Social Science & Government

Study Examines Federal Investment in Social Research

by Lawrence J. Rhodes

Nine themes run through the findings and recommendations of the first step of congressional scrutiny of the federal system of support for social knowledge production and application which was conducted, in part, to find ways to increase the global system contribute more effectively to the formation of public policies related to social problems. The themes are:

1. Government decisions on the support and application of research are not exempt from the political process.
2. Research can only make a fully contributing to the public policy process.
3. The concept of social knowledge production and application rather than the traditional concept of social research and development more accurately describes the federal investment in knowledge of social problems.
4. The diversified needs of government require a variety of research strategies and management techniques. Across-the-board reforms are likely to do more harm than good.
5. The executive and legislative branches of government must share responsibility with the research community for the current state of the system.
6. More planning and coordinating activities must be undertaken if the research system is to become more effective, especially for "oversight institutions" in the government.
7. More attention must be given to synthesizing research findings, to cumulative programs of research, to cross-cutting research, to broad social problems, to the processes of social change, and to emerging problems.
8. The needs of users of research findings must be systematically included in the planning, dissemination, and application of research. More effort should be expended on disseminating and applying quality research findings.
9. Scientific criteria should guide the allocation of support to knowledge-building activities.

These themes run through the Federal Investment in Knowledge of Social Problems, the final report of The Study Project on Social Research and Development. The Study Project was conducted by the Science and Technology Policy Office of the National Science Foundation, and was sponsored by the Science and Technology Policy Office of the National Research Council. The Study Project was conducted through the Assembly of Behavioral and Social Sciences of the National Research Council.

The Study Project's recent publication report may serve as the stimulus for redefining the situation concerning the current federal social knowledge production and application (FSPA) community, it is given extensive coverage in this issue of FOOTNOTES.

Glazer: Graduate Training Needs Professional Perspective

Although the disciplinary and professional styles of graduate training in the social sciences are coming "closer together," a greater "fusion of the professional perspective into disciplinary study" is needed if the social sciences are to make a necessary adaptation to a changing world.

That is the opinion expressed by Nathan Glazer, professor of education and sociology at Harvard University's graduate school of education. In a paper, "The Disciplinary and the Professional in Graduate Training in the Social Sciences," presented at a conference on the philosophy and the future of graduate studies held at the University of Michigan.

According to Glazer, the disciplinary perspective "emphasizes learning and research for their own sake, the advance of theory and understanding independently of their utility for practice. The professional perspective is concerned with practical and effects and the preparation of students for practice in some field. In order to capitalize on the trend toward cross-fertilization between these styles of education, Glazer called for comparative studies to see how these styles may "interact productively" and how they may avoid the specific defects they tend to develop when they remain isolated from each other.

PRACTICAL/DISCIPLINARY

Glazer cites practical and disciplinary reasons for bringing the disciplines and the professional schools closer together. Two practical reasons are:
1. There may be more job opportunities for graduate students who have done their research in a field linked to professional practice, rather than in a more theoretical field closer to the heart of the discipline.
2. Research opportunities are more likely to be available from a grant-giving agency in a field of practice than from one which is willing to advance the discipline as such.

Glazer, however, believes there are "good reasons from the point of view of the development of the discipline" to infuse disciplinary study with the professional perspective.

Meeting Moves To New York

The 1983 ASA Annual Meeting will be held in New York Hilton, August 28-29, as a result of the sending referendum held last summer. The new location was selected by ASA Council during its meeting in San Francisco in September.

The referendum was held to determine whether the 1980 meeting should remain in Atlanta or be moved to an ERA state. The final vote tally showed that 5,386 members cast ballots in the referendum with 2,896 or 56.8 percent voting to move to an ERA state and 2,390 or 43.2 percent voting to stay in Atlanta.

Glazer admits that the infusion of the professional perspective into disciplinary study will not be easy, for he asks, "How does one teach for practice, or the understanding of practice, when theory remote from practice has been the mainstay of teaching in graduate social science?"

Glazer believes the infusion of a professional perspective into disciplinary study will raise the most difficult issue faced by professional scientists in the graduate schools.

One reason, perhaps the main reason," he said, "is that what one learns, teaches, and researches changes sharply as one approaches the frontier of practical work, the kind of work that professionals in fields of social policy do.

Glazer thinks that education within a discipline is very different from education within a profession and he explicates these differences in the following manner: "There is a very different flavor to each. One significant element of training within a discipline in the social sciences is that the writings of masters is crucial. This is what theory is all about. The way one studies the discipline is by studying texts, comparing texts, penetrating texts, developing their implications . . . and one's status in the discipline depends on the degree to which one has contributed a text worthy of such analysis, one which is itself an analysis of the texts of earlier fathers of the discipline."

Glazer says that he is not one of these professional scientists, and when one sees it, it is generally the analysis of less worthy texts. But in contrast with academic disciplines, there is little of this. One examines practice, through courses which are often entirely professional.

Glazer Announces Retirement

Alice Myers, Administrative Officer of the American Sociological Association, informed ASA Council that she will retire after the 1979 Annual Meetings. This will represent a significant loss to the Association in which she has played a major administrative role for the past 16 years. Those who work most closely with her understand the important contributions she has made to the history and growth of the Association. She will be missed.
THE JOSSEY-BASS SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE SERIES
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SOCIOBIOLOGY AND HUMAN NATURE
An Interdisciplinary Critique and Defense

This is the first comprehensive evaluation of an exciting but controversial topic: Sociobiology—the study of the biological basis of all social behavior—first came to national attention in 1975 with the publication of Edward O. Wilson's Sociobiology: The New Synthesis. Since then it has been called everything from the first major biological paradigm since Darwin's to a doctrine that is viciously racist and sexist. After three years of partisan debate, it is time to take a balanced look at sociobiology and its implications for human beings. Sociobiology and Human Nature presents pro and con views in original chapters prepared for this book by authorities in the biological and behavioral sciences, philosophy, and the history of science. The book brings into focus professional perspectives on the human impact of sociobiology. At the same time, the chapters interact to reveal four particular themes that have wider implications for both the sciences and the humanities. (1) Culture: Is genetic determinism compatible with culturally derived learning? (2) Consciousness: Is the mind merely a product of the genes? (3) Reproductive potential: How is it that the human capacity to maximize reproductive potential is used to produce tools, language, art, and culture? (4) Ethical implications: If we are not responsible for our behavior, what is our place in the scheme of life?

