

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume XI, Number 9

May 18, 1992

RESCISSION BILL UNRESOLVED: DISAGREEMENT ON NSF GRANTS PERSIST *HS*

The House and Senate continue to disagree on the fiscal 1992 Rescissions bill concerning funding for certain grants awarded by the National Science Foundation (NSF). The version the Senate adopted on May 6 contains the provision rescinding funding for 31* grants, named by title and mostly in the social and behavioral sciences, that have been merit reviewed and awarded. The House version, passed on May 7, does not contain this provision. A House-Senate conference committee has convened to resolve this and the other differences (mainly in defense spending) between the two bills.

The major negotiators for the House, Rep. Bob Traxler (D-MI) and Rep. Bill Green (R-NY), Chairman and Ranking Republican of the VA, HUD, Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee respectively, have stood firm for their position opposing the earmarking of specific NSF grants for rescission. The major negotiator for the Senate, Sen. Robert Byrd (D-WV), Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has been just as adamant for his position that these 31 grants are "wasteful spending" and examples of "executive branch pork." As of Friday, May 15 the situation remains deadlocked. Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) and Sen. Jake Garn (R-UT), Traxler and Green's counterparts in the Senate, are participating in the process, but are deferring to the Chairman of the full appropriations committee, Sen. Byrd.

After receiving news of the Senate action, the scientific community has mobilized effectively to deplore this threat to the merit review system at NSF. Aside from COSSA, the American Psychological Association and the Federation of Behavioral, Cognitive and Psychological Sciences, who usually defend attacks on the social and behavioral sciences, the Coalition for National Science Funding, the Council of Scientific Society Presidents, the Association of American Universities, the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, the Association for Women in Science, the American Chemical Society, the American Physical Society, and other groups and individuals have written,

faxed, and phoned their opposition to the Senate legislation.

* In the last issue of *Update* the number of grants targeted for rescission was listed as 32. We apologize for the error.

NIH BILL NEARS COMPLETION: SEXUAL BEHAVIOR RESEARCH LIKELY TO BE SUPPORTED *JA*

The joint House-Senate conference committee on the bill to reauthorize the National Institutes of Health currently is meeting to resolve differences between the House and Senate versions of the legislation. As has been frequently mentioned in *Update*, this bill contains the reauthorization of the National Cancer Institute, as well as providing authorization for programs related to women's health, minority health, sexual behavior, and fetal tissue transplantation research. While the latter two have been the most controversial components of the bill, the other elements are equally significant to the research community.

COSSA has learned that many issues already have been settled in conference. One of these is sexual behavior research. The conference report (as the final version of the bill is called) will retain the so-called "Waxman-Simon" amendment allowing for federally funded surveys of sexual behavior, as well as the provision introduced in the House by Pat Schroeder (D-CO) for a comprehensive study of adolescent health.

INSIDE UPDATE...

- ADAMHA Reorganization Succeeds: Research Shifts to NIH
- COSSA Testifies in Support of Social and Behavioral Science at NIH
- Balanced Budget Amendment: Nuclear Bomb or Kool-Aid?
- Science Committee Hears Economists Discuss Promoting Economic Growth
- COSSA Seminar Highlights Criminal Justice Research

In addition, the bill will authorize the Office for Research on Women's Health within the Director's office, establish contraceptive and infertility research centers, and provide increased support for breast cancer research (including behavioral research).

On a different matter, but one that affects all researchers, the conference committee also has agreed to drop the controversial indirect costs provisions in the House version of the bill.

