

# COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume XI, Number 5

March 23, 1992

## SENATE APPROPRIATORS SCRUTINIZE OSTP AND NSF *HB*

The Senate VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, chaired by Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) heard testimony on March 19 from D. Allan Bromley, director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), and Walter Massey, director of the National Science Foundation (NSF), on their proposed FY 1993 budgets. In both cases, the discussion centered more on broader questions of science policy and less on the specifics of the proposed budgets.

Mikulski opened the hearing by stating her opinion that OSTP and NSF are "two crucial agencies for winning the war for America's future." In a theme she was to reiterate throughout the hearing the Maryland Senator noted the U.S. was "losing jobs, ground, and time, and squandering opportunities" in relation to its economic competitors. With Bromley, Mikulski was particularly interested in what the administration was doing to deal with the "defense drawdown," the effects of lower defense spending on the American workforce. She was astounded that the administration has not established a Cabinet level task force to focus on the transference of defense jobs, especially in science and technology, to the civilian economy. She urged that Bromley convey the sense of urgency with which the Congress views this issue, particularly for the FY 1993 budget.

Concerning the proposed 18 percent increase for NSF in FY 1993, Mikulski noted she was "sympathetic", but unless there was a change in the budget act that would "tear down the walls" prohibiting the shifting of dollars between defense and domestic spending, it was unlikely that the 602B allocation for her Subcommittee would be large enough to provide for the requested increase. When asked about how he would respond to possible reductions from the request, Massey sought to "retain the maximum flexibility in support of our goals." As he told the House Subcommittee, (Update, March 9, 1992) Massey noted his priorities for NSF were people, instrumentation, and facilities, in that order.

Mikulski raised the question of the lack of requested funds for a facilities modernization program in the NSF's FY 1993 budget. However, the discussion, which was joined by National Science Board chairman James Duderstadt, President of the University of Michigan, focused on the overall need of universities for facilities and on broader solutions rather than NSF spending a certain amount of dollars to solve this problem.

Regarding the proposed minimal increase for NSF's Education and Human Resources directorate, Massey, as he did with the House Subcommittee, explained the need for consolidation and effective management of the large increases heaped upon EHR during the past two years. He also stressed the need to evaluate and assess what NSF was already doing in this area. Mikulski was interested in the relationship between NSF and the Department of Education, and Massey reported that it was much improved. The Department and NSF have signed a memorandum of understanding pledging to cooperate in the dissemination of math-science model curricula and teacher enhancement programs, Massey told the panel.

Unlike the House hearing, no questions were raised about substantive items in the proposed budget for the research directorates. This was done in private meetings between Subcommittee staff and NSF Assistant Directors prior to the hearings, leaving the public hearing focused on broader questions of science policy.

### INSIDE UPDATE...

- FY 1993 HHS Budgets Defended in Appropriations Hearings
- Controversy at ADAMHA: Goodwin "Demoted" to Head NIMH
- Busy Week on Hill for Education Research
- COSSA Seminar Highlights Rural Development Policies
- Report Criticizes EPA Research
- Sources of Research Support: National Science Foundation

## FY 1993 HHS BUDGETS DEFENDED IN APPROPRIATIONS HEARINGS

The appropriations cycle is in full swing as hearings have begun in the House on the proposed budgets for the various agencies and institutes within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). So far, the hearings have been non-controversial, with agency heads defending relatively modest increases in the President's budget request. Since there weren't many new dollars to talk about, the hearings became occasions to discuss specific research programs at greater length.

### NIH

On March 12, Bernadine Healy, Director of the National Institutes of Health, appeared before the House Appropriations Labor, HHS Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. William Natcher (D-KY), and defended the overall budget request for NIH, as well as describing some of the specific accomplishments and barriers faced by the agency. She stated that in allocating the 4.9 percent increase in funding over FY 1992 levels, "NIH concentrated heavily on providing substantial increases to sustaining the talent base and the research capacity of the NIH." The continued priority of investigator-initiated research is evident in the 7.1 percent increase in Research Project Grants (RPGs) in the FY 1993 request, Healy said.

