

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume X, Number 12

June 24, 1991

SCIENCE BOARD REVIEWS SEPS DIRECTORATE *HS*

"The division of the directorate makes perfect sense," Peter Raven, Director of the Missouri Botanical Gardens, told his fellow members of the National Science Board (NSB) at its meeting on June 20. Raven argued that there was "no real reason to continue the marriage" between the biologists and the social/behavioral sciences that currently exists in the BBS directorate at the National Science Foundation (NSF).

Raven, a former chairman of the BBS Advisory Committee, was supported by NSB member James Duderstadt, President of the University of Michigan. Duderstadt noted that the move for a SEPS directorate was a "grass roots driven proposal," and also suggested that a separate directorate was consistent with most academic structures.

Raven's arguments followed a presentation of the conclusions of the BBS Task Force "Looking to the Twenty First Century," by its chairman, Pete Magee, Dean of Biological Sciences at the University of Minnesota. Magee was introduced by Mary Clutter, current Assistant Director for BBS. Magee told the NSB of his own transformation from skeptic to firm believer in the recommendation "that two distinct directorates be established," one devoted to research in the biological sciences (BIO) and the other to the social, economic and psychological sciences (SEPS). The Task Force chairman noted that there have been four meetings of the Task Force and mentioned the particular importance of the testimony from the scientific community during two days of hearings last November.

Mixed Reaction by NSB

The reaction of the rest of the NSB varied. Some members expressed concern over the administrative costs of establishing the SEPS directorate, and Sandra Toye, comptroller of NSF, was asked to determine those costs. Others asked questions about congressional reaction. Charles Hosler, Acting Provost and Senior Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School at Penn

State, wondered whether the Congress would earmark increased funds for the SEPS.

The lone social scientist on the NSB, Hoover Institute counselor W. Glen Campbell asked about the breakdown of current funds in BBS. Clutter responded that Social and Economic Science received \$39.1 million, Behavioral Sciences received \$32.0 million and Biological Sciences \$244.3 million. This led to inquiries as to whether establishing SEPS was simply a grab for more money. Alternatively, some expressed doubts that SEPS could be viable as a directorate with such a small amount of funds.

Others asked about the SEPS need for "protection" from political and budgetary attack. Magee responded that the Task Force had dealt with this issue and declared it was "not compelling," since the SEPS did not exactly prosper under the "protection" of the biologists.

Where anthropology fit into the two directorates was also discussed, and Magee noted the disagreements within the anthropology community. Raven argued that they belonged in the SEPS directorate, while Hosler was not so sure.

Massey Raises Questions

Walter Massey, the Director of NSF, who will ultimately make the decision about whether to

INSIDE UPDATE...

- ADAMHA Reorganization Plan Revealed: Research to NIH *JA*
- COSSA Testifies at NIH Women's Health Meeting *JA*
- Law Schools' Director Urges House Panel to Back Professional Education *MB*
- Research Community Concerned about Recent Supreme Court Ruling *JA*
- Yeltsin Visit, Soviet Aid Plans Bring Leading Scholars before Congress *MB*
- Sources of Research Support: Department of Education *KE*

establish SEPS, also raised some questions. Suggesting he still had an open mind on the issue, Massey noted that much of the Task Force report discussed the need for greater interdisciplinary research and cooperation. He thought, therefore, that dividing the directorate would not be the logical conclusion. Magee responded that the Task Force concluded that interdisciplinary work was not dependent on being in the same directorate. Raven echoed this in his remarks, noting that there is probably more interdisciplinary work in bio-chemistry than in bio-SEPS, and biology and chemistry are currently in separate NSF directorates.

Massey also noted the division within the BBS advisory committee, as reflected in its statement circulated to the Board (see UPDATE, June 10). Clutter did point out that the advisory committee's lone social scientist was not present during the drafting of the statement. (The advisory committee's lone behavioral scientist, out of nine members, was present and ensured that the statement included the notion that there was some support for the separation.)

The NSF director concluded the discussion by saying that there remained a number of factors that he needs to consider in determining whether to implement the Task Force recommendation. He acknowledged the strong support for SEPS among many in the social and behavioral science community. Massey wondered about the implications for other NSF programs and how this restructuring might affect other management questions facing the Foundation.

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

Executive Director:	Howard J. Silver
Government Liaison:	Judy Auerbach
Staff Associate:	Michael Buckley
Office Manager:	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.

ADAMHA REORGANIZATION PROPOSED: RESEARCH TO NIH AND CAN YOU SAY "ADAMHSA"?