ADAMHA REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL SUCCEEDS: RESEARCH SHIFTS TO NIH

The conference committee for settling difference between the House and Senate bills to reauthorize the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA) met and completed its business this week. In the end, the House conceded to the Senate's proposal to reorganize ADAMHA by transferring the three research institutes -- National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) -- to the National Institutes of Health (NIH). (See *Update* June 24, July 22, and September 9, 1991). The remaining elements of ADAMHA will be reorganized into a services only agency, re-named the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

When the proposal to reorganize ADAMHA first surfaced last year, there was much concern among the social and behavioral science community about how their research would fare at NIH, given

the fact that historically ADAMHA has had a much better record of supporting social science research than has NIH. As a result of urging by COSSA and others, the Senate provision adopted by the conference committee included language explicitly stating that social and behavioral research will continue to be an important part of the three research institutes' mandates even after their transfer to the overwhelmingly biomedically-oriented NIH.

While the Senate had moved very quickly on the reorganization proposal introduced originally by Edward Kennedy (D-MA) and Orrin Hatch (R-UT), Chairman and Ranking Minority member of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, the House held back and did not even include a companion proposal in its reauthorization bill. Reportedly, Representatives John Dingell (D-MI) Chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee and Henry Waxman (D-CA) Chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, who had jurisdiction over the bill, did not believe the reorganization was either necessary or desirable. As it turned out, the more likely explanation of their intransigence was that they were holding out to have something significant with which to bargain in conference over other issues in the bill. Apparently, Dingell and Waxman got what they wanted from the Senate conferees, and subsequently dropped their objection to the ADAMHA reorganization.

The reorganization will be effected once the bill becomes law. Both ADAMHA and NIH have been preparing for this outcome since last year when the proposal first emerged and immediately hit the legislative "fast-track."

COSSA TESTIFIES IN SUPPORT OF HEALTH AND BEHAVIOR RESEARCH AT NIH

COSSA Associate Director for Government Affairs Judith D. Auerbach presented testimony on May 5 before the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, chaired by Rep. William Natcher (D-KY). Auerbach advocated increased funding for social and behavioral science research at the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

Auerbach began by noting that in recent years it has become increasingly apparent that many of the diseases that afflict the population have a significant behavioral component, for example smoking and lung cancer, risky sexual behavior and

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

HIV/AIDS. She noted that many diseases and disorders can be prevented if the behaviors that lead to them can be controlled.

Auerbach noted that social and economic factors that contribute to quality of life are also important factors of the health experience. As examples, she cited racial/ethnic status, gender, age, income, education, community, cultural orientation, and religion. Auerbach told the panel that federal disease prevention and health promotion activities, "cannot be effective without recognizing the role of these social and economic factors in the health experience of individuals and groups." She said that while progress has been made in increasing the federal effort toward this end, "health and behavior" research still only constitutes about 4 percent of most NIH institute research budgets.

Auerbach devoted the majority of her testimony to supporting health and behavior research at two NIH institutes -- the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) and the National Institute on Aging (NIA).

Backs Increases for NICHD

Auerbach noted that NICHD historically has had one of the lowest funding rates among the NIH institutes, and told panel members, "funding inequities must be addressed in order for NICHD to fulfill its mandate to advance research on child health and human development." She said that the President's FY 1993 request of \$545.2 million, a 5 percent increase over FY 1992 levels, was insufficient, and instead endorsed an FY 1993 budget of \$672.8 million, which she said would increase NICHD's success rate from its current 24.8 percent to 35 percent.

Within the framework of NICHD, Auerbach made several specific recommendations. First, she supported a \$45 million request for the Office of Minority Programs to continue to fund programs assisting communities in developing broad health behavior interventions among minority populations. Second, she recommended the allocation of an additional \$1.5 million for FY 1993 for a network of researchers that would undertake a systematic effort to understand the relationship of family and child-well being. Third, she endorsed an additional \$2 million for FY 1993 to initiate data collection and analysis on the transmission of family values to children. Finally, Auerbach spoke in favor of expanding the number of demographic research centers for the Demographic and Behavioral Sciences Branch of NICHD.

COSSA ACTION ALERT

ISSUE: Reauthorization for the National Institutes of Health

TIMEFRAME: House and Senate votes may occur by May 21

CONTACT: Members of House and Senate

MESSAGE: Urge them to vote for the conference report for H.R. 2507, The NIH Reauthorization bill. You may also wish to stress your particular interest in research on minorities' health, women's health, sexual behavior, cancer, or adolescent health.