But Healy spent less time talking about dollars than she did about the structure and mission of NIH. She emphasized the need to "nurture" the

NIH, to not take for granted its existence and its potential. Comparing it to the current status of the nation's transportation infrastructure, built up at around the same time as the NIH (the 1950s), Healy described a set of "stresses" that have taken their toll on the NIH. She mentioned the stress "caused by scientific opportunities and public expectations," which requires making choices and assigning priorities in research; stress "caused in the management and stewardship of science," which has resulted in the implementation of a Financial Management Plan governing the number, average length and costs of grants, and overhead costs; and the stress from "societal pressure," which raises questions about the ethical, legal, and social implications of scientific advances, which will be addressed in the "framework for discussion of a strategic plan," now in process.

### NICHD

A week later, on March 19 the appropriations subcommittee heard testimony from individual NIH institute directors defending their budget requests. Once again, more attention was paid to programs than the specifics of the budgets. Duane Alexander, Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) described the broad nature of the research program at NICHD and its focus on prevention. In particular, he noted the importance of NICHD initiatives to address infant mortality by preventing low birth weight babies through behavioral interventions among pregnant women. NICHD Deputy Director, Wendy Baldwin, described the new Minority Youth Health Behavior Initiative, which is designed to address homicide, suicide, and other risky and violent behavior among minority youth through a series of community-based interventions.

### NIA

On the same day, Gene Cohen, Acting Director of the National Institute on Aging (NIA) described the budget request and programmatic emphases of his agency. When asked to list the top three priorities for NIH, Cohen identified Alzheimer's Disease, severe physical frailty, and basic aging research, noting that each reflects the goal of the institute's activities, which is to "reduce the risk factors that impinge on independence" in older age. In explaining why NIA grants on average cost more than those of other NIH institutes, Cohen noted that the newness of the field required the need for large epidemiological and demographic studies, which are expensive to conduct. In that regard, he

#### 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

announced that the comprehensive Health and Retirement Survey will be fully funded and launched within the next few weeks.

## ADAMHA

The appropriations subcommittee also heard last week from representatives of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA). Acting Administrator, Alan Trachtenberg, defended the overall ADAMHA budget and its continuing allocation of over 50 percent of its funding to drug abuse activities. Enoch Gordis, Director of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) explained that the very modest budget increase requested for his institute relative to the others reflected NIAAA's real research capacity and its desire to comply with financial management goals similar to those adopted by NIH. (Apparently, NIAAA is the only ADAMHA institute attempting to do this so far.)

This hearing also became the occasion for Frederick Goodwin to describe the ADAMHA-wide violence initiative that provided the context for some controversial remarks he recently made that resulted in his "demotion" from ADAMHA Administrator to Director of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). (See following story). Rep. Louis Stokes (D-OH) asked Goodwin to provide some detail about the violence initiative, and specifically to address its inclusion of social and behavioral science perspectives relative to biological science. Goodwin explained that the initiative is designed to provide early identification of risk factors related to violence (eg., learning disabilities, conduct disorders, etc.), to identify those most in need of interventions. He underscored the multidisciplinary nature of the initiative, which is designed to take into account factors on the individual, familial, and community levels, and noted that all the interventions so far included are psychosocial, although eventually some pharmacologic interventions may be indicated.

## CONTROVERSY AT ADAMHA: GOODWIN "DEMOTED" TO HEAD NIMH

After making some controversial, and highly publicized, remarks about the links between violence among male monkeys in the jungle and violence among inner city men, Dr. Frederick Goodwin resigned as Administrator of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration

(ADAMHA). He was promptly "demoted" to Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, one of ADAMHA's constituent research institutes, by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Louis Sullivan.

Goodwin's remarks were made at the February 11 meeting of the National Advisory Committee on Mental Health, where he was describing an ADAMHA-wide research initiative on violent behavior. After outlining research findings about the contribution of the lack of social structure to hypersexuality and hyperviolence among male monkeys, Goodwin made an analogy to inner city life, suggesting that perhaps "it isn't just the careless use of the word when people call certain parts of certain cities jungles, that we may have gone back to what might be more natural, without all of the social controls that we have imposed upon ourselves as a civilization over thousands of years in our own evolution."

Although Goodwin apologized publicly for the comments, this did not appease the numerous individuals, including members of the Congressional Black Caucus and Senator Edward Kennedy (D-MA) and Rep. John Dingell (D-MI), who saw the remarks as racist and urged Secretary Sullivan to dismiss Goodwin. Sullivan apparently chastised Goodwin, but allowed him to resign his post as ADAMHA Administrator and then appointed him Director of NIMH. In justifying the appointment, Sullivan characterized the incident as "an unfortunate lapse in a career of public service otherwise characterized by professionalism of the highest quality and great sensitivity to minority issues."