On June 17, Dr. Louis Sullivan, Secretary of Health and Human Services, announced the Bush administration's proposal for the reorganization of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA). While rumors of impending change at ADAMHA had been flying around Washington for months, details of the administration's proposal, which involves splitting the research and services components of the agency, appeared only within the last week, and things have been moving quickly ever since.

In cooperation with Dr. Sullivan and other officials in the administration who deal with substance abuse and mental health, Senators Edward Kennedy (D-MA) and Orrin Hatch (R-UT) introduced legislation (S.1306) on June 17 to implement the ADAMHA reorganization. In a statement accompanying the bill, Kennedy explained that the motive behind the legislation was the belief that HHS could "better fulfill its responsibilities in the fields of mental health and substance abuse if the research and service programs now administered by ADAMHA were separated." Arguing that "researchers and service providers share a common goal but they speak a different language and thrive in different professional cultures," Kennedy noted that service providers long have felt that service programs at ADAMHA have been "implemented with an undue emphasis on research."

The legislation, which closely parallels the administration's proposal, transfers the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) where they will continue as research-only institutes. The other units currently comprising ADAMHA--the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention and the Office of Treatment Improvement--would be reorganized along with a new mental health services component into the new Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Services Administration, or ADAMHSA.

Peer Review Councils to NIH

The peer review processes and advisory councils now utilized by NIAAA, NIDA, and NIMH at ADAMHA will be transferred to NIH. Services research that is statutorily authorized (much of

which is behavioral) will also be transferred to NIH; but ADAMHA programs that have been called "services research" but are more accurately "services" (and are not statutorily authorized) will remain at ADAMHSA.

Other provisions in the legislation require the Secretary to establish Mental Health and Substance Abuse Education programs, and encourage the Secretary to establish National Substance Abuse Research Centers for interdisciplinary research "relating to substance abuse and other biomedical, behavioral, and social issues."

Kennedy stated that, by placing NIAAA, NIDA, and NIMH at NIH, "Congress will be affirming the status of mental illness and substance abuse as diseases." And, following all good medical models, his legislation includes a provision to establish a new Medications Development Division at NIDA, which would promote the development of anti-addiction medications for substance abuse "diseases."

Research Community Unsure

While service providers seem to be lining up in support of the legislation (and the administration's proposal), researchers haven't made up their minds. Of deepest concern to the social and behavioral science community is the question of whether the new NIH institutes will continue the level of support for social and behavioral research that currently exists at ADAMHA. Language in the Kennedy-Hatch bill states that the research programs of all three new institutes are to include the "broadest possible participation of professionals and paraprofessionals in the fields of medicine, science, the social sciences and related disciplines." Furthermore, the bill instructs intramural research programs related to mental health and substance abuse to include "biomedical, epidemiological, and social research." But given NIH's history of limited support for social and behavioral research, many people remain concerned that the social and behavioral sciences will lose out in the transfer.

Waxman and Dingell Voice Doubts

This concern has been expressed by Rep. Henry Waxman (D-CA), chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, which has jurisdiction over NIH and ADAMHA, and Rep. John Dingell (D-MI), chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, parent of Waxman's subcommittee. So far, Waxman has held off introducing companion or competing legislation to S.

1306. A hearing on June 20 ostensibly about the reauthorization of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Block Grant program (ADM Block Grant) turned into an opportunity for Waxman to bash the ADAMHA Administrator, Fred Goodwin, for the administration's proposal. Waxman conveyed his dismay that the proposal was introduced before the completion of a National Academy of Sciences study commissioned to assess the value of reorganizing ADAMHA.

In a written statement read in his absence, Dingell noted that he had "yet to hear a reasonable explanation for this reorganization," and expressed concern "about the financial costs and the effects on research and services." He submitted a number of questions to the administration about the reorganization plan, including one about how the social and behavioral sciences will fare under the transfer of the three ADAMHA institutes to NIH.

The Senate bill is moving quickly. The Labor and Human Resources Committee, chaired by Kennedy, will hold a hearing on June 25, and mark-up is expected in mid- to late-July. The committee expects to finish business on the bill before the Congressional recess that begins on August 5.

* If you would like further information about the ADAMHA reorganization proposal, or if you would like to comment on it, please contact COSSA as soon as possible. We plan to submit comments and possibly report language, and need to do so by the first week of July. Input from researchers who have received support from ADAMHA or who have worked with the agency in some other capacity will be much appreciated.

