CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume II, Number 9
May 6, 1983

This Week . . .

* * *

JUSTIZ ANNOUNCES NEW PROGRAM AT NIE

Dr. Manuel J. Justiz, Director of the National Institute of Education (NIE), announced to the COSSA Executive Committee this week that he will be establishing a Scholar-in-Residence Program at NIE. The purpose of the program, according to Dr. Justiz, will be to give the NIE staff the opportunity to have close and continuing contact with resident research scholars. The program may begin as soon as the fall of 1983. Further details will be available from COSSA or from the social and behavioral science disciplinary associations as soon as the program is formally announced.

At the meeting with the COSSA Executive Committee, Dr. Justiz also described his efforts to assure fair and open competition for NIE grants, particularly in the competition for funds for national laboratories and research centers. Funding for the current set of 17 labs and centers will expire in the next two years. Approximately $25 million will be available for new labs and centers in FY 1984 and FY 1985.

COSSA Washington Update is a biweekly publication of the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), 1755 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036, 202/234-5703; Dell H. Hymes, *President;* Roberta Balstad Miller, *Executive Director.* Member associations are the American Anthropological Association, American Economic Association, American Historical Association, American Political Science Association, American Psychological Association, American Sociological Association, American Statistical Association, Association of American Geographers, Association of American Law Schools, and Linguistic Society of America. A list of COSSA Affiliates and Contributors can be obtained from the Consortium.

May 6, 1983

COSSA DEFENDS ASPE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

COSSA has submitted written testimony to the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education on behalf of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) in the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The testimony supports the ASPE budget proposed by the President as "a reasonable, if minimal, allocation for that office."

More importantly, the testimony takes issue with the recommendation of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control (the Grace Commission report) to abolish ASPE, transfer its research functions to one or more of the operating divisions within HHS, and eliminate evaluation in the Office of the Secretary of HHS. According to the Grace Commission report, elimination of evaluation in the Office of the Secretary would save $10.5 million per year in contracts and $2.2 million in ASPE personnel costs. The report recommends that the operating divisions within HHS (the Social Security Administration [SSA], the Health Care Financing Administration [HCFA], the Public Health Service [PHS], and the Office of Human Development Services [OHDS]) be granted sole evaluation responsibility in HHS. COSSA testimony points out the advantages of dividing evaluation responsibilities between the agency responsible for the program to be evaluated and an organization with no direct responsibility for the program.

Copies of the Grace Commission report on ASPE and COSSA testimony are available from the COSSA office (1755 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20036; 202/234-5703).

NEW RULE ELIMINATES PAY FOR ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS

An interim rule published by the General Services Administration (GSA) would preclude members of federal advisory committees from receiving payment for their services, but would allow them to continue receiving reimbursement for travel and *per diem* expenses. The new interim rule, which was published in the *Federal Register* on April 28, became effective on that day. GSA is soliciting comments prior to its publication of a final rule on this matter. Social and behavioral scientists who are interested in submitting written comments in support or opposition to the rule can do so until July 27, 1983. A copy of the *Federal Register* statement is available from the COSSA office (1755 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 300, Washington, DC, 20036; 202/234-5703).

May 6, 1983

REDUCED "PROPOSAL PRESSURE" ENDANGERS RESEARCH FUNDING

The number of research proposals received by several federal agencies that fund social and behavioral science research has shown an overall decline since the 1981 reductions in funding for social and behavioral science research. This trend is alarming because proposal pressure (i.e., the number of research grant proposals received) is viewed by the administration and by the Congress as a major indication of the health and vitality of particular research areas. Because of this, prolonged depression of submissions can threaten the integrity of research programs.

COSSA surveyed five federal agencies that fund social and behavioral science research to determine trends in proposal submissions. The agencies were the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), the National Institute of Education (NIE), the National Center for Health Services Research (NCHSR), and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH).

