
CONSORTIUM of SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume VI, Number 18
October 9, 1987

This Week . . .

- NSF Gets Full Research Request From Senate Committee *HS*
- Labor, HHS, Ed Bill Reported By Appropriations Committee *HS*
- NEH Passes Senate; Conference Committee Next *SC*
- Flexible Federal Funding for Survey Improvement *SC*
- Sources of Research Support: Department of Health and Human Services *SC*

* * *

NSF GETS FULL RESEARCH REQUEST FROM SENATE COMMITTEE

On October 1 the Senate Appropriations Committee voted to fund the National Science Foundation (NSF) at \$1.867 billion for FY 1988, a 16% increase over FY 1987 and \$23 million below the administration request. This is also \$74 million above the House version of the bill. For Research and Related Activities the Committee voted the administration's request of \$1.635 billion, a 16% increase over FY 1987 and \$130 million above the House allocation. Science and Engineering Education (SEE) was funded at the administration request level of \$115 million, which is \$30 million below the House but \$16 million above FY 1987.

The gloomy news that the NSF would receive no increase over its FY 1987 funding level as a result of the HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee's action on September 25 was altered by a decision by Senate Budget Committee Chairman Sen. Lawton Chiles (D-FL). The Senate Budget Committee, deciding not to count FY 1987 supplemental appropriations against FY 1988 outlays, allocated an extra \$500 million to the Appropriations Committee. After the vociferous objections of Sen. Jake Garn (R-UT) and others to the earlier allocation decisions made by the Senate Appropriations Committee (Update, August 14, 1987), a rather stormy Subcommittee markup, and strong lobbying by the science community, the full appropriations committee voted on October 1 to give the HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee the extra funds

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: David Jenness, 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*

David Jenness, *Executive Director*

to spend on its programs, including NSF. Sen. Pete Domenici (R-NM), who was persuaded by COSSA and others to lead the effort, convinced the full appropriations committee to modify an amendment sponsored by Garn and Sen. J. Bennett Johnston (D-LA) and restore full funding to the research activity and increased funding for SEE.

The bill is expected to go to the floor of the Senate the week of October 12. An amendment sponsored by Sen. Dennis DeConcini (D-AZ) to increase funds for the Veterans Administration is anticipated. Since budgeting is now a zero-sum game, if VA is increased something needs to be decreased. Sen. Alan Cranston (D-CA) wants to take the money from NSF. If he succeeds, NSF research funding will be reduced to FY 1987 levels again. All Senators, particularly DeConcini and Cranston, need to be convinced that extra funds for the VA should be not found at the expense of basic scientific research sponsored by NSF. Once the bill clears the Senate floor, a tough House-Senate conference is expected. A tradeoff between NSF funding and NASA space station funding is possible. Compromise within the NSF budget on House increases for SEE and Senate increases for research, if they are still there, will be necessary. As one NSF official has noted, "There's a long way to go yet." Stay tuned.

LABOR, HHS, ED BILL REPORTED BY APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

In addition to the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations bill, the Senate Appropriations Committee reported out the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies bill last week. The Committee demonstrated a clear concern with AIDS and like the House rejected administration attempts to defund various programs. What follows is a synopsis of the bill as reported, emphasizing agencies of particular interest to social and behavioral scientists.

Labor

The Bureau of Labor Statistics received \$183.8 million from the Senate appropriations committee. This is \$1 million less than the House allocation, \$1.5 million less than the administration request, and \$10 million above the 1987 level. Unlike the House, the Senate committee did not agree to the addition of \$1 million for a survey design research center.

The research and evaluation budget at the Employment and Training Administration received \$19.0 million, the same amount as the House and the administration request, and a 32% increase over FY 1987. COSSA testified in favor of increased funding for this program in May.

Health and Human Services

The bill included \$946.4 million for Public Health Service (PHS) program activities associated with AIDS, almost doubling the amount appropriated in FY 1987 and \$961,000 more than the

House figure for FY 1988. Like the House, the Senate committee recommended establishing four advisory committees of outside experts to evaluate all activities on AIDS within the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), the National Institutes of Health (NIH), and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA). Unlike the House, the Senate does not recommend the consolidation of AIDS funding for PHS activities in the Secretary of Health and Human Services' office. CDC will get about one-third of the PHS funds for AIDS activities.

The NIH received \$6.4 billion for research and training plus another \$467.9 million for AIDS research for a total of \$6.9 billion. This is more than \$1 million below the comparable House total. The Senate committee included bill language to require that NIH funds be apportioned following normal executive branch procedures--that is, according to the appropriations process. This reflected Congress' displeasure with attempts by OMB to manipulate the funding of grants through forward funding and other avenues. Like the House, the Committee report includes language supporting greater efforts by NIH in the Health and Behavior area, a matter on which COSSA has been active in recent years.

