

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume XIV, Number 5

March 20, 1995

HOUSE CRIME BILL INCLUDES RESEARCH AND EVALUATION AMENDMENT MB

On February 13 the House of Representatives adopted an amendment, promoted by COSSA and its allies, to the House crime bill that allocates funding to research and evaluate anti-crime programs.

The amendment, co-sponsored by Rep. Henry Hyde (R-IL) and Rep. Robert Scott (D-VA) would reserve three percent (\$60 million) of the bill's \$2 billion per year Law Enforcement Block Grants to states and localities for "studying the overall effectiveness and efficiency" of crime control strategies as well as overseeing compliance with other provisions of the block grants. If the Senate adopts similar provisions and they are signed into law, the National Institute of Justice could receive increased funding for its research and evaluation activities.

Speaking on the House floor on behalf of the amendment, Scott said: "We are going to spend \$30 billion fighting crime in these various bills. This amendment will ensure that that money is well spent. It provides for the evaluation of programs, which is extremely important so that other localities may get the benefit of the experience from some programs that work, and unfortunately, some programs that do not work."

Hyde, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, said that the bi-partisan nature of the amendment united his concerns about the need to oversee local governments' compliance with the block grant requirements and Scott's commitment to the importance of studying the effectiveness of anti-crime efforts.

The successful House vote came on the heels of a February 2 vote by the Judiciary Committee to reject a Scott amendment to provide \$25 million annually over the next five year to the National Institute of Justice for research and evaluation. (see *Update*, February 6)

(continued on page four)

CONGRESS TO NSF: PONDER A 20 PERCENT CUT HS

At a recent congressional hearing, NSF Director Neal Lane was asked what the Foundation would do if it received a 20 percent reduction in its next budget. Lane responded by telling the appropriators that they would "see a very different NSF."

As budgetary constraints tighten, appropriations hearings get shorter. The National Science Foundation appeared before the Senate and House VA, HUD, Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittees on March 10 and 14 respectively. The Senate hearing lasted about an hour, the House hearing a little longer, both a far cry from the protracted meetings of years past. During the course of the hearings, members of Congress emphasized the difficult budget situation. Rep. Jerry Lewis (R-CA), Chairman of the House Subcommittee, put it bluntly by asking, somewhat hypothetically, what NSF would do if it received a 20 percent reduction in its Fiscal Year 1996 budget. A cut of that magnitude in the current NSF budget would amount to close to \$650 million. NSF Director Lane asserted that this would clearly cause "a major change in the nature of NSF and what it does," but he did not provide any details.

Lewis pointed out that NSF had received a one-third billion dollar increase over the past three years. Given the current great pressure to reduce budgets, science is often an easy target, he said, since its payoffs are often in the future. However, the

(continued on page six)

INSIDE UPDATE...

- House Cuts Research, Education Funds
- Contract With America Targets Research on Minors
- Wolpert Represents COSSA before House Panel
- COSSA Testifies Before Agriculture Committee
- NSF Announces Civil Infrastructure Grants

HOUSE CUTS RESEARCH, EDUCATION FUNDS HS

On March 16 the House of Representatives cut \$17.3 billion from previously appropriated Fiscal Year 1995 spending, an action that affects federal research and education programs. The budget cuts, known as rescissions, will offset the supplemental appropriations to pay for last year's disasters in California and will also be used to reduce the deficit.

The rescissions are targeted at many of the small categorical programs that President Clinton's proposed FY 1996 budget seeks to eliminate (see *Update*, March 6). The Department of Education lost significant funding for the Goals 2000 program, but the bulk of that program survives. By contrast, rescinding FY 1995 funding for such programs as the Law School Clinical Program, Harris and Javits graduate fellowships, Chapter 1 evaluation, Faculty Development fellowships, and Library Research and Demonstrations, will effectively kill them. In eliminating a number of the small research and evaluation programs outside the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, the House suggested that they should be absorbed by OERI, however funding for them was not transferred.

An attempt to reduce funding for veterans' programs met defeat on the House floor. The \$206 million cut was restored at the expense of the National Service Program. Other programs affected include:

research and evaluation at the Employment and Training Administration (-\$3 million); Agency for Health Care Policy and Research (-\$3 million); research at the Health Care Financing Administration (- \$11 million); National Endowment for the Humanities (-\$5 million); Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars (-\$2 million); National Biological Survey (-\$17 million), research at the Environmental Protection Agency (-14 million); and Drug Courts (-\$27 million).

