

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No. 43089
Washington, D.C.



Published by the American Sociological Association
1722 N St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 • (202) 833-3410

Footnotes

Nominations Committee 1982 Election Slate Announced

The Committee on Nominations' slate of nominees for the Association's 1982 election is now complete. It includes nominees for President-Elect, Vice President-Elect, Secretary-Elect, and membership on Council, the Committee on Committees, the Nominations Committee, and the Publications Committee.

Additional nominees may be placed on the ballot through open nominations. Members have thirty days from the time that

Committee on Nominations candidates are announced to file petitions supporting other candidates. Petitions for nominees to Council and committees require the signatures of fifty members of the Association. The signatures of one hundred members are required to nominate candidates for other offices.

The complete set of candidates selected by the Committee on Nominations is presented below:

PRESIDENT-ELECT

Seymour Lipset, Stanford University

Charles V. Willie, Harvard University

VICE PRESIDENT-ELECT

Joan Moore, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Rita J. Simon, University of Illinois-Urbana

SECRETARY-ELECT

Theodore Caplow, University of

Virginia

Irwin Deutscher, University of Akron

COUNCIL

Michael Aiken, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Rodolfo Alvarez, University of California-Los Angeles

Amitai Etzioni, George Washington University

Allen Grimshaw, Indiana University

Ruth S. Hamilton, Michigan State

University

Rosabeth Kanter, Yale University

William T. Liu, University of

Illinois-Chicago Circle

Howard Schuman, University of Michigan

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS

Aaron Cicourel, University of California-San Diego

Norval Glenn, University of Texas-Austin

See *Candidates Page 12*

Council Unable to Act on Complaint Against Brandeis

At its first meeting in September 1980, the 1981 ASA Council received a series of recommendations from the Committee on Freedom of Research and Teaching (COFRAT) concerning a case involving Professor Richard Cloward and Brandeis University. COFRAT had previously accepted the case and a subcommittee of Lewis M. Killian, Chair, and Barbara Laslett had investigated for COFRAT.

Cloward, despite the unanimous recommendation of the Faculty of the Florence Heller School of Advanced Studies, has not been offered an appointment at Brandeis. The subcommittee was hampered by its inability to obtain full disclosure in its investigation and recommended that Council make another attempt to obtain information critical to the case. The subcommittee recommended and the full committee and Council agreed to send a letter to the President of Brandeis University indicating that:

"In view of the secrecy which surrounds Brandeis' personnel procedures in the case of Professor Richard Cloward, the Association is unable to conclude that discrimination against him did not occur. We are prepared to reconsider this conclusion under the following circumstances:

That an investigatory subcommittee from COFRAT return to Brandeis University for a second site visit under conditions of full disclosure. This would include: (1) access to the outside letters of evaluation received as part of the review process and to the three reports submitted by members of the Ad Hoc Committee to the President of Brandeis University; (2) interviews with all members of the Ad Hoc Committee about their de-

liberations and the criteria used to reach their recommendations; and (3) re-interviews with Dean Goldstein and President Bernstein which are unhampered by the reservations which confidentiality imposed during the original site visit.

It is only under these conditions that it will be possible to remove the reservations of the Committee and, as widely expressed among members of the academic community, others, that inappropriate, political criteria were used in deciding to deny Professor Cloward an appointment at the Heller School. The anonymity of individuals, excluding the Administrative Officers to whom reference has already been made, will be strictly maintained in reporting the results of this second, proposed site visit investigation.

Furthermore, we recommend that Brandeis adopt procedures which will reduce, in future, the secrecy that currently exists by: (a) making the contents of a candidate's evaluations available to him/her and (b) adopting an "open information" policy in relation to investigatory bodies of recognized professional associations, such as COFRAT."

Such a letter was sent to the President and, since the recommendations were not accepted by Brandeis, Council in its last meeting, August 27th, 1981, recommended that publication of that request be made public in *FOOTNOTES* and the non-compliance of Brandeis be indicated. As such, COFRAT is unable to conclude that discrimination against Professor Cloward did not occur. A full text of the report of the subcommittee report is available from the Executive Office.

COSSA Shows Interdisciplinary Cooperation is Effective; Long-term Commitment Needed

The successful effort which was mobilized to respond to the severe cuts in social science research support may prove to have lasting value to the cooperating groups. That cooperative effort by the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA) has already established credibility on the national science scene and, within the limits of the political climate, it has been successful in making the case for the social sciences.

The Consortium and its activities represent a departure from traditional activities of most associations which focus on publishing journals and holding annual meetings. In the past, few disciplinary associations have been able to undertake for their members what COSSA is undertaking in the name of several associations.

The problems which lead to the activation of COSSA in the spring

have not abated and show no signs of disappearing in the near future. While the original impetus centered on federal support for social science research, the problem is much larger than that issue. The issue more properly is seen as the worth of the social sciences, and social scientists, within a society which is dependent on knowledge. The issue, then, is wider than research budgets, although these are important symbolically, and in effect, centers on the validity of social science itself. Such a basic attack on social science demands a permanent presence for the social sciences in Washington, particularly since other scientific and professional groups are already organized. Without the continuity of a broad-based organization, social scientists will continue to be at a disadvantage when re-

search budgets are considered, when science policy is made, or when the relevance of knowledge for policy is discussed. Consequently, those who have been involved in COSSA's cooperative effort feel that it is important to sustain the momentum that has been built up over the past six months.

At the present time, the COSSA Executive Committee is working with various disciplinary associations to develop ways to continue support for the effort. Each cooperating association, including ASA, will be asked to contribute its fair share. In addition to the basic disciplinary associations, a number of other associations with social science membership have indicated their willingness to provide continued support.

See *COSSA Page 8*

Needed Research in the Sociology of Age

Matilda White Riley,
Associate Director,
National Institute on Aging

The 1970s have seen the burgeoning of basic social research toward better understanding of the processes of growing older and the place of older people in society. Two years ago at the ASA Annual Meeting, I described preliminary phases in the progress of research on age and aging, reaching the current phase of model specification and testing. Now, looking ahead through the 1980s, formulation and testing of hypotheses in two largely neglected but promising areas of

aging research demand special attention: (1) at the interface between individual aging and social change and (2) at the interface between biological aging and social and psychological aging.

Research in the second area—at the biological interface—is compatible with current political imperatives. But, far more important, research in both areas is potentially responsive to a basic sociological imperative: such research is necessary to a fuller scientific understanding of both aging (in the lives of individuals who are moving through society) and social change (as these lives are affecting society).

See *Challenges Page 10*

Handicapped Services Comments Wanted

Interpreters for the deaf were provided at several sessions at the recent Annual Meeting in Toronto. The ASA Council would like reactions to this service and information about other services that handicapped members need in connection with the meetings.

Please send your comments and suggestions regarding additional services to: Russell R. Dynes, American Sociological Association, 1722 N Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

Season's Greetings

A Commentary

Gutting Affirmative Action—New Policy in Action

by Bettina J. Huber

Moving from the West Coast to the East Coast, as I have done recently, is difficult in some respects. But, coming to Washington has its virtues. The city's beauty and liveliness compensate for the lack of California sunshine. And, being in the nation's capital does give one the sense, illusory though it may be, of having a personal voice in how the country is run. But being in the thick of it has its drawbacks, too. In particular, it is hard to overlook unpleasant new trends in government policy. As a result, I have become uncomfortably aware of the Reagan Administration's multi-pronged attack on affirmative action, since arriving here. Observing the seemingly inexorable process has been the most depressing feature of being in Washington this Fall.

Of course, the budget cuts were announced long before I came to Washington, and their negative effect on minorities and women has been well-known for some time. Although key programs, such as Head Start, were never in jeopardy, and the final 1982 appropriations passed by Congress were not as draconian as the initial proposals, both women and minorities were hard hit by the budget cuts. At the National Science Foundation (NSF), for example, the Science Education Pro-

grams were left entirely unfunded, as was the newly-established Women in Science program. In addition, a number of new programs designed to commensurate in 1981 had to be scrapped, due to lack of funds. Further, women and minorities will be disproportionately affected by the drastic cuts in student loan monies, while the cutbacks suffered by EEOC, the Office of Civil Rights and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance will make it even more difficult to have complaints of discrimination remedied.

In spite of this, one could still argue that the current economic crisis necessitated such budget reductions, and so hope for continued remedial action in other areas could be sustained. Moreover, on arriving in Washington, I discovered that some federal agencies are trying to devise means of pursuing affirmative action, despite the cutbacks. In the case of NSF, individual directorates were asked to provide training opportunities for women and minorities, when special agency-wide programs fell victim to the budget axe. Although unquestionably well-intentioned, such a strategy has serious drawbacks, since what is accomplished depends entirely on the commitment and good will of those running the individual directorates. To judge by recent discussion at a meeting of the NSF Committee on

Equal Opportunity in Science, some of the agency leaders will be a great deal less responsive than others. And, despite good intentions and diligent effort, the members of the blue ribbon equal opportunity committee ultimately lack the power to change the policies of recalcitrant directorates. In consequence, despite valiant efforts by many, the budget cuts will ultimately impede the ability of NSF to provide vitally needed training programs for women and minorities.

Add to this the Administration's recent proposals for altering both Title IX and the affirmative action guidelines of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, and one cannot avoid concluding that a full-scale effort to dismantle the federal affirmative action program is in full swing. Title IX, which is designed to insure equal opportunity for both men and women in all areas of education, is under attack on several fronts. First, the Education Department recently proposed that Title IX be restricted to discrimination against students, and not encompass the employment practices of educational institutions as well. Fortunately, the Justice Department did not support this move, largely because it would have meant an embarrassing reversal of the policy of past administrations, both Republican and Democratic. But the issue is by no means settled, as

Orrin Hatch, the Republican Chair of the Senate Labor Committee, has introduced legislation that incorporates the Education Department proposals.

Another feature of Title IX that is under attack is the section dealing with sex discrimination in school athletic programs. Long a controversial issue at the university level, current guidelines are under review by Vice President Bush's Task Force on Regulatory Reform. Also under review are the new EEOC guidelines on sexual harassment, largely because employers have complained of their supposedly vague wording. Even before the task force review is complete, policy is being changed, at least in the case of Title IX. This came to light in recent Education Department action with regard to the University of Hawaii at Manoa. Despite substantial inequities in athletic opportunities for men and women, the school's program was ruled to be in compliance with Title IX because the university administration came up with a plan for remedying disparities within "a reasonable period of time". The Department of Education refers to its new approach as a "cooperative one", characterizing earlier policy as too confrontational, but cynics might label it "talk and no action".

By far, the most comprehensive assault on affirmative action has come in the form of new

guidelines for the Office of Federal Contract Compliance. Released in late August, the proposals will become policy sometime after the period reserved for public comment ended on October 26th. According to a September 7th article in *Time*, "Government officials privately describe the new rules as an attempt to test how far it is politically safe for the Administration to proceed toward abandoning the current concept of affirmative action." A key effect of the new policies will be to drastically reduce the number of contractors required to prepare written affirmative action plans. This would be accomplished by two mechanisms requiring written plans of contractors employing at least 250 workers and having a \$1 million contract, rather than of those with 50 or more employees and \$50,000 in contracts; and abandoning the current practice of aggregating contracts for purposes of determining who must file plans. Thus, employers with millions of dollars in federal contracts, but no single million dollar grant, would no longer have to prepare affirmative action plans. The Department of Labor estimates that 75 percent of those contractors currently filing affirmative action plans would be exempt under the new regulations. Among universities an even higher proportion would be exempt, according to an

See Proposed Page 3

THE JOSSEY-BASS SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE SERIES

William R. Meyers
THE EVALUATION ENTERPRISE

William R. Meyers
THE EVALUATION ENTERPRISE

A Realistic Appraisal of Evaluation Careers, Methods, and Applications

Program evaluators and evaluation sponsors are persistently plagued by a number of difficult issues concerning evaluation careers, roles, funding, methods, and the nature of the programs being studied. These issues are crucial to effective evaluation practice, yet they are not adequately covered in most evaluation materials. In his new book, William Meyers remedies this deficiency by

(1) taking a realistic — and often skeptical — view of traditional evaluation concepts and procedures, (2) emphasizing the hard practical problems that evaluators encounter, as well as the technical expertise required, and (3) offering a wealth of specific suggestions for resolving these problems.

Meyers tackles such difficult questions as: *How do programs function — and why do they fail? What should evaluation accomplish? How can evaluators build productive careers? How should clients choose and guide evaluators? What alternatives are there to costly field experimentation? What are the most effective uses of qualitative and quantitative data? How valuable are complicated analytic tools?*

Drawing on his nearly twenty years of evaluation experience as an industrial consultant, federal research administrator, and university professor, Meyers provides a frank appraisal of the current status and problems of program evaluation. He presents a realistic view of what evaluations can and cannot achieve, discusses how professionals can attain a competitive advantage in the marketplace, and offers practical suggestions for coping with contracts and grants. He presents innovative approaches for avoiding the "goal trap," illustrates the utility of analytic experimentation, and explains how program managers can facilitate the evaluation effort. Meyers' insights will assist all evaluation professionals — and their clients — in making their efforts both productive and satisfying.

