The House-Senate conference committee on the FY 1992 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies appropriations bill completed its work the last week of October. In giving approval to the decisions of the conferees, both the House and Senate were aware of the presidential veto threatened because the bill overturns the regulation that prevents doctors from providing advice to pregnant women about all medical options available, including abortion.

The funding allocations made by the conference committee reflected a desire to provide as much funding as possible to the myriad of programs included in the bill while staying within the restraints imposed by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (BEA). In order to accomplish this, the conferees deferred spending $4.2 billion in the bill until September 30, 1992, the last day of FY 1992. This means that the "outlays" of funding will not be counted until FY 1993. (This "budget scoring" procedure is important in deciding whether the provisions of the BEA are being followed.) Researchers receiving funding from the National Institutes of Health will likely experience delays in their grants. Congress' short-term solution for FY 1992 could also create problems for FY 1993 funding when outlays will be even more constrained by the BEA. However, there are calls to abandon certain provisions of the act which limit transfers between defense and domestic discretionary spending.

In the meantime, a third Continuing Resolution (CR) has been passed providing funding for the agencies in the Labor, HHS, Education and Department of Defense appropriations bills until November 26. The previous CR provided funding for foreign aid programs until March, 1992.

Below is an analysis of how the conference treated those programs and agencies that affect social and behavioral science research.

Bureau of Labor Statistics

The conferees gave the BLS $256.9 million, a $53 million (26%) increase in its federal funds over FY 1991. The conferees restored funding, eliminated by the Senate, to improve federal economic indicators and to conduct studies to implement the Federal Employees Comparability Act. The Mass Layoffs statistics program continues to receive funding, but for FY 1992 it will come from funds available under the Job Training Partnership Act.

Research and evaluation at the Employment and Training Administration was funded at $10 million, continuing the downward trend visible for this activity during the past few years.

Graduate Education

Final action on programs supporting graduate students did not differ from funding levels agreed to by each house earlier.

Appropriation levels for FY 1992 are for the Javits Fellowship Program ($8 million), the Patricia Harris Graduate Fellows ($17.6 million), and Patricia Harris Public Service Fellowships ($3.2 million). The Law School Clinical Experience Program received $8 million and the Legal Training for the Disadvantaged Program received slightly over $3 million.
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International Education

The final bill provided $53 million for international education and foreign language programs, a 16 percent increase over FY 1991. Of this total, $34 million will go to domestic programs under Title VI, with $4 million deferred until September 30, 1992. Overseas programs under Fulbright-Hays receive $6 million and $13 million was appropriated for foreign language and area studies fellowships. The $5.3 million increase in Title VI domestic programs should go mostly to existing National Resource Centers, according to the conference report.

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) received $15 million, only a 2 percent increase over last year. By contrast, the United States Institute of Peace wound up with $11 million, a 25 percent increase over FY 1991.

Education Research and Statistics

The National Center for Educational Statistics received $47.3 million, a 3 million (7%) increase over last year. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) received $29.9 million, a 56 percent increase, as NAEP remains the major assessment tool for measuring the achievement levels of American students in meeting the national education goals and prepares for its expansion in 1994. The research programs were allotted $71 million, a 10 percent increase over last year. The Congress once again rejected the administration's attempt to significantly reduce funding for library programs. Although the research libraries appropriation line received the same funding as in FY 1991, college library technology increased by $2.5 million to $6.4 million.

NIH

The conferees agreed on an overall budget of $9.0 billion for NIH. This reflects an 8 percent increase over the FY 1991 level of $8.2 billion.

After much controversy over its support of sexual behavior research, the National Institute on Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) received a 9.5 percent increase over FY 1991 levels. Its total budget for FY 1992 is $524.4 million, including $27.4 million in delayed obligations. The conferees elected to eliminate funding for both the SHARP survey of adult sexual behavior and the American Teenage Study of adolescent life, but deleted the Helms amendment that would have transferred funds for those studies from NICHD to the Adolescent Family Life program in HHS (see Update, August 5, and September 23, 1991).

