

---

---

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

# COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

---

---

Volume VII, Number 10  
May 27, 1988

**This Week . . .**

- Senate Allocation Endangers NSF Increase *HS*
- Clearinghouse Provides Information on Language Pluralism Issue *SC*
- COSSA Seminar Examines Implications of an Aging Work Force *BD/SC/HS*
- NEH History Education Center to UCLA *SC*
- Northwestern Joins and Missouri Rejoins COSSA *SC*
- Coalition for National Science Funding Launched *HS*
- National Science Board Releases Biennial Science Report *SC*
- Sources of Research Support: National Science Foundation *SC*

\* \* \*

## SENATE ALLOCATION ENDANGERS NSF INCREASE

Decisions made by the Senate Appropriations Committee in allocating spending levels to its 13 subcommittees have damaged the chances for a significant increase in the FY 1989 budget of the National Science Foundation (NSF). The level for the Senate HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee is \$1 billion below the budget authority figure and, in outlays, \$250 million below the comparable figure for the House HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee. The House subcommittee increased FY 1989 NSF funding by \$168 million, well below the requested increase of \$333 million.

For the second year in a row the HUD Appropriations Subcommittee and the Labor, HHS, Education Appropriations Subcommittee in the Senate were the losers in the allocation process. It is noteworthy that the chairmen of these two subcommittees, Senators William Proxmire (D-WI) and Lawton Chiles (D-FL) are retiring. Sen. Jake Garn (R-UT), Ranking Republican on the HUD Subcommittee, has written a scathing letter to his colleagues protesting the allocation decisions and decrying their negative impact on NSF and NASA. Last year, funds were "found" to increase the allocations for these two subcommittees during

---

---

COSSA Washington Update is published 20-24 times per year, normally biweekly, by the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), 1625 I Street, NW, Suite 911, Washington, D.C. 20006 (202/887-6166). Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for \$40.00; institutional subscriptions, \$90.00; overseas airmail, \$50.00. ISSN 0749-4394. COSSA Members, Affiliates, and Contributors are listed on the back. The Update is written and produced by the Consortium's staff: Howard J. Silver, Simon Cordery, Brian Daly, and Katrina R. Styles.

The Consortium represents more than 185,000 American scientists across the full range of the social and behavioral sciences, functioning as a bridge between the research world and the Washington community.

Victor G. Rosenblum, *President*

Howard J. Silver, *Acting Executive Director*

---

---

markup. The likelihood of that occurring again for FY 1989 seems slight, but one never knows.

Another possible angle that may help the NSF is the fact that the winners in the allocation process (the Energy and Water, Agriculture, Transportation, and Interior subcommittees) may produce appropriations bills that the administration will veto. If this occurs, a continuing resolution in which anything can happen could loom on the horizon. In the meantime the Senate HUD Subcommittee is expected to mark up its bill under the present allocation in mid-June.

While the Senate was dealing with the subcommittee allocations, the House HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations bill overcame another barrier on May 24. The full appropriations committee approved the subcommittee bill without changing any of the funding levels for NSF (see Update, May 13, 1988). The bill is expected to reach the House floor during the first or second week of June, where debate will probably focus on the anticipated addition of a "drug-free workplace" amendment and a "buy America" provision forcing NSF to purchase a domestically built ice-breaker for the Antarctic program. The administration is quite upset about this last provision.<<

#### CLEARINGHOUSE PROVIDES INFORMATION ON LANGUAGE PLURALISM ISSUE

The metaphor of the melting pot is applied almost casually to the United States. It is easy to forget the adjustment problems immigrants and non-English speaking citizens face and the resentment and misunderstanding they encounter, often in the form of linguistic and cultural discrimination. During the 20th century, only Alaska, Maine, Utah, and Vermont have not considered language-restrictionist legislation. Moreover, the pressure for such legislation is again building under the impetus of well-financed national and local campaigns conducted by such groups as U.S. English and English First. In 1987 alone, 37 states considered some form of English-only legislation (Education Week, June 17, 1987). The best-known state action came in 1986, when Californians passed Proposition 63, a constitutional amendment requiring that all government business be conducted in English.

