
CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume VII, Number 6
April 1, 1988

This Week . . .

- NSF Defends Budget on Capitol Hill *HS*
 - Proxmire Assails Social and Behavioral Science Grants *HS*
 - Boland: Granting NSF Increase Will Be Difficult *HS*
 - Walgren Subcommittee Scrutinizes Education and Centers *HS*
- Science Does Well in Budget Resolutions *HS*
- Social Scientists Urge Sharper Focus on Rural Development *BD*
- Caplan Appointed CBASSE Executive Director *SC*
- Sources of Research Support: Council for International Exchange of Scholars *SC*

* * *

NSF DEFENDS BUDGET ON CAPITOL HILL

The annual ritual of agency directors defending their budgets on Capitol Hill is currently in full swing. During the past two weeks Erich Bloch, Director of the National Science Foundation (NSF), made his pitch for the proposed \$2.05 billion FY 1989 budget (a \$333 million increase over FY 1988 funding) for his agency to the House and Senate appropriations subcommittees and the authorizing subcommittee in the House.

To justify the administration's renewed commitment to doubling the NSF budget during the next five years, Bloch presented each subcommittee with the trinity of: "education and human resources--because people are our most important asset; disciplinary research and supporting facilities--because universities are the primary source of new knowledge; and research centers and groups--because we must foster interdisciplinary investigation and build stronger links between universities and industries to use our technical resources most effectively." How the three subcommittees reacted to Bloch's presentation and the proposed increase reflects the difference between appropriations and authorization, House and Senate, personalities and leadership of the subcommittees, and a Congress in some ways straight-jacketed by deficit-reduction schemes and agreements.

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*

Proxmire Assails Social and Behavioral Science Grants

Sen. William Proxmire (D-WI), chair of the Senate HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, questioned a number of specific grants the NSF had awarded in behavioral and social science. During the week preceding the hearing, Proxmire had awarded another of his "Golden Fleece" grants to an NSF grant in the psychobiology program that he claimed spent almost \$200,000 to study the sex lives of Japanese quails. David Kingsbury, Director of the Biological, Behavioral, and Social Science Directorate, tried, without much success, to explain to the chairman the nature of "experimental systems to examine fundamental questions of behavior." The use of animals--in this case to study learning in a social context--was important to obtaining a controllable, measurable environment, Kingsbury noted. Proxmire could not get past the "sex life of Japanese quails" aspect of the grant.

The chairman then turned his ire on the social and economic sciences. His attacks on two grants in the economics program elicited this response from NSF Director Bloch: **"Economics is one of the most important sciences we are sponsoring."** NSF Deputy Director John Moore, a Ph.D. in economics, also defended support for basic research in the discipline. In addition, Proxmire was disturbed by the exorbitant salaries NSF was allowing for its grantees. Moore, armed with an academic salary study of public colleges and universities produced by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, noted the escalation of academic salaries for senior professors to the point where many were now better paid than Members of Congress. Proxmire concluded his attack on social science by questioning grants in sociology and political science. The chairman wanted to know why studies of congressional behavior needed support when such "exciting and interesting work" was being done by Congressional Quarterly, the Washington Post, and the New York Times.

Aside from these specific attacks, Proxmire began the two days of hearings by referring to the cuts Congress made in NSF's FY 1988 requested increase and asserting, "the news this year is no better; in fact it may be worse." He then debunked one of the major arguments NSF has been making in search of greater support by declaring that he was not impressed with the competitiveness argument for support of research and development and because of "corporate reluctance to invest in the future."

Proxmire was also skeptical of the Science and Technology Centers appropriation, comparing it to the notorious RANN (Research Applied to National Needs) program NSF supported in the 1970s. RANN was an attempt by NSF to apply technological solutions to urban problems. After spending \$484 million the program was terminated because of political and managerial problems and a feeling that NSF was moving away from its basic-research mission. Proxmire also questioned whether funding for the Centers would overlap individual-investigator grants.

Praising NSF for taking "appropriate steps to improve science education," Proxmire also noted "You have spent a lot of money: where are the results?" All agreed that the NSF role in science education was small and at best catalytic to state and local education agency efforts. Yet it was also agreed that better assessment mechanisms should be built into the programs the Foundation does support.

Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) chaired the second day of the hearings, during which Bloch took the opportunity to discuss the importance of the social and behavioral sciences. He noted that looking at individual grants out of context was not a productive means of evaluating the work of the Foundation.

Boland: Granting NSF Increase Will Be Difficult

The main concern of House HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman Rep. Edward Boland (D-MA) is whether or not his subcommittee will receive enough of an allocation (under the 302B process, a major new factor in the appropriations game as funds get squeezed tighter) to fund all the important programs under his subcommittee's jurisdiction--NASA, EPA, Housing, Veterans' Administration, and NSF. He made it quite clear that without a significant increase over last year's allocation level the chances of NSF receiving a significant increase were nil.

