtained better scores than the smaller units.

The general impression is that Norwegian development research provides high quality, although with significant variations among the research units as well as individual researchers. The publications reviewed in this evaluation scored quite high on originality, solidity and scholarly relevance. From a comparative international perspective, however, there is still room for improvement, including a larger number of publications in peer-reviewed international journals.

6 Relevance and use

This chapter first describes the relevance and use of Norwegian development research as reported in the self-assessment reports and by the informants (Sections 6.1-6.2.4). Section 6.2.5 reports the results of the citation analysis, and Section 6.3 offers some more overall reflections on the conditions for the relevance and use of development research.

6.1 Major users of Norwegian development research and modes of user interaction

One section of the self-assessment report was designed to solicit information about the different types of users of development research as well as perspectives on the relevance and impact of such research. 'User groups' were divided into three general types: A. Domestic users; B. International organisations; C. Users in less developed countries. In the main, most respondents listed users of their research in all three categories. They were also asked to indicate the mode of user interaction: commissioner/client, participant in seminars/receives reports etc., and other kinds of users (open category). The table below shows the number of users listed in the various categories.

Table 6.1 Users of Norwegian development research by performing sector, type of user and user location

Type of user and type of research unit	Domestic users			International organisations			Users in LDCs		
	Sum	Average	Max	Sum	Average	Max	Sum	Average	Max
Commissioning institutionss/clients									
Universities/u.colleges	50	2.6	10	32	1.7	8	7	0.4	2
Institutes	35	5.8	10	39	6.5	9	14	2.3	9
Total	85	3.4	10	71	2.8	9	21	0.8	9
Participant in seminars, report recipients and other users									
Universities/u.colleges	112	5.9	48	63	3.3	19	44	2.3	23
Institutes	39	6.5	27	10	1.7	3	48	8.0	26
Total	151	6.0	48	73	2.9	19	92	3.7	26

Source: The research units' self-assessment reports.
Notes: 25 research units answered this question. Averages and max values show numbers of listed users per research unit. "Sum" shows the sum of users reported by all 25 organisations, implying that each user is counted once for each time it is reported (the total amount of different users are not calculated).

One research unit reported only foreign users, and two reported only domestic users. Apart from these three, all units reported both domestic and foreign users (that is, those 25 that filled in this part of the self-assessment report).

Domestic users

The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and Norad were the most frequently cited domestic users. This finding was expected, confirming widely held perceptions about these two public institutions' interest in development research and the funding of such research. Other public sector agencies include the Directorate for Cultural Heritage,

Directorate for Nature Management (DN), the Ministries of Defence, Education, Justice, Environment, and Oil and Energy, the Norwegian Programme for Development, Research and Education (NUFU), and the Norwegian Research Council (RCN). Other non-departmental public bodies mentioned as users included the Norwegian State Educational Loan Fund, FK Norway (Fredskorpset), City of Oslo (Oslo Kommune), Statkraft, Statoil, and the State Forestry Commission.

Listed as part of the NGO community were the Development Fund, Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA), CARE Norway, FORUT, Save the Children, Norwegian People's Aid, Norwegian Red Cross, Norwegian Association of Development Research, Norwegian Church Aid, Royal Norwegian Society for Development (SNV), Transparency International, WWF-Norway and so forth. Of these, SNV is one of the more prominent user groups cited. Norwegian companies and consultancy groups included Norconsult, NorskHydro and Norplan.

Importantly, other Norwegian research institutes and universities were identified as users although these institutions were very much less likely to be the commissioner or client of the research process. As expected, interaction and engagement occur among these institutions through participation in seminars or the circulation of research reports.

International organisations and users in less developed countries

Among international organisations most frequently cited as users were the World Bank and various UN agencies – especially UNDP but also FAO, UNEP and UNESCO (cf. Section 3.3). Distinctive from the domestic users and the international organisations, the most common type of institution cited as a user organisation in LDCs was either universities or independent institutes/research centres. Furthermore, the character of user interaction was more likely to be of an indeterminate nature via Norwegian participation in seminars in LDC institutions or by these institutions receiving reports from Norwegian research institutions.

Those institutions commissioning research were usually governmental, Norwegian embassies based in LDCs or international organisations. For instance, public sector clients included the State Ethnic Affairs Commission in China, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) in eastern Africa, the UN sponsored Mine Action program for Afghanistan, UNDP Khartoum and UNESCO South Pacific. Public sector commissioning of Norwegian research in LDCs represented approximately 10 percent of interactions. NGOs clients of research included Research on Poverty Alleviation (REPOA) in Tanzania, *Dialogue Nationale* in Haiti, and the Farmers' Rights Project cutting across a number of countries.

By no means do the various organisations and user groups identified above represent the extent of the interaction of Norwegian research bodies with other development research

actors or stakeholders. We have not received complete users lists, and the way in which the self-assessment report was filled in varied.

6.2 Relevance of research to major target groups

The relevance of institute or university research was defined by research institutions (in their self-assessment reports) in a variety of ways, as itemised below. A frequent statement was that the main or first target group is the research community, and it is within this group that relevance resides, albeit not exclusively. A second target was society as a whole. A third target group was decision makers.

Relevance to researchers

Among the most noted reasons for the value of development research was the provision of arenas for researchers (and younger scholars) to meet and work on common research interests. Important also was the way in which development research was beneficial in raising awareness and developing critical thinking. Other modes of relevance to the research community include (i) building networks that provide access to issue-specific networks and/or international networks; (ii) finding avenues for research cooperation and collaboration as well as stimulating new avenues of research; (iii) participation in research associations, particularly the European Association of Development Institutes (EADI) and the Norwegian Association for Development Research (NFU), as well as various Scandinavian associations, also including involvement with institutions such as the Nordic Africa Institute; (iv) recognition and accreditation of development studies as an academic field within formal university structures; and (v) inclusion of staff publications on the reading lists of course curricula at national and international higher education institutions.

Relevance to civil society – Norwegian and international

The relevance of development research to Norwegian society and other societies throughout the world is multifaceted, but relevance arises mostly from the benefits of general knowledge production. This may include the role played by development research in the articulation of an alternative/independent research agenda; that is, as noted in one self-evaluation report, “playing useful roles in debates among both intellectuals and (when possible) ordinary folk in parts of the world where (we) have done research”. More specific social roles include (i) training undergraduate and graduate students who hope to have careers in the broad field of development; (ii) developing a media presence; (iii) providing research support to activist groups and civil society organisations; and (iv) undertaking long-term assignments and capacity building that builds competence at the local level. Finally, regardless of whether it benefits society or more directly benefits policy formulation and the political sphere, development research also promotes the development of human capital with regard to future bureaucrats and politicians.

Relevance to policy makers

The relevance of Norwegian development research to policy making was a frequently occurring refrain. This included statements in the self-assessment reports regarding the involvement of research teams or institutes in "formulating development strategies" as well as "filling information and analytical gaps for better informed decision making". More specific activities of involvement in the policy world included: (i) participating in policy debates in public venues such as the Norwegian national assembly (Storting); (ii) appointment as advisors to politicians and/or official agencies as advisors; and (iii) undertaking research projects relevant to a specific location/country or to a specific development issue (e.g. female genital mutilation or the social implications of electrification in rural Zanzibar).

6.2.1 Participation in policy processes

Another concern of the Evaluation Committee was to develop a sense of the manner in which development research was incorporated into wider policy processes that potentially inform decision making and public debate. 'Participation in policy processes' was a specific type of impact identified for response in the self-assessment reports. The responses show a rich diversity of interactions with the official policy realm. Not all institutes, or the researchers within them, are involved in all of the activities mentioned here. Nevertheless, at an individual level, such engagements have included: appointment as *ad hoc* consultants to the World Bank or other development banks; appointment as chairs of Norwegian government commissions; and more often, the writing of background policy papers for evaluation committees or policy briefs. At an institutional level, research institutes or universities have, *inter alia*, provided: the lead person and secretariat (such as for the Norway-Finland Trust Fund Reference Group); intensive training courses for staff of international organisations; conference or meeting organisation; input to internal policy processes of Norad's strategic plans and white papers or advice within consultation processes within MFA.

While participation in policy processes is not a concern of all institutions, communication with policy makers or the desire to inform public debate was nevertheless noted as important by a majority of institutions. One institution's involvement in the 'Bridging Research and Policy' project of the Global Development Network (www.gdnet.org) is a singular example.

6.2.2 Use and impact of research

Frequently, respondents did not answer the question about the impact and use of their research in the self-assessment reports. Of the third of institutions that did reply, impact was usually asserted. Generally, however, evidence of such impact is lacking. Some institutions claimed media exposure (such as articles in the international press) as evidence of impact.

Statements made by institutions asserting that their research makes an impact often raised more questions than answers. For instance, the statement that "our research has also had impact on World Bank understanding on issues related to governance, aid and conflict" brings to the fore difficult methodological questions as to how one ascertains World Bank 'understanding' and changes thereof. As noted by one institution:

> *"Tracing direct links between research and impact represents a challenging and manifold task. The routes and mechanisms of dissemination are many and varied, and the ways in which research is used are also complex. Relevant questions to be considered are, amongst others:*
>
> - *Are we primarily interested in impact processes (how research outputs are used)?*
> - *Impact per se (the initial consequences of research use in the various decision arenas)?*
> - *Or outcomes (the subsequent consequences of changes in decision arenas for clients or public)?*
>
> *There are conceptual, practical and methodological issues to be considered, and 'impact' and 'worth' cannot be conflated. … Impact cannot be understood separate from an understanding of users to understand, absorb and utilise findings".*

Moreover, what might be considered to be a form of relevance and impact by members of the research community may well be discounted by decision makers or other users operating with different priorities and standards. Perception and subjective judgement play a large role in evaluating impact.

6.2.3 Agenda setting effects and international organisations

Some Norwegian researchers have found avenues of engagement with international organisations. Whether or not those researchers who interact with multilateral initiatives have an effect on agenda setting within these international organisations is a moot question. Nevertheless, for a small country and development research community, Norwegian scholars or their institutes sometimes achieve considerable input into the design of new initiatives, international policy debates pertaining to development issues or formal dialogue processes (such as on power-sharing in conflict zones). Two research-oriented international organisations are of relevance to this evaluation. The Global Development Network (GDN)[30] has received substantial support from Norad, and in this connection there has been a notable degree of critical engagement with a few Norwegian scholars. Although it is a small, informal body in comparison with the GDN, the Researchers Alliance for Development (RAD)[31] is another multidisciplinary network of researchers.

---

30 The GDN (www.gdnet.org) is formally constituted as an International Organisation. It is an international association of researchers dedicated to supporting high quality, policy-oriented research in the social sciences to promote development.

31 RAD (www.worldbank.org/rad) currently comprises more than 600 representatives of academic institutions and research centres, as well as research units in NGOs, bilateral agencies, the private sector and trade unions from all over the world. Its objectives are: (1) facilitating interaction between the academic community and the World Bank; (2) mobilising the academic and student community on development issues and curricula, and facilitating mutual flow of knowledge.

RAD aims to strengthen the interaction between the World Bank and the research community worldwide. The current and founding chair of the RAD Steering Committee is Norwegian. In general, it appears that interaction with international development agencies can have the effect of providing positive incentive or encouragement for the engagement of other Norwegian researchers with international organisations.

6.2.4 The opinions of the interviewed users

As explained in Section 1.4, input to this evaluation from the users was less extensive than requested. Thanks to those users who took the time to be interviewed by the Evaluation Committee, valuable input was still obtained. All the users interviewed were concerned to contribute to the evaluation and provided valuable input. This section presents a summary of the views expressed in the interviews with user representatives.

Access and use

Evaluation seems a major purpose of commissioned research in this field. The researchers are perceived to be available, and the users are also able to combine research units and consultancies on the same projects. Most often the users are able to get what they need in time. On the other hand, they perceive "user-group communication" to be the researchers' third priority – after scholarly journals and the general media. The users have to be active to get information.

Users read research reports (at least sometimes) and gain some overview of the pertinent research, but they have little time to delve into the content. Normally users do not read books or scholarly articles, but acquire an overview of the relevant research through more popular media and arenas. Direct contact with researchers at seminars and meetings seems to be an important source of their information. In general, the users point to a need to improve the dissemination and use of development research and that scarce resources limit NGOs' linkages and interaction with researchers. They pointed out that it is difficult to stay updated on all the relevant research reports and that there could be better management of the information flow. Above all, the information should be provided in the form of summaries or "briefs" rather than drafts of long reports that no one has time to read. For instance, Norad could provide more material for the embassies and other central users, but better summarised and conveyed than it currently is. More time for digesting research and more interaction with researchers, as well as funds/grants directed at dissemination (for the research community), were also suggested.

