

# COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume XI, Number 12

June 29, 1992

## HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVES NSF APPROPRIATIONS BILL *HS*

The House VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee chaired by Rep. Robert Traxler (D-MI) marked up its FY 1993 appropriations bill on June 26. The National Science Foundation (NSF) received \$2.723 billion, an increase of \$150 million over the current FY 1992 level.

Research and related activities received \$1.879 billion, a minuscule \$6 million increase over the post-rescission FY 1992 level, and \$330 million below the request. The Subcommittee is expected to include report language urging NSF to take the research reduction proportionately across all the disciplines. Thus, the proposed 26 percent increase for the new Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences directorate is unlikely to survive the congressional appropriations process.

The Subcommittee provided \$465 million for the Education and Human Resources directorate, the same as last year. The Subcommittee accepted NSF's argument that it was time to consolidate the recent funding gains for EHR, albeit helped by the fiscal constraints the Subcommittee faced.

NSF did receive a \$6.5 million increase for Salaries and Expenses. The Subcommittee removed from the NSF budget funds proposed to pay for NSF's planned move to the Virginia suburbs in Spring 1993. Most of the rest of the \$150 million increase went to the U.S. Antarctic Research Program, including replacing the funds provided in the FY 1992 Defense Department appropriations bill, and the purchase of a new airplane.

The minimal increases provided for NSF resulted from the Subcommittee's vote to continue funding for Space Station Freedom. Although the space station received \$525 million less than the President requested, the \$1.73 billion appropriated limited the maneuverability of the Subcommittee, as significant demands for veterans' medical care and housing programs also were met.

The bill now moves to the full Appropriations Committee in late July, and then to the House floor. An amendment to remove funding for the Space Station is expected. The Senate Subcommittee chaired by Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) is not expected to mark up until late July.

## MASSEY OUTLINES NEW STRATEGIC PLAN FOR NSF *HS*

At a meeting of the Coalition for National Science Funding on June 16, Walter Massey, director of NSF, outlined the strategic plan that would be presented to the National Science Board on June 18 and 19.

According to Massey, the new plan takes NSF to the brink of the 21st Century and reflects changes: 1) in the way scientific research is done; 2) in the way institutions & organizations operate; 3) in the development of important research areas that cross disciplines; and 4) in the way NSF will organize and operate internally.

Massey said that in the face of all the external changes, the NSF cannot keep conducting business as usual. Therefore, he declared "intellectual integration" will drive NSF's future activity, focusing on increasing multi-disciplinary efforts that will examine, to some extent, national problems.

### INSIDE UPDATE...

- Marrett Addresses Structure and Future of SBE
- Override Vote on NIH Bill Fails
- NIH Holds Two-Day Task Force Meeting on Strategic Plan
- Linguists Tell Senate Panel of Support for Native Languages Bill
- Science Community, State Department at Odds over U.S. Role in UNESCO
- Social Scientist Honored at White House Ceremony
- House Approves Panel to Review Congress
- Sources of Research Support: National Institute for Literacy

According to Massey, 35 to 40 percent of current NSF activity does this now.

In addition, NSF will emphasize "organizational integration," working with other entities in government as well as industry and universities. Massey cited the Education and Human Resources (EHR) directorate's memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Department of Education. He also announced that a recently concluded MOU with NIH will transfer training dollars to NSF for teacher enhancement and minority recruitment programs. EPA is also interested in joining with NSF to fund environmental research.

As always, Massey stressed that people still remain a Foundation-wide priority, as evident in all aspects of human resource development. Yet, according to Massey, there will be a greater focus on goal-setting activities, similar to EHR programs for women and minorities, and the Statewide Systemic Initiative (a program that funds states that develop comprehensive plans to improve their math and science education programs).

Massey also suggested NSF will be moving away from small grants -- "proposals for \$50K grants won't work anymore." He explained that the NSF staff is too small, not likely to grow, and is overburdened with proposals, of which only 15-20 percent are funded. Finally, Massey said the Foundation will conduct more evaluations of its programs to improve its accountability. Despite all these changes, Massey expects that the overwhelming amount of NSF funds will continue to support individual investigator initiated research.

#### CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

Executive Director:	Howard J. Silver
Government Affairs:	Judy Auerbach
Public Affairs:	Michael Buckley
Administrative Officer:	Karen Carrion

President:	Joseph E. Grimes
------------	------------------

The Consortium of Social Science Associations represents more than 185,000 American scientists across the full range of the social and behavioral sciences, functioning as a bridge between the research world and the Washington community. Update is published fortnightly. Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for \$50; institutional subscriptions, \$100, overseas mail, \$100. ISSN 0749-4394. Address all inquiries to COSSA, 1522 K Street, NW, Suite 836, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phone: (202) 842-3525, Fax: (202) 842-2788

Addressing the difficulties facing NSF in the foreseeable future, Massey noted: 1) foremost will be the competition for available resources. Can NSF continue to achieve real growth? How does NSF and its supporters continue to make the case for real growth? 2) NSF's need to make clear it is contributing to national priorities. Science for science's sake will continue to be a difficult sell; and 3) finding a replacement for the end of the national security rationale for supporting science and technology. Can economic competitiveness be sustained indefinitely? Massey warned of difficult years ahead.

The recent problems with rescissions and the congressional investigation into the manpower report are not isolated examples, and Massey said he expects more episodes similar to these down the road. He said that he views the rescission situation not as an attack on peer-review, but as a result of NSF being caught in a squabble between the Bush administration and Congress. However, Massey acknowledged that internal changes will be made to ensure that more attention is paid to how NSF describes its grants. He stated emphatically that NSF was "not going to yield on the peer review system," but that all concerned about NSF must pursue long-term education of Congress on this issue.

Massey also expressed his opinion that the academic community needs to react to an important transition period that is currently occurring. He argued that many universities have not yet recognized that it is essential to reexamine questions of teaching/research balance, career roles for young faculty, and the reward structures of universities.

Indicating a determination to place more emphasis on international programs at NSF, Massey mentioned various partnership programs that would encourage American scientists to go abroad. Joint research projects, not only with scientists in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, but with Mexico and Latin America and Africa, also will be developed further.

At the June 18 and 19 Board meeting, the reaction to the plan reflected a tension that has marked the history of NSF between its mission to support basic scientific research and its need to satisfy its funders who often view science and technology as the key to solving national problems. The National Science Board historically has guarded NSF's basic research mission and has warily viewed attempts to move toward applied research. The

next few months should produce further specificity in and refinement of Massey's plan.

## MARRETT ADDRESSES STRUCTURE AND DIRECTION OF SBE *MS*

Cora Marrett, the new Assistant Director for the Social Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE) at the National Science Foundation, spoke to the Federation of Behavioral, Psychological and Cognitive Sciences' Forum on Research Management on June 11. She discussed her guiding principles for leading the new directorate and some of her thinking about its structure.

She expressed her basic belief that science should be concerned with and related to the condition and welfare of human beings. Social, behavioral and economic sciences at NSF are in a unique position to contribute to the agendas of the other directorates, but our sciences cannot just be appendages; we need an agenda that is our own, she claimed. That agenda must be developed, according to Marrett, by those on the inside of NSF in partnership and collaboration with those on the outside.

In thinking about the structure of the directorate, the key, according to Marrett, will be to achieve intellectual integration through an emphasis on shared approaches and common problems researched from a multidisciplinary perspective. This does not negate the importance of disciplines as broad communities, but favors the structural approach of program "clusters" similar to the Language, Cognition and Social Behavior program in the Behavioral and Cognitive Science Division and the new program structure in the Biology directorate.

## OVERRIDE VOTE ON NIH BILL FAILS *JA*

On June 24, the House failed to override the President's veto of H.R. 2507, the legislation to reauthorize the National Institutes of Health (NIH), by a vote of 271 to 156. Legislators voting against the override continued to find fault with the bill for its provision overturning the moratorium on federally funded fetal tissue transplantation research, for including specific authorization levels for various research programs of NIH, and for undermining the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human

Services in the Ethics Advisory Board mechanism (See Update January 13, 1992).

