
CONSORTIUM of SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume II, Number 19
October 21, 1983

This Week . . .

Reagan Cites Social Scientists

Congressional Conferees Complete Labor, HHS, Ed Appropriation

U.S. Leads in Defense R&D, Trails Badly in Basic Research

Treasury Seeks Continued Exclusion of Social Sciences from
Tax Credit

Conference Committee Maintains DOL Research Cut

Computers in Education: House Holds Hearings, COSSA to Hold
Seminar

Social Sciences Highlighted in New French Science Museum

Need for NARS Autonomy Intensifies

Senate to Vote on Soviet Studies Funding

Sources of Research Support: Department of Health and Human
Services

* * *

REAGAN CITES SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

In his radio message of October 15, 1983, President Ronald Reagan cited the results of a survey by social scientists at the University of Michigan on attitudes toward the government. The radio message dealt with the broad issue of the quality of life in the United States. Mr. Reagan referred to social and economic statistics on life expectancy, infant mortality, crime rates, venture capital expenditures, and new job creation to show that the quality of life was improving. He went on to say that one of the most important indicators was a rise in confidence in government as evidenced by the Michigan data.

The data were collected as part of the National Election Studies, funding for which has traditionally been provided by the Division of Social and Economic Science at the National Science Foundation. It is ironic that the President finds the Michigan survey so useful. His original NSF budget proposals for FY 1982 would have cut the budget of the Division of Social and Economic Science so severely as to preclude funding the survey.

October 21, 1983

CONGRESSIONAL CONFEREES COMPLETE LABOR, HHS, ED APPROPRIATION

It appears likely that the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education will have a regular appropriation for the first time since 1978. House and Senate conferees agreed on the FY 1984 appropriation for these departments on October 18. The conference report must first be approved by the House and Senate before it can be signed by the President and become law. Congressional passage and the President's signing are considered likely.

The bill provides \$174 million for research at the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), a compromise figure that is closer to the higher Senate figure than that of the House and is \$21.7 million more than was available for FY 1983. Conferees also agreed to split the difference between House and Senate appropriations for the various National Institutes of Health, with the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) receiving \$265.0 million, a \$20.2 million increase over FY 1983, and the National Institute on Aging (NIA) getting \$112.3 million, \$20.7 more than was available in FY 1983. The appropriation for the National Institute of Education (NIE) will be \$48.2 million for FY 1984, a \$7.4 million reduction from last year's budget level. Both House and Senate versions of the FY 1984 appropriation included \$11.7 million for the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), which represents level funding from FY 1983. Before the conference, COSSA worked with members of both Appropriations Committees to encourage them to reject the administration's proposal to halve the FIPSE budget.

Senator Lowell Weicker (R-CT), Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, HHS and Education, worked closely with the administration in preparing the Senate bill. His cooperation is widely credited with the anticipated successful passage of the legislation.

U.S. LEADS IN DEFENSE R&D, TRAILS BADLY IN BASIC RESEARCH

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) recently released comparative figures on national R&D funding in the natural and social sciences, engineering, and the humanities showing that the United States leads 14 western nations in the proportion of its R&D investment in defense-related research. At the same time, the U.S. lagged behind all these nations in the proportion of its R&D funds directed toward the advancement of knowledge or basic research. See Attachment 1 for a copy of the OECD figures.

October 21, 1983

TREASURY SEEKS CONTINUED EXCLUSION OF SOCIAL SCIENCES FROM TAX CREDIT

The Treasury Department has expressed a willingness to extend the time limit on the tax credit for industrial research and development (R&D) provided in the Economic Recovery Act of 1981, but it maintains that the definition of R&D must be made more stringent. A Treasury Department official told COSSA that the Treasury Department is strongly opposed to including social science research as part of the definition of R&D because it would make the administration of the tax credit even more difficult than it already is.