Countering this "English only" movement is the English Plus Information Clearinghouse (EPIC), which held its first general meeting May 23. EPIC, a project of the Joint National Committee for Languages and the National Immigration, Refugee and Citizenship Forum, facilitates the dissemination of information about language-restrictionist legislation. EPIC publishes a newsletter, EPIC Events, and serves as a resource for organizations and individuals concerned with protecting and enhancing the cultural and linguistic diversity of the United States. EPIC does not seek to promote any one language over another, although the Clearinghouse's statement of purpose acknowledges the continued de facto primacy of the English language. So far, 46 religious, cultural, ethnic, and language organizations have endorsed the EPIC statement of purpose. COSSA and several other organizations maintain observer status in EPIC.

At the general meeting, participants discussed the English Only/English Plus debate. One of the chief difficulties opponents of English only face is the apparent "motherhood and apple pie" aspect of "official English" measures. Proponents of such measures argue that they are acting out of a patriotic desire to ensure the continued vitality of the country, ignoring the American tradition of plurality to focus on what they consider the evil of government-funded bilingual services and the purportedly divisive impact of multilingualism. While the consequences of English-only legislation can only be guessed and early indications are that local measures may have little real impact (Proposition 63 was recently ruled "symbolic" by a federal appeals court in California), one tool the English-only movement is attempting to employ is an amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

There are several English-only statutes at various stages in Congress, the best known of which is the English Language Amendment to the Constitution (ELA), championed by Rep. Norman Shumway (R-CA). This amendment, which would mandate exclusive use of the English language for all official documents and government publications, is the subject of ongoing hearings before the House Civil and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Don Edwards (D-CA). At the first hearing, held May 11, Rep. Stephen Solarz (D-NY) questioned the "patriotism" justification of ELA, noting that the government sold war bonds during the Second World War by printing posters in many languages, eliciting a tremendous response from ethnic minorities. In addition to Solarz, Sen. John McCain (R-AZ) and Reps. Albert Bustamante (D-TX), Ben Nighthorse Campbell (D-CO), and Gerald Kleczka (D-WI) testified against the ELA. Several co-sponsors of ELA testified in its favor with Shumway, including Reps. Robert Badham (R-CA), William Broomfield (R-MI), and Clarence Miller (R-OH).

For more information about the official-English issue and English plus, including details of current state initiatives and EPIC Events (which is available at an annual subscription rate of \$12), contact EPIC at: 227 Massachusetts Avenue, NE, Suite 120, Washington, DC 20002; 202/544-0004.<<

#### COSSA SEMINAR EXAMINES IMPLICATIONS OF AN AGING WORK FORCE

The aging of America's work force was the focus of a COSSA-sponsored congressional breakfast seminar on May 26, one in a series of seminars designed to educate Congress on the latest findings in social and behavioral science research. Entitled "Older Workers in an Aging Society," the seminar outlined demographic changes in the age structure of the population of the United States and examined policy challenges these changes will create.

The seminar, co-sponsored by the Gerontological Society of America, a COSSA affiliate, and the Population Resource Center (PRC), was attended by more than 80 people, including congressional and committee staff members, federal agency personnel, local interest group representatives, and members of

the press. The three invited speakers were Angela O'Rand, associate professor of sociology at Duke University; Richard Burkhauser, professor of economics at Vanderbilt University; and Harold Sheppard, director of the International Exchange Center on Gerontology at the University of South Florida. Nancy McConnell, director of PRC's Washington office, served as moderator.

Prof. O'Rand laid out the demographic landscape, noting that the work force will take on new dimensions as the "baby boom" generation approaches retirement age and the "birth-dearth" children of the 1970s take their places in a shrinking labor pool. She outlined three reasons for this decline: the increasing availability of private pension plans; an increase in social security payments; and the shift from manufacturing to service industries. The last of these, according to O'Rand, accounts for an increase in the number of women aged 55-64 as a percentage of the labor force, which contrasts with the current decline in the percentage of men aged 55-64 in the labor force. O'Rand suggested that driving the increase in older women workers is the problem of losing health benefits if they retire early. Future changes in the overall composition of the work force will include a labor-pool shift from large corporations to smaller firms. "Externalization" of work (greater flexibility in work hours, an increase in contracted "home work," etc.) will also affect the composition of the work force in the years ahead.

The impact of "defined pension plans" on individual retirement decisions was the focus of Prof. Burkhauser's remarks. The average retirement age is now 62, due in part to workers choosing to retire at the highest pension value, which is often before the age of mandatory retirement because of inflexible pension plans. Thirty percent of all workers leave career jobs in their late 50's and early 60's, and many of them move on to part-time or less-remunerative full-time jobs. Pension plan inflexibility also affects employers, as the experience of the Chrysler Corporation--which has one retired, pensioned employee for every current employee--demonstrates. In terms of formulating policy, Burkhauser concluded that ending mandatory retirement will have little impact on a person's retirement decision. Likewise, the composition of the work force will be little affected by "monkeying around with social security." The real potential for change, according to Burkhauser, lies in pension plan reform.