FIELD RESEARCH
A Manual for Logistics and Management of Scientific Studies in Natural Settings

Field research—the process of making scientific investigations in natural settings such as schools, hospitals, streets, factories, and homes—entails special problems of logistics and management, which, if not dealt with efficiently, can upset the most polished research design and even threaten the validity of research findings. However, these problems and the practical issues of field research are seldom detailed in final research reports nor are they given careful attention in courses on research methodology. In her new book, Judith Fiedler provides a long-needed, carefully considered rationale for determining field procedures and the first step-by-step guide for identifying and resolving problems in field research. Beginning with the original planning of field studies through site selection, public information and communication, staffing, cost estimates, budgeting, supplies, and record keeping, the book examines every stage of field operations. Each chapter fully discusses a specific aspect of field research, makes practical suggestions for implementation, and presents vivid examples of field research conducted under authentic conditions. Numerous samples of budget and report forms, operations schedules, and other materials actually used in field research are provided. The book is designed to simplify and facilitate field operations of all types, from small, controlled academic research projects of graduate students to large-scale studies involving thousands of subjects, many staff members, and multiple settings.

INCEST
A Psychological Study of Causes and Effects with Treatment Recommendations

Although incest is relatively rare occurrence, its impact on those who experience it, especially children, is cause for concern. However, incest has been given little attention by researchers, and many questions about its cause and effects remain unanswered. How does incest affect the development of personality adjustment in adulthood? What specific conditions in the family encourage incestuous situations? What are the characteristics of incestuous fathers? What are the patterns of sexual behavior that different types of incestuous fathers exhibit? How does participation in father-daughter incest affect the development of the son? To what extent is mother-son incest associated with mental illness?

In her new book, Karin Meiselman integrates concrete findings from her own study of incest with those of earlier researchers to provide a comprehensive summary of what is known about overt incest. She presents previously unreported information to fill major blanks in knowledge of the short- and long-term effects of incest and offers recommendations for its prevention, detection, and treatment. Meiselman's findings are the result of a unique study of the experiences of incest victims. Her sample included sixty-eight cases, and she employed a control group—one of the few incest studies to do so. Throughout, Meiselman compares and integrates her findings with the world literature on incest, thus making the observations and hypotheses of researchers over the past fifty years available to clinicians.

DEVELOPING AN INTERDISCIPLINARY SCIENCE OF ORGANIZATIONS

The authors of this new book question traditional approaches to the study of organizations and offer new strategies for moving this study from a collection of unrelated and incongruous facts toward an integrated science. They assess approaches to organizational research used by sociologists, social and organizational psychologists, and human factors specialists to show that such approaches are too limited and usually reflect misunderstanding of related sets of phenomena. As a first step toward overcoming interdisciplinarity differences, the authors describe a common research language consisting of a small number of concepts whose meanings are, in general, agreed on. They use this language to develop a framework for organizational research and theory that focuses on both structure and processes of organizations and that provides a way of maintaining the generalizability of findings across disciplines and across levels of analysis. The authors discuss a frequently encountered problem in organizational studies—aggregation bias—and make tentatively supported for dealing with it. They provide examples of past research, demonstrating how their framework could have been profitably applied to those studies. Finally, the authors discuss the use of organizational data in support of public policies, the need to determine the external validity of findings, and the social values of organizational research.

Developing an Interdisciplinary Science of Organizations

Free copies are not available. For personal or library orders, write Box ASA.
Assessing Interest in Social Aspects of Space Utilization

A survey is being conducted to assess the level of interest that social sciences and humanities scholars concerning the social aspects of the probable permanent commercial utilization of space by the turn of this century. Like every technology, space industry is expected to provide new opportunities and cause new problems for the world community. Unlike earlier technologies, however, Chason is hopeful that “incipient social, political and economic problems that might otherwise be overlooked in technology planning” will be diagnosed early by social scientists and humanities scholars and addressed by policy makers “before they manifested themselves in the wider community.”

Serious proposals for the large scale use of space have not given extensive consideration to the social and humanistic issues raised by such proposals, so the broad participation of the social sciences/humanities is needed because of its importance to the planning and eventual utilization of space, Chason said.

If you are working on or interested in this new area of investigation, you can have your name placed on the survey mailing list by writing to The Space Utilization Team, The Graduate School Office, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20057.
Study Recommends Larger Role for Oversight Institutions
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nature of the policy process." Finally, it asserts that "the production of knowledge on social problems and its application by government and other decision makers requires "effective political support" for its continued existence.

ROLE OF RESEARCH

The Study Project report states that "knowledge based on good research is costly, and the research community at any time has a limited capacity to produce it. Involvement in such work is therefore based on an understanding of the diversified ways that knowledge obtained from this involvement can strengthen the nation's capacity to see and deal with its social problems."

The report continues, "In contrast to the process research, the research is inherently apolitical in the sense that it cannot resolve the value questions that underlie the policy process. Research may clarify these differences and widen the range of acceptable disagreement by showing the likely consequences of policy choices, but research cannot show why one set of values should be preferred to another."

But, the report concludes "although appropriate and critical wisdom will continue to be the major important ingredients of decision making, systematic research is an increasingly important source of insights, ideas, and evidence. Under these circumstances, resistance by policy makers to investing in and applying new knowledge will be detrimental both to the development of effective government policies and to the maintenance of the creative energies of the research community."

The major problem resides in the inherent tensions between the policy and research processes. The report states, "If government and the research community are to be effectively linked, a policy process that is simultaneously political, in complete and informed, and forced by events must be reconciled with a research process that is unable to resolve the conflict, resistant to closure, and time-consuming."

PRODUCTION AND APPLICATION

The Study Project developed the new concept of "social knowledge production and application" because it felt that the traditional concept of "social research and development" did not accurately describe the broad federal portfolio of investments in knowledge about social problems and (2) that "development" was not understood when used in relation to social problems.

DIVERSIFIED NEEDS

Because the federal government holds a diversified portfolio of investments in social P&A, "it will need very different policies to manage the strength of the community and improve federal prog-

rams and policies to benefit third parties, to gain more understanding of social problems, and to add basic resources of knowledge and method."

Consequently, the Study Project developed a fivefold classification of the motives of the federal government in investing in social P&A. See related article on funding patterns. The diversified needs of the investment program led the Study Project to argue against "simple remedies": "Sweeping organizational prescriptions are more likely to change government than to improve it. We believe that action on the recognized need for the centralization of research administration, the mandated use of peer review or user panels, a shift to multi-year funding, or the establishment of standardized planning processes or standardized formats and procedures for reporting research results would do more harm than good."

The report also appears the Study Project is arguing for management by objectives.

The Study Project also reported that it was alert to the problem of incentives for change" in making its suggestions for improvements: "The present system is an integral part of ongoing political and administrative processes and will not easily change. We have therefore avoided certain recommenda-
tions that recognize the incentives and disincentives that shape the system."

