

---

---

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

# COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

---

---

Volume II, Number 2  
January 28, 1983

This Week . . .

State of the Union: Time for R & D  
FY 1984 Budgets  
Help Needed: Social Science Occupations Dropped from  
Employment Handbook  
Congressional Report Calls for More Social Science Research  
New Members of Science and Technology Committee  
NIJ: A Commitment to Scholarly Research?  
British SSRC Saved -- But is it Science?  
SBIR Program Underway  
Editorial: Will Social Science Go the Way of Physics?  
Sources of Research Support: Department of Health and  
Human Services

\* \* \*

## STATE OF THE UNION: TIME FOR R & D

In his State of the Union address on January 25, President Reagan emphasized the importance of high technology and science and math education. Speaking of what he called the "frontier of high technology," the President said that his administration "is committed to keeping America the technological leader of the world now and into the twenty-first century." In keeping with this emphasis, Mr. Reagan also called for improvement in math and science education, adding that this should be accomplished through block grants to the states.

Despite these priorities, it was the Democrats, not the administration, who made the heaviest commitment to research. In the television presentation prepared by the Democratic National Committee to follow the State of the Union address, Democrats proposed that 3 percent of the gross national product (GNP) be devoted to research and development (R&D). Although it is admittedly easier for the party out of power to



STATE OF THE UNION: TIME FOR R & D (cont.)

propose spending government funds, this still represents a substantial commitment by the Democrats. National Science Foundation (NSF) estimates suggest that the United States was spending 2.37 percent of GNP on R&D in 1981. An increase in R&D spending from 2.37 percent to 3 percent would increase the U.S. R&D investment by over \$435 million at 1981 levels. Only the Soviet Union spends a higher proportion of its GNP for research and development. For comparative figures on national investments in R&D as a percentage of GNP, see Attachment 1 from Science Indicators - 1980.

FY 1984 BUDGETS

The administration's budget for FY 1984 is expected to be made public on Monday, January 31. In previous years the budget was released to the press on the Friday preceding the official publication of the budget, which occurred on a Sunday. This year, a delayed production schedule forced the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to announce that budget documents would not be available until 48 hours after previously announced.

The next issue of the COSSA Washington Update will contain a preliminary assessment of how social and behavioral science research fares under the administration's budget proposals.

HELP NEEDED: SOCIAL SCIENCE OCCUPATIONS DROPPED FROM EMPLOYMENT HANDBOOK

COSSA has learned that the next edition of the Occupational Outlook Handbook, which is published biennially by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), will not include five major social science occupations: geographer, political scientist, anthropologist, historian, and market analyst.

These are among 60 occupations that have been slated for elimination from the Handbook because of budget cutbacks in BLS. The Division of Occupational Outlook, which compiles the Handbook, at one time had a staff of 100. Today the staff numbers only 30. Determination of which occupations would be eliminated from the Handbook was made on the basis of the size of the occupational group and the degree of effort necessary to reconcile current employment data, which is now being obtained from the Occupational Employment Survey (OES) with data from former years that came from the Current Population Survey (CPS). Because the OES provides poor coverage of the social sciences, social science occupations were cut more heavily than other occupations.



HELP NEEDED: SOCIAL SCIENCE OCCUPATIONS DROPPED FROM EMPLOYMENT HANDBOOK (cont.)

The Occupational Outlook Handbook is used extensively by vocational counselors in high schools, community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities to advise students who are making occupational choices. It contains information on the number of practitioners, the outlook for the profession or occupation, and required courses of study. Elimination of these social science occupations from the Handbook will have a detrimental effect on both recruitment to these fields and enrollments in college and university courses.

