Consortium of Social Science Associations

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume III, Number 10 May 18, 1984

This Week . . .

House Subcommittee Increases Appropriation for BBS
Testimony Before Congress: NSF, HUD
Labor Department Abolishes Research Office
House Instructions to NSF
The Impact of the Budget Cuts on NSF Programs
House Committee Eliminates Research in OJJDP
Sources of Research Support: Department of Justice

* * *

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE INCREASES APPROPRIATION FOR BBS

For the second year in a row, a House Appropriations subcommittee added funds for social and behavioral science research in the National Science Foundation. At a mark up on Tuesday, May 15, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on HUD-Independent Agencies, chaired by Representative Edward Boland (D-MA), approved a FY 1985 appropriation for NSF that raises the administration's budget request for the Directorate for Biological, Behavioral and Social Sciences (BBS) by \$5 million. The money is to be used for the social, behavioral and information sciences.

The bill provides a total appropriation for NSF of \$1.499 billion in FY 1985. This is slightly under the administration request. The action taken by the Subcommittee follows House approval of an NSF authorization with a \$5 million increase for BBS. The authorization bill sets ceilings for FY 1985 budgets, and the appropriations bill sets actual spending levels.

The Boland bill now goes to the full Appropriations Committee, where deference is usually given to the actions of the Subcommittee, and then to the House floor. Observers suspect that Chairman Boland would like to have a bill passed by the House by the beginning of June. In recent years the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations bill has been the first appropriations bill passed by the Congress.

(continued)

COSSA Washington Update is a biweekly publication of the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), 1200 Seventeenth Street, NW, Suite 520, Washington, D.C. 20036 (202/887-6166). Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for \$25.00; institutional subscriptions, \$90.00; overseas airmail, \$40.00. COSSA Members, Affiliates, and Contributors are listed on the back.

Dell H. Hymes, President

Roberta Balstad Miller, Executive Director

The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on HUD-Independent Agencies, chaired by Senator Jake Garn (R-UT), is expected to mark up the NSF appropriation for FY 1985 within the next few weeks. Senate agreement on the \$5 million increase for BBS is necessary for the House increase to become law. Letters to Senator Garn and Members of his Subcommittee would be helpful at this time. A list of the Subcommittee follows:

Jake Garn (R-UT), Chairman Lowell P. Weicker, Jr. (R-CT) Paul Laxalt (R-NV) Alfonse M. D'Amato (R-NY) James Abdnor (R-SD) Pete Domenici (R-NM) Walter D. Huddleston (D-KY)
John C. Stennis (D-MS)
William Proxmire (D-WI)
Patrick J. Leahy (D-VT)
James R. Sasser (D-TN)

TESTIMONY BEFORE CONGRESS: NSF, HUD

COSSA presented testimony twice on May 8 before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on HUD-Independent Agencies. F. Thomas Juster, Director of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, prepared testimony on the FY 1985 budget of the National Science Foundation (NSF). However, because of a heavy fog which closed the Washington airport, Dr. Juster was unable to appear before the Subcommittee, and his testimony was presented by Roberta Balstad Miller, COSSA Executive Director. Later in the day, Sandra Newman, Associate Professor of Public Policy at Johns Hopkins University, testified in favor of increased funding and stronger research programs in the Office of Policy Development and Research of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

LABOR DEPARTMENT ABOLISHES RESEARCH OFFICE

The Department of Labor (DOL) plans to abolish the Office of Research and Evaluation in the Employment and Training Administration (ETA). With a budget of \$12.2 million in FY 1984, this is the largest research program in the Department. After May 25, ETA research and evaluation functions will be separated and lodged in two divisions. (Within DOL, a division is ranked lower than an office.)

It is expected that there will be little or no new research supported in ETA in the coming program year (July 1, 1984, through June 30, 1985). Major emphasis will be placed on the evaluation of the Jobs Training Partnership Act, the National Longitudinal Surveys (NLS), and evaluations of performance standards. However COSSA was told that without an increase in the ETA budget for research, there will be no funds to support the NLS in the following program year. The National Longitudinal Surveys of Labor Market Experience have been conducted since 1965.

HOUSE INSTRUCTIONS TO NSF

"The Committee intends that the \$3.6 million added for the Behavioral and Neural Sciences and the Social and Economic Sciences Divisions be directed specifically to the social and behavioral sciences. Funding for these programs in BBS must not be allowed to erode further. The Committee feels strongly that they should be returned to their fiscal year 1980 level; this increase will bring them nearer to that level."