Grant Proposal Submissions in the Social and Behavioral Sciences

	FY1980	FY1981	FY1982	%Change 80-81	%Change 81-82	Overall %Change 80-82
NSF						
Div. of Social & Econ. Science	1095	876	1185	-20%	+35%	+8%
Economics	313	235	428	-25%	+82%	+37%
Geography/Regional Science	96	100	92	+4%	-8%	-4%
Sociology	216	155	181	-28%	+17%	-16%
History & Philos. of Science	161	115	198	-28%	+72%	+23%
Measurement Methods	55	57	57	+4%	-	+4%
Political Science	149	111	124	-26%	+12%	-17%
Law & Social Sciences	105	103	105	-2%	+2%	-
Div. of Beh. & Neural Science	1308	1210	1110	-7%	-8%	-15%
Psychobiology	189	155	155	-18%	-	-18%
Neurobiology	294	302	364	+3%	+20%	+24%
Sensory Phys. & Perception	210	185	168	-12%	-9%	-20%
Memory & Cognitive Dev.	85	84	71	-1%	-15%	-16%
Social & Dev. Psychology	136	127	50	-7%	-61%	-63%
Linguistics	97	99	62	+2%	-37%	-36%
Anthropology	297	258	240	-13%	-7%	-19%
NIMH						
Total	1307	1262	978	-3%	-22%	-25%
Social & Behavioral	401*	320*	156*	-20%	-51%	-61%
NIE	415	207	270	-50%	+30%	-35%
NCHSR	374	250	185	-33%	-26%	-50%
NEH	529	480	404	-9%	-16%	-24%

*Calendar year.

May 6, 1983

REDUCED "PROPOSAL PRESSURE" ENDANGERS RESEARCH FUNDING (cont.)

Following the initial social and behavioral science budget cuts and rescissions in early 1981, the number of research proposals submitted to federal agencies by social and behavioral scientists declined dramatically. Efforts by some research program staffs to stimulate proposal submission were successful in increasing the number of proposals by FY 1982.

However, when compared with FY 1980, proposals submissions in FY 1982 remain depressed. Only the Division of Social and Economic Science at NSF has shown an increase in the number of proposals submitted between FY 1980 and FY 1982, and that only by 8%. The Division of Behavioral and Neural Science at NSF, while sustaining an overall decrease in submissions of 15% between FY 1980 and FY 1982, has seen the number of submissions in one of its programs, Social and Developmental Psychology, fall by 63%. NCHSR, where proposal submissions fell by 50% between FY 1980 and FY 1982; NIMH, where proposals in the social and behavioral sciences were down by 61%; and NIE, where an increase in proposals in FY 1982 could not overcome an overall decline in proposals submissions since FY 1980 of 35%, were the agencies most affected by reduced proposal pressure.

Social and behavioral scientists should be aware that research funds are available from these federal agencies and researchers are encouraged to contact program officers in those programs appropriate to their own research interests. Funds for social and behavioral science research are endangered when scientists do not elect to compete for them.

COSSA TESTIFIES BEFORE PROXMIRE ON NIMH

Dr. Morris Rosenberg, Professor of sociology at the University of Maryland, testified for COSSA before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. Dr. Rosenberg spoke of the important contributions the social and behavioral sciences have to make in understanding mental health issues. He also urged the Subcommittee to add $5 million to the NIMH budget for research training. He made his remarks directly to Senator William Proxmire (D-WI), a sometime foe of the social sciences, who was chairing the hearing at the time he was called to testify. A copy of the testimony is available from the COSSA office (1755 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20036; 202/234-5703).

May 6, 1983

ON ROOTING OUT WASTE, FRAUD, ETC.

In assuming the mantle of the protector of the taxpayer, politicians at times don the cloak of absurdity as well. A recent case in point is a letter from Senator Thomas F. Eagleton (D-MO) to the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) protesting the printing of a study of the economic impact of the Black Death in England in the 14th century. According to FTC spokesmen, the study examined dislocation resulting from government regulations and was useful to the FTC for methodological purposes. It was reprinted as one of a number of industrial economic analyses.

Senator Eagleton was concerned about both the content of the study and the printing costs. "How in the world," he wrote FTC Chairman James C. Miller III, "can a study of economic conditions during the British plague of 1348-51 have any possible relevance to the work of today's FTC?" He went on to say that "minimal as the costs for producing this work may have been, it sends a very ugly message to the taxpayers of this country, especially at a time when the FTC is cutting back in areas like antitrust enforcement." The cost of reprinting the study was $115. A random check of current prices for manuscript typing in the Washington area reveals that $115 might not cover the cost of typing the 45-page paper, much less printing it.

The Senator's indignation represents an unfortunate attitude, still held by some Members of Congress, that research is a suspect activity. COSSA is working to change this attitude by meeting with congressional staff and sponsoring congressional seminars on research. Although Sen. Proxmire's Golden Fleece awards no longer command the attention they did at one time, there remains much educating of Members of Congress to be done by scholars and scientists. COSSA staff is prepared to arrange visits to congressional offices for social and behavioral scientists who are coming to Washington. In addition, social scientists in Missouri might wish to write Sen. Eagleton directly about the use of the taxpayer's money for research.