Social scientists are urged to write to officials at the Department of Labor asking for reinstatement of all five social science occupations and revision of the OES to include better information on social science occupations. In addition, Members of Congress should be informed that these exclusions are occurring. The congressional subcommittees that have jurisdiction over the BLS are the Subcommittee on Labor Management Relations in the House of Representatives and the Subcommittee on Labor in the Senate. Names and addresses of those to whom letters should be sent are given below:

Janet Norwood, Director  
Bureau of Labor Statistics  
U.S. Department of Labor  
200 Constitution Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20210

Raymond Donovan, Secretary  
U.S. Department of Labor  
200 Constitution Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20210

The Honorable Philip Burton, Chairman  
Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations  
2451 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

The Honorable Don Nickles, Chairman  
Subcommittee on Labor  
A609 Immigration Building  
Washington, D.C. 20510

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT CALLS FOR MORE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

The House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology, which held hearings on The Human Factor in Innovation and Productivity in September, 1981, is calling for additional funding for research on human factors in innovation and productivity. In a recently published report and analysis of the hearings, the Subcommittee emphasized the need for social science research on the impact of technology on the



CONGRESSIONAL REPORT CALLS FOR MORE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH  
(cont.)

industrial labor force and on problems in the implementation of new technologies in the workplace. The report held that social science research is closely related both to the organization of the workplace and to the design and utilization of physical technologies:

"...research on this subject is needed for the design of new technological hardware and the appropriate utilization of technology in the workplace. It is also needed to understand how to better organize work in the workplace and to address specific problems that might arise from a particular way of work."

The hearings from which the recommendations were drawn were chaired by Rep. Stan Lundine (D-NY). Mr. Lundine and members of the Subcommittee heard testimony from government, industry, labor and the social science research community. After consideration of the testimony, the Subcommittee made the following recommendations:

"Private organizations which perform research on the human factor in innovation and productivity should be encouraged by the Federal government. Creation of an inter-disciplinary, problem-oriented research program as part of the National Science Foundation, or as an independent entity, should be authorized and funded by Congress. Congress should provide funds for research on the interaction between human factors and innovation and productivity. National Science Foundation programs, in particular the social sciences, should be emphasized. Research efforts funded should explore the various aspects of human factors, including the impact of the human factor on technological development, and vice versa. Organizational behavior in the workplace should be studied with the goal of understanding and developing solutions to problems which arise in the workplace involving human factors. A demonstration pilot program oriented to case studies of organizational problems and experimentation with possible solutions would be particularly helpful.

Congress should provide incentives to the private sector for efforts to understand the interaction between the human factor and the workplace. Disincentives should be removed where they exist. The exclusion of social science research from the definition of basic research given in section 221 of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981, which allows a tax credit for increased funding of basic research, is a disincentive to private funding of human factors research which should be eliminated by repealing the exclusion."

For further information on the hearings or a copy of the report, contact the COSSA office (202/234-5703) or the office of Congressman Stan Lundine (202/225-3161).



NEW MEMBERS OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

The membership of the House Committee on Science and Technology will change in the 98th Congress. Although membership of the subcommittees has not yet been fully determined, the composition of the full committee will be as follows:

Majority Members

Don Fuqua, FL, Chairman  
 Robert A. Roe, NJ  
 George E. Brown, Jr., CA  
 James H. Scheuer, NY  
 Richard L. Ottinger, NY  
 Tom Harkin, IA  
 Marilyn Lloyd Bouquard, TN  
 Doug Walgren, PA  
 Dan Glickman, KS  
 Albert Gore, Jr., TN  
 Robert A. Young, MO  
 Harold L. Volkmer, MO  
 Bill Nelson, FL  
 Stanley N. Lundine, NY  
 Ralph M. Hall, TX  
 Dave McCurdy, OK  
 Mervyn M. Dymally, CA  
 \*Paul Simon, IL  
 \*Norman Y. Mineta, CA  
 \*Richard J. Durbin, IL  
 \*Michael A. Andrews, TX  
 \*Buddy MacKay, FL  
 \*Tim Valentine, NC  
 \*Harry M. Reid, NV  
 \*Robert G. Torricelli, NJ  
 \*Frederick C. Boucher, VA

Minority Members

Larry Winn, Jr., KS  
 Manuel Lujan, Jr., NM  
 Robert S. Walker, PA  
 William Carney, NY  
 F. James Sensenbrenner, WI  
 Judd Gregg, NH  
 Raymond J. McGrath, NY  
 Joe Skeen, NM  
 Claudine Schneider, RI  
 Bill Lowery, CA  
 \*Rod Chandler, WA  
 \*Herbert H. Bateman, VA  
 \*Sherwood L. Boehlert, NY  
 \*Alfred A. McCandless, CA  
 \*Tom Lewis, FL

\*New members of the Committee are marked with an asterisk.

