

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume XI, Number 13

July 13, 1992

SENATE COMMITTEE CONSIDERS REAUTHORIZATION OF JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS

At a July 2 hearing, the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Justice, chaired by Senator Herb Kohl (D-WI), considered S. 2792, legislation recently introduced by Kohl to reauthorize the Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). The office's current authorization expires on September 30, 1992.

OJJDP was created under the 1974 Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act and is responsible for efforts to prevent juvenile crime and to find alternatives for youths already incarcerated. OJJDP's agenda, which primarily focuses on training and technical assistance programs, does contain a research component.

There is concern on the part of some in the social science research community that the research agenda and priorities of the OJJDP have become adversely affected by political influence. An August 1991 ruling by the Comptroller General found that Congress' intent to have policy control over the OJJDP and the other component agencies of the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) vested in the individual agency heads was violated by a February 1991 decision by the Attorney General delegating authority over contract and grant programs to the Assistant Attorney General for Justice Programs. The Justice Department's reauthorization proposal seeks to codify this decision, ending the political independence Congress had intended for these programs.

The Kohl bill takes several steps, supported by COSSA, toward addressing these issues. The bill allows the administrator of OJJDP to report directly to the Attorney General, instead of through an assistant attorney general, in an attempt to give the office more autonomy. It also reverses the delegation of powers cited in the Comptroller General's ruling. Kohl's bill requires a competitive process for the awarding of discretionary grants, and requires OJJDP to formulate a long-term plan for the office, including specific goals and criteria for

making research grants and contracts. Earlier this year the House Education and Labor Committee approved similar legislation. (See *Update*, June 1, 1992).

Justice Department Opposes Key Provision

At the hearing Assistant Attorney General for OJP Jimmy Gurule expressed the Department's opposition to the direct reporting provisions of the Kohl bill, stating that it would "impede our ability to focus and coordinate" OJP programs. Gurule said that the Attorney General's February 1991 order sought to establish a clearer line of authority between OJP and its component agencies in the hopes of achieving greater communication and cooperation between agencies. Gurule added that removing OJJDP from OJP would "greatly increase the administrative costs of OJJDP."

In a statement prepared for the hearing, Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Joseph Biden (D-DE) supported reauthorization of OJJDP, and said that any reauthorization "must also ensure that this office remains insulated from political pressures, so that it is free to serve only one interest -- the needs of America's children." Several children's advocacy leaders also testified at the hearing and offered strong support for removing OJJDP from OJP.

INSIDE UPDATE...

- Congress Passes Revision of Higher Education Act
- House Passes Agriculture Appropriations: National Research Initiative Level-Funded
- Results of Census Reform Test Reviewed by House Panel
- Global Change Data Guide Published
- Demographic Hearings Continue: Focus on Families, Children, and Income Patterns
- Senate Panel Approves Native Languages Bill
- Social Scientists Tell Congress of Role of Politics in Monetary Policy
- COSSA Reception Honors NSF's Marrett
- Sources of Research Support: National Institutes of Health

CONGRESS PASSES REVISION OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

After almost a year and a half of deliberations, the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is now ready for President Bush's signature. The Senate passed the conference report on June 30 and the House did so on July 8. Despite earlier threats of a veto, the President is expected to sign the bill.

Speaking on the Senate floor, Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-MA) outlined the central goals of the legislation: 1) to expand student aid for low and middle income families; 2) to simplify access to student aid; 3) to correct fraud and abuse in the student aid system; 4) to establish and enhance programs to train, retain and develop teachers; and 5) to expand early intervention programs to keep students in school so that they ultimately may attend college.

In addition, the bill seeks to improve the quality of postsecondary education in America through: a new emphasis on community service among college students; a strengthened program of library services; an upgraded and expanded program of institutional aid; a more comprehensive approach to graduate education assistance; a new program of Federal assistance to improve library and academic facilities; and a continuation of highly successful programs in international education, cooperative education, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, and the United States Institute of Peace.

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

Graduate Programs Reauthorized

Under the new Title IX dealing with Graduate Programs, the legislation rejects the administration's attempt to consolidate funding for current programs into one Graduate Fellowship program with the Secretary determining national need priority disciplines for the making of awards. The bill reauthorizes the Patricia Roberts Harris fellowships to provide grants to assist master's level, professional, and doctoral students from minority groups and women who are underrepresented in such programs. Master's level students who are pursuing careers "that serve the public interest" are given second priority. The Jacob K. Javits fellowships for graduate study in the arts, humanities, and social sciences are also reauthorized with a special emphasis on making timely awards.

