

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume XI, Number 19

October 26, 1992

NSF COMMISSION MOVES TOWARD DECISIONS IN SECOND MEETING *HS*

The National Science Board Special Commission on the Future of the National Science Foundation (NSF) held its second meeting on October 16. Faced with a short time frame (its report is due November 20) and an outpouring of responses from the scientific community (over 400 letters and statements responding to a request for comment), co-chairman William Danforth, President of Washington University in St. Louis, urged his colleagues on the commission to focus on moving toward decisions about what should be included in the report.

NSF Director Walter Massey began the meeting by claiming that the mission of the commission had been widely misunderstood and had led to unnecessary unease in the academic community. Massey announced that the commission's report would be part of a process that would include a National Science Board planning retreat in January and possible public hearings around the country early next year "to continue the discussion." Trying to reassure the research community, Massey asserted that NSF was committed to continuing support for fundamental research. "It's not an issue, it's a given," the director declared. The core issue, Massey stated, was to enhance NSF in a different environment and "make a better case for fundamental long-term research" by educating Congress and the public of the value about basic research.

Noting that the NSF "was already involved in the issues of the day," Massey asked if NSF will continue "to play [this role] at the margins" or make linkages with industry and other actors, e.g. state governments, "integral to NSF activities." Massey contended that "the status quo at NSF was not healthy," with only 30-40 percent of outstanding proposals getting funded, and the "breadth of expectations already outstripping current resources."

Responding to Massey, the Commission members focused on a series of questions whose answers began to set the stage for the drafting of the report. Earl Richardson, President of Morgan

State University, spoke to the strengths of NSF. He noted these were: 1) concern about the vitality of the long-term research and science education enterprise; 2) a proven record of linkages with universities; 3) use of a merit based selection process that has served as a model; and 4) a strong reputation that belied its rather meager resources.

Relations with Universities Discussed

Addressing the question of how changes in the environment for science will affect NSF, Peter Magrath, President of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, and Percy Pierre, Vice President for Research at Michigan State University, perceived different situations. Magrath called for a strengthened alliance between NSF and America's universities, but also noted that the states must have a strong role, that distinctions between basic and applied research "break down, both intellectually and politically," that science research and education need "to be demonstrably useful to the economy and the society, just as they were in the years following World War II when science was supported by the government and the public as a vehicle for defense." "It is therefore critical," Magrath concluded, "that we act accountably--both the research universities and the NSF--and listen to the voices out there who are talking about economic competitiveness, the transfer of knowledge, and collaborative industry-university-federal linkages."

INSIDE UPDATE...

- PCAST Comments on NSF Commission and Possible Future Agenda *HS*
- Women's Health Research Focus of Chicago and Washington Meetings *JTA*
- AAAS Announces Fellowships *MB*
- New AAU President Named *MB*
- Carnegie Report Calls for Long-Term Science Goals *MB*
- Alberts Nominated for NAS Presidency *MB*
- Text of COSSA Statement to NSF Commission *HS et al*

Pierre, on the other hand, asked if industry was ready to participate in this partnership. He was unsure, but stated that "nothing should be done at the expense of basic research." He perceived any expansion of NSF's mission as leading to more funding of applied research. Pierre also questioned whether the environment had really changed, specifically, shortening the time frame for the transfer of basic research into applications. Commission member Ian Ross, President Emeritus of Bell Labs and a member of the National Science Board, agreed with Pierre. Ross noted that what has been accelerated is product differentiation, e.g. an extra button on the VCR, not taking basic research and translating it into a marketable product.

Reacting to the question of how NSF's activities contribute to practical benefits, Marye Ann Fox, Professor of Chemistry at the University of Texas and a member of the National Science Board, noted that the universities contribute to technology transfer by providing human resources to industry and by developing intellectually the disciplines that contribute to scientific discovery. Dismissing the teaching v. research argument as counterproductive, Fox suggested that NSF does a good job of balancing untargeted vs. strategic research, individual vs. multiple investigators, and subspecialized vs. cross disciplinary research.