October 1981, \$15.95

Reanalyzing Program Evaluations

Robert F. Boruch, Paul M. Wortman, David S. Cordray, and Associates

REANALYZING PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

Policies and Practices for Secondary Analysis of Social and Educational Programs

Evaluations designed to measure the impact of social and educational programs typically involve large investments of time and money — and often result in findings that no one can use. Fortunately, there is now a technique for retrieving valuable information from past evaluations, including those that initially misfired. *Secondary analysis* — the systematic reanalyzing of existing information and findings — provides a means of greatly increasing the usefulness of evaluation data by (1) verifying the credibility of earlier findings, (2) testing new hypotheses, (3) trying out new methods of analysis on data that are well understood, and (4) clarifying the conclusions and judgments that may be reached from data. In its detailed treatment of the technique, this new book will enable all evaluation professionals to gain the knowledge and skills necessary for using secondary analysis successfully in their work.

Reanalyzing Program Evaluations brings together experienced professionals from a variety of disciplines — sociology, psychology, education, and economics — who together offer a comprehensive guide to secondary analysis. The twenty-two chapters are systematically arranged in four parts, each one addressing a major issue of secondary analysis. Part One discusses the difficulty of obtaining data and describes the position of federal agencies regarding access to data. Part Two addresses the problem of insufficient documentation of the original analysis and provides detailed guidelines for documenting computerized data. Part Three is concerned with the methodological problems that can impede reanalysis and explains the use of various analytic tools. The final section presents nine case studies that exemplify the diversity in function and type of secondary analysis.

September 1981, \$19.95

Proposed Guidelines Allow Many Exemptions

(continued from page 2)

analysis by the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL). Of the 272 colleges and universities required to file written plans in 1980, approximately 20 percent would continue to do so under the new regulations. According to WEAL, those who would become exempt include Yale, Tufts, Brown, Duke, the University of Michigan, the University of Arizona, and the University of Southern California.¹ Further, even in situations where affirmative action plans are still mandatory, a compliance review would no longer be required before the contract is awarded, and an institution would be exempt for five years once such a review is completed. In short, under the new regulations, the written affirmative action plan would no longer be the effective means of self-evaluation that it has been in the recent past. This is particularly unfortunate for universities, since faculty hiring and promotion decisions rest on relatively subjective considerations.

Even under the new regulations, complaints by employees could be investigated at any time. These could not be filed in class action terms, however, since third party complaints would have to include the names of all employees alleging discriminatory treatment. Presumably, the theory behind this approach is that employees receiving unfairly low wages, for example, are not subject to discrimination, as long as they lack the relevant information to be aware of this, or accept prevailing conditions out of necessity. Further, those speaking out against unfair treatment would no longer be protected against retaliation by employers. And, therefore, the new procedures would unquestionably prevent the many workers who cannot afford to put their jobs in jeopardy, from filing complaints of discrimination. The new emphasis on naming names is apparently government-wide. In recent testimony before the House Subcommittee on Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action, William Bradford Williams, Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, stated that the Justice Department will seek relief only for those specifically identified as victims of discrimination. As the class action approach is considered "unsound" by current Justice Department officials, goals and timetables will no longer be required in employment discrimination suits.² Active efforts to recruit minorities and women will suffice. This new approach has already been put into practice, as a recent consent decree entered into by the Justice Department and the New Hampshire state police illustrates.³

Although the new orientation at the Justice Department appears to be firmly entrenched, the new affirmative action guidelines are not. Further, they have generated considerable negative reaction. Congressional committees have

been very critical of the proposals, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has objected to certain sections. In addition, various women's and minority groups have taken advantage of the opportunity to file critical public comment. Moreover, the Administration's view that an extensive affirmative action program is no longer necessary, because voluntary action by business will eliminate remaining discrimination, is not widely shared. A recent survey of corporate executives found considerable disagreement about what effect the new affirmative action regulations would have, but almost all agreed that government policy affects commitment to equal opportunity programs.⁴ In the absence of government pressure, voluntary action appears unlikely, therefore. Such negative evidence, and all the critical comment, may have little effect, however. What with some businessmen grumbling that the revision of affirmative action policy does not go far enough⁵, and university administrators gleefully anticipating an end to regulation⁶, it is all too likely that the arguments favoring affirmative action will fall on deaf ears.

If the new regulations become policy in their current form, the federal government's affirmative action program will be a dead letter, for all practical purposes. Should this occur, the burden of proof will fall on those powerful white males, neo-Conservatives and neo-Marxists alike, who have continuously asserted that they are unbiased, and that if only there were less government interference, women and minorities would be incorporated into university faculties with far greater ease. These men, be they at Harvard, Berkeley, or at less prestigious institutions, will now have to live up to their bold assertions by taking the lead in voluntarily perpetuating affirmative action programs. Of course, a skeptic like myself assumes they will play this role more enthusiastically if a little judicious pressure is applied. And it is the powerless affirmative action advocates of all races, colors

and genders who must devise means of exerting such pressure in an era of federal inaction. This means forming broad-based local coalitions dedicated to keeping the issue of affirmative action alive on individual campuses by continually pressing departments and university administrations for concrete progress in achieving greater equity. It is a daunting task, requiring far wider participation and cooperation than has been evident in the past. Unless attacked with vigor on campuses all over the country, however, women and minorities will find themselves relegated to the fringes of academia once again.

Responses to the above as letters or in a format suitable for OPEN FORUM are invited.

Footnotes

¹ There is some debate about whether all of these schools, especially Yale, lack a one million dollar contract. Should the new regulations be adopted, however, \$999,999 grant proposals will undoubtedly become legion.

² Lorenzo Middleton, "U.S. Enforcement of Anti-Bias Laws Will Focus on 'Identifiable Victims'," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 23 (September 30, 1981): 13.

³ "Justice Department Eases Remedies for Settling Job Bias Suits," *The Washington Post*, September 18, 1981, p. A5.

⁴ *Manpower Comments*, 18 (October, 1981): 5.

⁵ See page 9 of "Every Man for Himself," *Time*, September 7, 1981.

⁶ See "Plans to Limit Paperwork of Anti-Bias Laws Praised by Colleges, But Other Effects Feared," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 23 (September 9, 1981): 9.

Administration's Budget Threatens Fulbright Program

The latest round of administrative budget cuts threatens to curtail sharply, or abolish, several of the U.S.'s leading international education and cultural exchange programs, in particular, the Fulbright program. The Fulbright program is administered by the International Communications Agency which is funded as a part of the overall State Department budget. The administration has suggested a cut of \$171 million in the overall budget. Among the most severely affected programs would be the Fulbright program which provides grants for graduate study, teaching and research on an exchange basis with other countries.

According to an internal ICA document, the agency would cut the Fulbright programs 53 percent below the original budget figure and the current exchanges with 120 nations would be cut to 59, ending most programs in the Third World. The ICA internal memorandum says, "The agency has decided to allocate a major share of the reductions to the exchange programs on the assumption that a significant part of this very valuable grant program can be deferred for a year or two and can be rebuilt more readily than our more staff-intensive programs".

In addition, the cuts would also mean the elimination of counseling and orientation programs for some 300,000 foreign students studying in the U.S. and a 50 percent reduction in the number of grants for international visitors to the United States. Such programs in the past have brought many

young foreign leaders to the U.S. early in their careers.

Fulbright programs have also been a major means for U.S. sociologists to gain international experience and to establish continuing contact with colleagues in other countries. According to estimates presented in FOOTNOTES in November 1978, close to 600 sociologists over the years have participated in various Fulbright exchange programs and much of the continuing network of contacts among sociologists around the world had their origin in relationships established by the Fulbright programs.

Some Congressional leaders, such as Rep. Dante B. Fascell (Florida), have expressed hope that some programs might be protected when the House bill goes into conference with the Senate in November. Fascell, who heads the Subcommittee on International Operations of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, has been a long-time supporter of the program. On the other hand, the cuts strongly suggest that the administration, under the guise of economy, is shifting the focus of international relations toward increased military expenditures while reducing cultural and educational contacts. A number of current world leaders, themselves former Fulbrighters, have begun to point out the shortsightedness of that approach. They have been joined by a large number of U.S. leaders in international education who project the future costs of the elimination of the programs to be much greater than the immediate savings.

Tenth World Congress Set for Mexico City: August 16-21, 1982

The Tenth World Congress of Sociology will be held in Mexico City, August 16-21, 1982. It is anticipated that a large number of ASA members will be attending that meeting.

The Association has been working with Association Travel Coordinators, 3128 M Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20007, (202) 333-1800, in developing travel arrangements to the World Congress. While a variety of possibilities will be available, an inclusive tour fare which combines air costs and hotel accommodations would seem to provide considerable savings from most points in the U.S. When those arrangements are completed, their availability will be indicated in FOOTNOTES.

In addition, it is likely that the ASA will have a grant from NSF which will provide a limited number of partial travel grants for those who have official participation in the meetings. Again, details of the application process will be announced in FOOTNOTES as

soon as the grant procedures are final.

In making plans to attend the World Congress and in making travel arrangements, members should remember that the Annual Meeting of the ASA will be held soon after, September 6-10, in San Francisco. We would hope to see you there.

NEH Publishes Application Deadlines

The National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) has published grant application deadlines for 1982-83 in a comprehensive annual program overview now available for distribution.

The brochure, "An Overview of Endowment Programs for 1982-83," concisely explains how NEH grants are awarded, describes the agency's principal grant-making programs, lists the areas it funds, and details eligibility requirements for grant applicants.

Grant application deadlines through 1983 are presented by program for the agency's six divisions and its Office of Planning and Policy Assessment. NEH grant-making divisions are: Edu-

cation Programs, Fellowships and Seminars, Public Programs (libraries, media, museums and historical organizations), Research Programs, Special Programs and State Programs.

Some NEH programs may expand or contract depending upon final Congressional action on the fiscal '82 budget. Programs for '83 will be similarly affected by action on that year's budget request to be submitted to Congress next spring.

Copies of the NEH "Overview" may be obtained on request without charge from: Public Affairs Office, NEH, 806 15th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20506. Telephone: (202) 724-0386.

NEW!
A History of the
ASA

Members—\$3.00
Non-members—\$5.00
Order pre-paid from the ASA

JHSB Editorial Address Change

Beginning on January 1, 1982, please send contributions to the *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* to:

Leonard I. Pearlin, Editor
Journal of Health & Social Behavior
Human Development & Aging Program
University of California
745 Parnassus Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94143

Federal Funding for the Social Sciences: Threats and Responses

by Kenneth Prewitt
and David L. Sills*

The Public Announcement on February 18, 1981 that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) was proposing drastic cuts in the NSF budgets for social science research sent shock waves through the social science community. Although basic research budgets for the National Science Foundation were still scheduled for funding increases in FY 82, according to the OMB's so-called "black book," social, behavioral, and economic research in NSF's Directorate for Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences (BBS) was slated for massive budget cuts in both FY 81 and FY 82. For FY 82, OMB requested a 75 percent reduction in the budget for NSF's Social and Economic Science Division, and within the Behavioral and Neural Sciences Division, a 66 percent reduction in the anthropology program and a 60 percent reduction in the cognitive and behavioral science research program. The rationale provided by OMB for these proposed reductions in funding was simply that "the support of these sciences is considered of relatively lesser importance to the economy than the support of the natural sciences" (*Additional Details on Budget Savings*, Executive Office of the President, OMB, April 1981).

Regardless of how these proposed cuts in the NSF (and other federal social science research) budgets were interpreted, they set in motion a train of events that is perhaps unprecedented in the history of the social sciences. Because many Council committee and board members, past and present, were active in these events, and because the issues underlying the ensuing dispute—such as the "usefulness" of basic research—are central to all the social sciences, a substantial portion of this issue of *Items* is devoted to publishing excerpts from letters, testimony, and resolutions, as well as sufficient commentary to guide the reader through the excerpts. Hundreds of thousands of words were written or published in the period of six months or so encompassed by this review, and we are able to publish only a small sample of them.

Ashbrook Amendment Recalled

Federal funding for social science research declined in real dollars during the 1970s, but certain critics in the Congress nevertheless attacked individual projects—attacks that sensitized social scientists to the fragility of legislative appropriations for social science research. The most publicized critic was Senator William Proxmire (D-Wisconsin), whose "Golden Fleece" awards were occasionally conferred upon social science research projects. The "Golden Fleece" mentality, that is, the belief that federally-sponsored social science research is inept, dangerous, or driven principally by a desire to extract money from the government, also dominated much of the debate in the House of Representatives over authorizations for the National

Science Foundation.

During 1978, 1979, and 1980, Representative John M. Ashbrook (R-Ohio) cited many examples of grants that displeased him; accordingly, he proposed amendments to decrease spending for NSF's Directorate for Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences (BBS)—amendments that were aimed specifically at the social sciences within BBS. The 1978 Ashbrook amendment was defeated. In 1979, however, the amendment was unexpectedly adopted by the House, but its provisions were removed in conference with the Senate. In 1980, the by-then traditional Ashbrook amendment called for smaller decreases than expected, and its effect was diffused by actions of Representative George E. Brown, Jr. (D-California), then chairman of the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, which began in the late 1970s to play an increasingly important role in defense of the social sciences.

