BBS TASK FORCE REPORT DELAYED, MASSEY TELLS SCIENCE COMMITTEE

The report of the Biological, Behavioral and Social Science (BBS) Task Force “Looking to the Twenty First Century” has been delayed until June 1, according to National Science Foundation (NSF) director Walter Massey. Massey announced the delay in response to an inquiry from Rep. Rick Boucher (D-VA), Chairman of the House Science Subcommittee, at a hearing on April 12. The report, which is expected to recommend the establishment of a separate directorate at NSF for the social, economic and psychological sciences (SEPS) was originally scheduled for completion by April 1. (An interim report due on January 31 was never issued.)

At the hearing before the House Science, Space and Technology Committee (SST), chaired by Rep. George Brown (D-CA), Massey reiterated his position on the SEPS directorate. Massey noted he has “an open mind” about the SEPS directorate and “no preconceived position,” adding that he is, “willing to hear the arguments.” Rep. Boucher concurs with this view. At the hearing before Brown’s committee, there was no explanation given for the delay of the Task Force report. Mary Clutter, Assistant Director for BBS, was out of the country, and nobody else proffered a reason.

The hearing allowed SST Committee members to question the new director about what Chairman Brown called Massey’s “vision of the future for the Foundation.” Massey, who has been director since February 25 of this year, expressed his belief that the “Foundation was working very well” and that the programs it was supporting were “quite appropriate.” However, he also stated that “priorities, programs and methods of support must be constantly reevaluated to ensure that the NSF is identifying and stimulating new and potentially promising areas of research and human resources development.”

Massey contended that it is important to examine the balance of NSF’s research portfolio between individual investigator initiated research and the research needs of the nation. Massey also noted that it may be time to “look at the outcomes of our investment,” particularly in the education and human resources area. He asked for more funds to hire additional staff to help NSF manage the explosive growth in the programs and budget of the Education and Human Resources Directorate.

Several Science Committee members focused on the President’s FY 1992 budget eliminating the funding for the facilities modernization program. Massey expressed his belief that it was a matter of priorities, with, in his opinion, the recently proposed $50 million instrumentation modernization program being a better way to spend limited funds.

Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R-CA) referred to the recent headlines concerning university indirect cost rates and expenditures and asked Massey whether new controls should be placed upon universities to ensure that research dollars are actually being spent on research. The new NSF director responded with a strong statement from his written testimony asserting: “Nowhere in the world is there a substitute for the setting at U.S. colleges and universities - one that encourages young scientists and engineers to explore new ideas and challenge the work of more senior researchers; one that promotes intellectual freedom, stimulates creativity, and contributes to economic growth.” Massey concluded: “Our basic research enterprise, particularly within our universities, must not be allowed to weaken.”
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For his first appearance before NSF's House authorization committee, Massey seemed to satisfy the small number of committee members who attended the mid-afternoon hearing. Chairman Brown advised the director he expected to hear from him again.

**BUDGET RESOLUTIONS SHIFT DOMESTIC SPENDING PRIORITIES**

The House Budget Committee, on a partisan vote, shifted domestic spending priorities away from those set by President Bush in his Fiscal Year 1992 budget proposal. Deliberating under the constraints of spending caps set by last fall's budget agreement, the committee, chaired by Rep. Leon Panetta (D-CA), deviated from the president's budget only in the area of domestic discretionary spending in adopting its FY 92 budget resolution on April 9.

The budget resolution's recommendations, which do not have the force of law, serve as guidelines for the Congressional appropriations process. The committee added $2 billion above the Administration's request for elementary, secondary and higher education programs. The budget resolution called for an additional $1 billion for health, including $52 million above the president's request for the National Institutes of Health. These increases were offset by a $1.2 billion reduction from the request for NASA, as well as other decreases in the president's budget for transportation and general government functions.

Although the budget resolution assumes the administration's request for a 17.5 percent increase for the National Science Foundation, if the recommended decrease for space programs is followed by the appropriations committees, it will be extremely difficult to fully fund the president's request for the NASA space station and provide for the NSF increase.