The bill also reauthorizes The Council for Legal Opportunity (CLEO) program to assist minority, low-income or educationally disadvantaged college graduates to successfully pursue a law degree and the Law School Clinical Experience program. In addition, the legislation establishes a new Faculty Development Fellowship program to assist talented faculty from underrepresented groups who wish to pursue doctoral degrees or other faculty development programs, and to help identify and support talented bachelor degree recipients who want to become college professors.

International Education Expanded

Under the new Title VI dealing with International Education, the bill expands the purposes of the title to include assisting area studies and professional international affairs education. The grant programs for the Graduate and Undergraduate Language and Area Centers, the Intensive Summer Language Institutes, and the Language Resource Centers are reauthorized. American Overseas Research Centers are now eligible to receive Title VI grants. The Centers for International Business Educations and Research (CIBERS) are also reauthorized and are encouraged to expand joint ventures with others institutions of higher education and professional schools of international affairs, and to provide greater opportunities for business students to study abroad. The bill also creates an Institute for International Public Policy at an Historically Black College or University or a consortium of such, in order to significantly increase the numbers of African Americans and other underrepresented minorities in international service, public or private.

The reauthorization of the United States Institute of Peace (USIP), included in this legislation, creates the Spark Matsunaga Scholars Program. Named after the late Senator from Hawaii who was a strong proponent for the creation of the USIP, this program provides scholarships and educational programs in international peace and conflict resolution for outstanding secondary school students, as well as scholarships for undergraduates. For more information on the reauthorization of USIP, see *Update*, April 6, 1992.

HOUSE PASSES AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILL: NATIONAL RESEARCH INITIATIVE LEVEL-FUNDED

On June 30, by a vote of 312-99, the House of Representatives passed the FY 1993 Agriculture, Rural Development appropriations bill. Reflecting the general mood of the Congress, most programs in the bill received the same amount of funding for FY 1993 as they did in FY 1992.

For payments under the Hatch Act, the House appropriated \$168.8 million, which was the same as the administration's budget request. The National Research Initiative Competitive Grants program (NRI) received \$97.5 million, the same as last year, and \$52.5 million under the request. The Markets, Trade and Policy component of the NRI received \$4 million, the same as FY 1992. The House level-funded all other NRI components. Thus, the planned expansion of the NRI to its originally intended funding level of \$500 million remains a distant goal.

Special research grants received \$57.7 million, a decrease of \$15.4 million from FY 1992 levels, yet an increase of \$28.8 million above the request. The decrease from last year's level is somewhat deceiving since House members fund only their special projects in the House bill, while not funding special projects favored by Senators, who then add them when the Senate considers the bill. As an example, the Rural Policies Institute at the Universities of Arkansas, Missouri and Nebraska did not receive funding in the House bill. However, the Senate, which originally provided sponsorship of this institute, is expected to add back the funding.

The House continued the 14 percent cap on competitive research grant indirect costs that was instituted in FY 1991. A successful amendment on the House floor sponsored by Rep. Lamar Smith

(R-TX), will force each agency to cut its administrative costs by ten percent.

The Senate expects to mark-up its version of the bill after July 20, when it returns from its current recess for the Democratic National Convention.

RESULTS OF CENSUS REVISION TEST REVIEWED BY HOUSE PANEL

Asserting that the "next Census must be fundamentally different from 1990," House Census and Population Subcommittee chairman Rep. Tom Sawyer (D-OH) examined the results of a simplified questionnaire test (SQT) during hearings held by his committee on July 1.

Noting that "the 1990 Census form may have been too long and too complicated for many Americans to complete," Sawyer hoped that a simplified and more user-friendly questionnaire would improve response rates for the 2000 Census. There was a large drop, 10 percent, in the mail response rate for 1990 compared to 1980.

The Census Bureau conducted a SQT on a stratified sample of 17,000 housing units. The sample was stratified by low response rates for the 1990 Census and all other areas. The test also sought to measure the effects of three other factors: use of a better designed questionnaire; multiple contacts with households; and asking for a Social Security number.