EXECUTIVE LEGISLATIVE

The Study Project did not ignore the contributions the executive and legislative branches of government made to the inefficiency of the present system. In particular, it called attention to the sins of commission and omission committed by OMB, the White House, the central planning and budgeting offices of federal agencies, congressional committees and subcommittees, the General Accounting Office, and the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

For an extended treatment of the problems and options of the system see related article in this issue.

PLANNING/COORDINATION

The Study Project placed the responsibility for creating mechanisms by which the radicaliy decentralized and compartmentalized system could be integrated to some unattained degree in the hand of "oversight institutions" in the government, especially departmental policy and planning offices, OMB, and congressional committees acting, in part, through their support agencies.

For a listing of the "oversight institutions" see related item in this issue. The report stated, "We recognize that urging more intervention by oversight institutions in the management of P&A and development application may invite more controls. Our expectation, however, is that this will not occur. Currently, controls are more apt to result from too little exposure to the problems of research ad-

ministration, rather than from too many."

The report continued, "Effective oversight may require more stringent regulation of performance as well as limiting budgets on occasion, so that competent staff are not stretched too thin. Moreover, it may require that or-
ganizations such as OMB and agency budget offices refrain from issuing posture statements and reports out of prudence for quality for quality, do not spend their budgets by the end of the fiscal year."

The Study Project identified "predictability of future budget and staff size" as the key to good research and effective research planning.

NEW INITIATIVES

The Study Project also pinned its hope for new research initiatives—cross-cutting research, broad social problems, emerging problems—on the "oversight institutions" because they "have responsibilities that cut across the interests of individual agencies," and because of "an emerging trend toward the incorporation of more cross-cutting perspectives in the political process."

The report states, "This trend (toward cross-cutting perspectives) has significant implications for federal support of social knowledge production and application for two reasons. First, it increases the incentive for institutions with a cross-cutting role in policy making to promote investments in new knowledge that will help them in making or recommending policy and program changes, enhancing their influence in the policy process. Second, because of their jurisdictions, these institutions are peculiarly able to promote the kinds of improvements in federal support of social knowledge production and application that we suggest. They are able to maintain direct lines of communication with decision makers, re-

search administrators, and researchers. Most of these institutions have an analytical capacity and participate in the policy-making process. Hence they have both the competence and the opportunity to bridge gaps between decision makers and knowledge producers. And their incentive to perform this role (knowledge brokerage) is increasing."

DISSEMINATION/APPLICATION

The Study Project emphasized its "strong belief that the key to the dissemination and use of re-
search intended to aid in program support is the clear coordination of research planning with program and policy planning."

Consequently, it suggested that "a demand-pull model of use, where funders and program managers calling for information they need, is much likelier to succeed than is a supply-push model, with research administr-
tors trying to hawk the results of work they have supported."

The Study Project also urged that "serious attention" be given to improving in-house research capabilities in the federal agencies as a means of promoting program and policy research.

BASIC RESEARCH

The Study Project also called attention to a "key issue facing independent research agencies in recent years: how much criteria of relevance or social utility should complement science criteria in setting priorities for knowledge-building activities?"

The Study Project recommended that "scientific criteria, rather than policy or relevance, guide the allocation of sup-
port budget and that planning for such research be the "shared responsibility of the research community and research administrators in research agen-
cies, such as NSF, that support fundamental knowledge building."

In addition, the report states, "The authorization and appropri-
ations committees of Congress, and

From Social R&D to Social Knowledge P&A

A new concept of social knowledge production and application was employed in the study rather than the conventional concept of social research and development in an attempt to give a sharper description of central efforts to acquire and use knowledge of social problems.

The new concept was also employed because the term "development" is not well understood when applied in the social sphere.

Seven categories of activities are subsumed by the concept of social knowledge production and application, four of which fall outside the scope of social R&D as traditionally defined.

KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION

Four categories define knowledge production: (Those marked by an "f" outside the definition of R&D used by NSF and OMB.)

Research: Research is sys-
tematic, intensive study di-
rected toward greater knowl-
edge or understanding of the behavior of individuals, groups of individuals, and collections. Includes basic, applied and policy research.

Demonstrations for policy formulation: A demonstra-
tion for policy formulation is undertaken to learn new in-
formation about the outcomes and administrative or political effects of particular action and occur in an operational setting for a limited period of time. Social experiments fall into this category.

Program evaluation: Program evaluation is a mana-
gement tool that seeks to sys-
tematically analyze federal programs (or their compo-
nents) to determine the extent to which they have achieved their objectives.

General purpose statistics: General purpose statistics include either current or periodic data of general in-
terest and use the characteristics of such data are that of the specific users and uses are unknown.

KNOWLEDGE APPLICATION

Three categories define knowledge application: * Demonstration for policy implementation: A demonstra-
tion for policy implementation is undertaken to promote or initiate a particular action rather than to generate new information.

Development of materials: The development of materials consists of the systematic use of knowledge and under-
standing gained from research to produce materials.

* Dissemination: Dissemi-
nation consists of activities undertaken by research mana-
gers or others to promote the application of knowledge or data resulting from social knowledge production ac-
tivities.

OTHER DIFFERENCES

This study also differs from surveys conducted by NSF and OMB in two more ways: first, it was decided that research on social problems carried out by investigators in disciplines other than social science and psychology.

Second, it included 14 agencies that do not report any of their activities as "re-
search" or "development" in response to the NSF survey of R&D.
Problems Hamper Social Organization of Federal Research Effort

by Laurence J. Rhodes

Numerous problems confronting the management of federal support for social knowledge and application need to be addressed by the executive and legislative branches of government before P&A can more effectively contribute to policy formation related to social problems.

The Study Project in its final report groups the problems into three broad categories: (1) setting research agendas; (2) disseminating and applying results; and (3) managing the system.

Each of these broad categories contains a number of more specific problems:

(i) Setting Research Agendas
   (1) a lack of routine input from social knowledge and application
   (2) failure to deal with gaps in research
   (3) absence of incentives to promote coordination in research and the conduct of “cross-cutting” research both within and between agencies.

(ii) Disseminating and Applying Results
   (1) reasons for neglecting dissemination and application
   (2) need for a more complete audience for supported research
   (3) an excessive project orientation
   (4) a lack of understanding of the process of change and innovation
   (5) the highly varied use of knowledge brokers across the government.

Managing the system: (1) rapid turnover of staff and labor-scarce environments; (2) highly uncertain and unstable funding; (3) no consistent rationale for choosing instruments of support, an issue that requires the testing of the alternative communication systems.

