

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume XII, Number 12

June 28, 1993

SCIENCE COMMITTEE HEARS FROM NSF ON REAUTHORIZATION *HS*

Following up on testimony received from public witnesses on May 20, the House Science Subcommittee chaired by Rep. Rick Boucher (D-VA) heard from the Acting Director of the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the Chairman of the National Science Board (NSB) on June 15. The Subcommittees' scrutiny of NSF is in preparation for its reauthorization later this year.

Boucher stated that the Subcommittee's goal in the NSF reauthorization "is to institute policies under which the resources made available to NSF will be allocated most effectively to meet the agency's broad range of responsibilities." The chairman cited the Clinton administration's proposal to increase NSF spending by \$3.3 billion in the next five years. Rep. Sherwood Boehlert (R-NY), Ranking Republican on the Subcommittee, bemoaned the Congress' inability to fully fund NSF's budget requests in recent years because Congress was foolishly wasting funds on the superconducting supercollider.

Boucher, in his opening statement, pointed out that NSF funds the majority of academic research in the social sciences, a comment echoed in the testimony of NSF Acting Director Fred Bernthal, who noted that in 1991 NSF provided 88 percent of federal funding for the conduct of research in anthropology and 87 percent in political science.

In addressing the Subcommittee's concerns about the priorities at NSF, particularly between so-called strategic research and what is referred to as "curiosity-driven" research, Bernthal insisted that these two categories overlap considerably, and they really "comprise a distinction without a difference." He also suggested that research and education activities supported by the NSF "are best viewed as an integral, inseparable part of our mission."

Boucher, in both reauthorization hearings, has expressed keen interest in the problem of academic facilities, where recent estimates suggest a \$10 billion shortfall. He commented that the current authorization established a facilities modernization

program authorized at \$890 million for five years, but only \$94 million has been appropriated. NSB Chairman James Duderstadt, President of the University of Michigan, argued that the needs are so overwhelming that for NSF to attempt to solve the problem in the current budgetary climate would distort its priorities. The Office of Science and Technology Policy must take the lead to coordinate a cross-agency solution, Bernthal declared.

Also on Rep. Boucher's list of issues was providing bloc grants to research universities to relieve the proposal pressure on NSF and on scientists. Bernthal noted that a 1960s NSF program, Centers of Excellence, utilized such an approach. He argued, and Duderstadt agreed, that the idea might be worth trying, but it would have to include a peer review system administered by NSF.

Duderstadt commented on the role of the NSB and mentioned its statement "In Support of Basic Research" (see *Update*, June 14). He suggested this exemplified the NSB's greater activism on science policy issues, as recommended by the Commission on the Future of the NSF.

Rep. Anita Eshoo (D-CA) took NSF to task for the lack of women on the National Science Board (1 out of 24) and, as she had done at the earlier hearing, asked about the efficacy of NSF's programs to promote women in science and engineering.

INSIDE UPDATE...

- ◆ Senate Subcommittee Explores NAS Report on Science and the Federal Government
- ◆ House Hearing Looks at Academic Earmarking
- ◆ Exchange Program Dealt Setback
- ◆ Panel Restores Title VIII Research Program
- ◆ NIMH Minority Fellowship Announced
- ◆ Mann & Ornstein Call for "Strong, Assertive" Congress
- ◆ Update of Clinton Nominees
- ◆ Torrey Named CBASSE Executive Director
- ◆ Nursing Research Elevated at NIH

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE EXPLORES NAS REPORT ON SCIENCE AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT *HS*

The Senate Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space held its first hearing on science under its new chairman, Sen. Jay Rockefeller (D-WV), to review Science, Technology, and the Federal Government: National Goals for a New Era, a report produced by the Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy (COSEPUP) of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine. The witnesses at the June 22 hearing were Frank Press, outgoing President of the NAS (he leaves office on July 1) and Phillip Griffiths, chair of COSEPUP and Director, Institute of Advanced Study at Princeton.