Although admitting the test could not re-create a real census environment, U.S. Census Bureau Director Barbara Everitt Bryant testified that asking fewer questions, using a "respondent friendly" form, and mailing a replacement questionnaire improved overall completion rates. However, shorter forms did not raise response rates in low response areas and user-friendly forms did not have an impact on response rates in high response areas. Asking for a Social Security number lowered response rates overall, but not for high response areas.

The questionnaires tested included: the 1990 short form with 14 questions; a five question form asking name, date of birth, gender, race, and Hispanic origin; a six question form adding social security number to the five questions; and a two question form asking only name and date of birth. The five question form would satisfy reapportionment, redistricting and Voting Rights

Act requirements and elicited more responses than the two question form that would only meet reapportionment and redistricting needs.

L. Nye Stevens, Director of Government Business Operations Issues at General Accounting Office, whose testimony at a previous hearing (see *Update*, June 15, 1992) called the 1990 census design "no longer adequate," was impressed by the results of the SQT. Stevens concluded that these results "confirm that exploring changes in census short-form questionnaire content, design, and implementation strategy should be at the forefront of the Bureau's efforts to improve the census response rate."

The Subcommittee also heard from Charles L. Schultze, Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution and a member of the COSSA Board of Directors. Schultze serves as Chair of the Panel on Census Requirements in the Year 2000 and Beyond of the National Academy of Sciences. This panel will be examining and evaluating the needs for data currently collected in the census, identifying where the census is either required or is the most effective means to collect data, recommending accurate and cost effective means for achieving through the Census the constitutional requirement for a count of the population, and evaluating the needs for other data either through the census or alternative means.

According to Schultze, a key consideration is to weigh needs against costs. He noted that to conduct the 2000 Census in the same way as the 1990 Census would double the cost to an estimated \$5.2 billion. Since the cost of the 1990 Census raised the ire of many members of Congress and the public, this cost estimate should increase support for the reform efforts.

Another panel, chaired by National Opinion Research Center Director Norman Bradburn, will examine alternative census methods and designs.

Rep. Sawyer expressed concern about the timetable for the panels: Could they meet the fast approaching deadlines for determining changes for the year 2000? Schultze was unsure. An interim report from his panel is due in May 1993, but the full study would not be complete until November 1994. He did stress that the title of the study encompassed "2000 and beyond."

The Census Bureau is currently looking at 14 possible designs for the 2000 census. According to Bryant, by 1994 the list should be reduced to four for testing, with a final design selected in 1995.

EVALUATION OF GLOBAL CHANGE DATA PUBLISHED

The International Social Science Council (ISSC), as part of its Human Dimensions of Global Environmental Change (GEC) project, recently published a report Population Data and Global Environmental Change.

The report, written by John I. Clarke and David W. Rhind, inventories the demographic data currently available, evaluates their adequacy, recommends how they could be made more useful for the study of GEC, and considers what types of additional statistics are necessary. In examining the nature of the available population data, the authors note that the data exist for political units, rarely relate to physical environments, demonstrate increasing concentration of people, and vary greatly in comprehensiveness and reliability.

The report also surveys global population data sources, examines the U.S. Bureau of Census Center for International Research database, and discusses the role of Geographic Information Systems and remote sensing in aiding population data development. An appendix includes a compilation of available international and national demographic data sets.

For information about obtaining copies of this report contact the International Social Science Council, 1 Rue Miollis, 75015 Paris, FRANCE; Phone 45.68.25.58/59 Fax: 33-1-43.06.87.98.

DEMOGRAPHIC HEARINGS CONTINUE: FOCUS ON FAMILIES, CHILDREN AND INCOME PATTERNS

Following earlier hearings that examined population trends delineated by the 1990 Census, the House Subcommittee on Census and Population chaired by Rep. Tom Sawyer (D-OH) held a second set of hearings on "America's Changing Profile." (For a discussion of the earlier hearings see *Update*, June 1). The discussions on June 23 and 24 examined characteristics of families, children, and income distribution.

Frances Goldscheider, Professor of Sociology and Director, Population Studies and Training Center, Brown University, argued that the definition of the "traditional" family is the nineteenth century model where "both parents were responsible for the care, training, social, and moral development of their children..." Unlike the commonly referred to "traditional" family of the 1950s, which Goldscheider classified as the "family of separate spheres," the earlier model included fathers much more in parental relationships and child development. The consequences of the 1950s family, where fathers were "out in the world" while women remained at home, has been a society of "polarized men and women" that emphasizes differences, "rather than placing these differences in the context of what it means to be a caring and productive adult." The result, according to Goldscheider, is that "the alternatives to marriage have never looked better," and that "unmarried adults have options for independence and privacy that are unique."