NIJ: A COMMITMENT TO SCHOLARLY RESEARCH?

Two recent developments at the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), the major research agency within the Justice Department, have raised questions about the commitment of the Institute to scientific research on crime and criminal justice. The questions concern the members of the NIJ Advisory Board and the new Director of the Institute.

The National Institute of Justice was established in 1979 through the Justice System Improvement Act. Instrumental in this legislation was a report by the National Academy of Sciences that recommended the establishment of an independent research institute at the Department of Justice. The institute was to have an autonomous director and an advisory



NIJ: A COMMITMENT TO SCHOLARLY RESEARCH? (cont.)

board that could provide expert advice on issues of crime and criminal justice research. The goal of the legislation was to establish a research agency that would be independent of the political pressures that affect the various categorical programs in the Department of Justice.

A new NIJ Advisory Board was sworn in in August. Of the 17 members, none is a researcher; most are criminal justice practitioners. Only one of the new members holds a faculty position, and his areas of specialization do not include criminal justice. There is concern among social and behavioral scientists that the absence of researchers on the NIJ Advisory Board will lead to NIJ support for heavily applied research and for studies that promise immediate results rather than for research that attempts the more difficult tasks of assessing the major intervention strategies and addressing basic issues of crime, deterrence, and criminal justice. This concern is stimulated in part by the fact that the NIJ Advisory Board has shown strong interest in becoming more involved in the grants process than it has been previously, and has even expressed a desire to be involved in the approval of individuals grants. So far, however, the Board has not succeeded in expanding its responsibilities or its influence.

Adding to the unease of social and behavioral scientists is the recent appointment of James "Chips" Stewart as the first Director of the Institute. Mr. Stewart was previously Chief of Detectives in Oakland, California, and was the first policeman to be a White House Fellow. Reservations about his appointment do not involve his ability as an administrator, but rather his lack of background in research. Ideally, the Director of NIJ would be a respected criminal justice researcher.

Despite the early desire to remove the institute from politics, there are political forces that influence it. For example, Professor Norval Morris, a distinguished criminologist from the University of Chicago Law School, was initially proposed as Director of the Institute. His nomination was later blocked in the Senate because he was an opponent of the death penalty. The current Director is well-intentioned and acceptable to the Senate, but it is not yet clear that he can provide NIJ with the scholarly leadership and research experience that was originally envisioned for the job.

BRITISH SSRC SAVED -- BUT IS IT SCIENCE?

The British government has formally announced that it will not disband the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) and will see that it is funded. Accepting the injunction of the Rothschild report, the government also pledged not to undertake any further inquiries into the purpose and function of the Research Council.



BRITISH SSRC SAVED -- BUT IS IT SCIENCE? (cont.)

Despite these reassurances, delivered at the first meeting of the Association of Learned Societies in the Social Sciences, the government has cut the SSRC budget by 4% and asked that the SSRC consider removing the word "science" from its title. Sir Keith Joseph, Secretary of State for Education, has asked the Research Council to consider calling itself the Social Studies Research Council, claiming that the word "science" is misleading when describing social research. For additional information, see Attachment 2 from the London Times Higher Education Supplement.

SBIR PROGRAM UNDERWAY

The Small Business Administration (SBA) has issued a Pre-Solicitation Announcement for the Small Business Innovation Research Program (SBIR). The new program, which was established after passage of the Small Business Innovation Development Act last fall (see COSSA Legislative Report, October 29, 1982), makes a percentage of the extramural research and development budgets of federal agencies available to small research firms. Included in the SBIR Pre-Solicitation Announcement are suggested topics in social and behavioral science research from the National Center for Health Services Research (NCHSR), the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs (OAPP), the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), the National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA), the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) and the National Institute on Aging (NIA). To obtain copies of the announcement, write to the Small Business Administration, 1441 L Street, NW, Room 500, Washington, D.C. 20416.

EDITORIAL: WILL SOCIAL SCIENCE GO THE WAY OF PHYSICS?

According to Wolfgang Panofsky, Director of the Stanford Linear Accelerator, the United States has lost its world lead in physics. Responsibility for the decline, Panofsky told a Washington Post reporter, lies in the fact that U.S. research budgets for physics over the past decade could not support both facilities construction and personnel. Announcement of the decline was precipitated by the news that European physicists this week discovered the "W" particle, one of the four basic forces in the universe.