Overall, social science funding has not been a major issue in Congress in recent years, and social science issues attracted the attention of only a small minority of members. Among them, however, were both tireless supporters and tireless detractors of the social sciences, and by the beginning of 1981, the roles and the arguments of each were well established. The Ashbrook amendments had thus set a framework for congressional treatment of social science issues.

The Congressional Response

Congressional opposition to the Administration's proposal first surfaced in the hearings held on March 12 by the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology. In previous years, when social science research funding had been threatened by the Ashbrook amendment, this subcommittee emerged as the major source of support for the social sciences. In 1981, Representative Doug Walgren (D-Pennsylvania) replaced Mr. Brown as chairman of the subcommittee and continued the subcommittee's tradition of leadership in this area. At the hearings, Mr. Walgren invited a number of social scientists to testify before the subcommittee. (Excerpts from the testimony are printed below.) Throughout the authorization process, both Mr. Walgren and Mr. Brown continued to lead the Congress in opposition to the disproportionate cuts requested by the Administration for social science research.

The July 21 Debate and Vote

The first major congressional debate on the Reagan Administration's proposals for budget cuts in social and behavioral science research took place on July 21, 1981. The occasion was the debate on the House appropriations for the National Science Foundation, which included an increase of \$70 million over the Administration's request. Among other changes, the proposed appropriation would have restored \$45 million to research and related activities at

the National Science Foundation. The report of the Appropriations Committee stipulated that the total amount would be divided among the three directorates facing disproportionate budget cuts. One of these was the Directorate for Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences. However, Representative Larry Winn, Jr. (R-Kansas), ranking minority member of the House Committee on Science and Technology, introduced an amendment to reduce the appropriation to the original Reagan Administration level, a reduction that would seriously endanger the Foundation's programs in social and behavioral science research. After an extended debate, and a rare show of opposition to the Administration, the amendment was defeated by a 112-vote margin (152 for; 264 against). The opposition included 69 Republicans. This vote, although important, did not of course by itself resolve all of the complicated issues involved in federal support for social science research. Yet it did signal an important positive shift in congressional support for the social sciences—and a broadening of that support as well.

For this reason, the debate on the measure is as important as the vote, and is significant for two reasons. First, there was broad bipartisan support for greater funding for the behavioral and social science programs of the National Science Foundation. This was apparent several days before the debate. A "Dear Colleague" letter to congressmen was sent jointly by Representative Edward P. Boland (D-Massachusetts) and Representative Bill Green (R-New York), chairman and ranking Republican, respectively, of the Appropriations Subcommittee on HUD and Independent Agencies. In addition, a second letter was sent by three Democrats, Representatives George E. Brown, Jr. (California), Doug Walgren (Pennsylvania), and Don Fuqua (Florida), and three Republicans, Representatives Jim Dunn (Michigan), Carl D. Pursell (Michigan), and Harold "Cap" Hollenbeck (New Jersey). A third letter was sent to members of the House by Representative Lawrence J. DeNardis (R-Connecticut). Debate on the appropriation, which lasted several hours, was similarly bipartisan, and was led initially by Representative Bill Green (R-New York), ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

A second aspect of the debate worth noting was the general tenor of the discussion. In sharp contrast to earlier debates on the Ashbrook amendment, there was little reference to "foolish" research, to inappropriate or special interest research, or to research which merely confirms common sense. Instead, the congressmen who spoke appeared to understand both the need for maintaining a strong research base in the social, behavioral, and economic sciences and the nature of some of the research currently under way. Throughout the debate, the message that the nation needs to main-

tain, not curtail, support for social science research was repeatedly delivered. Even those who supported the amendment—with one exception—based their arguments on fiscal considerations, not on issues of scientific merit.

A number of themes emerged in the course of the debate. Some representatives noted that the social sciences are as scientific as the physical sciences. Carl D. Pursell (R-Michigan), for example, said that any research activity can be criticized, but asked if this was a justification for singling out the social science activities of the Foundation. He answered his own question:

"A close review of the record suggests not. The quality of social science research supported by the Foundation was intensively examined some years ago by a committee of the National Academy of Sciences, headed by the Nobel laureate, Dr. Herbert Simon. The committee concluded that the quality of the social science research program fully met prevailing NSF standards."

As further evidence, he cited the April 28 resolution of the National Academy of Sciences (cited below).

"More recently, scientists in the Academy (most of whom are not social or behavioral scientists) passed a resolution with virtual unanimity affirming the critical importance of social and behavioral science research."

Other opponents of the Winn amendment objected on the grounds that Administration attacks upon the social sciences endanger the democratic process. For example, Representative Ronald V. Dellums (D-California):

"We have struck a significant blow at our representative, democratic form of government if we impeded the capacity of a society to think. We have an obligation here on the floor of this Congress to think and to plan and to project and to analyze and to evaluate and to come up with new and exciting ideas. But we debate this amendment as if it is cutting \$70 million in a vacuum. We are not cutting \$70 million in a vacuum. It is terribly important that we understand the practical effects of what we are doing here. We cannot discuss all of these matters as if they are purely numbers games. I am saying to the Members that if we are going to cut \$70 million from anywhere, do not cut our capacity to continue to engage in basic social science/behavioral research."

A similar note was struck by Representative Bob Traxler (D-Michigan):

"Our committee's modest increase protects the hard sciences and, additionally, helps to maintain efforts in the biological, behavioral, and social sciences, an area where OMB made drastic, ideological, and completely disproportionate cuts.

The restorations we are providing in this bill will allow us to maintain data bases and studies of our society that are critical to sound, intelligent public policymaking."

Representative Traxler went on

to list the issues facing the Congress: inflation, productivity, aging, the drift to the Sun Belt, sluggish rates of savings and capital formation, and barriers to innovation:

"The list is endless, and it should be clear that simplistic, ideological solutions cannot work. The formation of public policy to deal with these problems depends upon the vitality of the social, behavioral, and economic science research programs within the NSF. Cutting these programs in the name of reducing the size of the public sector is a little like slimming down an overweight giant by removing his eyes, ears, and brain."

And Representative Jim Leach (R-Iowa) reminded the House of the effects on the Soviet Union of the politicization of its science:

"Today, Soviet agricultural practices are obsolete, their health technologies limited, and their behavioral and biological sciences profoundly skewed by the prejudices of a narrow political philosophy. Politicization of scientific inquiry has stunted economic and social progress in the Soviet Union and, perhaps more importantly, led to the stultification of free thought and free inquiry."

Much of the support that developed during the debate was on what many believe to be the heart of the issue: the importance of basic, nontarget research for the conduct and problem-solving ability of a democratic society. Representative Lawrence J. DeNardis (R-Connecticut) expressed this as inherent in the mission of the National Science Foundation:

"I regard support for the biological, behavioral, and social sciences, including social and economic science, a critical responsibility of the National Science Foundation."

The Winn amendment, according to Representative Leach, would pose a threat to the development of a rational science policy for the United States:

"The National Science Foundation bears a unique responsibility among Federal agencies for the health and well-being of basic scientific research in America. To eliminate virtually all remaining NSF support for the behavioral and social sciences carries grave consequences for our society. The health of our citizens, our commercial vitality, and our national security are directly dependent upon our command of fundamental scientific knowledge. The challenge posed by the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas to the worth of behavioral, social, and economic research raises unsettling questions as to what our national science policy is, and how it is decided. Budgetary dispositions, after all, should be consistent with a policy for science, and not presume to redirect it."

In his opinion, scientists themselves should set research priorities. Citing the examples of the code of autism being broken by research on pigeons, and of the effects of drugs upon memory and learning being known through

Associations Organize and Effectively Protest Cuts

animal research, he drew an important conclusion:

"These stories are important ones because they tell us an important truth about basic science. We seldom know what its outcomes will be or from where discoveries will be made, but we do know that basic science is fundamental to the economic and social progress of our country. This is why we must maintain a balance in our investment in science. This is also why scientists rather than Congressmen should determine research priorities and why professional peer groups rather than political peer groups should take final responsibility for allocating the limited scientific resources provided by Congress."

The relevance of social and behavioral research for competing with and learning from other industrial nations, with the goal of increasing national productivity, was also noted. Representative Bob Traxler (D-Michigan) stressed the need to compete with Japan and Germany:

"This committee by and large subscribed to the Reagan recommendation. However, we did restore \$70 million, which is now being attempted to be taken away, and I oppose that, because in my opinion these further cuts of \$70 million would begin to erode this basic scientific base which we are going to have to maintain if this Nation is going to be one of the foremost technological nations in the world. We cannot compete with our competitors in Japan or West Germany or, for that matter, with the Russians if we do not have these kinds of basic scientific research commitments."

Representative Dave McCurdy (D-Oklahoma) focused on the problem of productivity:

"The problem of productivity must be addressed before full economic recovery can be reached. However, for productivity to be adequately addressed we need to look not only at major capital investments, but also the human side of the problem. It is the behavioral, social, and economic sciences that will provide these solutions: Individual human motivation, personal productivity, worker satisfaction, and adjustments to economic, environmental, and social changes. These are some of the human issues behind the productivity problem. These also are the issues for which the NSF's social and economic research programs provide the basic knowledge. We must continue to build on that knowledge by investing in quality research."

And Representative Margaret M. Heckler (R-Massachusetts) recalled that the Japanese had earlier learned important lessons from American social science:

"Critical national problems of the 1980's such as productivity and energy have major social and economic elements, making economic research a vital necessity. The Japanese application of social science principles, mainly of American origin, to problems of industrial management illustrates

how innovation in social organization for manufacturing and marketing can lead to increased productivity and economic gain. Important enterprises are now built around economic forecasting, cost/benefit analysis, demographic projections, survey research, management science, public relations, and consumer research."

An Interpretation of Congressional Support

The bipartisan support and the informed nature of this debate were welcomed by social scientists. How did this change come about? Instant interpretations of historical events are of course risky, and will not be made here, but there were a number of events and actions between the February budget proposals and the July debate that should be described and documented. At first, social scientists, with help from their colleagues in the physical sciences, spoke out against the proposed cuts, in letters, telegrams, testimony, and in person, to those who might influence the final budget levels. By April, social scientists were beginning to work through existing organizations and were even creating new ones to influence Congress in its deliberations and decisions on social science research budgets. We cannot recount here more than a fraction of the activities and arguments made on behalf of the social sciences, but we hope that what is presented will make readers aware of the important accomplishments of this six-month period.

The materials presented here fall into three categories. First, there is a description of the activities of the social science associations, which played a major organizational role in influencing congressional opinion. Second, there are excerpts from (a) the testimony that social scientists and others presented at congressional and other hearings in Washington and (b) the letters that were sent by social scientists and others either to congressmen directly or to others who would in turn seek to influence congressional opinion. Finally, there are excerpts from the statements of support made by the nation's three most important science organizations—the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), the board of directors of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), and the National Science Board (NSB), the governing body of the National Science Foundation.

Social Science Associations Made Individual Protests More Effective

As soon as the proposed cuts in the NSF budget were announced, both individual social scientists and the social science associations began to protest. These protests took many forms. Most associations informed their members—through a newsletter or a special mailing—of the proposed cuts, urging them to write and/or telephone members of Congress. For

example, on April 1, Lawrence M. Friedman, a Professor of Law at Stanford and President of the Law and Society Association (LSA), sent the following message to the membership.

"The government proposes, but it only disposes in conjunction with Congress. I want to urge you, as members of LSA, to speak out on this issue. Make your voices heard. Write to your Congressman, and to the relevant heads of important Congressional Committees. Write to your Senators; write to members of the Administration. The Labor and Human Resources Committee of the Senate has authorization power over NSF; its Chair is Senator Orrin Hatch, Republican of Utah. The Chair of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on HUD and Independent Agencies, which appropriates funds for NSF, is Senator Jake Garn, Republican of Utah. In the House, the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology of the Committee on Science and Technology has authorization power over NSF; its Chair is Congressman Doug Walgren, Democrat of Pennsylvania. The Chair of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on HUD and Independent Agencies, which appropriates money for NSF, is Congressman Edward Boland, Democrat of Massachusetts.

"The Law and Society Association does not normally take a stand on political or social issues. Our membership is too diverse for that. If there is one thing that unites us, however, it must be our belief that our work is worthwhile, that what we do is deserving of continued public support. We would be willing to do our share in the face of financial crisis; but we are not willing to be thrown overboard as useless baggage, at the first hint of rising winds."

Similar messages were sent out through the various disciplinary association newsletters. The Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research contacted all of its members, urging them to speak out. And the Social Science Research Council wrote to its board members and to many of the scholars serving on its committees.

Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA)—An important role in these associational activities was played by the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), an informal coalition of the various social and behavioral science disciplinary associations. COSSA representatives have met irregularly since the late 1960s to discuss issues common to their associations. Current members include the American Anthropological Association, the American Economic Association, the American Historical Association, the American Political Science Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Sociological Association, the American Statistical Association, the Association of American Geographers, the Association of American Law

Schools, and the Linguistic Society of America.

