

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume XIII, Number 3

February 14, 1994

FY 1995 BUDGET RELEASED: NSF, NIH WINNERS, SBE GETS LARGE BOOST FOR GLOBAL CHANGE *HS*

The Clinton Administration released its proposed Fiscal Year 1995 budget on February 7. Calling the \$1.5 trillion spending blueprint a "very future oriented budget," Office of Management and Budget Deputy Director Alice Rivlin, speaking at the Office of Science and Technology Policy briefing, said that because of the hard freeze on domestic discretionary spending contained in the 1993 budget agreement any increased spending for a program or agency reflects the administration's investment policy. Since the FY 1995 budget became a zero-sum game, many agencies' budgets were frozen, and some actually had declines from their FY 1994 spending. In addition, the administration asked for the termination of 116 programs, many of them small categorical ones in the U.S. Department of Education. The Law School Clinical Experience Program is one of the 116, but it has survived earlier attempts at elimination.

The new budget, however, does include good news for some science agencies and for social, behavioral and economic research within those agencies. Overall, the Research and Development (R&D) budget proposed for FY 1995 increases by 3 percent to \$73 billion (including facilities), after declining from FY 1993 to 1994 due to decreases in defense R&D and the termination of the Superconducting Supercollider. In addition, in FY 1994 the military/civilian R&D ratio declined from 57/43 to 53/47. The ratio will be maintained in FY 1995 as both defense and civilian R&D will increase by 4 percent. Basic research in both categories will rise only 2 percent to \$12.9 billion on the civilian side, and \$1.2 billion on the defense side.

Major increases in the R&D category go for Technology Transfer (57%), Energy Conservation Research (42%) National Information Infrastructure (32%), Global Change Research (24%), and the Human Genome Project (22%). Among the agencies, the major winner is the National Institute for Standards and Technology (up 38%).

The National Science Foundation (NSF) fares relatively well compared to other agencies, but not so well compared to previous administration requests for double digit increases. For FY 1995 the administration is asking for an overall increase of 6 percent, while the research and related activities category goes up by 8.3 percent. NSF has rearranged its budget and now counts the old Antarctica program as part of R&RA, while separating out major science equipment into a separate budget line. The Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences Directorate's (SBE) request in percentage terms is the largest for any research directorate in the Foundation (14.6%). This is tempered by two factors: the low base from which this is calculated, and most of the increase will go to research on the human dimensions of global change.

The National Institutes of Health will receive a 4.7 percent increase across all its programs to \$11.5 billion, including \$1.4 billion for AIDS research.

A full explication of the FY 1995 administration budget and its impact on over 40 agencies that fund social, behavioral and economic research will appear in the COSSA 's annual budget analysis issue of *Update* scheduled for publication on March 7.

INSIDE UPDATE...

OSTP Science Forum Highlights:

- ◆ Gore Cites Need for Basic Research in Criminal Justice
- ◆ Brown's View of National Goals to a Better Society
- ◆ Mikulski Proclaims a New Paradigm in Science Policy
- ◆ Rockefeller Echoes Mikulski
- ◆ The SBE Perspective

Varmus Outlines Vision of NIH Behavioral and Social Science Office

NIH Forum Looks at TB and Social Science

COSSA Examines Criminal Justice Research at Capitol Hill Breakfast Seminar

GORE, BROWN PRAISE SOCIAL SCIENCE, MIKULSKI EXPLAINS STRATEGIC RESEARCH *HS*

A two day forum sponsored by the White House's Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) brought together over 200 scientists and science policy-makers to examine the Clinton administration's science policy. Organized by the OSTP Associate Director for Science M.R.C. Greenwood, the January 31 and February 1 forum "Science in the National Interest" was held at the National Academy of Sciences and sought to develop a document expounding the administration's science policy similar to the document issued in 1993 explaining the administration's technology policy.

Much of the meeting focused on explaining to the scientists the notion of "strategic research." This phrase has entered the science policy debate in many ways, but most strikingly in the Senate appropriations report last Summer with regard to the future of the National Science Foundation (see *Update*, September 13). In that and other reports, research was dichotomized into strategic or applied versus curiosity-driven or basic. Many scientists feared that the individual investigator initiated research system that had prospered for many years was now under attack.