FOR MORE INFORMATION: Please contact COSSA at 202/842-3525

Research on Aging Underfunded

Turning to NIA, Auerbach commented: "The pronounced aging of America's population demands greater attention to possibilities for enhancing the health and well-being of older persons. While its value has increased, biomedical and behavioral research on aging still goes underfunded." She expressed COSSA's support for the professional judgement budget of \$640.9 million for NIA for FY 1993, compared to the FY 1992 level of \$383.6 million and the President's FY 1993 request of \$407.3 million. Auerbach termed the contributions of NIA "immeasurable."

Specifically within NIA, Auerbach recommended that \$3.5 million be provided in FY 1993 for research on the burdens of caregiving, particularly as it relates to Alzheimer's Disease. She also urged the panel to allocate \$1.5 million in FY 1993 for research on health quality of life in assisting individual, families, and health care providers in arriving at decisions regarding treatment and care. Additionally, Auerbach recommended increased support for NIA efforts regarding the psychosocial aspects of menopause among women, data collection for the longitudinal Health and Retirement Survey, and for surveys of the Oldest Old (those 85 years of age and older.)

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT: NUCLEAR BOMB OR KOOL-AID?

Calling it "our political scientists hearing" Rep. Leon Panetta (D-CA), Chairman of the House Budget Committee, presided over a May 11 hearing to examine proposals for a constitutional amendment to require a balanced federal budget (BBA). The amendment would take effect a number of years after passage allowing for time to adjust to its stringent requirements. It may also include provisions for super-majorities to enact a tax increase to insure compliance.

Testifying at the hearing were: Aaron Wildavsky, Professor of Public Policy at the University of California, Berkeley; Norman Ornstein, Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute; Louis Fisher, Senior Analyst at the Congressional Research Service; and former Rep. Bill Frenzel, now a Guest Scholar at the Brookings Institution.

Frenzel, after spending most of his testimony noting the problems with a BBA, concluded by "sadly, reluctantly, and in deep frustration" supporting it. He noted that the amendment "has been called the nuclear warhead of fiscal policy." Since the other weapons to reduce the deficit -- Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, the Budget Enforcement Act, the regular policy process -- did not work, Frenzel decided "Congress must throw the big one."

The problems with the BBA, according to Frenzel, are: 1) Congress admits its failure to manage the power of the purse; 2) it is uncertain as to whether the amendment will work to actually eliminate the deficits; 3) the possibility of economic disaster as painful spending reductions or tax increases become necessary to satisfy the balanced budget requirement; and 4) the potential for the injection of the Courts into fiscal policy decisions.

Ornstein and Fisher focused on these problems. Responding to Frenzel's nuclear warhead analogy, Ornstein claimed the BBA was more akin to the mass suicide by poisoned Kool Aid that the followers of Rev. Jim Jones committed years ago. The AEI scholar argued that the budget deficit is a political problem that needs resolution in the political arena, rather than through a constitutional amendment. He viewed with alarm Congress' timidity to confront challenges to its prerogatives, citing its submission to the subpoena of House bank records and the acceptance of the addition of a 203 year old amendment to the Constitution without a debate on the need for time limitations on proposed constitutional changes. The BBA, Ornstein

concluded, would be another example of Congress passively and cynically responding to policy problems.

Fisher blamed the rush to embrace the BBA on the failure of presidential and congressional leadership to make tough policy judgments on the budget deficit question. He noted that Presidents Reagan and Bush, although supporting the amendment, never proposed a budget that was in balance. Fisher echoed Chairman Panetta's concern about how the amendment would be implemented and the need to educate the American people about the tough choices that would be necessary to enforce it. Like Ornstein and Frenzel, Fisher also worried about the Courts intruding on Congress' power of the purse.