Commissions and relevance

Some general "barriers to relevance" were pointed out in the user interviews. For instance, it is difficult to foresee the needs that will arise in five years, both for users and researchers. Some users also felt that today's situation and trends often are not reflected in the research. Some thought that Norwegian researchers should be better integrated into the international research community. When asked about how to secure the broader Norwegian

knowledge base, the long-term topics under the RCN programmes, as well as RCN's open calls for proposals, were referred to. It should be added that users seemed satisfied with the way in which the RCN programmes function. They perceived both the academic quality and the relevance of the proposals to be high. Grant applications to RCN programmes for studying the effects of Norwegian aid were said to be welcome, whereas the interviews with selected research groups gave the opposite impression.

For long-term research, "value for money" was said not to be important. For short-term funding, "value for money" was perceived as difficult to assess, but in general the users seemed satisfied with what they received. It was stated that institute researchers are typically more thorough and analytical than staff from consulting firms. They are especially adept at conducting broader studies such as those needed to gain a better understanding of the conditions in recipient countries. A combination of Norwegian and local researchers would be the best means of satisfying the need for a better understanding of the local structures in LDCs/recipient countries. Moreover, practical experience in the field was perceived as an important factor determining who can do a good job in advising policy analysts, government officials and NGOs. It was also emphasised that researchers who do not deliver the kind of relevant, applicable and readable papers needed are not consulted any more.

In general, the users did not perceive the relationship between short-term commissioned research and more long-term basic research as problematic. On the contrary, commissioned applied research was viewed as a win-win situation: The commissioning institutions gain access to expertise and the researchers gain access to data and informants that can also be used for more long-term research. Some challenges were mentioned nonetheless. A well-placed person in the MFA commented that the increased emphasis on scientific quality in the institute sector means that there is a risk that relevance to the field is lost. On the other hand, because donors coordinate their work in each recipient country, fewer studies are likely to be commissioned by each individual agency, thus limiting the number of studies accessible to Norwegian institutes.

Moreover, users commented that some institutes are driven more by individual than institutional agendas. Also, project allocations seem to some extent to depend on personal factors and serendipity. Experienced staff members know whom to hire or which institute to turn to when they are in need of research. On the other hand, the limit of NOK 0.5 million without tender competition seems to be respected.

6.2.5 Relevance to the international research community (citations)

As a basis for assessing the relevance of the Norwegian research output to the international research community, a citation analysis was performed. We examined a selection of ISI-indexed journals related to development research for the period 1991-2005. Table 6.2 shows the journals in which we found articles with Norwegian author-addresses. In total, 289 "Norwegian" papers were retrieved for the studied period. The majority of the papers

have obtained a moderate amount of citations (57 percent between 1 and 9 citations). Thirty-six percent have obtained no citations, and 7 percent are cited 10 times or more (up to 65 times by the end of 2005). The skewed distribution of citations is normal and about what could be expected.

Table 6.2 Articles with Norwegian author-addresses in a selection of ISI-indexed development research journals 1991-2005, frequencies and average number of citations by journal

Journal	# Articles	Total cites per article all years including 2005		DBH level
		Average	Maximum	
Environmental & Resource Economics	41	1.4	7	1
Third World Quarterly	21	2.8	33	1
Land Economics	20	4.1	8	2
World Development	16	5.1	28	2
Journal of Conflict Resolution	14	11.6	65	2
African Journal of Ecology	13	1.8	5	1
Global Environmental Change-Human and Policy Dimensions	13	8.1	64	1
Mountain Research and Development	12	1.3	7	1
International Journal of Educational Development	11	2.9	16	1
Journal of Development Economics	11	5.0	37	2
Journal of Agricultural Economics	10	1.7	4	1
Journal of Modern African Studies	9	2.3	8	1
Food Policy	8	2.5	7	1
Land Degradation & Development	7	2.3	5	1
Disasters	6	1.3	3	1
Political Geography	6	4.0	13	2
Environment and Development Economics	5	1.0	4	1
Ethnic and Racial Studies	5	4.0	10	2
Human Ecology	5	4.4	10	2
Human Rights Quarterly	5	2.4	9	1
Africa	4	0.5	1	2
Entrepreneurship and Regional Development	4	0.5	2	1
Journal of Development Studies	4	6.3	8	2
Journal of Contemporary Asia	3	0.7	2	1
Population and Development Review	3	11.0	16	2
Public Administration and Development	3	0.7	1	1
Rural Sociology	3	7.0	11	1
Sustainable Development	3	2.3	7	1
Development and Change	2	10.5	12	2
Gender & Society	2	7.0	14	2
Global Governance	2	0.0	0	1
Growth and Change	2	10.0	19	1
International Migration	2	0.5	1	2
Canadian Journal of Development Studies	1	0.0	0	1
Dialectical Anthropology	1	1.0	1	1
International Affairs	1	0.0	0	1
International Journal of Middle East Studies	1	0.0	0	2
International Migration Review	1	6.0	6	2
Journal of African Economies	1	2.0	2	1
Journal of Asian Studies	1	1.0	1	2
Journal of Democracy	1	1.0	1	2
Journal of Latin American Studies	1	1.0	1	2
Journal of Peasant Studies	1	1.0	1	1
Modern Asian Studies	1	0.0	0	2
Regional Studies	1	17.0	17	2
South African Journal of Economics	1	0.0	0	1
World Politics	1	1.0	1	2
Total	289	3.5	65	

Sources: ISI-Thompson/NCR for Norway. We searched a total of 63 ISI-indexed journals in which research relevant to development is published. Articles with Norwegian author-addresses were found in 47 of these journals. The figures in the table include articles, review articles and research notes. Book reviews and editorials are not included.

DBH level: see Section 4.1.2 and Box 4.1 for explanations.

Box 6.1: Precautions regarding citation analysis

To be able to perform a citation analysis delimited to development research articles by Norwegian authors – regardless of their institutional affiliation – the analysis in this section has been based on ISI searches *delimited by journal*. The Evaluation Committee selected 63 ISI-indexed journals in which the majority of articles could be expected to fall within the RCN definition of development research. The 63 journals (listed in Appendix 5) were selected on the basis of the submitted publication lists, information from the Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions*, the Committee members' knowledge of the journals and some examination of the titles of the Norwegian contributions to the journals. Articles with Norwegian author-addresses were found in 47 of these 63 journals.

The journal-based searches enabled us to include all articles in the selected development journals regardless of author or author affiliation. (Alternatives such as searches by author name or author affiliation would have made it much more difficult to delimit the analysis to development research.) It should be noted that searches by journal still imply clear limits on the coverage of the analysis. The sample is far too small to compare citation impact by institution or to say anything substantial about the standing of Norwegian development research. In many cases, the most frequently cited articles on development research may have been published in disciplinary journals not covered by the analysis. Comparing the list of frequently used journals compiled from the publication analysis in Chapter 4 with the list of 63 journals included in the citation analysis, we find very little overlap – only four of the 15 journals most frequently used by the research units/institutions in this evaluation when they publish development research articles are included in the citation analysis in this section (partly because the journals most often used are not ISI-indexed, partly because they are not devoted primarily to development research). When reading this section, it should therefore be kept in mind that a great deal of development research is published in disciplinary journals and that perhaps some of the most frequently cited development research is not published in the development journals – and that these journals are not included in the analysis.

There are also several general weaknesses with citation analysis. The coverage of publications within social sciences and humanities is generally quite low. Only 28 percent of the 996 publications included in the statistics in Chapter 4, for instance, appear in ISI-indexed outlets. This implies that the vast majority of the publications (book articles, books and non-indexed journal articles) are not included in the citation analysis. Moreover, citations in themselves are no direct measure of impact (or of quality). Citation scores rely on a variety of factors, such as the centrality of the topic in the present scholarly debate, the kind of contribution (for instance, articles on methods tend to bet frequently cited), the citation practices in the relevant research area, the size of the relevant scholarly community addressed, etc.

Nonetheless, the Committee has found the citation analysis to be useful in terms of gaining an overview of the amount of Norwegian articles in the given journals, getting a rough picture of the international collaboration profile of Norwegian development research, obtaining a better overview of the various institutions active in the field, and studying the overall citation impact of Norwegian development research compared to average citations in the given journals.

*Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions (UHR) provided us with the submitted list of journals nominated for inclusion in the performance-based budgeting model by the Committee for Development Studies ("Nasjonalt fagråd for utviklingsstudier").

Table 6.3 shows articles and citations according to the four thematic areas. "Resource Management" is best covered with 199 articles, whereas there are only 14 articles within "Culture, Education and Gender" – reflecting the number of ISI-indexed journals found in each of the areas (see note to Table 6.3).

Table 6.3 Articles with Norwegian author-addresses in a selection of ISI-indexed development research journals 1991-2005, number of articles and citations by thematic area

Thematic Area	N articles	Sum citations	Average citations	Max citations of one article	Average XCR*
Resource Management	119	333	2,8	64	3,3
Rights, Security and Democracy	46	237	5,2	65	4,1
Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction	45	188	4,2	37	3,4
Culture, Education and Gender	14	47	3,4	16	1,9
Multiple Areas	64	213	3,3	33	3,1
Total	**288**	**1018**	**3,5**	**65**	**3,3**

Source: ISI-Thompson/NCR for Norway. Articles, notes and review articles in development-related journals are included (journals as in Table 6.2). Book reviews and editorials are not included.

Notes: The journals were categorised into thematic areas by the Evaluation Committee. Within Resource Management 10 journals were searched; 16 within Rights, Security and Democracy; 14 within Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction; 4 within Culture, Education and Gender; and 19 journals were found to cut across these areas.
*XCR (expected citation rate) indicates the average citation rates of the journals/issues involved (average number of citations including all articles in the issues in which the studied articles are published).

Table 6.4 shows the number of articles and citations by author affiliation. It should be noted that with the limited number of journals included in the analysis, the result could be far from representative for development research at the various institutions (see Box 6.1). It can be concluded, however, that the number of Norwegian institutions publishing in international development research journals is high. A broad range of institutions are involved – both among those selected for this evaluation and other institutions – and several of them have citation scores higher than what would be expected, taking into consideration where their articles are published (average citations compared to average expected citation rate/XCR, explained in a note to Table 6.3).

Table 6.4 Articles with Norwegian author-addresses in a selection of ISI-indexed development research journals 1991-2005, number of articles and citations by author institution

Research unit	N Articles	Sum citations	Average citations per article	Max citation of one article	Aver-age XCR*
Included units at universities and university colleges					
UMB: Department of Economics and Resource Management***	21	112	5.3	64	3.1
NHH - Norwegian School of Economics and Business Adm.	15	40	2.7	7	6.7
NTNU: Department of Economics	12	24	2.0	10	2.6
UiO: The Centre for Development and the Environment	11	20	1.8	9	2.5
UiO: Department of Economics	11	32	2.9	16	2.8
UMB: Noragric	11	45	4.1	12	3.4
UiO: Department of Sociology and Human Geography	10	54	5.4	33	3.3
UiO: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights	7	16	2.3	7	3.3
UiO: Department of Political Science	6	35	5.8	32	2.1
UiO: Institute for Educational Research	3	4	1.3	3	1.3
UiO: Department of Social Anthropology	3	8	2.7	5	1.3
UiB: Department of Social Anthropology	2	9	4.5	9	6.5
NTNU: Department of Geography	1	0	0.0	0	0.0
UiB: Comparative Research Programme on Poverty	1	1	1.0	1	0.3
UiB: Department of Comparative Politics	1	4	4.0	4	6.5
UiB: Centre for Development Studies	1	0	0.0	0	0.9
Unspecified units at included universities and university colleges**					
UMB Unspecified address	8	47	5.9	19	4.3
UiO: Unspecified address	10	34	3.4	17	4.9
NTNU: Unspecified address	7	8	1.1	3	2.6
UiB Unspecified address	1	1	1.0	1	4.3
UiT: Unspecified address	3	8	2.7	7	1.7
UiS: Unspecified address	2	2	1.0	1	1.8
HiAgder: Unspecified address	2	5	2.5	5	3.7
Omitted units at universities and university colleges					
UMB: Omitted units (8 with less than 7 reg articles)	17	22	1.3	5	1.5
UiO: Omitted units (11 with less than 5 reg articles)	18	58	3.2	10	3.8
NTNU: Dept. of Sociology and Political Science	8	105	13.1	65	5.0
NTNU Other omitted units (3 with less than 3 reg articles)	4	33	8.3	14	8.3
UiB: Dept. of Economics	6	9	1.5	5	3.6
UiB: Other omitted units (6 with less than 3 reg articles)	6	6	1.0	2	1.5
HiOslo	5	6	1.2	2	1.0
UiT: Dept. of Economics	2	6	3.0	4	3.1
UiT: Other omitted units (3 with less than 3 reg articles)	4	11	2.8	7	2.8
UiS: Omitted unit	1	0	0.0	0	0.5
Other omitted institutions (3 with less than 4 reg articles)	7	11	1.6	7	2.0
Included institutes					
CMI - Chr. Michelsen Institute	23	124	5.4	37	3.8
PRIO - International Peace Research Institute	22	135	6.1	65	3.6
FNI - Fridtjof Nansen Institute	6	13	2.2	6	6.3
NINA - Norwegian Institute for Nature Research	6	27	4.5	12	3.6
NUPI - Norwegian Institute of International Affairs	5	8	1.6	5	1.2
Fafo	3	5	1.7	5	1.7
NIBR - Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research	1	0	0.0	0	0.4
Omitted institutes					
SSB - Statistics Norway	14	46	3.3	16	3.7
SNF - Institute for Research in Economics and Business Adm.	11	9	0.8	4	2.4
CICERO	6	27	4.5	19	2.5
Other omitted institutes (15 institutes with less than 4 reg articles)	24	73	3.0	16	2.5
Other sectors					
Government units and humanitarian organisations (5 units)	5	7	1.4	5	1.9
Private/commercial sector (ECON, Interconsult Int. and Prevista)	4	1	0.3	1	1.0
Total	**357**	**1251**	**3.5**	**65**	**3.2**

Source: ISI-Thompson/NCR for Norway. Articles, notes and review articles in development-related journals are included (list of journals in Appendix 5).