Finally, the conference report noted that the NICHD budget includes funds for establishing a comprehensive gynecology and obstetrics program, including intramural and clinical research.

The trend of giving relatively large boosts to the budget of the National Institute on Aging (NIA) continued this year, as NIA received a 19.5 percent increase. The FY 1992 budget of $387.0 million, including $31.3 million in delayed obligations, compares to the FY 1991 level of $323.7 million. The conferees noted that up to $15 million of the delayed obligation amount may be transferred by the Director of NIH to other institutes for the purpose of conducting Alzheimer's Disease research, which remains a top priority for Congress.

The other big winner at NIH was the National Cancer Institute (NCI), which received $1.99 billion, a 15 percent increase over FY 1991 levels. This notable increase results from mounting concern within Congress and the public that not enough research has been conducted on breast, cervical, ovarian, and prostate cancers. Conferences made clear their intention that the bulk of the FY 1992 increase is to support research on these particular cancers. Awareness has been heightened by the range of initiatives occurring this past year related to remedying the dearth of research on women's health, and by revelations that more than one member of Congress has suffered or died recently from prostate cancer.
The Office of the Director of NIH received a $143.3 million budget (including $12.5 million in delayed obligations), up from $97.6 million in FY 1991. Included in the FY92 amount is $10.3 million for the new Office of Research on Women's Health, and $10.3 million for the Office of Research on Minority Health.

ADAMHA

While the debate over reorganizing the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA) continues elsewhere in Congress (see Update, June 24; July 22; and September 9, 1991) the conferees allotted the agency $3.1 billion for FY 1992, including $164.1 million in delayed obligations. The FY92 budget represents a 6.9 percent increase from the FY 1991 level of $2.9 billion.

The National Institute on Mental Health (NIMH) received a total budget of $674.5 million, representing a 9.5 percent increase over the FY 1991 level of $615.8. Research at NIMH received an even larger boost--11 percent from FY 1991--for a total FY 1992 budget of $455.5 million.

Similar increases were experienced at the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA). The overall budget of $185.1 million is 8.4 percent higher than that of FY 1991; and the research budget of $152.4 million is 9.8 percent higher than FY 1991.

But unlike its ADAMHA siblings, and unlike previous years, the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) did not receive such a significant increase for FY 1992. Its overall budget of $431.3 million is only 4.7 percent higher than the FY 1991 level.

OASH

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health (OASH), which is charged with carrying out the health promotion and disease prevention objectives of HHS, was level-funded this year: Its $7.8 million budget is the same as FY 1991’s.

Two things of note, however, occurred in the conference. First, the Office of Minority Health was given $500,000 to develop a national education and information demonstration to communicate healthy lifestyle messages to minority populations. Second, the Adolescent Family Life program, which is unauthorized for FY 1992 and consequently had received no appropriations from either the House or Senate (even though the President requested $12 million for it), was given a legal citation and granted $7.8 million--the same amount as last year. None of this funding was transferred from NICHD as had been supported by a Senate amendment that was deleted in conference (see above re:NICHD).

AH C P R

The Agency for Health Care Policy and Research (AHCPR) received $121.2 million, including $101.8 in federal funds, $5.8 million in Trust funds, and $13.4 million in 1 percent evaluation funds. This overall figure represents a 5.4 percent over the FY 1991 level of $115.1 million. The conferees noted their support for training new health services researchers.

NCHS

The National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) was level-funded, meaning its $51.4 million budget is the same as FY 1991’s. It also receives $29.4 million from the 1% set-aside for evaluation of Public Health Service programs.