Boland began the two days of hearings by focusing on large issues such as big science (Space Station, Superconducting Super Collider) vs. little science (individual-investigator grants at NSF), particularly the large costs of the former. Boland was quite happy with the Foundation's efforts, spurred on by Congress, to increase its commitment to science and engineering education. Concern was raised over the proposed \$150 million separate appropriation for Science and Technology Centers, with Boland and ranking Republican William Green (R-NY) both suggesting that it would be politically difficult down the road to stop funding established Centers. Bloch assured members that sunset provisions are included and that NSF was about to cancel funding for two of the original Engineering Research Centers, although the political fallout from this action has not yet become apparent.

The Subcommittee's modus operandi is to go seriatim through the budget-justification book prepared by NSF, asking a few questions about various programs and giving each Assistant Director a chance to defend his bailiwick. This year no questions were asked about the social and behavioral sciences in the public session, although written questions answered by NSF for the hearing record will cover some of these programs.

Walgren Subcommittee Scrutinizes Education and Centers

The House Science, Research, and Technology Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Doug Walgren (D-PA), made it clear that it would support the full-funding request for NSF when it authorizes the Foundation later this month. The authorization process takes a back

seat (last year there was no authorization for NSF) to the budget and appropriations processes in determining actual funding. Authorization hearings perform a useful oversight function by examining the specific programs of the Foundation more vigorously than the appropriations subcommittees. In addition to the NSF witnesses, panels of outside experts are called to discuss specific facets of the Foundation's work.

This year the Subcommittee focused on the science and engineering education programs, the Science and Technology Centers, polar research, and supercomputing. Rep. William Green even made an appearance to advocate a \$200 million budget for science and engineering education (the request is \$156 million), although he admitted that the current budget squeeze would probably mean his Subcommittee (see above) could not appropriate such funds. Green also sought support for his bill to expand the role of NSF to include responsibility for curriculum evaluation and development for math, science, and technology for elementary and secondary education. Other witnesses called for greater efforts in pre-college education, and a return to the days in the late 1950s and early 1960s when science and engineering education programs constituted between 40% and 50% of the Foundation's budget. This Subcommittee has been sympathetic to such entreaties in the past and may consider rearranging the NSF request to increase support for science and engineering education.

Concern about the \$150 million separate request for the Science and Technology Centers' impact on individual-investigator research was at the heart of this Subcommittee's discussion of the subject. Walgren asked why NSF was "leaping so completely for the S&T Centers" by making a five-year funding commitment in one year's budget? Outside witnesses noted the "tension" between Science and Technology Centers and individual-investigator grants "because the program is being launched at a time when the NSF budget has been disrupted." Others called for priority to be given to the Research and Related Activities disciplinary grants over the commencement of the S&T Centers if, as last year, the full NSF request is not appropriated.<<

SCIENCE DOES WELL IN BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

On March 23 by a vote of 319-102 the House of Representatives passed the FY 1989 Budget Resolution. The action, taken quickly and with unusual bipartisan support, sets guidelines by budget function for the appropriations committees to determine actual FY 1989 spending by program. Working under the deficit reduction agreement of last November which limited increases for non-defense discretionary programs to 2%, the House protected a number of low-income priority programs, increased the science and education functions above the agreement levels, and, using OMB's rosy economic assumptions and what one Budget Committee staffer called "cute tricks," brought the resolution in under the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings targets for FY 1989 deficit reduction.

The Science Function (#250) received a \$1.65 billion increase above the Congressional Budget Office freeze level to \$12.45 billion in Budget Authority. Most of the increase would

go to NASA, but the Budget Committee report assumes an additional \$300 million for the programs of the National Science Foundation (NSF). This is slightly below the \$333 million increase requested by the President's budget. Yet NSF and the science community seem generally satisfied with this outcome.

Late News: On March 30, the Senate Budget Committee passed its version of the budget resolution. This included \$1 billion more for the Science Function (#250) than the House version. However, unlike the House, the Senate included almost the full requested increase for NASA and significant funding for the construction of the superconducting super collider. Thus, the assumed increase for NSF was only about \$200 million. The Senate also accepted the administration's reductions in housing and local development subsidies, which, if accepted by the full Congress, will limit the amount of funds available to the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittees and impact their maneuverability when it comes time to decide NSF appropriations. The full Senate will not consider the budget resolution until it returns from the spring recess on April 11.<<

SOCIAL SCIENTISTS URGE SHARPER FOCUS ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Researchers of rural economics and sociology have delivered a clear message to committees of both houses of Congress: an increasingly diversified and troubled rural economy requires more than a successful farm policy to save it. In testimony echoing remarks made at a COSSA-sponsored breakfast seminar last April (see Update, April 10, 1987), these researchers described a rural economy increasingly dominated by the manufacturing and service industries, an economy whose salvation depends in large part on its ability to invest in human capital.

Testifying on March 23 before the Conservation, Credit, and Rural Development Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, chaired by Rep. Ed Jones (D-TN), Professor Louis Swanson, a sociologist in the College of Agriculture, University of Kentucky, pointed out that non-farm activities are increasingly important to a rural community's well-being. Swanson added that the level of this well-being is determined in large part by the quality and availability of education in a given community, and stressed the need to concentrate on improving rural America's human resources.