Immediately following the vote, however, Rep. Henry Waxman (D-CA), chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, which has jurisdiction over NIH, introduced a new bill (H.R. 5495) that offers a compromise on the three contentious issues. An identical bill (S. 2899) was introduced at the same time in the Senate by Edward Kennedy (D-MA), chairman of the Labor and Human Resources committee.

With regard to fetal tissue transplantation research, the new bill requires researchers to first use tissue from the "Fetal Tissue Bank" established by President Bush in May of this year. Under the President's Executive Order, the bank is to provide fetal tissue from spontaneous abortions or ectopic pregnancies only. The new bill says that if that tissue proves to be insufficient or inappropriate for research, the researcher may then use tissue from other sources, including induced abortions. In the area of funding levels for NIH research, the bill retains the original figures for women's health initiatives and for prostate cancer, but replaces all other specific authorization numbers with the generally used parlance, "such sums as may be necessary."

With regard to the issue of the Secretary's authority under the EAB mechanism, the new bill states that the Secretary may overrule the recommendation of the EAB only if he or she can prove that the recommendation was "arbitrary and capricious," a standard legal term. In the context of the EAB, this phrase means that the Secretary would have to prove that the EAB's recommendation had no relation to the evidence before it. According to legal scholars, this is an extremely difficult test; and advocates of the NIH bill believe the Secretary thus will be discouraged from attempting to overrule the EAB.

Other than these three changes, the NIH bill remains the same as H.R. 2507, including the provisions related to sexual behavior research that were in the earlier bill's conference agreement. Congressional staff report that the bills in both houses are "on the fast track," and may be voted on as early as this week. Stay tuned to Update!

## NIH HOLDS TWO-DAY TASK FORCE MEETING ON STRATEGIC PLAN

JA

On June 23-25, over 300 scientists, administrators, and others invited by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to constitute a National Task Force met in suburban Washington, DC to engage in further revision and refinement of the NIH Strategic Plan (see *Update*, September 9, 1991 and January 27, 1992.) This two-day, intensive, working meeting continued a somewhat contentious year-long process, championed by the NIH Director, Bernadine Healy, of developing a document outlining the priorities and future direction of NIH. While the immediate purpose of the Strategic Plan document is to help make the case for NIH funding in the next budget cycle (FY 1994), Healy hopes to have initiated an on-going process.

The focus of the Task Force meeting was a 17 page document, called the "Framework for Discussion of Strategies for NIH" (or "framework") which reiterates the mission statement and goals of the NIH and identifies significant science and policy issues that the agency will address in the coming years. The framework document is accompanied by more detailed documents outlining accomplishments and opportunities in specific science and policy areas, which themselves are organized into five general categories: Critical Science and Technology; Research Capacity; Intellectual Capital; Stewardship of Public Resources; and Public Trust.

The Task Force meeting was organized by panels on many, but not all, of the science and policy topics in the draft document. The science panels included among others, Molecular Medicine, Structural Biology, Biotechnology, and Population-Based Studies; and the policy panels included Cost Management, Peer Review, Training and Infrastructure, and Scientific Codes of Ethics. The charge to each panel was to discuss and make suggestions for revising the framework document, to evaluate the detailed document on the panel's subject, and to answer the question, "What would you do with an additional billion dollars in the NIH budget?" (The latter was referred to as "The Billion Dollar Question.")

The flavor of the two-day Task Force meeting was mixed. From the beginning, the process was marred by a common perception among the scientific community that their input had not been solicited in the formulation of the original Strategic Plan, and was only being solicited after the fact in order for NIH to "save face." Consequently, many

participants approached the meeting with cynicism. Numerous attendees already had submitted extensive written comments on the first version of the plan, and had participated in regional, public meetings held earlier in the year (in San Antonio, Los Angeles, Farmington (CT), Atlanta, and St. Louis), and felt that their comments and contributions had not been incorporated into the emerging "framework" document (the second iteration of the Strategic Plan) or its accompanying science and policy reports.

This was the pronounced sentiment of attendees from the social and behavioral sciences, many of whom participated in the Population-Based Studies panel. Much of that panel's discussion focused on the continued lack of inclusion within the planning documents of social, behavioral, and environmental factors in the conceptualization of promising research areas. Participants noted that some reports, such as that on Molecular Medicine, made absolutely no reference to the contributions of behavioral science to the field, and that others confined their understanding of behavior to functions of the brain. The Population Studies panel agreed to emphasize in its report to the whole Task Force the need for NIH to recognize the importance of examining human health and illness not just on a molecular, subcellular, or organ level, but by treating humans as total beings "in their habitat."

