

The Economics of Social Science in the Middle East and North Africa: Analysis of Funding for Social Science Research and Knowledge Production in the MENA Region

# **Supplementary Information**

Prepared by the Governance and Local Development Institute

# **Supplementary Information**

## 1. Data Collection and Initial Coding

A research proposal was drafted by the project's three Principal Investigators and sent to the research assistance team to work out a coding scheme. The research proposal contained several research questions for the overall project to address, all of which should ideally be answerable by the collected data. The proposal also contained a list of funding sources the project was interested in and examples of such organizations, agencies, etc. The first step of the data collection was compiling a list of funding sources, building on the examples provided in the research proposal. The types of funding sources were divided into several categories: private foundations (e.g., Carnegie Corporation of New York), national grant agencies (e.g., the Swedish Research Council), international multilateral organizations (e.g., the World Bank), national governmental agencies (e.g., USAID), Higher-Income Country organizations in the MENA region (e.g., Carnegie Middle East Center in Beirut), large national universities in the MENA region (e.g., Mohammed V University in Rabat), and large universities outside the MENA region with prominent MENA scholars (e.g., Columbia University). The initial stage of the data collection was to get a general overview of the funding sources. The research assistants first put together a list of 44 funding sources of various types and added them to an Excel sheet. The categories in that very initial overview were, for each funding source, as follows:

- Focus area
- Number of grants approved to MENA (-related projects)
- Share of total amount of grants (to MENA-related projects)
- Share of budget given to MENA (-related projects)
- Links to further information

Each project identified at the funding source's website was then coded in the general overview (separate from the more detailed coding done at a later stage). The coding for each funded project used the following categories:

- Grantee
- Year
- Amount
- Project length
- Program (if applicable)
- Project title
- Project description

The more detailed coding of the projects built on the categories above but added several new categories, outlined in the table below.

#### **Detailed Coding Process**

The main coding in the report comes from the organizations below, covering the listed timespan.

Table 1: List of Organizations Initially Included in Search for Information

Private Foundations		
Funding Source	Database of Granted	Link to Grants Database
	Projects (Timespan)	
Carnegie Corporation of New York	2004-2021	https://www.carnegie.org/grants/grants-database/?q=Middle+east&per_page=26
Ford Foundation	2006-2021	https://www.fordfoundation.org/work/our-grants/awarded-grants/grants-
		database/?minyear=2006&maxyear=2022&page=0&originatingoffices=%26RegionIds%3D88
		Types=&search=%26SearchText%3Dresearch&thematicareas
Social Science Research Council	N/A	
Open Society Foundation	2016-2020	https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/grants/past
Gates Foundation	1998-2021 (annual	https://www.gatesfoundation.org/about/committed-grants
	reports until 2019)	
Wallenberg (Marianne and Marcus	N/A	https://kaw.wallenberg.org/en/grants
Wallenberg Foundations)		
Riksbankens Jublileumsfond (RJ; Swe)	2000-2021	https://www.rj.se/en/grant-listning/
Suwairis Foundation	N/A	
Qatar Foundation	N/A	
Microsoft	N/A	
National Grant Agencies	•	
Funding Source	<b>Database of Granted</b>	Link to Grants Database
	Projects (Timespan)	
National Science Foundation (NSF)	1979-2021	https://nsf.gov/awardsearch/simpleSearchResult?queryText=middle-east+north-africa
Swedish Research Council	2007-2023	https://www.vr.se/english/swecris.html#/?funder=202100-5208
(Vetenskapsrådet / VR; Swe)		
International Multilateral Organization	s	
Funding Source	Database of Granted	Link to Grants Database
	Projects (Timespan)	