The report notes the changes in the environment for U.S. science and technology policy (the end of the Cold War, the need to compete economically in a global context) and calls for federal funding of science based on a set of performance standards that would assess the contributions of various fields of science. Since science and technology are linked to national objectives in economic growth, health care, national security, and environmental protection it is important, the report declares, that the nation decide what goals it should have for science.

The COSEPUP panel makes distinctions for U.S. science policy. It claims the U.S. "should be among the world leaders in all major areas of science." (Our underline) "Major areas" refers to

the broad areas of science, defined by the report as biology, physics, mathematics, chemistry, earth science, and astronomy. The panel did not consider the social and behavioral sciences according to chairman Griffiths. Being among the leaders means that "U.S. scientists understand and participate in expanding the frontiers of human knowledge."

By contrast, the report states that "the nation should maintain clear leadership in some major areas of science." The selection of these fields will be made by government decision makers with "appropriate advice from interested groups." These decisions, the report notes, "must be fully informed by the comparative assessments of different scientific fields."

COSEPUP believes it is feasible to monitor U.S. scientific performance with field-by-field peer assessments. The report recommends establishing independent panels consisting of researchers who work in the field, individuals who work in closely related fields, and research "users" who follow the field closely to assess the performance of U.S. research scientists in a given field and compare it with the performance of researchers in other nations. Quantitative measurements, such as movements of individuals, literature citation counts, quantity and quality of instrumentation could be important criteria for the panels.

The report concludes that "assessments of fields will prove useful in the allocation of resources both within and among fields" and provide a basis for a new approach to designing and enacting federal research budgets. The panel felt that current funding levels of over \$70 billion were sufficient to meet present needs, but that the performance goals could lead to a reallocation of resources and a more coherent process of allocation, both in the Congress and the Executive Branch.

Sen. Rockefeller expressed concern about how the new performance assessments would work with regard to megaprojects like the space station and the superconducting supercollider. According to Griffiths, the costs would be assessed in terms of the performance goals. If the area of the megaproject was one where the U.S. chose to be among the leaders, then the megaproject would proceed only with international cost-sharing; if it was an area where the U.S. wanted to demonstrate clear leadership it would proceed on its own. Although in discussing the space station, Press admitted that political considerations, such as jobs, would also be taken into account by decisionmakers.

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

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

President: William Julius Wilson

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 \$60; institutional subscriptions, \$120, overseas mail, \$120. 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

HOUSE HEARING LOOKS AT ACADEMIC EARMARKING *SP*

On June 16 the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee began a series of hearings on academic earmarks, federal grants advocated by Members of Congress for specific projects at particular academic institutions. Earmarks do not go through regular merit review processes, and are not included in the Administration's budget request.

Although controversy over the "porkbarrel" process of academic earmarking is not new, Committee Chairman George Brown (D-CA) said at the hearing that the issue needs further deliberation because the number of projects and the amount of money awarded has spiraled out of control. "In 1992, 209 universities were named as recipients with over \$700 million awarded. Since 1980, there has been a 70-fold increase in academic earmarking, with no evidence that the practice is abating," Brown reported. Brown anticipates that the hearings will "shine more light on the problems of earmarking, and lead to more equitable solutions." He hopes that "focusing on the pressures that have resulted from earmarking will be helpful in fighting the practice in the upcoming appropriations cycle."

Jeffords Critical of Appropriators

Senator James Jeffords (R-VT), echoed the concerns of Chairman Brown in a statement released at the hearing. Jeffords was "shocked to learn that my colleagues who serve on the Appropriations Committee were actively trying to suppress information on academic earmarks." While trying to access studies on earmarking issued by the Congressional Research Service, Jeffords said he was told that the Appropriations Committee had intervened to prevent further release of the reports. Jeffords said, "It seems my colleagues don't want the public to know how bad the problem is." Jeffords hopes the Senate will also schedule hearings on earmarking, commenting that "all universities are badly in need of financial assistance. Earmarking funds for a few universities is not the way to address this problem."

