

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume XII, Number 10

May 31, 1993

NSF RECEIVES 11 PERCENT INCREASE FROM HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE *HS*

The House VA, HUD, Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee marked up its FY 1994 bill on May 27. The National Science Foundation (NSF) received \$3.024 billion, an increase of 11 percent over FY 1993, but a reduction of \$156 million from the President's request. However, given the incredibly tight budget situation for the Subcommittee, the size of the increase was a remarkable outcome reflecting the Subcommittee's willingness to continue to invest in the future.

Research and related activities was appropriated \$2.045 billion, an increase of 10 percent over last year, but a \$160 million decrease from the request. The double digit increase for research is also quite good in the current budgetary climate.

As usual, the Subcommittee increased the request for the Education and Human Resources Directorate appropriating \$570 million, a 17 percent increase over last year, and \$13.5 million above the request. The increase will enhance funding for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCOR), Community Colleges, and Minority Summer Science Camps.

The Subcommittee also provided \$55 million, the requested level, and a \$5 million increase over FY 1993 for facilities and instrumentation. The Salaries and Expenses Appropriation increased by \$10 million (9 percent) over last year, and an additional \$5.2 million was provided to pay for NSF's relocation to Ballston in the Virginia suburbs.

This is the first step in the FY 1994 funding process that ends with NSF's allocation of the appropriated funds to the Directorates. The full appropriations markup will occur in late June following the report of a commission studying the redesign of NASA's Space Station. The Senate Subcommittee is not expected to mark up its bill until late June or early July.

WILSON REPRESENTS COSSA AT NSF REAUTHORIZATION HEARING *HS*

COSSA President William Julius Wilson, Lucy Flower University Professor of Sociology and Public Policy at the University of Chicago, testified at a May 20 meeting of the House Science Subcommittee that "Enhancing the status and funding for the SBE [Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences] Directorate are the primary goals for COSSA in the NSF reauthorization."

Wilson spoke on behalf of COSSA regarding the reauthorization of the National Science Foundation, an issue which the Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Rick Boucher (D-VA), will be addressing this year. The five-year authorization, which provides NSF the authority to exist and sets spending parameters for the various components of the Foundation, expires this year. Congress will scrutinize NSF's operations and structure as the reauthorization process unfolds in the House and the Senate. The congressional appropriations process provides the actual amounts of funding.

Wilson, after reminding the Subcommittee of COSSA's creation in 1981 to respond to Reagan administration budget cuts for social and behavioral science research, traced the recent developments that led to the creation of the separate directorate at NSF for the social, behavioral and economic sciences. He thanked Chairman Boucher for his active support for the creation of SBE. The COSSA President also noted the importance of NSF to the funding of basic research in the SBE sciences.

INSIDE UPDATE...

- ◆ NIH Behavioral and Social Science Research Office Emerges from Conference
- ◆ NRC Census Panel Releases Interim Report; House Hearing Looks at Reforms
- ◆ House Panel Hears Call for Change at OERI
- ◆ GAO Examines National Student Testing
- ◆ NIAAA Working Group Discusses Alcohol and AIDS Research
- ◆ Sources of Research Support: Department of Justice

Cites Changing Perceptions by Researchers

Responding to a question submitted in advance to all witnesses, Wilson noted that the dichotomy between "strategic research" and "curiosity-driven research" is not an important distinction, saying that individual investigators operate in each realm. He said that what has become significant is researchers' perceptions that the system which has led to tremendous scientific achievement, "the scientific community interacting with NSF, usually its program officers, to generate new ideas and projects worthy of support," has been altered to a "top down approach determining the NSF research agenda."

Citing the large social science data collections as examples, Wilson noted that "immediate payoffs are not always the object" of the scientific enterprise. "Instead," he suggested, "research develops a base of information that can later be utilized to formulate solutions to individual and societal problems."