HARVARD PRESIDENT WRITES OF LAW SCHOOLS, SOCIAL SCIENCES

In his annual report to the Board of Overseers of Harvard College, Derek C. Bok, President of Harvard University, criticized the nation's law schools for failing "to seek the knowledge that the legal system requires." Noting that lawyers tend to be skeptical about the utility of academic research, he wrote that we nonetheless "ignore the social sciences at our peril, for their techniques grow steadily more refined." An excerpt from Dr. Bok's report is included as Attachment 1.

May 6, 1983

THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN SOCIAL RESEARCH AND SOCIAL SCIENCE

A large number of social and behavioral scientists work for government agencies where they administer or conduct what is generally known as social research, that is, research that is directly related to the administration of government social programs. The present administration has made very clear its lack of regard for social research, first by declaring in 1981 that none should be supported at the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) and most recently by efforts to more than halve the research budget of the Office of Human Development Services (OHDS), which administers many of the federal government's major social programs. Although the difference between social science and social research is not always a clear one, the tension between university researchers and private "beltway bandit" research firms that contract to conduct social research for government agencies implies that such a distinction does exist. The question of how an integration of these two areas of research might be effected is discussed in Attachment 2, from the London Times Higher Education Supplement (April 22, 1983).

May 6, 1983

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 on Aging (NIA)
Behavioral Sciences Research Program

NIA was established in 1974 for the "conduct and support of biomedical, social, and behavioral research and training related to the aging process and the diseases and other special problems and needs of the aged."

FY 1983 Budget: The FY 1983 budget for extramural research is $69.4 million. Funds are allocated between the Biomedical Research & Clinical Medicine Program and the Behavioral Sciences Research Program on the basis of priority scores.

Purpose of Program: The Behavioral Sciences Research Program is concerned with "the social, cultural, economic, and psychological factors that affect both the process of growing old and the place of older people in society." Three broad categories of research are supported: (1) research on age as a structural feature of society; (2) research that identifies the cognitive, intellectual, and perceptual changes that, interacting with biological processes, occur with aging; and (3) research that investigates the changes and stabilities that occur with aging in the health, behavior, personality, and attitudes of people as related to the social environment.

Funding Mechanisms: Primarily investigator initiated grants.

Restrictions on Awards: Regular research grants, 5 years; New investigator awards, 3 years; small grants, 1 year.

Review Process Employed: Peer panel review.

Success Ratio: 20 - 25%

Contact: Ronald P. Abeles, Ph.D.
Health Scientist Administrator
NIA, Social & Behavioral Research
Building 31C, Room 5C05
Bethesda, MD 20205
301/496-3136

Excerpt from the annual report of Derek C. Bok, President of Harvard University, to the Harvard Board of Overseers:

* * *

A comprehensive effort to improve our legal system will call for help from every quarter: lawyers, judges, legislators, regulatory officials. I will not try to describe the contributions that each of these parties can make. The occasion does not allow it, and my qualifications are unequal to the task. My immediate concerns lie with education, and it is there that I would concentrate my attention.

One way by which educational institutions can contribute to reform is to mobilize their capacities for generating new knowledge. The public complains about the cost of legal services, but no one has discovered how much money we spend each year on our legal system. Communities experiment with alternative forums for resolving disputes, but do not evaluate these experiments systematically to learn which ones work and how well. Though doctors are learning to assess the costs and benefits of medical procedures and new technologies, lawyers are not making a comparable effort to evaluate provisions for appeal, for legal representation, for adversary hearings, or for other legal safeguards to see whether they are worth in justice what they cost in money and delay. Scholars have shown little interest in the theories of cognition that might help decide whether rules of evidence permit judges to make more accurate decisions or merely accumulate useless data that add to legal expenses and delays. Nor has anyone done much to explore the forces that encourage or inhibit litigation so that we can better predict the rise and fall of legal activity.