-- from the Report, "Authorizing Appropriations to the National Science Foundation," House Committee on Science and Technology, Report No. 98-642, p. 13.

THE IMPACT OF THE BUDGET CUTS ON NSF PROGRAMS

Now that several years have passed since the major budget cuts of FY 1981 and FY 1982 were imposed on the social and behavioral science programs at the National Science Foundation (NSF), it is possible to gauge some of the effects of these cuts. The tables printed here, prepared from data supplied by the National Science Foundation, present a rather clear story. 1 shows the average annual award in constant dollars in the various social and behavioral science programs at NSF. Table 2 shows proposal success rates, or the proportion of proposals submitted to NSF that were funded. Table 3 gives the total number of proposals submitted to NSF by program. The "year" in the tables refers to the fiscal year. The Decision and Management Science Program and Regulation and Policy Analysis Program of the Division of Social and Economic Science are not listed in these tables because data were not available for those programs over the entire period shown.

The cumulative effect of the budget cuts is apparent from a quick look at the tables. There was, overall, a reduction in the success rate of submitted proposals in 1981. Although the success rate began to rise again in most programs in 1982 and 1983, this was due in large part to the fact that the total number of proposals submitted to NSF was declining. (See Table 3.)

The most telling evidence of the impact of the budget cuts is provided by the figures showing the size of the average ann al award in constant dollars. In a number of programs, the value of the average grant declined by as much as 50% or more. Overall in the Division of Social and Economic Science, the average grant was 40% smaller in 1983 than it had been in 1980. So even if a research proposal were awarded funding, the level of funding was considerably reduced from earlier levels.

The tables printed here can only show administrative evidence of the effects of the budget cuts on NSF programs in the social and behavioral sciences. Although they do not provide evidence of how the budget cuts affected the substance of research or how that research was conducted, some general conclusions can be drawn.

First, many social and behavioral scientists were discouraged by the FY 1981 and FY 1982 budget cuts from submitting proposals to the Foundation. Submission rates declined, and we can assume that a number of promising research ideas were not pursued.

The initial decline in the success rates of competitive proposals suggests that this discouragement was well founded. NSF had less money available to fund research projects in the social and behavioral sciences and fewer proposals were funded. Moreover, even if a social scientist were fortunate enough to receive a grant, he or she was faced with a sharp reduction in the size of that grant when compared to previous years. Whether awards were smaller because proposals were scaled down before they were submitted to NSF or because NSF only had funds to support part of what was requested is not clear from these tables. The effect, however, is the same: fewer, smaller, and, perforce, less ambitious research projects were funded by NSF in the social and behavioral sciences immediately after the budget cuts than before.

NSF budgets for social and behavioral science research have since been rising for several years. At the present time, some of the programs in the Behavioral and Neurosciences Division have reached their FY 1980 levels and a number of programs in the Division of Social and Economic Science are approaching that level. The task now facing the social and behavioral science community is to consider ways to leverage those funds and use them most efficiently.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

		7	able	e 1			
Average	Annual	Award	(in	constant	thousand	\$)	

