

---

---

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

# COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

---

---

Volume III, Number 6  
March 23, 1984

This Week . . .

Walgren Subcommittee Increases Authorization for BBS  
Looking Backward: NSF Funding in Constant Dollars  
Changes to National Science Foundation Act to Emphasize  
Engineering  
AERA to Fight for Larger NIE Budget  
NIE Appoints Panel to Review Peer Review Procedures  
Swedish Labor Group to Establish Research Institute  
House Holds Hearings on National Security Legislation  
Secret Service Expands Behavioral Science Training  
Correction  
Sources of Research Support: Department of Justice  
From the Pages of the Federal Register...

\* \* \*

## WALGREN SUBCOMMITTEE INCREASES AUTHORIZATION FOR BBS

The House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology approved an authorization for the National Science Foundation (NSF) on March 14 that contained an increase of \$5 million for the social, behavioral, and information science programs in the Directorate for Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences (BBS). Of this amount, \$3.6 million is earmarked for BBS programs in the social and behavioral sciences. Maintaining the position that the Subcommittee has taken in previous years, Chairman Doug Walgren (D-PA) noted that the additional funds would bring the social and behavioral science research programs at the Foundation nearly to their FY 1980 levels in current dollars.

In addition to the budget increase, the Subcommittee approved a floor of \$73.88 million for the budget authorizations of the Division of Social and Economic Science and the Division

---

---

COSSA Washington Update is a biweekly publication of the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), 1755 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20036 (202/234-5703). 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*

---

---

of Behavioral and Neural Science in BBS. This is the FY 1985 request level plus the increase noted above.

On March 22, the Science and Technology Committee approved the Subcommittee's recommendation for NSF. At this point, a date has not been set to bring the NSF authorization to the full House of Representatives.

LOOKING BACKWARD: NSF FUNDING IN CONSTANT DOLLARS

Most of the discussion of the budget cuts for the social and behavioral science research programs at the National Science Foundation (NSF) involves comparisons of funding levels in current dollars. In the table below, budget levels for the various social and behavioral science research programs are given in constant 1972 dollars from FY 1978 to FY 1983.

The table confirms that, by any measure, the social and behavioral sciences have suffered and continue to suffer from the budget cuts of FY 1981 and FY 1982. The table does not contain figures for several NSF social science programs. The Regulation and Policy Analysis and the Decision and Management Science Programs are not included here because they were not established until 1980 and figures were not available for the preceding fiscal years. Neural science programs in the Division of Behavioral Sciences were also not included.

NSF Social and Behavioral Science Programs  
(Budget levels in constant 1972 hundred thousand \$)

	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>
Division of Social and Economic Sciences	166.9	157.8	155.0	129.1	85.5	95.2
Economics	60.9	58.6	60.8	38.5	30.2	32.8
Geography	11.7	9.0	8.4	5.6	3.4	3.7
Measurement Methods and Data Resources	13.8	27.3	28.1	19.9	13.7	15.2
Political Science	19.4	21.4	20.4	15.0	10.0	10.9
Law and Social Science	6.0	5.5	5.1	6.0	5.3	5.7
Sociology	26.7	21.9	21.7	15.3	10.6	11.2
History & Phil. of Science	10.2	9.6	8.4	5.6	4.3	5.0
Division of Behavioral & Neural Sciences (selected programs)						
Psychobiology	25.0	24.6	24.5	22.0	17.2	17.4
Memory & Cognitive Processes	13.6	15.0	14.5	12.3	11.0	10.4
Social & Developmental Psych.	20.1	20.2	18.2	13.2	7.2	10.4
Linguistics	13.1	14.7	14.9	11.4	10.0	9.4
Anthropology	35.9	37.1	36.2	30.6	28.4	27.2

---

CHANGES TO NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT TO EMPHASIZE ENGINEERING

---

As part of the markup of the FY 1985 authorization for the National Science Foundation (NSF), the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology voted to change the NSF Organic Act to emphasize engineering. The change was presented as an amendment to the act offered by Rep. Joe Skeen (R-NM) and Rep. George Brown (D-CA). The amendment also would insert references to engineering throughout the act to parallel references to science.

During hearings on the changes held by the Science and Technology Committee on March 21, Reps. Brown and Skeen assured witnesses that the proposed change was to codify the current role and mission of NSF and that it would not mean a shift in emphasis from anything the Foundation was already doing. They also said that the added emphasis on engineering would not endanger the funding of any current programs at NSF.

