
CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume II, Number 10
May 20, 1983

This Week . . .

House Votes to Restore NSF Social Science Funds
Autonomy of NIJ and BJS Threatened
COSSA Requests Increased Funding for FIPSE
BJS Advisory Board: Lawyers 10, Statisticians 0
Norwood to Continue as Commissioner of BLS
Proposal Submissions to NIMH Increasing
High Tech and the Social Sciences
Sources of Research Support: National Science Foundation

* * *

HOUSE VOTES TO RESTORE NSF SOCIAL SCIENCE FUNDS

By a vote of 297 to 111, the House of Representatives approved an FY 1984 authorization for the National Science Foundation (NSF) on Thursday, May 12. The authorization, as reported out of the House Committee on Science and Technology, restored funding for the NSF social and behavioral science research programs to their FY 1980 levels.

In describing the House bill, Representative Doug Walgren (D-PA) said that the Committee "has added some strength to the social and the behavioral sciences. That is particularly important when we realize that we must keep a strong university research base in this area as well. There is much to be contributed by the social and the behavioral sciences. They had suffered inordinately in the reductions associated with the 1980-84 timeframe. In fact, while the Math and Physical Science Directorate of the National Science Foundation was increasing its funding by some 60 percent, the behavioral and social sciences were losing 40 percent of their funding...after considering inflation. The fact of it is that, if we are to have a strong university-based effort in this area which has such potential to contribute to our society, we have to

May 20, 1983

HOUSE VOTES TO RESTORE NSF SOCIAL SCIENCE FUNDS (cont.)

maintain, not cut, the funding. This is the only way those with good talent will stay in research in the behavioral and social sciences."

Representative Don Fuqua (D-FL), who introduced the Committee bill, noted that the bill restores funding for the social, behavioral, and information sciences to their FY 1980 level, but also pointed out that this was balanced by slight decreases in the proposed FY 1984 increases in other research programs. "I wish to stress," he said, "that these other research programs will still receive increases of between 19 and 20 percent above last year's appropriations."

In a departure from previous years, there was no objection to the Science and Technology Committee's action to restore funds to the social and behavioral sciences. Representative Larry Winn (R-KA), who has introduced amendments to reinstitute the administration's priorities in NSF authorization and appropriation bills in past years, introduced no amendment to change the Committee's research priorities this year.

In a statement introduced into the Congressional Record, Representative Sam Gejdenson (D-CT) said, "In addition to authorizing increased support for the mathematical and physical sciences as well as \$50 million for the costs of instrumentation, H.R. 2066 specifies that \$15 million be set aside for support of research in the social and behavioral sciences. Research in the social and behavioral sciences addresses problems such as economic productivity, capital formation, savings behavior, learning, and cognitive development -- all areas of great concern as America struggles to regain its economic preeminence. Much of our productivity problem has behavioral rather than technological roots, as the Japanese have taught us only too well."

Representative William D. Ford (D-MI) also made a statement on behalf of the social and behavioral sciences: "I am pleased to support passage of H.R. 2066, the reauthorization of the National Science Foundation. The provision of this bill that earmarks \$15 million for support of research in the social, behavioral, and information sciences goes a long way toward remedying past imbalances in the NSF scientific programs which have arisen over the years...There is much to be learned from the social science disciplines of psychology, economics, sociology, anthropology, and political science, among others, about how our society functions and how we might be able to improve upon our past performance. I am pleased to see that Mr. Fuqua's committee has seen fit to restore funding for research in these important scientific disciplines. The Nation will be healthier for it in the long run."

May 20, 1983

AUTONOMY OF NIJ AND BJS THREATENED

COSSA recently submitted testimony to the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Justice urging that Congress maintain the independent status of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). The Senate version of the Justice Assistance Act of 1983 (S.53), which is scheduled to be marked up by the full Senate Judiciary Committee next week, is being amended to alter substantially the independent status of NIJ and BJS. However, the House version of the bill, passed on May 10, makes only minor changes in the status of these agencies.

The bill under consideration by the Senate would place NIJ and BJS within an Office of Justice Assistance (OJA), headed by an Assistant Attorney General who would be appointed by the President. The Assistant Attorney General, rather than the President, would appoint the Directors of NIJ and BJS and would have final grant and contract authority. The bill would also eliminate the NIJ and BJS Advisory Boards and replace them with a single Justice Assistance Board. The legislation does not require that social and behavioral scientists be represented on the Advisory Board, only that members "...shall include representatives of the public, various components of the criminal justice system at all levels of government, and persons experienced in the criminal justice system, including the design, operation and management of programs at the State and local level." Moreover, the bill does not specify budget levels for NIJ and BJS, instead authorizing only "such sums as are necessary." Because Sen. Joseph R. Biden, Jr. (D-DE) is concerned that such vagueness may result in research funds being used for other purposes, he plans to introduce an amendment in the Judiciary Committee mark up that would set authorization levels at \$25 million each for NIJ and BJS.