Notes: Articles with authors from multiple Norwegian institutions are counted once for each registered institution. Not including co-authorships, the number of articles is 288, not 357. *XCR: see note to previous table.
** "Unspecified" implies that these articles may come from any unit at the institution.
***For this unit we have also included articles with the author address "Dept Econ & Social Sci" after checking that this name did not correspond with any official unit name at UMB and that the articles had author names which appeared on the personnel list we received from the Department of Economics and Resource Management.

Table 6.5 shows the geographic distribution of the co-authors of the studied articles. Of the non-Norwegian co-authors, the North Americans are the largest group. Co-authorship with Africa and Asia is more prevalent than in other fields, but it still remains at a moderate level. (In the "Africa and Asia" category, 3.5 percentage points pertain to authors in Africa and 1.7 applies to authors in Asia. Of the Europeans, only 1 percentage point comes from the Nordic countries.)

Some considerations regarding the extent of internationalisation and collaboration with researchers outside Norway arise in light of Table 6.5. With regard to co-authorship, collaboration dynamics are stronger in relation to European and North American academic communities. The extent of Norwegian co-authorship with colleagues in Africa and Asia may well have strengthened since the mid-1990s. However, it appears that neither the incentives nor the conditions for such engagements are very strong.

Table 6.5 Co-authorship in Norwegian development research by region and year, percentages within years

		Co-authors from					
Year	One author	Norway	Europe	North America	Africa & Asia	Multiple continents	N
1991	50.0	25.0		25.0			4
1992	71.4	28.6					7
1993	50.0	8.3	8.3	25.0		8.3	12
1994	22.2	66.7				11.1	9
1995	88.9	11.1					9
1996	71.4		7.1	14.3	7.1		14
1997	55.6	11.1	11.1	22.2			9
1998	47.4	42.1		10.5			19
1999	44.0	28.0	12.0	8.0		8.0	25
2000	54.5	13.6	9.1	13.6		9.1	22
2001	44.4	11.1	7.4	14.8	14.8	7.4	27
2002	44.4	22.2		11.1	14.8	7.4	27
2003	45.5	18.2	15.2	6.1	9.1	6.1	33
2004	36.1	33.3	2.8	13.9		13.9	36
2005	25.0	44.4	2.8	8.3	8.3	11.1	36
Total	**45.3**	**25.3**	**5.9**	**11.1**	**5.2**	**7.3**	**289**

Source: ISI-Thompson/NCR for Norway. Articles, notes and review articles in development related journals are included (journals as in Table 6.2). Book reviews and editorials are not included.

When analysing citation scores by co-authorship, we find that co-authored articles have higher citation rates on average than articles written by a single author (Table 6.6). Moreover, the articles with European (non-Norwegian) or North American co-authorship score somewhat higher than articles with co-authors from Asia or Africa, or Norway. However, it is important to be cautious when drawing conclusions based on average citation rates. Citations are very skewed, and a few highly cited articles may have great impact on the averages for the whole category (cf. the standard variations in the table below).

Table 6.6 Co-authorship and citation rates in Norwegian development research, ISI-publications 1991-2005

Co-authorship	Average cites per article	Cites per article: Std. Deviation	Maximum citations to one article	*Average expected citation rate	Maximum expected citation rate	N (articles)
One author	2.9	5.4	37	3.4	15.8	131
Co-authors from:						
Norway	3.1	7.9	65	3.3	19.9	73
Europe	6.5	8.7	33	3.3	12.0	17
North America	5.6	6.9	27	4.5	12.8	32
Africa or Asia	2.3	2.5	6	2.4	10.1	15
Multiple continents	4.4	13.8	64	1.8	7.1	21
Total	**3.5**	**7.3**	**65**	**3.3**	**19.9**	**289**

Source: ISI-Thompson/NCR for Norway. Articles, notes and review articles in development-related journals are included (journals as in Table 6.2). Book reviews and editorials are not included.
*Expected citation rate (XCR) indicates the average citation rates of the journals/issues involved (average number of citations including all articles in the issues in which the studied articles are published).

6.3 The changing context for relevance

Development research in Norway, as in other countries, has followed quite closely the priorities set by those who make development policy and also fund a large share of this type of research. Therefore, development research has been obliged to demonstrate not only its academic quality, but also its relevance to policy and various constituencies. On the one hand, these connections between policy makers and researchers provide Norwegian aid authorities with relevant expertise. On the other hand, they may create uncritical group-think, and severely limit the independence of research (and in particular investigations into the efficiency of aid and development policy) and thus the broader relevance of development research.[32] Many development researchers want to get out of this predicament, and the changing context of development research may provide an opening that did not exist before.

The first condition that has undergone change in the past decade is the notion of development. For a long time, development has conveniently been viewed in European and American donor circles as "something that is done for the poor countries of the world". It has provided the rationale for massive foreign aid. Much of this perception persists, such as in the context of pursuing the Millennium Development Goals. Since these goals were first adopted in 2000, however, the forces of globalisation have made an increasingly strong impact on they way in which development is perceived. It is no coincidence that Europeans and Americans now consider security to be part of the mainstream conceptualisation of development. This amounts to an admission that development is no longer something pursued only in developing countries but in the backyards of developed countries as well. The development hen has come home to roost. Liberalisation of trade, migration and terrorism has changed the basic structural conditions of development in a global direction.

[32] Cf. Terje Tvedt (2003): "Forskningsmiljøene og forvaltningsmasten" in T. Tvedt: *Utviklingshjelp, utenrikspolitikk og makt. Den norske modellen.* Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.

Foreign aid is no longer as singularly important as it once was in the relations between the North and South.

*Box 6.2: The New World of Development Research**

The Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs recently found out how the world actually operates as opposed to the way it might like it to be. It found itself in a diplomatic tangle because an Italian ship, acting on Spanish instructions, recently intercepted a North Korean boat with a Georgian crew off the coast of Senegal. It was carrying about 300 people, most of them Indian or Pakistani, who had set sail from Guinea bound for Spain. Earlier this year, Spain intercepted a boat off Mauritania flying an Ivory Coast flag with a Russian crew. On board were 400 people from countries including Bangladesh, Liberia and Sri Lanka who had paid to be smuggled into the European Union.

One may think of these people on the move as the bottom rung of the globalisation process that also whisks business executives across the world in flat-bed airline seats. Globalisation produces various categories of denationalized subjects, high and low, for whom allegiance is due principally to the flag of opportunity.

Our mental framework for seeing the world is inadequate. It is still geared to the familiar references of borders and national citizenship. The very words emigration and immigration, with their air of finality, are inadequate for a globalised time when many have one foot in an adopted home and another in the place from which they came. Conditions of the developed and developing worlds coexist within one country. Walls are built or contemplated to keep rich and poor apart, but the forces driving movement seem overwhelming.

European nations still tend to have difficulties viewing the nation as a political rather than an ethnic entity. A change in mindset is needed to separate ethnicity and nationhood, a task that will remain difficult as long as the temptation is there to draw clear lines to undo the mess that flux produces.

* Taken from “Migration makes flux the new world order”, International Herald Tribune, March 28, 2007.

The second condition is that the international donor community is becoming increasingly convinced that its own blueprints do not work. Direct budget support to countries that qualify for this less conditional form of aid is a case in point. This new direction calls for, or at least should call for, a better understanding of the local conditions in partner countries. Such knowledge used to be provided in an unsystematic fashion by field experts hired by the donors. These days such experts are few and far apart. The feedback that the donor agency receives, therefore, is on the decline. Research that is not tied to donor programme priorities but is aimed instead at providing deeper insight into the conditions in partner countries could reverse this trend. This type of research would not seek to solve specific policy problems of interest to the donors, but probe underlying issues that explain why specific policies may fail to gain “political traction”. This would amount to a much broader definition of development research, one that calls for more independent studies.

The third condition that has changed in recent years is the role of the donor agencies. These agencies no longer disburse money as they used to, nor do they manage large numbers of experts in the field. Instead, they are increasingly evolving into think tanks for their respective foreign ministries. This means that their main task is to stay on top of research being conducted in their field. They are the monitors of the growing knowledge base that the ministry officials can rely on. This role does not imply the same directive implications as in the past, but one in which listening to the research community becomes most important. Policy is no longer the prime rationale for research on development; instead, research is increasingly becoming the rationale for policy. The Department for International Development (DfID) in the United Kingdom has taken the lead in this regard, and their initiative is increasingly being viewed with interest in other donor countries.

These changes in the external environment should pave the way for development researchers to redefine their agenda in a way that makes the research activity less dependent on policy-based funding and allows for closer integration both with mainstream disciplines and new emerging fields such as sustainability science.

6.4 Summary of main observations

Major target groups

- Relevance was defined by research institutions (in their self-assessment reports) in multiple ways. A frequent statement was that the main or first target group is the research community, and it is within this group that relevance resides, albeit not exclusively. The second target group mentioned is society as a whole, and the third target group is decision makers.
- The research units state that they are concerned with a wide variety of relevance aspects, also including the benefits of general knowledge production, playing a role in the articulation of an alternative/independent research agenda, providing research support to activist groups and civil society organisations and undertaking long-term assignments aimed at local competence building.
- In general, it seems that a large proportion of the research is still in some way directed at user needs.
- Nearly all units reported having both domestic and foreign users. MFA and Norad were the most frequently cited domestic users. Among international organisations most frequently cited as users were the World Bank and various UN agencies.

Use and impact

- The research is communicated to a broad set of users, and the work of Norwegian development researchers seems to be relevant and used in several different contexts.
- The users interviewed perceive Norwegian development researchers to be readily available for commissioned research and that, in most cases, they conduct the research requested. On the other hand, the users also perceive "user-group communication" to be the researchers' third priority – after scholarly journals and the general media.
- Few concrete effects of research are documented in the self-assessment reports, although extensive participation in policy processes is reported. The researchers are concerned with helping to formulate development strategies as well as filling information and analytical gaps to facilitate better informed decision making. There is a rich diversity of interaction with the official policy realm for informing decision making and public debate. The researchers also take part in government commissions and provide secretariat functions for conferences and training courses (e.g. for staff of international organisations). There also seems to be extensive input and advice to internal policy processes, such as direct interaction and background policy papers or briefs, provided to different types of users.

- More specifically, interaction with international development agencies also seems to provide positive incentives and encouragement for the engagement of Norwegian researchers.

Citations

- A study of Norwegian contributions to journals related to development research (a selection of 63 ISI-indexed journals during 1991-2005) shows that the majority of the articles have obtained a moderate amount of citations (1-9) or no citations at all. Seven percent of the articles are cited 10 times or more. The skewed distribution of citations is normal and about what could be expected.
- The area of "Rights, Security and Democracy" has the highest average citation rate. Here the articles with Norwegian author-addresses are cited 5.2 times on average.

Changed conditions for relevance

- Section 6.3 deals with the need to reconsider the concept of relevance in development research, as the basic structures for development are changing. The changes should pave the way for development researchers to redefine their agenda in a way that makes the research activity less dependent on policy-based funding and allows for closer integration both with mainstream disciplines and new emerging fields such as sustainability science.
- Policy is no longer the prime rationale for research on development; instead, research is increasingly becoming the rationale for policy.

In conclusion, Norwegian development research has policy relevance as well as wider relevance for civil society and developing countries. The clearest evidence for knowledge utilisation is found in the close interconnections between research expertise and policy processes.

7 Major challenges for Norwegian development research

This section discusses a number of important challenges that were reported to the Committee through the self-assessment reports and in interviews with researchers. Each sub-section covers a major challenge and discusses first the views expressed by the researchers and ends with the views of the Committee on the subject. The most important challenges for Norwegian development research can be summarised as follows: (1) funding limitations, (2) independent versus programme-driven research, (3) relevance versus quality considerations, (4) competition versus cooperation among institutions, and (5) attracting and maintaining expertise.

7.1 Funding limitations

Three issues are of special relevance in relation to this challenge: (a) inadequate core funding of the institute sector, (b) the relationship between short-term and long-term funding, and (3) the dominant role played by RCN in providing money for development research.

