

Asians, Blacks, and Hispanics accounted for 12.6 percent of the political science Ph.D.s awarded in 1983, compared with 12.7 percent in 1982. □

## Trends in Political Science Funding at the National Science Foundation, 1980-1984

William Mishler\*

Political Science Program  
State University of New York, Buffalo

This is a report on the health of the Political Science Program at NSF at the end of my two-year tenure as director. My term at NSF has been a time of rebuilding for the program. When I arrived in September 1982 the program was suffering the effects of the social science budget cuts which reduced political science funding at NSF by more than 40 percent between FY 1980 and FY 1982. In the aftermath of these reductions, proposal submissions to the program fell dramatically; funding for the National Election Studies (NES) was extended for only two years and with a "minimum maintenance" budget; and the program was unable to hire a replacement for Gerald Wright at the conclusion of his term as director. Although the budget cuts and restorations at NSF were distributed relatively equally across the social sciences, the absence of a full-time program director handicapped political science when the thaw in social science budgets began to occur in FY 1982.

Two years later, the program appears to be making slow but steady progress toward recovery. The program's budget is on the rise; proposal submissions have returned to pre-1980 levels and are growing; the NES has been renewed for an additional five years at a level which insures the maintenance of the core time

series through the 1988 elections while providing opportunities for research innovations; the program has regained its standing relative to the other social sciences at NSF; and Lee Sigelman of the University of Kentucky has been appointed as my successor effective January 1985. To be sure, the program's budget still lags far behind its 1979 and 1980 levels in real dollars discounted for inflation. But recent trends are encouraging. This brief report documents these trends and provides some basic information on program actions and funding patterns over the past five years. (The data reported here are derived from the Foundation's proposal information database and have been coded so as to maximize their comparability to previous reports of program activity, especially Gerald Wright's October 1980 report in *PS*, "Trends in NSF Political Science Program Activities, 1975-1979.")

### Budget and Proposal Trends

Table 1 provides an overview of long-term budget trends and makes obvious the roller coaster pattern of political science funding over the past decade. After a period of modest but essentially steady state funding in the early 1970s, the program enjoyed a series of healthy budget increases in the late 1970s which enabled it to grow both in real dollars and relative to the two principal other disciplinary programs in the Division of Social and Economic Science (Economics and Sociology). The early 1980s witnessed the budget miseries whose effects continue to be felt despite small budget increases in 1983 and 1984 and a proposed 33 percent increase for 1985.

Less obvious in these data are two important if countervailing points about the relationship between the program's budget and the National Election Studies. On the one hand it should be noted that the budget increases since 1982 and the proposed increase for 1985 are not entirely what they seem since they have been accompanied by a requirement that the program bear an increasing share of the cost of the NES. In 1984, for example, while the program's budget in-

---

\*William Mishler has been associate program director for political science for the past two years (1982-83, 1983-84) at NSF. He is currently professor and chair of the Department of Political Science at SUNY, Buffalo.

**TABLE 1**  
**NSF Political Science Budgets (in millions) by Fiscal Year, 1977-1985**

<b>FY</b>	<b>Current †</b>	<b>Constant (1972)‡</b>	<b>% of Sociology and Economics Budgets</b>
1972	1.50	1.50	20%
1973	1.63	1.56	20%
1974	1.55	1.38	18%
1975	1.55	1.26	15%
1976	2.19	1.66	22%
1977	2.30	1.63	20%
1978	2.97	1.98	23%
1979	3.52	2.15	26%
1980	3.62	2.03	26%
1981	2.87	1.46	23%
1982	2.10	1.01	25%
1983	2.38	1.09	24%
1984	2.70	1.17	23%
1985	3.60	1.46 (est.)	26%

creased by approximately \$325,000 its share of the cost of NES increased by more than \$385,000. Similarly, the \$900,000 increase proposed for FY 1985 includes the stipulation that the program fund 100 percent of the NES, an increased cost to the program of \$300,000 in 1985 and \$600,000 in 1986. At the same time, however, it also is the case that the NES has been the principal engine which has propelled the program's growth (and arguably that of the Division of Social and Economic Science, as well) in good times and retarded its decline in bad. The substantial increases in the program's budget in the late 1970s are widely attributed by higher officials at NSF to the program's decision in 1977 to assume responsibility for the NES. The conventional wisdom around the Foundation is that the need to maintain the large social science data sets (of which the NES is generally considered to be the flagship) provided the most effective arguments with the OMB and on Capitol Hill against even deeper budget cuts in 1981 and for our restoration since then. And the program's substantially greater than average increase for next year is justified both within the Foundation and without almost exclusively on the basis of the program's increasing support for this valuable data resource. Suffice it to say that it is doubtful the program budget would have been

restored as quickly without the National Election Studies, even though most of the increases are now committed to funding it.