"Technology Transfer Myth"

John Armstrong, Vice President for Scientific Research at IBM, noted that science has always been related to defense, health and the need for an increased standard of living. Under the defense

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

rationale the government was the customer for the basic research, but this is not true anymore, he contended. Armstrong also dismissed the notion that the U.S. competitive disadvantage was the result of technology transfer problems. He said the "technology transfer myth" overstates the importance of science and technology to commercial success. He added that there continues to be a need for robust university research seeking out the frontiers of knowledge without concern for national needs. A strategic research program related to national goals might be undertaken, according to Armstrong, with industry given a role in choosing the strategic areas. It would be more useful to industry to promote a robust exchange of people working jointly toward common goals, he continued, arguing that NSF should not be doing technology transfer.

Echoing a comment made by others, Peter Eisenberger, Director of Princeton's Materials Laboratory, said that a \$60,000 grant, the NSF average, was not enough to dent industrial needs. He agreed with Armstrong that it might be possible to continue to grow the strategic component of NSF, but that scientists should decide how this would be done, rather than leaving it to the NSF leadership or industry. Eisenberger reiterated that science and technology serve to answer "quality of life" questions. He also made a pitch for continued attention to K-12 education and the need for a technically literate society.

A Three Part Future Mission

Commission member Donna Shalala, Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin at Madison, provided her colleagues with a statement that argued for a three part future mission for NSF. "First and foremost, it must remain the primary funder of long-term non-health related research in the United States," she declared. Secondly, the NSF should continue to take the lead in science education and training. Third, NSF should maintain the research infrastructure, both research facilities and equipment. Shalala also argued for continued NSF support for ready access to large data bases, particularly in the social sciences. *(An excerpt of her comments appears on page 4 of this issue.)*

In discussing the response to the Commission from the scientific community, Chuck Brownstein, Executive Secretary of the Commission, reported that comments reflected the strong concern that NSF continue its major function of support for basic research.

Outlining which of the current missions of NSF remain essential, Jacqueline Barton, Professor of Chemistry at Cal Tech, and John Hopcroft of Cornell University, noted the central importance of supporting basic scientific research, training new people, and developing new fields. Barton argued that the current NSF is "flexible and responsive" to new ideas. She also supported more graduate fellowships.

Responding to the question of what a future NSF might look like, Ross said that it should maintain and enhance its current role, improve and simplify the proposal process, and increase the role of the National Science Board on national science and technology issues. If NSF is to be expanded to include technology transfer, Ross stated, it should focus mostly on people exchanges and enhanced graduate training. In no way, he declared, should NSF ever directly fund industrial research and development.

Congressional Concerns

Former Congresswoman Lindy Boggs, a member of the Commission who once sat on NSF's appropriations subcommittee in the House, urged that the Commission must produce a report that provides sufficient guidance for NSF to satisfy congressional interest that science and technology meet society's concerns. If the Commission does not supply this, Congress is likely to mandate it, according to Boggs.

The committee hopes to have a draft report available for its next meeting on November 7. It appears that strong support for continuing NSF's role as a supporter of basic scientific research and education will be the cornerstone of the report. The issue of enhancing partnerships will be given some attention, but with a wariness for diluting the key mission. There may also be some discussion of procedural changes NSF could take to make it a more effective agency. Enhancing the role of the National Science Board is also likely to receive attention.

PCAST COMMENTS ON NSF COMMISSION AND POSSIBLE FUTURE AGENDA

At the October meeting of the President's Council of Advisers on Science and Technology (PCAST), PCAST Chairman and presidential science adviser Allan Bromley announced that the report of

the U.S. Research Intensive Colleges and Universities study would be released on December 15 along with the companion study of university-federal government relations conducted by the Federal Coordinating Council on Science, Engineering and Technology (FCCSET), directed by Walter Massey.

PCAST members, preferring not to discuss the proposed recommendations of their report in the open discussion, focused on a series of other items, including the National Science Board's Special Commission on the Future of the National Science Foundation.