The amendment passed by the Subcommittee represents a compromise in that it does not call for changes in the name of the Foundation nor does it propose a change in the number of members of the National Science Board (NSB), as did an earlier version of the amendment introduced by Reps. Brown and Skeen. The amendment was opposed at the hearing by the National Academy of Sciences, but accepted as a "modest change" by NSF and the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS).

AERA TO FIGHT FOR LARGER NIE BUDGET

The American Educational Research Association (AERA), a COSSA affiliate, has proposed an FY 1985 appropriation of \$75 million for the National Institute of Education (NIE). This would restore the NIE budget to its FY 1980 levels in current dollars. The administration requested \$54.2 million for NIE in FY 1985. The AERA proposal of \$75 million, which is being promoted by the "Working Coalition for Educational Research and NIE", of which COSSA is a member, includes \$50 million to maintain current NIE commitments. It also provides \$10 million to restore grants competitions that have been suspended due to lack of funds and \$15 million for the application of research findings to state and local educational reform efforts.

It will be difficult to achieve this level of funding in the current budget cycle because deficit reductions are the major concern of the Congress. Yet David Florio of AERA believes that the case for increasing the NIE budget must be made to make the Congress aware of the limitations of the current level of research support in education.

NIE APPOINTS PANEL TO REVIEW PEER REVIEW PROCEDURES

An informal panel has been established at the National Institute of Education (NIE) to examine review procedures used by NIE in awarding research contracts. Members of the panel have been asked by NIE Director Manuel Justiz to analyse how well the NIE peer review process is working and to compare proposal review procedures at NIE with those employed in other research agencies. The four person panel is comprised of social scientists who represent various sectors of the educational research community. Members of the panel are Lee S. Shulman, Stanford University; James G. Greeno, University of Pittsburgh; David C. Smith, president of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education; and Robert H. Mattson, director of the Center for Educational Policy and Management at the University of Oregon.

The immediate stimulus for conducting this examination of NIE peer review procedures was the series of problems that arose during and after the NIE review of proposals for a new research center on educational technology. Dr. Justiz first questioned and then overturned the recommendations of an NIE review panel on proposals for the new center submitted by the Bank Street College of Education and Harvard University. Because NIE will be conducting a major competition for 17 education laboratories and research centers next year. Dr. Justiz told COSSA that he has established the panel to examine and improve the NIE peer review procedures before that competition begins.

SWEDISH LABOR GROUP TO ESTABLISH RESEARCH INSTITUTE

The Lands Organisationen of Sweden, more widely known as the LO, a confederation of trade unions, voted this month to establish a new research institute. The LO institute is expected to concentrate on economic research and have a permanent research staff of six or seven economists. The Swedish LO has long had an interest in labor market research and the plans for setting up a research institute are seen as a logical result of this interest.

The Swedish research institute will not be the first labor union sponsored research institute to be established in Scandinavia. The Norwegian LO set up a research institute over a year ago and appointed sociologist Gudmund Hernes as Director of Research. Unlike the planned Swedish institute, the Norwegian labor research institute has a broad interest in a number of areas of social research and does not simply focus its attention on economic research.

HOUSE HOLDS HEARINGS ON NATIONAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

The House held hearings on the Federal Polygraph Limitation and Anti-Censorship Act of 1984 (H.R. 4681), which was introduced by Rep. Jack Brooks (D-TX). The bill was intended to counter provisions of President Reagan's National Security Decision Directive (NSDD) 84 which would require federal employees with access to classified information to sign nondisclosure agreements and to submit to lie detector tests if asked, and would require employees with access to Secret Compartmented Information (SCI) to submit to lifetime prepublication review of all writings. (See COSSA Washington Update, February 24, 1984.) This could sharply limit the freedom of academics who hold positions in the federal government from later writing about the government or public policy.

Hearings were held by the House Civil Service Subcommittee to determine whether prepublication review is ever appropriate, whether there are legitimate and reliable uses of the polygraph, whether any federal agencies should be exempt from the legislation, and whether any action should be taken to curtail unauthorized disclosures of classified information. The Brooks bill would limit the use of the polygraph to criminal investigations and ban prepublication review for all employees except those in the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the National Security Agency (NSA).

The Subcommittee went ahead with the hearings despite the President's announcement that he would rescind the polygraph use and prepublication review provisions of the Directive because at that time, no written confirmation of the amended Directive existed. Later, on March 20, the administration confirmed its pledge to suspend the controversial provisions for the duration of this session of Congress. Suspension of the polygraph use and prepublication review provisions does not make the Brooks bill unnecessary, however, for at present any U.S. President has the authority to determine -- and to change -- policy concerning national security.