Table 2 provides data on political science proposals, awards, and funding patterns. "New research" proposals are requests for support of previously unsupported (by NSF) research projects or for the renewal and extension of successfully completed initiatives whose NSF support has ended. Together these account for 85 percent of all proposals and 70 percent of all awards since 1979. "New political science" proposals are those that originate in the political science program. This category excludes the 20 plus "joint proposals" reviewed each year that originate in other programs but which are considered for possible joint funding by political science. Other types of actions include dissertation proposals (of which we receive an average of about 12 each year), supplements to existing awards, previously committed yearly increments to multi-year continuing awards, and technical amendments to existing grants. New research and dissertation proposals undergo peer review. Other actions normally do not.

Of particular interest in these data is the clear evidence of the resurgence of "proposal pressure" in political science since 1982. As indicated earlier, the number of

## **POLITICAL SCIENCE IN EUROPE**

### **Department of Government, University of Essex**

The University of Essex, one of Europe's major political science centers, is keen to attract students—both graduate and undergraduate—from the United States and Canada. The Department of Government offers a range of graduate degrees and also opportunities for studying for a year or a semester at the undergraduate level.

For prospective graduate students, the Department in 1984-85 offered no fewer than nine M.A. degrees in political science. The English M.A. degree differs from that of many other countries in being a self-contained, one-year degree. It is a valid degree in its own right, not merely a stopping place on the road to some other degree. It is ideal for someone who would like a "graduate year abroad," perhaps before finding a permanent job or going to a professional school. It keeps open the option of further graduate work without committing the student in any way.

The Essex M.A.s this year are in the following fields: Political Theory, Political Economy, Political Behavior, Latin American Government and Politics, Soviet Government and Politics, United States Government and Politics, Western European Politics, Ideology and Discourse Analysis, and History and Philosophy of Social and Political Science.

The British Ph.D. also differs from that in many other countries in being a research-only degree. It thus permits the student to concentrate almost exclusively on a research topic that interests him or her. The resulting dissertation is expected to be of high quality, and a large proportion of Essex Ph.D.s in recent years have been published.

Most North American undergraduate students at Essex are taking a junior year abroad or a junior semester abroad. A personal program is arranged for each individual student, and every student has a personal academic advisor. Credits can be transferred from Essex to most universities in the U.S. and Canada. Students from North America may wish to explore the possibility of taking an integrated year abroad, concentrating on contemporary European politics but taking Europe-related courses in other departments such as Art, History and Language and Linguistics.

Among the teachers at Essex are Anthony King, author of *British Members of Parliament* and editor of *The New American Political System*; David Sanders, author of *Patterns of Political Instability*; Ivor Crewe, co-author of *Decade of Dealignment*; Robert Goodin, author of *The Politics of Rational Man* and *Manipulatory Politics*; Joe Foweraker, author of *The Struggle for Land*; Michael Taylor, author of *Anarchy and Cooperation and Community, Anarchy and Liberty*; Mary McAuley, author of *Politics and the Soviet Union*; Michael Freeman, author of *Edmund Burke and the Critique of Political Radicalism*; Ernest Laclau, author of *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory*; David McKay, director of the ECPR and author of *American Politics and Society* and *Housing and Race in Industrial Society*; David Marsh, co-author of *Abortion Politics*; Emile Kirchner, author of *Trade Unions as a Pressure Group in the European Community*; and Bob Jessop, author of *Theories of the Capitalist State*.

The Department of Government at Essex is the home of the European Consortium for Political Research, the Essex Summer School in Social Science Data Analysis, the ESRC Data Archive and the *British Journal of Political Science*.

More details on all aspects of studying political science at Essex can be obtained by writing to:

Eric Tanenbaum  
Department of Government (1)  
University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park  
Colchester CO4 3SQ, England

**TABLE 2**  
**Political Science Program Proposal and Award Activity**  
**and Funding Requests and Commitments**

<b>Proposals and Awards</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1981</b>	<b>1982</b>	<b>1983</b>	<b>1984*</b>
No. of all proposals received	149	111	124	176	90**
No. of new research proposals***	127	92	107	168	65**
No. of all awards	64	61	49	61	57
No. of new research awards	40	45	34	43	40
No. of new political science research awards	33	40	27	36	39
No. of dissertation awards	8	6	6	8	6
<b>Funding (in millions)</b>					
Total requested +	13.80	10.70	9.65	26.45++	26.62++
Total requested successful proposals	5.75	4.92	3.91	6.40	13.15
Total NSF commitments to political science projects + + +	3.95	3.27	3.18	3.23	9.55
Current FY political science funding	3.62	2.87	2.10	2.38	2.60
Future FY commitments made	.14	.20	.61	.85	6.12

\*Preliminary data.