The impact of the changes noted by Goldscheider were discussed by Kristin Moore, Director of Research at Child Trends, Inc. Moore noted that the total number of children in the U.S., 69.3 million under the age of 18, grew in the 1980s after declining absolutely in the 1970s, but since 1960 has declined from 35 percent to 28 percent of the population.

Moore also pointed out that although the birth rate and the fertility rate are much lower than several decades ago, the major transformation has been the increase in the percent of births to unmarried women from 5 percent in 1950 to 27 percent in 1989. For African-American mothers the figure is 64 percent, almost doubling since 1970; for white mothers the rate is 19 percent, almost quadrupling since 1970. Adding divorce and separation to this leads to the significant numbers of children living in one-parent households: 20 percent for white children; about 67 percent for African-American children.

One consequence of single-parent households is the increased number of children who live in poverty. Those children, according to surveys conducted by the National Commission on Children, worry more about such things as their personal safety, and have less satisfying lives, including higher incidence of emotional and behavioral problems, than children in two-parent families.

There are some positive trends amid all these statistics, Moore said. There are fewer large

families today than earlier, so that time and economic resources are not stretched across very large numbers of children. In addition, today's parents are better educated. Moore added that there is also incredible diversity among families, noting that even among single parent families, poverty is not universal.

Changing Patterns of Family Income

Patricia Ruggles of the Urban Institute and Margaret Simms of the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies focused their testimony on changing patterns of family income. Ruggles demonstrated that "the overall distribution of income has become more unequal over the past decade or so," asserting that despite questions about the interpretation of these data, "the overall story of rising inequality is so documented as to be compelling."

For families with children, according to Ruggles, the changes in average income have been even larger. She noted that "families with children have slightly higher incomes, on average, than do all families, but their incomes have declined more in relative terms over the past decade." The impact has been greatest on younger people, especially those with low skills, who due to technological changes and increased international competition, have faced declining demand for their employment.

Simms discussed the income distribution data as it affects black families. The proportion of these families with incomes over \$50,000 almost doubled between 1970 and 1988, mostly in situations where the husband and wife both worked. In terms of annual income, the 1990 ratio of these couples to their white counterparts was 85 percent, as compared to 72 percent in 1967. The proportion of the black population with a college degree tripled between 1970 and 1990 and the proportion of black workers in managerial, professional and related occupations almost doubled in the same twenty year period. However, two earner married couple families constituted only 31 percent of all black families in 1990 compared to 48 percent of white families, according to Simms. In contrast, female headed families, who have the lowest median incomes, are 46 percent of black families compared to 13 percent of white families.

Simms also suggested that "changes in economic opportunity for different segments of the population have been at least as important as family structure in explaining the declining status of black families

with children." She also noted regional differences in black economic circumstances. For example, in the Northeast and Midwest, black children were more likely to be living in welfare dependent poor families, while poor children in the South were more likely to be in working poor families.

In discussing his reactions to the testimony, Chairman Sawyer associated himself with Larry Bumpass' presidential speech to the Population Association of America, in which Bumpass said that because of the tight budget constraints facing all levels of government, the best we could do was to attempt the "amelioration of negative consequences," rather than the implementation of policies that would reverse some of these trends.

SOCIAL SCIENTISTS TELL CONGRESS OF ROLE OF POLITICS IN MONETARY POLICY

Two prominent social scientists appeared before a House Subcommittee to discuss the role election-year politics can play in setting monetary policy. The July 7 hearing was conducted by the House Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy, chaired by Rep. Stephen Neal (D-NC).

Thomas Havrilesky, Professor of Economics at Duke University, testified on the ways Congress and the President can influence Federal Reserve Policy. He noted that Congress can pressure the Fed to change its policies through public statements and hearings, and that Administration officials can achieve a similar aim through both public and private signals for a change in monetary policy. According to Havrilesky, "My tests show that monetary policy will respond to these signals to the extent that there are concurrent Congressional threats to Federal Reserve powers and privileges." Havrilesky also commented that a President can influence monetary policy through his or her power to nominate members of the Board of Governors at the Fed. He noted that appointees to the Board may change their policy preferences over time, and that according to his research, "Presidents who do not want their appointees to waiver should choose economists." Havrilesky added that President Bush's three nominees all have been professional economists.