Solomon Buchsbaum, former head of the White House Science Council under President Reagan, and a current PCAST member, noted the short time frame for the NSF Commission's work, and stated that there was "not a snowball's chance in hell of their coming up with anything sensible." PCAST member Mary Good, former chairman of the National Science Board, claimed the Commission was composed of dedicated people, but also expressed concern about the short time frame they have to complete their work.

Bromley noted the "gross misunderstandings" by the scientific community that Walter Massey, NSF Director and former PCAST member, is planning to shift NSF away from basic research, and he also discussed the possible enhanced role for the National Science Board in national science and technology policy. He suggested the "NSB was attempting to reclaim turf" originally granted it in the NSF Charter, but relinquished by Alan Waterman, the first director of the Foundation. The Council did agree to invite Massey and NIH Director Bernadine Healy, who is also in the midst of preparing a new strategic plan, to their next meeting on November 12.

The PCAST members also spent time discussing possible future agenda items. Bromley pushed for a major reexamination of the Vannevar Bush report, saying that it was time to scrutinize the blueprint discussed in *Science: The Endless Frontier* and to ask whether the rationale, support, structure, and utilization of science and technology outlined by Bush were still appropriate. What is necessary, Bromley declared, is to "articulate a vision" that will sustain science and technology efforts into the 21st Century. Of course, if the other Bush, President George, is not reelected on November 3, Bromley could be offering this new vision from a different chair.

WOMEN'S HEALTH RESEARCH FOCUS OF CHICAGO AND WASHINGTON MEETINGS

The subject of women's health research and policy, which has been receiving increased attention lately, was the focus of two very different meetings in one week. From October 15 to 17 in Chicago, the Center for Research on Women and Gender at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) sponsored a multidisciplinary conference on women's health research and practice, called "Reframing Women's Health." This conference brought together scholars, researchers, physicians, nurses, other health care providers, and community activists to discuss a range of issues related to the growing women's health agenda.

COSSA was represented at the conference by Judy Auerbach, Associate Director for Government Affairs, who spoke on a panel devoted to policy issues in women's health. Auerbach presented a paper titled, "Including Social Science Perspectives in the Emerging Women's Health Research Agenda: Barriers, Strategies, and Advances." She described the range of activities surrounding the current development of women's health research policy in Washington and the role COSSA has played in ensuring the participation of social and behavioral scientists.

Dominance of the Biomedical Model

Auerbach identified the dominance of the biomedical model of health and illness as the major barrier to inclusion of social science perspectives in new health programs, such as the Women's Health Initiative (WHI) at the National Institutes of Health. In particular, she mentioned the lingering resistance to recognizing how social, cultural, and psychological factors interact with individuals' experiences of health and illness. As evidence, Auerbach cited the lack of inclusion of social science theory and method in the WHI's original study design (see *Update*, Nov. 4, 1991). She noted the accomplishments of the social science advocacy community in eventually getting the WHI design modified to include some social and behavioral measures of quality of life and treatment compliance.

Auerbach was not alone at the UIC conference in conveying the message about a fully inclusive agenda on women's health research. The final panel of the meeting was devoted to the link between

NSF PANEL MEMBER SHALALA ON THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

"The need to maintain an active presence of the Foundation in the support of the social sciences cannot be overstated. I am convinced that much progress can be made in solving our current problems with a better understanding of our social institutions, individual social behavior, and their interactions. The National Science Foundation has played a unique role in the funding of research in the social sciences in the past, and it is crucial that they continue to provide that assistance. There is no other agency prepared to assume that responsibility if the Foundation should drop it."

— NSF Special Commission Member and University of Wisconsin at Madison Chancellor Donna Shalala in a statement prepared for the panel's October 16 meeting

feminist theory and women's health, and panelists Sandra Bartky, Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies at UIC, and Jean Hamilton, Professor of Psychology and Women's Studies at Duke University underscored the importance of understanding the historical and cultural context of gender itself in approaching women's health.