\*\* Figures are for proposals received as of June 1st and should increase by about 75 percent with the influx of new submissions for the September 1st target date.

\*\*\* Includes research conferences but excludes dissertations, supplements, increments to continuing awards, and amendments.

+ Includes amounts requested of other programs when political science participated in funding.

+ + Includes a \$9 million request for the NES.

+ + + Includes contributions from other programs and future commitments.

proposals submitted to the program and the total support requested fell dramatically following the 1981 budget cuts apparently in response to the belief that NSF meant Non-Sufficient Funds. In fact, because of decisions to discourage supplementary proposals and impose strict limits on certain categories of research expenses (such as academic year released time for investigators), the program was able to prevent the number of new research awards from falling as far or as fast as the political science budget. As efforts increased to spread the word that the program remained open for business in 1982 and after, proposal pressure increased sharply. Whereas in the first half of FY 1983 the program received fewer than 40 new research proposals, more than 130 new proposals were received in the second half of the year—a record number and a level of activity that has been sustained thus far in 1984.

Significantly, in both 1983 and 1984 total dollar requests for support have been higher in political science than in any other program in the division (including economics, whose research budget is nearly three times bigger than political science). Moreover, the consensus of political science panelists and NSF staff members is that the quality of proposals has been sustained even as the numbers have increased. As a consequence, the program has had to decline large numbers of meritorious proposals both in 1983 and 1984 because of insufficient funds.

In addition to setting limits on certain categories of support, the program has responded to increased proposal pressure by increasing future fiscal year commitments. Of the 36 new political science research awards made in FY 1984 nine were received and approved by the program in FY 1983. Three others are continuing awards whose second and third

**News of the Profession**

years of support will be provided from FY 1985 and 1986 funds. Six proposals received and approved by the program this year will be funded out of FY 1985 funds. However, the enormous jump in the level of future fiscal year commitments, noted in Table 2 for FY 1984 is due primarily to the NES which received \$1.6 million this year and will receive \$5.4 million spread unevenly across fiscal years 1985-1988.

**Success Rates and Award Sizes**

Table 3 reports the success rates for new research proposals, new political science proposals, and doctoral dissertation improvement proposals. The second category is the most meaningful since it excludes jointly reviewed proposals originating in other programs. Because jointly reviewed proposals from other programs are included in the political science data base only if they are successful, their consideration artificially inflates official figures on program success rates.

Considering only political science awards and declines actually processed during the fiscal year (formal actions on a substantial number of proposals are processed during the fiscal year following their receipt by the Foundation), the success rate for the program has fluctuated

between 30 and 35 percent over the past five years. This compares very favorably with the success rates maintained by the leading journals in the discipline although it lags approximately 10 percentage points behind the success rate of the economics program at NSF and light years behind success rates in many of the physical sciences. The political science success rate has fallen slightly over the past two years as proposal pressure has surged, but it is reasonable to expect this figure to begin improving next year as proposal pressure levels off and program funding begins to catch-up. About half of the dissertation proposals submitted to the program also have been funded, though the figure varies substantially from year to year. The Political Science Program leads the Division of Social and Economic Science by a wide margin both in the number of dissertation grants awarded and in dissertation success rates.

The bottom half of Table 3 presents data on the median requests for support and median funding levels of new proposals and awards. The small differences observed in the average support requested by all proposals and by proposals ultimately receiving awards sustains my frequent contention to prospective applicants that budget size has little bearing

**TABLE 3  
Political Science Program Success Rates and Award Sizes**

<b>Success Rates*</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1981</b>	<b>1982</b>	<b>1983</b>	<b>1984**</b>
New research proposals	32%	38%	39%	34%	29%
New political science research proposals	28%	35%	34%	30%	29%
Dissertation proposals	42%	50%	86%	62%	33%
<b>Proposal/Award Size (in thousands)</b>					
Median request new research proposal	95.5	87.9	71.8	86.8	95.1
Median request new research award	95.5	78.2	63.1	86.2	93.1
Median NSF commitment new research award	54.6	51.5	54.9	51.8	54.0
Median political science funding new research awards (current FY)	45.3	49.7	41.8	37.4	38.2
Median dissertation award	2.5	8.9	3.8	4.9	6.7

\* Calculated as total awards as a percentage of total actions (awards and declines) officially taken during the fiscal year. Proposals received in one year frequently are not acted on officially until the next.