Wildavsky argued for a less radical approach to solve the budget crisis. He suggested three ways of reducing the deficit without resorting to the BBA. First, he would eliminate the current services budget, which assumes an inflation increase for all programs as the starting point for discussing the budget. Second, as a first step toward reducing the entitlement part of the budget, he would end guaranteed increases, and insist that certain entitlements would only be available at 95 percent of their value. Third he would extend the pay-as-you-go provisions of the Budget Enforcement Act to all federal spending. Any new expenditures would need to be offset by increasing revenues or decreasing other expenditures.

The amendment is expected to come to a vote in the Senate next month, with a House vote shortly thereafter. Three-fourths of the States would need to ratify the BBA before it became part of the Constitution. Political observers expect the amendment to pass the Congress, since liberals such as Sen. Paul Simon (D-IL) have joined conservatives such as Rep. Charles Stenholm (D-TX) and Sen. Robert Kasten (R-WI) as chief sponsors.

SCIENCE COMMITTEE HEARS ECONOMISTS DISCUSS PROMOTING ECONOMIC GROWTH *HS*

On May 5, the House Science, Space and Technology Committee, chaired by Rep. George Brown (D-CA), heard four economists discuss policies to promote economic growth and encourage investment. The hearing was a prelude to the introduction of legislation by Brown promoting civilian research and development in technology and

manufacturing to enhance America's competitiveness.

Appearing before the committee were: Robert M. Solow, Nobel Laureate in Economics, and Institute Professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Charles L. Schultze, Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution and former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers; Martin N. Baily, Professor of Economics and Public Policy at the University of Maryland; and Richard N. Cooper, Professor of International Economics, Harvard University and Chairman, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston.

All agreed on the basic premise that the United States must invest more in civilian research and technology to increase its economic growth. All cited the federal budget deficit as a deterrent to increased investment. Each of the four also mentioned the need to improve education and training to create a better qualified workforce that would increase productivity.

Solow argued that in the manufacturing sector, improving the skills and motivations of workers and the attitudes and practices of managers may be an even more urgent need than increasing investment in R&D. According to the Nobel Laureate, in order to increase productivity, respect for quality and reliability must be increased, training and retraining of workers must no longer be neglected, job security must be increased, and labor-management relations need to become less adversarial.

Schultze, a member of the COSSA Board of Directors, focused on the need to increase, reallocate, and reform federal support for civilian research and development. He urged that any support for commercial and industrial research must require a very substantial commitment of private funds; large scale industrial R&D projects should be supported reluctantly; the government should not allocate resources to favored industries; and the basic concept of peer review should govern spending decisions for specific projects within broad categories that would receive initial allocations of funds. He also warned that Congress should not focus on the manufacturing sector as the only way to improve economic growth. All sectors of the economy must be examined, especially the non-manufacturing sector where productivity growth has virtually stopped, Schultze said.

Baily argued that the U.S. economy is in better shape than many people realize, but that its current strengths will be eroded in the near future unless

steps are taken to counter adverse trends. Baily recommended stepped up investment in productive assets in the United States, even to the point of sacrificing short run improvements in the federal deficit. He also recommended that the potential for practical benefits be a criteria for support of basic research, especially in "big science" projects. Baily also noted that if Congress is to become involved in support for pre-commercial research, it should take a long-range perspective and not become meddlesome over which projects actually get selected.

Cooper discussed the recommendations of a National Academy of Sciences and Engineering panel, of which he was a member, that produced the report: The Government Role in Civilian Technology: Building A New Alliance. The panel, chaired by former Defense Secretary Harold Brown, stated in its report that there is a legitimate government role in support of pre-commercial research and development. The question was: how can this federal role be executed? The report recommended an increased role for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) in developing dual-use technology, particularly in those areas related to computers and information processing. It also recommended enhanced utilization of the federal laboratories to make contributions to private sector technology development. The report also calls for the establishment of an Industrial Extension Service at the Department of Commerce to help industry by gathering and disseminating information on new technologies. Finally, the report urges the creation of a Civilian Technology Corporation to advance federal government investment in pre-commercial R&D to \$5 billion.