The House Judiciary Committee, in reporting their version of the Justice Assistance Act of 1983 (H.R. 2175), reaffirmed the need to maintain the independence of NIJ and BJS, saying that, "[T]he Committee is sensitive to the need to separate the research and statistics arms of the Justice Department from the more 'action oriented' Office of Justice Assistance." The House bill would, however, eliminate the Office of Justice Assistance, Research and Statistics (OJARS) with a streamlined Office of Justice Assistance.

May 20, 1983

AUTONOMY OF NIJ AND BJS THREATENED (cont.)

COSSA's congressional testimony, which was submitted to the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Justice, urged that NIJ and BJS "...not be consolidated with or within another unit...whose purpose is primarily to aid in the process of law enforcement. While justice assistance and justice research can and must reinforce each other, we are convinced that this relationship can best be achieved if the National Institute of Justice retains its autonomy...." Submitting the testimony on behalf of COSSA were Richard D. Schwartz, Syracuse University College of Law; David C. Baldus, University of Iowa College of Law; Alfred Blumstein, Carnegie-Mellon University; Herbert Jacob, Northwestern University and President, Law and Society Association; Norval Morris, University of Chicago Law School; Peter H. Rossi, University of Massachusetts; James F. Short, Jr., Washington State University and President-elect, American Sociological Association; Marvin E. Wolfgang, University of Pennsylvania; and Roberta Balstad Miller, COSSA.

Copies of the testimony can be obtained from the COSSA office, 1755 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20036; 202/234-5703.

COSSA REQUESTS INCREASED FUNDING FOR FIPSE

In its budget request, the Reagan administration proposed that the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) be phased out because the program "...ha[d] been extremely successful over the past ten years." The administration's FY 1984 budget for FIPSE is \$6.0 million, down almost \$6 million from its FY 1983 level.

Willis D. Hawley, Dean of Peabody College, Vanderbilt University, testified on behalf of COSSA before Rep. William H. Natcher's (D-KY) Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. Dean Hawley urged the Subcommittee to maintain FIPSE's funding at the FY 1983 level, citing the important contributions this agency has made to innovations in postsecondary education and the growing need for such support in these times of constricting education budgets. Copies of the testimony can be obtained from COSSA, Suite 300, 1755 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20036; 202/234-5703.

May 20, 1983

BJS ADVISORY BOARD: LAWYERS 10, STATISTICIANS 0

Earlier this spring, 20 members of the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) Advisory Board were sworn in by Attorney General William French Smith. There were no statisticians among them. Ten were attorneys and the remainder businessmen, police officers, and private citizens.

BJS, currently part of the Justice Department's Office of Justice Assistance Research and Statistics (OJARS), collects and analyzes information concerning crime, victims, offenders, criminal justice processes, juvenile delinquency, and civil disputes in support of public and private policy and decision-making on crime and criminal justice. It also provides technical assistance to initiate new applications of communications and information systems technology for state and local criminal justice systems. [See "Autonomy of NIJ and BJS Threatened" for information regarding pending legislation that would affect the autonomy of BJS and the National Institute of Justice (NIJ).]

Most federal research and statistical agencies have advisory committees whose responsibility is to advise agency directors and set agency priorities. Although members of these boards are usually political appointees, researchers and scholars had comprised a fair-sized portion of their membership until recently. The Advisory Committee to the National Institute of Justice, like that of BJS, has no social scientists as members.

NORWOOD TO CONTINUE AS COMMISSIONER OF BLS

On May 12, President Reagan announced his intention to nominate Dr. Janet Norwood to another 4-year term as Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). Dr. Norwood, a Carter appointee, has been Commissioner of BLS since May, 1979. After the Department of Labor receives formal nomination of Dr. Norwood by the President, her reappointment must be confirmed by the Senate.

May 20, 1983

PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS TO NIMH INCREASING

Although fiscal year 1983 is little more than half over, there is evidence that proposal submissions to the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) by social and behavioral scientists are increasing. The total number of research proposals submitted to NIMH is higher overall for the first two quarters of FY 1983 than for the same period in FY 1982. Importantly, however, the Behavioral Sciences Review Committee, which reviews a large portion of the social and behavioral science proposals at NIMH, has the highest workload of all NIMH review panels in the latest round of applications.