\*\* Preliminary data.

on a proposal's prospects for success. In general, political science reviewers and panelists understand that the budget requested in an NSF proposal is an "asking price" and is subject to hard negotiation before an award is made. The constant level of total NSF commitments per political science award since 1980 and the decreasing size of the average political science contribution to these awards suggest, first, that budget negotiations have become progressively harder as the program has struggled to maintain reasonable success rates in the face of the 1980 budget cuts and more recent increases in proposal pressure; and, second, that the Political Science Program has been increasingly successful in finding other sources of NSF funds to supplement the program's contributions to political science projects.

The data in Table 4 on success rates, disaggregated by the length of time since the Principal Investigator (PI) received the Ph.D. and by the ranking of the PI's department in the most recent survey of graduate programs, demonstrate that there is virtually no relationship between success rates and seniority and a surprisingly small relationship between success rates and institutional prestige. Because of the small number of cases, success rates in many categories vary considerably from year to year. However, over the entire five-year period almost identical percentages of proposals submitted by young, intermediate, and senior scholars received NSF support. Although scholars in the 21 highest ranked graduate political science programs have fared somewhat better than scholars located elsewhere, the differences are smaller than one might expect given the likelihood that more prestigious institutions both succeed in attracting better research faculty and provide greater opportunities for research (including lighter teaching loads, more and better research assistants, and better facilities). Moreover, the important points to be emphasized here are that more than one quarter of all proposals submitted by scholars who are not in the top 21 departments have received NSF support and nearly 60 percent of all NSF awards go to investigators who are not members of these elite departments.

With regard to the type of research supported by NSF, the data in Table 5 on success rates disaggregated (albeit crudely) by subdiscipline indicate that there are substantial opportunities for support in most areas of political science. (It should be noted, however, that the program does not accept proposals in normative political theory or philosophy of science.) Although it is true that proposals focusing on American institutions and elite behavior have fared somewhat better than average over the past five years, proposals concerned with American public opinion and mass behavior have met with only average success. Public choice proposals have fared especially well, although the N is very small. The success rates for proposals in international relations and comparative politics have been at or reasonably near the five-year mean. Only public policy proposals have lagged substantially behind the norm. Although considerable effort has been expended to insure that public policy proposals are fairly treated, the fact remains that the great majority of policy proposals emphasize problem solving or applied research over more theoretically oriented, basic research concerns. Because they do not appear likely to contribute to theory or fundamental knowledge about political processes and because they sometimes pose intractable data gathering problems, public policy proposals have not fared well in the peer review process at NSF.

Although data are not available on the methodological orientation of proposals, the average success rate for proposals dealing with public opinion and mass behavior (arguably one of the more data intensive, methodologically advanced, and mathematically oriented subdisciplines) suggests that technical sophistication and "lots of data" are not sufficient to insure success. Similarly, the substantial success rates of proposals focusing on communist or third world systems (subdisciplines where more traditional methods predominate) suggests that a project's methodology by itself has little direct bearing on success.

It should be emphasized, however, that none of the patterns in Tables 4 and 5 are the results of the conscious application

**TABLE 4**  
**Success Rates of New Political Science Research Proposals**  
**by Seniority of Principal Investigator and Prestige of Institution**

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984*	5-Year Total
<b>Years since Ph.D.</b>						
6 or less (N)	31% (35)	34% (32)	53% (17)	18% (39)	53% (17)	34% (140)
7-12 (N)	27% (41)	36% (41)	36% (28)	28% (25)	41% (29)	23% (164)
13 or more (N)	30% (37)	32% (40)	23% (35)	42% (53)	45% (33)	35% (198)
Unknown (N)	0% ( 4)	50% ( 2)	0% ( 0)	0% ( 1)	5% (56)	6% ( 63)
<b>Institution</b>						
Top 11** (N)	36% (20)	41% (29)	33% (24)	37% (19)	42% (26)	38% (118)
2nd 10 (N)	47% (17)	42% (12)	33% ( 8)	37% (19)	38% (13)	39% ( 69)
All others*** (N)	24% (80)	31% (74)	33% (48)	29% (80)	24% (96)	27% (378)

\*Data on 1984 are preliminary—year of Ph.D. has yet to be coded for many proposals.

