

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume XI, Number 14

July 27, 1992

WHITE HOUSE COUNCIL HEARS UNIVERSITIES SPEAK OF STRAIN IN PARTNERSHIP *HS*

The President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) heard from the university association community on July 24 concerning the relationship of research intensive universities and the federal government. The hearing, held at the National Academy of Sciences, was conducted to receive input on a study (see *Update*, April 6, June 15) that will be completed after the November election.

Study co-chairman Harold Shapiro, President of Princeton University, was joined on the panel by his PCAST colleagues, Peter Likins, President of Lehigh University, and John McTague, Vice President-Technical Affairs, Ford Motor Company to hear testimony.

Witnesses described the partnership as "strained," "troubled," and "fragile." Peter Magrath, President of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) noted that the relationship needed "repair" since it had become "cumbersome, adversarial and bureaucratic." Magrath also made a special plea for attention to the social and behavioral sciences calling them "as critical to the national interest" as the physical and natural sciences. He also decried the federal government's cancellation of the surveys of sexual behavior of adults and teenagers.

Despite the problems, Jules Lapidus, President of the Council of Graduate Schools, noted that "the American research universities are an intellectual resource unparalleled in the world." He suggested that recently "some of these institutions...look and act more like industrial or national research laboratories." It was time he said, to return to the unique role research universities have in "educating students--undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral--in an atmosphere dominated by inquiry."

Robert Rosenzweig, President of the Association of American Universities, focused on the notion that "our capacity for doing science has outgrown our ability or willingness to pay for it." It

is, he claimed, the fusion of politics and economics--the belief among politicians that science and technology are the keys to local economic growth--that is expanding the capacity, unfortunately often through the earmarking of science appropriations. Rosenzweig called for "intellectual honesty." Echoing Lapidus, he suggested that "what universities do in science and technology...is to educate and train high-quality scientists, engineers and other professionals to perform tasks that require a honing of the intellect to its highest level." It is the Executive Branch, less subject to local pressures, Rosenzweig noted, that must take the longer view and "bring the issue out into the open for serious study and debate."

Franklyn Jenifer, President of Howard University, argued for federal spending for science based on "evidence of excellence" rather than on strict merit peer review. Claiming that Historically Black Colleges and Universities lack the scientific infrastructure to compete because of a late start in the science funding game, Jenifer suggested focusing on certain identified areas of excellence for transforming institutions like Howard into major research universities.

Also testifying were Donald Langenberg, Chancellor of the University of Maryland system, Jonathan Cole, Provost of Columbia University, Susanne Woods, Dean of Franklin and Marshall

INSIDE UPDATE...

- Final Forum Held on NIH Strategic Plan
- Social Scientists Featured at Capitol Hill Seminar on Children and Poverty
- Social Historian Testifies at Hearing on Government and Families
- AALS Names New Executive Director
- Political Scientists Discuss Electoral College Reform before Senate Panel
- House Panel Examines Role of International Exchanges in a Changing World
- Sources of Research Support: Department of Education

College, and representatives of the Council of Scientific Society Presidents, the Association of American Medical Colleges, and the American Society for Engineering Education. PCAST will resume its series of hearings on September 24 at Northwestern University.

FINAL FORUM HELD ON NIH STRATEGIC PLAN JA

On July 15 and 16, all the institute, center, and division directors of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), as well as invited scientists and some members of the press and the public, met for a final review of the working draft of the NIH Strategic Plan. This meeting was intended to iron out remaining wrinkles in the draft document, following a series of public and agency meetings over the past year (See *Update* September 9, 1991; January 27, 1992; and June 29, 1992.)

As at previous meetings, participants were organized into panels to review the current iteration of sub-documents intended to comprise the Strategic Plan. These documents reflected accomplishments and goals in specific science and policy areas organized into six "objectives": Critical Science and Technology; Critical Health Needs; Intellectual Capital; Research Capacity; Stewardship of Public Resources; and Public Trust. The inclusion of "Critical Health Needs" -- a new category that included Disease Control and Prevention; Childhood Health and Mortality; Chronic and Recurrent Illness, Rehabilitation, and Aging; Health of Women; and Health of Minorities and Underserved

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

Populations -- indicates that planners finally were attending to the concerns expressed throughout the process by social and behavioral scientists and their advocates that research on the social, cultural, and environmental factors influencing health and disease be included explicitly in the NIH agenda.