World Bank	N/A	
European Union (EU)/	2014-2020	Horizon Europe 2020: https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-
European Research Council (ERC)		tenders/opportunities/portal/screen/opportunities/projects-results;programCode=H2020
United Nations – UNDP Oslo Governance	e N/A	
National Governmental Agencies	·	
Funding Source	Database of Granted	Link to Grants Database
	Projects (Timespan)	
USAID	2012-2020	https://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/PEER/PGA_167039;
		https://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/PEER/PGA_161128
SIDA (Sweden)	2004-2019	https://www.sida.se/publikationer/sidas-arsredovisning-2004 (Swedish)
	(Annual Reports)	
AECID (Spain)	N/A	N/A
GIZ (Germany)	N/A	N/A
NORAD (Norway)	N/A	https://grants.mfa.no/#home/info; https://www.norad.no/en/front/funding/ (no database
FCDO (Foreign, Commonwealth &	N/A	https://www.gov.uk/international-development-funding (no database)
Development Office)		
Folke Bernadotte Academy	2017-2021	https://fba.se/en/how-we-work/research/research-grants/
(FBA; Sweden)		
Western Organizations in the Region		
Funding Source	<b>Database of Granted</b>	Link to Grants Database
	Projects (Timespan)	
Carnegie Middle East Center	N/A	
NYUAD	N/A	
American University in Cairo (AUC)	N/A	https://www.aucegypt.edu/research/faculty-support-grants#RSG (no database)
American University of Beirut (AUB)	N/A	
Georgetown Qatar	N/A	https://cirs.qatar.georgetown.edu/research/research-grants/;
	(links not working)	https://cirs.qatar.georgetown.edu/research/research-initiatives/mobility-displacement-and
		forced-migration-middle-east/awarded/
Brookings Doha Center	N/A	
RAND Center for Middle East Public	N/A	

Policy		
J-Poverty Action Lab/AUC	N/A	
Large National Universities in the MENA		
Cairo University	N/A	https://cu.edu.eg/Research_Awards (none on social science)
Mohammed V University (Morocco)	N/A	
University of Jordan	N/A	http://research.ju.edu.jo/Pages/FundingAvailableatTheDeanship.aspx (no database)
Mohammed Bin Rahid School of	N/A	
Government/John F. Kennedy		
School of Government (Dubai Initiative)		
Large Universities Outside of the MENA		
Columbia	N/A	
Yale	N/A	
Harvard	N/A	
SciencesPo	N/A	
Aarhus	N/A	
Research Organizations in the MENA		
Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research	N/A	
Jordan Center for Strategic Studies	N/A	
Arab Center for Research and Policy	N/A	
Studies	,	
Gulf Research Center (Saudi Arabia)	N/A	
Emirates Center for Strategic	N/A	
Studies and Research		

Table 2. List of Organizations Coded and Timespan

	Organization	Coding acronym	Timespan covered
1	Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab	JPA	2006 – 2020
2	American University in Beirut	AUB	2015 – 2020
3	American University in Cairo	AUC	2007 – 2021
4	Carnegie Corporation of New York	Carnegie	2005 – 2021
5	Carnegie Middle East Center (Beirut)	ССВ	N/A
6	Center for Strategic Studies at University of Jordan	JCS	1993 – 2020
7	Columbia Global Centers (Imman)	CGCIm	2020
8	Columbia Global Centers (Istanbul)	CGCI	2011 – 2015
9	Columbia Global Centers (Tunis)	CGCT	2018 – 2020
10	Doha Institute	Doha	2016 – 2022
11	Ford Foundation	Ford	2006 – 2020
12	French Institute for the Near East	FINE	1991 – 2021
13	Georgetown University in Qatar	GUQ	2009 – 2022
14	Gulf Research Center	SAGR	2003 – 2018
15	Horizon Europe	EU	2015 – 2022
16	National Science Foundation	NSF	1983 – 2020
17	New York University Abu Dhabi	NYAUD	N/A
18	Open Society Foundation	OSF	2016 – 2020
19	Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research	PCS	2003 – 2019
20	Riksbankens Jubileumsfond	RJ	2003 – 2021
21	The American Center of Research	AmCR	1982 – 2017
22	The Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies	ACR	2011 – 2016
23	Vetenskapsrådet	VR	2010 - 2022

These organizations can be divided into funders and two types of research programs:

- 1. Funders (Carnegie Corporation of New York, Ford Foundation, National Science Foundation, Vetenskapsret, Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, Horizon Europe).
- 2. Centers in and of the region (Center for Strategic Studies, Doha institute, The Arab Center for Research and Policy, Gulf Research Center, Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research).
- 3. Foreign centers located in the region (Carnegie Middle East Center, American University in Beirut, American University in Cairo, Columbia Global Centers, Georgetown University in Qatar, New York University Abu Dhabi, The American Center of Research, French Institute for the Near East, Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab).