The Study Project addresses these problems through recommendations that also take into account (1) the nature of government structure as an agency reactor, its short-term perspective, its need to act on incomplete information—and (2) the diversity of the federal systems—program-supporting, policy-forming, problem-exploring, knowledge-building—that produce a “remarkable variety of support-and-application loops.”

A support-and-application loop has two arcs, “one representing the setting of research agendas and the support of the work, the other representing the dissemination and application of the knowledge gained by research.”

Support-and-application loops vary by (1) the length of time needed to close the loop, and (2) the degree to which applications can be supported, and (3) the number of loops that must be interconnected. When the loops are joined, the arc is comprised of the loops, and the arcs are joined.

The four types of research supported by the government can be considered a continuum of difficulty which starts with programs requiring support from both the inside and outside with knowledge-building research on the higher end.

(iii) Setting Research Agen
d

The Study Project found that “the general content and emphasis of research agendas are shaped largely by factors external to the agencies. Many agencies respond to these forces ‘largely in ad hoc, reactive fashion.’”

The report said, “agency management activities that could be described as ‘planning’, i.e., the systematic derivation of research agendas from an analysis of the issues or problems with which the agency should be concerned, their ‘re-searchability’, and the potential benefits to those with a stake in research.”

The ideas and priorities of users are not found to be systematically considered in the research planning process even in agencies where research programs are directly tied to operating service programs.

The Study Project found “little coordination” occurring among agencies, and inadequate pursuit of “numerous aspects of large policy or problem areas...either because they are not perceived as being a part of a particular agency’s mission or of one funding agency, or because they are vaguely within the domains of more than one agency.”

The Study Project also found “little attention” given to “forecasting social problems in order to direct current social knowledge.”

Finally, the Study Project found little evidence of duplication of effort, probably because agencies need to coordinate their products in order to maintain support.

The Study Project asserted that those in the executive and legislative branches who might encourage better research planning should recognize the effects of agencies and organizations on agenda setting.

The report concluded, “...‘overnight’ institutions—the dominant policy staff in the White House, OMB, the central planning and budgeting offices of federal agencies, congressional appropriations committees, and the General Accounting Office—might play an important role in establishing the forces that discourage unified and coordinated action and dissipate the benefits that could be realized from social P&A.”

The report further states, “Without incentives, research should be assured that it will divert score time and talent to activities that can seem to be abstract exercises with little impact on the growth or survival of their agencies.”

The conclusion, “Indeed, many government communications on agencies supporting the production and use of knowledge—such as the survey of research questionnaires and field interviews, regulations on agency staffing and control, and contracts on the use of grants and contracts—frequently exacerbate the weaknesses of research administration. The report to management controls is a natural tendency of those who must oversee a decentralized system with widely varying responsibilities, but those controls do not offer research administrators positive incentives for creative planning of research needs.”

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recognizing the critical role set by the management of the entire system of social knowledge production and applications, the Study Project made its recommendations for change to this problem area:

1. We recommend that federal research administrators and other officials in departmental policy planning and analysis offices

Need for Outside Evaluation Cited
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other oversight agencies, should recognize the need for building the support of basic advances in knowledge in the national pursuit of social research and development. NSF and other research agencies should state the logic of their inclusion in the federal government. These agencies should also take the lead in assessing the potential application of knowledge in social problems. They should have the full cooperation of the research community both in making the use of social knowledge a priority and in periodically assessing the relevance of new knowledge to social problems.

FURTHER EVALUATION

The Study Project recommended further evaluations of major programs every five to ten years by outside firms or institutes under the auspices of an advisory committee composed in part of prominent researchers and consumers of research in the federal government to ensure objectivity. The evaluations should address, “address the quality, timeliness, and applicability or value of the results; the appropriateness of the methods used to develop a research agenda, to choose and support projects, and to oversee the preparation, presentation, and dissemination of knowledge; and the relevance of the overall program to emerging social problems, scientific developments, and public policy issues.”

Members of the Study Project were Donald E. Stokes, Chairman, Princeton University; Frederick O. Haynes, Massachusetts; Lester B. Lave, Carnegie-Mellon University; Laurence E. Lynn, Jr., Harvard University; Guy Orcutt, Yale University; Michael D. Reagan, UC Riverside; George Tanham, RAND Corporation; and Robin M. Williams, Jr., Cornell University.

Oversight Institutions Named

The study project identified the following oversight positions within the executive and legislative branches of the federal government that exercise critical oversight of federal efforts to create and use knowledge of social problems:

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

• Director of OMB
• Science and Technology Adviser to the President
• Director of NSF
• Director of the National Science Board
• Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission
• Secretary of HEW
• Secretary of HUD
• Secretary of Labor
• Secretary of Transportation
• Assistant Secretary of HEW for Planning & Evaluation
• Assistant Secretary of HUD for Policy Development & Research
• Assistant Secretary of Labor for Policy, Evaluation & Research

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

• Comptroller General of the U.S.

SENATE

• Chairman, Appropriations Committee plus the Chairman of its Subcommittees on:
  • —HUD-Independent Agencies
  • —Labor, Health, Education & Welfare
  • —Transportation
• Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing & Urban Affairs
• Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation plus the Chairman of its Subcommittee on:
  • —Science, Technology, & Space
• Chairman, Committee on Governmental Affairs

HOUSE

• Chairman, Committee on Human Resources plus the Chairman of its Subcommittee on:
  • —Health & Scientific Research
  • —Aging
  • —Alcoholism & Drug Abuse
  • —Child & Human Development
  • —Education, Arts & Humanities
  • —Employment, Poverty & Migratory Labor
  • —Hospitals
  • —Labor

• Chairman, Appropriations Committee plus the Chairman of its Subcommittee on:
  • —HUD-Independent Agencies
  • —Labor

• Chairman, Committee on Banking, Finance & Urban Affairs
• Chairman, Committee on Education & Labor plus the Chairman of its Subcommittee on:
  • —Postsecondary Education
  • —Vocational Education

• Chairman, Committee on Government Operations
• Chairman, Committee on Science, Space & Technology plus the Chairman of its Subcommittee on:
  • —Domestic & International Scientific Planning, Analysis, & Cooperation
  • —Science, Research & Technology
Study Outlines What Is Wrong & What Can Be Done About It
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to undertake production and application activities to explore major social problems. Such programs will require the substantial and continuing involvement of federal policy makers and research administrators, in addition to the appropriate, potential users of research outside the federal government. It is our belief that if adequate support is provided, a period of five to ten years.