The U.S. world lead in social and behavioral science research should not be allowed to suffer similar decay. Although federal budget cuts over the past two years have threatened the central position of U.S. social and behavioral science, U.S. leadership in these disciplines has not been eroded as seriously as leadership in physics. With strong federal support in the next two years, the U.S. can maintain its preeminence in these sciences. --Roberta Balstad Miller



SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES (HHS)

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

National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH):  
Community Support Program (CSP)  
(State Service System Research on the Chronically Mentally Ill)

NIMH supports mental health research in many areas. That described below is one of many different NIMH research programs.

FY 1983 Budget: \$700,000 available.

Purpose of Program: To develop generalizable knowledge for the improvement of Federal, State and local planning, policymaking and program management for chronically mentally ill persons. Research areas to be supported include (a) studies on the structure, operation, effect on clients, and other effects of state mental health service delivery systems for the chronically mentally ill; (b) studies that assess State mental health services for particular subgroups of chronically mentally ill patients; (c) studies that examine funding and cost issues pertinent to state services; (d) studies of service management.

Funding Mechanism: Grants. Applications may be obtained from Grants Operation Section, Room 7C-05 Parklawn Bldg., 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20857. Submission deadline is April 1, 1983.

Restrictions on Awards: Awards limited to one year. Priority to multi-state collaborative projects or to state-specific projects with potential for generalization to other states.

Review Process Employed: Public Health Service peer review procedures.

Contact Person: For inquiries regarding relevance of a project to the goal of NIMH's Community Support Program (CSP):  
Judith Turner, Chief  
Community Support and Rehabilitation Branch  
Division of Mental Health Service Programs  
Room 11C-22 Parklawn Building  
5600 Fishers Lane  
Rockville, MD 20857 (301/443-3653)

For inquiries regarding technical aspects, research design, and methodology:

Ronald W. Manderscheid, Ph.D., Acting Chief  
Survey and Reports Branch  
Division of Biometry and Epidemiology  
Room 18C-05, Parklawn Building  
5600 Fishers Lane  
Rockville, MD 20857 (301/443-3343)



Appendix table 1-3. National expenditures for performance of R &amp; D as a percent of gross national product (GNP) by country: 1961-81

Year	France	West Germany	Japan	United Kingdom	United States	U.S.S.R.
Ratio of R & D expenditures to Gross National Product <sup>1</sup>						
1961	1.38	NA	1.39	2.46	2.73	NA
1962	1.46	1.25	1.47	NA	2.73	2.64
1963	1.55	1.41	1.44	NA	2.87	2.80
1964	1.81	1.57	1.48	2.29	2.96	2.87
1965	2.01	1.73	1.54	NA	2.89	2.85
1966	2.06	1.81	1.48	2.32	2.88	2.88
1967	2.13	1.97	1.53	2.30	2.89	2.91
1968	2.08	1.97	1.61	2.27	2.82	NA
1969	1.94	2.05	1.65	2.22	2.71	3.03
1970	1.91	2.18	1.79	NA	2.63	3.23
1971	1.90	2.38	1.84	NA	2.48	3.29
1972	1.86	2.33	1.85	2.06	2.40	3.58
1973	1.76	2.22	1.89	NA	2.32	3.66
1974	1.79	2.26	1.95	NA	2.29	3.64
1975	1.80	2.38	1.94	2.05	2.27	3.69
1976	1.77	2.29	1.93	NA	2.26	3.55
1977	1.76	2.32	1.92	NA	2.24	3.46
1978	1.76	2.37	1.93	2.11	2.23	3.47
1979 (prelim.)	NA	2.36	NA	NA	2.25	3.44
1980 (est.)	NA	NA	NA	NA	2.33	3.47
1981 (est.)	NA	NA	NA	NA	2.37	NA