\*\*Ranking based on standardized value of "Scholarly Quality of Faculty" as reported in *An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1982). Two schools were tied for 10th.

\*\*\*Includes unranked colleges and universities, non-profit institutions, and individuals not affiliated with institutions.

of factors such as age, prestige, or subject matter as key criteria in the review process. The program staff and political science panelists at NSF are committed to funding research with the greatest promise of contributing to theory or increasing fundamental knowledge about government and politics regardless of the investigator's seniority, institutional affiliation, or field of study. The patterns observed in the data reflect decisions made as nearly as possible on the scientific merits of individual proposals.

Since I will have left NSF in August, I want to take this opportunity to thank collectively the upwards of 1,000 individuals who have reviewed frequently multiple proposals for the Political Science Program over the past two years. The quality of the program's awards depends greatly on the critical judgments rendered by reviewers. I also want to

take the opportunity to stress that the Political Science Program continues to seek good proposals in all areas of political science. We especially encourage proposals from doctoral candidates and individuals who have not previously had NSF support. Proposals are accepted at any time of the year. However, the target date for proposals with winter or spring starting dates is September 1. For summer and fall starts, the target date is February 1. Although current staff workloads preclude extensive reviews of pre-proposals, telephone inquiries about the appropriateness of particular topics are always welcome.

**Recent Political Science Awards**

The following lists contain all new research, conference, and dissertation improvement grants awarded in FY 1983

**TABLE 5**  
**Success Rates of New Political Science Research Proposals by**  
**Subject of Research**

Subfield	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984*	5-Year Total
American: Public Opinion and Mass Behavior (N)	34% (29)	28% (14)	19% (16)	15% (20)	44% (32)	31% (111)
American: Institutions and Elite Behavior (N)	30% (23)	50% (22)	71% ( 7)	36% (25)	40% (25)	41% (102)
Comparative: Industrialized Nations (N)	19% (16)	17% (12)	21% (19)	40% (15)	40% (10)	26% ( 72)
Comparative: Developing and Communist Nations (N)	33% (18)	18% (22)	22% ( 9)	33% (15)	12% (17)	23% ( 81)
International Relations and Foreign Policy (N)	13% ( 8)	38% (16)	43% (14)	29% (17)	30% (20)	32% ( 75)
Public Policy (N)	13% (15)	18% (11)	40% ( 5)	8% (13)	5% (20)	12% ( 64)
Public Choice (N)	67% ( 6)	70% (10)	43% ( 7)	100% ( 3)	14% ( 7)	54% ( 33)
Methods (N)	0% ( 1)	33% ( 3)	0% ( 1)	40% ( 5)	0% ( 3)	23% ( 13)
Research Conferences (N)	0% ( 1)	60% ( 5)	100% ( 2)	40% ( 5)	100% ( 1)	57% ( 14)
<b>TOTAL</b> (N)	<b>28%</b> <b>(117)</b>	<b>35%</b> <b>(115)</b>	<b>34%</b> <b>(80)</b>	<b>30%</b> <b>(118)</b>	<b>29%</b> <b>(135)</b>	<b>31%</b> <b>(565)</b>

\*Preliminary Data.

and 1984. Supplementary awards, yearly increments to continuing awards, and awards approved in 1984 to be funded from the 1985 budget are not shown. Proposals with asterisks (\*) beside them were jointly funded with another program. The amounts shown are the total NSF funds committed to a project, not simply the political science contribution. New continuing grants are shown for the full expected duration, although only first-year increments are actually awarded in the year the grant is made. Collaborative grants are separate awards to investigators at different universities working together on a single project. These proposals are identical except for their budgets, but they count as independent proposals in the NSF data base.

## POLITICAL SCIENCE AWARDS New Research Grants

### Fiscal Year 1983

Raymond W. Baker, Williams College: \$28,521, 12 months. *Egyptians Today: Integration of Diverse Groups into the National Political Culture.*

Robert H. Bates, California Institute of Technology: \$115,911, 24 months. *Public Choice Theories of Commercial Agriculture.*

Leonard Binder, University of Chicago: \$101,204, 24 months. *The Prospects for Liberal Government in the Middle East: The Ideology and Politics of the Islamic Resurgence.*



## News of the Profession

\*George F. Bishop, Robert W. Oldendick and Alfred J. Tuchfarber, University of Cincinnati: \$24,170, 12 months. *Political Information-Processing and Responses in Sample Surveys.*

G. R. Boyton and Benjamin A. Most, University of Iowa: \$14,278, 24 months. *A Computer-Based Teleconference for Quantitative International Politics.*