5. We recommend that appropriate oversight be developed of the development of more adequate methods of forecasting emerging social problems, of defining research agendas, and of laying an adequate research-based understanding of such problems. This should include attention to the social aspect of emerging problems with a high technological or scientific consequence.

6. Within programs of research that seek to enlarge general re- sources of knowledge or method, we recommend the use of specific criteria, rather than problem or policy relevance, as the guide to allocation of support to particular projects. The primary importance of scientific criteria should be recognized by Congress and other oversight agencies.

7. We recommend that agencies funding research directed to users outside the government should more effectively involve those users in setting research agendas and in developing strategies for applying their recommendations. They should be strongly encouraged in this by the Office of Management and Budget and by Congress. We recommend further that a special review be undertaken of the effectiveness of third-party research in meeting the needs of its potential users.

Disseminating Applying

The Study Project found "con-sensus emphasis on disseminating research results ranged from heavy to nonexistent" among the agencies supporting social and S&A, yet with few exceptions, discovered "little developed policy concern concerning dissemination or application.

Reasons for neglecting dissemination include: (1) doubts among research administrators about either the quality of the research or the relevance of the results; (2) lack of agreement inside or outside the government concerning the appropriate federal role in disseminating research results; (3) administrative and academic orientations believe they have an automatic dissemination mechanism while administrators of the agencies do not rely on this mechanism typically have no alternative system; and (4) efforts by federal agencies to improve dissemination have frequently been thwarted by agency or OMB hostility to expenditures for the publication of "self-serving" agency reports, to the subsidized distribution of materials, or to publication of politically sensitive findings.

Evidence indicates that research administrators do not have a clear sense of the appropriate audience for the research they support, even when they have definite expectations that findings will be published.

The Study Project found "little effort" devoted to synthesizing research knowledge or seeing the results of particular research projects as net additions to an existing body of knowledge.

Consequently, an excessive project orientation has lead to the dissemination of project findings "with little attempt to place them in a substantive or intellectual context." From our discussions, discovered "little developed policy concern concerning dissemination or application.

The project states, "the incentives that produce fragmentation and ad hoc, reactive decisions on research priorities clearly operate here as well. A policy process concerned with negotiating incremental changes to statutory authorities, budgets, and regulations generates no more than a weak demand for broad syntheses of knowledge.

Although research administrators need to have a good understanding of the ways in which change occurs and innovations are adopted, this problem was only partially identified in the study of case studies of change rather than to personal inadequacy.

The report said, "it is especially striking how often those who are concerned with the dissemination of research findings substitute a faith that good research will find its audience for systematic understan dings into the process of change."

The use of knowledge brokers was found to be well-developed only in those areas of government where planning and policy analysis activities are influential in decision making.

The project states, "The success of the brokerage function is therefore largely dependent on how ef fectively program planning is managed. If there is an orderly program planning and development, knowledge brokers can channel research information to policy makers and influence the direction policy needs to researchers."

The Project believes the fragmentation of decision making with overlapping, subcom mittee in Congress "complicates the organization of research brokerage, but also makes it essential.

The Study Project sees a more developing in the development of "real-world" ize these functions in support agencies that are politically neutral"—the Congressional Research Service within the Library of Congress, the Office of Technology Assessment, the General Accounting Office, and the Congressional Budget Office—in order to give congressional policy makers a brokerage function simi lar to the one developing in the executive branch.

Recommendations

The Study Project made four recommendat ions for change that are related to disseminating and applying research results:

1. We recommend that department and agency budget officials, the Office of Management and Budget, and congressional committees responsible for proposing agency authorizations require that more attention be given to the dissemination of high-quality research results to potential users.

2. We recommend that federal agencies supporting knowledge production and dissemination of their own should conform their research to propose a public, periodic basis of synthesis the knowledge gained from their research programs to oversight institutions, particularly the Office of Management and Budget and the congressional support agencies, and perhaps the National Science Foundation, should sponsor a regular and periodic basis of synthesis of existing knowledge concerning social problems or policy areas.

3. We recommend that more studies of the process of social change and the adoption of innovations by federal and non-federal policy makers be conducted by agencies that support social knowledge production and application activities for these reasons. More and better information is needed about how knowledge from social research is translated into social policy programs.

4. We recommend that departments and agencies organize and manage their own program planning and budgeting activities to provide a significant role for knowledge brokers. Such brokers should assume increased responsibility for promoting systematic policy planning and program development within federal agencies specifically ensuring the regular involvement of potential users in setting agenda for social knowledge production and application activities.

Managing the System

The Study Project found that frequent turnovers among high-level decision makers have adversely affected continuity and coherence of programs, (2) the morale of other staff members, (3) the stability of the organizations, (4) the organization of the agencies, and (5) the ability to develop working relationships between those in leadership and people in the field.

Mid-level staff personnel in labor or social services agencies which do not allow them adequate time to perform planning, monitoring, and analysis of experimental and research activities. This labor-scarce situation tends to produce a treded workforce that cannot function as experts in experimental and research functions that tend to leave one or the other neglected.

Consequently, agency monitoring is overly realized in quar terly and semi-annual reporting requirements that are costly and time-consuming for administrators or the policy implications of research is neglected, the capacity to disseminate research results and the development of practice is ignored.

The report comments, "it is striking that the extent that the overall federal budget has increased dramatically since 1948, the number of federal employees has been remarkably stable." (1948: slightly more than 2.0 mill ion employees; 1977: slightly less than 2.8 million.)

Nevertheless, Congress and OMB have responded to requests for more adequate staffing by pre scribing "strict controls to be used by the agencies supporting research" including an increasing use of consultants and outside experts, demands for better justification for staff increases, and more attention to the "practical implications" of the report.

The report concluded, "In gen eral, however, the combined effect of Cse/Se restriction on re cuiting full-time and part-time people employed by OMB have created barriers to filling key staff posi tions with qualified experts."

The Study Project also found that agencies supporting social S&A research are frequently subject to highly uncertain and unstable funding.

Uncertainty discourages strategic planning and contributes to the politically inspired search for the most "salable" research proposals which may lead to more instability if expectations about project outcomes are not met.

The Study Project also found "no consistent pattern of grant and contract activities throughout the federal government" and the diversity which was found could not be "explained in terms of the differences in the specificity of the knowledge being sought or in the need to hold researchers accountable to specific funding agencies."

The increasingly significant shift from grants to contracts produced the following comment in the report:

"See More Page 7"
Federal Funds: How Much, From Where, For What, For Whom

by Lawrence J. Rhodes

An analysis of fiscal 1976 obligations shows the magnitude of federal obligations for social knowledge production and application and demonstrates two of the characteristics of the federal social knowledge production and application sector: its concentration and its multiple objectives.