COSSA TESTIFIES AT NIH WOMEN'S HEALTH MEETING

COSSA's government liaison, Judy Auerbach, testified on June 12 at a public meeting of the National Institutes of Health's Task Force on Opportunities for Research on Women's Health. The meeting--at which sixty-three organizations from the research and medical world testified-- was called as part of the Task Force's mandate to develop a "comprehensive biomedical research agenda for women's health for the coming decade."

Reflecting COSSA's ongoing efforts to remind NIH that a truly "comprehensive" agenda on women's health must include social and behavioral, as well as biomedical, perspectives, Auerbach high-

lighted the contributions of research in anthropology, sociology, and psychology. The value of this research, she noted, is in making linkages between social forces, behavior, and health outcomes.

Research Shows Links

Auerbach focused on a few themes in social and behavioral research that make these linkages clearer. From anthropological research, she noted, we have learned that the relationship between human behavior and physical health is a reciprocal one. "The existence of a disease may lead to the adoption of particular health behaviors that enhance or mitigate further illness; and at the same time, the adoption of particular behaviors may lead to the contraction or prevention of disease," Auerbach explained. As an example, she mentioned anthropological research that suggests that the rise of monogamous marriage in many cultures may have resulted from the existence of sexually transmitted diseases, and in turn, may have stemmed the spread of these diseases.

The contextual nature of health status was the second theme Auerbach discussed. She described social-demographic data that show differential decline in smoking behavior over time by gender and social class. These data, said Auerbach, lead to the conclusion that "in addition to establishing a link between smoking and mortality, research must make a link between social class structure and gender role dimensions that support or discourage cigarette smoking."

Gender Role

The gender role itself was the third area of social and behavioral research highlighted by Auerbach. One of the biggest issues in women's health research today, she pointed out, is the extent to which the multiplicity of roles women now experience in family and work life is either beneficial or detrimental to their health. Auerbach noted that sociological and psychological researchers come to different conclusions on this question: "Some argue that women with multiple role obligations are more likely to be sick because of the strain of multiple roles. Others, however, suggest that these very role obligations mitigate illness, if for no other reason than that women are too busy to be sick!" Overall, research on role strain, caregiving burden, and the value of social support to women's mental and physical health has not been adequately supported, said Auerbach.

As a final theme, Auerbach addressed the area of prevention. Arguing that a good portion of prevention is behavioral, she noted that generally, in our race for immediate cures, "too little attention has been placed on understanding the behavioral and social dimensions of health--why people do or do not engage in healthy behaviors." With regard to women, she said, one area of needed research is the extent to which women "defer consideration of their own health status while ensuring the well-being of others."

A "Truly Comprehensive Agenda"

Auerbach concluded her testimony with an appeal for the inclusion of all perspectives--biomedical, social, cultural, and behavioral--in the forging of a "truly comprehensive agenda" on women's health. She argued that women "must be viewed not only as individuals who harbor specific disorders, or a group that suffers common ailments, but also as occupants of a multiplicity of roles defined in particular social and cultural contexts that have significant implications for their health."

LAW SCHOOLS' DIRECTOR URGES HOUSE PANEL TO BACK PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Betsy Levin, Executive Director of the Association of American Law Schools and a former dean of the University of Colorado School of Law, testified before the House Education and Labor Committee's subcommittee on Postsecondary Education on June 13 in support of federal graduate and professional education programs.

Levin appeared before the subcommittee, chaired by Rep. William Ford (D-MI) to express her support for the graduate and professional education provisions of Title IX of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which is currently before Congress for reauthorization. Levin presented her testimony on behalf of the Association of American Law Schools (AALS) and in consultation with the American Bar Association and the Law School Admission Council.

"Legal education serves a national need as well as providing opportunities for individuals, and the federal government must play a critical role in its support," stated Levin, outlining her support of three key programs contained in Title IX.

First, she strongly backed continuation and funding increases for the Law School Clinical Experience Program, which she termed "an invaluable part of the student's training" because it provides hands-on experience in a wide range of legal areas. The administration has proposed eliminating this program.

Second, Levin urged the panel to reauthorize the Assistance for Training in the Legal Profession Program, which aims to prepare economically disadvantaged students and minorities for law school. Administered by the Council on Legal Education Opportunity (CLEO), the program has increased the percentage of lawyers who are members of minority groups from 1% in 1968 to the current figure of 6%, according to Levin. While Levin was quick to add that she believes this figure to still be too low, she told the panel that the program has been a success.