NSF BUDGET: FAR FROM OVER $H

Former New York Yankees catcher Yogi Berra’s famous quote “It ain’t over ’til it’s over,” once again applies to the FY 1992 budget for the National Science Foundation (NSF). Last year NSF lost $40 million for its research budget after the conclusion of the appropriations process because of budget scoring problems with money being transferred from the Defense Department’s appropriation for the Foundation’s Antarctic program.

A similar situation is possible this year. The President already has signed the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations bill with the regular FY 1992 funding for NSF. However, NSF has been counting on $105 million from the Defense Appropriations bill to pay for the environmental cleanup and logistics parts of its Antarctica program. The $105 million is included in the DOD appropriations bill now before a House-Senate conference committee.

However, only $30 million will be defined as “defense spending” under the Budget Enforcement Act (BEA). The other $75 million will be scored
by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) as "domestic spending." Unfortunately, under the spending caps of the BEA all domestic spending has been used up for FY 1992. Therefore, $75 million of FY 1992 spending already approved will have to be rescinded. OMB will make the choice and the NSF research budget could be a prime target.

NSF AND EDUCATION DEPARTMENT JOIN FORCES TO IMPROVE MATH AND SCIENCE EDUCATION

Discussions at two meetings revealed growing cooperation between the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the Education Department (ED) to push the education reform agenda embodied in the President's America 2000 strategy. Emphasis was on goal #4: "By the year 2000, U.S. students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement."

David Kearns, Undersecretary of Education and former Chief Executive Officer of the Xerox Corporation, appeared before the President's Council of Advisers on Science and Technology (PCAST) on November 13 to report on efforts that NSF and ED were making to deal with what presidential science adviser Allan Bromley has called the "scandalous" state of precollege education in America.

Kearns credited Tom Ratchford, Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology, with playing a major role in bringing the two agencies together to forge a coordinated effort to improve teacher training and student performance in science and mathematics. According to Kearns, Luther Williams, NSF's Assistant Director for the Education and Human Resources Directorate (EHR) is preparing a memorandum of understanding to be signed by NSF Director Walter Massey and Education Secretary Lamar Alexander that would formalize the cooperative ventures.

Kearns also noted that Diane Ravitch, Assistant Secretary for Education Research and Improvement, has joined in the discussions concerning future measurements of student achievement. This topic is also on the minds of the National Council on Education Standards and Testing, although Kearns suggested the early rush to push a national testing system is stalled because of skepticism by the congressional members of the Council.

NSF STILL SEEKS CANDIDATES FOR SBE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

Nominations are still encouraged for the position of Assistant Director for the Social, Behavioral and Economic Science Directorate. They should be addressed to Dr. Walter Massey, Director, National Science Foundation, 1800 G Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20550. The closing date is December 2, 1991.

In response to a question from PCAST member and former Presidential Science Adviser John McTague about "energizing the public" behind educational improvement, Kearns referenced a recent poll conducted by the PTA that suggests the American public does not believe the education goals can be achieved. However, Kearns asserted that the efforts of the Business Roundtable and the Advertising Council to create messages that would get the American public "to take ownership" of the educational problem in the country would be helpful.

At the meeting of the EHR Advisory Committee on November 12 both Luther Williams and Walter Massey spoke to the issue of NSF-ED cooperation. Williams focused on the preparations for the proposed FY 1993 government-wide math/science education and human resources budget that emerged from the FCCSET (Federal Coordinating Committees on Science, Engineering and Technology) process. Williams suggested the focus will be on teacher enhancement with increased resources that will allow programs to reach 50 percent of the math/science teachers in the country. He also explained that each agency would have lead roles, NSF for teacher enhancement, ED for assessments and the development of world class standards, but that both NSF and ED would be strong players on all issues dealing with educational improvement in math and science.