We based the coding on the categories in the table below.

Table 3: Coding Guide for Categories

Coding category:	Answer options:								
Funding source (name)	Open answer								
Location of funding source	Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Other MENA country, MENA region country not specified, United States, Canada, Other North American country, United Kingdom, Sweden, Finland, Germany, France, Cyprus, Greece, Portugal, Ireland, Austria, Belgium, Norway, Denmark, Netherlands, Italy, Spain, European Union (country not specified), Other European country, Other African country, Other South American country, Other Asian country, Other Oceanian country, Not specified								
Grant number	Open answer								
Location of grantee	Same options as location of funding source								
Amount awarded	Open answer								
Currency	SEK, EUR, USD, Other								
Project start date	Open answer								
Project duration (months)	Open answer								
Project title	Open answer								
Project description	Open answer								
Type of project	Research Project, Scholarly Exchange,								

	Conference/Workshop, Other
Quantitative methods used	Coded yes if identified, left blank if unable to identify
If yes, which one(s)	Open answer
Qualitative methods used	Coded yes if identified, left blank if unable to identify
If yes, which one(s)	Open answer
Country/ies the project studies	Same options as location of founding source
Topic	Regional Conflict, Civil War, Terrorism/Political Violence, Authoritarianism, Democratization, Autocratization/Democratic Backsliding, State Formation, Elections/Participation, Bureaucracy, Corruption, Non-state Governance, Radicalization/Political Polarization, Civil Society/Activism, Justice/Human rights, Social Welfare, Refugees/Migration, Citizenship/Statelessness, Remittances, Development, Labor Market/Livelihood, Economic Inequality, Climate Change/Environment, International Agencies/Humanitarian Activities, Transnational Movements/Networks, International Relations/Foreign Policy, Islam, Judaism, Christianity, Other Religions, Language/ Literature/Art, Communication/ Media, Identity/Ethnicity, Gender, Education, Agriculture, Peacebuilding, Public health, Psychology, Ideology, Trade, Security
URL	Open answer
Extra notes	Open answer
Who coded (survey)	List of research assistants
Number of PIs	Open answer
PI 1 Name (loops for up to 10 PIs)	Open answer
PI 1 Gender	Woman, Man, Non-Binary
PI 1 Location/where based	Same options as location of founding source
PI 1 Institution (name)	Open answer
PI 1 Institution (type)	Public university, Private university, Public research program, Private research program, Government body, NGO, CSO (civil society organization),

	Development consulting firm, Other
PI 1 Discipline	Political science, incl. IR, Economics, History, Sociology, Anthropology, Public Policy/Public Administration, Development Studies, Environmental Studies, Archaeology, Political Economy, Geography, Linguistics/Literature, Religious Studies, Law/International Law, Communication/Media, Architecture, Peace/Conflict, Architecture/Urban Planning, Philosophy, Other
Number of collaborators	Open answer
Collaborator 1 Name (loops for up to 10 collaborators)	Open answer
Collaborator 1 Gender	Woman, Man, Non-Binary
Collaborator 1 Location/where based	Same options as location of founding source
Collaborator 1 Institution (name)	Open answer
Collaborator 1 Institution (type)	Same options as PI institution (type)
Collaborator 1 Discipline	Same options as PI discipline

During the coding process, we encountered several obstacles.

- Our primary difficulty was finding information regarding the principal investigator(s) and collaborator(s). Since the data came from three different types of organizations, what we could gather from each varied. For example, we were rarely able to identify PIs for projects that did not come from a Funder. In this category, we could easily identify PIs for all organizations except those funded by the Carnegie Corporation New York, Ford Foundation, and the Open Society Foundation. Initially, we put down the program director where a PI was unavailable, but ultimately decided that these roles were not similar enough. This also meant that coders needed to assume that the program director was the project PI, which was not necessarily the case. Therefore, for data reliability reasons, we have omitted the PI and collaborator roles from the coding of the aforementioned three organizations.
- Some organizations, most often European Union (the Horizon 2020 program), had projects with over 10 collaborators. Most projects had considerably fewer, which is why the coding sheet only included 10 columns for collaborators, making projects with 10+ collaborators impossible to code in the existing sheet. However, this project is primarily interested in PIs rather than collaborators, as the PIs are responsible for the project and receiving the project funding. For this reason, we decided to continue using the existing coding sheet and include a maximum of 10 collaborators. There