The first witness, Vanderbilt University Chancellor Joe B. Wyatt continued the argument against academic earmarking, stating that "the problem is that the nation is yielding the allocation of already limited research funds -- arguably our most important policy decision influencing the future -- to a process very skillfully and very prosperously practiced, if not invented, by well-

connected lobbyists and those they represent." He further said that "since the early 1980's federal research dollars have increasingly been appropriated not on the basis of who can best do the needed research, but as a result of which institution can buy the most political influence in Congress." He concluded that "earmarking subverts the national interest in the responsible funding of scientific research." Vanderbilt does not pursue or accept earmarked funding, Wyatt said.

"A Pernicious Practice"

Robert M. Rosenzweig, former President of the Association of American Universities, did not mince words regarding his perspective on academic earmarking. His view is that "science funding through primarily political processes and without regard to careful judgment of the scientific merits of the work to be done is a pernicious practice, destructive of high-quality science, wasteful of the public's money, and erosive of public confidence in the integrity of universities and the political process." Rosenzweig's observed that no proposal for limiting earmarking he has seen addresses its root cause: "it is in the political interests of Members of Congress to help their constituencies and it is in the institutional interests of university presidents who wish to use the argument to find ways to help their Congressmen to help their constituencies."

A Defense of Earmarking

Ken Schlossberg, President, Ken Schlossberg Consultants, was the only witness to testify in favor of academic earmarking. He spoke from personal experience as a Senate Staff Director for the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs from 1969 through 1974, and more recent experience as a lobbyist for facilities projects. His view is that "the blanket indictment of congressional earmarking of academic facilities as simply a 'pork barrel' activity and a threat to scientific research in America is wrong and represents, in my opinion, an unbalanced view of the nation's academic and scientific needs. I do not believe that every dollar for research is sacred and every dollar for facilities profane." He also challenged the peer review process as being the only legitimate process for awarding funds. He said the rigorous Congressional review process should not be discounted.

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM DEALT SETBACK *MB/HS*

The House Intelligence Committee chaired by Rep. Dan Glickman (D-KS), voted on June 17 to deny authorization to the National Security Education program (NSEP), which sought to convert \$150 million in intelligence funding to a trust fund for international studies and foreign language education and training. Viewed by some as an apparent retaliation against NSEP's major patron, Sen. David Boren (D-OK), for his refusal to support President Clinton's original budget package, the committee's action could also be seen as a cost-cutting measure against a program that has existed for eighteen months, yet is still in its planning stages and has yet to get its Policy Board members appointed.

Despite the House Committee's action, the NSEP received \$10 million in the Senate version of the FY 1993 supplemental appropriations bill. A jurisdictional dispute is also brewing between the Intelligence and Armed Services Committees, with the latter claiming the former no longer has claims on the NSEP since it has been moved to the Office of Policy in the Department of Defense.

SUBCOMMITTEE RESTORES TITLE VIII RESEARCH PROGRAM *HS*

The House Foreign Operations Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. David Obey (D-WI,) has restored funding for the Russian, Eurasian, and East European Research and Training Program (Title VIII). The President's budget request had originally proposed no new funding for the program. However, it has been included as part of the aid package to the Newly Independent States (NIS) of the former Soviet Union.

The program, which has enjoyed bipartisan support, and which had its appropriation significantly increased in recent years, provides funding for American scholars' research, training, and language expertise concerning the successor states of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The Committee noted that "the program is an investment designed to ensure that broad-based expertise is available in both the academic and policy making community on a range of policy issues in the region."

NIMH ANNOUNCES MINORITY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM *MB*

The National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) recently announced its Minority Research Fellowship Program, which is designed to support the development and training of individuals in doctoral programs in sociology to enable them to undertake active, productive careers in scientific investigations related to mental health and mental illness. Applications must be received by July 21, 1993. For more information, contact NIMH (301) 443-3373.