The second venue for discussing women's health research the same week was the annual meeting of the Institute of Medicine (IOM), held on October 19 at the National Academy of Sciences in Washington, D.C. IOM, arguably the most prestigious medical body in the U.S., is chartered by NAS to provide advice to the federal government as well as to develop its own initiatives on issues of medical care, research, and education. Like the NAS, membership in IOM is by nomination and historically has been overwhelmingly male. Indeed, IOM's failure this year to nominate more women to membership was excoriated by one attendee at the annual meeting who noted the connection between women's exclusion from the top echelons of medicine and other science careers and the lack of attention to women's health issues.

The IOM meeting was designed to present an overview of the question of gender differences in health. Presentations were structured like "short-courses" on everything from biological factors in gender differences to legal, social, and ethical issues in women's participation in clinical trials. In one of the only social science presentations, Eleanor

Maccoby, Professor of Psychology Emeritus at Stanford University, reviewed research on psychosocial differences in childhood and adolescent development.

Given the widely different audiences at the UIC conference -- with 99.9 percent of the attendees women -- and the IOM meeting -- with its overwhelmingly male membership -- it is evident that this "Year of the Woman" has come to include attention to women's health across the spectrum.

AAAS ANNOUNCES FELLOWSHIPS

The American Association for the Advancement of Science is now accepting applications for its Science and Engineering Fellowships Program.

AAAS offers fellowships in four programs: Congressional, Diplomacy, Executive Branch, and Environmental. The application deadline is January 15. All programs begin in September 1993, except the Environmental program which begins in June 1993.

Additional information can be obtained by contacting: Fellowships Office, American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005. Phone: (202) 326-6600.

NEW AAU PRESIDENT NAMED

Cornelius J. Pings, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs of the University of Southern California, has been named as the next president of the Association of American Universities (AAU).

Pings will assume his new post in February, 1993 to serve a five-year appointment. He will succeed Robert M. Rosenzweig, who announced last October that he would step down in early 1993 after two five-year terms in the position.

Pings has served in his current position at USC since 1981. He was previously Professor of Chemical Engineering and Chemical Physics, Vice Provost, and Dean of Graduate Studies at the California Institute of Technology. He currently serves as chairman of a joint Public Policy Committee of the National Academies of Sciences and Engineering and the Institute of Medicine.

CARNEGIE REPORT CALLS FOR LONG-TERM SCIENCE GOALS

A new Carnegie Commission report says that short-term thinking threatens U.S. science and technology and calls for greater attention to long-range goals and linkages to societal needs.

The report, *Enabling the Future: Linking Science and Technology to Societal Goals*, calls on the federal government to undertake strategic initiatives to link science and technology policy more directly to societal goals. According to the report, "We badly need a focusing of national attention and resolve." One of the key recommendations proposes forming a nongovernmental National Forum on Science and Technology Goals to facilitate the exchange of ideas on long-term policies in the context of national and international goals.

The Carnegie report outlines similar concerns to those of Rep. George Brown (D-CA), chair of the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology (see *Update*, September 28, 1992). For a copy of the report, contact the Carnegie Commission on Science, Technology, and Government at (202)-332-2221.

ALBERTS NOMINATED FOR NAS PRESIDENCY

Bruce M. Alberts, American Cancer Society Research Professor of Biochemistry and Biophysics at the University of California, San Francisco, has been nominated to be the next president of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS).

Alberts was selected by a nominating committee appointed by the NAS Council, the Academy's governing body. NAS members will vote on the nomination in December. The new president will take office on July 1, 1993, succeeding Frank Press, who has served as president since 1981. NAS bylaws allow an individual to be elected to two six-year terms as president.

Alberts has been a member of the Academy since 1981 and serves as chair of the Commission on Life Sciences of the National Research Council. The Research Council is the principal operating agency of NAS and the National Academy of Engineering.

COSSA STATEMENT TO SPECIAL COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The following is the complete text of the October 15 COSSA statement submitted to the Special Commission on the Future of the National Science Foundation:

The Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA) represents over 90 professional associations, scientific societies, and academic institutions who support our important work of promoting attention to and federal funding for the social, behavioral and economic sciences.