7.1.1 Inadequate core funding for the institute sector

While core funding is not an issue within university-based departments and centres, it is a concern for some, if not all, entities in the institute sector. It is a problem which, according to the opinion shared with the Committee, goes beyond single projects. More generous core funding is viewed as necessary for a congenial research environment in which quality can be combined with relevance in ways that enhance the contribution that the institutes can make to the field of development research. It would also be a step towards making the institutes more efficient in their operations. There were frequent complaints that too much time is spent on attracting short-term money to keep the institution operating. This pre-empts the opportunity to engage in more solid research that would help build capacity and improve quality.

7.1.2 Relationship between short-term and long-term funding

This issue is related to the first, but it cuts across the university and institute sectors. The opportunities for short-term funding seem to be many, especially through commissioned research, including evaluations, according to those interviewed. The complaint that was raised by some, however, implied that even money channelled through RCN was not sufficiently long-term in nature. Project funding is usually provided to support one or two doctoral candidates for a few years under the supervision of a more senior researcher, but there is not enough attention paid to promoting a research environment in which a critical mass of younger scholars can work in collaboration with senior mentors. Such a task would require a commitment to support a given institution for a period of 5-10 years.

7.1.3 The dominant role of RCN

Because RCN plays such a prominent role as the mechanism for channelling funds to the development research community, it is no surprise that many of the points raised with the Committee centred on its role. Several of these points will be revisited in other sub-sections. The main issue here concerns the views on the current arrangements for allocating money through research competitions. No one disputes the value of competition, but there is a sense among several researchers that the current system does not work as it should. Some of this critique seems misplaced or misinformed, for instance, the view that an external reviewer is able to veto a particular project proposal. The programme board that decides on funding takes many more factors into consideration before approving particular projects. Such misperceptions notwithstanding, the complaint remains that the procedures for allocating money for research projects are not well understood.

7.1.4 The views of the Committee

Norwegian development research is quite generously funded in an international perspective. The issue is rather whether the current arrangements cater well enough for its continued high quality capacity building. The planned, new performance-based funding arrangement for the institute sector may be a step in the right direction when it comes to establishing a better mix between short-term and long-term needs, but it is too early to make an assessment of its effects. Will it solidify the foundation for development research? Will it reward good performance? Will it affect institutional fragmentation? These are some of the key questions that the development research community and others concerned should try to find answers to in the next few years.

For several years now, RCN has channelled most of its funding for development research through multi-year programmes. These have been created in response to requests for priorities, partly by MFA and/or Norad and partly by the research community. They are sufficiently broad to cater to a broad constituency of development researchers. The issue is rather whether these programmes are too blunt as instruments for promoting the capacity for high quality development research. The Committee believes that there is merit in trying to differentiate the funding to provide opportunities to conduct research that does not necessarily fall within specific programmatic frameworks (including the existing FRIMUF programme) but may be innovative or excellent and thus worthy of funding. In short, more open calls for proposals would be preferable.

The Committee has no reason to support claims that RCN does not do its job fairly and properly when it comes to approving research grants. For instance, the rejection rate seems no higher than in other research competitions in Norway or elsewhere. It does, however, share the view expressed by the researchers that RCN could be more effective in sharing information about its procedures. At the same time, it rejects the idea that comments by

external reviewers should be shared with applicants *before* a decision about funding is taken. The integrity of the peer review process is too important to be tampered with.

7.2 Independent versus programme-driven research

The balance between independent and programme-driven research is an issue that many different people had an opinion about. Their comments clearly tended towards a desire for a broader range of research activity that is not programme-driven. This call consisted of two separate but related components: (a) more funding for basic research, and (b) more support for independent critical research.

7.2.1 More funds for basic research

This issue parallels the discussion above regarding the structure of funding for development research. There is widespread opinion in the research community that development research suffers from being driven too much by "applied" concerns. That is, the research has to be valuable in terms of solving particular problems of interest to the policy community. Policy drives research rather than the other way around. This means that the search for new insight into and a deeper understanding of central issues in the field tend to be overlooked. This view is held in particular by researchers at university-based departments and centres. This is not to ignore the important role played by researchers in helping to build knowledge in the user community by conducting research in which they have a particular interest. The researchers' concern however, is that at present the balance is weighted too heavily in favour of programme-driven research, an opinion that was seen expressed also in an earlier review of Norwegian development research in 2001.[33]

7.2.2 More support for independent critical research

Development research is sometimes politically sensitive. Some of the researchers who were interviewed addressed this issue and suggested two different approaches. One was to try to stay clear of politics and thus avoid participation in meetings with political decision makers. The other was to acknowledge the sensitivity of the research they conduct and try to deal with it. Measures to deal with this issue included securing publication rights in the contract with a user and avoiding dependence on a single source of funding. This set of challenges reflects the quite close relationship established over the years between a significant number of development research institutions and MFA and Norad. In this context, there was also some concern expressed that the interest in MFA/Norad seems to have shifted in favour of funding research institutions in the South rather than those at home.

---

[33] See "Norsk utviklingsforskning – utviklingstrekk og utfordringer" Oslo 2001: RCN, page 1 of summary.

7.2.3 The views of the Committee

Building on the recommendation in sub-section 7.1.4 about the value of a more flexible funding arrangement within RCN to support development research, the Committee endorses the call for more support for basic research. The term "basic" here refers to projects initiated by individual researchers with the aim of providing knowledge not related to particular research programme frameworks. Such funding should be set aside within the overall budget for development research and be treated separately from the existing FRIMUF funding, which caters to research in the field of development and environment. This funding for basic research should not be interpreted as support only of research in the mainstream disciplines, but should also include new and exciting inter-disciplinary fields such as sustainability science.

Those who advocate for more support for independent critical research view this type of research primarily in terms of challenging the assumptions of mainstream models and theories in the field. The Committee believes that such research has its place, but it wants to emphasise that it should not be pursued without respect for the rules that make research as an enterprise independent, such as proper peer review, revision, and attention to methods of data collection and analysis.

The Committee also believes that to guarantee this kind of independent research the role of representatives from MFA or Norad on the RCN committees that take decisions about allocating funds should be reconsidered. Given the doubts that many researchers – and Research Directors – have about the criteria used for the allocation of grants by RCN, applying the "arm's length" principle to the relationship between researchers and user institutions is appropriate. It is important that RCN clearly specifies and communicates to programme selection committees the academic basis of proposal assessments and the primacy of merit criteria; that donors agree to such criteria; and that such criteria are also clearly conveyed to the wider Norwegian development research community.

7.3 Relevance versus quality considerations

This is yet another issue that is also related to the discussion above about the structure of funding and the nature of the research enterprise. The various research entities felt by and large that they have a good relationship with those who sponsor or commission research. They expressed the opinion that they are able to satisfy their demands. At the same time, most entities also mentioned that there was too much pressure to demonstrate the relevance of their research to Norwegian development policy. For instance, relevance is one of the criteria applied in the research programmes administered by RCN on behalf of MFA. Several interviewees believed that there is not enough appreciation – or even understanding – of the value of quality in the products that researchers present to the sponsors and users. The issue of quality versus relevance has two dimensions in the various comments that the Committee received: (a) quality as perceived by peers in the disciplines, and (b) combining quality with relevance.

7.3.1 Quality as perceived by peers

Because development research has evolved as a separate field funded by MFA rather than the Ministry of Education and Research, it has been generally regarded in the academic disciplines as driven by considerations other than scientific quality. Some feel that development research has been stigmatised as inferior in quality. This view is not shared by development economists whose research is generally considered to be part of the mainstream, but it is a view held in many other disciplines. Voices in the development research community have raised this concern for a long time, but those interviewed suggested that as long as the funding is dictated by MFA, quality issues will be regarded as secondary to policy relevance.

7.3.2 Combining quality with relevance

The issue of quality versus relevance is most pronounced in the institute sector. Most of the complaints originate from these sources. It is important to point out, however, that those who represent the larger and more established institutes see this as less of a problem. Several claim that they can balance basic research concerns with commissioned research and consultancy assignments that are necessary to raise money from external sources. They have enough human resources to differentiate their dissemination effort. They produce the necessary reports, issue briefer policy-relevant documents, and allow their researchers to use the material to publish articles in peer-reviewed journals. The relative success of institute-based researchers to get published in international peer-reviewed journals (Section 4.1) is evidence of this ability to combine relevance with quality.

7.3.3 The views of the Committee

The Committee believes that the time has come for development research to be "emancipated" from its close association with Norwegian development policy. This is not a call for breaking the ties with the policy community, but for redefining development research to be more in tune with the "bigger" issues of globalisation and sustainable development. To date these issues have featured only marginally in what is generally regarded as development research in Norway. Geographers have been in the forefront of developing interdisciplinary research frontiers that deal with the large environmental issues. Existing funding structures have yet to produce a closer integration between development research that focuses on economic, social and political issues on the one hand and broader sustainability issues on the other. There is a need to review these structures with a view to facilitating a closer integration. This would be an important means of overcoming the preconceived notion that development research is not as scientifically as good as other research.

The institute sector is bound to continue its reliance on external funding from commissioned research as well as consulting. It is important, therefore, that they can combine relevance with quality. It is encouraging that the larger institutes seem capable of

doing this quite well. That others find it difficult means that with the new performance-based budgeting formula, some institutes may find it a real challenge to meet its expected quality enhancement.

7.4 Competition versus cooperation among institutions

Competition and cooperation are both important elements of the development research landscape. The self-assessment reports as well as the interviews confirm that they are sometimes at loggerheads with each other. There is nothing peculiar about this, but competition, in particular, becomes a concern in a situation of scarce resources and greater emphasis on performance assessment as the basis for funding. This is a challenge that has a national as well as international dimension.

7.4.1 The national arena

RCN would like to see greater cooperation between the university and institute sectors in the development research field. There is evidence in the self-assessment reports that some such cooperation has already been established. It is also evident that many researchers have multiple institutional affiliations, sometimes one foot in a university department, the other in an institute. This indicates that there is a substantial amount of cross-institutional research being conducted.

There is still a concern in some circles, especially in the institute sector, that the funding structures encourage competition rather than collaboration. The complaint is that a lot of time is wasted on preparing research proposals that do not get funded because the ratio of applicants to recipients of funding rules out rewarding every one. This does suggest that more collaboration among independent institutes, university departments and centres – even consultancy firms – is desirable in order to make better use of existing but scarce expertise.

7.4.2 The international arena

When it comes to funding, the development research scene in Norway has been quite confined for a long time to domestic sources. This situation has begun to change as some actors, especially in the institute sector, are venturing into the international arena in search of funding for their operations. This has so far been focused largely on consulting and commissioned work. Applications for research support from the EU and other international sources have yet to yield significant amounts of funding.

Cooperation with institutions outside Norway should be viewed not only in monetary terms. Co-authorship among Norwegian and international researchers should be encouraged and expanded. There should also be recognition of the valuable spin-offs from working with institutions in the South in terms of gaining relevant field experience.

Sabbatical periods in relevant institutions in the North may also be important as part of building or enhancing competence.

7.4.3 The views of the Committee

The challenge of working together across institutional boundaries is generally met quite well in the domestic arena. Institutional actors who perceive competition as a problem need to find ways of dealing with a competitive environment. More strategic thinking about how to do this is necessary, especially among independent institutes that complain about spending too much time and effort on chasing short-term funding. One option would be collaboration with domestic or foreign institutions that can add valuable expertise, thus making an application more successful in a competitive setting.

The Committee also believes that Norwegian institutions in the development research field should become more pro-active in seeking collaboration with compatible institutions in other countries, both in the North and the South. There is valuable experience to be gained from such contacts. This would also help Norwegian researchers to broaden the development research agenda beyond the more immediate policy concerns that so many consider confining.

7.5 Attracting and building competence

Norway has a number of very highly qualified and experienced researchers in the development research field. This applies across the disciplines. Anthropologists, economists, geographers and political scientists – even historians – have made their mark in the field not only in Norway but also internationally. The self-assessment reports and interviews, however, also draw attention to problems of attracting and building competence. At least two issues are of special concern: (a) the inability to offer permanent positions, and (b) the uneven quality within the institute sector.

7.5.1 Inability to offer permanent positions

According to those reporting to and being interviewed by the Committee, there is no shortage of qualified people who can address central research challenges related to development. Their concern is the shortage of funding to hire and retain them. A common view is that a lack of resources undermines recruitment efforts and makes it harder to retain good researchers. In the university setting, this is exacerbated by heavy teaching loads that limit the time staff can devote to research. In the institute sector, it is the time that is needed to attract income through consulting assignments. Even though there are permanent positions in the institutes, these do not seem sufficient in all cases for ensuring longer term planning and quality enhancement. In these cases, the relatively extensive reliance on short-term funding is seen as a problem. The institutional milieu could be improved to enable more time for research and to attract competent foreign scholars. This

does raise the question as to whether the development research landscape is too fragmented.