The Committee endorsed funding of \$10 million, the same as last year's level. It also recommended preserving the Title VIII mechanism of disbursing funds through a regrant process.

MANN & ORNSTEIN CALL FOR "STRONG, ASSERTIVE" CONGRESS *MB*

Noted Congressional scholars Thomas E. Mann and Norman J. Ornstein, in their second report of the Renewing Congress Project, call for a series of institutional reforms to make Congress stronger and more efficient. Mann, of the Brookings Institution, and Ornstein, of the American Enterprise Institute, are working closely with the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which is expected to release its recommendations in early September (see *Update*, February 22).

The cornerstone of the report is that members have become over-extended from proliferating committee assignments, and the scholars urge a reduction in the number of committees and subcommittees to allow members to focus more substantively on a particular set of issues and legislation. Mann and Ornstein argue that the proliferation of committees has diminished the quality of hearings and complicated the legislative process. They call for merging small, narrow standing committees into larger panels to give them more range, breadth, and attractiveness to members.

Other recommendations include creating a process to allow serious deficit reduction proposals to be given a fast-track through the legislative process, restricting the ability of senators to put "holds" on bills they oppose, and creating an

independent agency to ensure that Congress abides by the same workplace laws it passes for the nation.

Senators' Attitude Criticized

Addressing the Senate, the authors note that the prevailing culture of the Senate is a barrier to a strong Congress: "The attitudes of Senators towards the institution and its processes, toward debate and toward one another, have evolved in ways that maximize the convenience of individual senators at the expense of the Senate's business."

For more information on the report, "Renewing Congress: A Second Report," contact the American Enterprise Institute at (202) 862-5829.

UPDATE ON CLINTON NOMINEES FOR KEY SOCIAL SCIENCE POSITIONS *HS*

Following up on the chart in the June 14 *Update*, Education Department nominees Marshall (Mike) Smith and David Longanecker have been confirmed by the Senate as Undersecretary and Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education respectively. Sharon Porter Robinson has been cleared by the Senate Labor and Human Resources as Assistant Secretary for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

At the Labor Department, Jack Donahue has been confirmed as Assistant Secretary for Policy and Katharine Abraham has been nominated by President Clinton as the next Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

At the Department of Health and Human Services, Philip Lee has been confirmed as Assistant Secretary of Health, and Harold Varmus has been mentioned as the probable nominee to direct the National Institutes of Health.

Sheldon Hackney's nomination to head the National Endowment of the Humanities was received by the Senate and hearings were held on June 25. Alan Blinder and Joseph Stiglitz' nominations as members of the Council of Economic Advisers have been received by the Senate.

TORREY NAMED EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF CBASSE *HS*

Barbara Boyle Torrey has been selected the next Executive Director of the Commission on Behavioral, Social Sciences and Education (CBASSE) of the National Research Council (NRC). Currently the President of the Population Reference Bureau, a non-profit center of national and international population research and dissemination, Torrey replaces Suzanne Woolsey, who has been named Operations Officer, a new position on the senior management team of the NRC. Torrey will assume the CBASSE position on September 1.

Prior to heading the PRB, Torrey was Chief of the Center for International Research at the U.S. Census Bureau from 1984 through 1992. She has also served as a fiscal economist at the Office of Management and Budget (1970-78, 81-84), Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation of Income Security Programs at the Department of Health and Human Services (1980-81), and Deputy Director of the President's Commission on Pension Policy (1979).

A former Peace Corps volunteer in Tanzania, Torrey has served on the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Population Commission and as a consultant to the National Economic Commission. She is currently a member of the National Academy of Sciences' Committee on Population and its Committee on the Human Dimensions of Global Changes. She previously served on the Board of the Luxembourg Income Study.