By April 1981, COSSA recognized that without concerted action by the community of social and behavioral scientists, social science research budgets were not only likely to remain at the low levels requested by the Administration—they might also be cut even further in the next fiscal year (FY 83). Late in the month, COSSA decided to establish a Washington office to work both with Congress and with social scientists in opposition to the proposed budget cuts. Roberta Balstad Miller, a historian on the staff of the Washington office of the Social Science Research Council, was granted a leave of absence and was hired by COSSA to direct the effort; Joan Buchanan, formerly with the White House Conference on Aging, also joined the COSSA staff on a full-time basis. The COSSA staff was assisted by an advisory group of four executive officers: Russell R. Dynes, American Sociological Association; Patricia J. McWethy, Association of American Geographers; Thomas E. Mann, American Political Science Association; and Michael S. Pallak, American Psychological Association.

It was decided initially that COSSA should focus its attention on the budgets of four agencies: the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Institute of Education, and the National Institute of Mental Health.

In practice, COSSA gave greatest attention during the late spring and early summer to the budget of the National Science Foundation. This emphasis was important symbolically and practically. NSF is a major funder of basic research in all the social science disciplines and it is the only federal agency charged with responsibility for the health and vitality of the social and behavioral sciences themselves. Moreover, the requested budget cuts for the Directorate for Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences (BBS) were the most severe of all social science research budget cuts.

Early decisions by social scientists and, independently, the Congress, to press for greater NSF and National Science Board participation in budget allocations meant that officials at the Foundation became nearly as important as the Congress in determining social and behavioral science research budget levels. This led to a secondary COSSA focus on the Foundation itself.

As part of its activities, COSSA prepared testimony for presentation before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, chaired by William H. Natcher (D-Kentucky) and a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, chaired by Senator Jake Garn (R-Utah). A grass roots mailing was sent to 300 social scientists in districts of conservative Democrats prior to the Memorial Day congressional recess, and to an additional 350 social scientists prior to the July 4

recess. In all, social scientists in over 50 congressional districts were contacted by early July. Follow-up calls were made to all recipients of the mailings to urge their help in upcoming floor votes. COSSA's effort was helped immeasurably by timely and supportive newspaper articles and by the work of the many social scientists who volunteered to help. Some of these volunteers came to COSSA through the disciplinary associations; others came because COSSA provided a source of information and coordination in a confusing and unfamiliar political process. At times, COSSA served as a source of information on congressional social science budget activities not only for social scientists, but also for NSF staff, journalists, and congressional staff members.

The effect of both the grass roots and the organized campaigns upon the vote on the Winn amendment was undoubtedly substantial, although it is difficult to measure it with the data available. Margaret M. Heckler (R-Massachusetts), the ranking minority member of the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, is convinced that it was decisive. She stressed this in a report on the status of the NSF appropriations bill, distributed to her constituents and others on August 24:

"The Winn amendment was defeated in a 264 to 152 vote, and I have been told that many members joined in the opposition on the basis of my statement, along with letters and calls they received from the scientific community in their districts. The fact that scientists made their feelings known was undoubtedly the deciding factor. This is one case where constituent views unquestionably changed the outcome of a vote."

Testimony for the Social Sciences

During the first half of 1981, more than a dozen prominent social scientists testified either at hearings of various committees and subcommittees of Congress or at meetings of the National Science Board. Many hundreds of social scientists wrote letters (and also telephoned and telegraphed) to representatives and senators, urging the Congress to increase support for social and behavioral science research. We have available to us only a fraction of this material, particularly of the letters, and we have space only to print excerpts from this fraction.

Four rather discrete themes emerge in a review of this material. First, there is an emphasis upon the unity of science; that is, the social and behavioral sciences are as integral a part of science as are the physical and natural sciences.

Second, there is a recognition that the Administration's proposed cuts were to some extent motivated by misunderstandings of the nature of the social sciences, and there are efforts made to correct these misunderstandings.

Third, there is an emphasis on

Applied Orientations of Social Sciences Emphasized

the importance for science of maintaining continuity and momentum.

Fourth, and far and away the most frequent, there are assertions and examples of the usefulness of the social sciences: not simply the usefulness of applied or targeted research, but rather the usefulness of basic research. Many examples are given; the most frequent is the contribution of the social sciences to industrial productivity.

The unity of science.—One of the most disturbing aspects of the Administration's treatment of the social sciences was the implicit accusation that they are lesser sciences than the physical and natural sciences—if indeed they are sciences at all. This view is implicit in the Reagan Administration's acceptance of the Carter budget for NSF support of the physical and natural sciences and a 75 percent reduction for social and behavioral sciences.

The inferiority of the social sciences was explicitly refuted by John B. Slaughter, an engineer who serves as Director of the National Science Foundation, in his testimony on March 12 to the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology:

"The social and behavioral sciences play a key, and in some cases preeminent, role in some of the critical problems facing the country. The enormous challenge facing the Foundation and the scientific community particularly concerned with the social and behavioral sciences demonstrates (the point conclusively). We must strengthen the role of the behavioral and social sciences within the Foundation and strengthen the support to the scientific community in the future."

Similarly, eight winners of the Nobel Prize in Economic Science—Kenneth J. Arrow, Lawrence R. Klein, Tjalling C. Koopmans, Simon Kuznets, Wassily W. Leontief, Paul A. Samuelson, Theodore W. Schultz, and Herbert A. Simon—in a jointly signed letter dated March 6, 1981, protesting the NSF cuts, asserted that economics is on a par with the other sciences:

"The continuation of basic research in the 'hard' sciences is, of course, of the greatest national importance. The quality of research in economics does not suffer in comparison with the usual research work in science. The discriminatory treatment of economic research in the new budget is incomprehensible."

David A. Hamburg, M.D., formerly President of the Institute of Medicine and now Director of the Division of Health Policy Research and Education, Harvard University, in a letter to Representative Doug Walgren (D-Pennsylvania), the new chairman of the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, noted that medical knowledge is sometimes based upon behavioral science knowledge:

"You will note that the biobehavioral and social sciences have an important place in this analysis. For example, advances in

cardiovascular disease, some forms of cancer and mental illness depend heavily on advances in the scientific understanding of human behavior. The fund of knowledge from which health applications can be drawn is based in large part on fundamental research supported by the National Science Foundation."

Henry W. Riecken, a past president of the Council, now a social psychologist at the University of Pennsylvania, in his testimony on March 12 to the Walgren subcommittee, noted the methodological equivalence of the sciences:

"...most behavioral and social scientists spend most of their time doing exactly what other kinds of scientists do—namely, making observations and measurements—and a lot of effort has gone into improving the measurement of behavioral and social phenomena. A lot more is still needed, since the phenomena are complicated and complexly determined."

An eloquent case for the unity of science was made by Otto N. Larsen, Director of the Division of Social and Economic Science at NSF, in a statement in defense of funds for social science research. Reporting on public skepticism about "the social sciences as science" that stems from an alleged difference between physical and social phenomena, Mr. Larsen noted:

"This position implies that atoms are more real than attitudes, or that microbes and molecules are more stable and observable than, say, migration, monogamy, or monetary systems. Can one really be scientific about how people influence one another, how economics function, how organizations grow or decay, how rules and laws emerge and affect our lives, or why it is that there is not war of all against all? The answer would have to be 'no' if such phenomena were, in fact, not patterned.

But patterns do exist. They emerge not to create a social science but to sustain and extend all that is human. In political, economic, cultural, and social matters, a wide range of behaviors is possible. The challenge is to discover which acts really occur, with what frequency, and under what conditions. In social science, as in the physical and biological research realms, it is exciting to discover the source of patterns, how they emerge, what forms they take, the linkages between them, how the patterns break, and how they change. Human social behavior does not yield meekly to probes that seek understanding through scientific research. But, over time and with increasingly sophisticated sets of observational and analytic tools, the substance of social science is maturing, even as its conceptions are changing."

Misunderstandings of the social sciences.—Although it was announced that the Administration's proposals for budget cuts were purely economic in intent, "social research" seems to have been linked with social philosophies in the minds of the budget cutters. This linkage was

deplorable by Philip Handler, then President of the National Academy of Sciences, in a March 20 editorial in *Science*:

"Apart from eliminating such major new starts as the research instruments program, however, the programs selected for most other large reductions seem dictated not so much by financial constraints as by social philosophy. Thus, social science has been all but removed from the budgets of the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH); the NSF education programs were virtually eliminated; the international programs of NSF were painfully shrunk; programs involving university-industry collaboration were eliminated; the institutional support component of National Institutes of Health training grants was deleted. Each warrants fair debate before the new Administration begins to implement its policies."

Other examples of misunderstanding are two parallel but interrelated themes that have appeared and reappeared in many decades of attacks upon the social sciences: the use of jargon to obscure and the explication of what is "obvious" or "common knowledge". In one sense, the two themes are incompatible: if language is obscure, how can it report on common knowledge? But in another sense, the two themes are directly related. Having little that is original to say, critics complain, social scientists disguise the obvious by the use of jargon.

In testimony given on February 20, 1980, in response to Representative Ashbrook's attacks, Herbert A. Simon, Professor of Computer Science and Psychology at Carnegie-Mellon University, asserted that the "common sense" of the social sciences is not a mirror of society but is a result of research:

"The social sciences are often discounted because much of what they learn seems to be common sense. Well, it is common sense today to say that if you drop a feather and a rock together in a vacuum, they will fall at the same pace. It was not common sense before Galileo. In a democratic society, which has to make its own decisions about what it wants to be, one of the basic aims of the social sciences must be to take knowledge that comes out of the laboratory—knowledge that may be stated in language that is hard to understand—and make it part of the common sense of our society. That is the most important goal in the application of the social sciences."

In a February 13 editorial in *Science*, the senior author noted that many of the common sense terms used in ordinary discourse had their origin in social science research:

"Ironically, the social sciences seldom get full credit for their theoretical accomplishments, because the discoveries, once labeled, are quickly absorbed into conventional wisdom. This is easily demonstrated; note the number of social science concepts

common to our vocabulary: human capital, gross national product, identity crisis, span of control, the unconscious, price elasticity, acculturation, political party identification, reference group, externalities. Obviously, the phenomena revealed through such concepts existed prior to the relevant research, just as DNA, quarks, and the source of the Nile existed prior to their discovery. Yet concepts generated through research are discoveries that make phenomena intelligible and accessible that previously were inaccurately or incompletely understood."

Agreeing with this, Mr. Riecken claimed in his March 12 testimony that the social sciences are often misunderstood precisely because they deal with everyday phenomena:

"And in the course of my experience, I've come to conclusions about these sciences that are remarkably similar to those of my colleague, Dr. Prewitt; namely, that they are the most misunderstood of any sciences we have. Many people seem to find it difficult to believe that there is a science of behavior, and I think that's probably because the behavioral sciences deal with phenomena that, unlike astronomy or microbiology, are well within everyday experience, so everybody can, in some sense, consider himself to be an expert, an experienced observer of human behavior."

Maintaining continuity in the sciences.—Creativity in the social sciences—as in other sciences—is cumulative in nature, and when momentum and continuity are lost for some reason, it may take many years to recover. The proposed drastic cuts in the NSF basic research budget were clearly a threat to continuity. The importance of maintaining large-scale data bases was stressed by F. Thomas Juster, Director, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, in a March 24 letter to John B. Slaughter, Director, National Science Foundation:

"The importance of these basic data projects is hard to overestimate. In the physical sciences, there is a long tradition of scientists generating their own measurements, guided by theoretical developments within the various disciplines, and the large amounts of support needed for various measurement devices in the physical sciences are well understood to be an important priority. But the social sciences do not have the same tradition, and that is in part why they have not enjoyed the same scientific success in building a secure base of firmly tested and reproducible knowledge...In my judgment, it is absolutely crucial that development of data bases with a scientific orientation, rather than data bases derived from administrative sources and adapted to scientific purposes, be encouraged. But I do not see how that would be possible within the budget reductions that are currently recommended by the Administration."

Four weeks later, in an April 17

editorial in *Science*, Frederick Mosteller, a Harvard statistician and the immediate past president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, reminded readers of the impact that the interruption of social science research had in recent decades in China:

"If we fail to invest in social science research, we can anticipate a drying up of that research among our younger scholars. Worse yet, the best will leave the field altogether or not take it up. With the opening of China to the world, we have seen what an interruption of research can do to a society. It produces a long and sorry period of playing catch-up. The research that we fail to do now will penalize our own generation with a lack of ideas in a decade or so."

Similarly, James G. March, a political scientist at Stanford University, has speculated on the consequences for the social sciences in the United States of a drastic reduction in research funds. At the Sixth Annual AAAS Colloquium on R&D Policy, held on June 26, 1981, he participated in a panel discussion on the impacts upon R&D of the proposed FY 82 federal research budgets. In his view:

"Reductions in federal support would make social and behavioral sciences somewhat more theoretical, somewhat less empirical, somewhat more case-specific, somewhat less general, somewhat more expressive, somewhat less of a science."