The tax credit was designed to stimulate R&D in U.S. industry. The social sciences were explicitly excluded from the ~~provisions of the tax credit in the legislation.~~ Regulations later issued by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) defined the excluded research in the social sciences and humanities as "all areas of research other than research in a field of laboratory science (such as physics or biochemistry), engineering or technology."

In commenting on the IRS regulations when they were proposed earlier this year, COSSA noted that such an expansive definition of social sciences and humanities introduced unforeseen and unwarranted rigidity into the regulations and that it ran counter to congressional intent. As COSSA pointed out,

"industrial research is frequently interdisciplinary and... new branches of interdisciplinary basic and applied science which include the social sciences, such as ergonomics, cybernetics, and computer sciences, have had major technical and economic impacts in recent years."

The R&D tax credit is scheduled to expire in 1985. However, industry representatives have been urging that the expiration date be eliminated, or at least extended, and legislation has been introduced that would remove the sunset provision on the R&D tax credit (H.R. 3031 and S. 738).

A Cabinet Council workgroup is currently exploring how best to alter the definition of R&D for purposes of the tax credit. For further information, contact the COSSA office.

October 21, 1983

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MAINTAINS DOL RESEARCH CUT

A congressional conference committee this week adopted House appropriation language that reduces the research and evaluation budget of the Labor Department Employment and Training Administration (ETA) from the requested \$22 million to \$12 million in FY 1984. The ETA research budget was \$19 million in FY 1983. Of this amount, \$14 million was budgeted through ETA and \$5 million through Youth Training Funds. These latter funds were used primarily for the National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Force Participation, a longitudinal labor force survey that has been conducted by the Department of Labor since 1966. Because the Youth Training Funds will not be available in FY 1984, the administration increased the ETA research budget to permit continuation of the NLS. The budget proposal also allowed expansion of other ETA research programs.

As a result of the conference committee action, ETA research and evaluation will be reduced by 37% from last year's level. Because most ETA evaluations are required by law, this reduction will affect the research program most heavily. COSSA worked with social scientists in the states of members of the conference committee to persuade the committee to adapt the Senate provisions for the ETA research budget. However the House legislative report language was upheld in the conference. The House report provides that funding for four rural Comprehensive Employment Programs (CEPs) be taken from ETA research and evaluation for one and three-quarters years.

COMPUTERS IN EDUCATION: HOUSE HOLDS HEARINGS, COSSA TO HOLD SEMINAR

The House Science and Technology Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations heard testimony on the use of computers in education at hearings on September 28 and 29. Secretary of Education Terrel Bell, Director of the National Science Foundation Edward Knapp, and university administrators were among those who testified at the hearings, under the chairmanship of Rep. Al Gore, Jr. (D-TN). The testimony consistently identified three major problems in using computers in precollege education: (1) teachers have not been trained to utilize computer technology; (2) economically advantaged children are more likely than disadvantaged children to have access to computers; and (3) software is often incompatible with computers or insufficient for educational needs.

October 21, 1983

COMPUTERS IN EDUCATION: HOUSE HOLDS HEARINGS, COSSA TO HOLD SEMINAR (cont.)

The need to expand the role of computers in education will be the topic of a COSSA Congressional Seminar on October 27. Marc S. Tucker, Director of the Project on Information Technology and Education, funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, will discuss why current uses of computers in the schools -- for instructional purposes and to teach "computer literacy" -- do not meet the needs of this country's educational system and are not likely to prepare students to compete effectively in the labor markets of the future. What students need, according to Tucker, is intensive training and experience in the use of the computer as an analytic tool. The seminar is co-sponsored by the House Science and Technology Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations and the Special Interest Group on Computer Uses in Education of the Association for Computing Machinery.