In addressing the "Billion Dollar Question," the Population-Based Studies panel identified as an appropriate use of money conducting a large-scale, multi-site, community-based study, combining population cohort and clinical trial methods and based on the notion that targeted interventions can contribute to both the promotion of health and reduced health care costs. The panel articulated the need to move to "a multi-organ, multi-disciplinary, multi-institute initiative, from the molecular to the social level."

The fact that social and behavioral scientists who felt there had not been much support for including their perspectives in the strategic plan then made good-faith suggestions, illustrated the other common sentiment at the meeting, that so long as the process continued, the external scientific community should participate where possible, since, as more than one person put it, the NIH "is not the Bethesda campus."

In her closing remarks, Healy acknowledged the level of the cynicism existing among the community,

saying "I've been extraordinarily pleased, and somewhat surprised, by the good will of this meeting."

The results of this meeting, which will take the form of a number of new recommendations for revising the document, will be incorporated by NIH officials for consideration at another meeting in mid-July among NIH institute, center, and division (ICD) directors. Healy intends for the ICD meeting to be the last stage in producing a document that she can use during the FY 1994 budget and appropriations cycle, beginning this September, although, with the support of the external scientific community promised at the Task Force meeting, she expects the strategic planning process to be ongoing.

### LINGUISTS TELL SENATE PANEL OF SUPPORT FOR NATIVE LANGUAGES BILL *MB*

Two leading linguists recently testified before a Senate panel in support of legislation to create a grant program to assist Native Americans in ensuring the survival and vitality of their native languages.

The legislation, S. 2044, was the subject of a June 18 hearing of the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs, chaired by Sen. Daniel Inouye (D-HI). S. 2044, authored by Inouye, would award grants to create centers for the preservation of Native American languages, establish community language programs to bring together language speakers of different generations, and develop and disseminate teaching materials for Native American languages.

Michael Krauss, Professor of Linguistics at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks and chair of the Linguistic Society of America's Committee on Endangered Languages and their Preservation, offered strong support for the legislation. After being warmly introduced by committee member Sen. Frank Murkowski (R-AK), Krauss gave an overview of a statistical survey of Native Languages slated for publication later this summer. According to Krauss, there are approximately 6,000 languages in the world. While he added that it is impossible to know exactly how many of these languages are moribund, or not spoken by children, conservative estimates place this figure at at least 20 percent. Furthermore, he stated, approximately 40 percent are considered "endangered."

### UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA JOINS CONSORTIUM

COSSA is pleased to announce that the University of Arizona has become a member of the Consortium. We look forward to working with the university in the years ahead.

Krauss argued that the biological data for mammal extinction is strikingly similar to the linguistic situation throughout the world. "The intellectual future of mankind is just as important -- if not more -- as the biological future of mankind," Krauss told the senators. He commented that while one cannot legislate the will of people to preserve a language, Inouye's bill will support the needs of people seeking that goal. Krauss said that the linguistic community can serve a major role in such efforts through providing expertise and teaching materials for the language centers.

Kenneth Hale, Professor of Linguistics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and incoming vice-president/president-elect of the Linguistic Society of America, echoed many of Krauss's comments about the proposed legislation and also discussed the human value and importance of linguistic and cultural diversity. Hale noted that the loss of Native American languages is "a result of cataclysmic events in the histories of indigenous communities. It is part of a general process of loss of cultural and intellectual diversity in which politically dominant languages and cultures simply overwhelm indigenous local languages and cultures, placing them in a position which can only be described as embattled." According to Hale, the loss of a language involves the loss of intellectual wealth, for while a language can be documented and its great works translated, much is lost in terms of inability of people to express themselves in the language of their relatives and ancestors.