Government Must Communicate with Researchers

However, Wilson stated, if strategic research agendas are here to stay, "it is vitally important that scientific agenda-setters within the government make an extra effort to stay in touch with researchers, so that priorities reflect new findings, new tools, areas where scientific breakthroughs of unanticipated impact seem possible."

Discussing the strategic research initiatives which now account for a large portion of the NSF research budget, Wilson stressed the important roles the SBE sciences should be playing in the High Performance Computing and Communication,

Advanced Manufacturing, Intelligent Systems, and Civil Infrastructure initiatives. For example, Wilson called for resources to support social impact studies of the HPCC. "If changes in our information infrastructure are going to alter radically our education system and change our communications system, we should set aside resources to explore the effects of these changes," Wilson argued.

Arguing that SBE scientists need technologically advanced information processing systems and the escalating costs of collecting data for longitudinal and cross-sectional analyses, Wilson called for greater resources for the "increasingly complex" instrumentation needs in the SBE sciences.

Supports Clinton Increase

Concerning NSF's budget, Wilson supported the efforts by the Clinton administration to enlarge the NSF budget by \$3.3 billion over the next five years, and the significant increase for FY 1994. He made particular mention of the need for increased funding for the SBE sciences, urging "a concrete proposal to restore funding for research in the SBE sciences" from its current 4 percent share of the research budget to its earlier 6 percent share.

Responding to a question from Rep. Anita Eshoo (D-CA) about the small numbers of women in science, Wilson discussed the research conducted by SBE scientists on the reasons why women and minorities do not often choose science as a career. He suggested that systemic changes are necessary and urged wide dissemination of the results of these studies.

NSF Bloc Grants Mentioned

Chairman Boucher also raised the possibility of NSF providing bloc grants to institutions for research. One purpose of this would be to reduce the workload on NSF program officers and reviewers and the time spent writing proposals by scientists. Other witnesses thought this might be tried on an experimental basis, but COSSA did not take a position on this issue.

Also testifying at the May 20 hearing were representatives of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Association of American Universities, the American Chemical Society, and the American Association of Engineering Societies. The reauthorization process will continue with an appearance by NSF officials before the Subcommittee in mid-June.

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS	
Executive Director:	Howard J. Silver
Government Affairs:	Susan Persons
Public Affairs:	Michael Buckley
Administrative Officer:	Karen Carrion
President:	William Julius Wilson
<p>The Consortium of Social Science Associations represents more than 185,000 American scientists across the full range of the social and behavioral sciences, functioning as a bridge between the research world and the Washington community. Update is published fortnightly. Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for \$60; institutional subscriptions, \$120, overseas mail, \$120. ISSN 0749-4394. Address all inquiries to COSSA, 1522 K Street, NW, Suite 836, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phone: (202) 842-3525, Fax: (202) 842-2788</p>	

NIH BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH OFFICE EMERGES FROM CONFERENCE *SP*

The version of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Reauthorization bill that recently emerged from a joint House-Senate conference committee was adopted by the House on May 25 by a 290-130 vote. It is expected that the bill will pass the Senate and be signed into law by President Clinton in the coming weeks.

As reported in the May 17 issue of *Update*, the bill establishes an Office of Behavioral and Social Science Research within NIH. As stated in the report accompanying the legislation, "the initial responsibility of the new Office will be the preparation of a special report to the Congress identifying those specific activities within the national research institutes which represent the NIH's behavioral and social science research portfolio. The report will encompass both intramural and extramural research projects supported in fiscal year 1993. In preparing the report, the Conferees have directed that a standardized definition of 'behavioral and social science research' be established and applied uniformly to the research portfolios of each national research institute."

The report further states that in developing this definition, "the Director of the Office is expected to consult with professional research organizations with expertise in behavioral and social science research." COSSA anticipates being a part of that process.