Third, Levin cited the Patricia Roberts Harris Fellowships Program, which she termed an important source of grants to enable minority and disadvantaged students to attend law school. Levin also expressed AALS' concern with the small number of minority faculty members, adding that, "a minority teacher brings a perspective and a presence to the classroom that cannot be acquired by any other means."

Opposes Education Dept. Plan

Levin joined many committee members, including Chairman Ford, and other witnesses in opposing a Department of Education proposal to collapse many graduate and professional education programs into a single National Graduate Fellowships Program. The proposed new structure would provide the Secretary of Education with authority to set annual funding priorities based on national needs. The consensus at the hearing was that such consolidation -- and the discretion it extends to the Department of Education -- would reduce or possibly eliminate funding for federal professional education programs.

RESEARCH COMMUNITY CONCERNED ABOUT IMPLICATIONS OF RECENT SUPREME COURT DECISION

A number of research, science, and arts groups, including COSSA, have met in Washington on an ad hoc basis to discuss their concern about the potential implications on the activities of their con-

stituencies of the recent Supreme Court decision in Rust v. Sullivan. In Rust, the Court upheld the legality of a regulation promulgated by Secretary of Health and Human Services, Louis Sullivan, that prevents any program receiving Title X family planning funds from providing information, counseling or referral services related to abortion. The Court ruled that this regulation did not violate free speech rights (the doctor is still free to counsel about abortion in a non-Title X-funded environment) and did not interfere with the doctor-patient relationship, but instead merely reflected the government's preference for childbearing over abortion. This "viewpoint discrimination" was justified by saying that it was consistent with numerous existing government restrictions on abortion funding.

Even though the Court's decision said that speech restrictions cannot be applied where freedom of expression is the core of a program -- as in universities -- research, science, and arts groups are concerned that the administration might try to extend the viewpoint discrimination principle of Rust to other domains of federal funding when it can be squared with agencies' governing statutes. Specifically, in the Rust decision, the Court made clear that where there is ambiguous language in a governing statute--for example, Title X restricts funding for "abortion as a method of family planning", but says nothing explicitly about abortion counseling or referral--the benefit of the doubt will be given to the agency's interpretation.

Research and arts groups fear that if this principle is extended to other government agencies, those agencies will be given more power to define projects as inappropriate for federal funding, regardless of peer review. Put simply, they fear that the Rust ruling could be used to codify the principle that "he who pays the piper gets to call the tune."

Interested groups have expressed their concerns to the administration and are monitoring its activities for any indications that the Rust decision might be applied more broadly.

YELTSIN VISIT, SOVIET AID PLANS BRING LEADING SCHOLARS BEFORE CONGRESS

Historic events occurring in the Soviet Union and the announcement of the "Great Bargain" -- a package of Western economic assistance in exchange for Soviet economic and political reforms worked out between American and Soviet academics -- have

made the future of U.S.-Soviet relations a hot topic of debate in Washington in recent weeks.

The debate was heard last week in the halls of Congress as the visit of newly-elected Russian President Boris Yeltsin coincided with two key Congressional panels, the Senate Foreign Relations European Affairs Subcommittee, chaired by Sen. Joseph Biden (D-DE) and the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, chaired by Rep. Lee Hamilton (D-IN), which invited leading Soviet scholars to testify on recent developments in the Soviet Union.

"Great Bargain" Authors Testify

At the hearings, Professors Graham Allison and Robert Blackwill of the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University -- leaders of the American delegation that helped design the Great Bargain -- outlined the rationale for their still largely confidential plan of aid in exchange for reform.

Allison told Biden's panel that the central concept of the plan involves long-term strategic interaction and support by the West on a step-by-step basis conditional on USSR taking steps towards democracy and a market-based economy. Citing American interest in Soviet stability and the spread of U.S. values of democracy and capitalism, Allison urged Congress to ask, "how much would it be worth, not how much it would cost."

Blackwill, appearing a day earlier before Hamilton's committee, stated that the pre-eminent U.S. interest should be ensuring that command and control of Soviet nuclear weapons is not lost by the nation falling into turmoil. He added that a stable Soviet Union affects U.S. defense spending levels as well as the outcome of regional conflicts throughout the globe. Blackwill outlined the extent of reforms needed to allow for Western assistance: multi-party democracy with free elections and human rights for all citizens, a federal system of government, private ownership of property, private enterprise, and a liberalization of price controls to allow for the laws of supply and demand to take effect.