EHR Advisory Committee member Frederick Humphreys, President of Florida A&M University, expressed skepticism about the nation's ability to meet the goal of being number one in math and science. Massey responded that he too was unsure if that goal was achievable in the proposed time frame. Yet, he said he was glad that the goal is there. Massey noted that Williams had a plan to achieve the goal, but it was a question of whether sufficient resources would be available.
Massey and Williams also focused on the increased attention to evaluation and assessment of EHR's programs. Indicating that Congress had given EHR enormous increases over the past few years (44 percent for FY 1992), Massey suggested at some point Congress is going to ask what has all the money bought? Thus, Massey said, NSF has a strong need to determine what has worked in enhancing science and math education.

USE OF REVISED CENSUS DATA DISCUSSED BY SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Continuing questions over the accuracy of revised census data and their inclusion into federal grant formulation were the topic of a November 13 hearing held by the Subcommittee on Government Information and Regulation of the Senate Governmental Affairs committee, chaired by Sen. Herb Kohl (D-WI).

At issue is incorporating information from the 1990 Post-Enumeration Survey (PES) into the intercensal estimates, which are used to make allocations of federal funds through formula grant programs. The PES adjusts the figures of the 1990 census, which is estimated to have undercounted the nation's population by 5.3 million. Earlier this year Commerce Secretary Robert Mosbacher decided against using revised census data in determining representational apportionment, yet left the door open for the PES data to be included in population estimates used for formula grants, provided that the PES data passed methodological reviews run by the Census Bureau and the Department of Commerce. While the quality of the data is under review by federal statisticians, concern on Capitol Hill focuses on whether one's home state would gain or lose federal funding by including PES data into population estimates.

Mark W. Plant, Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs at the Commerce Department appeared before Kohl's panel to discuss efforts to evaluate the PES data. Plant outlined five main issues that he believed must be addressed before Mosbacher decides whether to include PES information into intercensal estimates: lack of stability of complex adjustment models, lack of ability to correct the PES for measurement biases, resolution of differences between the PES and other demographic analyses, an examination of the components that determine level of error in the PES, and an evaluation of the assumption that each person in a PES grouping has a similar chance of being included in the census.

Sen. Kohl, while noting that the issue is still under study by Commerce, asked Plant whether he would include the PES data in the estimates if he had to make a decision today. Plant said he would recommend against including the PES data, a response which appeared to sit well with Kohl, whose home state of Wisconsin is likely to lose federal funds if PES data were to be used.

L. Nye Stevens, Director of Government Business Operations Issues at the General Accounting Office (GAO), presented to the committee the findings of a GAO report on the potential impact of using adjusted census counts in grant formulas. The GAO report found that overall impact "would likely be small as a percentage of total funding." According to the GAO this is because formula grant funding is influenced by many other factors, such as use of nonpopulation data (for example, miles of roads) and by minimum or maximum allocations. The GAO ran simulated allocations of three major federal grant programs and found that less than half of a percent of overall funding would be redistributed if revised population data were used. However the report did note that some individual states may see a gain or a loss of millions of dollars annually.

Meanwhile, on the other side of Capitol Hill, Rep. Tom Sawyer (D-OH), chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee's Subcommittee on Census and Population, remains locked in a protracted battle with Secretary Mosbacher over the release of the PES data. Sawyer, whose home state of Ohio is likely to gain from the PES, is requesting that the complete PES figures be released, while Mosbacher has said he is only willing to provide Sawyer's committee with adjusted figures for cities with populations over 25,000. Mosbacher is contending that PES data are inaccurate in smaller population units, while Sawyer argues that PES data should be public information.

HOUSE PANELS REVIEW INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Issues of international development and poverty were the focus of two recent hearings held by House committees. The House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, chaired by Rep. Mervyn Dymally (D-CA) met on November 12 to review the Agency for International Development's (A.I.D.)
policies in Africa, and two days later the House Select Committee on Hunger's International Task Force, chaired by Rep. Byron Dorgan (D-ND) examined the growing urbanization of the Third World.