The National Institute on Aging was allocated \$199.6 million for FY 1988. This was about \$4 million below the House allocation, but a 12% increase over FY 1987 and a 28% increase above the administration request. The Committee report notes the importance of behavioral sciences research on the aging.

The National Institute on Child Health and Human Development received \$408.3 million for FY 1988, including \$14.9 million for AIDS activities. The comparable House figures are \$405.7 million and \$9.9 million for AIDS.

The National Institute of Mental Health received \$265.5 million for research in FY 1988, the same as the House allowance, representing a 22% increase over the request and a 13% increase over FY 1987. The National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) was allocated \$125.7 million for non-AIDS drug abuse research. This is a 67% increase over the request and a 17% increase over FY 1987. The House deferred action on this appropriation. The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism received \$80.1 million for research, a 16% increase over FY 1987. ADAMHA received \$117.3 million for AIDS activities, with almost two-thirds of the funds going to NIDA.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation received \$5.1 million, a 37% decrease from FY 1987 (not the same as last year as reported in an earlier Update). The National Center for Health Statistics and the National Center for Health Services Research and Technology Assessment remain unauthorized and their funding levels were deferred.

Education

The Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) was appropriated \$69.2 million for FY 1988 (excluding library programs). This is \$1 million below the request and \$4.6 million below the House. The Senate committee agreed to significant increases for the Center for Education Statistics, particularly for the National Assessment of Educational Progress. However, unlike the House it made no specific commitment to the funding of investigator-initiated research. The House included \$2 million for such research and the authorization bill sets a floor of \$500,000 for this activity. The Committee was also concerned about the integrity of the peer review process within OERI.

Graduate education programs, despite administration attempts to abolish them, did well, although not as well as in the House. The Javits Fellowship Program received \$5.2 million, \$1.8 million below the House figure. The Law School Clinical Program received \$1.5 million, \$3.5 million less than the House. International education and foreign language programs authorized by Title VI of the Higher Education Act received \$32.1 million, the same as the House allowance. The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education received \$12.2 million, the same as both the FY 1987 appropriation and the FY 1988 House figure.

United States Institute of Peace

The United States Institute of Peace (USIP), which was zero-funded by the House, was appropriated \$5 million by the Senate, reflecting USIP President Robert Turner's confidence in the continued viability of the Institute (Update, September 25, 1987). The Committee report carries warnings which are probably going to have to be heeded if the Institute is to survive beyond FY 1988. The report notes that the Institute "has been deficient in its efforts to seek participation from a broad cross-section of the Nation." The Committee also expresses concern about the grant-making process, under which "some grants have been awarded to organizations with which Board members are affiliated, representing at least the appearance of a conflict of interest."

NEH PASSES SENATE; CONFERENCE COMMITTEE NEXT

As noted in the last Update, the Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee allocated a slight increase in funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). On September 30, the Interior and Related Agencies appropriations bill passed the full Senate. A House-Senate conference committee will meet soon to resolve differences in the two versions of the bill.

The Senate figure is \$143.791 million, roughly \$350,000 lower than the House allocation but about \$13 million above the

administration request. Some observers were surprised at the increase coming out of the Senate subcommittee, having anticipated a figure approximately \$1 million lower. However, as one informed source noted, this was mostly "new money," the result of a vigorous letter-writing campaign by state humanities councils and of concern among members of the subcommittee that NEH increase its commitment to the preservation of deteriorating books. There was a loser in all of this: funding for Challenge Grants was 10% lower than the FY 1987 appropriation.

FLEXIBLE FEDERAL FUNDING FOR SURVEY IMPROVEMENT

In a climate where the Office of Management and Budget tries to limit the use of federally funded surveys, on the grounds that they impose a 'burden' on the public and are sometimes of questionable practical utility to government, some agencies are taking creative steps to improve survey methodology. One such effort is the application of cognitive science to the study of survey design and response error. These efforts may prove important to outside researchers, who can become involved with the essentially intramural effort in a number of ways.

The lead was taken by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) of the Department of Health and Human Services in 1986, when the National Laboratory for Collaborative Research in Cognition and Survey Measurement was established there, jointly funded by NCHS and the National Science Foundation (NSF). The National Laboratory intends to bring cognitive research to bear on surveys; to provide (in turn) survey research data and contexts for the investigation of cognitive processes; and ultimately to improve the quality of federal statistics by this cross-stimulation. A Questionnaire Research Design Laboratory has been established at the National Laboratory to develop and test questionnaires and other data collection instruments using the methods of cognitive science.