### SCIENCE COMMUNITY, STATE DEPARTMENT AT ODDS ON U.S. ROLE IN UNESCO *MB*

The long-running debate over American involvement in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) was the focus of a June 25 hearing conducted by three House Subcommittees. The hearing was held by three Congressional panels that oversee

UNESCO -- the Subcommittee on the Environment of the Science, Space and Technology Committee and the Subcommittees on Human Rights and International Operations of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The hearing was held in conjunction with the release of a report by the General Accounting Office (GAO) evaluating managerial reform efforts at UNESCO. These reforms were undertaken in part because of the 1984 decision by the U.S. to withdraw from UNESCO, citing that the organization was poorly managed and that its programs were politically biased. While the GAO report did not examine the question of political influence, it concluded that significant progress is being made in the general management and program planning at UNESCO, but that it is too soon to reach a definitive conclusion on the success of reform efforts.

Responding to the GAO report, John R. Bolton, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations told the combined panels that he was pleased that the GAO noted progress at UNESCO, and attributed this in part to the U.S. policy of insisting on substantial reform at UNESCO before the U.S. considers re-entry. According to Bolton, the U.S. has maintained a sizable presence within UNESCO, including the creation of an Observer Mission, attendance at governing body sessions, and voluntary contributions of approximately \$2 million annually to selected activities of the organization. He concluded his testimony by stating "much needs to be done... at present, we do not believe the changes adopted warrant opening the question of whether to rejoin the organization, at an expenditure of approximately 55 million dollars per year."

Frank Press, President of the National Academy of Sciences, prepared testimony delivered by Philip M. Smith, Executive Officer of the National Research Council. In his prepared statement, Press said "the criticisms by the U.S. government leaders have been and are being addressed," and praised UNESCO Director General Federico Mayor's reform efforts. Commenting that scientific cooperation across disciplines and between nations is at an all-time high, Press said that organizations such as UNESCO can play a valuable role in these endeavors, particularly in stabilizing the scientific base of nations undergoing sweeping political and economic change.

Richard Getzinger, Director of International Programs for the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), testified of AAAS' strong support for the U.S. to return to full membership in UNESCO. He cited "the distinguished record of accomplishment of UNESCO" and AAAS' concern about "the extent to which the United States has isolated itself from portions of the international community of science and science education by not participating in UNESCO programs." Getzinger specifically praised UNESCO's Man and Biosphere program, which coordinates international studies of the environment, and UNESCO's efforts to help developing countries optimize the use of science and technology in improving quality of life. Getzinger noted that these programs are hindered by the absence of U.S. support and guidance.

## SOCIAL SCIENTIST HONORED AT WHITE HOUSE CEREMONY *MB*

Social scientist Eleanor J. Gibson, a psychology educator, was honored by President Bush as a recipient of the National Medal of Science in a White House ceremony on June 23. The National Medal of Science is the nation's highest scientific honor bestowed by the United States government. Gibson was joined by seven other scientists in having been nominated by the National Science Foundation to receive the award.

In presenting the awards, President Bush said that the medal winners are "individuals who asked why and then followed wherever that question led" and who "bless mankind not only with the brilliance of their minds, but with the integrity of their hearts."

Gibson, the Susan Linn Sage Professor of Psychology Emeritus at Cornell University, was cited for "her conceptual insights in developing a theory of perceptual learning and development in children."

Gibson is the author of Principles of Perceptual Learning and Development (1967) and the Psychology of Reading (1975), and is the winner of numerous awards and fellowships.

## HOUSE APPROVES PANEL TO REVIEW CONGRESS *MB*

The House of Representatives voted 412-4 on June 18 to create a 28-member panel to review congressional operations and procedures. The bipartisan committee, officially called the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, is an outgrowth of growing frustration from both Members of Congress and the American public over perceived shortcomings of the legislative process, as well as the House Bank and Post Office controversies.

The committee is charged with studying the organization and operation of Congress, and recommending improvements with an aim toward strengthening the effectiveness of Congress, simplifying its operations, and improving relations with the Executive Branch. The panels recommendations must be finalized by December 31, 1993. The joint committee is modeled after several

panels formed since World War II to offer specific Congressional reform proposals.

The Senate must approve the bill before the committee is created. Senate approval is expected later this summer.