7.5.2 Uneven quality in the institute sector

There has been an improvement of the scientific and academic quality in the institute sector, which recruits more highly educated junior staff and collaborates with academic departments to upgrade its research. In the past, the principal performance criterion was the ability to act as a good policy advisor but today, according to what the Committee learnt, it is also to be an excellent researcher. This improvement, however, remains unevenly distributed among the institutes. The larger institutes have been quite successful in upgrading their staff and improving scientific output, but as suggested above, those institutes with fewer researchers permanently staffing the field find this to be a challenge. It is not that they do not wish to improve, but they find themselves constrained by the funding structures and – it should be added – their own inability to engage in more strategic thinking about how to overcome this shortcoming. There needs to be a critical mass of researchers on a full-time or part-time basis in the area to allow for the findings from applied research to be fed into more scientific products. The question can be raised as to whether all institutes actually possess these minimum requirements for viability in terms of simultaneously meeting quality and relevance criteria.

7.5.3 The views of the Committee

It is not easy to strike the right balance between giving individual researchers the opportunity to develop their own research agenda and seeking institutional coherence and strength. Promising and competent researchers should have a chance to pursue projects even if they are not necessarily related to a particular institutional agenda. At the same time, even the best researchers need a good institutional environment with compatible colleagues in order to sustain their professional advancement. The view of the Committee is that in a comparative perspective, development research in Norway is spread out among quite a large number of institutions. Attracting and building competence under these circumstances is not easy.

At the same time, the Committee is not convinced that the existing formula of supporting "Centres of Excellence" is necessarily the best way of addressing this issue, as it tends to create differences in resource endowment among the various entities that are potentially counter-productive. This particular formula goes to one extreme by stressing the importance of institutional strength as the most critical criterion for funding research and research capacity-building. This does not mean that the need for some form of longer term support should be ignored. As suggested in sub-section 7.1.4, grants that focus on building research competence should be offered on a competitive basis outside of what is done in the context of ongoing programmes such as UTISØR and POVPEACE.

Individual researchers who find themselves in an environment where few, if any, devote their time to development research can still be supported through other mechanisms, whether this be through networking on an individual basis with more senior scholars elsewhere or through institutional cooperation agreements encouraged by the Government, e.g. between independent research institutes and university departments. Ensuring that promising individuals have an opportunity for professional development, even if the institutional setting may not be the most congenial, is an important aspect of attracting and building competence for development research.

7.6 Summary of main observations

- Given the significance that funding issues have for members of the Norwegian development research community, there is reason to review the current structure used to channel money to researchers through RCN.
  - In any such review, consideration should be given to making more funding available for researcher-initiated project ideas that may not fall within ongoing programme funding parameters and to setting aside money for building or strengthening research milieus through 5-10 year-long grants.
  - Calls for more support for basic or independent research should not be interpreted to mean only discipline-based research, but should include new interdisciplinary fields such as sustainability science.
- It is possible to combine relevance with scientific quality through more strategic approaches to the dissemination of information, as some research units have already done quite successfully.
- There is virtue in having only researchers represented in the programme boards responsible for making grant allocations to individuals or institutions in order to enhance academic accountability and reduce doubts about the primacy of criteria in these processes. The role of sponsors/government representatives on the programme boards therefore needs reconsideration.
- Competition among actors in the field is not necessarily negative, but the actors need to adopt strategies, such as institutional cooperation, for dealing successfully with a competitive environment.
- Norwegian development research institutions could benefit from greater interaction and cooperation with universities or research institutes in the South as well as the North.
- Development research would benefit from more permanent positions at university departments or research institutes through enough core funding to make these units more viable and capable of sustaining a congenial research environment.

8 Conclusions and recommendations

This chapter presents the major conclusions concerning the issues raised in the Terms of References as well as other issues of importance, and then offers recommendations for improvements.

8.1 Conclusions

Volume, orientation and resources

The volume of development research is unusually high in Norway for a country of its size. The organisation of development research in Norway is somewhat particular in that an unusually large share of the research is conducted by the institute sector. This orientation seems reasonable, but it would be desirable to have more opportunities to promote emerging research and address innovative issues – that is, more free research.

Quality

One very central question of the evaluation concerns the level of quality in general, its variation across researchers and institutes, and the reasons for this variation. With regard to the level of quality, the Committee concludes that the best development research in Norway is of high quality, but there is considerable variation in academic quality across the academic departments and independent research institutes. The top quality research is found, on the one hand, in some academic institutions, where the volume of development research is not necessarily large but where the research environment is such that output can be published in prestigious outlets. On the other hand, there are also a few large independent institutes in specific areas that have been able to achieve a critical mass of competent researchers who produce high quality research. These institutes have achieved international standing and function as meeting points for internationally renowned scholars. The next level in terms of research quality is made up of a bulk of academic institutions and some larger research institutes. These conduct some good research, although there is less of it and the quality more varied. Finally, there are smaller institutes and university colleges that produce relatively little output of high academic quality.

Communication, relevance and use

The research is communicated to a broad set of users, and the work of Norwegian development researchers seems to be relevant and used in several different contexts. Moreover, the users who were interviewed perceive the Norwegian development researchers to be readily available for commissioned research and that, in most cases, they conduct the type of research requested.

The pressing issues concerning relevance does not relate to relevance for specific user groups, but rather to the possibility of undertaking independent research with a broader

societal relevance. The major problem identified is the close relationship and high mobility between the research community and Norwegian policy making bodies, which may endanger critical thinking and the broader relevance and independence of Norwegian development research. Ties to the source of funding and to policy-making processes – both of which might reduce research independence and critical distance – seem to be a problem. Close ties might affect the substance of research and it is amazing, for instance, how little research is conducted on the effects of aid and development assistance, even though this topic is crucial to Norwegian foreign policy.

Relevance versus quality

The lower academic quality produced by some of the institutions reflects in part the fact that most of their work consists of consultancy reports rather than research aimed at academic publication. Such reports are not generally exposed to academic control and competition and can more easily circumvent the issue of scientific soundness.

It should be noted that in the case of Norwegian development research, this problem only partly seems to be a sector-related. In general, one might expect the independent institutes to provide inferior conditions for scholarly quality. The institutes are more closely linked to the policy makers than are the academic departments, and they have a greater need to adjust their activities to policy demands. This leads to the production of reports that are requested by the buyers, and the incentive might be weak to push the research beyond the consultancy report level to the level of publishable articles. Another factor constraining the activities of the institutes is that, at least in some areas, it may be harder for the institutes to recruit the most academically qualified people. The Committee still finds considerable overlap in the distribution of the output quality produced by the university and institute sectors, and there is substantial variation within both sectors. The fact that several of the institutes have been able to publish articles in highly rated international journals indicates that these institutes have sufficient interconnections with the universities and with academic research, and should not be taken as a product of short-term commissioned research.

Policy makers often want quick answers and easily accessible policy discussions. However, policy makers also have an interest in building up long-term knowledge in development research that can provide the basis for such policy-related projects. Long-term knowledge needs to have at least part of its basis in the academic units in charge of sustainable competence building in terms of basic research and the education of research recruits. Moreover, the universities generally provide a broad research environment, allowing development researchers to draw on the expertise of colleagues also outside the narrow field of development research. The long-term health of development research will benefit from close involvement with the academic mainstream in the various disciplines, and it is beneficial for the field when good generalists devote some of their time to development issues. Such interaction promotes good research, that is, research which is theoretically sound and anchored in the relevant discipline(s).

In conclusion, it is important to build up general academic competence and not to seek short-term measures to develop research only in those areas perceived by policy makers to be of importance in the short term. To build up such competence, research institutions need basic funding and considerable leeway to conduct researcher-initiated projects.

Funding structures (management and organisation)

There is also some concern among researchers within the field about what the closeness to policy advisers – in terms of funding – could imply for the independence of research. The huge sector of independent research institutes is largely dependent on income from commissioned work and has little core funding, which compels these institutes to be consumed by short-term rather than long-term considerations. This means that they may be less able to take an independent stance and to conduct original, groundbreaking research.

It is desirable to increase the volume of free resources or resources at RCN that are not earmarked for any specific niche of development research. This will make it easier to build up scientific competence, which in the long run also will be the best guarantee for good policy advice. Open calls for research proposals should be the main alternative in RCN as opposed to programme calls. To the extent that RCN has to accept specific themes in development research, since doing so facilitates fundraising, RCN should attempt to make the themes as broad and comprehensive as possible.

Domestic cooperation

There seems to be no general "sector divide" in the collaboration patterns of domestic development research. There are about as many collaboration links between the higher education sector and the institute sector as within the two sectors. Moreover, there is a considerable amount of development research personnel with affiliations to multiple research units and a good deal of domestic co-authorship. On the other hand, the major components of the funding structure seem to encourage competition rather than collaboration. And even if we have found several indications of functioning cooperation, the researchers themselves seem to think that the level of cooperation is unsatisfactory.

Another important issue in this context is the fragmented structure of Norwegian development research. This structure, consisting of many small research groups, might provide less than optimal conditions for cooperation, although dual affiliations and collaboration between units do exist. In the quality review, the smaller groups generally obtained lower average scores than the larger groups (Section 5.2). In the universities, location in a good disciplinary department, international collaboration and a long-term research agenda may outweigh the limitations of small groups.

International cooperation

The research units in this evaluation participate extensively in international research collaboration. On average, they each list 10 international project collaborators, of which half are in LDCs. When examining international co-authorship, we find that 29 percent of Norwegian articles in international development research journals are co-authored with researchers outside the Nordic countries, whereas the comparable figure for economic journals is 22 percent[34].

It should also be noted that the research units listed a wide range of international organisations as their users and that their international funding is far above the average for Norwegian social sciences. The researchers nonetheless complained about a lack of funds to maintain their international research relations.

Interdisciplinarity, focus and identity

The self-assessment reports voiced some frustrations related to interdisciplinary research. Conducting interdisciplinary research is demanding in terms of time and other resources, and requires a committed effort. In some cases, researchers may fear that an interdisciplinary career will result in less professional recognition, but this concern does not seem to be widespread. The informants expressed different views on the role and value of interdisciplinarity – and the degree of emphasis on the need for a solid disciplinary basis of research varied – but interdisciplinarity does not seem to be viewed as a major issue or obstacle in Norwegian development research. It may be added, however, that a substantial number of research recruits in the field have an educational background in "development studies" – indicating that future researchers will have a different basis for interdisciplinarity. It should also be kept in mind that interdisciplinarity has no intrinsic value and that much development research can be conducted within a disciplinary framework. On the other hand, many research questions require input from multiple disciplines, and such research seems to be handled well within the Norwegian structure, with both university centres and independent institutes.

The issue of the *identity* of Norwegian development research still needs to be addressed. The development research community in Norway has been defined both by the aspiration to have an identity of its own as confirmed, for example, by members congregating in a single association – the Norwegian Association for Development Research (NFU) – and by the responses of mainstream, discipline-based researchers for many of whom the interdisciplinary-oriented development research is seen as being of secondary quality. Although in an international comparative perspective, development research in Norway enjoys a level of interest and financial support that is unmatched in most other countries, as a field in its own right, in Norway it has been boxed into a corner from where it has difficulty emerging.

---

[34] Liv Langfeldt (2006): *Economics Research in Norway: Institutions, resources, personnel and publishing*. Oslo: NIFU STEP (page 37).

There is no single way out of this predicament, but certain measures can be taken to facilitate the integration of development research into the mainstream without resulting in a total loss of identity. Perhaps the most important is for funders to put aside money for research that is not just programmatically determined in advance to respond to policy concerns within MFA or Norad. Another is for the research community to rethink the boundaries of development research with regard to (a) its scope, and (b) its focus. There is reason to broaden the scope to include issues that affect not only developing countries but also developed countries such as Norway. Globalisation links the North and the South, the East and the West in new ways, and entails new linkages between society, security and environment that research funded as part of the foreign aid budget typically does not address. This means that finding a single or more coherent focus may not be possible, although this might actually be a blessing.[35] Individual researchers should have greater opportunities to define the agenda by developing innovative projects that would have an impact on mainstream disciplinary studies, exciting, emerging interdisciplinary fields such as sustainability science, as well as policy thinking.

A third step would be to ensure the quality of development research in Norway. Many of the proposals submitted for funding may be theoretically interesting or potentially relevant for policy making, but they often lack an indication of how concepts and theories lead to hypotheses and other operational aspects of the proposed study. This problem is partly a result of researchers not having enough time – or not giving themselves the time – to prepare high-quality proposals, but it also reflects the requirements placed on them by RCN, which prompts evaluation of not only of scientific quality but also of a proposal's relevance to policy, the research programme and society. This arrangement tends to encourage research for which scientific quality is only one of several criteria for success.

Finally, it should be added that a closer link between development and mainstream research may be facilitated by the growing recognition also within the disciplines in the social sciences as well as the natural sciences that research questions cut across existing disciplinary boundaries. Therefore, the distance between disciplinary and interdisciplinary research is narrowing, a trend that should help development research move out of the corner in which it has so unfortunately been placed for a long time.