1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
26.4	20.6	21.5	17.0	13.9	13.0
30.3	26.3	26.2	18.5	14.2	12.8
28.7	14.7	16.5	13.3	10.2	9.3
132.5	32.7	59.4	40.1	35.3	27.6
24.2	16.7	18.1	15.9	19.0	13.3
16.0	16.3	19.4	15.5	13.6	13.1
24.0	22.1	21.2	18.7	13.3	15.3
10.7	12.5	9.6	7.0	5.2	5.4
grams)					
22.4	17.3	15.4	16.4	15.5	15.4
23.7	21.1	22.7	17.4	19.7	18.6
23.5	19.2	21.6	16.6	21.8	21.4
17.1	14.7	16.4	15.4	13.0	12.5
12.0	12.1	15.2	13.5	11.9	10.3
	26.4 30.3 28.7 132.5 24.2 16.0 24.0 10.7 grams) 22.4 23.7 23.5 17.1	26.4 20.6 30.3 26.3 28.7 14.7 132.5 32.7 24.2 16.7 16.0 16.3 24.0 22.1 10.7 12.5 grams) 22.4 17.3 23.7 21.1 23.5 19.2 17.1 14.7	26.4 20.6 21.5 30.3 26.3 26.2 28.7 14.7 16.5 132.5 32.7 59.4 24.2 16.7 18.1 16.0 16.3 19.4 24.0 22.1 21.2 10.7 12.5 9.6 grams) 22.4 17.3 15.4 23.7 21.1 22.7 23.5 19.2 21.6 17.1 14.7 16.4	26.4 20.6 21.5 17.0 30.3 26.3 26.2 18.5 28.7 14.7 16.5 13.3 132.5 32.7 59.4 40.1 24.2 16.7 18.1 15.9 16.0 16.3 19.4 15.5 24.0 22.1 21.2 18.7 10.7 12.5 9.6 7.0 grams) 22.4 17.3 15.4 16.4 23.7 21.1 22.7 17.4 23.5 19.2 21.6 16.6 17.1 14.7 16.4 15.4	26.4 20.6 21.5 17.0 13.9 30.3 26.3 26.2 18.5 14.2 28.7 14.7 16.5 13.3 10.2 132.5 32.7 59.4 40.1 35.3 24.2 16.7 18.1 15.9 19.0 16.0 16.3 19.4 15.5 13.6 24.0 22.1 21.2 18.7 13.3 10.7 12.5 9.6 7.0 5.2 grams) 22.4 17.3 15.4 16.4 15.5 23.7 21.1 22.7 17.4 19.7 23.5 19.2 21.6 16.6 21.8 17.1 14.7 16.4 15.4 13.0

Source: National Science Foundation data

Table 2
Success Rate of Competitive Proposals (in %)

	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
Division of Social and Economic						
Science	38.4	40.7	36.7	30.7	34.7	35.5
Economics	52.5	53.7	47.6	37.7	37.8	43.0
Geography	34.8	34.8	31.7	30.8	39.1	35.4
Measurement Methods and	and algebra	2				
Data Resources	36.8	38.6	27.7	26.7	38.6	50.9
Political Science	36.4	39.8	33.8	39.1	42.6	36.7
Law and Social Science	46.3	29.0	20.3	18.1	29.7	24.0
Sociology	23.6	28.5	28.2	22.5	30.7	33.3
History & Phil. of Science	43.7	42.3	39.5	36.4	40.6	45.6
Division of Behavioral and Neural Sciences (selected pro	grams)					
Psychobiology	29.6	29.4	32.2	29.7	32.1	27.6
Memory & Cognitive Processes	24.1	23.0	32.6	21.6	32.9	25.9
Social & Developmental Psych.	23.6	23.0	22.5	19.9	28.3	21.7
Linguistics	34.6	27.9	38.1	28.8	47.8	40.7
Anthropology	30.4	31.9	32.4	31.9	36.0	34.1
Source: National Science Foundat	ion data					

Table 3
Competitive Proposals Received

	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
Division of Social and Economic						
	1075	1160	1201	1202	1100	1000
Science	1275	1160	1381	1293	1183	1089
Economics	348	320	373	301	347	257
Geography	130	135	115	111	81	85
Measurement Methods and						
Data Resources	36	47	77	76	44	44
Political Science	130	156	167	116	98	163
Law and Social Science	95	65	152	137	94	112
Sociology	251	218	254	174	134	124
History & Phil. of Science	209	197	201	133	185	139
Division of Behavioral and						
Neural Sciences (selected prog	rams)					
Psychobiology	273	266	247	230	193	202
Memory & Cognitive Processes	162	169	134	108	88	125
Social & Developmental Psych.	224	239	217	103	94	116
Linguistics	204	219	159	121	72	109
Anthropology	708	614	637	507	418	532

Source: National Science Foundation data

HOUSE COMMITTEE ELIMINATES RESEARCH FUNCTION IN OJJDP

In an abrupt change in direction, the House Committee on Education and Labor has abolished the research function for the National Institute of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention in the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). The Committee report accompanying H.R. 4971, the Juvenile Justice, Runaway Youth, and Missing Children's Amendments of 1984 states: "The Committee believes that over the last ten years a sufficient number of studies have been done upon which to base action that should be carried out at the State and local level...that portion of funds previously designated for research has been shifted to...assistance to States and localities." OJJDP will continue to have training, information collection and dissemination, and evaluation functions.