Of general interest to the larger research community is the Collaborative Research Program (CRP), which offers paid residencies at the Laboratory to outside scientists (the Visiting Scientist Program) and a Contract Research Program, which awards competitive contracts to universities and research centers for 'directed research' at the contractors' laboratories. Broad Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for the competitive contracts awarded under this program are circulated annually, usually in late winter or early spring. They are advertised by NCHS in the Commerce Business Daily; extramural scientists then propose their own specific approach within the broadly outlined topic area; and the final contract is negotiated between the researcher and the agency.

The pattern seems to show a federal agency contracting with academic researchers on their own terms (within limits), and with

due respect to academic norms. Submittals to a given RFP are judged competitively on scientific merit by a panel of three university scientists, three government scientists, and the director of the CRP as chair. There is strong pressure in this format for the award to go to the proposal which offers the most creative cognitive approach to the subject matter of the RFP. There is also tolerance for the investigator or group given the contract to follow side-issues (e.g., methodological fine-points), provided that the awardee complies adequately with the contract. CRP officials work collaboratively with the contractor's researchers to ensure the best possible research. Though NCHS typically publishes the reports, the investigators are also encouraged to disseminate their findings elsewhere.

At present, at least, the co-funding NSF approves the review panel, and also encourages investigators (successful or unsuccessful at NCHS) to propose related projects to the appropriate NSF program, particularly, though not exclusively, Measurement Methods and Data Improvement (MMDI). This added flexibility provides additional openings for innovative improvements in survey methodology, which should be particularly welcome to cognitive scientists. In sum, the multiple funding format encourages flexibility that is normally bootlegged in a contract project, when it occurs at all; more often, the contract specifications severely limit the conditions for significant research. Moreover, this cooperation helps bridge the divide between norms of the research community and the needs of federal agencies--a discontinuity that has often troubled Congress and outside commentators.

In related efforts, NSF has been funding competitive fellowships for researchers at the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), and the Center for Education Statistics--also for the improvement of surveys and statistical methods. This new research frontier was expanded to include cognitive science applications at the recommendation of the Committee on National Statistics (CNSTAT) of the National Research Council, which, in 1983-84, conducted a study of how survey research and cognitive science can improve one another. At present, the oversight work done by CNSTAT is being continued by an NSF-funded committee of the Social Science Research Council. And for FY 1988, the House has appropriated funds for the creation of a Survey Design Research Center in BLS, an effort which will be related to the National Laboratory at NCHS and similar ones elsewhere in government (but see p.2, this issue).

For more information on the NCHS-NSF project contact Dr. Jared B. Jobe, director, Collaborative Research Program at the NCHS (301/436-7111) or Dr. Murray Aborn, MMDI program director at NSF (202/357-7913). The NCHS retains a mailing list of individuals and organizations interested in receiving information regarding the CRP; contact Dr. Jobe if you wish to be placed on this list.

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 further information and application materials. A comprehensive listing of federal funding sources is contained in COSSA's Guide to Federal Funding for Social Scientists.

National Cancer Institute

The Cancer Control Research Program offers a number of Cancer Prevention and Control Small Grant Awards. The Program, which is part of the Division of Cancer Prevention and Control (DCPC) of the National Cancer Institute, invites applications from researchers and institutions (profit and nonprofit) for research grants of up to \$35,000. Human intervention research in such areas as cancer prevention, the health promotion sciences, smoking prevention and cessation, and applied epidemiology is particularly encouraged. This list is not exhaustive: please contact DCPC for a complete list of eligible research areas.

These small grants are designed to be used to test ideas or conduct pilot projects. Relevant fields and disciplines include: the behavioral sciences (including sociology, social psychology, health education, and community organization); health services research; public health; health promotion; social work; epidemiology; disease prevention and control; medicine; nursing research; nutrition; and health policy.

Eligibility: All qualified investigators at profit or nonprofit institutions are eligible for awards, including doctoral students engaged in dissertation research.

Restriction: Individuals who are or have been principal investigators for NCI-funded cancer control projects for more than two years are ineligible for these awards.

Review Process: Standard Grant Review Committee (peer review)

Budget: \$35,000 (plus indirect costs) per project for the duration of the proposed research (normally one year, but up to two years if within the \$35,000 limit). Up to 30 awards will be made, contingent upon the availability of funds.

Deadline: December 10, 1987, for completed applications.

Contact: Dr. Carlos E. Caban
Program Director for Cancer Control Research
Cancer Control Applications Branch
Division of Cancer Prevention and Control
National Cancer Institute
Blair Building, Room 4A01
9000 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, Maryland 20892-4200
301/427-8735

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
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
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
University of Missouri
National Opinion Research Center
University of Nebraska
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