Speeches by Vice President Gore, Senators Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) and Jay Rockefeller (D-WV), and Rep. George Brown (D-CA), offered some reassurance to the scientists. By the end of

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

Executive Director:	Howard J. Silver
Government Affairs:	Susan Persons
Public Affairs:	Michael Buckley
Administrative Officer:	Karen Carrion
Intern:	Elizabeth Harrell

President: William Julius Wilson

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

the meeting the sense was that strategic research really meant "research in pursuit of strategic national or societal goals." The research could be basic or applied, with the debate now shifting to defining the goals. What follows are some highlights from the meeting, attended by COSSA Executive Director Howard Silver.

GORE CITES NEED FOR BASIC RESEARCH IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE *HS*

Vice President Al Gore, who has taken an intense interest in science policy since his days in the Congress as chair of science committees in both the House and the Senate, strongly defended basic research during his address to the meeting. Mindful that many in the audience perceived the Clinton administration as favoring technology over science, Gore stated that "science has to be a top priority for the administration and the country." The Vice President noted that "without science civilizations stagnate."

Claiming that the nature of scientific inquiry sometimes leads to "dead ends," Gore urged that decision makers, particularly in Congress, become cognizant that you "can't hope to see the results of scientific research right away." Without research failures, Gore noted, there would be fewer opportunities to learn. He also chastised Congress for "earmarking" funds for specific non-merit reviewed projects.

The Vice President also argued for maintaining a broad research base. Using a library metaphor that the nation's research portfolio "must not have empty shelves," Gore mentioned the social sciences as an important factor in filling up those shelves. In particular, he cited research on crime and violent behavior as helping to shape the administration's response to meeting the goal of reducing violent crime. Calling for more research in this area, Gore specifically noted the impact of previous research on social networks, the impact of social programs on individuals, neighborhood instability and poverty, career criminals, and the causes and correlates of crime and violence.

BROWN'S VIEW OF NATIONAL GOALS TO CREATE A BETTER SOCIETY *HS*

In his remarks to the Forum, House Science, Space and Technology Chairman Rep. George Brown (D-CA) echoed his many recent speeches, as well as the Health of Research Report produced by his committee, to sketch a new vision of science's

role in creating a new America. He declared: "America now seems ready to channel its energy and resources toward creating a more productive, humane, and benevolent society. The nation's science structure must respond to that need, both by helping to define that society and by helping to achieve it."

Rejecting the idea that scientific research in pursuit of national goals was a departure from previous practice, Brown asserted that the Cold War produced federal support of science and shaped and directed the scientific enterprise. "America's science structure," Brown proclaimed "was forged in this limited framework" of defense needs. The aviation and computer industries, the weapons laboratories, and the civilian space program were all outgrowths of that effort to win the Cold War. With the demise of the Cold War as a "national organizing principle," Brown insisted it is now time to focus on "internal threats that have festered below the surface of Cold War policy."

Role of Social Science

Among the "big picture" items that need examination to better connect our scientific research to our national goals, Brown asked "What is the role of the social sciences?" He suggested that this exploration "may lead us to a correction of the historical bias for focusing on the natural sciences and technology to the exclusion of the important contributions the social sciences can make toward a compassionate, cooperative, and balanced society." Among the examples he cited were discerning the roots and resolutions of violence, revitalizing families and communities in an increasingly technocratic society, understanding the implications of the nation's swiftly changing demographics, and investigating the potential of social-policy modeling to find solutions to urban problems.

Aside from these specific questions about the social sciences, Brown mentioned other national concerns that social and behavioral scientists are in the forefront of examining in conducting their research: 1) What is the future of work in our society? 2) What will redesigning health care for the 21st Century require? 3) How can we rethink environmental protection? 4) How can we anticipate changes for education in the Information Age? 5) How do we predict and avoid the social stresses that could accompany the advent of the Information Superhighway? 6) How do we marshal innovation for our growing service sector? 7) How do we balance the vast potential for good arising

from technological intervention in the human genome with its complex societal implications? and 8) How can science and technology enhance our relations with other nations?