Some have questioned the "demotion" of Goodwin, given that he was already promised the Directorship of NIMH should the proposed reorganization of ADAMHA occur (See Update June 24 & September 9, 1991). Furthermore, some objected that the manner in which Goodwin was appointed appeared to circumvent the normal national search process.

This whole event comes in the context of mixed reviews among the research and services community of Goodwin's tenure as ADAMHA Administrator. While many organizations have been impressed with his knowledge and leadership in neuroscience research, others have questioned Goodwin's commitment to social and behavioral science research and to the services components of ADAMHA. These criticisms were reiterated and

highlighted during debate on the Feb. 11 incident and the subsequent appointment to NIMH chief.

So far, Goodwin has weathered the fray. When questioned at a recent House appropriations subcommittee hearing about the content of the ADAMHA violence initiative and its attention to social and behavioral factors relative to biological "markers," Goodwin spoke about the importance of "psychosocial" research in the study and in the agenda of NIMH generally.

But Goodwin is still engaged in "damage control" from the Feb. 11 incident. Speaking on March 20 before a coalition of mental health research and services organizations -- some of which condemned his appointment -- he spent a great deal of time both explaining the context of his remarks and apologizing for them. In the end, though, he insisted, "I am Director of NIMH; I will be Director of NIMH. I am not resigning; I've already done that once, and I am not doing it again. I have put this behind me, and I hope you all will, too."

## BUSY WEEK ON HILL FOR EDUCATION RESEARCH

MB

In a Congress seemingly preoccupied with a slightly different system of checks and balances than that envisioned by the Founding Fathers, House and Senate Committees took time last week to debate the reauthorization of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) at the Department of Education.

The Select Education Subcommittee of House Education and Labor Committee, chaired by Rep. Major Owens (D-NY), held oversight hearings on OERI on March 17 and 18, which were dominated by discussion of HR 4014, legislation Owens has introduced to reauthorize OERI. Owens's bill would create a 20-member Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board consisting of both educational researchers and representatives of other related fields to guide OERI's activities. Specifically, this board would develop a long-term set of research priorities, establish standards to govern OERI-sponsored research, and review all grant and contract applications. The bill would also structure OERI research according to an institute framework shaped by perceived research and dissemination needs. Advisory boards would be created for each institute.

## Ravitch Sharply Critical

Assistant Secretary of Education for OERI Diane Ravitch was the lead witness at the House hearings, and she sharply criticized several key components of Owens's bill, stating that the Department of Education would oppose the legislation if it were left in its current form. Ravitch said that the proposed board is too large and unwieldy. She added that there is no reason to have such a large board other than to guarantee that interest groups are well-represented on the board. She stated her opinion that such a board would make OERI less efficient, saying "No business is run by its board of directors... The nature of this board -- its size and powers -- will cause people to wonder who is in charge."

Acknowledging long-standing criticism that OERI has been adversely affected by political influence, Ravitch said that such a board would "politicize the agency at the highest levels" and would be fraught with conflicts of interests between the board and the organizations its members represent. She urged that the board be reduced in size to no more than eleven, and that the members be selected by the Secretary of Education on the basis of expertise and achievement in education research.

The second objection Ravitch voiced toward HR 4014 was regarding its creation of District Education Agents to assist targeted disadvantaged communities with their education reform efforts. While lauding its goal, Ravitch said that such a program would "create another layer of administration that would be unnecessary and counter-productive. The money would be better spent on enhancing and improving existing dissemination programs."

Owens and Ravitch engaged in a contentious and protracted debate over the issue of advisory boards. Ravitch repeatedly stated her opposition to these provisions of the Owens bill, while Owens said that in the area of education research, "incremental changes and tinkering at the edges are not permitted." He blasted what he termed Ravitch's "contempt for process" for opposing the advisory board components of the bill and blamed troubles in the savings and loan industry, the American automotive industry, and the corporate world on their being run by people who have a "contempt for committees" and are averse to outside opinion. Owens inquired about Ravitch's administrative background before she came to OERI last July, with

Ravitch replying "I've been a scholar, not an administrator... and that shouldn't be held against me." The exchanges between the two ended on a conciliatory note, with Ravitch speaking of the need to "stop the warfare between OERI and its critics" and Owens expressing his hope that the exchange of views can continue in the future.