SOCIAL SCIENCES HIGHLIGHTED IN NEW FRENCH SCIENCE MUSEUM

The French government is currently investing over \$500 million in the establishment of what is expected to be one of the largest science museums in the world. Although plans for the museum were first developed during the administration of former President Valery Giscard d'Estaing, the museum also has the strong support of Giscard's successor, President Francois Mitterrand. One of the changes instituted by the Mitterrand government, however, is an increased emphasis on exhibits that focus on the role of science and technology in society and in the economy. This emphasis has led to expanded coverage of the social sciences in the museum.

Museum exhibits will be organized in thematic sectors according to the uses of science and technology, rather than by scientific fields or areas of inquiry. For example, space and astronomy science will be part of a cluster of exhibits on the theme of exploration. Biology and industrial technology will both be grouped under the general category of using and producing. Other sectors are the human environment and communication. Social science exhibits are expected to be organized for each sector.

The museum, currently called the National Museum of Science, Technology and Industry of the Park of la Villette, is expected to open in 1986.

October 21, 1983

NEED FOR NARS AUTONOMY INTENSIFIES

The need for independence of the National Archives and Records Service (NARS) was heightened last week when it was learned that General Services Administration (GSA) Administrator Gerald Carmen has made several top level appointments without consulting U.S. Archivist Robert Warner. These recent appointments include the Deputy Assistant Archivist for Public Programs and Exhibits and the Associate Archivist for Management. NARS is presently administered by GSA.

The history and archives communities have been supporting efforts to grant independence to NARS and have expressed concern that such unilateral moves by GSA serve to undermine Mr. Warner's leadership and management of the Archives. Legislation has now been introduced in both the House and the Senate that would restore independence to NARS. On September 27, Representatives Jack Brooks (D-TX) and Glenn English (D-OK) introduced H.R. 3987, a bill to grant autonomy to NARS that closely parallels S. 905, introduced by Senator Thomas Eagleton (D-MO), which now has 41 co-sponsors. The Senate bill is expected to be voted on in November.

SENATE TO VOTE ON SOVIET STUDIES FUNDING

The Soviet and East European Research and Training Act has been made Title VII of the State Department authorization (S.1342) for FY 1984. The Senate is expected to approve the authorization next week. The House version of the authorization does not contain provisions for Soviet and East European studies funding. Differences between the House and Senate bills will be resolved in conference.

October 21, 1983

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

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

Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs (OAPP)

OAPP is responsible for administering the provisions of the Adolescent Family Life Demonstration Projects Act (Title XX, Public Health Service Act).

FY 1983 Budget: Approximately \$2 million. An increase in FY 1984 is anticipated.

Purpose of Program: The OAPP research program supports studies concerning the societal causes and consequences of adolescent premarital sexual relations, contraceptive use, pregnancy, and childrearing. The most recent research grant announcement delineated two major areas of inquiry: (1) family, peer, and institutional influences on adolescent premarital sexual relations and (2) adoption.

Funding Mechanisms: Primarily investigator-initiated grants.

Disciplines Supported: A broad range of social sciences, including sociology, psychology, social work, epidemiology and other areas of public health research.

Review Process: OAPP is required by law to conduct grant reviews in a manner substantially like that of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). NIH has been reviewing OAPP proposals since its inception two years ago.

Restrictions on Awards: Annual awards are limited to \$100,000 in direct costs, with a maximum of 5 years.

Success Ratio: In FY 1982, 17% of the proposals submitted were approved, although only 8% were funded.

Contact: The next deadline for proposals will be in the spring. For further information contact:

Dr. Gerry Hendershot
Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs
Room 725H, Hubert H. Humphrey Building
200 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20201
202/245-7473

Summary of government R & D funding by socio economic objective

natural sciences and engineering plus social sciences and humanities 1981 and 1982

(Provisional or forward data)