He added, somewhat sardonically, that "in the context of current and future national needs, it is not obvious that such changes are sensible." And William H. Kruskal, a statistician who is Dean, Division of the Social Sciences, University of Chicago, in a July 16 letter to Senator Charles Percy (R-Illinois), stressed that basic research is a prerequisite of applications:

"The social sciences do not, of course, have immediate cures for most of our social difficulties. The answer to that, in my view, is more and better research. We do not cut off research on cancer or arthritis because no wonderful cures have come along. Just the contrary: I could easily argue for more, not less, basic research in social science."

Usefulness for productivity.—Most of the testimony and letters we reviewed stressed the point that research in the social sciences—particularly basic research—is useful for society. One could hardly expect to find the opposite position expressed. Many of the comments state just this: the social sciences are useful for understanding and solving problems. In a letter to Harriet Zuckerman, Professor of Sociology at Columbia University and a member of the Board of Directors of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), D. Allan Bromley, Professor of Physics at Yale University and President of the AAAS, noted that the "central questions" of most national problems are so-

Support for the Social Sciences Remains Precarious

cial scientific questions:

"One thing that has become clear is that the Reagan Administration has specifically targeted the social and behavioral sciences for marked reduction, as well as science education, flying squarely in the face of the fact that in a great many of our most important national problems the central questions are not in the physical sciences and technology per se, but rather in areas of social and behavioral science."

Zvi Griliches, a Harvard economist, in his March 12 testimony, noted how much of the Administration's economic program is based upon NSF-funded research:

"It is ironic...that most of the recent conservative ideas in economics—the importance of rational expectations and the impotency of conventional macroeconomic policy, the disincentive effects of various income-support programs, the magnitude of the regulatory burden—all originated in or were provided with quantitative backing by NSF-supported studies."

Ernestine Friedl, Professor of Anthropology at Duke University and a member of the National Science Board, noted at the March 12 hearings the lack of Board involvement in the 1981 budget decisions and then singled out national defense as an example:

"As, of course, you know, the National Science Board was not involved because of the timing in the various decisions with respect to this. One can say that the last time we were involved—that is, in the preparation of the previous budget—the Board had set its priorities, and the priorities included, as you know, an increase in the behavioral and social sciences budget."

At that time, I think the underlying reason was the assumption that not only is this important for science, but if we are concerned with the national security, as both the Congress, the Administration, and the citizens of the United States must of necessity be, and if we are concerned with the human problems of maintaining order, harmony, and a decent quality of life in our society, this research is important for those ends as well. The functioning of our entire defense system depends not only on the Department of Defense, the kind of research that it will do, and the funds that it gets, but also on the human relations in the Armed Forces which are an equally important subject for the maintenance of a good defense system. The behavioral and social science research that has been historically conducted has been of inestimable value to the Armed Forces. Some of that research resulted from what we call basic research in the social and behavioral sciences of the kind that the National Science Foundation has always supported, so that the previous decision on the part of the Board to emphasize the behavioral and social sciences was at least partly motivated by the sense that they were vitally important to this country."

Specific examples of usefulness abound, Harold T. Shapiro, President of the University of Michigan, in an April 4 telegram to Representative James R. Jones (D-Oklahoma), stated:

"The total dollars involved are modest; restoring some \$100 million would probably suffice. Not restoring these funds will severely damage the nation's capacity to gain a better understanding of such important subjects as the causes of inflation, declining productivity, poverty, and social change."

In a February 13 editorial in *Science*, the senior author listed numerous examples of applications of the social sciences to the economy:

"National attention has turned to the productivity, the performance, and even the profitability of science. Measured against such criteria, how will the social sciences fare? Quite well, I believe. Close scrutiny will disclose substantial contributions to economic growth and the public welfare. For instance, numerous well-established industries now market technologies that are derived from social science research: demographic projections, programmed language instruction, standardized educational testing, behavior modification, man-machine system design, political polling, consumer research and market testing, management consulting. Just as medicine draws upon biological research or electronics upon physics, government and management draw upon psychology, economics, demography, geography, and other social sciences."

Earlier, the Association for the Advancement of Psychology and the American Psychological Association, in a statement prepared for the February 1980 discussion of the Ashbrook amendment, had listed low productivity among the problems that the social sciences can provide information about:

"In the coming decade, many of the social and economic problems facing this country will certainly continue to plague us: low productivity, lack of educational achievement, inflation, an aging society, declining citizen involvement, an eroding work ethic, dissolution of families, just to name a few. It is crucial that policymakers at all levels of government have high quality and accurate information to use in approaching the necessary solutions. A primary concern of the behavioral and social sciences is developing information about the personal, governmental and social activities that influence the creation and continued existence of these kinds of problems. These secondary and tertiary investigations simply cannot progress without a solid primary—basic—research foundation."

Harvey Brooks, a physicist who is Professor of Technology and Public Policy at Harvard, in a March 9 letter to Representative Walgren, cited the example of Japanese productivity as one that we have only learned about by

means of the social sciences:

"...a large part of the superior economic performance of the Japanese is not the result of superior innovation in the technological sphere, but rather the result of superior organization and managerial techniques which are more respectful of the motivations and perceptions of people. Most of the Japanese successes have been based on more effective use of American technology. Perhaps this success was due more to the fortunate concatenation of cultural circumstances than any conscious superior use of social knowledge or insight; I would not want to pretend that the Japanese miracle is attributable to their better support of or use of social science knowledge. Nevertheless, it may take social science knowledge for us to understand the sources of Japanese success, and to determine what aspects of it are applicable in the sharply different American culture and traditions. The whole virtue of science, after all, is that, properly applied, it enables us to learn from the successes of others without having to imitate blindly and gradually discover by trial and error what works and doesn't work in our circumstances. When we understand why things work or don't work we are not condemned to retrace the entire learning process of the pioneers."

And in their March 6 letter, the eight recipients of the Nobel Prize in Economic Science stressed the importance of basic research for innovation:

"Overnight a fruitful and important area of advancement of knowledge is being deprived of needed support, and the intellectual development of a newer generation of economists will be stunted. The matter is all the more important because the National Science Foundation is the only disinterested source of funds for research. Research supported by private industry and by government agencies with specific missions is very important for practical purposes, but usually is too directly targeted to permit the genuine innovation that comes only with freedom to inquire and is not without some pressure to conform to preconceived outcomes."

The Still Precarious Position of the Social Sciences

Many explanations have been offered to account for the proposed reductions in federal funding for the social sciences. They emphasize everything from conspiracy to happenstance, from ideological vindictiveness to standard budget pruning. Several talented journalists went searching for the "smoking gun", but no one produced an explanation with sufficient credibility that it eliminated alternative explanations.

If the search did not produce a convincing explanation, it was not a wasted effort. For it did produce one fairly clear truth, a truth which the social science community should ponder at length. A budget decision was taken, without prior

consultation, one that would reduce the social sciences at the National Science Foundation to the point of threatened extinction. Those who made the decision did not expect it to be politically costly. The ax would fall, but who, other than the few on whom it would fall, would care?

An administration that starts from the premise that the social sciences are a needless luxury could easily assume that trimming them back during a time of large-scale reductions in the federal budget would generally go unnoticed. That subsequent events revealed this to be a flawed assumption (because it rested on a flawed premise) is less instructive than is the initial political assumption. Even after several decades of effort to include the social sciences in the national science system, and in particular under the funding umbrella of the National Science Foundation, their place is far from secure.

The seeming ease with which the social sciences could be greatly curtailed and even eliminated from the National Science Foundation stands in marked, and somewhat puzzling, contrast to the secure role they enjoy in the nation's research universities and even in the commercial and industrial sectors of American society. Our research universities provided early and hospitable homes for the social science disciplines, and, along with the learned societies and private foundations, furnished the support and the respect necessary to launch them as scholarly disciplines. In the ensuing decades, our social science disciplines have become world leaders, attracting to American research universities large numbers of students and scholars from other countries. The social sciences have also earned their place in the commercial and industrial sectors, especially through such specialties as industrial psychology, opinion research, organizational sociology, demographic analysis, and economic planning.

What explains this puzzle, this seeming inconsistency between the successes of our disciplines, internationally recognized, and the continuing difficulty of the social sciences in the national science system? Why is it that a large and growing part of our nation's intellectual and economic life could be so little understood that its removal from the federal funding of science could be thought, even by politically shrewd people, to be practically costless?

The answer, we believe, has three parts, each of which is illustrated in the materials presented in this article.

First, social scientists, certainly in comparison with engineers and with physical and life scientists, have been politically naive—not even seeing the need to be a political presence in Washington.

Second, the national science leaders, drawn almost exclusively from the natural sciences, have generally failed to view the social sciences as part of the scientific resources of the society and, con-

sequently, have assumed no responsibility for protecting and enhancing them.

Third, social scientists have been indifferent toward their own intellectual and practical accomplishments, and correspondingly timid about telling their own story.

Add these three explanations together, and it is not puzzling that a simple OMB directive could threaten to make the social sciences an even smaller corner—maybe just a few desks—at the National Science Foundation. This has not yet happened, and the events of 1981 have lessened the chances that it will happen. All three of the politically debilitating conditions were aggressively confronted, and some modest successes were registered.

The social science community has never taken seriously the need to become a political presence in Washington, D.C. Certain temporary political efforts have been directed toward specific issues: getting the social sciences included in the National Science Foundation; protecting private foundations during the McCarthy era; easing restrictive interpretations of regulations on the protection of human subjects; arguing for Title VI funds for area study centers; and so forth. These have generally been ad hoc arrangements, focused on specific organizational or funding issues, and allowed to die when the issue was resolved. Somewhat more permanent efforts have been made by specific disciplinary associations, especially by those of psychology and economics, with the former having a Washington office and an impressive organizational apparatus and the latter, located in Nashville, tending to rely on interventions by prestigious individuals and institutions. Political science has also been a political presence at times, usually through the network of personal acquaintances that develops naturally in a discipline that studies politics and prepares some members for political careers.

These ad hoc arrangements and discipline-specific efforts have never led to a collective social science presence. There has never been a community-wide decision, backed with resources, to undertake those political chores which would secure the place of the social sciences in the national science system.

The material just reviewed suggests that the faint stirrings of such a collective commitment and effort occurred in the spring of 1981. And it turned out to be easier than many would have thought only a year ago. Walking the halls of Congress, negotiating favorable press coverage, building an alliance with natural science colleagues, effectively using professional associations, working out a division of labor, flooding relevant congressional offices and executive agencies with letters and materials; in short, telling the story where it mattered, came quickly. When we say "easier", we don't mean easily. An enorm-

Social Science Mobilization Accomplished Several Goals

ous effort was made by a large number of behavioral and social scientists—much of it spontaneous, creative, forceful. Eventually much of this effort came to be organized under the sponsorship of COSSA, which led the way in establishing a coordinated and collective voice. The absence of this voice, it seems reasonable to assume, contributed to the seeming ease with which parts of the political process decided that the social sciences are of low priority, and perhaps dispensable. Whether the social sciences have the will and the resources to sustain a collective voice is a question we will return to below. But first we turn to the other two conditions which seemed to make the social sciences easy targets.

In their political battles, the social sciences have not had many allies. They have generally suffered from the indifference and at times even the hostility of natural scientists. When under attack, as in the Ashbrook amendment of the late 1970s, social scientists could not be confident that leaders in the natural sciences would weigh in on their behalf. It was sometimes more difficult to get members of the National Science Board than members of Congress to take note of the scientific accomplishments of disciplines that were presumably their responsibility. More than one National Science Board member confessed "embarrassment" at being called upon to defend anthropology or sociology or political science. Many social scientists, often with good reason, have been uneasy with attempts to establish an alliance with natural scientists.

Some of this unease and uncertainty was erased by the year's events. We have quoted in this article the important statements defending the social sciences by the National Academy of Sciences, led by its then president, Philip Handler; by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, led by its president, D. Allan Bromley, and its executive director, William D. Carey; and by the National Science Board and the National Science Foundation, led respectively by Lewis M. Branscomb and John B. Slaughter. These statements were complemented by similar statements from dozens (probably not hundreds) of other colleagues from the physical and biological sciences, especially from some key university presidents. The message conveyed cannot be underestimated, for it was these statements that reaffirmed the principle that the social sciences are integral to the nation's scientific resources. For this "unity of science" message we need not thank the National Academy, the National Science Board, or the AAAS. They were exercising what is, after all, one of their central responsibilities—to enhance, politically and intellectually, the scientific resources of the nation. Later we will consider the chances that this newly-found resolve by national science leaders will persist beyond the immediate crisis which motivated it.

The last of the three conditions which, it seems to us, contribute

to our insecure position in the national science system is the most troubling one. A political effort, whether in the harried halls of Congress or in the quieter halls of the National Academy, is only as good as what it has to say. The social science community has not been very effective at narrating its own intellectual and practical successes. Social scientists have often incorporated, in their own defense, mindless attacks on them. The attacks are familiar: "the social sciences find the obvious and then obfuscate it as jargon"; "the social sciences are trivial and, paradoxically, responsible for the 'sorry state' of the nation"; "the social sciences are not science—or at best, are descriptive, 'soft', and noncumulative sciences".