---

[35] It was also noted by a prior evaluation that that due to globalisation, it is almost impossible to distinguish between LDC problems and Norwegian problems, and that if research needs are defined only on the basis of a Norwegian-foreign/South policy agenda, it will always lag behind both the South policy and the research frontier ("Norsk utviklingsforskning – utviklingstrekk og utfordringer" Oslo, 2001: RCN). Norwegian policy documents also refer to such issues: "In recognition of the fact that we are living in a situation of increasing international interdependence, development policy may also be regarded as a way of meeting common challenges" ("Fighting Poverty Together. A Comprehensive Development Policy" Report No. 35 (2003–2004) to the Storting, page 6).

8.2 Recommendations

The objective defined for this evaluation is to strengthen Norwegian development research. The sections below discuss the needs and opportunities for improvements related to five topics defined in the Terms of Reference:

1. How can quality be enhanced?
2. How can relevance be enhanced?
3. How can internationalisation be strengthened?
4. How can focus/identity be improved?
5. How can the role played by research on developing countries and development issues in Norwegian research policy be strengthened?

Under each topic, RCN, other national authorities, and relevant research communities, are addressed, and measures for improvement are recommended – in response to the request in the Terms of Reference for "recommendations on strategic aims, priorities, organisation and resources".

8.2.1 How can quality be enhanced?

In general, the units included in this evaluation conduct a substantial amount of good quality research. There are still some weaknesses in their framework conditions that should be resolved: first, the small proportion of funding allocated through open calls for proposals and based on academic quality review only, and second, the fragmentation of the Norwegian research community.

Recommendations directed at the RCN and national authorities

- The scope for undertaking independent critical research is vital for ensuring high quality. An arm-length's distance between development research and Norwegian authorities should be better assured, and the role of government officials on programme boards should be reconsidered, including reconsideration of the need for such representation. At a minimum, all members of the selection committees should fully recognise and agree to the primacy of academic quality criteria.
- In line with this, RCN should more clearly emphasise that academic quality is the most important selection criterion in its development research programmes, and better communicate the requirements for a methodological and theoretical foundation of the project proposals. On the other hand, the rejection rates seem normal, and there should be no reason to complain about high rejection rates.
- Given the significance of funding issues for the quality of Norwegian development research, there is reason to review the current structure used to channel money to researchers throughRCN. In any such review, consideration should be given to making more funding available for researcher-initiated project ideas that may not fall within ongoing programme funding parameters as well as setting aside money for building or strengthening research milieus through 5-10 year long grants. Clearer emphasis on quality and long-term grants offered on a competitive basis

would be an adequate measure for attracting and building competence in the presently fragmented Norwegian research structure:
  - A larger share of the resources should be allocated through open calls for proposals within development research and be based on academic quality criteria only. This implies that open calls for research proposals within development research should be the main RCN alternative. To the extent that RCN is obliged to establish programmes devoted to specific themes within development research, these themes should be as comprehensive as possible.
  - Setting aside long-term funding (5-10 years) is vital to building up capacity and ensuring the researchers' ability to have a long-term focus on development research. The funding should also facilitate international and domestic collaboration.
- Moreover, permanent positions and sufficient core funding are important for making the research milieus more viable and capable of sustaining a congenial research environment.

Recommendations directed at the research communities

- A stronger focus on international collaboration, as well as on domestic project collaborations/staff mobility/affiliated staff should be maintained.
- To facilitate a more long-term research focus, the research units should reserve some of their core funding for development research.

8.2.2 How can relevance be enhanced?

Recommendations directed at the RCN and national authorities

- There is a need to address the fact that Norway has a very high profile on aid and development, but very little independent critical research on these issues. Measures should be taken to ensure an arms-length distance between research institutions and official policy-making, as well as independent investigations into the efficiency of aid and development policy.
- Relevance should be understood in a broader context. Relevance refers to more than just the perceived short-term needs of users. Other results can be extremely relevant, e.g. free independent evaluations, critical capacity building, as well as social relevance and the forming of social opinions in a broader sense.
- There is a need for better structures for input on policy formulation, but researchers and policy makers should meet in arenas *other* than the funding arenas. Relationships characterised by dependency should be avoided, and the conditions for independent critical research and broader relevance should be ensured.
- National authorities and the central aid organisations should, in cooperation with the research community, try to develop more efficient channels for communicating research to users groups, enhancing user competence and improving the basis for use of research results.

Recommendations directed at the research communities

- The research community should continue to address relevance in broad terms. As stated above in the recommendations to the authorities, relevance encompasses much more than simply what the users' request.
- The research community should continue to insist on the interrelationship between quality and relevance. The ability to conduct good basic research is a prerequisite for conducting good applied research. Competence building for development research in Norway is one of the most important ways in which the research community can ensure relevance – to recruit more talented individuals and give them training in development research.
- To avoid an uncritical and one-sided research focus, the research units should take care to maintain a greater critical distance from Norwegian aid authorities. Too much mobility may distort independent, critical research.

8.2.3 How can internationalisation be strengthened?

The general level of internationalisation in Norwegian development research seems to be high. Norway is also a "good citizen" in the international development society and good at placing people abroad – and this pays off. The challenges in this area are of a general nature, and most of them probably apply to Norwegian research as a whole, not only to development research.

Recommendations directed at the RCN and national authorities

- Continue to support projects that facilitate international collaboration.

Recommendations directed at the research communities

- Researchers should be encouraged both to attract international funding and to publish internationally. Also, the university departments should try to attract more international funding.
- Norwegian development research institutions can benefit from greater interaction and cooperation with universities or research institutes in the South as well as the North.

8.2.4 How can focus and identity be improved?

As the basic structures for development are changing (Section 6.3), the focus and identity of development research should be reconsidered.

Recommendations directed at the RCN and national authorities

- The individual researchers should be given more leeway to define the research agenda by developing innovative projects that would have an impact on mainstream disciplinary studies or interdisciplinary studies, as well as on policy thinking.
- By including open calls for proposals, the process of seeking funds will become less supply-driven and thus enhance ownership of the research enterprise, which is important for sustaining the development research identity.

Recommendations directed at the research communities

- Rethink the boundaries of development research with regard to its scope and focus, and broaden the field to include issues raised by globalisation that link the North and the South, the East and the West in new ways and by considering human-environment-security perspectives.
- A clearer acceptance that research on development issues is part of the mainstream social sciences is needed. This does not necessarily imply an abandonment of interdisciplinarity, but it does involve recasting the research agenda in such a way that it becomes more comparative and addresses issues of interest to those in the mainstream disciplines.

8.2.5 How can the role of development research in research policy be strengthened?

Whereas development research has a central role in Norwegian development policy, at present it has only a marginal role in Norwegian research policy.

Recommendations directed at the RCN and national authorities

- Basic development research should be given priority irrespective of immediate policy relevance.
- Future policy making needs to take into account that capacity building and the ability to acquire long-term funding and conduct long-term independent research represent the bottleneck in Norwegian development research, not the overall amount of resources available.

Recommendations directed at the research communities

- The research community needs to insist that quality and relevance are interrelated, and consciously fight for a separate role for development research in Norwegian research policy, not only in Norwegian aid policy.

Appendix 1 Key information on the research units/institutions in this evaluation

This appendix summarises some key information from the research institutions'/units' self-assessment reports – quantitative information regarding personnel and publications.

There are notable incongruities between the researchers on the personnel list and on the publication lists – some persons appear on the personnel list but on the publication lists and vice versa. In general, the material submitted for this evaluation gives the impression that the research units put very different levels of effort into compiling complete and correct personnel and publication lists for the present evaluation. Note that the figures included in the tables below as *"researchers appearing in submitted publication lists"*[36] only include those authors who appear in the submitted *personnel* lists – as we did not know what kind of affiliation other authors had to the unit under review or what position they held. (For instance, several would be co-authors from other research institutions.) In one case in which no personnel list was submitted but a limited number of authors appeared on the publication lists, we have still tried to extract some information about the number of "in-house" authors by consulting the website of the institution (case number 15 below: Department of Media, Culture and Social Sciences at UiS).

Moreover, it should be noted that whereas the *author counts*, as stated in the tables, only include "researchers appearing in submitted publication lists", the *publication counts* in the last part of the tables include all listed publications in the given categories and period regardless of author.

Notes to the Tables in this Appendix

Senior-level positions include Director/Deputy Director/Head of Research; Professor; Associate Professor and Senior Researcher/Associate ("Forsker 1" and "Forsker 2" and similar).
Junior-level positions include all non-senior-level positions: Researcher ("Forsker 3" and similar); Post Doctorate; Research Fellow/PhD Student and Other (research assistant/adviser/teacher).

DBH level key

2 = published in a scholarly journal/at a publishing house that UHR has deemed to be among the most important in its field
1 = published in other scholarly journal/at publishing houses that UHR has deemed to be a scholarly outlet ("vitenskapelig publisering kanal")
Not registered = UHR has not assessed the publication outlet/it is not registered in the DBH publication outlet database

[36] The entire publication lists submitted were examined, not only the scholarly publications 2001-2005 included in the publication analysis.

1 NTNU: Department of Geography

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total**
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	11	15	27
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	4	15	20
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	9	6	16
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	7	13	0
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	0	5	3
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		5	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.
**We lack information about the position of one staff member. This person is included in the totals only.

2 NTNU: Department of Economics

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	5	5	10
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	3	5	8
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	3	5	8
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	10	11	0
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	5	0	2
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		2	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

3 UiB: Comparative Research Programme on Poverty

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	1	2	3
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	1	1	2
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	1	1	2
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	0	0	0
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	1	6	0
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		0	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

4 UiB: Department of Comparative Politics

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	4	3	7
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	2	0	2
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	3	1	4
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	3	3	0
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	5	4	0
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		1	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

5 UiB: Department of Social Anthropology

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	12	4	16
Of these: Researchers who have their main position at the institute and devote more than half of their research time to development research	2	0	2
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	11	4	15
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	11	17	5
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	13	8	3
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	1	1	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		10	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

6 UiB: Centre for Development Studies

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	1	11	12
Of these: Researchers who have their main position at the institute and devote more than half of their research time to development research	1	3	4
Number of researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	1	6	7
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	0	1	0
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	1	3	1
Number of doctoral dissertations		0	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

7 UiO: Department of Archaeology, Conservation and Historical Studies

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	3	2	5
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	2	2	4
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	3	1	4
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	1	4	0
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	0	2	0
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		2	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

8 UiO: Department of Sociology and Human Geography

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	6	7	13
Of these: Researchers who have their main position at the institute and devote more than half of their research time to development research	5	7	12
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	6	3	9
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	8	13	7
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	5	3	2
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	1	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		1	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

9 UiO: Department of Political Science

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	35	15	50
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	1	0	1
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	8	2	10
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	1	3	0
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	2	2	1
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	1	0	1
Number of doctoral dissertations		0	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

10 UiO: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	4	10	14
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research	1	5	6
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	3	10	13
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2003-2005)*	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	2	3	4
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	2	1	0
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		3	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.
*This unit submitted publication lists only for 2005-2006, and dissertations for 2003-2006.

11 UiO: Institute for Educational Research

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	2	12	14
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	1	9	10
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	1	8	9
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	0	13	3
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	3	4	12
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		1	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

12 UiO: Department of Social Anthropology

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	8	8	16
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research (or no information submitted).			
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	3	5	8
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	1	5	0
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	2	3	0
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		0	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

13 UiO: The Centre for Development and the Environment

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	6	22	28
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research	3	15	18
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	6	20	26
			Publisher level in DBH
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	10	30	7
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	15	27	9
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	5	8	2
Number of doctoral dissertations		8	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

14 UiO: Department of Economics

Quantitative summary for UiO: Department of Economics			
Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	4	6	10
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	3	5	8
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	3	0	3
			Publisher level in DBH
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	8	11	0
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	1	0	0
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		2	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

15 UiS: Department of Media, Culture and Social Sciences

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
*Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report			
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research	0	0	0
Number of researchers appearing in submitted publication lists			4
			Publisher level in DBH
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	0	2	0
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		0	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.
* No list of relevant staff members was submitted by UiS. The self-assessment report from the department stated that “very few works on issues relevant for development research but only as a minor activity”.

16 UiT: Department of Social Anthropology

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total**
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	2	3	6
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	2	3	5
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	2	2	5
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	2	4	5
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	0	3	0
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	0	1
Number of doctoral dissertations		0	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.
**We lack information about the position of one staff member. This person is included in the totals only.

17 UiT: Department of Sociology

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	3	0	3
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	0	0	0
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	1	0	0
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	0	0	0
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		0	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

18 UMB: Department of Economics and Resource Management

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	6	1	7
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	5	1	6
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	5	0	5
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	5	20	1
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	3	15	0
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	1	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		4	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

19 UMB: Noragric

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	23	19	42
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	17	16	33
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	21	9	30
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	5	54	11
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	7	24	5
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	1	2	2
Number of doctoral dissertations		5	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

20 HiAgder: Dept. of Economics and Business Administration/Institute of Development Studies

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	6	0	6
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research	5	0	5
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	4	0	4
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	1	20	1
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	2	0	0
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		0	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

21 NHH - Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	4	8	12
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	3	1	4
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	4	5	9
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	12	20	1
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	4	2	0
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		1	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

22 CMI - Chr. Michelsen Institute

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total**
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	39	8	49
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	28	6	35
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	37	5	44
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	11	2	0
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	19	0	0
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	1	4	7
Number of doctoral dissertations		8	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.
**We lack information about the positions of two staff members. These persons are included in the totals only.