	United States ^{5, 6}		Germany		France		United Kingdom		Italy		Canada	Netherlands		Sweden		Belgium		Norway		Denmark		Finland		Ireland		Greece
	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1981	1982	1981/82	1982/83	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981 ¹	1982 ²	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981
Total Government R & D Funding																										
Million national currency			17 774	18 820	40 032	50 770	3 316	3 532	2 603 053	2 511 218	1 661	3 281	3 439	6 594	7 725	22 395	25 428	2 471	2 864	1 982	2 207	1 238	1 465	44	57	4 253
Million US current dollars ppp	35 547	38 701	7 345	..	6 962	..	6 256	..	2 975	..	1 361	1 257	..	1 155	..	593	..	368	..	246	..	285	..	83	..	102
Percentage of Total Government R & D Funding																										
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	2.2	2.1	2.0	2.0	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.0	3.0	20.0	7.8	7.5	2.0	2.0	4.7	4.4	9.6	9.9	9.5	9.0	11.8	11.4	31.0	33.1	30.0
Industrial Growth	0.3	0.3	10.9	12.0	8.8	12.5	7.7	7.0	18.6	13.5	13.2	7.6	10.4	4.8	4.5	14.6	16.4	14.7	13.7	16.2	16.8	21.4	22.3	18.7	18.8	4.0
Agriculture and Industry	2.5	2.4	12.8	13.9	12.7	16.4	11.6	10.9	21.6	16.4	33.2	15.4	17.4	6.8	6.5	19.4	20.8	24.3	23.5	25.6	25.8	33.2	33.7	49.7	52.1	34.0
Production of Energy	9.8	7.5	15.2	16.1	7.4	7.1	6.5	6.2	24.6	21.7	14.6	4.7	4.5	10.6	10.4	6.0	9.3	5.1	4.7	10.0	11.2	5.9	5.7	3.2	4.7	9.2
Transport & Telecommunications	2.4	1.9	2.1	..	2.4	2.2	0.4	0.4	0.3	..	4.5	1.8	1.9	3.2	3.2	1.9	..	5.0	4.4	0.8	0.8	1.7	1.5	0.2
Urban and Rural Planning	0.3	0.2	1.8	..	1.3	1.3	0.9	0.9	0.5	..	0.4	3.4	3.3	1.9	1.8	1.6	..	0.7	0.5	2.4	2.3	0.6	0.6	5.5
Earth and Atmosphere	1.9	1.5	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.9	0.7	0.6	1.9	1.8	5.6	1.2	1.2	0.6	0.5	4.1	3.7	1.5	1.8	2.9	2.9	7.3	7.3	0.9	1.4	4.9
Energy & Other Infrastructure	14.4	11.1	22.0	22.4	13.9	13.5	8.6	8.2	27.3	24.2	25.0	11.1	11.0	16.3	15.9	13.5	17.0	12.3	11.4	18.1	17.2	15.6	15.1	9.8	12.9	16.0
Environment Protection	0.8	0.6	1.8	..	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.8	..	1.3	1.9	1.7	3.0	..	3.6	3.4	1.8	1.8	0.9	0.9	0.5
Health	11.3	10.3	4.1	..	4.4	4.4	1.3	1.2	2.8	..	7.1	4.7	4.2	8.0	7.1	14.4	..	4.9	4.7	9.5	9.5	0.8	1.3	3.4
Social Development Services	1.6	1.2	4.1	4.0	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.1	1.4	1.4	5.6	5.2	4.7	8.1	7.8	11.6	11.1	7.3	7.7	7.8	7.4	7.5	7.5	7.3	6.8	8.3
Health and Welfare	13.6	12.1	10.7	9.9	6.7	6.6	3.3	3.3	5.9	6.1	14.0	9.9	9.5	18.0	16.5	29.1	27.7	15.9	15.8	19.0	18.7	9.1	9.7	10.9	11.0	14.7
Advancement of Knowledge ³	3.8 ⁷	3.6 ⁷	42.3	40.7	24.6	23.5	22.4 ⁴	23.7 ⁴	32.4	40.3	21.3	54.0	52.7	39.5	38.5	29.7	29.4	40.4	40.8	35.8	34.8	40.1	39.5	27.8	22.6	29.9
Civil Space	13.9	13.9	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.2	2.0	1.7	5.8	5.8	..	3.4	3.1	3.4	3.4	4.9	4.7	0.7	0.7	3.2	3.4	1.8	1.2	0.3
Defence	51.8	56.9	8.8	8.9	37.2	35.1	52.0	52.2	6.5	6.7	6.6	3.0	3.0	16.0	19.2	0.3	0.3	6.5	7.7	0.3	0.3	1.9	2.0	5.2
Defence and Space	65.7	70.9	12.9	13.0	41.4	39.3	54.9	53.8	12.3	12.5	6.6	6.4	6.3	19.4	22.6	5.2	5.0	7.2	8.4	3.5	3.7	1.9	2.0	1.8	..	5.5
Not Specified	0.7	0.8	0.4	0.4	..	3.3	3.2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Per 1 000 GDP																										