- were no instances where a project had over 10 PIs (in such a case, we would have extended the coding sheet to include all).
- The categories for project topics and PI and collaborators' disciplines were decided before the coding process started. However, this decision was based on the general and initial overviews of the projects. As the coders worked with the data in more detail, they recorded any new topics and areas of study they encountered during the coding process. The most common categories were added (and those that were infrequent were kept as Other). The categories that were added were:
  - Topics: Education, Agriculture, Peacebuilding, Public Health, Psychology, Ideology, Trade, Security.
  - Disciplines: Geography, Linguistics/Literature, Religious Studies, Law/International Law, Communication/Media, Architecture, Peace & Conflict, Architecture/Urban Planning, Philosophy.

#### **Bases for Data Analysis**

- Funding by donor/source across time and funding by all donors across time
- Funding for research projects across time total funding and that from individual donors
- Funding for scholarly exchange, total funding, and that from individual donors
- Funding for workshops/conferences, total funding, and that from individual donors
- Funding for other activities, total funding, and that from individual donors
- Number of projects focused on each topic
- Amount spent on each topic
- Number of PIs by the different disciplines
- Number of collaborators by the different disciplines
- Amount of money spent on PIs by discipline
- Number of primary PIs (PI 1) from different disciplines
- Amount of money spent on primary PI from different disciplines
- Number of Single-PI vs. Multi-PI projects funded
- Number of Single-PI vs. PI + collaborators funded
- Amount of money awarded to Single-PI vs. Multi-PI projects
- Amount of money awarded to Single-PI vs. PI + collaborators
- Number of projects awarded to PIs by country (including all PIs)
- Amount of money spent on PIs by country (including all PIs)
- Number of projects awarded to PIs by country (PI 1 only)
- Amount of money spent on PIs by country (PI 1 only)
- Number of projects awarded to studies of each country (country of study, not country of researcher)
- Amount of money spent on studies of each country
- Number of projects awarded to Public university vs. Private university vs. Other institutions
- Amount of money awarded to Public university vs. Private university vs. Other institutions

- Amount of money spent on male-solo vs. female-solo vs. male Multi-PI vs. female
   Multi-PI vs. mixed-gender Multi-PIs
- Amount of money spent on male PIs + male collaborators vs. female PIs + male collaborators vs. mixed PIs + collaborators
- Number of projects awarded to male-solo vs. female-solo vs. male multi-PI vs. Female Multi-PI vs. mixed-gender Multi-PIs
- Number of projects awarded to male PIs + male collaborators vs. female PIs + male collaborators vs. mixed PIs and collaborators
- Number of projects awarded to PIs in Western countries only vs. in West and MENA vs. in MENA only
- Amount of money awarded to projects for which the PIs are in the West only vs. in West + MENA vs. in MENA only
- Amount of money awarded to projects for which the PI and collaborators (both) are in the West only vs. PI and collaborators (both) are in MENA only vs. PI and collaborators are in West and MENA
- Type of data method the sponsored project uses, quantitative or qualitative, and specific type

## 2. Description of Data Limitations

### **Summary of Missingness**

To understand the robustness of our claims, we need to understand if, and if so where, we have systematic missingness in our data. Most of our claims are about trends across donors or years.

#### **Awarded Grants**

Table 4: Missingness of Variables by Donor

Donor	Observations	Type of Project	Amount	Topic	Country of Study	PI Info
Carnegie	141 (14.4%)	5%	%	%	%	41.8%
EU	112 (11.4%)	1.8%	%	.893%	%	21.4%
Ford	156 (15.9%)	1.3%	%	%	%	67.9%
NSF	75 (7.6%)	1.3%	%	%	8%	1.3%
OSF	58 (5.9%)	1.7%	%	%	%	51.7%
VR	62 (6.3%)	3.2%	%	%	%	3.2%
ACR	5 (0.5%)	%	1 %	%	%	6 %
AmCR	7 (0.7%)	%	1 %	%	%	1 %
AUB	35 (3.6%)	%	1 %	%	%	1 %
AUC	74 (7.5%)	2.7%	1 %	%	%	21.6%
CCB	6 (0.6%)	%	1 %	%	%	1 %
CGCA	5 (0.5%)	%	1 %	%	%	%
CGCI	16 (1.6%)	%	1 %	%	%	37.5%
CGCT	3 (0.3%)	%	1 %	%	%	%
Doha	18 (1.8%)	5.6%	1 %	%	%	5.6%
FINE	22 (2.2%)	%	91%	%	%	1 %