Social scientists, to their discredit, have sometimes seemed to accept such charges: "Well, we are a young science; besides, what we study is particularly difficult—give us a few more years, and we'll come up with something." To anyone familiar with the history and accomplishments of the social sciences this line of defense is absurd. Fortunately, such silliness was largely absent this past year.

As a result of this crisis, many social scientists, including many of our most eminent scholars, took a close look at the significance of their intellectual enterprise and found a compelling story to tell. The quotations already cited and a few paragraphs here cannot begin to recapitulate this story—which ranges from research on the origins of man to human factors engineering, from improved measurement systems to a deepened understanding of and respect for other cultures and peoples, from commercially successful technologies to fundamental insights into how infants think and societies act. The many pieces of this impressive story quickly found their way into newspaper articles, background memos to OMB, and congressional speeches. Basic research in the behavioral and social sciences has, it can be demonstrated, been a worth-the-cost investment for this society. This is a truth not missed in various nations around the world, now busy copying U.S. leadership in the social sciences.

Obviously much work remains. Comprehending and articulating the contributions of our sciences is not a task for a few months. But the work is under way and the pace can easily be accelerated. Part of the task is to uncouple the social sciences from things outside its scope of activities but which frequently become associated with it. Thirty years ago, the social sciences in this country had to be uncoupled from the political doctrine of socialism, with which its political enemies eagerly associated it. More recently, the task has been to uncouple it from social policies, to which a small part of the social sciences made important contributions but which hardly account for the totality of the intellectual enterprise. Who knows what "guilt by association" traps lurk in the future? For example, some of our more impressive technical accomplishments—

survey research, psychometrics, human factors engineering, econometrics—have been displayed as if they were the social sciences. This leads to a pernicious confusion of the science with some of its technical by-products. It is a confusion which will in the end do more harm than good.

The social sciences should be defended as a loosely-integrated intellectual system, with permeable boundaries, which studies the human condition. There have been many by-products of this study—political doctrines and political movements, social policies and commercial enterprises, technologies which manipulate and technologies which liberate. Not all by-products have been popular, and their reception can shift over time, as the history of IQ testing or opinion research suggests. In this respect, the social sciences do not differ from chemistry or biology or physics, sciences whose by-products are not always well-received. What is important to all sciences is to resist being defined in terms of by-products, whether popular or not.

The social sciences are making some progress toward this goal. They are no longer confused with socialism, and the task is now to uncouple the social sciences from social policy—or from commercial technologies. The uncoupling is the first step. The next is to state what the social sciences, as an intellectual system, are actually about. The past several months have been a time of renewed effort to make such a statement. Those fair-minded enough to examine the record have more often than not come away convinced.

And the Future?

Crises are standard opportunities for mobilization. In our judgment, the three most impressive accomplishments of the mobilization effort of the past few months are those just reviewed: (1) establishing a political presence in Washington, D.C., (2) forming an alliance with natural science colleagues on behalf of the unity of science, and (3) narrating intellectual and practical successes. All three accomplishments, though especially the first two, radically altered the prior state of affairs. A political invisibility was replaced with an assertive political presence. An uninformed and often demeaning characterization of the "soft sciences" by the "hard sciences" was replaced, on the part of some important national science leaders, by a clear statement respecting the social sciences for their accomplishments. A self-imposed indifference and even timidity about our accomplishments is being replaced by an intellectually compelling story.

What is the prognosis for these accomplishments? All three are in a premature state. The political presence could virtually disappear overnight, mothballed until another crisis leads to another mobilization. Unwise though this would be, it will be difficult to hold a coordinated political effort in place. The alliance with national science leaders is certainly

fragile. Their support of the social sciences cuts neither deep nor wide. Much effort was spent simply getting formal statements from already knowledgeable leaders. To "convert" widespread ignorance, indifference, even hostility toward the social sciences among physicists, mathematicians, chemists, and biologists is a formidable chore.

It will get tougher when we leave the shared culture of research universities and learned societies and turn to the for-profit sector. Social scientists may know that survey research has contributed to the marketing industry, operant conditioning to the behavior modification industry, cognitive psychology to the information processing industry, demography to the insurance industry, psychometrics to the testing industry. But we do not yet know how to get these industries to acknowledge the contribution to their well-being made by an earlier wave of basic research, and to provide material and moral support for continued work. Without support from the natural sciences and from the for-profit sector, the social sciences will remain peripheral both to federal funding and to national science policy.

We have suggested that the social sciences have been hesitant, even maladroit, at explaining their own intellectual successes and practical accomplishments. The spring of 1981 corrected this situation; many scholars provided convincing accounts of important scientific findings, methodological advances, practical applications,

and general progress within and across the disciplines. This momentum is likely to be sustained. Indeed, the social sciences are just beginning to write a history of their accomplishments and failures. This history will document the way in which the intellectual activities commonly labeled "social science" have produced a wealth of information, concepts, and analyses that are now part of the society's conventional wisdom.

Of the three accomplishments outlined in these brief notes—establishing a political presence in Washington, soliciting needed support from natural science leaders, and arguing a compelling case for the social sciences—the latter, we believe, has the most secure future. Perhaps, if well enough argued, the brief will insure the preservation of the other two accomplishments as well. A political presence and an alliance are only as good as their intellectual content. Consequently, in the end, we will have to rest our case in terms of what we have been and are becoming as scientific disciplines.

*Mr. Prewitt, a political scientist, has been President of the Council since 1979. Mr. Silles, a sociologist, has been an Executive Associate at the Council since 1973. This article originally appeared in the Social Science Research Council *ITEMS*, Vol. 35, No. 3, September 1981. It is reprinted, with minor deletions, with the permission of the authors.

COSSA Sets Up Office

(continued from page 1)
For example, the Council of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion meeting in late October pledged financial support and many other associations are now considering similar action. The Executive Committee of COSSA recently appointed Roberta Balstad Miller as Executive Director, confirming her initial work in coordinating the effort. In addition, COSSA established an independent office at 1775 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 300, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 234-5703, and has continued its efforts in the legislative struggle while developing strategies for the future.

Eastern Kentucky University's College of Law Enforcement will begin publication of a tri-annual newsletter in November 1981. As a project undertaken by the newly-formed Research and Service Center within the College, the publication will be directed at criminal justice professionals, College of Law Enforcement alumni, and criminal justice educators. Those interested in receiving copies of the newsletter and other mailings from the Center should contact: Dr. Bruce I. Wolford, College of Law Enforcement, Eastern Kentucky University, 101 Stratton, Richmond, KY 40475; (606) 622-1394.

If COSSA is able to develop the necessary base for continued support from the disciplinary associations and others, it will be critical for it to deal with a range of educational and informational activities on behalf of the social sciences. The cooperative format among the various associations moves the effort beyond pleading specialized disciplinary interests to a broader concern about the role of the social sciences. It will also provide a more visible presence for the social sciences in Washington. Such a continued presence will be of critical importance in the future in the way in which the social sciences are viewed nationally and internationally.—RRD

Rensis Likert, 78, Director Emeritus of the Institute for Social Research and former Professor of Psychology and Sociology at the University of Michigan, died September 4th in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

T. Scott Miyakawa, 75, Professor Emeritus of Boston University, died in August in Boston. A memorial fund for a minority graduate fellowship is being organized in his name.

Many Teaching Products Now Available; Others Are Being Developed

Over fifty publications related to the teaching of sociology are currently distributed through the Teaching Resources Center (TRC). Most of these products have been written by sociologists for the TRC and are supplemented by some commercial publications relevant to sociology instruction. These materials are sold at cost upon receipt of a prepaid order.

Ten new products are in the development stages and will be added to the TRC holdings in 1982. The authors for these projects would welcome contributions from colleagues' teaching experiences. The TRC editorial board emphasizes high quality materials, some innovative and some "traditional", from a wide range of institutional settings and teaching styles. The ten products under development are listed with the coordinators to whom contributions should be sent.

(1) Some of the most useful and popular TRC products are syllabi sets for specific courses. The first such set produced, *Syllabi and Instructional Materials for Introductory Sociology Courses*, is under revision to update materials and add additional class exercises, films, test items, simulations and games, sample lectures, and other useful items for the first course. Contact: Charlene Black, Department of Sociology, Georgia Southern College, Statesboro, GA 30460, or Norma Seerley, Division of Social Science, Gainesville Community College, Gainesville, GA 30503.

(2) The Section on Social Psychology is compiling *Syllabi and Instructional Materials for Social Psychology Courses*. Contact: Howard Schuman, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109.

(3) The Section on Aging is undertaking a similar effort for gerontology courses at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. For *Syllabi and Instructional*

Materials for Sociology of Aging, contact: E.B. Palmore, Duke University Medical Center, P.O. Box 3003, Durham, NC 27710.

(4) *Syllabi and Instructional Materials for Research Methods Courses* will include a range of laboratory and field projects to train students in social methodologies. Contact: Russell Schutt, Department of Sociology, University of Massachusetts, Boston, MA 02125.

(5) The Clinical Sociology Association has been gathering sample program and course materials for its *Curriculum and Training File in Clinical Sociology*. Additional contributions, class exercises, field placements, and special tracks in clinical sociology for undergraduate or graduate students are requested. Contact: Clifford Black, Department of Sociology, North Texas State University, Denton, TX 76201.

(6) *Multiple Choice Test Items for Introductory Sociology Courses* are being collected to develop a pool of test questions with reliability and validity scores. If possible, these items may be normed with the test results from different introductory courses around the country. The items would test basic sociological knowledge and concepts, independent of particular textbooks. Contact: Michael Delaney, Department of Sociology, Des Moines Area Community College, Ankeny, IA 50021.

(7) *Ideas for Evaluating and Testing Students* will contain innovative ideas and procedures for testing, examining, or evaluating students in sociology courses. Contact: Theresa G. Turk, California State University-Long Beach, Long Beach, CA 90840.

(8) *Teaching Sociology Through Humor* will contain humorous material (at least in the eyes of the instructor)—puns, one-liners, groaners, stories, jokes, anecdotes, fables, parables, routines,

and visuals—useful in illustrating sociological concepts. Contact: David S. Adams, Department of Sociology, Ohio State University-Lima, Lima, OH 45804.

(9) *Occupations and Professions: A Teaching Bibliography* annotates books, textbooks, and articles useful in teaching the sociology of occupations and professions. Contact: Ronald M. Pavalco, Division of Behavioral Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Parkside, Kenosha, WI 53141.

(10) *The Film Guide for Sociology Courses* is in revision for a second edition. The editors, Sally Rogers and Robert Wolensky, request annotated listings of films that instructors have found useful in sociology courses. The annotation should include the film's title, date, distribution source, length, and whether it is black and white or color. If possible, provide a brief description of the film's content and how it was used in the classroom. Contact: Sally Rogers, Division of Social Sciences, Montgomery Community College, Takoma Park, MD 20912.

CBH

Teaching Services Program Announces Spring Workshops

Continuing its program of offering services to teachers of sociology, the ASA Teaching Services Program will again, in March 1982, sponsor a series of workshops for sociologists seeking to enhance their own teaching capabilities and resources.

Three simultaneous workshops will be scheduled for March 25 to March 27, 1982 at New York, Dallas, and Los Angeles. Each of the workshops will start at noon on Thursday and close at 3 p.m. on Saturday. This will be the third year that teaching workshops have been offered simultaneously in locations across the country, chosen for accessibility and economy.

The major emphasis for the 1982 workshops will be the actual practice of teaching and the application of teaching techniques to sociological subject matter. The theme represents a developmental pattern in workshop offerings: the national workshops in 1980 focused on the basics of teaching techniques; the 1981 workshops covered teaching resources, selective substantive course material, and exploration of course construction and evaluation. The 1982 workshops will focus on classroom application, including the application of teaching skills and the selection of course materials for effective course planning. The 1982 workshops will be useful for teachers who have not previously attended an ASA teaching workshop, as well as for those who have participated in earlier programs.

Each workshop will offer sessions which will explore ways by which lower division courses, particularly the first course, can be made maximally relevant to student needs. Based on suggestions from previous participants, the workshop will include exploration of teaching styles such as discussion and lecture techniques and study of various approaches to the evaluation of teaching.

A new feature of these workshops will be a laboratory experience in which participants will have an opportunity to demonstrate, to review, and to discuss their own teaching approaches as recorded in videotaping sessions with feedback from other participants and staff. Since this approach combines the opportunity for self evaluation with new learning experiences in a supportive environment, this type of program has been much in demand.

The details about specific locations in each of the three cities, together with information about program, travel, housing and registration, will be announced in the January *FOOTNOTES*. For preliminary information and to assure an early place on one of the workshops in Los Angeles, Dallas, or New York, write to Hans Mauksch or Gail Woodstock, Coordinators, Teaching Workshops, Section of Behavioral Sciences, TD3-West Health Sciences Center, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65212; (314) 882-6183.