**Senate Action**

The Senate budget committee began marking up its budget resolution on April 12. The committee accepted an amendment offered by Sen. Tim Wirth (D-CO) to provide $4.4 billion above the president's request for pre-school education, health care, teacher training and nutrition. The increase would be offset by a four percent across-the-board reduction in other domestic discretionary programs. An amendment by Sen. Charles Grassley (D-IA) to freeze domestic spending at FY 1991 levels was rejected 10-11.

The budget committees recognized their options were limited by the spending caps imposed by the October 1990 budget agreement. Their recommendations may also be limited by the often self-proclaimed autonomy of the members of the appropriations committees. Both the House and Senate are expected to pass judgments on their committees' actions next week.

**SENATE COMMITTEE HEARS POLLSTER ON PUBLIC'S VIEW OF HEALTH CARE**

“Everyone wants to know what Americans think; they get incredibly angry when they find out,” quipped Dr. Robert Blendon, chair of the Department of Health Policy and Management at the Harvard School of Public Health, summarizing the political role of public opinion polls. Blendon presented a summary and analysis of health care polls at an April 9 Senate Finance Committee hearing on health care costs and access chaired by Sen. Lloyd Bentsen (D-TX).

Polling data from eight studies in the past two years, Blendon reported, indicate “a forty year high in positive public attitudes toward a national health care system.” Approximately 60 to 70 percent of the American population now favors a national plan funded by taxes, Blendon said. Most people, how-
ever, prefer increased “sin” taxes on cigarettes and alcohol to hikes in the income tax.

Polls by various organizations, including Harris, Gallup, the National Opinion Research Center (a COSSA Affiliate), and the Harvard Community Health Plan (HCHP), have found general satisfaction with health care services received. The same polls, however, have indicated overwhelming dissatisfaction with the cost and financing of care. This disparity in attitude is greatest among Americans, as compared with Canadians and West Germans, according to Blendon’s HCHP data.

Polls have found that when the Canadian system (a nationalized program) is described to Americans, they say it sounds like Medicare, and are all for it. (Indeed, Blendon pointed out, the Canadian program is called “Medicare”.) On the other hand, Americans are vehemently opposed to any expansion of Medicaid as the national health system, since they see Medicaid as a welfare program. In general, said Blendon, Americans would be more likely to accept paying a higher deductible for coverage than giving up access to new, expensive, high technology procedures that are often “rationed” in countries with nationalized health care systems.

In summarizing the polling data, Blendon noted that the underlying current in the results is a fear on the part of working people that they will lose their health insurance and benefits.

Most of the questions posed by senators to Blendon focused on what the American people would be willing to give up in exchange for universal coverage. Blendon said that Americans would be more likely to accept paying a higher deductible for coverage than giving up access to new, expensive, high technology procedures that are often “rationed” in countries with nationalized health care systems.

**HOUSE PANEL REVIEWS JUSTICE DEPARTMENT POLICY OFFICE**

A newly created Justice Department Office of Policy Development (OPD) was the subject of an April 11 hearing by the Subcommittee on Intellectual Property and Judicial Administration of the House Judiciary Committee, chaired by Rep. William Hughes (D-NJ).

Paul J. McNulty, acting director of OPD (and a former minority counsel to Rep. Hughes’ subcommittee on crime), outlined the office’s responsibilities within the 83,000 person Justice Department.

OPD was created by Attorney General Thornburgh in November 1989 in an effort to coordinate policies on a department-wide basis. Thornburgh gave OPD three principal areas of focus: policy development, policy coordination, and policy support. According to McNulty, OPD has assumed a “leadership role in developing and implementing policy initiatives” within the Justice Department.

Acting Director McNulty stated that coordinating policy within Justice is a demanding role, citing the 6,300 requests from Congress alone during the 101st Congress. The Fiscal Year 1991 appropriations bill for the Justice Department mandated that this responsibility be shifted to OPD from the department’s Office of Legislative Affairs, in an attempt to address long-standing Congressional concerns over what critics perceive as slow response time to these requests.

OPD coordinates all Justice Department responsibilities in carrying out the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). OPD advises other agencies on FOIA requests, and publishes the annual “Justice Department Guide to the FOIA.” According to McNulty, the Justice Department adjudicated 2,862 FOIA appeals and responded to 620 initial requests for records in 1990.