He concluded that his recommendations would "upset the status quo in our research system and many of our institutions." "We must have a research system," Brown declared, "that arches, bends, and evolves with society's goals." However, he derided the term "strategic research," calling it "a contrived combination of words to achieve politically correct science parlance." Instead we must have strategic goals for the nation and invest in research as part of a strategy to advance those goals.

He also rejected the notion that basic and applied research are mutually exclusive. Citing the recent work Pasteur's Quadrant by Donald Stokes, former Dean of the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton University, Brown noted Pasteur's scientific work as heavily influenced by both public health and commercial goals all during his ground breaking career in microbiology.

MIKULSKI PROCLAIMS A NEW PARADIGM FOR SCIENCE POLICY *HS*

For many attendees the most eagerly awaited address to the Forum was by Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), Chair of the Senate VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies appropriations subcommittee. As noted above, the committee had issued a report last summer to accompany the NSF appropriation that alarmed some in the scientific community by insisting that NSF focus more of its funds on "strategic research."

At the Forum, Mikulski spoke of a "war for America's economic future" that has replaced the Cold War. "Science and technology," she declared, "must be part of the strategy to help win the war by creating jobs for the present and the future." She asserted that federal science investments have largely been driven by one over-arching "strategic" objective -- America's national military security. She claimed that NSF was a child of America's Cold War policy.

America's science community was now in a crisis, she proclaimed, because the old assumptions about how it is organized and how it spends increasingly limited dollars "seem out of step with where we as a new age democracy must move."

Mikulski expressed concern that without a national science strategy federal support for science

would continue to be a target of opportunity for those who seek further cuts in national spending. The Senator cited the example of the Superconducting Supercollider's cancellation by Congress, a project she supported, as a decision made in this atmosphere.

She declared that "there is a new paradigm emerging on how science is conducted and how science policy is organized. It's based upon the principle that science -- should lead to new ideas and new technologies -- which should lead to jobs, particularly in manufacturing." This new paradigm also seeks new areas of collaboration between universities and the private sector. And most importantly, it focuses "our science investments more strategically -- around national goals that are important to economic growth and whose results will ultimately improve people's day to day lives." Scientists and engineers must be trained for the challenges of a job market with the uncertainties of the new global market, and not for lifelong careers in universities, she said.

Commenting on the committee report's requirement that 60 percent of NSF research be "strategic," she defined it as "investments in science that are focused around important national goals." She identified these as climate change, advanced manufacturing, biotechnology, high performance computing, civil infrastructure, and magnetic levitation technology. Focusing on strategic research does not mean an end to basic research, but the latter "must be done in more strategic areas." Recognizing that not every science project will have a private sector payoff, Mikulski explained that is why only 60 percent of NSF funding should go into research in strategic areas.

She praised the National Institutes of Health as a model for what she envisions for NSF. "NIH is not organized like a university," she noted, "We don't have a National Institute for Behavioral Modification, but a National Institute of Mental Health." NIH supports a range of research activities from the most basic aspects of life and medical sciences to the most applied activities which lead to stunning new treatments and medicines that fight diseases, she said, declaring, "NIH saves lives, creates jobs, and strengthens our nation's productivity."

She suggested that the current NSF directorate structure, organized around disciplines like universities, needs reexamination. It is the Federal government's job, she asserted, "to be a catalyst to

help get the knowledge and technologies in our academic community into the market place. Federal science institutions need to be more nimble and more agile."

ROCKEFELLER ECHOES MIKULSKI *HS*

Sen. Jay Rockefeller (D-WV), Chairman of the Senate Science Subcommittee, also called for research that was "useful to the American economy." He suggested that because of the changes in national priorities the public expected changes in basic research. Reflecting the reinventing government orientation of the administration, Rockefeller argued for strengthened mechanisms to reach out to users of research, arguing for a more "client oriented" approach. He also called for giving industry a more formal voice in U.S. science policy.