COSSA SEMINAR HIGHLIGHTS CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH *mb*

On May 8 COSSA held a Congressional seminar, *Strategies for Winning the War on Crime*, to highlight the contributions of social science to the formulation of criminal justice policy. The breakfast seminar attracted an audience of over 90, primarily Congressional and federal agency officials. The event was co-sponsored by the American Society of Criminology, the Law and Society Association, and Rep. Charles Schumer (D-NY), chair of the House Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice.

After a brief welcome by COSSA Executive Director Howard J. Silver, Richard Groskin, an aide to Rep. Schumer, expressed Schumer's regrets at

being unable to attend the seminar, and delivered opening remarks. According to Groskin, Rep. Schumer has two major concerns in the area of crime: that the rate of victimization continues to increase, and that public confidence in the criminal justice system continues to decrease. He said that these twin challenges make it imperative to explore ways research-based knowledge can help policymakers formulate effective criminal justice policy.

Delinquency Research Discussed

Malcolm Klein, Professor of Sociology and Director for Research on Social Control at the University of Southern California, addressed two areas of criminal justice research -- the deinstitutionalization of status offenders (DSO), and youth gangs -- as contrasting cases of ways in which research results tend not to be used. Klein discussed his research that evaluated the 1974 Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act's creation of eight trial sites to assess the use of alternatives to the institutionalization of status offenders. Klein found that the effect of DSO was minimal, and in some cases actually led to an increase in recidivism. Klein said that by the time of the report's release, status offenders were no longer a prevailing topic because policymakers had come to believe that DSO and community treatment programs were working, leading, in his opinion, to the data either being ignored or being used to carry out a particular purpose. He commented that criminal justice research often has little effect because the world of practice moves faster than the world of research. Because of the time needed to collect and analyze data, Klein said that policymakers either have to anticipate the kind of research that will be needed or learn to be more patient.

Klein said there is currently an "enormous explosion" in gang activity, with 261 cities reporting gangs in 1991, as opposed to 78 cities in 1980. He argued that the current trend of gang suppression through street sweeps, strict parole and probation, and special prosecution is only increasing gang cohesiveness, and that we can expect the number of gangs to increase at a rapid rate. He said that the recent truce declared between the Bloods and the Crips in Los Angeles would only reinforce cohesiveness because it is a situation of "us" making peace with "them." Klein concluded with his opinion that gang research is falling on deaf ears because it is not the message practitioners want to hear.

Demographic Links to Crime

Alfred Blumstein, Dean of the School of Urban and Public Affairs at Carnegie Mellon University and current president of the American Society of Criminology, discussed the demographics of crime and its effects on crime rates. Blumstein's research showed that the increased crime rates of the late 1960s and 1970s were partially caused by demographics, with the Baby Boom generation reaching and then passing through high crime stages. In discussing criminal careers, he presented data showing how offenders move through different criminal stages. For example, robbery peaks in the late teens, burglary around age 20, and aggravated assaults continue into one's mid-30s. He said that while crime is affected by many factors, demographics is the only factor that can be projected more than a year or two in advance. Blumstein said that race is a key demographic factor, arguing that unless there are dramatic changes in the racial composition of those arrested, a growing minority community will cause considerable strain on the criminal justice system.

Blumstein partially attributed the rapid rise in incarceration rates to politicians reacting to the public outcry for stricter sentencing. He attributed the crackdown on illegal drugs to political pressure to "crank up the sanctions." Blumstein said this is less than rational because if you incarcerate someone for drug distribution, market forces will lead to a replacement for that offender. He added that deterrence will be minimal as long as demand creates a replacement. Blumstein's recommendations for policymakers in this area are focus resources on treatment for current drug users, and for prevention efforts to reduce the demand for illegal drugs.