A.I.D. Assistant Administrator Scott Spangler outlined his agencies priorities for development assistance for Africa in Fiscal Year 1992. He cited support for open and accessible governments, emphasizing African, not Western, initiatives, and the creation of a center for conflict resolution, which Spangler stated must be both independent and African-based to be successful. To implement A.I.D.'s goals, Spangler said that the agency is concentrating its resources on 22 nations on the continent, and emphasizing regional, not bilateral, approaches to development.

In response to a question by panel member Rep. Amo Houghton (R-NY) who expressed frustration over the persistence of high rates of poverty in Africa despite years of international assistance, Spangler replied that a key issue is "governments getting their act together" and stated that A.I.D. recognizes the need to create strong governmental structures in Africa to allow for better use of development aid and to eliminate dependency on outside assistance.

George Ayitteh, an American University economics professor, testified that many Africans have little confidence in economic reforms, and feel betrayed by their leaders for what he termed "Swiss bank socialism," the misuse by African leaders of foreign assistance. He stated that economic aid that is not "concomitant of political restructuring is a waste of time." Ayitteh said that absent effective leadership in African nations, economic aid will not reach the needy and African governments will remain dependent on outside assistance.

Ray Copson of the Congressional Research Service discussed for the committee the results of research he conducted under a grant from the United States Institute of Peace on the effects of war on development. Copson termed the 1980s as a decade of war in Africa, with regimes using instruments of state to rule by force. Copson noted that opportunities for political participation eroded as leaders consolidated their power, exacerbating domestic tensions and hurting the ability of the government to respond to the needs of its citizens. He cited war's disruption of agriculture, and industry, lost opportunities for economic growth, and the loss or diversion of foreign aid.

ANTHROPOLOGISTS SELECT NEW EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

John M. Cornman has been named the new Executive Director of the American Anthropological Association, effective December 1. For the past ten years Cornman has served as Executive Director of the Gerontological Society of America.

Previously, Cornman was Chief Executive Officer of the National Rural Center and Director of Communications for the late U.S. Senator Philip Hart. He was an American Political Science Association Congressional Fellow in 1964 and has been active in Virginia politics. He has published numerous articles and books on health care, public policy and aging. Cornman received his B.A. degree in English from Dartmouth College in 1955.

Appearing before the Hunger Committee, David Dowall, Chair of the Department of City and Regional Planning at the University of California at Berkeley spoke of the trends and challenges of urbanization of the Third World. According to Dowall the four percent annual rate of population growth in cities in under-developed nations will increase the urban population in the Third World by 600 million by the year 2000. Dowall said 25 percent of this group will live in poverty.

Dowall stated that this growth is the result of economic growth and development in the better off of the underdeveloped nations. He cited "push and pull" factors, with the push being agricultural improvements displacing workers from rural to urban areas, and the pull being migration to the cities in search of better job prospects. Dowall said that on the whole those who migrate to urban areas experience higher incomes and lower rates of poverty and infant mortality than in rural areas. However, Dowall was quick to cite the challenges facing Third World urban areas: improving the quality of governmental and economic infrastructures, relieving urban poverty, and developing sustainable environmental policies, particularly regarding air and water quality and waste management.
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'SOFT' SCIENCES GROW UP
by Daniel S. Greenberg

The social sciences have long been allowed only meager portions at the feasts of federal research grants. Billions are spent on the "hard sciences." Mere millions are allotted to psychology, sociology, criminology, economics and the other scholarly specialties under the umbrella of social sciences-disparaged as the "soft" sciences.

But now, in a little-noted administrative shuffle, the social sciences have been put on an organizational par with the disciplines that have long regarded themselves as the "real" sciences-chemistry, biology, physics, math and so forth. It's too early for the money balance to be altered. But that's coming. Meanwhile, the elevation of the social sciences tells a good deal about the evolving relationship to knowledge and politics.

The National Science Foundation (NSF) is the biggest federal bankroll of university research outside the health sciences. Founded in 1950, NSF was the creation of physicists and academic engineers who first experienced the joy of federal largesse during World War II. They wanted to keep it coming-to their gang. They were fearful that social science research would tread on sensitive issues and offend Congress.