\*Ronald D. Brunner, University of Colorado at Boulder: \$28,811, 15 months. *Monitoring Political Symbols: A Concordance to Presidential State of the Union Messages, 1945-1984.*

\*Henry W. Chappell, University of South Carolina at Columbia: \$30,496, 12 months. *Collaborative Research on "Conceptions of Economic Rationality in Political Support Models."*

Gary W. Cox, University of Texas at Austin: \$17,955, 12 months. *Electoral Behavior in Double-Member Districts.*

James W. Dyson, Florida State University: \$25,100, 18 months. *Collaborative Research on Cognitive Processes and Information in Political Problem Solving.*

Robert S. Erikson, University of Houston: \$24,611, 15 months. *Collaborative Research on Measurement and Analysis of State Partisanship and Ideology.*

\*Linda L. Fowler, Syracuse University: \$51,400, 12 months. *Policy Representation and Environmental Regulation.*

Janet Grenzke, University of Massachusetts at Amherst: \$26,992, 12 months. *Campaign Financing and the Nature of Representation.*

Richard Gunther, Giacomo A. Sani and Goldie Shabad, Ohio State University: \$52,000, 24 months. *The 1982 Spanish Elections: The Consolidation of a New Democracy.*

Ole R. Holsti, Duke University: \$50,430, 24 months. *Collaborative Research on the Lessons of Vietnam and the Breakdown of Consensus of Foreign and Domestic Policy: A Study of American Leadership.*

John E. Jackson, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor: \$51,800, 12 months. *Full Information Structural Estimation with Limited Variables.*

\*John E. Jackson and Ann R. Thomas, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor: \$59,899, 12 months. *The Political Economy of State Financial Regulation and Industrial Change.*

Irving L. Janis, Yale University: \$80,000, 36 months. *Stress Reaction Related to Decisionmaking in International Conflicts.*

\*William R. Keech, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: \$25,549, 12 months. *Collaborative Research on Conceptions of Economic Rationality in Political Support Models.*

D. Roderic Kiewiet and R. D. Rivers, California Institute of Technology: \$75,054, 15 months. *Short-Term and Long-Term Fluctuations in Party Preference: Empirical Estimation of a Bayesian Learning Model.*

\*Allan Kornberg, Duke University: \$167,204, 24 months. *Sources, Distribution and Consequences of Political Support in Canada.*

Kenneth P. Langton, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor: \$16,251, 12 months. *Conflict Behavior of Mine Workers.*

Michael S. Lewis-Beck, University of Iowa: \$122,065, 12 months. *The Relationship Between Economic Conditions and Voter Decisions in Western Industrial Democracies.*

Peter J. McDonough, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor: \$31,925, 12 months. *Spanish Transition in Comparative Perspective.*

Manus I. Midlarsky, University of Colorado at Boulder: \$43,000, 18 months. *Stochastic Models of System Transformation and Structural Change.*

\*Gary J. Miller, Michigan State University: \$29,991, 12 months. *The Politics of Collective Consumption and Bureaucratic Supply.*

Michel Oksenberg, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor: \$43,256, 12 months. *Provincial Variations in Social Policy Outputs in the People's Republic of China, 1949-1982.*

\*Mancur Olson, University of Maryland at College Park: \$69,975, 36 months. *Indivisibilities and Information.*

John M. Orbell, Robyn M. Dawes, Alphons Van De Kragt and Randy T. Simmons, University of Oregon: \$94,000, 14 months. *Effects of Discussion on Cooperative Behavior in Game Theoretic Settings*.

Benjamin I. Page and Robert Y. Shapiro, National Opinion Research Center: \$68,144, 16 months. *The Impact of Mass Media on Policy Preferences*.

Glenn R. Parker, Florida State University: \$45,000, 18 months. *Explaining the Incumbency Advantage in House and Senate Elections: 1958-1980*.

\*Charles R. Plott, California Institute of Technology: \$373,586, 36 months. *A Laboratory Experimental Investigation of Institutional Influence on Political Economic Processes*.

Helen E. Purkitt, U.S. Naval Academy: \$24,851, 24 months. *Collaborative Research on Cognitive Processes and Information in Political Problem Solving*.

James N. Rosenau, University of Southern California: \$69,148, 24 months. *Collaborative Research on the Lessons of Vietnam and the Breakdown of Consensus on Foreign and Domestic Policy: A Study of American Leadership*.

James N. Schubert, Alfred University: \$43,488, 14 months. *Dominance and Influence in Small Group Political Decision-Making*.