Our limited knowledge seriously inhibits efforts to increase efficiency and access in the legal system. It is idle to talk of sunset provisions if lawmakers lack the methods to assess the costs and benefits of legislation. It is useless to create arbitration panels and mediation services if no one troubles to test their performance against predetermined criteria. It is reckless to offer proposals to ease congestion in the courts if even the proponents cannot tell whether such measures will achieve their goal or simply evoke more litigation (much as wider highways often succeed in merely calling forth more cars). Worst of all, it will be impossible ever to develop more sensible theories of the appropriate role of law if we do not make greater efforts to examine the effects of the laws we already have.

Although these points seem obvious enough, law schools have done surprisingly little to seek the knowledge that the legal system requires. Even the most rudimentary facts about the legal system are unknown or misunderstood. We still do not know how much money is spent each year on legal disputes and services in the United States. We still hear law professors and eminent jurists refer to the "litigation explosion" and "our litigious society," even though the factual basis for such assertions is shaky at best. In part, perhaps, this ignorance results from the lawyer's skepticism about the usefulness of academic research. Over a century ago, Christopher Columbus Langdell was fond of asserting that law is a science and "that all of the available materials of that science are contained in printed books." More recently, a witty law professor is said to have remarked: "All research corrupts, but empirical research corrupts absolutely."

It is easy to find examples to justify this skepticism. One's eyes glaze over at the recollection of parking-meter studies, scalograms to predict judicial behavior, game theories that purport to illumine litigation tactics. Yet we ignore the social sciences at our peril, for their techniques grow steadily more refined. Business-school professors begin to have more intricate theories of competitive markets that might help legal analysis predict the effect of changes in our antitrust laws. Scholars in schools of public policy and education develop more sophisticated methods of program evaluation that could help implement sunset laws or detect the secondary and tertiary effects of legal rules on human behavior. Doctors work with statisticians to measure the costs and benefits of protracted hospitalization, of coronary bypass surgery, of mastectomy, of CAT scanning; one cannot help but wonder whether similar techniques might not help to assess the usefulness of legal procedures as well.

As yet, this work is largely overlooked by our great schools of law. One can argue that such studies are not the proper province of the legal scholar and that it is better to wait for social scientists in other parts of the university to do the necessary research. But experience shows how empty this observation is. Law professors cannot stand idly by and expect others to investigate their problems. Social scientists have not done much of this work in the past nor will they in the future. If the necessary research is to go forward, legal scholars must help organize it and participate in it, albeit with the aid of interested colleagues from other disciplines.

THE TIMES HIGHER EDUCATION SUPPLEMENT 22.4.83

A suitable case for state aid

Martin Bulmer

Much of the recent debate over the utility of academic social science – for example, in connexion with the Rothschild review of the Social Science Research Council – focused on what academics could or could not offer government. Far less attention has been paid to what government social research and social statistics may be able to offer social science. Yet this is an important issue, for recent changes in the shape of social science in Britain have implied a view of the balance between "in-house" government social research and external research done in universities and institutes. Cutbacks in government statistics and research – publicized in the case of the Rayner review of the Governmental Statistical Service, but more severe and less noticed in the cae of departmental social research units, some of which have disappeared – imply that more of the work they have done will in future be done by academic researchers. The reshaping of the SSRC is seen by some as a sign that it will be more responsive to the demands of policy makers. Yet no one has systematically examined the case for locating research in particular settings and assessing the relative merits of funding through, say, the Department of Health and Social Security as opposed to the SSRC. Rothschild was expected to make some observations on "in-house" versus research council support, but concentrated exclusively upon a reasoned and critical defence of the SSRC. The growing literature on the applications of social science is almost all from the outside looking in rather than from the inside looking out.

To the researcher inside government, social research appears to be a professional activity defined by a distinctive product, usable results. Social research in this sense is distinct from the academic disciplines which constitute the social sciences. Professional social researchers in government are orientated primarily to practical problems, and draw on the constituent disciplines of the social sciences only to the extent that they can provide leverage upon those problems. (The strength of economics as a subject within Whitehall owes a good deal to the leverage which Keynesian theory seemed to provide upon real-world problems.) The social sciences as disciplines, on the other hand, are corporations of scholars pursuing knowledge within an intellectual framework provided by leading figures in a discipline, past and present. Universities are corporations of disciplines, collectively committed to the pursuit of learning through the advancement of discipline-based knowledge. This is a different calling from that of someone working within an organization committed to research as a professional activity which produces results that are ultimately of practical utility. This difference between *social research* and *social science* runs right through the history of British social inquiry, and partly accounts for the very wide gulf that separates academic from non-academic social science research in this country.