Nathaniel Beck, Professor of Political Science at the University of California-San Diego, discussed the

NATIVE LANGUAGES BILL CLEARS SENATE PANEL

On July 2 the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs, chaired by Sen. Daniel Inouye (D-HI), approved legislation, S. 2044, to award grants to create centers for the preservation of Native American languages, establish community language programs to bring together language speakers of different generations, and develop and disseminate teaching materials for Native American languages.

At a June 18 hearing held by Inouye's committee, two leading linguists testified in support of the legislation. For a more detailed account, see *Update*, June 29.

possible existence of a political monetary cycle, a tight monetary policy early in a presidential term, followed by an easier policy closer to the election in order to aid the President's re-election. Beck outlined research showing that there is no direct indication of the Fed manipulating monetary policy to aid an incumbent. According to Beck, "elections put the Fed in a difficult position. It obviously knows what the president wants. If the Fed doesn't help the president, the president may show his unhappiness. On the other hand, if it creates a pre-election boom, the Fed faces the loss of its most important source of power, its legitimacy." Beck said that elections do have an impact on Fed policy-making, and that this effect is likely to occur early in the new term when the President is likely to be politically powerful. He said that this is because the Fed knows that the President will not want a weak economy to persist by the next election, causing the Fed to opt for a tight monetary policy to induce growth.

COSSA RECEPTION HONORS NSF'S MARRETT

At a June 30 reception, COSSA honored Cora B. Marrett, the first Assistant Director for the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences (SBE) at the National Science Foundation (NSF). The reception, which was attended by over 80 representatives of the science policy community, was held at the HELDREF Foundation townhouse in Washington, D.C.

After being warmly introduced by COSSA Executive Director Howard J. Silver, Marrett thanked the social science community for its persistent support of the creation of the SBE directorate and for its advice and assistance in getting SBE off the ground. She particularly thanked the other Assistant Directors at NSF for their cooperation during the early stages of SBE.

NSF Director Walter Massey also attended and spoke of his enthusiasm for the new directorate, and for the leadership he said Marrett brings to it. Massey also praised the social science community

for its efforts in advocating for the new directorate, and seeking an active role in making it work.

Marrett was named to lead SBE in February, and officially began her new responsibilities in early May. Prior to coming to NSF, she was a professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Marrett brings extensive experience in the social and behavioral sciences to NSF, having served on numerous government and professional panels.

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

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.

The Role of the Family in Preventing and Adapting to HIV Infection and Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome

The purpose of this Request for Application (RFA) is critical because little information is currently available about family processes on a wide variety of family configurations, including those that are at high risk for Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) infection. In this RFA, the term "family" refers to the breadth of family configurations, including biological kin networks and non-related persons who consider themselves to be family through a "network of mutual commitment." Thus, family level of analysis may include the family of origin, family of choice, or a combination of these. Results from studies funded under this RFA will be used to develop effective prevention efforts aimed at high risk individuals and their families or to enhance treatment efforts for families already coping with HIV infection.

Application Procedure: Prospective applicants are requested to submit, by August 15, a letter of intent that includes a descriptive title of the proposed research. The research grant application form PHS 398 is to be used in applying for this grant. These forms may be obtained from the Office of Grants Inquiries, Division of Research Grants, NIH, 5333 Westbard Ave, Rm. 449, Bethesda, MD 20892, telephone (301)496-7441.

Funding Mechanism: In FY 1993, a minimum of \$1.8 million has been set aside for this RFA. The NIMH will provide a minimum of \$1.4 million; the NIDA and the NIAAA will each contribute a minimum of \$.2 million to support three to five awards.

Deadlines: The signed original and five legible copies of the completed application must be sent to: Division of Research Grants, National Institutes of Health, Westwood Building, Rm. 240, Bethesda, MD 20892, by September 15, 1992.

Contact: For further information on grants management issues and other contact persons, contact: Stephen J. Hudak, Chief, Grants Management Section, National Institute of Mental Health, Parklawn Building, room 7C-23, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857, telephone (301) 443-4456.

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