The analysis also demonstrates that operating programs of mission agencies are the major sources of support for social knowledge production and application. The analysis supports the view that despite the increased emphasis on research to support policy making in recent years, less than 10 percent of the total P&A obligation is directedly associated with offices primarily performing policy-making functions.

Finally, the analysis indicates that only 11 percent of the total obligation is spent on the advancement of knowledge.

TOTAL OBLIGATIONS

The federal government obligated $1.8 billion in fiscal 1976 to acquire and use knowledge of social problems. Although large in absolute terms, this figure is actually small compared to the cost of R&D outside the social fields and mission agencies, which accounts for 9 percent when compared to the cost of operating the government's social programs.

Two-thirds of all obligations during fiscal 1976 were for the four categories of knowledge production: (1) research including basic, applied, and policy-oriented research; (2) demonstrations for policy formulation; (3) agencies—operating programs, policy-making offices, R&D funding, and collection or analysis of statistics; and (4) goals and audience.

The categories are subdivided into four major groups: (1) concentration and expenditures; (2) major sources of support; (3) knowledge production and application; and (4) collection and analysis of statistics.

TABLE 1: Twenty Agencies with Largest Budgets for Social Knowledge Production and Application (fiscal 1976 obligations, $ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Knowledge Production</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Office of Education</td>
<td>HEW</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. National Science Foundation</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Office of Human Development</td>
<td>HEW</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. National Institute of Education</td>
<td>HEW</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bureau of Census</td>
<td>HEW</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. National Institutes of Health</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. National Science Foundation</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. National Institutes of Health</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Social Security</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Administration</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Health Services</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. AAA for Planning &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Statistical Reporting</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Economic Research</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. National Highway Safety Administration</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Social Security</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Cooperative State</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Office of the Secretary of the Treasury</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The report contains only the following recommendation concerning the allocation of resources to the various activities, policy areas, types of agencies, goals, and audiences:

"We recommend that the Office of Management and Budget, the Senate and House Budget Committees, and the Congressional Budget Office at their direction, and the planning offices of federal agencies regularly review and assess the allocation of social knowledge production and application resources among policy areas, organizations, programs, or activities within their jurisdictions.

More Problems, Recommendations

Four classifications were used to analyze the funding patterns in the system: (1) type of activity—knowledge production or knowledge application; (2) social area—human resources, community resources, natural resources, educational resources, or technology base; (3) agency—operating programs, policy-making offices, R&D funding, and collection or analysis of statistics; and (4) goals and audience.

FUNDING PATTERNS

The categories are subdivided into four major groups: (1) concentration and expenditures; (2) major sources of support; (3) knowledge production and application; and (4) collection and analysis of statistics.

The report said, "Most of the evidence of our study, however, points to the systematic discouragement and erosion of this methodological and policy review process by management and budget officials, as well as by policy analysis and program development offices. What has this study done for me, orientation, most of these officials regard institutional self-interest and personal ambitions as the potential of such arrangements in the recent past.

RECOMMENDATION

The Study Project made four recommendations for changes that are related to managing the system:

1. We recommend that the Office of Management and Budget, congressional committees, and budget agencies periodically review the staffing and funding of agencies that support knowledge production and application with the objective of tailoring their capabilities to the mission and responsibilities.

2. We recommend that each agency develop and implement policies to increase the awareness of the options available and to match its staff to those options to its mission and responsibilities.

3. We recommend that training programs be provided, either by departmental agencies or by the Office of Management and Budget, to inform agency administrators and program staff about the implications of the recommendations.
Projects State Workshop for New Teachers

A practical workshop for new teachers—those in their first or second year of teaching—will be held at the University of Houston January 2-5 by the ASA Projects on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology.

Registration deadline for the workshop is December 4. The workshop will be limited to about 20 teachers.

Peter Bishop, workshop coordinator, said the workshop will "mix general ideas about teaching in higher education with practical techniques for teaching specific curricula" and offer workshops being placed on practicality.

The workshop will concentrate on three concrete problems facing new teachers: (1) course planning, (2) classroom strategies, and (3) course evaluation.

Bishop said workshop participants will be expected to work on their courses and classroom strategies as they are using or planning to use in their departments.

Participants will choose a registration fee to cover workshop materials, lodging and some meals. Participants will also be responsible for their travel costs and other meals.

For additional information contact: Peter Bishop, Department of Sociology, University of Houston-Clear Lake City, 2701 Fay Avenue Boulevard, Houston, TX 77058.

Syllabi on Sociology of Education Available from Resources Center

A new publication, "Teaching the Sociology of Education: Syllabi and Materials from Undergraduate Courses," is available for distribution in the discipline through the ASA Teaching Resource Center in cooperation with the ASA Sociology of Education Section.

The Teaching Resources Center also has a syllabi set on introductory sociology available. A syllabi set on social problems is being developed.

The 75-page document was compiled by Caroline Hodges Perkins, Floyd Morgan Hammad and Warms Theakston, with the assistance of Theodore Wagenau.

Most of the document is devoted to reproducing nine complete syllabi, plus excerpts from six additional syllabi. The excerpts were selected because they contain helpful course rationale, study questions, project ideas or useful bibliographic material.

Sociologists Teaching Chautauqua Courses: Apply Now

Six sociologists will offer Chautauqua-type short courses for teachers of undergraduate students in and around the country during the 1978-79 academic year.

The sociologists are: Austin Leon F. Bovier, U.S. Bureau of the Census; Howard E. Freeman, UCLA; Dennis F. Johnston, U.S. Bureau of the Census; Hans O. Mauksch, University of Missouri-Columbia; Dennis Miteli, Colorado State University; and E. Percil Stanford, San Diego State University.

These short courses are patterned after the Chautauqua program of the late 19th and early 20th centuries which brought educational and cultural activities to small towns and rural areas of the U.S.

In this program, supported by NSF and administered by AAAS, the instructors "ride the circuit," repeating their course at several field centers located on college campuses or in large numbers of college science faculty.

Enrollment in each course is limited to 25 teachers. Each course meets twice in two-day sessions: once in the fall, and again in the spring.

The Chautauqua sessions are designed to provide a structure to teachers to incorporate new knowledge and concepts into teaching their courses with minimum delay.

Applications are available from the centers where the courses are taught. Applications are accepted on a space-available basis until the course begins.

Cost of instructional materials and lodging for non-commuting students is covered by centers large or small.

Grants. Teachers or their institutions must pay travel, meals and other expenses.