The bill still includes a prohibition against federal funding of the SHARP Adult Sex Survey and the American Teenage Study. Advocates of research on sexual behavior believe this sets a troubling precedent. However, the legislation also includes language reflecting support for this research. A provision entitled, "Requirements Regarding Surveys of Sexual Behavior," states that such surveys may not be funded unless the proposal has undergone an ethics panel review, and the Secretary of HHS has determined that the information obtained through the survey will assist "in reducing the incidence of sexually transmitted diseases, the incidence of infection with the human immunodeficiency virus, or the incidence of any other infectious disease; or in improving reproductive health or other conditions of health. All of this "restrictive" language explicates the purpose of sexual behavior research.

Although previous prohibitions of the aforementioned surveys have had a chilling effect on research, COSSA has learned that the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) will favorably receive and fund research meeting the new requirements. NICHD remains strongly interested in funding such research, and recognizes a continued need for a national study of sexual behavior, COSSA has been told.

The conference committee also compromised on the attempts by some in Congress to eliminate another study dealing with sexual behavior. Project Aries, administered by the University of Washington at Seattle, tests the efficacy of telephone counseling of men who have sex with men. (See *Update*, March 21) The compromise states that the project may not receive any future funding from the NIH unless the proposal has undergone the scrutiny of institutional review boards and ethics guidance, and peer review, and unless the Secretary of Health and Human Services makes a determination that the project will assist in reducing the incidence of infection with HIV; in reducing the incidence of sexually transmitted diseases; or in reducing the incidence of tuberculosis; and that the data to be collected through the project cannot be obtained in any other manner. Observers expect HHS Secretary Donna Shalala to see the relevance of the above conditions and continue to fund Project Aries.

NRC CENSUS PANEL RELEASES INTERIM REPORT; HOUSE HEARING LOOKS AT REFORMS *HS*

The Panel on Census Requirements in the Year 2000 and Beyond, one of two National Research Council (NRC) groups investigating how to improve the census, has released its interim report. Appearing before the House Subcommittee on Census, Statistics, and Postal Personnel on May 27, Charles Schultze, chair of the NRC panel and COSSA Board member, discussed the interim report's recommendations made now to help the Census Bureau prepare for the 1995 test of the design for the 2000 census. The final report of the NRC panel will be released in November 1994.

Previous hearings held by the Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Tom Sawyer (D-OH), have focused on the problems of the 1990 Census and how to do a better job of counting the country in 2000. At the May 27 hearing Sawyer noted: "The census, and the statistical system that is built on that once-a-

decade instrument, are at a crossroads. Costs are rising. Accuracy is diminishing. And, most importantly, we may be failing to measure the things that count, when they count."

Schultze agreed that cost and quality are the key issues facing his panel. The census that cost \$11 per housing unit in 1970, cost \$25 per unit in 1990, and is expected, without any changes, to cost close to \$30 per unit in 2000 (these are constant dollar figures). While the expense is going up, response rates have fallen, public cooperation is down, and there is increased demand for accurate data to meet various requirements, such as those imposed by the Voting Rights Act. In particular, accurate data are needed for poor urban areas which is where, Schultze noted, the response rate problem is the greatest.

The legal and constitutional requirements of the census include the need for a complete enumeration of the population once a decade, which rules out the idea of a rolling census or a sample census, Schultze argued.

The NRC panel's first recommendation is "that serious consideration be given to investigating sampling for nonresponse follow-up in the 1995 census tests...and testing to provide information on the costs, effects on small-area data, and statistical problems." This, Schultze suggested, could help cut the large costs of the labor-intensive non-response follow-up techniques used in 1990.

The NRC panel's second recommendation is "that the Bureau of the Census analyze 1990 Post-Enumeration Survey data to produce estimates of gross errors at the block level in the census. This information is required for examining census requirements for the accuracy of small-area data in the future." Schultze stated that block level data biases should be examined as to how they affect the accuracy of aggregate level figures.

The NRC panel's third recommendation includes initiating a separate program of research on uses of administrative records, undertaking a planning study to develop detailed design options for a 2010 administrative records census, seeking the cooperation of federal agencies to conduct experimental minicensuses based on administrative records, and using administrative records in the 2000 census where feasible to improve coverage. Suggestions that sample surveys replace some questions on the census will increase rather than decrease costs, Schultze argued. Therefore, using

administrative records, with the proper safeguards to protect confidentiality, may provide the necessary data and decrease the expense. This, Sawyer pointed out, will probably require changes in federal law.