Donor	Observations	Type of Project	Amount	Topic	Country of Study	PI Info
GUQ	4 (4.1%)	%	1 %	%	%	92.5%
JCS	47 (4.8%)	1 %	1 %	%	%	1 %
JPA	38 (3.9%)	5.3%	1 %	%	%	1 %
NYAUD	15 (1.5%)	%	1 %	%	%	53.3%
PCS	14 (1.4%)	14.3%	1 %	%	%	1 %
RJ	19 (1.9%)	%	%	%	%	%
SAGR	14 (1.4%)	%	1 %	%	%	85.7%

Table 5: Missingness of Variables by Year

Year	Observations	Type of Project	Amount	Topic	Country of Study	PI Info
2001	3 (0.3%)	%	%	%	%	%
2002	2 (0.2%)	%	%	%	%	%
2003	9 (1%)	%	33%	%	%	33.3%
2004	6 (0.7%)	16.7%	17%	%	16.7%	16.7%
2005	11 (1.2%)	27.3%	9%	%	%	27.3%
2006	28 (3.2%)	21.4%	18%	%	%	67.9%
2007	34 (3.9%)	5.9%	15%	%	%	85.3%
2008	3 (3.4%)	3.3%	33%	%	%	8 %
2009	3 (3.4%)	3.3%	17%	%	%	76.7%
2010	39 (4.4%)	1 .3%	26%	%	%	43.6%
2011	37 (4.2%)	%	27%	%	2.7%	45.9%
2012	32 (3.6%)	6.2%	34%	%	%	5 %
2013	57 (6.5%)	7%	37%	%	1.8%	43.9%
2014	55 (6.2%)	9.1%	44%	%	5.5%	54.5%
2015	64 (7.2%)	6.2%	33%	%	%	43.8%
2016	9 (1 .2%)	2.2%	27%	%	%	36.7%
2017	71 (8%)	4.2%	34%	%	%	35.2%
2018	77 (8.7%)	1 .4%	47%	%	%	4 .3%
2019	79 (8.9%)	8.9%	34%	%	%	3 .4%
2020	71 (8%)	12.7%	18%	1.4 8%	%	45.1%
2021	58 (6.6%)	%	16%	%	%	29.3%

Table 6: Distribution of Funding Sources Across Time

	2 1	2 2	23	2 4	2 5	26	2 7	28	2 9	21	2 11	2 12	2 13	2 14	2 15	2 16	2 17	2 18	2 19	2 2	2 21
Carnegie					4	4	3	5	6	4	3	5	11	8	12	22	1	9	12	11	12
EU															1	13	15	1	18	18	27
Ford						14	24	12	18	11	12	5	9	11	16	7	4	5		8	
NSF	3	2	5	5	5	4	2	2	1	13	7	3	5	6	2	3	4		1	1	
OSF																12	1	11	11	14	
VR										1	5	8	1	5	2	8	2	4	5	4	8
ACR											1					1					
AmCR									1					1		1	2				
AUB															1		5	2	1	2	
AUC							1	1		4	3	4	6	5	5	8	5	6	8		7
ССВ																					
CGCA																				2	
CGCI											1		6		6						
CGCT																		2		1	
Doha																3	5	4	3		1
FINE										1							1	3	4	1	2
GUQ									2		1	2	2	1	3	5	2	5	2	1	
JCS				1	1	4	1	1		4		1	3	4	3	2	2	8	6	5	
JPA						1	2	1	1	1	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	6	2	1	
NYAUD																					
PCS			1					1			1		1	1		1			1		
RJ			1		1	1		1					1	1	1	1	2	1	5	2	1

	21 22	23	2 4	25	26	2 7	28	29	2 1	2 11	2 12	2 13	2 14	2 15	2 16	2 17	2 18	2 19	2 2	2 21
SAGR		2				1	6	1		1	1	1					1			