\*Kenneth A. Shepsle and Barry R. Weingast, Washington University: \$192,436, 36 months. *The Two Arenas: A Theory of Legislative Institutions*.

Dennis G. Sullivan, John T. Lanzetta and Roger D. Masters: \$70,605, 12 months. *The Influence of Nonverbal Expressive Behavior of Political Leaders on Emotional Responses, Trait Attributions, and Support Dispositions*.

\*Charles Tilly, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor: \$194,871, 24 months. *Social Change and Collective Action*.

Michael D. Ward, University of Colorado at Boulder: \$43,892, 16 months. *Modeling Some Aspects of the Contemporary Arms Race*.

Herbert F. Weisberg, Ohio State Univer-

sity: \$88,054, 18 months. *Partisanship and Voting*.

Susan Welch, University of Nebraska at Lincoln: \$37,346, 17 months. *The Impact of Urban Political Structures on Council Member Characteristics and Urban Public Policy*.

\*Ernest Wilson, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor: \$162,663, 18 months. *Public Sector-Private Sector Relations in Africa*.

Raymond E. Wolfinger, University of California at Berkeley: \$81,697, 12 months. *Planning for the 1984 NES Election Study*.

Gerald C. Wright, Indiana University at Bloomington: \$53,380, 15 months. *Collaborative Research on Measurement and Analysis of State Partisanship and Ideology*.

### **Doctoral Dissertation Improvement Awards**

Ted R. Gurr and Desmond S. King, Northwestern University: \$4,424, 12 months.

Harold K. Jacobson and Michael Huelshoff, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor: \$2,021, 12 months.

John W. Kingdon and Mark A. Peterson, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor: \$3,031, 12 months.

Peter Lange and Hudson Meadwell, Duke University: \$10,500, 12 months.

John F. McCamant and David Pion-Berlin: \$5,117, 12 months.

Samuel C. Patterson and John G. Kolp, University of Iowa: \$9,286, 12 months.

Hugh D. Price and Kenneth Finegold: \$2,660, 12 months.

George Rabinowitz and Paul H. Gurian, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: \$10,496, 12 months.

### **POLITICAL SCIENCE AWARDS New Research Grants**

#### **Fiscal Year 1984**

Alan I. Abramowitz, State University of New York at Stonybrook: \$25,374, 20 months. *Collaborative Research on Presi-*

## News of the Profession

*dential Activists in 1984: Precinct Caucus Attenders Before and After the Convention.*

John H. Aldrich, Eugene Borgida and John L. Sullivan, University of Minnesota: \$169,963, 24 months. *Ideological Constraint, Issue Voting and the Nature of Political Reasoning.*

Paul A. Anderson and Timothy McKeown, Carnegie Mellon University: \$39,945, 12 months. *Explaining the Outbreak of Interstate War.*

\*Robert Axelrod, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor: \$74,000, 24 months. *Theories of Cooperative Behavior—II.*

Enrique A. Baloyra, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: \$75,144, 12 months. *Determinants of Public Support for Democracy in Venezuela.*

Larry M. Bartels, University of Rochester: \$17,199, 12 months. *Collaborative Research on Micro-Theories of Momentum in Presidential Primaries.*

Henry Brady, University of California at Berkeley: \$42,361, 12 months. *Collaborative Research on Micro-Theories of Momentum in Presidential Primaries.*

Steven J. Brams, New York University: \$35,988, 14 months. *Verification and Deterrence in Arms Control: A Game-Theoretic Analysis.*

Jack Dennis, University of Wisconsin at Madison: \$59,999, 12 months. *Popular Premises of Electoral Participation.*

James M. Enelow, State University of New York at Stony Brook: \$59,025, 24 months. *Collaborative Research in the Empirical Testing of Spatial Models of Electoral Competition.*

Heinz Eulau, Stanford University: \$20,048, 24 months. *Collaborative Research on Network Analysis of Representation.*

John R. Freeman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology: \$68,030, 24 months. *The Politics of Mixed Economies.*

Ronald Hedlund, William J. Kritek and Ronald L. Lingren, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee: \$74,999, 24 months. *The Effects of Organizational, Demand Making and Environmental Variables on*

*State Legislative Policy Making.*

Melvin H. Hinich, University of Texas at Austin: \$37,974, 24 months. *Collaborative Research in the Empirical Testing of Spatial Models of Electoral Competition.*

R. R. Huckfeldt, University of Notre Dame: \$150,811, 36 months. *Collaborative Research on Social Influence in an Election Campaign.*