Dr. Sheppard outlined some of the policy implications of the various phenomena described by O'Rand and Burkhauser, provoking a lively discussion with members of the audience. Sheppard agreed with Burkhauser that the real policymaking challenge is in reforming private pension plans, and he predicted that this will be an increasingly hot issue in the decade ahead. He also expressed concern as to whether many of today's workers are aware of their pension eligibility or benefits. Given the importance of recognizing that "economic phenomena include non-economic variables," Sheppard suggested that federal agencies such as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration should become more involved in examining the impact of health on retirement decisions. In addition, he recommended that the United States

look to Canada and other countries for pension plan models and innovative ways to deal with an aging work force. Sheppard strongly recommended increased federal funding for research and data collection on the aging work force, with a stronger commitment to the study of psychological and social factors.<<

#### NEH HISTORY EDUCATION CENTER TO UCLA

The National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) has awarded \$1.5 million over a 3-year period to the University of California, Los Angeles, to fund a Center on the Teaching and Learning of History in Elementary and Secondary Schools. The award is the first NEH cooperative agreement, giving the endowment a significant voice in the selection of research projects and appropriate means of distributing the center's findings. The center will conduct research and disseminate information aimed at improving history instruction, one of the needs highlighted in last year's NEH report on the state of the humanities, American Memory. The center will also serve as a national resource for data on the K-12 history curriculum.

American Memory and other studies of education in the United States have documented alarming and oft-cited deficiencies in the teaching of history and other humanities subjects. The UCLA center will attempt to address these deficiencies by designing an ideal history curriculum and comparing that ideal against course content in the schools. Research conducted by center personnel (8 scholars and up to 60 teachers) will therefore focus on the content of the history curriculum, particularly ways to integrate social history and the histories of women and minorities into the school curriculum. Other topics will include teaching materials--particularly textbooks, which have come in for a great deal of criticism lately--and continuing teacher education.

The director of the center is Professor Charlotte Crabtree of the UCLA graduate school of education. She has been closely involved in the curriculum reform debate, having served on the advisory boards of American Memory and American Education: Making it Work (a recently released U.S. Department of Education report on the progress of education reform since the publication of A Nation At Risk in 1983). She is also principal writer of the new California social studies curriculum. The associate director is UCLA professor of history Gary Nash. The findings of the center should prove useful for the ongoing work of the National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools (see Update, December 11, 1987), which is tackling many of the same issues in the context of social studies education, which of course includes the study of history.<<

#### NORTHWESTERN JOINS AND MISSOURI REJOINS COSSA

COSSA is pleased to announce the addition of two contributor universities. Northwestern University is joining COSSA for the first time, while the University of Missouri has recently rejoined the Consortium. These additions bring to 54 the total number of contributors.<<

---

---

**COALITION FOR NATIONAL SCIENCE FUNDING LAUNCHED**

COSSA has joined over 50 other scientific societies and professional associations in the Coalition for National Science Funding (CNSF). The goals of the group are to keep the United States a world leader in research and education, to foster technological growth and increased productivity, and to encourage scientific and technological literacy among all citizens.

CNSF has produced "Investment for the Future," a brochure its members are using to persuade Congress to increase funding for the National Science Foundation (NSF) in FY 1989. COSSA, as a member of the CNSF Steering Committee, has ensured that the increased funding of social and behavioral science research is included in the coalition's message.

Although the general reception on Capitol Hill to the coalition has been positive, the FY 1989 appropriation for NSF has run into the problem of competing priorities for scarce resources (see related story, this issue). For more information about the CNSF, contact COSSA or CNSF at 1 Dupont Circle, Suite 730, Washington, DC 20036; 202/466-5030.<<

**NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD RELEASES BIENNIAL SCIENCE REPORT**

The National Science Board (NSB), the governing body of the National Science Foundation, has released Science and Engineering Indicators 1987, the latest in its ongoing series of biennial reports on the status of science mandated by Congress. The report is a synopsis of surveys published by the NSF, the National Academy of Sciences, the National Research Council, and many other organizations, both governmental and nongovernmental.