Representative Ike Andrews (D-NC), Chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources, convinced his colleagues on the full Education and Labor Committee to take this action because of his anger at the way the research program at OJJDP was conducted by the current administrator, Alfred Regnery. Representative Andrews was particularly irked by the fact that over 80% of OJJDP research funds were awarded on a noncompetitive basis (see COSSA Washington Update, April 20, 1984, p.3). One specific grant of over \$800,000 to American University and Dr. Judith Reisman to study possible linkages between pornography in the media and juvenile delinquency, violence and criminal activity raised the Committee's ire. Committee report notes that this award "provided funds to an untenured faculty person who was recommended for appointment only on condition that she would be accompanied by Federal funds." The Committee also questioned Dr. Reisman's credentials, noting that "she was little published," and her budget ("\$10,000 for pads and pencils").

In the same legislation, the Committee took a strong stand against the use of OJJDP funds for any biomedical or behavior control experimentation on individuals. Specificially included in the prohibition are studies or demonstrations involving psychosurgery, physical punishment, shock treatment, drug and chemotherapy, and aversion conditioning. The Committee report did suggest "that a limited number of programs involving procedures generally recognized as not subjecting a child or juvenile to physical or psychological risk" would be legitimate if there were specific approval of such procedures by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

The parallel Senate bill on OJJDP (S. 2014) does not include these provisions. It has been reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee and now awaits action by the full Senate.

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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

Bureau of Justice Statistics Data Analysis Program

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) collects and analyzes statistical information concerning crime, victims, offenders, criminal justice processes, juvenile delinquency and civil disputes. The Data Analysis Program offers financial suport for the analysis of BJS data on crime, victims, offenders, and criminal justice administration.

Purpose of Program: BJS is particularly interested in projects which address any of the following topics: the natural history of incarceration careers; analysis of period between incarcerations; predicting "chronic offenders" or "career criminals"; juvenile versus adult incarceration careers; specialization in offenses; predicting sentence lengths; predicting violent offenders; failure on probation and parole; and characteristics of state prison populations. BJS is also interested in analyses relevant to methodological improvements in its existing statistical series and the development of new statistical series.

FY 1984 Funds: Approximately six projects at a \$50,000 level will be funded.

Funding Mechanisms: Grants

Review Process: Applicants are required to submit a concept paper which will be reviewed by a peer panel. Successful applicants will then be asked to submit a formal application.

Restrictions on Awards: Small-scale projects that can be completed within six to nine months are encouraged.

Disciplines Funded: No restrictions

<u>Deadlines</u>: Concept papers must be submitted by June 15; formal applications in August.

Contact: Copies of the solicitation may be obtained from Ms. Janet Vavra, Criminal Justice Archive and Information Network ICPSR, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI, 48106, 313/763-5010.

For more information about the Data Analysis Program contact Dr. Jeffrey L. Sedgwick, BJS, 202/724-7765.

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

MEMBERS

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
Linguistic Society of America

AFFILIATES

American Association for Public Opinion Research
American Educational Research
Association
American Society of Criminology
Association for Asian Studies
Eastern Sociological Society
Economic History Association
Evaluation Network
Evaluation Research Society
History of Science Society
International Communication
Association
International Studies Association
Law and Society Association

National Council on Family Relations
North Central Sociological Association
Northeastern Anthropological Association
Population Association of America
Regional Science Association
Rural Sociological Society
Social Science History Association
Society for American Archaeology
Society for the History of Technology
Society for Research in Child
Development
Society for the Scientific Study
of Religion
Society for Social Studies of Science
Southwestern Social Science Association

CONTRIBUTORS

University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
Center for Advanced Study in the
Behavioral Sciences
Center for International Studies,
Duke University
University of Colorado
Columbia University
Cornell Institute for Social and
Economic Research

Cornell University Florida State University Georgia Institute of Technology Harvard University University of Illinois Indiana University Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan University of Iowa The Johns Hopkins University University of Michigan University of Missouri University of Nebraska New York University Ohio State University University of Oregon University of Pennsylvania University of Pittsburgh Princeton University Social Science Research Council University of Southern California Stanford University State University of New York at Stony Brook Texas A & M University **Tulane University** University of Washington University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Consortium of Social Science Associations

1200 SEVENTEENTH STREET, N.W., SUITE 520, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036