The National Science Foundation lost \$132 million from its Facilities Modernization account. These were the funds appropriated on a contingency basis in FY 1995, assuming the President would ask for \$250 million for this program in FY 1996. Since this did not happen, the rescission became somewhat automatic. The program still has \$118 million for FY 1995.

Major cuts came from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (-\$7.2 billion), and the Job Training Programs at the Department of Labor (-\$2.3 billion). The total reduction for the Education Department was \$1.5 billion.

The version will have to be reconciled with a Senate bill that will be marked up on March 27.

CONTRACT WITH AMERICA TARGETS RESEARCH ON MINORS SP

A provision in the Republicans' Contract With America that seeks written parental consent for research in broad categories of studies involving minors was the subject of a March 16 House hearing. The hearing examined legislation that seeks to broaden the scope of a 1994 amendment that impedes school-based research.

The House Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology heard testimony on Title IV, the "Family Privacy Protection" provision, of H.R. 11, the Family Reinforcement Act. This legislation would require explicit written parental permission for eight categories of research questions involving minors.

The purpose of the new legislation is to "safeguard the primacy of parents' authority,"

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

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

President: Charles Schultze

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 \$65; institutional subscriptions, \$130, overseas mail, \$130. 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

according to Subcommittee Chair Stephen Horn (R-CA), who holds a Ph.D. in political science. He said that the bill "attempts to achieve the right balance between government power and individual rights... and would emphasize and recognize parents' role in keeping families strong." The categories of research questions that would require written parental consent include any survey, analysis, or evaluation that reveals information concerning:

- 1) parental political affiliations;
- 2) mental or psychological problems potentially embarrassing to the minor or his family;
- 3) sexual behavior or attitudes;
- 4) illegal, anti-social, self-incriminating, or demeaning behavior;
- 5) appraisals of other individuals with whom the minor has a familial relationship;
- 6) relationships that are legally recognized as privileged, such as those with lawyers, physicians, and members of the clergy;
- 7) the minor's household income, other than information required by law to determine eligibility for participation in a program or for receiving financial assistance from a program;
- 8) religious beliefs.

The lead witness at the hearing, Senator Charles Grassley (R-IA), told the House panel "we should not place a child in a compulsory atmosphere in the position of having to determine what is private information and if he should reveal it. These are adult decisions to make. That is why the choice in this language is specifically and deliberately placed in the hand of parents." Comparing H.R. 11 to his 1994 amendment to the Goals 2000 bill, he said, "I am pleased that the committee has decided to make this language apply in all federally funded programs. Many of the offensive surveys come out of the Departments of Health and Human Services, Justice or Centers for Disease Control. By covering all agencies, you guarantee family privacy protection." Title IV would also apply to all federally funded entities, including States, cities, research institutes and universities. Grassley did not address the barriers to research nor the risks to children's safety that opponents of the legislation articulated.

Matthew Hilton, a Utah attorney and an authority on family privacy issues, spoke in favor of the bill, saying it would protect family privacy and autonomy. Hilton recommended that the legislation include "basic

factual or policy findings to justify the family privacy protections." He offered language to help clarify the intent of the legislation, and gave several reasons why protecting family privacy and autonomy is a compelling interest of government. One reason he cited was "the rights that are present in a parent-child relationship in a family unit are presumed to be an inherent and inalienable right."

Opponents Cite Research Burdens, Unintended Consequences

Testifying against the legislation, Sally Katzen, Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs at the Office of Management and the Budget, said that unintended consequences of this legislation would put children at risk and would jeopardize important areas of research. Stressing that the Clinton administration "recognizes and endorses the legitimate role of parental involvement in research activities," she argued that requiring written parental consent for research in cases involving family violence and abuse as well as homeless and runaway youth would place children at risk and create a barrier to research efforts. Routine law enforcement investigations of crimes against children might also be impeded by this bill, she said. Katzen stated that it is "standard practice in most social science research today to require some form of parental consent before interviewing minors." As most surveys and evaluations are conducted anonymously with no personal information that would identify the minor and family, she said the amendment is unnecessary.

William T. Butz, the Census Bureau's Associate Director of Demographic Programs, urged the subcommittee to reexamine the requirement for written consent because "there are occasions when other forms of consent, or no consent, are entirely appropriate." He concurred with Katzen, saying that "there are circumstances where obtaining written consent would be infeasible or might put a child at risk." He faulted the bill for its unclear language, citing the lack of a definition for "minor" as well as what is meant by words such as "anti-social," and "demeaning."