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.2	1.2	0.8	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.7	1.3	1.5	0.8
Industrial Growth	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.4	1.1	1.8	1.0	0.9	1.2	0.7	0.8	0.8	1.0	0.6	0.6	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.1	0.8	0.8	1.2	1.4	0.8	0.9	0.1
Agriculture and Industry	0.3	0.3	1.5	1.6	1.6	2.3	1.5	1.4	1.4	0.9	2.0	1.5	1.7	0.8	0.8	1.2	1.4	1.8	1.9	1.2	1.2	1.9	2.1	2.1	2.4	0.7
Production of Energy	1.2	1.0	1.7	1.9	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.8	1.6	1.6	0.9	0.5	0.4	1.2	1.3	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.2
Transport & Telecommunications	0.3	0.2	0.2	..	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.0	..	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.1	..	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0
Urban and Rural Planning	0.0	0.0	0.2	..	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	..	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	..	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2
Earth and Atmosphere	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.0	0.1	0.1
Energy & Other Infrastructure	1.8	1.4	2.5	2.6	1.8	1.9	1.1	1.1	1.8	1.3	1.5	1.1	1.1	1.9	2.0	0.8	1.1	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.9	1.0	0.4	0.6	0.3
Environment Protection	0.1	0.1	0.2	..	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	..	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	..	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
Health	1.4	1.3	0.5	..	0.6	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.2	..	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.9	0.9	..	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.1
Social Development Services	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.9	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.2
Health and Welfare	1.7	1.6	1.2	1.2	0.9	0.9	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.8	1.0	0.9	2.1	2.1	1.8	1.8	1.2	1.2	0.9	0.9	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.3
Advancement of Knowledge ³	0.5	0.5	4.9	4.8	3.2	3.4	0.3	0.3	2.1	2.2	1.3	5.3	5.2	4.6	4.8	1.8	1.9	3.0	3.2	1.7	1.6	2.3	2.5	1.2	1.0	0.6
Civil Space	1.7	1.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.3	..	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0
Defence	6.4	7.3	1.0	1.0	4.8	5.0	7.0	6.8	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	1.9	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
Defence and Space	8.1	9.1	1.5	1.5	5.4	5.6	7.2	7.0	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.6	0.6	2.2	2.8	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	..	0.1
Not Specified	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3
Total	12.3	12.9	11.5	7.4	12.9	14.3	13.4	13.1	6.5	5.3	5.9	9.8	9.8	11.6	12.5	6.2	6.6	7.5	7.9	4.8	4.7	5.8	6.3	4.2	4.6	2.1

1. In 1980 prices.
2. In 1981 prices.
3. Including General University Funds (GUF).
4. Excludes GUF in the Social Sciences and Humanities.
5. Excludes all or most capital expenditure.
6. Federal/central government only.
7. Underestimated. Excludes GUF.

Source: Science Resources Newsletter, No. 7, 1983
OECD