The COSSA Executive Committee has approved the following resolution opposing National Security Decision Directive 84.

The Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA) opposes the National Security Decision Directive 84. We support the action of the United States Senate in blocking its implementation and we urge the President of the United States to reconsider the sweeping and damaging implications this Directive would have on free public debate and discourse. This directive, if implemented, would impose a lifetime of censorship on

federal officials with access to Sensitive Compartmented Information. As an organization dedicated to the preservation, promotion and enhancement of knowledge, COSSA views this Directive as a dangerous threat to the ability of scholars and researchers to compile an honest, open, and uncensored analysis of the history and politics of this nation. It would curtail the flow of information that is so vital to an understanding of the nation's history and politics, and, thus, of the choices facing the American public.

#### SECRET SERVICE EXPANDS BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE TRAINING

Because 95% of those whom the Secret Service considers to be dangerous have histories of contact with mental health professionals, the Secret Service is making greater use of behavioral science and mental health perspectives in training its agents. Following a 1981 Institute of Medicine (IOM) conference and the recently published report of an IOM committee, the Secret Service established an in-house behavioral and mental health research unit and has increased its training of agents in these areas. The Service hopes that familiarity with behavioral models and mental health practices will help agents to identify and deal with potentially dangerous and violent individuals.

This effort by the Secret Service provides an example of the practical uses of social and behavioral science research for the federal government. At the same time that the Secret Service is supporting behavioral research, however, other divisions of the Treasury Department, within which the Secret Service is located, are opposing extension of the tax credit for research and development to social and behavioral science research.

#### CORRECTION

In the article "Keeping the Congress Informed: the General Accounting Office" (COSSA Washington Update, March 9, 1984), the amount of savings that GAO provides the federal government was printed incorrectly as \$5.9 million. The GAO estimates that the federal government saved \$5.9 billion by implementing GAO recommendations.

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.

National Institute of Justice  
Unsolicited Research Program

The mission of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) is to develop knowledge about crime, its causes and control. NIJ sponsors basic research, evaluation and demonstration projects, and serves as a clearinghouse of justice information. The Unsolicited Research Program (URP) provides funding for research and development projects which complement NIJ's planned research program.

Purpose of Program: The URP encourages the following types of projects: relatively small research projects for which there are few alternative funding mechanisms; those conducted by qualified researchers relatively new to the criminal justice field; replication of previous studies of critical importance; basic or applied research with an interdisciplinary perspective; exploratory studies in areas where there has been little previous work; and research aimed at developing, improving or evaluating practical responses to criminal justice problems.

FY 1984 Funds: The URP has two funding cycles. At least \$500,000 is available for the current cycle (Cycle 2). More money may be allocated by the end of the fiscal year. Up to one-third of available funds are allocated for grants of \$60,000 or less.

Funding Mechanisms: Grants

Review Process: Peer panel review

Restrictions on Awards: Maximum award is \$120,000. Maximum grant period is 2 years.

Disciplines Funded: No restrictions

Deadline: Applications for Cycle 2 funds must be received by June 1, 1984.

Copies of the URP program announcement may be obtained by sending a self-addressed mailing label to:

Announcement - Unsolicited Research Program  
National Criminal Justice Reference Service  
Box 6000  
Rockville, MD 20850

FROM THE PAGES OF THE FEDERAL REGISTER...

"Notice is hereby given that the United States Information Agency (USIA) has developed an internal regulation prohibiting the monitoring or recording of telephone conversations except under very limited circumstances." (Emphasis added)

[signed] Charles Z. Wick, March 2, 1984

**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 America Law Schools  
 Linguistic Society of America

**AFFILIATES**

American Association for Public Opinion  
 Research  
 American Educational Research  
 Association  
 Association for Asian Studies  
 Eastern Sociological Society  
 Economic History Association  
 Evaluation Network  
 Evaluation Research Society  
 History of Science Society  
 International Communication 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  
 University of Colorado  
 Columbia University  
 Cornell Institute for Social and Economic  
 Research

Cornell University  
 Georgia Institute of Technology  
 Harvard University  
 University of Illinois  
 Indiana University  
 Institute for Social Research, University  
 of Michigan  
 University of Iowa  
 University of Michigan  
 University of Missouri  
 University of Nebraska  
 New York 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**

1755 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036