R & D expenditures (national currency in billions) <sup>2</sup>						
1961	4.5	NA	275.5	68	14.3	NA
1962	5.4	4.5	319.3	NA	15.4	5.2
1963	6.4	5.4	368.3	NA	17.1	5.8
1964	8.3	6.6	438.1	.77	18.9	6.4
1965	9.8	7.9	508.6	NA	20.0	6.9
1966	11.0	8.8	576.6	.89	21.8	7.5
1967	12.2	9.7	702.5	.93	23.1	8.2
1968	13.1	10.6	877.5	.99	24.6	9.0
1969	14.2	12.2	1,064.7	1.05	25.6	10.0
1970	15.0	14.8	1,355.5	NA	26.1	11.7
1971	16.6	18.0	1,532.4	NA	26.7	13.0
1972	18.3	19.2	1,791.9	1.31	28.4	14.4
1973	19.8	20.5	2,215.8	NA	30.7	15.7
1974	23.0	22.3	2,716.0	NA	32.8	16.5
1975	26.2	24.6	2,974.6	2.15	35.2	17.4
1976	29.8	25.7	3,320.7	NA	38.9	17.7
1977	33.2	27.7	3,651.3	NA	42.9	18.3
1978	37.5	30.5	4,045.9	3.44	48.0	19.3
1979 (prelim.)	NA	32.9	NA	NA	54.2	20.2
1980 (est.)	NA	NA	NA	NA	61.1	21.3
1981 (est.)	NA	NA	NA	NA	69.1	NA

Table 1-3. (Continued)

Year	France	West Germany	Japan	United Kingdom	United States	U.S.S.R.
Gross National Product (national currency in billions)						
1961	328.4	333.0	19,852.8	27.5	524.6	NA
1962	367.2	360.5	21,659.5	28.9	565.0	197.2
1963	412.0	382.1	25,592.1	30.8	596.7	206.8
1964	456.7	419.6	29,661.9	33.5	637.7	223.2
1965	489.8	458.2	32,981.6	36.0	691.1	242.1
1966	532.0	487.4	38,872.8	38.4	756.0	260.1
1967	574.8	493.7	45,896.8	40.5	799.6	282.0
1968	630.0	535.2	54,576.8	43.8	873.4	NA
1969	734.0	597.7	64,513.6	47.1	944.0	329.6
1970	783.6	679.0	75,523.9	51.6	992.7	362.6
1971	873.1	756.0	83,166.0	57.8	1,077.6	394.8
1972	961.3	827.2	96,883.1	63.8	1,185.9	401.8
1973	1,121.3	920.1	117,257.9	74.1	1,326.4	429.4
1974	1,284.4	986.9	139,219.3	84.0	1,434.2	453.1
1975	1,455.2	1,034.9	153,126.3	104.7	1,549.2	471.8
1976	1,677.8	1,125.0	171,735.6	124.6	1,718.0	498.6
1977	1,881.8	1,197.2	190,426.3	142.3	1,918.0	528.8
1978	2,135.1	1,287.5	209,248.2	162.5	2,156.1	556.8
1979 (prelim.)	NA	1,393.8	NA	NA	2,413.9	587.9
1980 (est.)	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,626.1	614.5
1981 (est.)	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,920.0	NA

<sup>1</sup> Calculated from unrounded figures.

<sup>2</sup> Gross expenditures for performance of R & D including associated capital expenditures except for the United States where total capital expenditure data are not available. U. S. estimates for the period 1972-80 show that the inclusion of capital expenditures would have an impact of less than one tenth of one percent on the R & D/GNP ratio.

NA = not available.

NOTE: The latest data may be preliminary or estimates.

SOURCES: International Monetary Fund, *International Financial Statistics*, vol. 30 (May 1977); vol. 31 (May 1978); vol. 31 (August 1978); vol. 32 (January 1979); and vol. 33 (August 1980).

France: Délégation Générale à la Recherche Scientifique et Technique, unpublished statistics.

Japan: Scientific Counselor Embassy of Japan, Washington, D. C., unpublished statistics.

United Kingdom: Cabinet Office, The Central Statistical Office, London, unpublished statistics.

West Germany: Bundesministerium für Forschung und Technologie, unpublished statistics.

United States: Science Resources Studies, National Science Foundation, unpublished statistics.

U.S.S.R.: Robert W. Campbell, *Reference Source on Soviet R & D Statistics, 1950-1978*, 1978, and Robert W. Campbell, *Soviet R & D Statistics 1977-1980*, National Science Foundation, 1981.

