
CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume IV, Number 11
May 31, 1985

This Week . . .

COSSA Testifies on International Education Programs
House Budget Passes: Conference With Senate Next
Confidentiality of Research Notes Protected
More Visitors from PRC
Advisory Committee Deliberates Future of EVIST
Additional Guidelines for NIE Centers Competition
Announced
NIA Celebrates 10th Anniversary
Sources of Research Support: Department of Defense

* * *

COSSA TESTIFIES ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Professor Robert Cole of the University of Michigan represented COSSA before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, chaired by Rep. William Natcher (D-KY). Professor Cole, who is spending this year at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars writing a book comparing new work practices in the United States, Japan and Sweden, asked the Subcommittee to continue funding for International Education and Foreign Language Studies programs authorized by Title VI of the Higher Education Act. The administration's original budget proposal eliminated funding for these programs.

The testimony focused on the potential implications for American national security and competitive advantage in an internationalized economy if these programs were eliminated. Emphasizing the federal government's role as a catalyst in providing research and training in international and area studies and foreign languages, Cole stressed the importance of understanding the languages and cultures of prospective economic competitors and allies. He noted:

COSSA Washington Update is published 20-24 times per year, normally biweekly, by 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. ISSN 0749-4394 COSSA Members, Affiliates, and Contributors are listed on the back.

Risa I. Palm, *President*

David Jenness, *Executive Director*

At a time of rapidly growing internationalization, we are in the position where it is foreign nationals who are primarily learning English, not Americans learning their languages....It disadvantages us in every way conceivable. It means, simply put, that foreigners tend to know much more about us than we know about them. That wasn't so bad in 1945, when we could rightly assume that the overwhelming number of major technological developments and managerial innovations were taking place right here in the United States. We no longer have the luxury of believing that, for it is no longer true. We need to understand, from a commercial point of view, what are the driving forces of the economies of Brazil, the People's Republic of China, Nigeria, etc., and how they interact with political and social forces.

To illustrate the psychological disadvantage American businesses sometimes experience during trade negotiations, Professor Cole delivered part of his testimony in Japanese to a startled Subcommittee.

Although the administration has attempted to terminate these programs for the past three years, the Congress has continued to restore their funding. It is expected to do so again this year.

HOUSE BUDGET PASSES: CONFERENCE WITH SENATE NEXT

After waiting for the Senate to finish its work, the House of Representatives moved very quickly and passed its version of a deficit reduction Budget Resolution on May 23. The resolution sets spending ceilings for congressional authorization and appropriations committees. The House version differs from the Senate resolution in the major areas of social security and defense spending, but there are also differences in other programs.

The Senate has provided enough money in the Health function to fund 6,000 new and competing grants at the National Institutes of Health (NIH), while the House has provided enough funds for 6,500 grants. At the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA), the Senate has voted sufficient funds for 540 grants, while the House could fully fund ADAMHA at its FY 1985 level of 583 grants. The President requested only 500 grants be funded in FY 1986. The House provided a 2% increase in education and job training programs, while the Senate froze these programs at their FY 1985 levels. Both the House and Senate froze the Science function, which includes the National Science Foundation, at FY 1985 numbers.

The resolution now goes to a House-Senate Conference Committee to iron out the differences in the two versions. Although President Reagan has had input to the development of the resolution, he does not sign or veto it since it is simply a congressional resolution and not a law.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF RESEARCH NOTES PROTECTED

A decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in the case of Mario Brajuha, a graduate student in sociology at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, has established guidelines for when scholars have the privilege not to reveal sources to investigative bodies.

Brajuha, who had been researching his dissertation at a Long Island restaurant and had promised his co-workers confidentiality, refused to turn over his fieldnotes to a grand jury investigating a suspicious fire at the restaurant. (See Update, April 14, 1984, September 20, 1984.) In April, 1984, Chief Judge Jack B. Weinstein of the New York District Court quashed a subpoena that would have required Brajuha to release the notes, stating in his decision that "Serious scholars are entitled to the same protection as journalists. Affording social scientists protected freedom is essential if we are to understand how our own and other societies operate." The federal government appealed Judge Weinstein's decision to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Circuit Court ruled that the case could not be decided on the facts as presented and remanded the case back to Judge Weinstein. However, Circuit Court Judge Ralph K. Winter, Jr. wrote that "where a serious academic inquiry is undertaken pursuant to a considered research plan in which the need for confidentiality is tangibly related to the accuracy or completeness of the study," a claim of privilege might be recognized.

In the meantime, the Nassau County District Attorney has agreed to withdraw the original subpoena, thus rendering moot the appeal pending in the New York State Supreme Court. On the state level, this case, although it did not set a precedent, established the basis for scholars engaged in field work research to claim protection from state 'shield laws' or the First Amendment, under which journalists have established a qualified privilege with regard to revealing their sources.