Brian L. Job, University of Minnesota: \$55,999, 24 months. *Collaborative Research on the President and the Political Use of Force.*

Samuel H. Kernell, University of California at San Diego: \$61,657, 22 months. *Modelling the Emergence of Political Career Structures: Data Collection and Analysis.*

James H. Kuklinski, University of Illinois at Urbana: \$39,567, 24 months. *Conference on Information Processing in Political Perception.*

Richard R. Lau and David O. Sears, Carnegie Mellon University: \$17,046, 12 months. *Collaborative Research on Network Analysis of Representation.*

John C. McAdams, Marquette University: \$11,982, 12 months. *Testing the Theory of the "New Class."*

John J. McGlennon and Ronald B. Rapoport, College of William and Mary: \$59,699, 24 months. *Collaborative Research on Presidential Activists in 1984: Precinct Caucus Attenders Before and After the Convention.*

Michael A. Milburn, University of Massachusetts at Boston: \$27,951, 18 months. *Secondary Analyses of Ideological Consistency in the National Election Studies.*

\*Warren E. Miller, University of Michigan/University of Arizona: \$6,961,882, 60 months. *Long-Term Support for the American National Election Studies, 1984-1988.*

Edward N. Muller, University of Arizona: \$54,005, 24 months. *Economic Inequality and Political Instability.*

David Nachmias, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee: \$32,097, 15 months. *The Bureaucratic Elites in Israel.*

Charles W. Ostrom, Michigan State University: \$36,593, 24 months. *Collaborative Research on the President and the Political Use of Force.*

Elinor Ostrom, Indiana University at Bloomington: \$60,272, 12 months. *Modeling Institutional Arrangements and Their Effects.*

Brainard G. Peters, University of Pittsburgh: \$38,735, 12 months. *The Dynamics of Organizational Change in the Federal Government.*

Keith T. Poole and Howard L. Rosenthal, Carnegie Mellon University: \$84,998, 19 months. *Elections, Roll Call Voting and Spatial Representation.*

Barry S. Rundquist, Gerald S. Strom and Mildred Schwartz, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle: \$111,944, 24 months. *The Structure of Contributor-Candidate Relations in State Politics.*

Jerrold G. Rusk, University of Arizona: \$36,995, 12 months. *The Effects of Legal-Institutional Properties of the Electoral System on Voting Behavior: 1788-1982.*

John Sprague, Washington University: \$69,111, 36 months. *Collaborative Research on Social Influence in an Election Campaign.*

Walter J. Stone, University of Colorado at Boulder: \$24,887, 24 months. *Collaborative Research on Presidential Activists in 1984: Precinct Caucus Attendees Before and After the Convention.*

\*Sidney Tarrow, Cornell University: \$142,559, 36 months. *Social Movements, Political Parties and Reform in the Italian Cycle of Protest: 1966-1975.*

Carole J. Uhlaner, University of California at Irvine: \$44,928, 14 months. *Structural Causes of Gender Inequality in Congressional Campaign Funding.*

Jack L. Walker, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor: \$69,828, 18 months. *The Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups.*

James W. White, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: \$41,288, 21 months. *Theories of Protest and Violence in Non-Western Societies.*

Eugene R. Wittkopf, University of Florida: \$24,997, 21 months. *The Domestic Context of American Foreign Policy: Elite and Mass Foreign Policy Attitudes, 1974-1982.*

Dina A. Zinnes, Claudio A. Cioffi-Revilla and Robert Muncaster, University of Illinois at Urbana: \$126,084, 36 months. *Dynamic Models of Inter-Nation Conflict: Theory Development and Data Analysis.*

### **Doctoral Dissertation Improvement Awards**

Suzanne Berger, Massachusetts Institute of Technology: \$5,581, 12 months.

J. Garry Clifford, University of Connecticut: \$7,220, 12 months.

William R. Keech and Richard L. Hall, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: \$7,102, 12 months.

Kenneth P. Langton and Kenneth H. Hill, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor: \$4,200, 12 months.

Benjamin A. Most and William H. Meyer, University of Iowa: \$1,750, 12 months.

Robert D. Putnam and John B. Goodman, Harvard University: \$7,329, 12 months. □

## **Reports and Announcements**

### **Research and Study Assistance Offered by Federal Election Commission**

Research assistance and new study aids have recently been developed by the Federal Election Commission (FEC) for use by educators and students learning about federal elections. The FEC is an independent regulatory agency with jurisdiction over the campaign financing activities of candidates, committees and parties for elections to the presidency and the Congress.

By using the Commission's resources, high school teachers and college professors can do research or make assign-