TITLES/Locations

The following list contains, for each course offered by a sociologist, the course title, starting dates, locations, and name and number of the contact director:

- "Sociology of Austin," Texas A&M University, James W. Johnston; "Sociology of the University," Ohio State University, Harold G. Fineman; "Sociology of the Graduate," University of Texas, Robert E. Horvitz; "Sociology of the College," California State University, San Diego, Bruce W. Jorgensen, or Sheldon M. Eisenberg. (203) 245-4267, November 2-3, University of Texas-Austin (see above); November 9-10, Oregon Graduate Center for Study and Research, Nicholas J. Enor (503) 234-3211.
- "Social Indicators, October 30-31, University of Iowa, Department of Sociology, Paul Timmerman.

- "Sociology of the Process of Teaching," November 13-14, University of Colorado, Malcolm Correll (303) 492-8844, November 16-17, Oregon Graduate Center for Study and Research (see above).

36 Undergraduate Teachers Participate In Summer Seminars Offered by NEH Program

Thirty-six sociologists from thirty-five community colleges, colleges, and universities participated in 16 summer seminars sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities around the country last summer.

Participants received $2,500 to assist them in covering living expenses, the purchase of books and other research expenses, and the cost of travel and to and from the seminar location.

The summer program offers an opportunity for faculty members of two-year, four-year, and five-year colleges to work under the direction of a distinguished scholar and to have access to the collections of a major research library.

For more information on NEH programs for college teachers write to: Division of Fellowship, NEH, 800 15th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20506.

Sociologists and the seminars they attended are listed below:

- William C. Yee, Indiana University-Northwest; "The Social Responsiveness of Volkslore and Folklore" by Michael R. Dimon, Indiana University.
- John V. Hoerner, Indiana University-Purdue University, and Harriettt M. Skillem, Framingham State University; "Technology, Society, and Values in 20th Century America" by John G. Burke, UCLA (see above).
- Stephen W. Will, Marshall University; "Culture and Politics in Europe in the Era of the Liberal Crisis, 1890-1931" by Robert Wolf, UCLA.
- Lindburgh L. Smith, Albany State College; "The Importance of History to the Philosophy of Science" by Jack Hacking, Stanford University.
- Thomas R. Shannon, Radford College; "Political Participation and Mobilization in Comparative Perspective" by Joseph LaPalombara, Yale University.
- Nelson H. Hart, Spring Arbor College; "Religion and Politics" by Wilson C. McWilliams, Rutgers University.
- Pearl W. Bartlett, Glassboro State College, and Gene H. Starbuck, Mesa College; "Ideals and the Quest for Utopia" by Mihedul Q. Silberry, University of Minnesota.
- Harjinder S. Jassal, SUNY-Cortland; "Anthropological Models for the Study of Modern South Asia History" by Bernard S. Cohn, University of Chicago.
- Shirley W. Jackson, Randolph-Macon Woman's College, and Jane S. Weeks, Canons-Kew New College; "Themes in the Cross-Cultural Analysis of Women and Society" by Eleanor Loxom, CUNY.
- Grant M. Farr, Portland State University; Shirley Kolak, University of Lowell, and Eileen L. King, University of Arkansas; "Flourish: The Comparative Study of Slavery" by Orlando Patterson, Harvard University.
- Linda N. Frickham, California State University-Sacramento, Ferdinand Kolekar, Roosevelt University; and John R. Sivier, Indiana University-South Bend; "Intellectuals in Culture and Society" by Edward Shils, University of Chicago.

Carol R. Barnes, Frostburg State College; Philip C. Bossert, Salisbury State College; Varicike P. Demos, University of Minnesota-Morris, Kun D. Faught, Loyola Marymount University; James I. Foreman, Marion College; Rudolf K. Harle, Middlebury College; Benjamin Harrison, Valdosta State College; Nicholas J. Robak, Saint Joseph's College; and Frank R. Shuster, Framingham State College; "The Role of 'Schools in the Development of Social and Other Sociological Concepts" by Edward Shils, Duke University.

John E. Kramer, SUNY-Brockport; Charles D. McWiliams, Madison College; and Robert E. Shuster, University of Richmond; and Rose B. Tarleton, Saint Mary's College; "Sociological and Psychological Aspects of Modern Literature" by Robert N. Wilson, University of North Carolina.

1979 Supplementary Sessions

Papers for Supplementary Session should be submitted to the ASA Annual Meeting should be sent to: Professor Dorris R. En- twistle, Department of Social Relations, Barton Hall, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218.

Books for Asia, a continuing program of The Asia Foundation, is seeking donations of books and journals for the two libraries operated by the Asia Foundation in the Chinese University of American studies in Asia. Donations are tax deductible and formally acknowledged. Contact: Books for Asia, 450 Sixth Street, San Francisco, CA 94109. Phone: (415) 842-4660.
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GRANTS

The Joint Committee on Eastern Europe, AICSSC95, is offering post-doctoral fellowships to study the cultures and populations (regard-
less of their political loci) of Al-
bania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hun-
gary, Poland, Romania, Yugo-
slavia, and modern Greece. Such research should be problem-oriented, of theoretical rele-
Vance, and of significant value.

The program particularly invites such comparative research on social institu-
tions and processes as will be the focus of the individual fellowships. The program also supports research of conceptual and theoretical focus and aims to develop and improve the field of social institutions and processes in these countries. For more on this see the list of grants and deadlines above.


November 2-5, 2017 - Mid-Atlantic Popular Culture Association, Annual Meeting, Marriott Hotel, Baltimore, Maryland, USA.

November 2-4, 2017 - Mid-South Sociological Association, Annual Meeting, Nashville, Tennessee, USA.

November 2-4, 2017 - Mid-Atlantic Hispanic/Latino Studies Association, Annual Meeting, St. Louis, Missouri, USA.

November 3-4, 2017 - Pennsylvania Sociological Society, Annual Meeting, Crowne Plaza Hotel, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, USA.

November 10-11, 2017 - Michigan Sociological Association, Annual Meeting, Wayne State University, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, USA.


November 20-23, 2017 - Annual Scientific Meeting of the British Infection Society, United Kingdom.


December 6-8, 2017 - American Sociological Association, Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California, USA.

December 8-9, 2017 - American Sociological Association, Annual Meeting, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA.

December 2-4, 2017 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

December 3-5, 2017 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

December 7-9, 2017 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

December 10-12, 2017 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

December 13-16, 2017 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

December 16-19, 2017 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

December 19-21, 2017 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

December 21-23, 2017 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

December 22-24, 2017 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

December 25-27, 2017 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

December 28-30, 2017 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

December 31, 2017 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

January 2-5, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

January 6-8, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

January 9-11, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

January 12-14, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

January 15-17, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

January 18-20, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

January 21-23, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

January 24-26, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

January 27-29, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

January 30-31, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

February 1-3, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

February 4-6, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

February 7-9, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

February 10-12, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

February 13-15, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

February 16-18, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

February 19-21, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

February 22-24, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

February 25-27, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

February 28, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

March 1-3, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

March 4-6, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

March 7-9, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

March 10-12, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

March 13-15, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

March 16-18, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

March 19-21, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.