Social psychologist Lloyd D. Johnston of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, and director of "Monitoring the Future," a survey that provides information about adolescent drug use and other things, assured the panel that there

are "more than adequate safeguards in place to protect the privacy of minors and their families." He explained how a broad requirement for written parental consent for research on minors would result in low response rates that would invalidate research findings. Perhaps most relevant to the deliberations on this issue, Johnston reported, is that "extremely few parents object to their children participating in legitimate, established research surveys, on the order of only one to four percent." Johnston also highlighted the burden that would be placed on school administrators and parents as a result of this legislation. "Because schools cannot release parent's names, addresses, or telephone numbers to researchers, [schools] must assume the burden of obtaining the written consent, often requiring up to four contacts, and bothering a great many parents in the process." The follow-up efforts are time-consuming and costly and will "substantially raise the cost of research," according to Johnston.

Pressure from the House Republican leadership to enact all Contract provisions within the first 100 days of the 104th Congress has placed H.R. 11 on a fast track. Horn's subcommittee and the full Government Reform and Oversight Committee may each vote on the legislation as early as the week of March 20.

HOUSE ADOPTS CRIME RESEARCH AMENDMENT

(continued from page one)

Wilson Advocates Research Provisions in Senate Bill

Testifying at February 14 hearing held by the Senate Judiciary Committee, James Q. Wilson, professor at UCLA's Graduate School of Management, called for a similar research allocation in the Senate's anti-crime package, which will be voted on in early April. "Social science can bring to the table... the method for finding out what works" in the area of crime, he told the panel, chaired by Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-UT).

He urged a joint effort by the National Institute of Justice, the National Science Foundation, and the National Academy of Sciences to significantly expand the base of knowledge of crime and criminal justice issues. Wilson said that if the small level of funding

for justice research existed in areas such as AIDS or cancer, it would be "a national scandal."

In response to a question about the appropriate federal role in the area of crime, he cited research and development and prisons, with all other responsibilities more appropriate for states. He lamented that the scope of research and development similar to businesses investigating markets and products does not exist on crime. He said the federal government should have a "Hewlett-Packard laboratory of crime research"

Commenting on the National Institute of Justice and its Director, Jeremy Travis, Wilson labeled NIJ "a pathetic little agency... eight levels down at the Justice Department and only occasionally has it had a decent director, and now is such a time."

Senator Joseph Biden (D-DE), the ranking Democrat on the panel, praised Wilson, saying "I have read everything you have written." The Senator expressed his support for the "pathetically underfunded NIJ," which he said provided "an excellent example of federalism... it [research] is a legitimate federal function."

WOLPERT REPRESENTS COSSA BEFORE HOUSE PANEL *HS*

Affirming the importance of basic research, particularly in the social, behavioral, and economic sciences, geographer Julian Wolpert testified on behalf of COSSA before a House subcommittee examining the National Science Foundation. Wolpert's March 2 appearance before the House Science Committee's Basic Research Subcommittee marked the third straight year in which COSSA has been invited by a congressional panel to testify on NSF's reauthorization. In 1993 William Julius Wilson of the University of Chicago presented COSSA's views to the House Science Committee, and last year COSSA Executive Director Howard J. Silver appeared before a similar panel in the Senate.

Wolpert, the Henry G. Bryant Professor of Geography, Urban Planning and Urban Affairs at the Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University, a former President of the Association of American Geographers, and a current member of the Advisory Committee of NSF's Social, Behavioral and Economic

Science Directorate (SBE), joined representatives of engineering and mathematics societies, and the Council of Scientific Society Presidents, appearing before the newly created panel, chaired by Rep. Steve Schiff (R-NM).

Wolpert told the Subcommittee that "enhancing the status and funding for the SBE Directorate are the primary goals for COSSA in the NSF reauthorization." He also declared that "the principal purpose of the NSF must remain supporting basic research and developing scientific talent." To illustrate how basic research in the social sciences impacts policymakers, Wolpert cited the example of the Federal Communications Commission's recent auction to award licenses for use of the electromagnetic spectrum for new services. Basic research in game theory, computational and experimental economics helped design the auction. He also noted the importance of the large social science data collections such as the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, the General Social Survey, and the National Election Studies.

Demonstrating the integral role for the social and behavioral sciences in NSF's activities, Wolpert told the Subcommittee that SBE participates in all seven areas identified as strategic research initiatives, more than any other research directorate. In addition, SBE has developed its own efforts in cooperation with the other directorates in human capital, global change and the environment, violence, transformations to quality organizations, cognitive science, democratization, and human genetic diversity.

Wolpert reiterated COSSA's opposition to a NSF-only facilities program that would shift funds from basic research; instead he supported increased funding for instrumentation in the SBE sciences. He concluded by advocating for an integrated science policy that included "significant investments to explain the behaviors of human beings as they interact with each other and with their social, political, economic and technological environment." Furthermore, since NSF remains a vital actor in funding research in the SBE sciences, Wolpert urged the Committee to authorize sufficient funds "to carry out these important activities for the nation."