We are pleased to be able to respond to the important issues that led Dr. Massey and the National Science Board to establish this Special Commission. COSSA shares the goal of examining how the National Science Foundation should position itself to advance science in light of a changing world order. As the flagship agency dedicated to promoting the health of science, NSF plays a vital role in ensuring the continued production of new ideas and scientists to produce those ideas. Also, the Foundation can importantly contribute to public understanding of the value of continued investment in science and science education. Just as our nation faces many new challenges relating to economic growth, productivity, international communication, and the quality of life, so too does NSF face the challenge of setting priorities and strategies for science in this new context. Therefore, we commend the Commission for undertaking this effort.

SOCIAL BEHAVIORAL AND ECONOMIC (SBE) SCIENCES CONTRIBUTE IN TWO WAYS:

- **RELEVANT BASIC RESEARCH**
- **INTEGRATED RESEARCH WITH OTHER
SCIENCES TO FOSTER APPLICATION OF
KNOWLEDGE IN INDUSTRY AND THE
PUBLIC SECTOR**

The social, behavioral and economic (SBE) sciences already maintain connections with industry and other agencies of the government, providing them with basic research results that increase their effectiveness. These linkages demonstrate that as the NSF builds on its present mission, the SBE sciences' importance to the nation must be acknowledged and increased.

The social sciences have as their "product" the understanding of people and of their institutions in society, in a matrix of behavioral conditions. We believe, as NSF moves into its new era, that it is imperative to continue to support research that integrates systematic understanding of human and institutional issues as central to problems conceptualized as technological ones.

For example, the human dimensions of global change have been recognized as an essential part of the research agenda of the U.S. Global Change program. It is just as important that research on the human dimensions of technological change be examined in technology transfer research programs and initiatives such as the currently planned advanced manufacturing program. As Dale Compton, Lillian M. Gilbreth Distinguished Professor of Industrial Engineering at Purdue University, told his fellow members of the SBE Advisory Committee: "The problem in

manufacturing is not technology, it is management and the need to change large organizations, motivate people, and build work teams." All of these are subjects of social and behavioral science research. The problems, Compton noted are "too important to be left to the engineers." A larger role for the social sciences must be created in this initiative, and NSF can do that.

Transferring the results of SBE scientists' research has been demonstrated in numerous ways. Psychological, sociological, and demographic studies combined with methodological advances in survey techniques have created the market research industry which continues to utilize this knowledge to establish such innovative businesses as CLARITAS and American Demographics. This research has also been translated into the multi-million dollar polling industry which has explained political, social and economic behavior, not only in America, but in the rest of the world. In addition, basic research on political behavior helps the media industry interpret elections and other political events.

The National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis has been supported by NSF for a number of years. Its research and training activities have helped nourish a \$1.8 billion Geographic Information Systems industry that has transformed urban and rural planning, ecological analysis, and resource management in the United States and other industrialized countries. NSF support has been helpful in maintaining the U.S. lead in GIS and related technologies.

Sociological and anthropological research on race and ethnicity and multiculturalism have provided companies with the information and expertise to interact more effectively with increasingly multicultural workforces and markets. Given the demographic projections about the increased diversity of the U.S. workforce, these programs have become an important part of business planning. In addition, basic research on conflict resolution and risk taking has been utilized in mediation and negotiation efforts.

The NSF Science and Technology Center for Research on Cognitive Science at the University of Pennsylvania has attracted the support of nine major corporations interested in basic research on language processing, language acquisition, and perception and action. A "grasp laboratory" is conducting research on visual and tactile activities of robots. Prior research on computational linguistics provided the basis for pen based computing, a product now entering the marketplace.

Clearly, basic research on economics and sociology has changed the way businesses think about the functioning of financial markets, how people react to various economic stimuli, how monetary and fiscal policy work, and how organizations make decisions. In addition, research by economists has greatly contributed to our understanding of the critical importance of technological advances to the growth of American productivity.

Industrial and technological growth in a global economy is inevitably a public private partnership, and the creation of a climate for its success depends on research on politics, law, regulatory systems and governmental processes and institutions. This research helps provide for effective and successful negotiation, collaboration, and trade in the international arena.