He echoed Mikulski in calling for NSF to focus on research on areas of major national need, which he identified as health, environment and infrastructure. He wondered whether NSF was even the right agency to promote economic growth. Perhaps, he pondered, funds should be given to companies to give to universities. Although he said we should be careful about earmarking funds for specific projects, he also was concerned with geographical equity and suggested Congress has the "moral obligation" to spread federal research dollars more broadly.

Both Rockefeller and Mikulski warned the audience that if a proposed balanced budget amendment passed, (a vote in the Senate is expected around February 22) then any prospects for a bright funding future for science would be dimmed considerably.

THE SBE PERSPECTIVE *HS*

The social, behavioral and economic (SBE) perspective was represented on the program by Joseph Stiglitz, a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, and Charles Kiesler, Chancellor of the University of Missouri-Columbia and a psychologist. Stiglitz discussed the social returns of investing in research and made the administration's case for industrial policy intervention. He also expressed concern about the issue of intellectual property rights.

Kiesler presented the Human Capital Initiative developed by 75 psychology groups as a consensus of research funding priorities in the social and

behavioral sciences. The HCI focuses on six areas: Aging, The Changing Nature of Work, Health, Alcohol and Drug Abuse, Violence, and Schooling and Literacy,

Kiesler also discussed methodological advances in the SBE sciences: evaluation research, measurement theory, cost-effective analyses, cost-benefit analyses, policy sciences, and cognitive science. In addition, Kiesler discussed the usefulness of the SBE sciences to help scientists understand "people issues" such as changing organizations and cultures, the making of complex decisions, and the development of organizational strategies.

The meeting was co-chaired by NSF Director Neal Lane and NIH Director Harold Varmus. A major focus on NIH came during a speech by Senator Tom Harkin (D-IA), who explained his and Senator Mark Hatfield's (R-OR) proposal to fund more research at NIH by creating a trust fund from a tax on premiums paid to the alliances in the President's health care reform proposal.

VARMUS OUTLINES VISION OF NIH BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE OFFICE *HS*

During a February 9 meeting with research advocates, National Institutes of Health Director Harold Varmus discussed his expectations of the Office of Behavioral and Social Science Research (OBSSR) created by the NIH Revitalization Act of 1993.

Varmus outlined four things he wanted from the Office:

1) Strong leadership from an excellent director who would be broadly trained in the social and behavioral sciences, but who would also be able to relate to the major players at NIH from the biological and biomedical arena;

2) Funding help for social and behavioral science projects, perhaps modelled on the manner of supplemental funding provided by the Office of Minority Health and the Office of Women's Health Research;

3) Advice on the research portfolio for the behavioral and social sciences at NIH. What kinds of research should be expanded, what should be reduced or abandoned? and;

4) Close connections to the Office of AIDS Research to produce effective research on the psychosocial factors of AIDS.

Varmus announced that a search committee to find the Director of OBSSR would soon be established. Wendy Baldwin, Deputy Director for NIH Extramural Research and a sociologist, will serve as chair. Varmus expects the Director to be chosen within the next three to four months. Nominations of excellent candidates are encouraged.

Fred Goodwin, outgoing Director of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), (he announced his resignation on February 7) arranged the meeting to bring together Varmus and advocacy groups concerned with NIMH. COSSA, the American Psychological Association, the American Psychological Society, and the Institute for Social Work Research were among the 12 groups around the table.

In addition to Goodwin's announced departure, Alan Leshner, Deputy Director of NIMH and a psychologist, is expected soon to be named to head the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). A search committee will soon be announced to fill Goodwin's position, with a psychiatrist preferred. Rex Cowdry will fill in as Acting Director in the meantime.

NIH FORUM LOOKS AT TB AND SOCIAL SCIENCE *EH*

At a recent National Institutes of Health (NIH) forum, Miles Braun of the Environmental Studies Section of the National Cancer Institute, presented "Epidemiology of Tuberculosis and HIV Infection: At the Crossroads of Social Science and Medicine" to a multi-disciplinary gathering organized by NIH's Health and Behavior Coordinating Committee. Braun's presentation was the second in a series entitled "Behavioral Science and the TB Epidemic."