At a hearing before a Senate panel late last year (see *Update*, December 9, 1991), three noted political scientists -- Thomas E. Mann, Director of Governmental Studies at the Brookings Institution, Norman J. Ornstein, Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, and James Thurber, Director of the Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies at American University -- discussed the role political scientists could play in Congressional reform, stating that in addition to advising the proposed Joint Committee, the political science community could bring together experts on Congress to serve a pre-planning role.

## SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LITERACY *kc*

COSSA provides this information as a service and encourages readers to contact the agency for further information or application materials. Additional application guidelines and restrictions may apply.

### National Institute for Literacy Grants Program

The National Institute for Literacy Grants Program supports inquiry designed to advance literacy theory and practice. These authorized activities support the National Literacy Act of 1991, Public Law 102-73, and the National Education Goal to help make every adult literate by the year 2000. Applications are encouraged for research projects to conduct basic and applied research and demonstrations on literacy. The Institute is also interested in providing assistance for projects focusing on family literacy, workplace literacy and the use of technology. Also welcome are joint proposals emphasizing achievement of self-sufficiency for individuals and families.

**Eligible Applicants:** Proposals are sought from organizations, institution and entities planning collaborative projects between organizations experienced in providing social, training, and employment services and organizations experienced in providing and or arranging for adult literacy services.

**Budget:** There is \$2,500,000 in available funds. The estimated range of awards is \$10,000 to \$100,000, with an estimated average of \$75,000 for approximately 45 awards.

**Deadlines:** Applications may be submitted at anytime until August 14, 1992.

**Contact:** For a complete program announcement and additional information contact: Victor Westbrook, Special Advisor for Contracts and Grants, National Institute for Literacy, 800 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20202-7560. Telephone (202) 632-1512.

---

MEMBERS

---

American Anthropological Association  
American Economic Association  
American Historical Association  
American Political Science Association

American Psychological Association  
American Sociological Association  
American Statistical Association

Association of American Geographers  
Association of American Law Schools  
Linguistic Society of America

---

AFFILIATES

---

American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business  
American Association for Public Opinion Research  
American Educational Research Association  
American Society of Criminology  
Association for Asian Studies  
Association for Social Sciences in Health  
Association of Research Libraries  
Eastern Sociological Society  
History of Science Society  
International Studies Association

Law and Society Association  
Midwest Sociological Society  
National Council on Family Relations  
National Council for the Social Studies  
North American Regional Science Council  
North Central Sociological Association  
Operations Research Society of America  
Population Association of America  
Rural Sociology Society  
Social Science History Association

Society for Research on Adolescence  
Society for Research in Child Development  
Society for the Advancement of  
Socio-Economics  
Society for the Scientific Study of Religion  
Society for the Scientific Study of Sex  
Southern Sociological Society  
Southwestern Social Science Association  
Speech Communication Association  
The Institute for Management Sciences

---

CONTRIBUTORS

---

American Council of Learned Societies  
American University  
University of Arizona  
Arizona State University  
Brookings Institution  
University of California, Berkeley  
University of California, Los Angeles  
University of California, San Diego  
University of California, Santa Barbara  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences  
University of Chicago  
University of Cincinnati  
University of Colorado  
Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research  
Cornell University  
Duke University  
Emory University  
University of Georgia  
Harvard University  
University of Illinois

Indiana University  
Institute for Social Research, University of  
Michigan  
University of Iowa  
Johns Hopkins University  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public  
Affairs, Syracuse University  
University of Michigan  
Michigan State University  
University of Minnesota  
University of Missouri  
National Opinion Research Center  
University of Nebraska  
New York University  
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill  
North Carolina State University  
Northwestern University  
Ohio State University  
University of Oregon

Pennsylvania State University  
University of Pittsburgh  
Princeton University  
Purdue University  
University of Rhode Island  
Nelson A. Rockefeller College of Public  
Affairs and Policy, State University of New  
York at Albany  
Social Science Research Council  
University of Southern California  
Stanford University  
State University of New York, Stony Brook  
University of Tennessee  
Texas A & M University  
Tulane University  
University of Virginia  
University of Washington  
University of Wisconsin, Madison  
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee  
Yale University

---

Consortium of Social Science Associations

1522 K Street, NW, Suite 836, Washington, DC 20005

---