She is the co-editor, with Carole Joly, of the forthcoming Population Growth and Land Use Change, and co-editor with Tim Smeeding and John Palmer of The Vulnerable (1988). In recent years her writing and presentations have focused on global change issues. In the 1980s she published a number of chapters and articles on aging issues, including the oldest old. Torrey's degrees are from Stanford, earning an M.S. in International and Development Economics in 1970 and a B.A. in International Relations in 1963.

NURSING RESEARCH CENTER BECOMES NIH INSTITUTE *SP*

After nearly seven years of performing as an institute, the National Center for Nursing Research (NCNR) was redesignated as the National Institute for Nursing Research (NINR) by the recent passage of the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993. Just one day after the bill was signed by the President, HHS Secretary Donna Shalala officially recognized the center as the 17th institute of the NIH. Although the bureaucratic process for the change in status could have taken as long as six months, the strong support of NIH Director Bernadine Healy paved the way for its quick conversion.

The first proposal to establish a nursing research institute was made in the 1984 NIH Reauthorization bill, legislation vetoed by President Reagan. In 1985, as part of the Health Research Extension Act, a compromise establishing a center rather than an institute was struck between Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT) and the nursing community in an effort to avoid another veto. Reagan still vetoed the bill stating, "I do not believe that the establishment of a nursing center at NIH is appropriate, for a very basic reason -- there is a lack of compatibility between the mission of such a center and the mission of NIH..." Overriding Reagan's veto, Congress established NCNR in April 1986.

Congress created NCNR to provide a central focus for nursing research within the research mainstream of the NIH. Its general mandate is identical to that of the other NIH institutes, and provides the full array of program and training opportunities. Its specific mission is "to advance science to strengthen nursing practice and health care that promotes health, prevents disease, and ameliorates the effects of illness and disability." To fulfill this mission, the institute established the following goals:

- ◆ Enhance the scientific base for nursing practice and health care in order to promote health and optimal responses to illness;
- ◆ Generate innovative research and research training programs and strategies to address national health priorities;
- ◆ Expand the biomedical and behavioral research base for nursing practice and health care in

order to contribute to the nation's economic well-being and provide a continued high return on the public investment in research;

- ◆ Provide leadership for the advancement of nursing research based on a national perspective;

- ◆ Promote public accountability, scientific integrity, and social responsibility in research for nursing practice and health care.

Important to Social and Behavioral Science

The NINR is of particular importance to the social and behavioral science community. In FY 1994, approximately 45% of its total budget is designated to health and behavior research. Although the nursing center has tripled its budget in the eight years since its beginning from approximately \$16 million to an estimated \$48 million, it has one of the lowest competing awards success rates at NIH -- only 7.7%. The overall average success rate for NIH is approximately 25%. The FY 1994 President's request for NINR is \$48,975,000, an increase of \$479,000 or 1% above the FY 1993 level.

Six priority areas of NINR's research agenda for FY 1990-1994 include: low birthweight, HIV infection, long-term care, symptom management, nursing informatics, and health promotion. Research priorities for FY 1995-1999 include: developing and testing community-based nursing models; fostering health-promoting behavior to prevent HIV/AIDS in women and other special populations; developing and testing approaches to remediating cognitive impairment; testing interventions for coping with chronic illness; and identifying bio-behavioral factors and testing interventions to promote immunocompetence.

The Division of Extramural Programs at NINR is comprised of three branches: Health Promotion/Disease Prevention, Acute and Chronic Illness, and Nursing Systems. A recent report to the National Advisory Council for Nursing Research provides a summary of the three branches. Regarding the Health Promotion/Disease Prevention Branch, the report states that "studies on health promotion are aimed at developing an understanding of the various factors involved in the advancement of well-being and the avoidance of health risks across the life span. They focus on nursing's concern with informing people about how to make good choices for themselves, and providing them with the skills, resources, and social

environment needed to change and maintain healthful behaviors." Examples include but are not limited to studies on: special populations, smoking and health, misuse of alcohol and drugs, nutrition, physical fitness and exercise, risk-related sexual behavior, family violence, self care, normal developmental processes in women, and parenting practices.