March 22-24, 2018 - Annual Meeting of the Society for the Social History of Medicine, United Kingdom.
MINUTES OF THE 1978 COUNCIL MEETING

The fourth meeting of the 1978 ASA Council was held on Thursday, June 1, 1978, in the Dayton Plaza Hotel, Atlantic City, N.J. President A. Meriwether Haycock presided.

1. Approval of the Agenda. The agenda was approved as presented.

2. Report of the President. President Haycock reported that the ASA Council had recently had discussions concerning the acceptance of the Golden Flax award for which Berenice Bentley had been nominated and indicated that a session of the meeting would be devoted to the award. A letter from the President-elect was also read. The letter was not distributed, but a copy was available for interested parties.

3. Apologies of Members. Those members of the ASA Council who were unable to attend the meeting included Pamela A. Robertson, J. Edith Shirey, Ir. Maurice A. Donaldson, and J. Milton Younger, and Mervyn Zilinski. Per- sonal apologies were also read for J. Dwayne, Alice F. Moran, Lawrence J. McDonald, W. Rodman, and J. M. Robinson.

4. Report of the Executive Officer. A. Meriwether Haycock, Executive Officer, reported that the Executive Officer’s Office had been receiving increased mail and phone calls due to the expanded mail and phone services. He also reported that the number of applications for the 1978-1979 season had increased significantly.

5. Committee Reports. A. Meriwether Haycock noted that several reports were scheduled for presentation at the meeting. These included reports from the Committee on Professional Ethics, the Committee on the Status and Composition of the ASA, and the Committee on the Status and Composition of the Committee on Research.

6. Status of ASA Meetings. A. Meriwether Haycock reported that the status of ASA meetings was as follows: the 1978 annual meeting was scheduled for October 1978, and the 1979 annual meeting was scheduled for October 1979. He also reported that the 1980 annual meeting was scheduled for October 1980.

7. Report of the President, Part II. President Haycock noted that the Council should review the issues that had been discussed at the previous meeting and that the Council would be asked to provide recommendations in the future.

8. Report of the Executive Officer. A. Meriwether Haycock reported that the Executive Officer’s Office had been receiving increased mail and phone calls due to the expanded mail and phone services. He also reported that the number of applications for the 1978-1979 season had increased significantly.

9. Committee Reports. A. Meriwether Haycock noted that several reports were scheduled for presentation at the meeting. These included reports from the Committee on Professional Ethics, the Committee on the Status and Composition of the ASA, and the Committee on the Status and Composition of the Committee on Research.

10. Status of ASA Meetings. A. Meriwether Haycock reported that the status of ASA meetings was as follows: the 1978 annual meeting was scheduled for October 1978, and the 1979 annual meeting was scheduled for October 1979. He also reported that the 1980 annual meeting was scheduled for October 1980.

11. Report of the President, Part II. President Haycock noted that the Council should review the issues that had been discussed at the previous meeting and that the Council would be asked to provide recommendations in the future.

12. Discussion of Membership Concerns. A. Meriwether Haycock noted that the Council should review the issues that had been discussed at the previous meeting and that the Council would be asked to provide recommendations in the future.
Glazer continued, “This is something from which the profession and science is much too likely to be saved. It is not their style. But then one can make the opposite criticism: The concentration on the world as it is and how it is, and how it is narrow-minded and deadening. The larger perspectives generally provided by the disciplines bring in air and light. To emphasize an education based on rules and regulations (the social welfare code, the education code) is doubtlessly narrowing and, I believe there is less of this in professional schools than there should be, particularly since laws and regulations and codes change so rapidly these days.”

He concluded, “But at the same time the professional perspective retains the social sciences of their basic, though perhaps somewhat different, kind of artlessness, one in which concepts dance, and the life of soc-

cies is given far away as it is under glass.”

**MORE INVOLVED**

Glazer links the increasing acceptance of the professional perspective in disciplinary departments to a number of factors such as (1) the job market; and (2) the development of employment of discipline-trained social scientists in professional schools; (3) the emerging patterns of research funding; (4) the development of sub-specialties with applied orientations; and (5) the rising popularity of Marxism with its emphasis on social change.

Glazer, however, thinks three changes in the world have served as “inner sources of intellectual and disciplinary change” in the social sciences because they question some of the fundamental assumptions of these sciences. The 1. The enormous expansion of government in many spheres has questioned the “natural” character of social processes by showing how these processes are “increasingly affected by organized human activity, principally government.”

2. Radical change in such institutions as hospitals, prisons, schools, and social work agencies has caused a rethinking of the concept of these institutions as stable entities engaged in routine activities. The growth and change in government has become increasingly problematic, something to be questioned and defended. Consequently, concepts of social change have moved away from such processes as technological and movement, and revolutions and toward an emphasis on the behavior and scale of government and service institutions.

These changes, according to Glazer, have lead social scientists to take a more active stance toward the world and adopt a new style of work:

> “They have moved from a stance toward the world that emphasizes detached observation and analysis, inevitably an analytical and abstract account of the daily practice of governments, businesses, schools, cities, prisons, and services. The assumption that observation is increasingly mixed with participation, analysis with judgment and advice."

> "The social scientist today relates to institutions less an an involved scholar seeking to generate specific empirical data and an observer, whose concerns are close to, intertwined with, the concerns of the practitioner, either because the social scientist does not share these concerns, or because both share the same concerns in their general role of citizen."

As the social sciences become more “policy-oriented” the disciplinary approach to graduate education declines. Because “where one engages with a problem, one must consider the problem holistically, and not independently of the discipline’s capacities and interests. As soon as one begins to consider what is good for the social scientist, one breaks out of the shell of a discipline, which looks at one abstracted side of any issue, because policy must include everything relevant to something working...”

**Program Extended to Grad Students**

The U.S. Civil Service Commission has extended its Cooperative Education Program previously limited to undergraduate students to include graduate students.

Students pursuing master’s and doctoral degrees may now work for the government year in federal agencies. Upon completion of their degree and at least sixteen weeks of full-time work experience, students may be appointed to career service without further competition. Career status allows employees to move freely between agencies and between government and private employment.

Information about the program may be obtained from Department of Commerce, Civil Service Commission, 1500 E. Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20541.