SI-87 offers data on precollegiate and higher education, the science and engineering workforce, research resources, academic research performance, industrial research and technological innovation, the international technology market, and public attitudes toward science and technology. These topics are covered in narrative chapters containing tabular data which are detailed in an appendix of statistical tables. An introductory overview covers general trends in science and engineering, synthesizing much information covered in the separate chapters.

Prominent statisticians have discussed the problems associated with drawing data from a variety of different sources for the Science Indicators series. First and most obvious is the absence of a uniform terminal date for the longitudinal data; most of data in SI are current to 1986, but a few tables reach 1987 while others stop at 1985 or even before. There is, however, nothing the compilers could have done about this, but a more serious, correctable problem is the apparently uncritical acceptance of data by those who compiled this work (there is no discussion of the limitations of the statistics used). Nonetheless, as a readily accessible and comprehensive digest of science and engineering statistics, SI-87 is to be welcomed.<<

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

COSSA provides this information as a service, and encourages readers to contact the agency for further information or application materials.

Behavioral and Neural Sciences Division

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has a myriad of grant programs of interest to social and behavioral scientists across each of the five research directorates. Listed below are program brochure numbers, upcoming target dates, program directors, and telephone numbers for eight programs in the Division of Behavioral and Neural Sciences (Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences Directorate). Target dates are cutoff dates after which proposals will be reviewed, although they may miss a particular panel meeting.

Archaeology: brochure number NSF 85-71; target date July 1, 1988; contact Dr. John Yellen, 202/357-7804.

Cultural Anthropology: brochure number NSF 85-71; target date July 1, 1988; contact Dr. Stuart Plattner, 202/357-7804.

Linguistics: brochure number NSF 87-6; target date July 15, 1988; contact Dr. Frances Karttunen, 202/357-7696.

Human Cognition and Perception: brochure number NSF 87-6; target date July 15, 1988; contact Dr. Joseph Young, 202/357-9898.

Physical Anthropology: brochure number NSF 85-71; target date July 1, 1988; contact Dr. John Yellen, 202/357-7804.

Psychobiology of Learning and Memory: brochure number NSF 87-6; target date July 15, 1988; contact Dr. Dennis Glanzman, 202/357-7949.

Sensory Systems: brochure number NSF 87-6; target date July 15, 1988; contact Dr. Steven Price or Dr. Christopher Platt, 202/357-7428.

Social Psychology: brochure number NSF 87-6; target date July 15, 1988; contact Dr. Jean Intermaggio, 202/357-9485.

For detailed program information contact the Program Officers listed above, requesting the brochure indicated if desired. For general information, contact:

Division of Behavioral and Neural Sciences, BBS  
National Science Foundation  
1800 G Street, NW, Room 320  
Washington, DC 20550  
202/357-7564 <<

# 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 Assembly of Collegiate Schools  
of Business  
American Association for Public Opinion  
Research  
American Educational Research  
Association  
American Society of Criminology  
Association for Asian Studies  
Association for Social Sciences in Health  
Eastern Sociological Society  
Federation of State Humanities Councils  
Gerontological Society of America  
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  
Operations Research Society of America  
Population Association of America

Regional Science Association  
Rural Sociological Society  
Social Science History Association  
Society for the History of Technology  
Society for Research on Adolescence  
Society for Research in Child Development  
Society for the Scientific Study of Religion  
Southern Sociological Society  
Southwestern Social Science Association  
Speech Communication Association  
The Institute of Management Sciences

## CONTRIBUTORS

American Council of Learned Societies  
Boston University  
University of California, Berkeley  
University of California, Irvine  
University of California, Los Angeles  
University of California, San Diego  
University of California, Santa Barbara  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Center for Advanced Study in the  
Behavioral Sciences  
University of Chicago  
University of Colorado  
Columbia University  
Cornell Institute for Social and  
Economic Research  
Cornell University  
Duke University  
Florida State University  
Harvard University  
Howard 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  
University of Maryland  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Maxwell School of Citizenship and  
Public Affairs, Syracuse University  
University of Michigan  
National Opinion Research Center  
University of Nebraska  
Graduate Faculty, New School  
for Social Research  
New York University  
University of North Carolina,  
Chapel Hill  
Ohio State University  
University of Oregon  
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 Virginia  
University of Washington  
University of Wisconsin, Madison  
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee  
Yale University

---

## CONSORTIUM of Social Science Associations

1625 I STREET, N.W., SUITE 911, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

---

**FIRST CLASS**