23 Fafo Institute for Applied International Studies

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total**
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	8	13	25
Of these: Researchers who have their main position at the institute and devote more than half of their research time to development research	6	13	23
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	6	9	16
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	2	7	4
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	8	2	2
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	1	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		0	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.
**We lack information about the positions of four staff members. These persons are included in the totals only.

24 FNI - Fridtjof Nansen Institute

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	4	2	6
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	3	2	5
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	4	2	6
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	0	7	1
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	0	3	0
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	1	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		1	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

25 NIBR - Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior*	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	1	11	12
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	1	9	10
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	0	9	9
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	0	0	0
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	0	2	3
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		0	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.
*After finalising the analysis, we was informed by NIBR that correct numbers should be 11 senior-level staff members and 1 junior-level staff members. Note that the table above shows the incorrect figures that provided the basis for the analyses in Chapter 3, and not the correct figures.

26 NINA - Norwegian Institute for Nature Research

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total**
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	6	6	13
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	1	1	2
Number of researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	6	6	13
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)*	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	1	1	0
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	0	0	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		1	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.
*A comprehensive publication list was submitted, but most publications were not defined as development research by the Evaluation Committee.
**We lack information about the position of one staff member. This person is included in the totals only.

27 NUPI - Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total**
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	18	7	26
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	15	7	22
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	18	7	26
		Publisher level in DBH	
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	5	53	13
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	17	6	5
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	6	3	3
Number of doctoral dissertations		5	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.
**We lack information about the position of one staff member. This person is included in the totals only.

28 PRIO - International Peace Research Institute, Oslo

Scholarly personnel (2001-2005)	Senior	Junior	Total
Number of researchers listed in the self-assessment report	29	31	60
Of these: Researchers whose main position is located at the institute and who devote more than half of their research time to development research.	7	11	18
Number of listed researchers appearing in submitted publication lists	26	19	45
			Publisher level in DBH
Publications within development research (2001-2005)	2	1	Not registered
Number of articles in scholarly journals	32	26	2
Number of articles in anthologies/books at a publishing house	12	19	3
Number of books/monographs at a publishing house	2	4	0
Number of doctoral dissertations		3	

Note: See first page of this appendix for explications of the data.

Appendix 2 Terms of Reference

Evaluation of Norwegian Development Research - Terms of Reference

The objective of the evaluation is to strengthen Norwegian development research via recommendations on strategic aims, priorities, organisation and resources. Its purpose is to contribute to improved quality, relevance, internationalisation and focus/identity. The evaluation also aims to strengthen the role that research on developing countries and development issues plays in Norwegian research policy.

The evaluation will address development research in Norway from a broad perspective, including the research funded by the Research Council, research assignments funded directly by other sources, and those conducted within the university sector. The Research Council's definition of development research from 2003 provides the framework for the evaluation:

> *Development research is "research which is relevant for understanding the interlinkages and transition processes on global, regional and local levels and which can make an important contribution with this knowledge to poverty reduction, expansion of human rights and sustainable development."*

The evaluation will provide assessments and recommendations for the national level as well as the institute level (research institute, university college/university institute or similar organisation) based on the criteria stated below. The evaluation will differentiate between various focus areas within development research and indicate areas in which Norwegian development research or communities within Norwegian development research excel on the Nordic and international levels and areas in which they lag behind. The evaluation will also differentiate between various funding methods for research (via the Research Council or directly from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs / Norad, from the institution's core funding, international organisations, etc.). The following criteria will serve as a basis for the evaluation:

1. *Quality* assessed on the basis of international standards on a representative selection of publications. The evaluation will also assess the relationship and balance between basic research, applied research and more assignment-oriented research.
2. *Funding and resources*: Do the institutes have sufficient resources (human and financial) to conduct competence-building activities and maintain a basic level of expertise? What is the number of scientific and popular-scientific publications, researcher resources and the like compared to other research areas? Is there adequate expertise at the senior level in the specific discipline?
3. *Relevance* (1) in relation to prioritised areas and issues in Norwegian development policy and objectives established by international institutions, (2) in relation to the key challenges in development policy as determined by the evaluation group, and (3) in relation to the needs of other public authorities and the trade and industry sector for knowledge about developing countries and transition processes (see the definition of development research).
4. *Dissemination, communication and use of research results*: What is the situation regarding dissemination of research results to the public at large, communication within the research process and dissemination of results to decision makers? Are

research results and researcher expertise utilised? This applies both in Norway and internationally (including in relation to countries and users in the South).

5. *Cooperation* between institutes and between the institute sector and university sector in Norway.
6. *International* research cooperation and networks; participation in international committees and large-scale research programmes; participation in conferences; presentations, speeches and lectures; the profile and focus of the international activities as well as cooperation with and positioning in relation to international institutions; participation in processes that set the international research agenda. Activities and partners in Norway as well as the South are relevant in this context, assessed in relation to strategic assessments, the desire for competence transfer, and identification of the knowledge arena.
7. *Management and organisation*: Relationship between funding source (Research Council, The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norad, international organisation, etc.), the institute and researcher group; strategic management of research; institutional foundation and institutional focus of the development research.
8. *Cross-disciplinarity and multi-disciplinarity*: To what degree has the cross-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary orientation been maintained within development research and in relation to other research areas such as culture, welfare, working life and the environment?

It is recommended that the evaluation assess development research in the past ten years in terms of profile, relevance and quality. The evaluation committee will be presented statistics on publications, number of researchers, senior researchers vis-à-vis researcher recruits, doctoral degrees and similar data for the past five years. A selection of publications for expert assessment will be chosen from articles (both scientific and popular) published in the past ten years.

The evaluation should be based on publications, relevant sections of the institutes' and universities' annual plans, and the institutes' own assessments. Relevant evaluations of the field and of specific institutes[37] will be included in the basic material. Previous reviews of the sector,[38] as well as comparable Nordic evaluations, will also be relevant. Additionally, a user study should be conducted of representatives of the development aid authorities, other public-sector divisions and ministries, NGOs and the trade and industry sector for which the research should be relevant. In a number of areas the evaluation should utilise standard criteria and objectives for evaluations to facilitate future comparisons with other research areas (such as the number of publications, research staffs and advisers compiled by NIFU statistics). Additional requirements and the operationalisation of objectives and focus will be defined by the evaluation group.

The Research Council will make secretariat available for the evaluation. The secretariat will compile relevant statistics and lists of publications for use in the expert assessments. The Research Council can also arrange for peer reviewing which may serve as a basis for

---

[37] A parallel evaluation of the Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI) will be conducted in 2006. Previous evaluations of CMI will also be useful. A review of "Development Paths in the South" ("Utviklingsveier i Sør") will also be available in 2006.

[38] See in particular "Development Research - Characteristics and Challenges of Development" (Norsk Utviklingsforskning - Utviklingstrekk og utfordringer"). Report to the Research Council of Norway, area for environment and development, 2001. Produced by Johan Helland, Chr. Michelsen Institute.

the committee's own expert assessments, if so desired. The evaluation group will be free to obtain outside expertise and advice within the available budget. The adoption of a work plan and specification of tasks by the evaluation group must be approved by the Research Council before implementation.

The evaluation report shall be completed by 30 April 2007 and be made available in English. A draft of the report shall be circulated to the relevant research communities for their comments a few months before completion of the report.

Appendix 3 Questionnaire: Institutional survey mapping Norwegian development research

[Text version of the web-based survey to 158 research units]

(Q1)

Does your institution/unit perform research aimed at understanding development for less developed countries?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No (the unit does not, or very seldom, perform such research)

(Q2)

Please indicate the institution's/unit's total expenses on "development research" the last five years (estimated total for the period 2001-2005):

- ❍ Below 1 million NOK
- ❍ 1 to 4 million NOK
- ❍ 5 to 9 million NOK
- ❍ 10 to 19 million NOK
- ❍ 20 to 49 million NOK
- ❍ 50 to 100 million NOK
- ❍ Above 100 million NOK

NB: All kinds of costs should be included in the estimate, also salary for permanent staff and overhead costs.

(Q3)

Please indicate the institution's/unit's funding sources for "development research" the last five years (select all relevant categories):

- ❑ Institutional core funding (basisbevilgning)
- ❑ Grants from research agencies (domestic or foreign research councils/programs)
- ❑ Commissioned research without tender competitions (direkte oppdrag)
- ❑ Commissioned research obtained through tender competitions (anbudskonkurranse)
- ❑ Other sources (e.g. donations)

(Q4)

Please indicate the institution's/unit's external funding sources for "development research" the last five years (select all relevant

categories):

- ❑ The Research Council of Norway
- ❑ The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- ❑ NORAD
- ❑ The EU Framework Program
- ❑ UN agencies
- ❑ The World Bank
- ❑ Other external sources (fill inn below)

(Q5)

Please fill in the number of permanent senior staff who spend a substantial part of their research time on development research.

Persons who do not have their principal employment (hovedstilling) at the institution are not to be included.

Permanent senior staff

To be included: Professors, "Førsteamanunsis", "Forsker 1", "Forsker 2" and other persons with doctoral level research competence holding a permanent position at the institution/unit.

Temporary senior staff

To be included: Postdocs and other persons with doctoral level research competence holding a temporary position at the institution/unit.

(Q6)

The focus of development research

Please fill inn the most important thematic areas for development research at your institution/unit (up to three areas). If applicable, also fill inn the scholarly disciplines involved.

Thematic area 1

Thematic area 2

Thematic area 3

Discipline 1

Discipline 2

Discipline 3

(Q7)
If you have additional information relevant for the mapping of Norwegian development research, or for the selection of units to be evaluated, please use the space below.

Appendix 4 Review form and guidelines

Development research – review of Norwegian publications 2001-2005

Review form and guidelines for external referees

Name of institution:

1 Assessments

For each institution we want you to review the selected publications and give your statements on the four criteria below (a-d), about ½ page of comments per criterion. When adequate you should distinguish between the different (kinds of) publications and research topics at the institution, but in general you should comment on your summarised impressions from the publications and not on the single publications.

a) Originality

To what degree do the publications contribute with new insight relevant for development research? To what degree do they contribute with (other) new theoretical, methodological or empirical insights?

Reviewer's comments:

Concluding rating on originality (add an X under the adequate category):

Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent	Exceptionally good

b) Methods and solidity

How technically competent is the research? What is the strength of methods and theoretical approaches?

Reviewer's comments:

Concluding rating on methods and solidity (add an X under the adequate category):

Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent	Exceptionally good

c) Scholarly relevance

To whom (if any) is the research scholarly interesting? Do the researchers demonstrate knowledge about the research front in the areas?

Reviewer's comments:

Concluding rating on scholarly relevance (add an X under the adequate category):

Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent	Exceptionally good

d) Publication profile and research impact

Please select the category most adequately describing the publication profile and research impact of the institution. These judgements should be based on your review of the selected publications, but also taking into consideration the complete publication list from the institution. Note that the publications have been selected by the evaluation committee and should include the major thematic areas within development research at each institution and their most important researchers involved in such research at the institution. If you think the selection is inadequate, please comment on this below. If you think it helpful you may examine additional publications from the publication lists.

	Exceptionally good	Publications at highest international level; of greatest national and international interest with broad impact. Key publications in top journals indicating exceptionally high international standing and visibility.
	Excellent	Publications at a very high international level; of great national and international interest with broad impact. Publications in leading journals indicating excellent international standing and visibility.
	Very good	Publications at a high international level; of national and international interest with impact within their research areas. Publications in leading journals indicating very good international visibility.
	Good	Publications at a good international level, but of limited national and international interest. The researchers have publications in well-known, specialized journals indicating good visibility within subfields.
	Fair	Publications are only partly at a good international level and with limited national and international interest. The publication channels indicate moderate international visibility.
	Weak	Publications with very little national or international interest. The publication channels indicate low international visibility.
	Poor	Publications are without any national or international interest or significance, or research results are poorly communicated.
Reviewer's comments on the international standing and visibility of the institution:		
Reviewer's comments on the selection of publications from the institution:		

2 Other comments

Thematic areas

When putting together their publication lists, the research units participating in the evaluation were asked to list of all relevant publications resulting from the unit's development research and to indicate the thematic area of each publication according to the following categories:

A: *Resource Management* (Natural Resource management; Global and Regional Governance for Sustainable Development; Environmental Values and Social Change; Agricultural Development & Livelihood Security, and similar topics)
B: *Rights, Security and Democracy* (Rights, Conflicts & Resources; Rights and Development; Security and Peace Studies; Governance; Democratisation; Decentralisation, and similar topics)
C: *Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction* (Development Economics and Development Geography including: Rural-urban relations, Small Town Development; Technology and Entrepreneurship; Small Business Development, and similar topics)
D: *Culture and Gender* (Cultural Studies; Gender and Development; Indigenous Peoples; Internal displacement and migration, and similar topics)
E: Other topics in development research

We would very much welcome comments on the way the institutions have categorised its publications into these thematic areas. In cases where the institutions have not categorised their publications, we would like you to indicate in which category you would put the majority of its publications. If you find the list to contain publications outside the scope of the relevant definition of development research (see the attached Terms of Reference), please also comment on what share of the publications on the list you consider to be outside the area of development research.