See figure 1-3.



# Government 'will leave SSRC alone'

by Paul Flather

The Government has formally pledged to make no further inquiries into the troubled Social Science Research Council.

Mr William Shelton, under-secretary of state for education, said at the weekend that the Government's response to the Rothschild inquiry showed that it accepted the SSRC was needed and should be properly funded by the Government.

Mr Shelton was speaking at the inaugural conference of the Association of Learned Societies in the Social Sciences at Imperial College, London, attended by about 100 representatives from 18 affiliated societies.

He stressed that only one of Lord Rothschild's recommendations to the Government - that the budget should be reduced for at least three years - had been rejected, and this was because of pressing priorities in other fields.

"What I hope no one will overlook are the many positive points in the

Government's decision on the Rothschild report," he said. It was accepted that the SSRC was needed, that it should not be dismembered or liquidated.

It was accepted that the council should continue to administer post-graduate awards, and that its functions should not be hived off to other agencies. Underlying all this, he said, was a recognition that the SSRC should be properly funded.

One important conclusion was that the Government did not intend to hold further inquiries into the SSRC. "A line has been drawn under what I accept has been a fairly long period of uncertainty," he said.

In a conciliatory speech, Mr Shelton went on to stress that the SSRC had only been asked to consider dropping the word "science" from its title because it led to the false expectation that "exact results and precise prescriptions" could be produced.

He also hinted at the kind of "useful" research he favoured including

the implications of technical change; the aims and organization of the workplace; and health research.

He praised the SSRC's new programme on drug addiction research and stressed there must be continuing attention to "first-rate fundamental research".

Mr Shelton said he realized the seriousness of asking for a £6m cut from the SSRC's planned £73m budget over three years. "Difficult questions will be raised for the council about the proper balance of support for research," he said. The money has been diverted to help "new blood" in the natural sciences.

Both Mr Shelton and Mr Michael Posner, the SSRC chairman, welcomed the formation of the new association. They hoped it would do much to improve the cross-fertilization of ideas, break down disciplinary barriers, and help to communicate social science ideas to a wider audience.

## Council faces harsh decisions over cuts

A series of harsh decisions face the Social Science Research Council today when it considers cutting one in five staff posts, enforcing economies at its research units, and changing its own name.

Council members will have to brave a mass lobby from 120 staff who walked out of the London headquarters 10 days ago in protest at a proposal to shed 30 out of 146 jobs.

The four unions involved have said they will only call off their action if the management agrees to set up a joint working party to review the whole £21m SSRC budget to find savings. Cuts worth 4 per cent have been demanded by the Government.

Staff will report back for work next Monday whatever the council decides, but they will continue their protest with "internal sanctions". For example, they will not touch work which has come in over the past 10 days, nor do any new work assigned to them.

Union officials have asked Mr Geoff Rooker MP to convene a

meeting of MPs sponsored by the unions involved to put pressure on the Government to reverse the cuts. They have also alerted the TUC-sponsored educational alliance.

Mr John Macreadie, a national officer of the Civil and Public Services Association said the staff resolve appeared to be hardening. "We feel we have already paid for cuts in terms of staff cuts. We may even review going back to work next week."

Mr Michael Posner, the SSRC chairman said at a weekend conference that staffing was just one problem facing the SSRC. "We are having to say harsh things to a lot of our friends, to the units, to the staff, and to the academic community who are getting far fewer research students than in the past," he added.

Council members are also considering a paper discussing a change of title. Sir Keith Joseph, Secretary of State for Education, has asked for the word "science" to be dropped because he claimed it was mis-

leading.

Any change must be voted on, and will require a majority at two consecutive meetings to meet the SSRC charter requirements. The council can either become the Economic and Social Research Council, the Social Studies Research Council, or make no change. Members are also being asked to ratify a series of cuts at the SSRC's five specialist research units.

● It is understood three new council members have been appointed: Professor James Durbin, professor of statistics at the London School of Economics, current chairman of the SSRC's research resources and methods committee; Professor Philip Levy, professor of psychology at Lancaster University, and current chairman of the education and human development committee; and Mr Ian Byatt, deputy chief economic advisor at the Treasury. Their terms run until July 1986. Four more appointments are expected shortly.