Teacher Information Exchange

"What schools offer a BA degree in applied sociology?" "Who can advise me on the merits of the numerous textbooks for introductory sociology?" "I'd like to try a simulation such as SIMSOC, but I am cautious about the results." "Are there materials to help a Teaching Assistant function more effectively?" "I have so many students with reading problems; how can I help them cut through the sociological jargon without watering down content?"

These are the kinds of questions that come into the phone line called the Teacher Information Exchange (TIE). If you have a question about teaching, you may be able to get it answered by calling TIE at (513) 873-2039.

TIE serves as a referral service for information and advice concerning ideas, courses, techniques, media and other matters related to the teaching of sociology.

Sociologists calling TIE will be referred to a colleague with expertise in the requested area. The TIE secretary will be on duty 1-3 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday thru Friday. A 24-hour recording machine will take requests at other times.

The Teacher Information Exchange is located at Wright State University, Dayton, and directed by Jeanne Ballantine and David Oreinstein.

TIE is the newest service offered to teachers of sociology by the ASA Projects on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology. The only cost to you is the phone call.—CBH

Social Science Photo Exhibit at Northwestern University

Spanish gypsies, Brazilian Indians and inmates of an Arkansas penitentiary were among the subjects of a recent photographic exhibition at Northwestern University's Mary and Leigh Block Gallery. The exhibition, titled "Exploring Society Photographically", contained more than 185 works by 18 social scientists.

The exhibition was organized by the Block Gallery with Howard Becker, Professor of Sociology at Northwestern University, serving as curator. Becker also prepared a 96-page illustrated catalogue which accompanied the exhibition. According to Becker, the exhibition investigated some of the efforts by photographers and social scientists to combine their disciplines and perspectives.

Both the exhibition and the catalogue were supported by grants from the National Endowment for the Arts and the Illinois Arts Council.

"Exploring Society Photographically" includes the following projects:

- Charles Berger's "Flamenco Gitano", which examines the culture of gypsies living in Spain. Berger is a professional photographer with a degree in Sociology.

- Brazilian anthropologist Eduardo Viveiros de Castro's photographs "Two Rituals of the Xingu", which capture aspects of the ceremonial/mythological system of the Xingu region.

- Bruce Jackson's "Killing Time: A Life in the Arkansas Penitentiary", from shots taken at the Cummins Prison Farm. Jackson began his study of prisons while a member of the Society of Fellows at Harvard.

Also included were:

- "Two Views of Venice" by Bill Aron, an examination of two very different cultures—a community of elderly Jews and that of the roller-skating crowd.

- Douglas Harper's Selections From the Road", which resulted from research he did by "riding the rails" with "tramps".

Perhaps we need only to study how others present themselves and not worry how we, as sociologists, present ourselves. We frequently do a masterful job of compounding our own difficulties. During the spring, when there was much pessimism about budget cuts, Bill Carey, Executive Officer of AAAS, wrote a strong statement of support for the social sciences. It was thoughtful and helpful when it was published in *Science*. However, several weeks later, one of "us" wrote a letter to the Editor which was also published. It suggested with proper modesty that the social sciences had not contributed much important knowledge—and, in fact, our theories are no better than those of intelligent laymen.

Certainly modesty has its place. But is that place in a letter to the Editor to the international science community? Subsequent discussion ignored Carey's endorsement but not the letter to the Editor. All of us have doubts but to publish them so that others can use them against us is self-destructive. The current strategy should be to survive the assault, not to provide the weapons for our own destruction. I suppose I should not take it personally when sociology or sociologists come off badly in the press. It is certainly possible to be misquoted or distorted. But reporters seldom have to do that to sociologists.

At the recent Annual Meeting in Toronto, there was considerable press coverage. That's not surprising. Sociologists study interesting things. But sociologists say surprising things to reporters. One was quoted as saying, "The sessions are where you go to get bored and catch up on your naps." Another, described as a vivacious female, complained, "I didn't even get propositioned." Both were identified with universities with high scholarly reputes. Misquoted? I doubt it. Evidently, they didn't realize a reporter's response is to quote while a colleague's response would be to laugh. But now there are many more to laugh at us.

Several were liberally quoted on their colleagues "obscurantism". The session of "Why Sociologists Can't Write" was a reporter's delight. A quote from another paper was widely circulated—"The multidimensionality of the experience of temporality is elucidated by a phenomenology of the musical act." Misquoted? Probably not. Could it have been said differently? Certainly. Should it have been? I think I would side with the reporter who suggested "Play it again, Sam".

I'm concerned about what reporters do to us. The major problem seems to be that they quote us accurately.—RRD

Challenges in Aging Research Great; Money Available

(continued from page 1)

I. The Interface Between Aging and Social Change

Research at the interface between aging and social change rests on the principle that aging is by no means fixed and immutable (as many stage theorists seem to imply), but varies with social structure and social change. As society changes—undergoes wars, economic fluctuations, changes in science and the arts, etc.—people in different cohorts cannot age in precisely the same way. Moreover, the influences are reciprocal—when many individuals in the same cohort are similarly affected by particular social changes, the change in their collective lives can in turn produce further social change.

Despite the paucity of systematic research guided by this principle, numerous familiar examples give evidence of this dynamic interplay between aging and social change. As one example, consider retirement among males. Long-term social changes (in occupations, pension plans, etc.) have markedly altered the aging process by extending the years spent in retirement. Of the cohort of men reaching age 65 in 1900, approximately 2/3 were still in the workforce; today this proportion has dropped to only 1/5. Combined with increases in longevity, these cohort differences in work mean that a male at age 20, who in 1900 could scarcely have looked ahead to retirement at all, can now expect to spend nearly 1/4 of his adult lifetime in retirement. These added retirement years have marked consequences for the aging process in terms of income, social involvement, leisure activities, health, and so on.

Moreover, such effects on aging have reciprocal effects on social change. As fewer and fewer older men in each successive cohort remain in the workforce many social norms and social institutions are affected, including the emphasis on norms of achievement; the shape of leisure activities; the tax burden on younger people still in the labor force; the appropriate age for Social Security; and so on.

Many other examples of this continuing interplay between aging and particular social changes might well be considered. Yet such descriptive examples cannot explain how aging and social change influence each other. They merely suggest the intricate mechanisms and conditions on which systematic research is now needed. Topics needing research form a long list:

- How and under what conditions do many millions of individuals in successive cohorts alter their lives in response to changes in their social environs?
- What patterns of retirement develop as a consequence of particular conditions of modernization, industrialization, GNP, demand for labor, retirement income, age structure of organizations, or political character of the state?
- Why is it that members of cohorts in Western countries today age differently from those at

other times and places—in length of life, age of menarche, risk factors for chronic diseases of old age, later life performance on psychometric tests, timing and sequencing of major life events, and many other respects?

- How is it that alterations in the collective lives of many individuals can affect social norms and institutions, such as the widespread practice of elderly widows living alone, or the incipient practice of sequential marriage, or the not-yet-institutionalized age at which wives of retired males will retire?
- How can socialization, because it is lifelong, link aging to social change?
- How does conflict between old and young alter the lifecourse patterns of the cohorts involved?

These are just a few of the issues on which sociological research is needed at this largely neglected interface between aging and social change. As yet, few researchable questions have been clearly defined, and few testable hypotheses have been formulated. Nevertheless, as long as the dearth of research at this interface continues, neither aging nor social change can be accurately understood. We shall remain locked in the "cohort-centric" belief that everyone must age exactly as we ourselves do.

II. The Biological Interface

In the second neglected area, sociological research is needed at the interface between biological aging and social and psychological aging. Another central principle of the sociology of age is involved here: that aging consists of interdependent social, psychological, and biological processes. As people move in and out of roles from birth to death and interact with other people of all ages, they not only develop attitudes and personal commitments, accumulate experiences, and learn to cope with diverse social exigencies; they also change biologically as genetic make-up is expressed, habits of diet and exercise are formed, and as old age often brings slowed reaction time and increased vulnerability to disease. These biological changes set constraints upon the health of people in their middle and later years, upon their intellectual functioning, and upon their performance of complex sensori-motor tasks. Yet such biologically based constraints are by no means inexorably fixed. Rather the constraints are variable, depending upon how the aging individuals think and feel, the society they grow up in, and the others with whom they interact. For biological aging is interdependent with psychological and social aging; they mutually influence one another.

Much research already provides correlational evidence of these interconnections. Epidemiological studies have identified many social and behavioral factors that begin early in life and lead toward the chronic afflictions of old age: such as smoking; inappropriate caloric and alcohol consumption; a sedentary life style; and low levels

of social support. According to the Surgeon General, perhaps as much as half of U.S. mortality is due to unhealthy behavior or life style. Such health-threatening behaviors have been shown to vary with social conditions, not only across countries, but from one cohort to the next within a single country. E.g., cohort differences in cigarette smoking are pronounced. In recent U.S. history, life-course patterns of smoking have shown steady declines among successive cohorts of males; while among females earlier increases have recently given way to declines—cohort differences in smoking which, after a considerable time lag, will lead to predictable changes in the prevalence of heart disease and cancer in these cohorts. Cohort differences in intellectual functioning have also been reported; even in tests of those intellectual components once thought to be biologically determined, members of recent cohorts tend to perform better than their predecessors at every age.

But why do such correlations and such cohort differences arise? How and under what social conditions are the disabilities of later life postponed or prevented, and physical and mental functioning enhanced? Here a few scattered studies are beginning to point the way toward the needed research. For example, even in nursing homes, research findings indicate that social conditions which stimulate interaction, self-care, and a sense of mastery among patients can result not only in increased involvement and alertness but also in improvements in general health and, at least for one small sample of patients, in reduced death rates. In another example, one of the most dramatic research findings in recent years shows that the intellectual functioning of workers is specifically related to the challenging complexities of the work place: workers of all ages respond positively to complexity. Even when intellectual decline does occur with aging, it can often be slowed or reversed by relatively simple training interventions.

Yet such studies are merely suggestive of the research that is needed in this largely neglected but highly important area. For a deeper understanding of the subtle interconnections between biological aging and the ways in which people move through society, a long list of questions require attention:

- How is health affected by the "piling up" of major life transitions in adolescence or old age? What are the consequences for health or cognitive functioning of continuing "daily hassles" or "daily grinds"—as in school, in a job, or in a marriage?
- How do the negative stereotypes of old age disabilities become self-fulfilling prophecies?
- What Durkheimian forces of anomie can relate fluctuations in the economy to changes in the functioning of the immune system or to blood lipid levels that may

ultimately affect people's health?

- What is the mid-life effect on health of boredom on the job or the closing of opportunities for advancement?
- How is it that, while most people over 65 report one or more physical ailments or disabilities, some 85% nevertheless continue to perform their major function, and some 95% manage to live independently (outside of nursing homes)?

Such questions at this interface are important to a sociological understanding of aging as mobility through the age strata of society. The questions take on fresh significance as the numbers and proportions of people in the oldest age strata in society continue to mount.

III. NIA Program

How are these two neglected areas treated in the National Institute on Aging? Both are given high priority for funding. While we continue our broad area of research concern, our special initiative in the behavioral sciences rests explicitly on the two principles I have been enunciating: that aging is influenced by, and also influences, social change; and that aging consists of interdependent social, psychological, and biological processes. These two principles are both basic to a new program announcement on HEALTH AND EFFECTIVE FUNCTIONING IN THE MIDDLE AND LATER YEARS. The announcement invites qualified researchers to submit grant applications for research projects designed to specify how social and psychological aging processes, interacting with biological processes, influence later-life health and functioning under a wide range of social settings and conditions. In addition to substantive topics, applications are sought for methodological projects which promise new understandings, for example, through improved longitudinal or cohort-comparative designs. Many applications will require formation of interdisciplinary teams in which social or behavioral scientists combine forces with biological or medical scientists. (Proposals are due on March 1 and July 1.)

IV. Special Opportunities for Sociological Research

Speaking as a sociologist, not only for NIA but for aging research in general, I want to stress the special relevance for sociology—as distinct from other disciplines—of working in these two neglected but developing areas. To be sure, there are obstacles. Funding for research that is primarily social is currently curtailed. And special effort may be necessary to develop the appropriate interdisciplinary and methodological approaches. Given the additional effort and even minimal funding, however, we as sociologists cannot only make significant contributions to these areas from our own disciplinary base, but can also use these contributions to strengthen this base.

At the interface between aging and social change, sociologists have unique expertise both in dynamic studies and in multi-level analysis. Here the challenge lies in bringing these two together, in inventing and applying procedures for dynamic analysis of the interrelationships between particular societal changes and particular changes in the patterns of individual aging. At the biological interface, however, many sociologists seem largely unaware of the opportunities. If biologists relegate the sociological face to "social work" or "socialism", we sociologists often look askance at the biological face as ideologically unacceptable or strictly "applied". Yet the intimate linkages between health and behavior are manifold, as dramatized, for example, by the recent striking developments in psychosocial aspects of neuroscience. Increasingly the brain is recognized as both the seat of the mind and a regulator of endocrine, immune, and other physiological systems. But the brain always has a social context. Thus the door is opened to research on the accumulation with aging of behaviors and social reactions which feed through the brain and the mind to affect these physiological systems. Sociology is in a unique position to contribute the necessary social components to this evolving paradigm.