Sachs Says Aid Vital

Jeffrey Sachs, Professor of International Trade in the Department of Economics at Harvard, appeared before both committees. Sachs spoke of the vital role of Western aid, stating that an aid package is needed to, "help sustain social consensus"

for reform. He advocated a large scale aid package, arguing that without it reform would be incremental and narrow in scope, leaving the Soviet Union in between economic systems rather than facilitating the creation of a market-based economy. Sachs estimated the "Great Bargain" will cost \$100 billion annually to be financed by the World Bank/IMF, the new European bank, and the nations of the West. He put the annual U.S. share at \$3 billion.

Goldman Critical of Large Aid Plans

Marshall Goldman, Professor of Soviet Economics at Wellesley College, presented a scathing criticism of the plan to Biden's committee. He stated the plan has created false expectations which have drowned out other proposals. Goldman argued that the plan is too large to be manageable and that it is based on the false assumption that the USSR is similar to Eastern Europe, where comparable aid packages have been created. He cited the ethnic and nationalistic strife the Soviets have been experiencing, and the reality that the Eastern European economies needed a "jump start" while the Soviet economy is a "third world economy" requiring a massive revamping.

Goldman viewed as unlikely the Soviet acceptance of the conditionality of the "Great Bargain" and instead told Senators that the West should encourage private investment and the improvement of Soviet agriculture while allowing the Soviets themselves to resolve the nature of their political and economic future before the West undertakes a sizable aid plan.

Both Biden and Hamilton appeared cautious about Soviet aid plans, each refraining from passing definitive judgment on the idea. In questioning the scholars, both lawmakers focused instead on the framework and implementation of economic assistance plans of any size.

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: Department of Education

COSSA provides this information as a service and encourages readers to contact the agency for further information or application materials. Additional application guidelines and restrictions may apply.

Educational Research Grant Program

In 1990 the President and the nation's governors agreed upon the following six National Education Goals to be reached by the year 2000: (1) Readiness for School; (2) High School Completion; (3) Student Achievement and Citizenship; (4) Science and Mathematics Achievement; (5) Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning; and (6) Safe, Disciplined and Drug-Free Schools. With this in mind, the Educational Research Grant Program (ERGP) supports scientific inquiry designed to advance educational theory and practice.

Application Procedure: The application is divided into three parts, as well as a statement regarding estimated public reporting burden and various assurances and certifications: Part (1) Application for Federal Assistance (Standard Form 424 (Rev.4-88)) and instructions; Part (2) Budget Information--Non-Construction Programs (Standard Form 424A) and instructions; Part (3) Application Narrative. Applicant must mail the original and two copies of the application on or before the deadline date to: U.S. Department of Education, Application Control Center, Attention: (CFDA #84.117-L), Washington, DC 20202-4725.

Eligible Activities: The following are eligible for awards under the ERGP: (a) Institutions of higher education; (b) Public and private organizations, institutions, and agencies; and (c) individuals.

Budget: There will be an estimated 2 to 5 awards, ranging from \$400,000 to \$1,000,000 for a total of \$2,000,000 in available funds.

Review Process: Each application is reviewed by the Secretary to determine: the quality of the plan of operation for the project; the quality of key personnel the applicant plans to use on the project; the extent to which the budget is adequate to support the project; the quality of the evaluation plan for the project; the adequacy of the resources that the applicant plans to devote to the project, including facilities, equipment and supplies; the significance of the proposed project; the technical soundness of the proposed activities; and the extent of the applicant's commitment to the project, its capacity to continue the project, and the likelihood that it will build upon the project when Federal assistance ends.

Deadlines: August 9, 1991

Contact: For further information contact:

Dr. Robert Stonehill
U.S. Department of Education
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Room 610
Capitol Place
Washington, DC 20208-5644

(202) 219-2088; FAX: (202) 219-1817.

Deaf and hearing impaired individuals may call the Federal Dual Party Relay Service at 1-800-877-8339 (in the Washington, DC area code, telephone 703-9300) between 8 a.m. and 7 p.m., Eastern time.

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 Psychological Society
American Society of Criminology
Association for Asian Studies
Association for Social Sciences in Health
Eastern Sociological Society
Gerontological Society of America
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 Sociological Society
Social Science History Association
Society for Research on Adolescence
Society for Research in Child Development
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
Boston 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
Howard University

University of Illinois
Indiana University
Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan
University of Iowa
Johns Hopkins University
University of Maryland
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
National Opinion Research Center
University of Nebraska
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