HIGH TECH AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

A cornerstone of the administration's policy for science budgets this year has been a focus on the role of basic research in stimulating the economy. In practice, this emphasis has led the administration to increase research budgets in the physical sciences to a greater extent than in other sciences. This issue is addressed in an editorial by James J. Zuyiches, Cornell University, in the May 20, 1983, issue of Science, enclosed as Attachment 1.

May 20, 1983

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION (NSF)

COSSA provides this information as a service and encourages readers to contact the agency rather than COSSA for more information.

Productivity Improvement Research Section
(Division of Industrial Science and Technological Innovation)

FY 1983 Budget: \$1 million.

Program Goals: The program's goals are to improve understanding of the processes by which technological innovation occurs, to examine how those processes are affected by federal objectives and actions, by management, and by institutional practices, and to explore the relationship between technological innovation and industrial productivity.

Disciplines Supported: Although economists were formerly the principal beneficiaries of awards from this Section, at the present time awards are made to researchers from the full range of the social and behavioral sciences.

Funding Mechanisms: Grants. Proposers are encouraged to submit concept papers or preliminary proposals on an informal basis before embarking on formal submission.

Restrictions on Awards: Awards may not exceed 5 years and may not ordinarily be granted to foreign institutions.

Review Processes Employed: Usually individual mail reviews. Panels occasionally convened on an ad hoc basis for groups of proposals in a single area.

Success Ratio: Between 15 and 25% of proposals are funded.

Contact Person: For copies of the official program announcement and a recent Section publication, "The Process of Technological Innovation: Reviewing the Literature," write or call:

Dr. Louis G. Tornatzky, Section Head
Productivity Improvement Research Section
Division of Industrial Science & Technological Innovation
National Science Foundation
Washington, DC 20550
202/234-5703

SCIENCE

20 May 1983, Volume 220, Number 4599

High Technology and the Social Sciences

The recent AAAS colloquium on "R & D, High Technology, and Economic Recovery" provided multiple analyses of and justifications for the Administration's 1984 budget for research and development. The scientific and research management communities heard numerous assessments justifying defense priorities. They were also assured that substantial increases in funding of basic research in the physical sciences and engineering, primarily by the National Science Foundation, would lead to innovations in high technology and contribute to economic expansion and employment growth.

Inevitably, these analyses also raised a series of fundamental research questions about the training and supply of scientists and engineers, the problems of organizing research groups for innovation, the diffusion of knowledge and transfer of basic research from the laboratory to marketable technologies, and about the process of job creation associated with high-technology development. Each of these questions, posed at the colloquium by representatives of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, Office of Management and the Budget, and by other speakers, is central to the domain of social science. These questions, taken together, outline an agenda for basic social science research. Not all the participants in the colloquium, however, seemed to recognize the social scientific nature of these questions and the research efforts needed to understand the conditions conducive to technological innovation and the likely consequences of such change.

The challenge to the research community lies in providing research-based answers to these kinds of questions. Psychologists, sociologists, and economists have addressed these questions in studies of national laboratories, careers of scientists including Nobel Laureates, and the rise and productivity of specific industries, such as the semiconductor industry and agriculture.

A key question concerns the impact that organizational size and complexity, bureaucratic structure, and regulatory procedures have on productivity and innovation. Some analyses suggest support for small, high-technology firms will lead to higher rates of innovation and increases in employment; and policies have been proposed to support the individual small firm. But, is it the critical mass of many small firms on Route 128 in Massachusetts or in Silicon Valley that provides a creative environment? In such an environment ideas diffuse rapidly and spin-off growth of new firms is accelerated. A definitive answer concerning the relation between job creation and size of firm still remains elusive.

We need to understand the impacts of technological change in economic and social terms. Typically, economic benefits are estimated but potential costs ignored. Technological innovation in one area often means technological obsolescence in others. This can affect community tax bases as well as the demand for products of some firms and for skills of some workers.

These research questions represent only a few dimensions of the social science research agenda, yet research in such areas remains severely hampered by the reductions (despite partial restorations) of funds for social, economic, and behavioral science research in NSF and other agencies. The importance of the research questions and needed answers should justify support. The record of performance also warrants it. The value, significance, and yield of basic research in the social and behavioral sciences, concluded a 1982 report of the National Academy of Sciences*, justifies continued public investment as a national resource. Like basic research in physics and engineering, basic social science research is an indispensable part of the effort to achieve and sustain economic growth.—JAMES J. ZUCHES, Associate Director, Agricultural Experiment Station, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853

*Committee on Basic Research in the Behavioral and Social Sciences, *Behavioral and Social Science Research: A National Resource* (National Academy Press, Washington, D.C., 1982).