OPD organizes symposia on a wide-range of issues, including recent forums entitled “The Role of the Attorney General” and “The 25th Anniversary of the Voting Rights Act.” OPD’s Fiscal Year 1991 direct funding is $2,986,000, and OPD is requesting $3,383,000 for FY 92.

Committee members, rushing between party caucuses and other hearings, asked few questions of McNulty. W. Lee Rawls, assistant attorney general for legislative affairs, accompanied McNulty and was peppered with questions and concerns from panel members about the department’s delays in responding to Congressional requests.

The hearing was part of the annual oversight and reauthorization process by the Judiciary Committee.
NIH CONCLUDES SERIES ON WOMEN'S HEALTH AND BEHAVIOR

“Women’s Quality of Life: The Costs and Benefits of Living Longer” was the theme of the April 3 (and final) session of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) series on Women’s Health and Behavior. The year-long series of four sessions, sponsored by NIH’s Working Group on Health and Behavior, focused on the link between behavior and the experience of physical and mental illness. Specific topics included: major diseases affecting women (such as cardiovascular disease, osteoporosis, and cancer), childbearing and menopause, and women’s health and behavior issues for the future.

At the final session, discussion focused on the implications of women’s relative longevity (women still outlive men by about seven years). M. Powell Lawton of the Philadelphia Geriatric Center identified four intersecting “sectors of the good life” that contribute to quality of life among the elderly: 1) a sense of psychological well-being; 2) perceived quality of life; 3) the objective environment; and 4) behavioral competence. With regard to the latter, Powell noted that “aspects of personal competence” – such as the ability to do household chores well or to solve an intellectual problem – contribute as significantly to quality of life among elderly women as does physical health.

A striking finding of quality of life research, Powell noted, is that older people (age 70 and over) are consistently more satisfied with every dimension of their lives than are younger people. At the same time, he warned, older women in particular suffer from what may be called “excess satisfaction,” the traditional belief that one should be satisfied with what one has. This belief, Powell argued, has prevented many women from challenging themselves to achieve true personal satisfaction through a wide range of experiences.

Caregiving Takes Its Toll

The self-sacrifice that comes with a woman’s traditional role as “caregiver” can exact a demanding toll, according to Linda George, a sociologist at Duke University. George noted that in caregiving, usual “exchange” relations are suspended: one provides care without receiving any in return. This lack of reciprocity in providing social support and caregiving may contribute to the erosion of women’s physical and mental health, said George. Simply put, when women live up to the traditional role expected of them, they place themselves at great risk of mental and physical stress.

The potentially harmful effects of caregiving on women’s health are now receiving more attention among medical and behavioral researchers. For example, in George’s own study, one-third of the caregivers used psychotropic agents (prescribed for their clients) and one-third used alcohol as a way of coping with their stress. Emerging data collected by other researchers are beginning to identify a decrease in immune system functioning related to the chronic stress of caregiving.

Gender Differences and Stress

George noted that there are significant sex differences in the experience of caregiving and the resulting vulnerability to stress. Contrary to the gender role literature that implies that men would find caregiving more stressful because it is not part of their traditional gender role, research indicates that women experience more stress. George argued that we need to recognize caregiving as a social role, and suggested that “role theory” can provide insight into the relationships between gender, role strain, role conflict, and stress.

Diane Rowland of Johns Hopkins University outlined the socio-demographic aspects of quality of life for older women, specifically the relationship between poverty and health status. Women, she noted, constitute 70 percent of potential long-term care patients, but many will be unable to afford this care. While the poverty rate for elderly couples is about 6 percent, for elderly women it is 16 percent, leading Rowland to conclude, “You’re better off, even if you have to care for him, to keep your husband alive and contributing to family income!”

The problem of financing long-term care was addressed by Henry Aaron of the Brookings Institution and the University of Maryland. While everyone recognizes the serious nature of the problem, he noted, most solutions are ultimately politically uninformed. Aaron claimed that while it is understandable that Rowland’s data would lead to recommendations for greater federal funding of health care, the current political climate of deficit reduction through limits on social spending, coupled with a cultural dislike for large government social programs, makes a sweeping federal role unlikely. More creative solutions involving individuals and the private sector will be necessary, said Aaron.
This series is part of the ongoing activities at NIH, and its newly established Office of Research on Women's Health, to redress the insufficient attention that has been paid to women's health issues in the biomedical and behavioral research community.