President Harry Truman and the populist Sen. Harley M. Kilgore (D-WV) favored the social sciences as part of NSF's mandate. But, as NSF's official history notes, the reigning mandarins of science followed their own preferences: "With little support (and a good deal of opposition) from the communities of natural scientists and engineers, the National Science Board, and much of the NSF staff, those seeking a share of the Foundation's small budget for the social sciences had an uphill struggle."

As the social sciences developed despite their poverty, their exclusion from NSF's roster of recognized scholarly disciplines became so embarrassing that a diplomatic accommodation was reached. In 1976, the NSF Directorate for the Biological Sciences was expanded to the Directorate for Biological, Behavioral and Social Sciences. A scholarly rationale for wrapping the three together was not lacking, since a major wing of psychology was then meshing with studies of the brain and nervous system.

But the new shop was an odd base for sociology, economics and other fields under the banner of social and behavioral sciences. The Reagan administration, out of ideological distrust, cut back the little that NSF was spending in these fields. The losses were protested by business and high-tech industry, which have increasingly relied on the social sciences and trained researchers for a variety of needs, including market research, product design and personnel management. NSF's spending on the social sciences then started to creep up again. Even so, with an overall budget last year of $2.4 billion, NSF allotted the flock of them only $70 million.

Despairing of internal reform, social scientists took to the lobbying route. Individually and through their professional societies, they pitched their case to Congress on the theme of further study. The committee, as expected, concluded that a separate directorate should be established. On October 11, NSF announced the creation of its Directorate for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences.

The change can be attributed to effective lobbying, the intellectual growth of the social sciences and a maturity on the part of the physical and natural scientists who still dominate the foundation. But also present was the dwindling of confidence, among politicians and the public, in America's ability to cope with its many economic and social problems.

When the nation's challenges were military in nature, physicists and engineers responded with the bomb, radar and the space program. But the skills that produced those achievements are irrelevant to today's threats. Realizing that, politics is drawn to the potential of the social sciences. A lot more research money will inevitably follow.

But don't look for miracles. The trips to the moon were kid's stuff compared to the problems in the domain of the social sciences.
### MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Anthropological Association</th>
<th>American Psychological Association</th>
<th>Association of American Geographers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Economic Association</td>
<td>American Sociological Association</td>
<td>Association of American Law Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Association</td>
<td>American Statistical Association</td>
<td>Linguistic Society of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Political Science Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AFFILIATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business</th>
<th>Midwest Sociological Society</th>
<th>Society for Research on Adolescence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Association for Public Opinion Research</td>
<td>National Council on Family Relations</td>
<td>Society for Research in Child Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Educational Research Association</td>
<td>National Council for the Social Studies</td>
<td>Society for the Advancement of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society of Criminology</td>
<td>North American Regional Science Council</td>
<td>Socio-Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Asian Studies</td>
<td>North Central Sociological Association</td>
<td>Society for the Scientific Study of Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Social Sciences in Health</td>
<td>Operations Research Society of America</td>
<td>Society for the Scientific Study of Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Sociological Society</td>
<td>Population Association of America</td>
<td>Southern Sociological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Science Society</td>
<td>Rural Sociology Society</td>
<td>Southwestern Social Science Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies Association</td>
<td>Social Science History Association</td>
<td>Speech Communication Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Society Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Institute for Management Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONTRIBUTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Council of Learned Societies</th>
<th>University of Illinois</th>
<th>Pennsylvania State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American University</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookings Institution</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>University of Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Nelson A. Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy, State University of New York at Albany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University</td>
<td>Social Science Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie-Mellon University</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>State University of New York, Stony Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>National Opinion Research Center</td>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research</td>
<td>University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Consortium of Social Science Associations
1522 K Street, NW, Suite 836, Washington, DC 20005