The new documents were evaluated by panel members according to a set of questions posed by the NIH Director, Bernadine Healy, including whether the plan described in each: is a trans-NIH initiative; makes the best use of existing NIH resources; attends both to physical and psychological quality of life; addresses clinical, basic, and applied approaches; is appropriate, and; is feasible.

Throughout the general discussion that followed the panel sessions, participants made the point that one of the most important things the NIH should do is to make itself more known to the public. The comparison was made to NASA, which because of well-advertised space exploration, has become very familiar to the American people, while NIH, which has been responsible for much broader health and science applications, is obscure. This led to the suggestion that two documents be prepared for the Strategic Plan: one for the scientific community and government officials; and another for the lay public. Both would serve the purpose of demonstrating the achievements and the potential of the NIH.

According to Jay Moskowitz, head of the NIH Office of Science Policy and Legislation, and the architect of the Strategic Plan, the results of this meeting will be put together by the panel co-chairs over the next two to three weeks. The resulting draft will be condensed even further (by Moskowitz's office) and then circulated to the external scientific community for comment, probably in the early Fall.

SOCIAL SCIENTISTS FEATURED AT CAPITOL HILL SEMINAR ON CHILDREN AND POVERTY JA

Four social scientists offered different perspectives on the issue of child and family poverty at a July 17 seminar on Capitol Hill, titled "Families in Poverty: Patterns, Contexts, and Implications for Policy." The seminar was part of a series sponsored by Family Impact Seminar, the policy unit of the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy, Research and Education Foundation.

In attempting to develop a more comprehensive analysis of poverty in the U.S., panelists not only described the composition of the poor population, but also addressed the relative significance of structural and cultural factors -- a question that dominates the current policy debates in Washington.

Isabel V. Sawhill, economist and senior fellow at the Urban Institute, (and a former member of the COSSA Board of Directors) began by presenting an overview of poverty data. She noted some of the problems in measuring poverty -- for example, determining the appropriate unit of analysis (child or family), and making no allowance for the variation in cost of living in different regions. Sawhill also pointed out the importance of distinguishing between short-term and persistent poverty. For example, she noted, approximately 20 percent of American children lived in poverty at the point when the most recent data were collected, but only about 10 percent are consistently poor. In addition to economic restructuring, much of the explanation for family poverty, according to Sawhill, can be found in changes in family structure. Specifically, she noted, the growth in single parent, female-headed families can explain virtually all of the growth in child poverty.

Emergence of an "Underclass"

Alice O'Connor, an historian and Director of the Urban Underclass Program at the Social Science Research Council, provided an overview of research on the urban poor, including the emergence of the concept of the "underclass." She focused on the work of William J. Wilson, whose book, The Truly Disadvantaged hypothesized that abject urban poverty and the emergence of the underclass resulted primarily from economic restructuring, specifically, the removal of jobs and industry from the urban core. O'Connor noted that Wilson, and others of this school of thought, have come to believe that in addition to structural factors, demographic and cultural ones -- especially the increase in single-parent families -- also have affected the growing rates of urban poverty. These forces in addition to persistent racial discrimination and stereotyping have led Wilson to modify his earlier position that the significance of race had declined, and have led many other scholars to begin examining the impact on urban poverty of such things as immigration; women's labor force participation; and declining marriage rates.

The third speaker, Leif Jensen, of the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural

Sociology at Pennsylvania State University, focused on rural poverty. He first pointed out the differential potential for public assistance to ameliorate poverty in urban versus rural areas, presenting data that illustrate much lower participation rates in public assistance programs among the rural poor. Jensen explained these lower participation rates in cultural terms: rural populations maintain strong notions of pride in self-sufficiency; the stigma of public assistance makes many eligible people reluctant to take advantage of it. Jensen also underscored the significant role of underemployment (as opposed to employment or unemployment) among rural communities. He noted that underemployment and "working poverty" are higher in non-metro/rural areas and among minority populations.

In relation to the policy debate, Jensen came down on the side of structural arguments, concluding that differences between urban and non-urban poverty should not be overblown; all result from the lack of jobs at above poverty-level wages.