Legal Community Skeptical of Research

Andrew Sonner, State's Attorney for Montgomery County, Maryland and Chair of the American Bar Association's Criminal Justice Section, began his remarks by commenting that the prosecutorial community generally has little interaction with the research community. He said that criminal justice policy is largely shaped by lawyers -- as legislators, prosecutors, and judges -- people who tend not to come from a scientific background and who frequently have a high degree of suspicion of research products. As an example, Sonner noted the 1987 case of *McCleskey v. Kemp*, where the U.S. Supreme Court ruled against the use in death penalty appeals of social science data showing racial bias in determining which defendants receive the death penalty. He commented that he is

concerned about the lack of research findings being used in current debates on criminal justice policy.

Sonner said that the appropriate federal role in crime policy is one of supporting research and assisting states and localities in gathering information from other jurisdictions. He said that federal research efforts should be focused on three levels: public education, basic research, and applied research. Sonner used the National Institutes of Health as an example of educating the public about research findings, and in the process increasing the respect of that research. He said that in the area of criminal justice, rhetoric clouds the reality of a system which he believes, on the whole, tends to work. Regarding basic research, he stressed the need for a "good, solid base of knowledge... removed from politics" and based upon the scientific method. Sonner also advocated research and evaluation on specific programs and technologies. For example, he urged that more cost-benefit analysis be done on the costs of death penalty litigation.

Method of Federal Support Criticized

A lively and extended question and answer session followed, and topics included federal support for research, recent riots in Los Angeles, and gun control. In discussing federal support, Blumstein said that the Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs (OJP) needs to give its research programs a long-range perspective and agenda, as well as a consistent level of funding. He said that all too frequently research priorities and funding levels fluctuate dramatically according to what he termed "hot button items" which vary from year to year. He expressed his opposition to OJP imposing the same rules on research grants that it has for action grants, stating that in research, "one must take a longer view." Blumstein termed this absence of a long-term research perspective one of the most pressing concerns of the research community. Klein added his opinion that mission agencies tend to block out innovative research in order to fit their mandates in given areas. "The more the mandate affects the research the less the research is going to be of value," he said.

Response to Riots Questioned

Sonner began the discussion about Los Angeles by saying that the Kerner Commission created in the aftermath of the riots of the 1960s produced a sound product, but that the report has been largely overlooked by policymakers. Sonner said his reservations about commissions are that they tend to only be created after a crisis, but should be ongoing and should try to bridge the gap between

what research says and what policymakers do. Klein expressed doubt about the creation of another commission, saying that such a panel would not be able to obtain the pulse of the community. He spoke of the need to find and empower new leadership within a community, saying that there is "a gap between the formal leadership in those communities and the residents." Blumstein complained that this country has "an astonishingly monolithic response to everything that goes wrong," and there needs to be more done to prevent lawlessness than cries of "lock 'em up." He urged "open-minded" research to provide new alternatives to issues of crime and punishment, the breakdown of the family, and the socialization of youth. Blumstein said that this year's Congressional reauthorization of the OJP research programs provides an opportunity to create more open-minded research through restoring the independence of the research programs and the creation of outside advisory panels.

Discussing gun control, Sonner said that in his opinion the war against guns has been lost, because of the large number of illegal firearms already in society. He urged further research on ways to remove guns from criminals as opposed to adopting legislation in reaction to a specific incident. Sonner expressed frustration that "good, forward thinking" legislators have been defeated at the polls for their pro-gun control efforts. Echoing similar concerns, Blumstein questioned the practicality of legislative efforts to severely restrict guns in the face of a sizable percentage of the population supporting the right to bear arms. Labelling guns the "marijuana of the right," Blumstein spoke of the unofficial decriminalization of marijuana in many jurisdictions and the difficulties involved with enforcing a sweeping gun control measure in the absence of both a broad public consensus and consistent enforcement.

For a more detailed summary of the seminar, please contact COSSA at 202/842-3525.

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
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
New York University
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
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