In looking ahead to the further work of the NRC panel, Schultze explained that how to collect more detailed ethnic data and the changing definition of "household" are two issues the panel will need to examine more closely. Noting that changing the content of the questionnaire will not necessarily reduce costs, Schultze claimed making the instrument more user-friendly should increase response rates which, in turn, would reduce costs.

Also at the hearing, Harry Scarr, Acting Director of the Census Bureau, discussed the status of the bureau's current planning for the 2000 census. The Bureau has abandoned the 14 design alternatives it had under consideration and will now concentrate on taking the "best features and options from the designs as building blocks" to develop the design that will be tested in 1995. Scarr said that the Bureau continues to cooperate with the Schultze NRC panel and the NRC Panel to Evaluate Census Methods chaired by Norman Bradburn of the National Opinion Research Center. According to Scarr, the goals for assessing design alternatives and operational planning efforts remain: reducing differential undercounts; containing costs; and keeping the process open.

In regard to the recommendations of the Schultze panel, Scarr noted that he agreed with the first two points (sampling for non-response and examining block-level errors), but had some problems with the third recommendation on administrative records. Scarr stated that using administrative records presents more complex questions that need to be answered.

Following Scarr, William Hunt, Director, Federal Management Issues, General Government Division, General Accounting Office, expressed his concern that focused action is needed soon to achieve fundamental breakthroughs on redesigning the census. He claimed that the rejection of the 14 alternative designs puts the Bureau "in the same place they were when they started." He also decried the lack of a Clinton-appointed Director and noted the shortcomings in the FY 1994 budget request that could lead to underfunding some important activities such as geographic support activities and test census preparations.

HOUSE PANEL HEARS CALL FOR CHANGE AT OERI *HS/MB*

The House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Select Education and Civil Rights held a May 27 hearing to examine the reauthorization of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) at the Department of Education. Subcommittee Chairman Rep. Major Owens (D-NY), chief sponsor of H.R. 856, a bill to reauthorize and fundamentally change OERI, said that the panel will meet next month to mark up his bill.

"Neanderthal Thinking"

In his opening statement Owens set the tone for the hearing by declaring: "If we are going to enter a serious debate about educational reform, it is imperative that we have a federal educational research and development strategy -- one designed on a scale large enough to provide meaningful support for the ambitious national education goals. OERI has been trivialized, and its importance diminished, by neanderthal thinking that refuses to accept and understand that every significant endeavor (whether in health, science, agriculture, defense, or space exploration) has relied on research and development to ensure its success... Fads will continue to replace sustained efforts at school improvement."

Andrew C. Porter, head of the Wisconsin Center for Education Research at the University of Wisconsin, and G. Carl Ball, chairman of George J. Ball Inc. of Chicago, both members of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) panel that produced the 1992 report, *Research and Education Reform: Roles for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement* (see *Update*, April 6, 1992), testified before the Subcommittee on ways to strengthen the governance and mission of OERI and to restructure the agency to better focus and coordinate its efforts and operations.

Clinton Nominee Praised

For the most part they agreed with the provisions of the Owens bill. Porter argued that reauthorization is urgently needed since "badly needed increases in support may be held hostage to the lack of an authorization." Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman Rep. William Natcher (D-KY) is reluctant to provide funding for agencies that do not have authorizations. Porter also praised the Clinton administration's nomination of Sharon Porter Robinson (no relation) to be Assistant

GAO EXAMINES NATIONAL STUDENT TESTING *MB*

A new report by the General Accounting Office (GAO) surveys the nature, extent, and costs of systemwide testing in elementary and secondary schools. The study, *Student Testing: Current Extent and Expenditures, With Cost Estimates for a National Examination*, was done at the request of the House Education and Labor Committee.