The explanation also lies inside the universities. Different professions have been differentially incorporated into universities. Law and medicine, classically, have been most closely integrated, academic departments providing the theoretical underpinning and basic education for the practical activities of lawyers and doctors. Lawyers obtained their later practical training outside the university, trainee doctors within it in that specially created institution, the medical school, linked on the one side to academic departments of anatomy, physiology and biochemistry and on the other to the teaching hospital in which training and treatment of patients were combined.

Other professions have had more or less close links with academic departments. Statistics, accountancy and social work, for example, are all academic subjects which usually form distinct departments or sub-departments and have strong links to professional practice and an important role in professional or pre-professional training. That relationship varies. In statistics, bodies like the Royal Statistical Society link academics and practitioners, often making the practitioners seem rather academic. In social work teaching, the academic orientation is much more practice-orientated, tending to emphasize the common bonds between teachers and practitioners and putting less weight on research in the subject.

Yet other professional activities – those of actuaries, tax inspectors and social researchers, for example – have lacked altogether or have only had a precarious foothold in the academic world. The gulf which exists between government social research and academic social science owes a lot to the former's interdisciplinary character and practical orientation both of which distance it from social science disciplines. Of course people trained in sociology, social psychology, anthropology and political science go to work as social researchers in government, but once there, their orientation and professional outlook become distanced from the disciplines in which they were originally trained. The links which may be sustained in subjects such as law, accountancy or statistics become attenuated in the gap between social research practice and social science as an academic discipline.

The distance between government social research and academe is, however, not a uniform one. It can vary considerably. It may therefore be useful to consider the forms which this relationship can take. At least five may be distinguished.

1: Academic annexation, where the academic discipline takes over a branch of applied social research. This has happened most clearly in psychology. The use of psychological testing in the armed forces and in government began in the United States during the First World War. Since then it has become an established branch of applied psychology, whose products go to work in government as professional psychologists. Psychologists working in government are first and foremost psychologists, and retain firm links with academic psychology.

2: Autonomy, on the other hand, is characteristic of some parts of government which do not have strong professional links to the academic world. The Social Survey Division of OPCS is a case in point. Its staff are professional survey researchers. The Government Social Survey developed in large measure independently of any academic discipline, though there has been some peripheral contact with individual academics. Essentially, it is an autonomous organization. Such movement of staff as there is tends to be to and from commercial market research, itself largely insulated from academic social science.

3: Application is a mode where "in-house" government researchers draw on a body of academic research and design their own research programme to complement it, with more emphasis upon tactical, practical and action-orientated projects. The relationship between the Home Office Research and Planning Unit and the Cambridge Institute of Criminology has been of this kind, a particularly close and symbiotic one because the Home Office originally financed the institute. Work in the Department of Employment on industrial relations has stood in a similar relation to industrial sociology and industrial psychology.

4: Alienation and anomie has been characteristic less of a particular area than a general problem in the main "social" areas of government – law and order, race, education, health, for example. New graduates in social science have often experienced considerable difficulty in adapting to the very different time scales and intellectual orientations of government research. In some areas this has been linked to intellectual differences, for example between mainstream criminology and the "new" criminology and sociology of deviance. (See R. V. G. Clarke's article "The effectiveness of graduate education in sociology", *Sociology* Vol. 15, November 1981.)

5: Academic incorporation is the opposite of academic annexation. Instead of academic social scientists taking over an area of research, government researchers may take on some of the attributes of academics. This process is clearest in the case of statisticians, and was personified when Claus Moser moved in the mid-1960s from a chair at the London School of Economics to become head of the Government Statistical Service. Professional discussion at the Royal Statistical Society commonly involves academic and government statisticians equally (as well as other practitioners), a balance reflected in the officers of the society.

The contribution which government social research may make to social science is conditioned by the setting in which it takes place. It is my impression that autonomy, application or alienation and anomie are more common than academic annexation or incorporation, where the fit is tightest. Statistics and applied psychology are somewhat exceptional in the close links which have developed across the divide. Application involves some collaboration, though a clear division of labour between basic and applied research. Autonomy or alienation and anomie are very characteristic, where the meshing between government work and universities is slightest.