Neighborhood Factors Discussed

The final speaker, Claudia Coulton, professor of social welfare and director of the Center for Urban Poverty and Social Change at Case Western University, looked at the consequences of poverty on children and their families, and presented some preliminary research on the effects of neighborhood factors. Her three main points were that poor children have multiple vulnerabilities; that poor children are concentrated in neighborhoods that magnify these vulnerabilities; and that strategies aimed at poverty alone will not effect these ecological factors. Coulton described four approaches that incorporate a neighborhood, or ecological, level of analysis. One looks at the amount of stress from external factors, such as violence, upheaval, and uncertainty, experienced in poor neighborhoods. A second examines the composition of neighborhoods, for example, asking if poor children do better when living near middle class children. The third approach looks at the degree to which neighborhoods elicit certain parenting styles and strategies that contribute to either good or bad parenting outcomes. And finally, the fourth view examines how certain neighborhood factors, such as high mobility, contribute to or interfere with social organization and social control, which then have an impact on poor children's lives.

With regard to the policy debate, Coulton asserted that an appreciation of the ecological

perspective embodied in all of these approaches requires strategies that combine work at the neighborhood and the family levels. Specifically, she advocated "more comprehensive family and community-building interventions" as essential for combatting child and family poverty.

For further information about this seminar and the FIS series, contact: Family Impact Seminar, AAMFT, 1100 17th Street, N.W., Suite 901, Washington, DC 20036; telephone (202) 467-5114.

SOCIAL HISTORIAN TESTIFIES AT HEARING ON GOVERNMENT AND FAMILIES *JA*

In an attempt to shed some historical light on current policy debates about government assistance to families and about "family values," the House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, chaired by Rep. Pat Schroeder (D-CO) held a hearing on July 23, titled, "Investing in Families: A Historical Perspective," and highlighted testimony from a social historian.

Stephanie Coontz, a faculty member at Evergreen State College, and author of The Way We Never Were, began with two assertions. First, she stated, "the common conception of some natural family existing prior to government and, until recently, free of state interference, is a myth." Second, Coontz said, "there has never been a natural family economy that has been able to fully provide for all the personal dependencies and changing fortunes of its members." In short, she said, government always has been involved in either regulating family life or providing material assistance to families, and this assistance has been essential for families' survival.

With regard to regulation of family life, Coontz noted as an example the manner in which courts and legislatures between 1872 and 1900 regulated women's status as citizens, their right to work, and their access to fertility control through specific laws and court decisions. For example, the passage of a national obscenity law in 1873 banned the circulation through the mail of all fertility control information and technology.

As an example of government's direct involvement in providing material assistance to families, Coontz cited the early 20th-century creation of the "family wage" for two-parent families,

AALS NAMES NEW EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR *MB*

The Association of American Law Schools recently announced the appointment of Carl C. Monk as Executive Director of AALS, effective August 1. Monk will replace Betsy Levin, who will become a visiting professor at the University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill School of Law in January. Prior to that point, Dean Levin will be taking part in extensive travel and research.

Professor Monk was dean of the Washburn University School of Law from 1979-1988, and is now the Distinguished Professor of Law on the Washburn faculty. He is a 1971 graduate of Howard University School of Law, and his teaching and research have been in the fields of Constitutional Law, Media and the First Amendment, Civil Procedure, Administrative Law, and Contracts. He has visited and been an invited lecturer at many law schools in the United States and Japan. Professor Monk has enjoyed a lengthy relationship with AALS, and served as its Deputy Director from 1988 - 1990.

and the provision of public assistance to those families without a male breadwinner. According to Coontz, "the spread of a family wage system was the outcome of a concerted government initiative, adopted after the failure of 19th-century moral campaigns to transform families without concrete assistance." This government initiative is credited with preventing many families from floundering economically.

Thinking about the current debate on family values and government action, Coontz suggested that she didn't know "any historian who can define precisely what family values are." On the contrary, she stated, historical evidence would suggest great variation in the concept of family values by culture, region, and time period. "It is the context in which families exist that is critical, not the specific family type, and history shows that government has a tremendous impact in determining whether the social context will allow a range of family values to flourish or whether the economic and political environment will bring out the worst rather than the best qualities in families," Coontz said. The more appropriate role for government, she concluded, is to provide "a general infrastructure of support for families" allowing them to exercise their own family

values, instead of trying to "impose a unitary value system inside the family."

POLITICAL SCIENTISTS DISCUSS ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM BEFORE SENATE PANEL *MB*

The Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, chaired by Sen. Paul Simon (D-IL), held a hearing on July 22 to hear noted experts discuss reforming -- or abolishing -- the Electoral College as a method of selecting the president. While the hearing was scheduled long before the abrupt withdrawal of independent Ross Perot from the presidential campaign, many at Simon's hearing commented that the Electoral College is still an issue in need of serious debate.