WORK OF THE SBE SCIENCES SUSTAINS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES WITH PROMINENT ROLES IN NATIONAL PROGRESS

The SBE sciences also have demonstrated that their research agendas affect Federal government agencies which utilize basic research by applying it to specific problems. These include: Department of Agriculture interest in research on international markets, commodity pricing, rural development, and rural sociology; Department of Defense concern with personnel training, human relations, visual and auditory perception, and human factors engineering research; Department of Education attention to teaching and learning and testing and assessment research; Department of Health and Human Services interest in health and behavior, health economics, and poverty research; Department of Housing and Urban Development attention to research on housing choices, urban planning, and regional development; Department of Justice concern about the litigation explosion, white collar crime, criminal careers, and public confidence in the legal system; Department of Labor concern with workforce, workplace and organization research; Department of State and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative interest in knowledge about international institutions, trade regimes, and negotiations.

SBE SCIENCES UNDERPIN KNOWLEDGE ESSENTIAL FOR TRAINING IN ALL FIELDS

In addition, SBE basic research has affected how teachers teach and how people learn. Studies in cognitive science have provided knowledge about teaching and learning from the pre-school to the graduate level. Research in survey methodology and support for data collection allow students to be trained in data management and analysis techniques. Anthropological research provides information for teaching in and about multicultural places. Studies in the history of science and technology and ethics and values in science equip students with valuable information about how science developed and how science should be conducted. For much of this research NSF supplies a significant share of the support.

SUPPORT FOR TRAINING IS CRUCIAL FOR THE SBE SCIENCES

Jules Lapidus, President of the Council of Graduate Schools, told PCAST that "the American research universities are an intellectual resource unparalleled in the world." It is crucial that NSF does not reduce its commitment to nourishing this resource. Even in an expanded NSF, continued support for basic research conducted in the nation's universities is essential to the basic mission of universities: training the next generation of productive citizens and scholars. The often cited dichotomy between teaching and research is a false one. Without the research there

would be very little to teach. This is particularly true in the SBE sciences.

NSF support for basic research creates fundamental knowledge, satisfying one part of the Foundation's mission. To implement the second purpose of the NSF, this knowledge must be conveyed by teachers to the next generation. A substantial portion of what is empirically and systematically known about the SBE sciences, and therefore what is taught at undergraduate and graduate institutions of higher education, has been built on the results of basic research supported by NSF. These results are the cornerstones of curricula development in the SBE sciences. The SBE sciences need NSF support to continue training the next generation of social, behavioral, and economic scientists. Furthermore, an increasing number of these scientists are hired by industry to help it plan for and operate in the changing world economy.

NSF MUST MAINTAIN ITS SUPPORT FOR BASIC RESEARCH AND SBE

Above all, NSF must continue to be dedicated to fundamental knowledge building. The principal purpose of the NSF must remain supporting basic research and developing scientific talent. Despite the changed environment for federal support of science that Dr. Massey and others have discussed, this main function must not be neglected. NSF must continue to be the agency where new and promising ideas get incubated and nurtured. Without that, the nation does not develop intellectually, and our technology stagnates, rather than innovates. Although representing a small share of the federal research and development budget, NSF support for experiments and investigations into subjects without evident short-term payoffs has been vital to the development of the U.S. leadership role in science and technology.

Rep. George Brown, Chairman of the House Science, Space and Technology Committee, writing about the new relationship between society and the scientific community that NSF is seeking to develop, suggests that it will "require an increased emphasis on exploring humankind's relationship with the surrounding world, through research in the oft-maligned disciplines of the social and interdisciplinary sciences." Peter Magrath, a member of the Commission, testifying to PCAST about the research universities' relations with the federal government, also acknowledged that the social sciences are "as critical to the national interest" as the physical and natural sciences. The SBE sciences look forward to the new NSF built on the successful model of its past achievements.

MEMBERS

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

American Psychological Association
American Sociological Association
American Statistical Association

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

AFFILIATES

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

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

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

CONTRIBUTORS

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

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

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

Consortium of Social Science Associations

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