Some of the reasons for this state of affairs lies in the predispositions of social scientists towards government work. Others derive from the lack of understanding among some social scientists about what research in government is really like. Some radical social scientists are deeply suspicious of the state and all its works. On the other side there is a degree of isolation of government researchers from academic work, the relevance of which to their practical concerns is not always apparent. A necessary condition for greater contributions from government social research to social science is better communication. The creation of the Social Research Association has been an important first step, since its membership spans the divide. What is also needed is more bridge-building, more coordination (in which the SSRC should play a greater role) and more fighting of battles in common. Cuts in University Grants Committee-funded social science and in government research and statistics are rarely linked, and one would be infrequently aware from the press that the two sides had interests in common. One of the obstacles to better communication, it has to be said, is a certain degree of condescension by sections of the academic social science community towards social researchers working in practical contexts. Changes in the job market for their students, if nothing else, are likely to change this.

Attitudes may also change if some of the specific actual and potential contributions of government social research are appreciated. These are several. Potentially, government social researchers could do much to illuminate the policy-making process. They are much closer to policy makers and more familiar with what they are doing. A good deal of academic work on policy is not based on first-hand data. Government researchers can throw light on how policy is formulated and how knowledge feeds into government.

Access to data is often also superior, in two senses. There is access to bodies of administrative records which can be used for certain research purposes and which are closed to outsiders. And there is a greater probability "in-house" of getting permission to do first-hand research in relatively inaccesible contexts (for example, prisons). Government social researchers should do as much as possible to exploit these opportunities, and there are signs that they are doing so ("Fight to see Home Officer files" *THES* April 8). Academic social scientists appreciate insufficiently the virtues of the large-scale data sets planned, maintained and managed by government social researchers. These include the General Household Survey, the Family Expenditure Survey, the Labour Force Survey and the New Earnings Survey. Economists have perhaps been most energetic in exploiting such sources, and there have been notable studies of poverty using GHS and FES data. But very much more could be done. Government social researchers have a key role to play in communicating their potential to academics. (For one example, see C. Hakim, *Secondary Analysis in Social Research*, 1982.) Government conducts research on a relatively large scale, particularly in the OPCS Social Survey Division. This is a large and complex research organization which has no parallel in the academic world, and a form about which many academic social scientists are distinctly ambivalent. It is an important centre for the development of expertise on the practice of social survey research, but this is hindered by its relative lack of communication with academics. There are now other rivals, such as the SCPR-City University Survey Methods Centre.

The potential training function of government social researchers is considerable. This has two sides. The relatively underdeveloped state of research methodology, particularly in subjects like sociology and political science, requires attention. More training in social research needs to be provided at graduate level, though there are already some pioneering courses. But even when it is, there is nothing like the medical school in which practical experience can be gained. Potentially a great deal could be achieved by training placements for graduate students in government research divisions, as well as by secondments of existing staff in both directions between government research units and social science departments.

Government (and local government) social research also can offer career employment in research, whereas *research* staff in universities suffer chronic job insecurity, moving from one short-term contract to another. The advantages of a career in government research are increasingly apparent as the academic job market shrinks. The greater number of openings in applied social research may in the medium term open the eyes of social scientists to some of the benefits to be gained from greater interchange.

One avenue for improved communication is undoubtedly common participation in meetings of learned societies and study groups. The more government researchers and academics can meet in these settings, the better for both. Even more critical is publication of research results. Here the constraints on those working in government are considerable, but efforts must be made to improve their situation. The right to publish is an essential one for free inquiry and one which must be fought for at all times. Where there are constraints, the right to partial publication or some publication must be insisted upon, and the social science community can play its part in pressing for this (cf David Donnison's address to the Social Research Association in December, *THES* January 7, 1983). More ingenuity should be used in seeking a degree of anonymity or selectivity in negotiating publication. Heclo and Wildavsky's ***The Private Government of Public Money***, which gives a brilliant view of Treasury control at work, shows what access-with-strings can achieve. Such arrangements are not necessarily debasing. Government research divisions and units should try to publicize their own publications more effectively, by sending out review copies to journals as well as to the press. Social researchers in government should try to contribute more articles to academic journals, particularly in applied fields such as social policy, public policy, health, industrial relations, criminology or education. Thus can national and international scholarly communication be fostered.

Some of these things are being done already to some extent, but they are not very common. The gulf between government social research and academic social science remains a relatively wide one. It is one that none of us can afford to leave unbridged.

The author is lecturer in social administration at the London School of Economics and a former member of the Government Statistical Service. This article is based on a lecture given to the Conference of Social Science Research Officers at the Civil Service College in January 1983.