Incidence of active TB has increased in the U.S. in recent years, a trend unforeseen and expected to continue, particularly among those with suppressed immunity such as HIV-infected individuals. Braun estimated that 5 percent of current AIDS patients in the U.S. develop TB, an illness which first became an AIDS-defining diagnosis in 1987. That number is expected to increase, he said. As in the demography of AIDS, the incidence of TB is highest among African-Americans, followed by Hispanics, and lastly, Whites.

Possible approaches to stemming a potential TB outbreak discussed at the NIH forum included environmental prevention strategies such as improved ventilation and ultraviolet light in hospitals, prisons, shelters, and out-patient drug treatment centers, the present loci for much TB transmission. Braun also emphasized the importance of close monitoring of TB patient therapy to ensure completion of what is a long and difficult medical regimen. To date, social and behavioral science concerns regarding TB's resurgence have been largely overlooked in favor of "molecular biology" research, Braun said.

For more information, contact Alan Trachtenberg of NIH at (301) 443-6071.

COSSA SEMINAR LOOKS AT CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH *MS*

COSSA and the American Society of Criminology (ASC) co-sponsored a February 4 breakfast seminar, *A Menaced Society Is the Crime Bill the Answer?* The event was held in the Rayburn House Office Building and attracted over 90 congressional and federal agency officials to hear leading experts examine crime in America and research results that can better inform crime and criminal justice policy.

After brief welcoming remarks by COSSA Executive Director Howard J. Silver, the moderator of the event, Freda Adler, Distinguished Professor Criminal Justice at Rutgers University and President-Elect of the ASC, gave a brief overview of the role of crime and criminal justice research. She spoke of 1994 as "an auspicious moment" in American history, with growing levels of public outrage over crime, proposed sweeping anti-crime legislation, and the prominent role of crime in President Clinton's State of the Union address. Adler said "nobody knows for sure" whether the Senate crime bill will work, adding that most of its provisions are untested by the scientific community. She said that the bill's provisions for more police, boot camps, and strict sentences are "very expensive strategies and need to be evaluated." In setting the tone for the seminar, Adler urged a "calm, level-headed, scientific analysis" of these issues.

Questions "Intuitive, Reflexive" Strategies

Jerome H. Skolnick, Claire Clements Dean's Professor Law (Jurisprudence and Social Policy) at the University of California, Berkeley and current

ASC President, sought to question "intuitive, reflexive" crime control strategies and highlight the differences between retribution and crime prevention. He noted surveys showing that violent crime peaks at age 17 and is half as prevalent at 24, saying that from a prevention perspective, we need to address crime by those in the high crime cohort. Skolnick added that since over half of all violent offenders are under the influence of alcohol and drugs at the time of their arrest, drug treatment needs to be a key component of our correctional system. He cited research on crime patterns, and observed that violent, random crime is what drives public fear, even in jurisdictions where crime rates tend to be low or declining. "Fear of crime is perceptual," Skolnick said.

Skolnick said that the Senate crime bill attempts to address the large numbers of young, violent offenders, but "stumbles with its rigidified sentencing system. By incarcerating large number of young offenders without parole and often without rehabilitation, "you've bought into the most expensive taxpayer-supported middle and old age home in the history of the world," he declared. Skolnick used drug dealing as an example of the ineffectiveness of tough sentencing, saying that those engaged in drug selling do not make rational calculations and "live in a world that is already more threatening than any prison and continually threatens street imposed death penalties."

Skolnick concluded by telling the gathering: "We must distinguish between the urge to be retributive and the strategies and tactics of crime prevention. The criminal law is a blunt and largely ineffectual instrument of public protection. It deters some, it does incapacitate others, and it surely punishes. But if we are concerned primarily with public safety and crime prevention we need a larger strategic vision and tactics that have been researched and tested."