During the question and answer session, Chairman Schiff noted that he once had to defend himself against his physicist brother who denigrated his undergraduate

major, political science, as a science. Schiff agreed with Wolpert's assertion that political science has become "a very rigorous, hard science." Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee (D-TX) also noted her political science degree and agreed with the chairman and Wolpert. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-CA) expressed interest in the SBE sponsored Center on Violence Research.

Rep. Sherwood Boehlert (R-NY), as he has so often in recent years, pressured representatives of higher education to defend themselves regarding the instruction of undergraduates. Specifically, Boehlert cited the lack of attention by senior professors who, in pursuing research dollars, leave the instruction process to graduate teaching assistants. A recent report on *60 Minutes*, using the University of Arizona as an example of this practice, formed the backdrop for this discussion. Wolpert noted that policymakers exaggerate the distinction between teaching and research. He also criticized their attempts to mandate time professors must spend with undergraduates.

NSF Reauthorization Hearing

At a February 22 hearing of the Basic Research Subcommittee to explore NSF's reauthorization, Boehlert raised the issue with NSF Director Neal Lane, who stressed that NSF tries its best in this area but that the highly competitive nature of the research support game and the reward structure of universities create difficulties. Boehlert asked for specific measures indicating the success of NSF programs that seek a more direct connection between teaching and research. Subcommittee Chairman Schiff inquired whether NSF's responsibility for supporting math and science education leads to budget constraints on the research budget. Lane suggested that education is a key component of NSF's mission and that tradeoffs are often necessary.

During this hearing, House Science Committee Chairman, Rep. Robert Walker (R-PA) again reiterated his commitment to support the basic research NSF funds, but warned about the ramifications on all federal agencies of the commitment to a balanced budget. Responding to Walker's concern that NSF has moved toward supporting applied research, Lane asserted that NSF's continued emphasis on basic research in strategic areas stressed interdisciplinary inquiries rooted in the contributions made by fundamental research in disciplinary based investigations. Schiff stated that

one should think of basic and applied research as part of a continuum. Lane agreed and argued that NSF supported very little applied research, most of it in the congressionally mandated Small Business Innovation Research program.

Rep. Joe Barton (R-TX) raised the issue of a new Department of Science and Technology that would include NSF. Alternatively, Barton also proposed enlarging NSF by giving it responsibility for energy research (on the assumption that the Energy Department would be abolished) and all math and science education programs (on the assumption that the Education Department would be abolished). Lane declined comment in the open session, and offered to respond in writing for the panel.

The Subcommittee's Ranking member Rep. Pete Geren (D-TX) noted his continued interest in expanding funding for a Facilities Modernization program and his distress that the administration had not met the requirements for achieving such a program in FY 1996 (see page two). Lane, as he has in the past, stuck to the notion that any enlarged program would have to exist across agencies and be coordinated by the National Science and Technology Council.

NSF ASKED TO PONDER A REDUCED BUDGET

(continued from page one)

Chairman also warned that undue cutting of science "could easily lead to serious errors."

As has occurred at each NSF congressional hearing this year, members inquired about the Foundation's education programs and whether they duplicated the programs of the Department of Education. Lane used phrases such as "catalytic," "careful investment," "experimentation," "ideas from the community," to distinguish NSF's programs from a Department targeted for elimination by some members of Congress.

Unlike previous years, the House did not examine the budget by asking about specific items proposed for each NSF directorate, but jumped around on a series of topics. Questions focused on program evaluations for items such as the Science and Technology

Centers, Supercomputer Centers, EPSCOR, and education and human resource programs. Members of the Subcommittee also asked about NSF's relationships with other federal agencies and what would happen should their budgets get trimmed. Lane responded that, as an example, further reductions in the Defense Department budget would cause difficulties for NSF's Antarctic and Polar Programs.

Mikulski: No "research for the sake of research"

On the Senate side, former Chair and now Ranking Democratic member, Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), expressed her continued support for research related to national goals and competitiveness. She declared that "research for the sake of research" is out, and took credit for moving NSF in the direction of supporting basic research in strategic areas. She also announced that it was time "for a new state of mind" at academic institutions that will break down disciplinary barriers and help a new generation of students find twenty-first century jobs. Furthermore, Mikulski pressed for evaluations and assessments of the older strategic research areas, such as global change.