Thomas Mann, Director of Governmental Studies at the Brookings Institution, and a former member of the COSSA Board of Directors, told the panel that, in his opinion, the Electoral College is the most problematic feature of the American electoral system. Mann cited two potential problems with the current system: 1) the popular vote winner may not be the Electoral College winner, though he said "everytime we think it's going to happen it seems to evaporate," and 2) if the House of Representatives were to select the president because of a deadlock in the Electoral College, the one vote per state provision poses "genuine problems of legitimacy" for the new president because of perceptions of a backroom deal having been struck.

"No Free Lunch" with Reform

Addressing proposals to reform the Electoral College, Mann was quick to note "there's no free lunch" in that one has to weigh the consequences of the proposals versus the potential problems of the current system. In Mann's view, top priorities in any discussion of reform must be the quick closure of the election, the perceived legitimacy of the winner, and the preservation of the two-party system. Mann supported what some have termed the "National Bonus Plan," whereby the Electoral College is retained but expanded in membership, and the popular vote winner is given an extra 102 electoral votes. He argued that this would "virtually assure" that the popular vote winner prevails in the Electoral College and would make the final Electoral College vote more representative. Mann contended that such a system would avoid the

proliferation of candidates and preserve the two party system.

Norman J. Ornstein, Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, concurred with Mann's argument, and offered a strong defense of the Electoral College system. Ornstein said that the Electoral College protects against a political crisis that he said could arise in a direct election, where an extremely close election (e.g. 1960) could result in calls for a national recount, something he said would be highly controversial and would lead to chaos and instability in government. He added that the current system forces candidates to pay attention to specific groups; the example he cited was that of farmers, who while only comprising two percent of the American population, can play a large role in key states in the Midwest. Ornstein called for the abolition of the office of Elector, making the Electoral votes automatically cast on the basis of the results in a state. He also supported the winner take-all method of awarding Electors (used in all but two states), saying it prevents fragmentation, and agreed with Mann's call for an add-on method of Electors to the popular vote winner.

Judith Best, Professor of Political Science at SUNY-Cortland, echoed many of Mann and Ornstein's remarks, and noted that the five elections with a strong third party candidate have all resulted in an Electoral College landslide for the popular vote winner.

Several Criticisms Offered

Lawrence Longley, Professor of Political Science at Lawrence University, and a 1988 Elector, cited what he views as several problems with the Electoral College: it is an inherently distorted counting device; a candidate's strategy is profoundly shaped by these distortions; parochial interests and local leaders are magnified in importance in key states; and third party candidates will have their votes decreased in value if they have broad but not deep national appeal (e.g. John Anderson, 1980) or increased in value if their support is more heavily concentrated in a particular region (e.g. George Wallace, 1968). Longley feared that in a close election in the Electoral College, individual Electors could decide the outcome independent of their own state's vote. Longley told the committee that he supports abolition of the Electoral College, as has been proposed by Sen. David Pryor (D-AR).

Elizabeth McCaughey of the Center for the Study of the Presidency told the panel that in any

discussion of Electoral College reform, it is imperative to consider the importance of the public confidence in the electoral process and its widespread acknowledgement of the winner. She said that any reform proposal must be perceived as fair and not to the advantage of a particular candidate or party. McCaughey urged the elimination of the office of Elector, saying it would remove the current independence and discretion of the Elector. By making the electoral vote direct, she said it would increase the confidence of the electorate that they actually choose the president.

HOUSE PANEL EXAMINES ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGES IN A CHANGING WORLD *MB*

Calling for a discussion of "where international change and exchange meet," Rep. Howard Berman (D-CA), chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Operations, convened a July 9 hearing to examine the impact of sweeping political, cultural, and economic changes of the post-Cold War era on the organization and significance of international exchange. The hearing discussed the evolving relationship between government funded and privately sponsored international exchanges; the cost-effectiveness of exchanges in improving international relations; and the means of best allocating scarce federal resources to these efforts.

The main witness at the hearing was former Senator J. William Fulbright (D-AR), the principal architect of U.S. educational and cultural exchanges. Fulbright, representing the Liaison Group for International Educational Exchange, said that "the profound political changes we are witnessing necessitate that United States foreign policy be reconsidered," and termed next year's reauthorization of the programs of the United States Information Agency (USIA) as an important opportunity to ensure that the mechanisms of U.S. foreign policy reflect the nature of a changing world.