OSTP'S PERROLLE MEETS WITH COSSA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Pierre Perrolle, assistant director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), met with the COSSA Executive Committee on April 10. Perrolle, whose major responsibility at OSTP is the social and behavioral sciences, discussed his efforts to ensure including this research in the science policy agenda.

He reported that OSTP director Allan Bromley has been fully supportive of plans to promote the social and behavioral sciences as important elements in the global change research and education and human resources initiatives of the office. Perrolle also noted his intention to participate fully in interagency efforts to review risk assessment and management issues to see that relevant behavioral and social science research results are fully considered.

A social and behavioral science area Perrolle hopes OSTP will examine is the government's statistical data needs. Although still in its formative stages, this venture could help government respond more effectively to a wide range of policy issues including clarifying the conflicting information shaping the debate over scientific manpower, Perrolle said.

The social and behavioral science community has responded warmly to the initiative of Council of Economic Advisers Chairman Michael Boskin to improve the quality of the government's economic statistics. Concurrent efforts in OSTP could broaden the effort to improve not only economic statistics, but also the government's demographic and social statistics, leading to enhanced policy development and social science research.

Perrolle also discussed the role of the President's Council of Advisers on Science and Technology (PCAST) (see box) and the Federal Coordinating Committees on Science and Technology (FCCSET). He noted the direct relevance of the social and behavioral sciences to a significant portion of these groups' work.

BIDEN INTRODUCES BILL ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

A University of Kentucky Law School professor routinely begins her criminal law class by asking, "Will any of the male students here tell the class what you do each day to protect yourself from sexual assault?" Silence engulfs the room. The professor then addresses the same question to her female students, who immediately burst forth with comments like, "I don't go to a shopping center because its parking lot is badly lit," and "I sleep with my windows locked no matter how humid it is," or "I carry a gun."

Senator Joseph Biden (D-DE), chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, has introduced legislation, "The Violence Against Women Act of 1991," which makes sexual assault a civil rights crime, equating it with "hate beatings." The legislation calls for stricter punishments for both sexual assaults and domestic abuse. It would provide increased funding for states to take steps to improve public lighting, as well as to expand their efforts in dealing with victims of rape. Biden's bill also calls upon courts to study ways in which judicial proceedings can be made more sensitive to the needs of the rape victim.

Senator Biden's committee held hearings on this legislation on April 9. Burt NeUBORNE,
professor of law at New York University testified that the bill takes long-overdue action to address the issue of violence against women and, "empowers women to fight back in a powerful way."

Professor Cass R. Sunstein, of the University of Chicago, told the panel that he believed the bill to be constitutional on the grounds that Congress is responsible for ensuring equality in the administration of the criminal justice system under the Fourteenth Amendment.

No opposition to the bill was expressed by those committee members present. A mark-up hearing scheduled for April 11 was postponed.

---

**SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

COSSA provides this information as a service and encourages readers to contact the agency for further information or application materials. Additional application guidelines and restrictions may apply.

**INNOVATION IN EDUCATION PROGRAM**

The Innovation in Education Program supports projects that show promise of identifying and disseminating innovative educational approaches at the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels.

The Secretary of Education is interested in identifying effective strategies for restructuring and reforming schools and school systems with the goal of enabling every student to demonstrate competency in challenging subject matter and the ability to reason, solve problems, apply knowledge, and write and communicate effectively. The Department is particularly interested in strategies tailored to the specific problems and needs of students who are achieving under the current school system.

The Secretary believes, according to the Education Department's announcement, that a comprehensive approach to restructuring and reform is essential and requires school-wide or system-wide changes. Applicants are encouraged to focus on the following areas:

- New and challenging curricula to increase the academic performance of all students;
- Effective teacher development and instructional approaches to improve teacher quality and learner outcomes;
- New school organizational patterns and management strategies to create more productive working and learning environments.

**ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS:** State educational agencies, local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, private schools, and other public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions or consortia of those agencies.