In considering the creation of a national examination system, the GAO concluded that its cost (\$330 million annually) is greater than advocates contend, but less than opponents claim it would cost. The study found that a national exam would increase the average systemwide testing time per student (currently three and a half hours) by 30 minutes. After reviewing several national testing plans, the GAO concluded that no plan is clearly superior to the others.

Noting that opposition exists to a national test, the GAO recommends that if Congress were to create such a system, it would be prudent to involve teachers and local administrators in test development and scoring, and also seek the input of state and local educators in the administration of the exam.

To obtain a copy of the report, call the GAO at (202) 275-6241.

Secretary of OERI and urged her speedy confirmation by the Senate (Robinson's nomination was officially received by the Senate on May 20. No hearings have been scheduled). He also noted that OERI (and its predecessor the National Institute of Education) has gone through 9 leaders in 19 years and urged adoption of the NAS Report recommendation that OERI's heads have a six year term.

Porter and Ball both supported Owens' idea to create within OERI Institutes of Research for specific topics, a structure similar to the National Institutes of Health. In addition, Porter called for massive increases for Field Initiated Studies at OERI, also part of the Chairman's reauthorization bill.

Micromanagement Charge Denied

The one disagreement both Porter and Ball had with the Owens bill concerned a provision to create a policy board that would set priorities for OERI, and possibly attempt to micromanage the agency. This provision was controversial enough that during the last Congress, although the Owens bill passed the House, it could not muster enough support in the Senate to become law. Owens argued that his OERI policy board was modeled on the National Science Board, which he claimed has more power than his proposed OERI board would have, and disputed the micromanagement charge.

Discussing the role of research, Ball noted that in education reform, "new ideas are being advanced and implemented with little knowledge of how they will fare," and lamented the low status of education research in terms of both stature and funding. According to Ball, the federal government spends three times as much for space research and development and 30 times as much for health research. He continued that classroom teachers lack the training, time, and resources to appreciate and implement research findings. Ball expressed his opinion that the public expects immediate results from research, while basic research may take decades to sow the seeds of new teaching methods. He called for a long-term, sustained commitment to education research.

Ball also focused on the NAS report's recommendation for OERI to support a balanced portfolio of basic and applied research, statistics, dissemination, and technical assistance. OERI would develop partnerships between researchers and practitioners through expressing each group's needs to the other and supporting collaborative efforts between them.

The focus on partnerships was the subject of the second panel to testify at the hearings. Judith Lanier of Michigan State University and President of the Michigan Partnership for New Education described the successes of this university, local schools, and business collaboration to disseminate the results of education research into the classroom. Alfred Taubman, Chairman of the Board of Taubman Centers Inc. and Sotheby's Holdings Inc. and a major partner in the Michigan project also expressed his support for such collaborations.

NIAAA WORKING GROUP DISCUSSES ALCOHOL AND AIDS RESEARCH

The Alcohol and AIDS Work Group of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) recently met to review current research in alcohol, high-risk sexual behavior, and AIDS, and to consider future research directions for NIAAA. General areas discussed included: event-based analysis of alcohol and high-risk behavior; interventions with problem alcohol abusers; population-based prevention strategies; cognitive-motivational models; and issues related to the social context of alcohol use.

In discussing the correlation between alcohol and high-risk sexual behavior, the Working Group found many topics for future research. The following questions are some of those highlighted at the meeting: 1) What are the antecedents of risky behavior? 2) What are the protective factors that keep some people safe? 3) What are the social norms of subgroups? How can interventions be designed to change negative norms? 4) What are models of adolescent decision making? 5) How can heterosexual couple studies be helpful in addressing gender differences? (This is important especially regarding condom negotiation.) 6) How can the 12-point alcohol treatment system be redesigned to address AIDS? 7) How do family factors relate to risky behavior? 8) How does sexual behavior and alcohol use occur in the larger stream of behaviors? 8) How does social network theory relate to behavior? 9) How can scientists distinguish between perceived and actual social norms? 10) How can relapse in prevention be measured? How can triggers be identified? What is the efficacy of long-term treatment?