The next day, at a Senate Budget Committee hearing chaired by Sen. Lawton Chiles (D-FL), witnesses again stressed the need for investing in human capital in rural areas. Luther Tweeten, Anderson Professor of agricultural marketing, policy, and trade at Ohio State University, testified that "rural areas are losing their uniqueness and are in fact part of the rural-urban continuum. It makes less and less sense to have separate programs for rural areas and urban areas. Human resource development programs need to serve all sectors of the nation."

Tweeten offered the committee "a very modest list of federal programs" to spur development, including education assistance and expansion of the Cooperative Extension Service "to help rural

communities identify leadership, organize for action, and receive technical (feasibility study) assistance and advice on questions of whether to upgrade or expand community services, and what if any industry to seek or expand." Tweeten added that an expanded educational program for rural areas "would help local leaders and firms better understand and anticipate the macroeconomic forces and structural changes which often swamp local efforts." The states of Ohio, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin have "excellent" programs which could serve as models, he said, adding that job development should take the form of a wage-earnings supplement targeting disadvantaged, underemployed, low-income workers.

Before adjourning the House subcommittee hearing, Rep. Jones warned that a deficit-plagued Congress was unlikely to offer rural development supporters much in the way of increased funding. (Jones is by no means the only House or Senate subcommittee chair to issue such a warning in recent weeks.) Addressing the witnesses present, Jones added that whether Congress must find new funds or re-direct old, "we need your help."

Indeed, recognizing current budget constraints, witnesses seeking federal support for rural development have, for the most part, been careful not to emphasize dollars. At the Senate hearing, for instance, it was recommended that the federal government help in leveraging support and participation of the private sector in stimulating the rural economy, and that a stronger federal-state coordinated effort be forged.<<

CAPLAN APPOINTED CBASSE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Frank Press, president of the National Academy of Sciences, has announced the appointment of Robert D. Caplan as executive director of the Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education (CBASSE) of the National Research Council. CBASSE, chaired by Robert McC. Adams, seeks to improve both methodologies important to the social and behavioral sciences and our understanding of education as a process and a formal system. Caplan will take up his CBASSE duties on a full-time basis in May; he is currently a program director and research scientist at the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. An industrial and organizational psychologist, Caplan brings many years of experience in multidisciplinary social science projects to CBASSE. He replaces Dr. David Goslin, who served as executive director of CBASSE and its forerunner, the Assembly of Behavioral and Social Sciences, for 13 years (see Update, June 19, 1987).

On March 17, Caplan met with the Executive Committee of the Consortium to explore enhancing cooperation and communication between COSSA and CBASSE. Caplan touched on a number of CBASSE reports currently underway. He noted problems in obtaining funds from Congress to conduct a congressionally mandated study on the impact of changes in the mandatory retirement laws. He also noted the concern of CBASSE with recruitment of minority faculty and the need for courses integrating all the social sciences.<<

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: COUNCIL FOR INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF SCHOLARS

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

Fulbright Program and India Research Fellowships

The Council for International Exchange of Scholars (CIES) supports a wide variety of teaching and research fellowships, including those under the auspices of the Fulbright Program and the Advanced Research Fellowships in India, outlined below.

The Fulbright Program offers over 300 research grants and 700 university lecturing fellowships in more than 100 countries covering virtually all disciplines. Support under the Fulbright program includes round-trip travel for grantees and (for most full-year awards) travel for one dependent; a maintenance allowance; tuition for school-age children in many countries; and book and baggage allowances. Application deadlines are as follows: for Australasia, India, and Latin America (except lecturing awards for Mexico, Venezuela, and the Caribbean), June 15, 1988; for Africa, Asia, Europe, the Middle East, and lecturing awards in Mexico, Venezuela, and the Caribbean, September 15, 1988; for institutional proposals to the Scholar-in-Residence program, November 1, 1988; for Administrators' Awards (Germany, the United Kingdom, and Japan), the Seminar in German Civilization, the NATO Research Fellowships, and the Spain Research Fellowships, January 1, 1989; and for the France, Italy, and Germany Travel-Only Awards, February 1, 1989.

The 1989-90 Advanced Research Fellowships in India program offers two sets of awards--twelve 6-10 month and nine 2-3 month awards--in all disciplines except clinical medicine. Funding for this program is provided by the United States Information Agency, the National Science Foundation, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Government of India. The program seeks to open new channels of communication between academic and professional groups in the United States and India and to nurture research activity between the two countries. Scholars and professionals with limited or no prior experience in India are especially encouraged to apply.

Restrictions on Awards: All awardees must be United States citizens holding doctoral degrees or comparable professional qualifications; in addition, applicants to the Fulbright program must have university or college teaching experience and (for selected assignments) foreign language proficiency.

Contact: Lydia Z. Gomes (India Research Fellowships) or
M. Carlota Baca (Fulbright program)
CIES
Eleven Dupont Circle, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036-1257
202/939-5400 <<

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