Also appearing before the subcommittee was Ann Lieberman of Columbia University and President of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). Addressing the current state of educational research in America, Lieberman decried an inadequate amount of resources, an infrastructure that makes it difficult for universities to support young researchers in education research, inadequate funding available for individual scholars, and lack of a knowledge base on which to support sweeping educational reform. She stated AERA's support for HR 4014 and said that the Policy and Priorities Board is "an essential element of a successful federal education research program."

#### Senate Panel Clears OERI Bill

On March 18 the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, chaired by Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-MA), unanimously approved S 1275, legislation that would reauthorize OERI. The bill now moves on to the full Senate.

The Senate OERI bill would establish a nine-member board of governors for OERI, with members being appointed by the president and subject to Senate confirmation. The legislation requires that those nominated for the board display both "eminence in the fields of basic and applied research and dissemination" and "established records of distinguished service in educational research and the education professions."

The bill would also center research and dissemination around five directorates based on areas of national need: Curriculum Instruction and Assessment; Early Childhood Learning, Families, and Communities; Educational Achievement of Historically Underserved Populations; School Organization, Structure, and Finance; and Postsecondary and Adult Education. Under S 1275, the office of the National Assessment of Educational Progress would be authorized to conduct trial national educational evaluations for 4th, 8th, and 12th graders in areas of math, reading and science.

The Senate bill would create an international educational exchange program administered through the Department of Education. According to the legislation, this program would "provide a means for the exchange of ideas and experiences in civics and government education and economics" between the United States and emerging constitutional democracies. The proposal would evenly split funding for this program between civics and government education activities and economics education programs.

In praising the bill, Senator Kennedy expressed his hope that it would improve the quality and the standing of educational research in America.

#### COSSA SEMINAR HIGHLIGHTS RURAL DEVELOPMENT POLICIES MB

On March 6 COSSA held a Congressional seminar, "Rural Policies for the 1990s", to highlight the contributions of social science to the formulation of public policy. The breakfast seminar attracted an audience of 65, primarily Congressional and federal agency officials. The event was co-sponsored by the Rural Sociological Society, the Congressional Rural Caucus, Rep. Dave Price (D-NC), Rep. Rick Boucher (D-VA), and Rep. Charlie Rose (D-NC).

After brief opening remarks by COSSA Executive Director Howard J. Silver, Rural Sociological Society President Ronald Wimberley, Professor of Sociology at North Carolina State University, outlined the current state of rural America, noting that 62 million Americans are defined as living in rural areas, a record high. Wimberley said that only 1 in 15 rural residents lives on a farm, which he said necessitates the development of a rural policy separate from an agricultural policy. According to Wimberley, these changes in rural America have prompted rural sociologists to ask how our government and our society can better serve the needs of these residents.

Cornelia Flora, Professor of Sociology at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, presented an overview of *Rural Policies for the 1990s* (Westview, 1991), which she co-edited with Jim Christenson of the University of Arizona. Flora said that the book, copies of which were given to all attendees, is a decennial volume of essays by rural sociologists that discusses the challenges facing rural America and identifies possible solutions and implications. According to Flora, addressing these

issues is more than just a question of allocation of federal resources, it involves questions of human resource organization and empowerment. Flora said that the book discusses issues of economics, "people-related" problems, and environmental issues of rural America.

William Falk, Professor of Sociology at the University of Maryland, College Park, discussed industrial policy in rural areas, noting that citizens look to the government to "do something for us in the place we live." Falk said that industrial policy consists of concerns of both equity and efficiency in the economy, often contradictory aims. Falk argued that rural populations, particularly the non-farm rural population, has been "forgotten" in public policy discussions. He noted that rural areas are historically some of the most impoverished counties in America, and mentioned the massive out-migration in these areas. Falk said that rural areas compete against each other for new industry, with the government playing neither a refereeing nor an influencing role. Falk concluded his remarks by saying that the challenge for both social scientists and policymakers is to consider the people in rural areas, and not just look at questions of economic efficiency.

Daryl Hobbs, Professor of Rural Sociology at the University of Missouri, discussed the challenges facing education in rural areas. Hobbs argued that the focus in education has been too narrowly on schools and away from larger issues of income distribution and the well-being of diverse populations. Rural areas, Hobbs said, lack the tax base to adequately support public schools. He criticized much of the current debate on school reform for trying to create a "one size fits all" formula for improving schools, saying that this ignores geographic and economic variables. Hobbs discussed the correlation between school performance and socio-economic status, saying that families are the social capital that can best improve the quality of education. He urged policymakers to consider education and quality job growth together and to view education in the broader context of a "whole bundle of human resource issues."