Subcommittee Chair Sen. Christopher 'Kit' Bond (R-MO) appeared interested in the question of whether industry representatives should sit on peer review panels, especially in the area of risk assessment. Sen. Conrad Burns (R-MT), a member of the appropriations subcommittee, also chairs the Science, Space, and Technology Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, and will play a significant role in NSF's reauthorization. He asked about EPSCOR, telecommunications, and high performance computing, all important issues to Montana.

Committee members asked no questions about NSF's social, behavioral and economic science programs in either hearing. Given the brevity of the open sessions, NSF will have to respond to many congressional inquiries in writing.

Whether the 20 percent reduction becomes a reality, may depend on how far Congress wants to go on deficit reduction and tax cuts. It will also depend on the ability of scientists to make their case about the importance of investing in the future.

BARRY TESTIFIES TO AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE *AS*

Peter Barry, Past President of the American Agricultural Economics Association (AAEA), represented COSSA before the House Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA and Related Agencies Subcommittee on February 22. Appearing before new Chairman Rep. Joe Skeen (R-NM), Barry urged full funding for the National Research Initiative Competitive Grants Program (NRI). His testimony was echoed by groups representing universities, biologists, and nutritionists.

The President has requested \$130 million for FY 1996 funding for the NRI; a large increase of 26 percent and a tough sell in these constrained budget times. Uniquely in the hearing, Barry called for appropriating the requested level of \$6.5 million for the Markets, Trade and Rural Development component of the NRI and increasing the integration of social and economic dimensions into the other components of the NRI. In addition, he also endorsed changing the name of NRI's social science program to Economic and Social Issues to broaden the range of problems that it can address.

Barry explained that funding social science research in agriculture was important for four reasons: social scientists can clarify and measure the "so what" of science; researchers can help define more cost effective ways to solve rural problems; economics, sociology and the other social sciences are essential to understanding, measuring and fostering the long term competitiveness of U.S. agriculture; and social science research focuses on compelling public needs as contrasted with research that serves a few limited private interests.

Concluding his testimony, Barry described the social science agricultural and rural development research structure in the U.S. as a system with mutual reinforcement, communication and collaboration. Working with the land grant university system and through special grants for rural development and public policy research centers, the system leverages the NRI's federal funding. Barry also reminded the Committee to continue funding for the important staff support and research capability within the government provided by the Economic Research Service.

Chairman Skeen expressed interest in the dissemination of research results and studies examining grazing fees on western lands alluded to by Barry in his testimony. Barry told the Chairman that the AAEA publication *Choices*, which Skeen recognized, was a major dissemination tool for social science research in rural areas and that its latest issue described the grazing fee research. Lawrence Libby, current President of AAEA, collaborated with Barry in writing the testimony.

NSF ANNOUNCES CIVIL INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS *KC*

The National Science Foundation has announced a proposed competition for innovative, interdisciplinary research into intelligent renewal and public policy decision making for the nation's civil infrastructure systems (CIS). The competition includes opportunities for research on systematic change as well as unsolicited proposals.

Proposals for research on Systemic Change in Urban Infrastructure should include a systems integration perspective and an implementation approach to public policy formation, including the perspectives of engineers as well as the public owners and government agencies. Undergraduate and graduate students will participate in the research, and any successful proposal will include a commitment to work toward a well-educated and diverse workforce which can manage civil infrastructure-related issues in technical, socio-economic and political areas.

In addition, unsolicited proposals will be accepted from researchers and research teams to address four identified civil infrastructure systems research thrust areas of: deterioration science, assessment technologies, renewal engineering, and institutional effectiveness and productivity.

The deadline for application is **May 15, 1995**. NSF is dedicating \$3 million for this initiative, with awards ranging from \$250,000 to \$1 million for a three duration.

For more information on program announcement NSF 95-52, "Civil Infrastructure Systems: An Integrative Research Program," contact NSF at (703) 306-1361.

MEMBERS

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

American Psychological Association
American Society of Criminology
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
Association for Asian Studies
Association for Public Policy
Analysis and Management
Association of Research Libraries
Eastern Sociological Society

History of Science Society
International Studies Association
Midwest Sociological Society
National Council on Family Relations
North American Regional Science Council
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 Sexuality
Sociologists for Women in Society
Southern Sociological Society
Southwestern Social Science Association
Speech Communication Association

CONTRIBUTORS

American Council of Learned Societies
American Institutes for Research
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
Clark University
University of Colorado
Columbia University
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 the Advancement of
Social Work Research
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
Nelson Rockefeller Institute of Government
New York University

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
North Carolina State University
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
University of Oregon
Pennsylvania State University
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, N.W., Suite 836, Washington, D.C. 20005