**BUDGET:** The department estimates that $9 million will be available for this program. Awards will range from $200,000 to $750,000.

**DEADLINES:** June 3, 1991

**CONTACT:** Shirley Steele
U.S. Department of Education
Fund for Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching
555 New Jersey Ave., NW
Room 522
Washington, DC 20208-5524
Tel: (202) 219-1496
**NewsBriefs**

### APSA Releases Guide To Federal Funding

The American Political Science Association (APSA) has released the second edition of the *Guide to Federal Funding for the Social Scientists*. The APSA version replaces the guide's first edition, which COSSA produced in 1986. APSA has announced plans to revise the guide every three years.

The guide outlines more than 250 sources of federal funding for research in anthropology, economics, history, political science, psychology, sociology, statistics, geography, law, linguistics, and other social and behavioral sciences. Program descriptions include contact names, review processes, application procedures, deadlines, budget information, and examples of funded projects.

The guide is priced at $30 for members of COSSA Members (not Affiliates and Contributors) and $50 for all others. Contact: Publications/APSA, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20036; Tel: (202) 483-2512.

### Senate Confirms Henderson as OSTP Associate Director

Donald A. Henderson was recently confirmed by the Senate as Associate Director for Life Sciences of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

Henderson comes to OSTP after serving since 1977 as the Dean and Edgar Berman Professor at the Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health. He was awarded the National Medal of Science in 1986 and has also served as a Commissioned Officer for the U.S. Public Health Service from 1955 to 1977.

Dr. Henderson succeeds Dr. James B. Wyngaarden as Associate Director for Life Sciences.

### OMB and Census Bureau To Conduct Statistics Project

The Bureau of Census, with the support of the Office of Management and Budget, is conducting a study of approaches of identifying and representing geographic entities for federal statistical purposes, according to John F. Long, Assistant Division Chief for Population Estimates and Projections at the Bureau of Census.

This project will be the focus of meetings of the Association of American Geographers in Miami from April 13-17, as well as the annual meeting of the American Statistical Association in Atlanta from August 19-22.

For further information on this project, contact James D. Fitzsimmons, Population Division, Bureau of Census, Washington, D.C. 20233, (301) 763-5158.

### Supreme Court Data Base Now Available

A Supreme Court data base has recently been made available by the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research. The data base extends from the beginning of the Warren Court (1953) through October 1988.

The data base has been divided into six areas: identification, background, chronology, issue area, case outcome, and voting data.

For further information, write Harold J. Spaeth, Department of Political Science, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824.

### Forum to Examine Human Aspects of Global Change

What kind of world do we have? What kind of world do we want? What must we do to get there?

These are the questions to be explored in a forum entitled “Global Change and the Human Prospect: Issues in Population, Science, Technology, and Equity” sponsored by Sigma Xi, in association with COSSA and several other leading groups. In the words of event organizers, “The forum will address the knowledge generation, policy formulation, and societal transformations that are required to achieve a sustainable and equitable world.”

The forum will be held from November 16-18 in Washington. Dr. Maurice Strong, Secretary General of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, has been invited to give the keynote address. For further information, contact Sigma Xi forum coordinator Nancy Berry at (919) 549-4691.
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Anthropological Association</td>
<td>American Psychological Association</td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Economic Association</td>
<td>American Sociological Association</td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Association</td>
<td>American Statistical Association</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Political Science Association</td>
<td>Association of American Geographers</td>
<td>University of Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Agricultural Economics Association</td>
<td>History of Science Society</td>
<td>Nelson A. Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy, State University of New York at Albany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business</td>
<td>International Studies Association</td>
<td>Rutgers University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association for Public Opinion Research</td>
<td>Law and Society Association</td>
<td>Social Science Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Educational Research Association</td>
<td>Midwest Sociological Society</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Psychological Society</td>
<td>National Council on Family Relations</td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Asian Studies</td>
<td>North American Regional Science Council</td>
<td>University of New York, Stony Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Social Sciences in Health</td>
<td>North Central Sociological Association</td>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Sociological Society</td>
<td>Operations Research Society of America</td>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerontological Society of America</td>
<td>Population Association of America</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yale University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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