MORE VISITORS FROM PRC

On May 21, four members of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences visited COSSA to discuss social science research and publishing in the United States and the People's Republic of China (PRC). Mr. Feng Shize, Mr. Li Xuekun, and Mr. Ding Panshi, from the editorial department of Social Sciences in China, and Mr. Zhang Ding, of the China Social Science Publishing House, joined Howard Silver, COSSA Associate Director for Government Relations, and Rob Hauck, Assistant Director of the American Political Science Association, who had just returned from a two week visit to the PRC, in the lively discussion. In November three economists from the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences paid a visit to COSSA.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE DELIBERATES FUTURE OF EVIST

The Director of the National Science Foundation and the Advisory Committee to one of NSF's research programs, Ethics and Values in Science and Technology (EVIST), seem to be having trouble communicating.

Last December 4, when the Committee met, NSF Director Erich Bloch joined with the members briefly and asked them to consider and communicate to him the 'burning issues' facing the program and the field. The Committee gave a rough initial response and made plans for further deliberation. However, it was not until the FY 1986 budget for NSF became public that Committee members learned the program would be terminated.

NSF's decision to discontinue the program brought forth a round of agitated protests from the scholarly community as well as the press and Congress. (See Update, February 22, March 8.) Faced with this barrage of criticism, Mr. Bloch made it known that he intended to distribute EVIST's research budget (approximately \$1 million a year) across the various directorates and programs of the Foundation. By the time the Advisory Committee met again on May 3, 1985, they also knew that the Foundation planned to issue a new program announcement on this topic sometime in 1985, to signal to the scientific community that NSF support would still be available -- at least for FY 1986. The Committee intended to discuss with Bloch how a program that was no longer a Program would work. A last-minute scheduling conflict, however, prevented Bloch from meeting with the Committee. His spokesman at the meeting was Richard J. Green, Assistant Director for Scientific, Technological, and International Affairs (STIA), the NSF directorate where cross-disciplinary programs are normally lodged.

Green reported that Bloch's intention had been to "mainstream" the EVIST program and break down its isolation. But he acknowledged the obvious difficulties posed by the elimination of the program qua program. For example: If EVIST loses its own administrative identity and its own funds, won't EVIST proposals get lost in the competition? How would proposals be received, logged, assigned, reviewed, funded, and followed up? How could the National Endowment for the Humanities, which co-funds some individual EVIST awards, or any other agency collaborate with a decentralized decision process at NSF? If \$1 million was to be reserved for such proposals, would each NSF directorate be 'taxed', and if so, by what formula? If recommendations and final funding decisions are to be made in the 35 (or so) programs of NSF, can EVIST proposals really compete with conventional proposals that promise to advance disciplinary knowledge -- which is, after all, NSF's main task? Will not those programs argue that they already support research that somehow involves or touches on, or has implications for, ethics and values?

Questioning by the Committee revealed that EVIST has had some success in cooperating with various disciplinary-based programs in the Foundation; but it has always been EVIST that sought joint funding of the proposals it reviewed and approved, never the other way around. The Committee saw the reviewing process as the crux of the matter. Regular disciplinary program panels would be unlikely to have the expertise or sensitivity to review EVIST proposals, which tend by nature to be interdisciplinary. Ad hoc reviews of single proposals commissioned by the various program officers would suffer from the lack of a shared experience or a common frame of reference. In the words of one Committee member, the integrity of the field was at stake: "If we lose the reviewing function, we lose the ballgame."

By the end of the discussion -- which Green said would aid Bloch in deciding how to handle a distributed program -- the Advisory Committee seemed to be evolving the recommendation for a familiar model: a program announcement; an administrative coordinator; reviews of sets of proposals by a special pool of experts; co-funding of some projects with other NSF programs -- in fact, something very like the EVIST program in all but name.

At the December 1984 meeting, the Advisory Committee had discussed at some length the special complexities of composing a satisfactory new EVIST program announcement, under the old administrative plan. Given what has happened since, the new announcement (due in August) may become a collectors' item.

ADDITIONAL GUIDELINES FOR NIE CENTERS COMPETITION ANNOUNCED

After delaying the National Institute of Education (NIE) center competition in order to solicit more input from education researchers, Secretary William H. Bennett has announced additional guidelines to be followed by applicants. (See Federal Register, May 14, 1985.) Secretary Bennett convened a meeting of scholars in April to discuss education research priorities and review the previously announced mission statements of the centers. The group, chaired by Diane Ravitch, Columbia Teacher's College, discussed a number of priorities for future NIE research. As a result of this meeting, five additional emphases were requested from project applicants. The priorities include: content-related studies; state-of-the-art syntheses and international comparisons of education; projects aimed at middle schools and learning among adolescents; collaboration on cross-cutting study topics; and recognition that an educational reform movement is underway at the state and local level.

The deadline for submitting proposals, originally set for June 6, 1985, has been extended to August 15.