The Working Group also came to several decisions which might be applied to all areas of health research. They include the need: 1) for more funding for purely methodological studies; 2) to link qualitative, quantitative, and ethnographic studies; 3) to share instruments of research to compare findings and ensure consistency; 4) to utilize theory in designing interventions; 5) for help from the NIH in fostering ways to disseminate research as academics are not trained to do this, and the media often distorts/misinterprets findings; 6) for more funding support for long-term studies; and 7) to have multiple models, and not to rely on "linear-approach thinking."

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

The purpose of this announcement is to gain further knowledge of juvenile hate crimes, including the characteristics of juveniles who commit hate crimes, the characteristics of hate crimes committed by juveniles, and the characteristics of the victims of juvenile hate crimes. The long-term goal of this project is to better understand hate crimes in order to develop education aimed at preventing or reducing these offenses. The immediate goals of this research are (1) to assess information currently available regarding juveniles who commit hate crimes, the nature of the crimes they commit, and the nature of their victims; and (2) to assist OJJDP in developing a research strategy to collect efficiently information required by the JJDP Act that is not currently available.

Eligible Applicants: Applications are invited from public and private nonprofit agencies, organizations, educational institutions, or combinations thereof. Applicants must demonstrate knowledge of the civil, criminal, and juvenile justice issues relating to hate crimes and related incidents, as well as knowledge and experience in research methods, design, data collection, and implementation of this type of project.

Award Amount: Up to \$100,000 has been allocated for this award. One grant will be awarded competitively with a budget period of twelve (12) months for the completion of this project.

Review Process: OJJDP will select an organization to conduct an assessment of the current knowledge of the criminal justice and juvenile justice fields concerning hate crimes involving juveniles. The grantee must accomplish four major tasks to complete this project:

◆ **Definition:** Completion of this task will require the development of a working definition of hate crimes and related incidents. This definition should reflect the legislative definitions being developed as well as previous research definitions. The definition should clarify differences between criminal acts motivated by hate and noncriminal incidents that are intimidating or threatening.

◆ **Review of the Literature:** This will include a review of the current literature available on hate crimes and related incidents. The project should also include a review of all pertinent data and statistics. Sources covered should, at a minimum, include all State and Federal data sources. In addition to these data sources, private organization's databases should be reviewed and critiqued.

◆ **Research Design and Data Collection Strategy.** After completing the review of the literature, the grantee should prepare a report on the state of hate crime research. The report should review the current state of data collection projects and the overall quality of the data collected through these efforts. Additionally, the current research should be assessed to determine its goals and objectives and whether it addresses the above questions.

◆ **Research Design and Data Collection Strategy for other Issues:** The grantee should make recommendations on how to best obtain the statutorily-required answers to the questions not addressed in current research or in the data and statistics precisely gathered. These recommendations should include a research design and data collection strategy.

Deadlines: Applications must be received by mail or delivered to OJJDP, Room 742, 633 Indiana Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20531 by **June 21, 1993.**

Contact: Jeffrey Slowikowski, Research and Program Development Division (202)307-0586.

MEMBERS

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

American Psychological Association
American Sociological Association
American Statistical Association
Association of American Geographers

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

AFFILIATES

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

International Studies Association
Midwest Sociological Society
National Council on Family Relations
North Central Sociological Association
Operations Research Society of America
Population Association of America
Rural Sociological Society
Social Science History Association
Society for Research on Adolescence

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

CONTRIBUTORS

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

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

Ohio State University
University of Oregon
Pennsylvania State University
University of Pittsburgh
Princeton University
Purdue University
University of Rhode Island
Social Science Research Council
University of Southern California
State University of New York, Stony Brook
Temple University
University of Tennessee
University of Texas, Austin
Texas A & M University
Tulane University
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin, Madison
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Yale University

Consortium of Social Science Associations

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