A lively question and answer followed the presentations, with panel members and attendees discussing a wide range of issues relating to economic justice and the proper federal role regarding rural areas.

COSSA sponsors these seminars as part of its advocacy efforts on behalf of social and behavioral

science research. The goal of the seminars is to bring the results of that research to policymakers. The next COSSA seminar will be in early May and will discuss criminal justice issues.

## REPORT CRITICIZES EPA RESEARCH MB

A new report criticizes the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for conducting its research programs with inadequate funding, lack of premier scientists, and lack of strong direction and administration. The report, *Safeguarding the Future: Credible Science, Credible Decisions*, was commissioned by EPA Administrator Reilly and was the subject of a March 19 hearing of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, chaired by Rep. George Brown (D-CA).

The report was prepared by a special advisory committee to EPA and concludes, "currently EPA science is of uneven quality and the agency's policies and regulations are frequently perceived as lacking a strong scientific foundation." The report faults the agency for not effectively incorporating science into the formulation of environmental policies and regulations. The report recommends that EPA reach out to world-class scientists, name a science advisor to report directly to the Administrator, and improve its grant and contract programs through more extensive use of peer review and quality assurance tests.

Appearing before the House panel, Reilly enthusiastically praised the advisory panel's efforts, and promised swift implementation of many of the report's recommendations. Specifically, Reilly said he will appoint a science advisor for the agency as a whole, as well as science advisors for individual departments. He promised to publish an annual statement of EPA research priorities, and to meet often with science advisors. He said, "The time has come when science should be what we do and what we are seen to do. We are not eco-cowboys and we don't want to be seen that way," adding that he wanted to "alter the culture at the agency to be more pro-science."

Chairman Brown lauded both the report and Reilly's response, but noted that despite recent increases in the agency's research budget, research at EPA is currently funded at a lower level, when adjusted for inflation, than at the beginning of the Reagan administration.

**SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION** MB

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.

**Graduate Research Traineeship Program**

The National Science Foundation (NSF) recently announced a new program of Graduate Research Traineeships (GRT) beginning in 1992. The principal objective of this program is to increase the numbers of talented American undergraduates enrolling in doctoral programs in critical and emerging areas of science and engineering. GRT awards are packages of student support. The colleges and universities that receive the awards are responsible for the selection of trainees, retention of trainees, and the administration of traineeships. Individual social science departments are encouraged to submit proposals.

Approximately 180 traineeship positions will be made in this competition on a fully-funded basis (i.e., up to a maximum of 5 years support per traineeship). Within each award, traineeships will provide initially a \$14,000/year stipend and a \$7,500/year cost-of-education allowance in lieu of tuition and fees.

**Eligible Institutions:** Any university or other academic institution in the United States that awards a Ph.D. in a field of science or engineering normally supported by NSF.

**Eligible Activities:** Each proposal must be developed around a selected, and fully justified, critical area of anticipated national human resource priorities.

**Eligible Disciplinary (Focus) Area:** The disciplinary area of the proposal must lead to the Ph.D. in the proposed area or in a related area. Interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary proposals must include only combinations of fields of science and engineering that are normally supported by NSF.

**Eligible Students:** Only U.S. citizens or permanent residents are eligible for appointment to a GRT.

**Number of Submissions:** Only one proposal may be submitted by a department or comparable organizational unit within the institution. There is no limit on the number of departmental units within an eligible institution submitting GRT proposals. Proposals must request a minimum of five traineeships. There is no limit on the maximum number of traineeships that may be requested in an individual proposal or by all proposals submitted by an institution.

**Proposal Submission:** Copies of all application forms can be obtained by contacting: Graduate Research Traineeship Program, National Science Foundation, 1800 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20550. Phone: (202) 357-7861.

**Deadlines:** Proposals must be postmarked by May 15, 1992.

**Announcement of Awards:** NSF expects to announce GRT awards in early Fall, 1992 for initial implementation in Fall, 1993.

**Contact:** For further information, refer to the address and phone number listed above.

---

## 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  
Arizona State University  
Boston 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  
New York University  
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill  
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

---