NIA CELEBRATES 10TH ANNIVERSARY

The National Institute on Aging (NIA) recently celebrated its 10th anniversary on May 22-23. As part of the official observance the Institute sponsored a symposium focusing on the history, accomplishments and future directions of aging research. Originally, aging research came under the purview of the National Heart Institute and was later transferred to the Adult Development and Aging Branch of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. In 1974 the Research on Aging Act authorized the establishment of the NIA 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." In July, 1975, the NIA became a separate entity. Today, under the directorship of Dr. T. Franklin Williams, the NIA has a total extramural research budget of approximately \$107 million, of which an estimated 20% is spent on social and behavioral science research.

Presentations at the symposium pointed out the change in public attitudes toward aging and the increase of interdisciplinary research. Dr. Robert N. Butler, the first permanent Director of the NIA, offered his reflections on NIA and its position in the study of aging. The NIA has never been adequately funded, according to Butler. Although the National Institutes of Health supports approximately 50% of the medical research in the U.S., its program costs are equal to only one and a half Trident submarines. Dr. Butler suggested that a comprehensive, well-thought agenda is needed to offset the continued inaction of the nation to meet long-term care needs of the elderly.

Discussing some of the accomplishments of aging research, Dr. George Maddox, a medical sociologist with the Aging and Human Development Research Center at Duke University, spoke on social factors in aging. Dr. Maddox pointed out the need to have a proper perspective on the position of the individual in society and the importance of an informed social policy. One must study the individual in context, recognizing that this context may well alter. As there are risk factors for disease within the biomedical field, so are there social/economic risk factors. The individual's experience of aging is vitally affected by being poor, illiterate, and with no support system.

Dr. Maddox also stressed the importance of variability in social and behavioral science research, the dynamics of interaction and the "extraordinary challenge" this offers social scientists. Future directions for the behavioral sciences to meet this challenge were suggested by Dr. Robert Kahn of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan. Dr. Kahn presented a broad agenda for behavioral research that would continue to emphasize a positive view toward aging. He offered several research tasks for behavioral scientists, including the testing and correcting of dominant theories, the replacement of age-bias concepts, and the expansion of theories in aging.

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

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

U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral
and Social Sciences

The U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) is predominantly staffed by civilian behavioral scientists and serves as the Army's principal center for the "people" side of research and development in a primarily hardware-oriented research and development community. ARI's basic research program aims to produce the data, concepts, or techniques needed to support applied research on Army problems. ARI's current program consists of four broad funding categories: manpower and personnel, education and training, training devices, and human factors in systems. Critical topics of research which the Institute has identified include ability assessment, instructional techniques and systems, cognitive processing limitations, and artificial intelligence. The ARI accepts unsolicited proposals from individuals within universities and non-profit and for-profit institutions involved in basic research in the behavioral and social sciences.

FY 1985 Budget: The FY 1985 budget for extramural research is approximately \$3.5 million.

Funding Mechanisms: Mostly contracts, some grants for conference and symposium support

Review Process: The submission of informal preliminary proposals is strongly encouraged. Formal proposals are reviewed by internal and external review panels.

Areas Supported: Experimental psychology, industrial psychology, ergonomics, educational psychology, information science, artificial intelligence, and related areas

Restrictions on Awards: Contracts may be written to cover periods of one to three years with possible annual reviews.

Deadlines: Proposals may be submitted at any time during the year. The Institute has instituted a system of semi-annual releases in an effort to match the academic schedule, with start dates of September 1 and January 1. Applicants should allow 8 to 12 months for the review and contract writing process.

Contact: Director, Office of Basic Research
U.S. Army Research Institute
ATTN: PERI-BR
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333
202/274-8641

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 Studies Association
 Law and Society Association
 Midwest Sociological Society
 National Council on Family Relations
 National Council for the Social Studies
 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
 Speech Communication Association

CONTRIBUTORS

University of California, Berkeley
 University of California, Los Angeles
 University of California, Santa Barbara
 Carnegie-Mellon University
 Center for Advanced Study in the
 Behavioral Sciences
 Center for International Studies,
 Duke University
 University of Chicago
 University of Colorado
 Columbia University
 Cornell Institute for Social and
 Economic Research
 Cornell University
 Florida State University
 Harvard University

University of Illinois
 Indiana University
 Institute for Research in Social Science,
 UNC-Chapel Hill
 Institute for Social Research,
 University of Michigan
 University of Iowa
 The Johns Hopkins University
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology
 University of Michigan
 University of Missouri
 University of Nebraska
 New York University
 University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
 Ohio State University
 University of Pennsylvania
 Pennsylvania State University
 University of Pittsburgh
 Princeton University
 Rutgers University
 Social Science Research Council
 University of Southern California
 Stanford University
 State University of New York at Stony Brook
 University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 Texas A & M University
 Tulane University
 University of Washington
 University of Wisconsin, Madison
 University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
 Yale University

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

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