Research on the prevention of illnesses and the promotion of health within illness includes "the identification of biomedical, behavioral, and environmental risk factors and the development or refinement of methods in which nursing can intervene to enhance the abilities of at-risk individuals and their families to respond to potential health problems." Examples include but are not limited to: studies of hypertension control, pregnancy and infant health, sexually transmitted diseases, and stress and coping through the life span.

Research in the second branch, Acute and Chronic Illness, "deals with human responses to acute and chronic illness and disability throughout the life span. It is concerned with the biological, behavioral, and psychosocial factors that contribute to these conditions and with methods to improve or alleviate the effects of the illness or condition."

The third branch, Nursing Systems, "examines the clinical practice environment in which health care is provided, factors underlying the process of nursing care, relationships among aspects of clinical practice, and the influence of that practice on outcomes of care. Also included are investigations of promising approaches to strengthening quality of care, such as studies that link nursing management and quality of care delivery. The primary focus of nursing systems research is inquiry into the delivery of health care which includes the study of the structural, organizational, and economic context of clinical practice and the processes of care delivery in relation to the assessment of clinical endpoints of appropriate care which encompasses quality, efficacy, and effectiveness."

The intramural program at the NINR studies ways to minimize patients' symptoms and improve the quality of their lives. From its inception in 1988, the intramural program originated out of the Office of the Director. In January 1992, however, the formal office of the Division of Intramural Research was created and two laboratories, the Clinical Therapeutics Laboratory (CTL) and the Laboratory for the Study of Human Responses to

Health and Illness (HRHIL) evolved. At the CTL, two symptom management studies examine nutritional problems that occur during treatment for HIV infection, and explore the relationship of nutritional status to immune function. Another CTL study is addressing symptom management of incontinence-- a common and costly problem among the aging. At the HRHIL, two studies in progress examine caregiving of the elderly and quality of life in persons with HIV.

NINR Led by Sociologist

Dr. Ada Sue Hinshaw, Director of the NINR for the past six years, received her PhD and MA in Sociology from the University of Arizona, an MSN from Yale University, and a BS from the University of Kansas. Her major fields included maternal-newborn health, clinical nursing and nursing administration, and instrument development and testing. She has given more than 100 presentations and her findings have been widely published in over 90 journal articles, books, and abstracts. Hinshaw was recently honored with the 1993 Health Leader of the Year Award. Past recipients have included former and current Surgeons General C. Everett Koop and Antonia Novello.

In recent testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, Dr. Hinshaw identified what is distinctive about nursing research. She stated, "The goal of nursing research is to provide a strong scientific knowledge base for nursing practice to improve people's health. Though nursing research and medical research are highly collaborative, they have different emphases. Medical research focuses on finding better ways to diagnose and treat illness, such as AIDS. Nursing research focuses on how people react to an illness and its treatment -- for example, nutritional problems or muscle wasting associated with HIV infection -- how to prevent or reduce these life-threatening symptoms and improve quality of life. Nursing research is also biobehavioral, addressing the whole person and his or her surrounding circumstances. Emphasis is strong on promotion of health and prevention of disease, women's health, particularly in midlife; and, after looking through the prism of cultural and racial diversity, development of appropriately sensitive health care interventions."

For more information, contact Linda Cook, NINR Office of Information and Legislative Affairs at (301) 496-0207.

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
Law and Society Association
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
Midwest Sociological Society
National Council on Family Relations
North Central Sociological Association
Operations Research Society of America
Population Association of America
Rural Sociological 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
Kansas State University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public
Affairs, Syracuse University
University of Michigan
Michigan State University
University of Minnesota
National Bureau of Economic Research
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
Social Science Research Council
University of Southern California
State University of New York, Stony Brook
Temple University
University of Tennessee
University of Texas, Austin
Texas A & M University
Tulane University
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