The challenge is great. And we at NIA encourage those few innovative sociologists who want to take up the challenge. We welcome inquiries, questions, and suggestions. If you will write us in detail, we promise to respond in detail. (Address us at: National Institute on Aging, Building 31, Room 5C05, 9000 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, MD 20205.)

AAAS Socio-Psychological Prize

Submission of entries in the 1982 competition for the AAAS Socio-Psychological Prize of \$1,000 is invited. The prize is awarded annually for a meritorious paper that furthers understanding of human psychological-social-cultural behavior and is intended to encourage in social inquiry the development and application of the kind of dependable methodology that has proved so fruitful in the natural sciences. Unpublished manuscripts and manuscripts published after January 1, 1981 are eligible; submission deadline is July 1, 1982. For entry blank and instructions, write: Executive Office, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Eighth Floor, 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

Travel Research Award

All university students are eligible to submit a paper for this year's Wesley Ballaine Travel Research Award. The First Place Award provides a \$500 cash prize, complimentary registration to the 1982 TTRA Annual Meeting, and an allowance for travel to the Meeting and lodging. Entry deadline is March 1, 1982. For further information, contact: Dr. C.A. Gunn, Chair, Wesley Ballaine Travel Research Award, Recreation and Parks Department, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843.

GRADUATE

Yale Law School invites applications for its Master of Studies in Law program, a one-year program for people whose central professional interests are non-legal but would be better realized with a formal introduction to legal education. Total enrollment of the program is limited to ten persons per year. Five places are reserved for journalists; the remaining five places will be given to college teachers and scholars in history, economics, anthropology, sociology, philosophy, and other fields. Scholarship funds are available and loans may be secured through the Law School. Deadline for applications is February 1, 1982. Contact: Dean James W. Zirkle, Yale Law School, Box 401-A Yale Station, New Haven, CT 06520.

DISSERTATION

The Social Research Department of the American Foundation for the Blind announces its sixth year of partial funding of doctoral dissertation research in the areas of its concerns. The total amount to be awarded in 1982 is \$2,500, part of which will be awarded for each of two deadline dates, January 4th and April 5th. Preference will be given to outstanding proposals whose results may have policy significance of national scope in AFB's goal areas. Potential applicants are advised to contact AFB by mail or telephone before submitting a full proposal. Contact: Corinne Kirchner, Director, or Jacki Packer, Research Associate, Social Research Department, American Foundation for the Blind, 15 West 16th Street, New York, NY 10011; (212) 620-2067 or 2068.

POSTDOCTORAL

The Population Studies and Training Center at Brown University invites applications for postdoctoral fellowships in demography for a period of 6-12 months, beginning either in July or September 1982. Fellows are given free tuition, monthly stipend, office space, and research support services. Before submitting a formal application and supporting documents, interested individuals should request further information about the program and eligibility requirements. Contact: Sidney Goldstein, Director, Population Studies and Training Center, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912; (401) 863-2368. Application deadline is January 15, 1982.

The Rockefeller Foundation announces the continuation of its program for social science research fellowships in agricultural and rural development overseas. Up to four highly qualified recent social science doctorates per year will be selected to take appointments as researchers integrated into ongoing programs at international agricultural institutions, university or other research centers in developing countries. Applicants must demonstrate interdisciplinary adaptability and international agricultural or rural development interest through writings, course work, and/or prior experience. The PhD must have been granted after January, 1978 or expected before July, 1982. Salary and status are equivalent to U.S. Instructor or Assistant Professor. For further information, applicants should send a letter and curriculum vita to: Ms. Annette Prezioso, The Rockefeller Foundation, 1133 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10036, prior to December 31, 1981.

OTHER

The Department of Transportation's Office of University Research is soliciting research proposals for FY 1982. Of the research topics acceptable for funding, one is relevant to sociology.

Under the category "Transportation and Urban/Regional Structure", the Department is interested in research which analyzes the relationship between major changes in transportation systems and long-term changes in urban and regional structure. Proposals are due January 15, 1982. Contact: Edward Weiner, (202) 426-4441.

The Ethics, Values in Science and Technology Program, sponsored by the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities, offers Sustained Development Awards. These awards are intended to provide long-term support for research on ethical questions in science and technology to individuals with a "substantial record" of achievement in their field, and to encourage institutions to develop programs of research, teaching, application or dissemination of science and ethics programs. Awards are generally made to highly accomplished individuals in the sciences or humanities with advanced degrees and at least 5 years of postdoctoral professional experience. Proposal deadline is February 1, 1982. Contact: Dr. Rachelle Hollander, Division of Intergovernmental and Public Service Science and Technology Programs, National Science Foundation, 1800 G Street, N.W., Room 1140C, Washington, DC 20550; (202) 357-9569.

NIH National Research Service Awards allow for full-time research training in selected areas of biomedical and behavioral research. Programs are offered through all of the NIH institutes. Applicants must have a doctoral degree and working relationship with a particular sponsor affiliated with a research institution. Stipends range from \$13,380 to \$18,780 and awards carry service payback requirements. Application deadlines in 1982 are February 1 and June 1. For further information and individual announcements, contact: Office of Grant Inquiries, Division of Research Grants, Westwood Building, Room 240, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD 20205; (301) 496-7441.

Resources for the Future announces its 1982-83 Small Grants Program. Small grants of up to \$30,000 each will be awarded for research on resources, energy, or environmental policy problems by professionals in either the natural or social sciences. For further information and application forms, contact: Herbert M. Morton, Fellowship and Small Grants Programs, Resources for the Future, 1755 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20036; (202) 832-5016. Deadline for completed applications is March 1, 1982.

Wage War On Poor Writing! Critique grading method. Developed by sociologist; classroom proven. Money-back guarantee. \$7.95 pp.; includes special grading tool/kits. Critical Products, Dept. AS, Box 1036, Ellensburg, WA 98926.

For Sale: copies of *ASR*, 1958-68, \$5.00 per issue. Maurice N. Richter, Jr., Sociology Department, SUNY-Albany, 1400 Washington Avenue, Albany, NY 12222.

Howard Schwartz and Jerry Jacobs, authors of *Qualitative Sociology: A Method to the Madness*, New York, Free Press, 1979, apologize to Kathy Charmaz for the unacknowledged use of her unpublished paper, "Qualitative Methods in Death Research", University of California-San Francisco, 1973, in our book. Our section on Grounded Theory was largely derived from her paper. Thanks are also due to Richard Rizzo for suggestions which were incorporated into this same section.

The Woman Manager in the United States, by Linda Keller Brown, is based on an analysis of over 200 studies and reports on women managers. The book reviews the literature, explores areas of controversy, and suggests further research possibilities. Copies can be obtained by sending \$5.50 plus postage to: BPW Supply, 11722 Parklawn Drive, Rockville, MD 20852.

Determinants and Consequences of Maternal Employment is an annotated bibliography by Marsha Hurst and Ruth Zambrana. The authors review current research and literature on the effects of maternal employment on women and their families, and factors affecting employment. The bibliography includes professional articles, popular books, government reports and children's books. Copies can be obtained by sending \$3.75 plus postage to: BPW Supply, 11722 Parklawn Drive, Rockville, MD 20852.

Health Care and Minority Women, a forthcoming publication of Haworth Press. Edited by Sandra A. Salazar. Manuscripts solicited on the following subjects: reproductive health, occupational health, mental health services, health needs of undocumented and refugee women, lesbian health care, advocacy needs, etc. Manuscripts should be typewritten in standard publication format with text and references in index-medicus style. Submit 3 copies by February 15, 1982, to: Sandra A. Salazar, Consumer Advocate & Liaison, Office of External Affairs, California Department of Health Services, 714 P Street, Room 1240, Sacramento, CA 95814.

The Directory of Special Opportunities for Women, edited by Martha Merrill Doss, is a guide to educational opportunities, career information, networks and counseling for women. To order, send \$18.00 to: Garrett Park Press, Garrett Park, MD 20766.

International Conference on Research and Teaching Related to Women, July 27-August 4, 1982, Montreal, Canada. The purpose of the conference is to provide an international forum for discussions and exchanges on teaching and research relating to women. It will also try to provide support for women's studies groups and consider establishing an international association. Participants limited to 300, chosen from all geographic regions. For further information, contact: Mair Verthuy, Principal, Simone de Beauvoir Institute, Concordia University, Sir George Williams Campus, MU Annex, 1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd. West, Montreal, Canada H3G 1M8. Telephone: (514) 879-8521.

Journal of International and Comparative Social Welfare is publishing a special

issue in Spring, 1983 on "Facets of Family Violence". Manuscripts must be submitted by April 31, 1982. For further information, contact: Brij Mohan, Editor-in-Chief, *Journal of International and Comparative Social Welfare*, School of Social Welfare, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803.

Black Women's Educational Policy and Research Newsletter is designed to serve the needs of researchers and policy-makers interested in education of black women. Appears 3 times a year and can be ordered from: Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA 02181.

Ideas for Developing and Conducting a Woman in Science Career Workshop is a booklet designed to assist those providing career advice to women aspiring to be scientists and engineers. The booklet describes the various phases of a workshop, as well as appropriate follow-up activities. To get a copy of this free booklet, send a mailing label to: Women in Science Program, Directorate for Science and Engineering Education, National Science Foundation, 1800 G Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20550.

The Census Bureau has recently released three reports of interest to researchers concerned with gender and family: *Child Support and Alimony: 1978* (Series P-23, No. 112; \$4.00); *Marital Status and Living Arrangements: March, 1980* (Series P-20, No. 365; \$4.25); *Household and Family Characteristics: March, 1980* (Series P-20, No. 366; \$6.50). The first documents, among other things, indicated that about 60 percent of divorced mothers are awarded child support, and that of these, only half receive the full amount they are due. It also indicates that only 14 percent of divorced/separated women are awarded alimony. The second report highlights the dramatic rise in one person and "unmarried couple households" during the seventies, while the third shows that non-family households, often containing only one person, accounted for more than half of the 15.7 million increase in number of households between 1970 and 1980. Copies of all three reports can be obtained from: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20502.

A Woman's Yellow Pages: 570+ Organizations Concerned with Women's Issues was recently published by the Federation of Organizations for Professional Women. It is a national directory of organizations with expertise on various issues affecting women. Copies cost \$4.00, plus \$1.00 for postage and handling. To order, write: Federation of Organizations for Professional Women, Suite 403, 2000 P Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

Candidates Announced

(continued from page 1)
James McCartney, University of Missouri-Columbia
Howard Taylor, Princeton University

COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

District 1
Barbara Laslett, University of Southern California
David Gold, University of California-Santa Barbara

District 2
Albert McQueen, Oberlin College
Charlotte Wolf, Ohio Wesleyan University

District 3
Gordon Streib, University of Florida-Gainesville
Zena Blaw, University of Houston

District 4
Beth B. Hess, County College of Morris
Melvin Kohn, NIMH

District 5
Elizabeth Useem, Boston State College
Cheryl Townsend Gilkes, Boston University

District 6
Jerold Heiss, University of Connecticut
David L. Sills, Social Science Research Council

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

District 1
Kiyoshi Ikeda, University of Hawaii-Manoa
Pepper Schwartz, University of Washington

District 2
James Conyers, Indiana State University
Nancy DiTomaso, Northwestern University

District 3
Joseph Fichter, Loyola University-New Orleans
John Moland, Jr., Southern University

District 4
Jan Fritz, Georgetown University
Burkart Holzner, University of Pittsburgh

District 5
Carol Brown, University of Lowell
Franklin Wilson, University of Wisconsin-Madison

District 6
Mark Abrahamson, University of Connecticut
J. Allen Whitt, Brown University

ASA FOOTNOTES

Published monthly except June, July, and September. Distributed to all persons with membership in the ASA. Annual subscriptions to non-members: \$10. Single copy: \$1.50. Contributions to "Open Forum" should be limited to 800 words; "Obituaries", 600 words; and "Letters to the Editor", 400 words.

Editor: Russell R. Dynes
Associate Editors:
Carla Howery
Bettina Huber
Jo Ann Ruckel
Paul Williams
Secretary: Herbert L. Costner

Send communications on material, subscriptions, and advertising to: American Sociological Association, 1722 N Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036; (202) 833-3410.

Copyright 1981, ASA. Third class postage paid at Washington, D.C., and additional mailing offices.

Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Nominations Invited

Nominations are invited for the 1982 ASA Award for a Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship. The Award is given for a single work, such as a book, monograph, or article, published in the preceding three calendar years (1979-81).

The winner of this award will receive a certificate of recognition and will be offered a lectureship known as the Sorokin Lecture. Regional and state sociological associations/societies may apply to ASA to receive this lecture at ASA expense after the award recipient is announced at the 1982 ASA Annual Meeting.

Members of the Association or other interested or knowledgeable parties may submit nominations for the Award. Nominations should include name of author, title of work, date of work, and publishers, and should be sent by February 1, 1982, to: Joseph S. Himes, Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, NC 27412.