Boot Camps Evaluated

Doris MacKenzie, Research Scholar in the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology at the University of Maryland, College Park, discussed boot camps as a specific example of crime control mechanisms under consideration by policy-makers. Outlining her research on the topic, MacKenzie said "it is not an easy question" to say if boot camps are effective and gave an overview of the goals and differences of programs. The two main goals, she said, are to make changes in offenders and to reduce prison overcrowding. The programs tend to

target young, non-violent offenders and run from between 90 to 180 days in facilities ranging from 36 to 1,500 beds. Some states have separate camps for women. The core components of boot camps are: a military atmosphere, drill and ceremony, physical training, and hard labor. Key differences are: type of rehabilitation programs, level of decision making given to offenders, type of release supervision, voluntary versus involuntary stay, and the location of the camps.

According to MacKenzie, researchers seek answers to the following questions when studying boot camps: Do they deter crime?; Rehabilitate offenders?; Reduce recidivism? Reduce prison crowding?; Change young offenders? She said boot camps started in 1983 in Oklahoma and Georgia and have spread rapidly at the state and local level, with a few federal facilities as well. Her own research on measuring recidivism shows it varies with the how one defines recidivism, type of offenders in the camps, drop-out rates, length of program, and levels of rehabilitation. MacKenzie said that the biggest influence on reducing prison overcrowding is whether those in boot camps would have been sent to prison if the camps had not existed. This varies greatly from state to state, she said.

In her conclusion, MacKenzie said that boot camps are still experimental, some positive things do occur in some programs, careful designs can reduce prison overcrowding if they are part of an early release mechanism, and that the programs currently in effect have a "questionable impact" on recidivism and other activities after release. Saying, "I wouldn't throw them out," MacKenzie said that the issue needs further evaluation with an emphasis on looking at the specifics of different programs.

Police Research Needs Highlighted

Hubert Williams, President of the Police Foundation and former Director of Police in Newark, New Jersey, addressed the gathering on the importance of research in policing from a practitioner's perspective. He noted that the education levels of police have rapidly increased, and that the police community has begun to take a positive view of and implement the findings of research. Williams urged a major evaluation of crime in America and the effectiveness of our efforts to fight it, saying "we need to know what works and what doesn't."

He noted the effect of an early study showing that motorized police patrols did not work because the officers were viewed as too distant and were not noticed by the public. Following up on this study, Williams said, the National Institute of Justice undertook a study in Newark showing that foot patrols did not affect crime rates, but made people feel safer. This study, he commented, led police leaders to observe that maybe police have an impact that is not related to stopping or preventing crime. According to Williams, police officials learned from researchers that citizens feel safer when police are engaged in a type of policing that is interactive, positive, and non-threatening. He said it reduces fear and enhances the public's perception of police.

Williams called up on researchers to help future policing strategies by studying and evaluating community oriented policing. He urged a study of ways to eliminate "hierarchal, quasi-military" models of police structure and to empower police with the resources needed to interact with the community. Lamenting that this vision goes against long traditions in police work, Williams spoke of the need to "tailor police strategies to diverse populations -- old strategies won't work anymore." Specifically addressing the Senate crime bill, Williams urged research on how to most effectively use the 100,000 new police officers called for in the crime bill.

"Tough is Smart" Assumption Challenged

Adler offered brief concluding and synthesizing remarks, commenting that the Senate crime bill is based on the assumption that "tough is smart" and that this has not been validated by research. She lamented that the bill does not rely on science, and urged the House to add research and evaluation mandates to the bill. Adler concluded that the criminological community stands ready to help policy-makers in their anti-crime efforts.

A lively question and answer period followed, with discussion on evaluation research, gun control, and sentencing patterns.

For more information on the breakfast seminar, contact Michael Buckley, COSSA Assistant Director for Public Affairs, 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
Law and Society Association
Linguistic Society of America

AFFILIATES

American Agricultural Economics Association
American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business
American Association for Public Opinion Research
American Council on Consumer Interests
American Educational Research Association
American Society of Criminology
Association for Asian Studies
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
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
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
Criminal Justice Center, Sam Houston State University
Duke University
Emory University
University of Georgia
Harvard University

University of Illinois
Indiana University
Institute for Social Research, University of
Michigan
Institute for Women's Policy Research
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