According to Fulbright, "strengthening USIA's ability to conduct international exchanges in the coming decade requires a careful rearticulation of the concept of public diplomacy... There needs to be a clear differentiation between educational exchanges, on the one hand, and the overt effort to control public opinion in other nations on the other." He urged that USIA play a leadership role in ensuring that our national interests are met by

EDITOR'S NOTE

Kristin Moore, Director of Research at Child Trends, Inc., has alerted COSSA that population figures she cited in her testimony before a recent hearing of the House Subcommittee on Census and Population, and reported in the July 13 issue of *Update*, were incorrect.

According to Moore, the total number of children under 18 years of age in the United States in 1990 was actually 64.1 million (not 69.3 million), which changes the percentage of children in the total population in 1990 to 26% (not 28%).

exchange programs, noting that the vast majority of American students who study abroad go to Western Europe and study the humanities and the social sciences, while most students who come to the United States are from Asian nations and study business, engineering, and computer science. Fulbright stated that the United States currently receives over 36,000 university students from Japan, as opposed to 1,200 going from the United States to Japan. Commenting on this statistic, Fulbright said, "surely this trickle of U.S. students to Japan does not meet our needs for expertise about this critical nation."

Fulbright Addresses Specific USIA Programs

Turning to specific programs at USIA, Fulbright expressed his concerns that the Fulbright Program, which bears his name, "has been asked to do too much with too little." He urged that USIA provide strong support to facilitate private educational exchanges, particularly in the area of the J-1 Exchange-Visitor visa, an area of contention between the exchange community and several federal agencies. Fulbright also advocated that USIA increase its support for research on issues closely related to exchanges, such as the structure of other nation's educational systems and provision of credit for U.S. student academic work abroad.

Barry Fulton, Deputy Associate Director for Educational and Cultural Affairs at USIA also appeared before Berman's panel, and outlined ways in which USIA has adapted to the changes in the international arena in recent years. According to Fulton, the most important change undertaken by USIA has been the shift of resources to Eastern

Europe and the former Soviet Union. While supporting such a shift, he said, "it has not, however, been without a cost... [and] has seriously stretched our capacity to administer and monitor our programs effectively." More specifically, Fulton cited USIA's efforts in emerging African democracies as being in jeopardy because of the Agency being over-extended.

According to Fulton, the other major change that USIA has made in response to changes of the world scene is a shift toward what he termed "how to" programs, such as communicating practical knowledge on how to organize democracies and free market economies. Fulton noted that USIA is currently supporting visitor programs for Russians and Eastern Europeans on converting defense industries to civilian uses. He also discussed USIA-sponsored programs on grassroots involvement and volunteerism in American society.

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION *Ke*

COSSA provides this information as a service and encourages readers to contact the agency for further information or application materials. Additional application guidelines and restrictions may apply.

Centers for Research in Vocational Education

Under the National Center or Centers for Research in Vocational Education Program (the National Centers Program), the Secretary awards a grant to a National Center for the purpose of conducting applied research and development activities in the field of vocational education. Under the National Centers Program, the Secretary also awards a grant to a National Center for the purpose of designing and conducting dissemination and training activities that are consistent with the purposes of the Act, including the broad dissemination of the results of the research and development activities conducted by the National Center, and planning, developing, and conducting training activities that meet a national need. However, preference is given to any institution of higher education or consortium of institutions of higher education that demonstrates its ability to effectively carry out both the applied research and development as well as the dissemination and training activities referred to above.

Application Procedure: To apply for an award under this program competition, each application must be organized in the following order and include the following five parts: Application for Federal Assistance (SF 424), Budget Information, Budget Narrative, Program Narrative, and Additional Assurances and Certifications. The applicant may mail the original and six copies of the application on or before the deadline date to: U.S. Department of Education, Application Control Center, Attention: (CFDA# 84.051), Washington, DC 20202-4725.

Eligible Applicants: Institutions of higher education or consortia of institutions of higher education.

Budget: Funding for the National Center for Research & Development and the National Center for Dissemination & Training for a 60 month period will be \$4 million and \$2 million respectively. There will only be one award per center.

Deadlines: The closing date for the transmittal of applications for both Centers is September 4, 1992.

Contact: For further information contact Jackie L. Friederich, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 4526-MES, Washington, DC 20202-7242, telephone (202) 205-9071.

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