Reviewers comments on the thematic areas:

Further information

For more information about the evaluation to which your review will contribute, please see the attached Terms of Reference (ToR). You may also contact Inger-Ann Ulstein at the Research Council of Norway: iau@rcn.no

Appendix 5 Journals included in the citation analysis

Journal	ISSN	PUBLISHER
AFRICA	0001-9720	EDINBURGH UNIV PRESS, UK
AFRICAN AFFAIRS	0001-9909	OXFORD UNIV PRESS, UK
AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW-REVUE AFRICAINE DE DEVELOPPEMENT	1017-6772	BLACKWELL PUBLISHING, UK
AFRICAN JOURNAL OF ECOLOGY	0141-6707	BLACKWELL PUBLISHING, UK
DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE	0012-155X	BLACKWELL PUBLISHING, UK
DEVELOPMENT POLICY REVIEW	0950-6764	BLACKWELL PUBLISHING, UK
DIALECTICAL ANTHROPOLOGY	0304-4092	SPRINGER, NETHERLANDS
DISASTERS	0361-3666	BLACKWELL PUBLISHING, UK
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND CULTURAL CHANGE	0013-0079	UNIV CHICAGO PRESS, USA
ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT	0898-5626	ROUTLEDGE JOURNALS, TAYLOR & F, UK
ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS	1355-770X	CAMBRIDGE UNIV PRESS, USA
ENVIRONMENTAL & RESOURCE ECONOMICS	0924-6460	SPRINGER, USA
ETHNIC AND RACIAL STUDIES	0141-9870	ROUTLEDGE JOURNALS, TAYLOR & F, UK
FOOD POLICY	0306-9192	ELSEVIER SCI LTD, UK
GENDER & SOCIETY	0891-2432	SAGE PUBLICATIONS INC, USA
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE-HUMAN AND POLICY DIMENSIONS	0959-3780	ELSEVIER SCI LTD, UK
GLOBAL GOVERNANCE	1075-2846	LYNNE RIENNER PUBL INC, USA
GROWTH AND CHANGE	0017-4815	BLACKWELL PUBLISHING, UK
HUMAN ECOLOGY	0300-7839	SPRINGER/PLENUM PUBLISHERS, USA
HUMAN RIGHTS QUARTERLY	0275-0392	JOHNS HOPKINS UNIV PRESS, USA
IDS BULLETIN-INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES	0265-5012	INST DEVELOPMENT STUDIES, UK
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	0020-5850	BLACKWELL PUBLISHING, UK
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING REVIEW	1474-6743	LIVERPOOL UNIV PRESS, UK
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	0738-0593	PERGAMON-ELSEVIER SCIENCE LTD, UK
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MIDDLE EAST STUDIES	0020-7438	CAMBRIDGE UNIV PRESS, USA
INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION	0020-7985	INT ORGANIZATION MIGRATION, SWITZERLAND
INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION REVIEW	0197-9183	CENTER MIGRATION STUDIES, USA
JOURNAL OF AFRICAN ECONOMIES	0963-8024	OXFORD UNIV PRESS, UK
JOURNAL OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS	0021-857X	AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS SOC, UK
JOURNAL OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE TROPICS AND SUBTROPICS	1612-9830	KASSEL UNIV PRESS GMBH, GERMANY
JOURNAL OF ASIAN STUDIES	0021-9118	ASSN ASIAN STUDIES INC, USA
JOURNAL OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION	0022-0027	SAGE PUBLICATIONS INC, USA
JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY ASIA	0047-2336	J CONTEMPORARY ASIA, PHILIPPINES
JOURNAL OF DEMOCRACY	1045-5736	JOHNS HOPKINS UNIV PRESS, USA
JOURNAL OF DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS	0304-3878	ELSEVIER SCIENCE BV, NETHERLANDS
JOURNAL OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES	0022-0388	ROUTLEDGE JOURNALS, TAYLOR & F, UK

JOURNAL OF ETHNIC AND MIGRATION STUDIES	1369-183X	ROUTLEDGE JOURNALS, TAYLOR & F, UK
JOURNAL OF LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES	0022-216X	CAMBRIDGE UNIV PRESS, USA
JOURNAL OF MODERN AFRICAN STUDIES	0022-278X	CAMBRIDGE UNIV PRESS, USA
JOURNAL OF PEASANT STUDIES	0306-6150	ROUTLEDGE JOURNALS, TAYLOR & F, UK
LAND DEGRADATION & DEVELOPMENT	1085-3278	JOHN WILEY & SONS LTD, UK
LAND ECONOMICS	0023-7639	UNIV WISCONSIN, USA
LAND USE POLICY	0264-8377	ELSEVIER SCI LTD, UK
LATIN AMERICAN PERSPECTIVES	0094-582X	SAGE PUBLICATIONS INC, USA
LATIN AMERICAN POLITICS AND SOCIETY	1531-426X	UNIV MIAMI, USA
LATIN AMERICAN RESEARCH REVIEW	0023-8791	UNIV TEXAS PRESS, USA
MODERN ASIAN STUDIES	0026-749X	CAMBRIDGE UNIV PRESS, USA
MOUNTAIN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	0276-4741	MOUNTAIN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPM, USA
POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY	0962-6298	ELSEVIER SCI LTD, UK
POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW	0098-7921	BLACKWELL PUBLISHING, UK
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND DEVELOPMENT	0271-2075	JOHN WILEY & SONS LTD, UK
REGIONAL STUDIES	0034-3404	ROUTLEDGE JOURNALS, TAYLOR & F, UK
REVUE CANADIENNE D ETUDES DU DEVELOPPEMENT-CANADIAN JOURNAL OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES	0225-5189	INST INT DEV CO-OP, CANADA
RURAL SOCIOLOGY	0036-0112	RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SOC, USA
SOUTH AFRICAN JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS	0038-2280	ECONOMIC SOC SOUTH AFRICA, SOUTH AFRICA
STUDIES IN COMPARATIVE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	0039-3606	TRANSACTION PUBLISHERS, USA
SURVIVAL	0039-6338	ROUTLEDGE JOURNALS, TAYLOR & F, UK
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	0968-0802	JOHN WILEY & SONS LTD, UK
THIRD WORLD QUARTERLY	0143-6597	ROUTLEDGE JOURNALS, TAYLOR & F, UK
WORLD BANK ECONOMIC REVIEW	0258-6770	OXFORD UNIV PRESS, UK
WORLD BANK RESEARCH OBSERVER	0257-3032	OXFORD UNIV PRESS, UK
WORLD DEVELOPMENT	0305-750X	PERGAMON-ELSEVIER SCIENCE LTD, UK
WORLD POLITICS	0043-8871	JOHNS HOPKINS UNIV PRESS, USA

Appendix 6 Tables

Table A. 1 Analysis of submitted publications lists: All listed scholarly articles, books and doctoral dissertations 2001-2005 by research unit (frequencies)

Research unit	Articles in scholarly journals	Articles in books	Books	Doctoral dissert.	Total
NTNU: Department of Geography	20	8	0	5	33
NTNU: Department of Economics	21	7	0	2	30
UiB: Comparative Research Programme on Poverty	0	7	0	0	7
UiB: Department of Comparative Politics	6	9	0	1	16
UiB: Department of Social Anthropology	38	25	2	10	75
UiB: Centre for Development Studies	15	1	5	0	21
UiO: Department of Archaeology, Conservation and Historical Studies	6	2	1	2	11
UiO: Department of Sociology and Human Geography	28	11	1	1	41
UiO: Department of Political Science	5	5	2	0	12
UiO: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights	10	3	0	3	16
UiO: Institute for Educational Research	19	19	0	1	39
UiO: Department of Social Anthropology	8	9	0	0	17
UiO: The Centre for Development and the Environment	52	53	18	8	131
UiO: Department of Economics	19	1	0	2	22
UiS: Department of Media, Culture and Social Sciences	2	0	0	0	2
UiT: Department of Social Anthropology	13	4	2	0	19
UiT: Department of Sociology	1	0	0	0	1
UMB: Department of Economics and Resource Management	26	18	1	4	49
UMB: Noragric	111	40	6	5	162
HiAgder: Dept. of Economics and Business Administration/Institute of Development Studies	22	2	0	0	24
NHH - Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration	42	6	0	2	50
CMI - Chr. Michelsen Institute	13	23	12	9	57
Fafo Institute for Applied International Studies	18	16	1	0	35
FNI - Fridtjof Nansen Institute	8	3	1	1	13
NIBR - Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research	0	7	0	0	7
NINA - Norwegian Institute for Nature Research	31	2	0	1	34
NUPI - Norwegian Institute of International Affairs	97	44	13	5	159
PRIO - International Peace Research Institute	66	40	6	3	115
Total	**697**	**365**	**71**	**65**	**1198**

Table A. 2 Analysis of submitted publications lists: Scholarly articles, books and doctoral dissertations 2001-2005 included as "development research" by research unit (frequencies)

Research unit	Articles in scholarly journals	Articles in books	Books	Doctoral dissert.	Total
NTNU: Department of Geography	20	8	0	5	33
NTNU: Department of Economics	21	7	0	2	30
UiB: Comparative Research Programme on Poverty	0	7	0	0	7
UiB: Department of Comparative Politics	6	9	0	1	16
UiB: Department of Social Anthropology	33	24	2	10	69
UiB: Centre for Development Studies	1	0	5	0	6
UiO: Department of Archaeology, Conservation and Historical Studies	5	2	0	2	9
UiO: Department of Sociology and Human Geography	28	10	1	1	40
UiO: Department of Political Science	4	5	2	0	11
UiO: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights	9	3	0	3	15
UiO: Institute for Educational Research	16	19	0	1	36
UiO: Department of Social Anthropology	6	5	0	0	11
UiO: The Centre for Development and the Environment	47	51	17	8	123
UiO: Department of Economics	19	1	0	2	22
UiS: Department of Media, Culture and Social Sciences	2	0	0	0	2
UiT: Department of Social Anthropology	11	3	1	0	15
UMB: Department of Economics and Resource Management	26	18	1	4	49
UMB: Noragric	70	36	6	5	117
HiAgder: Dept. of Economics and Business Administration/Institute of Development Studies	22	2	0	0	24
NHH - Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration	33	6	0	1	40
CMI - Chr. Michelsen Institute	13	19	12	8	52
Fafo Institute for Applied International Studies	13	12	1	0	26
FNI - Fridtjof Nansen Institute	8	3	1	1	13
NIBR - Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research	0	5	0	0	5
NINA - Norwegian Institute for Nature Research	2	0	0	1	3
NUPI - Norwegian Institute of International Affairs	71	29	13	5	118
PRIO - International Peace Research Institute	60	35	6	3	104
Total	**546**	**319**	**68**	**63**	**996**

Table A. 3 Analysis of submitted publications lists: Scholarly articles, books and doctoral dissertations 2001-2005 by research unit, percent included as "development research"

Research unit	Percent included	N submitted
NTNU: Department of Geography	100.0	33
NTNU: Department of Economics	100.0	30
UiB: Comparative Research Programme on Poverty	100.0	7
UiB: Department of Comparative Politics	100.0	16
UiB: Department of Social Anthropology	92.0	75
UiB: Centre for Development Studies	28.6	21
UiO: Department of Archaeology, Conservation and Historical Studies	81.8	11
UiO: Department of Sociology and Human Geography	97.6	41
UiO: Department of Political Science	91.7	12
UiO: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights	93.8	16
UiO: Institute for Educational Research	92.3	39
UiO: Department of Social Anthropology	64.7	17
UiO: The Centre for Development and the Environment	93.9	131
UiO: Department of Economics	100.0	22
UiS: Department of Media, Culture and Social Sciences	100.0	2
UiT: Department of Social Anthropology	78.9	19
UiT: Department of Sociology	0.0	1
UMB: Department of Economics and Resource Management	100.0	49
UMB: Noragric	72.2	162
HiAgder: Dept. of Economics and Business Administration/Institute of Development Studies	100.0	24
NHH - Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration	80.0	50
CMI - Chr. Michelsen Institute	91.2	57
Fafo Institute for Applied International Studies	74.3	35
FNI - Fridtjof Nansen Institute	100.0	13
NIBR - Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research	71.4	7
NINA - Norwegian Institute for Nature Research	8.8	34
NUPI - Norwegian Institute of International Affairs	74.2	159
PRIO - International Peace Research Institute	90.4	115
Total	**83.1**	**1198**