

# COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume XIV, Number 7

April 24, 1995

## WHITHER THE REVOLUTION? BEYOND THE FIRST 100 DAYS

Congress will soon return (the Senate on April 24, the House a week later) to move past the first 100 days and answer whether the revolution promised by Republican leaders to dramatically reduce the size and scope of the federal government becomes a reality. During the first 100 days some giant steps have been taken by the House of Representatives and its leadership promises more, quoting their hero Ronald Reagan, "You ain't seen nothing yet." The Senate, viewed as the more "responsible" body may get caught up in Republican presidential politics that could prevent its ability to moderate the revolution. The role of President Clinton remains unclear.

The new leadership in the House, Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-GA) and Majority Leader Dick Armey (R-TX), demonstrated the ability to keep their members marching together toward common goals. They brought all ten items in the "Contract with America" to the floor and passed nine of them in the House. The Senate derailed the Balanced Budget Constitutional Amendment by one vote, and the Term Limits Constitutional Amendment fell considerably short of the two-thirds necessary to pass, as some senior Republicans deserted. In the House, the Republicans showed remarkable party unity losing an average of 6 votes on final passage. The Democrats, by contrast, found themselves voting with the Republicans on many items in the contract. On 25 votes, Republicans picked up an average of 83 Democratic votes (thanks to Charles Jones of the Brookings Institution for this data).

As many of the items from the Contract move from the House to the Senate, changes are expected. The Senate will likely revise such legislation as the welfare reform bill, and it has already significantly altered the line-item veto provision that emerged from the House. However as Majority Leader Robert Dole (R-KS) competes for the 1996 Republican presidential nomination, he will find himself pressured to satisfy the desires of the conservative wing of the GOP, which tends to dominate the nomination process and also expects the new GOP majority to deliver on the

Contract. Having three other contenders in the Senate will add to the pressure.

President Clinton, so far, has provided what most Presidents facing a newly hostile Congress have done. He has offered some carrots and some sticks. His veto threats combined with calls for cooperation, are typical presidential strategies. Although his rhetoric suggests some confrontations are looming, the pressure to enact legislation may produce compromises to his liking.

### Rescissions in Research, Education Programs

The House and Senate have passed two supplemental spending bills that have been offset by rescinding current year funding for mostly domestic agencies. The first bill, signed by President Clinton, provided \$3 billion for international peacekeeping missions and defense operations. These were offset mainly with cuts in defense programs, that included a 50 percent reduction in the National Security Education Program's trust fund.

The second bill currently sits in a House-Senate conference committee. The Senate bill provided \$6.7 billion in disaster relief and \$275 million in debt relief for Jordan. It would rescind \$16.1 billion in previously appropriated funds. The House bill does not include money for Jordan, but provides \$5.4 billion in disaster relief offset by \$17.4 billion in rescissions.

### INSIDE UPDATE...

- House Votes to Require Written Consent for Research on Minors
- COSSA Testifies Before House Panel on NSF Funding
- Merger of Foreign Policy Agencies Would Affect Exchanges
- OERI Announces Research Priorities
- COSSA Seminar Looks at Poverty Research
- Sources of Research Support: The Urban Institute

It is this bill that would affect many programs of interest to social and behavioral scientists. Both the Senate and House rescind \$132 million from the National Science Foundation's facilities modernization program. The National Endowment for the Humanities and the USIA Educational and Cultural Programs lose \$5 million each from their FY 1995 budgets. In general, the Senate cuts to education programs were smaller than in the House, e.g. the Javits Fellowship program lost all its FY 1995 funding in the House, but none of it in the Senate; the Law School Clinical Experience program lost all of its current year funding in the House, but only \$2.9 million out of the \$14.9 million in the Senate. Both Houses agreed that the Patricia Roberts Harris Fellowship program should be ended. The Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars lost \$1 million in the Senate version, and \$2 million in the House.

In the Health and Human Services area, the Senate rescinded \$79 million in construction money at the National Institutes of Health, the House took away \$50 million in this account and \$19 million from NIH's National Center for Research Resources. Both Houses rescinded a little more than \$3 million from the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research. The Senate took away \$2.9 million from the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, an office the House left alone. At the Department of Labor, the Senate rescinded \$1.1 million from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, while the House inserted language

about speeding up the revision of the Consumer Price Index.

### Budget Resolutions and Tax Cuts: Future Battlegrounds

When the Senate returns it will turn to producing the FY 1996 budget resolution, which will provide guidance to the appropriators who make the final allocation decisions to the agencies. Sen. Pete Domenici (R-NM) chairs the Senate budget committee and he is expected to unveil his proposal on April 26. The Senator, a widely respected player in the budget games, will propose reductions in entitlement programs, cut discretionary spending, and produce a plan to reach a balanced budget by 2002. To do this, he could recommend cutting domestic discretionary spending for FY 1996 12 to 15 percent. If applied to the National Science Foundation, for next year this would be a reduction of almost \$400 million. At NIH, the cut would be over \$1.5 billion. It is unclear whether the Senator's proposal will include a tax cut.

On the House side, Rep. John Kasich (R-OH) chairs the budget committee and his recommendations are expected the second week of May. Since the House has already passed a \$189 million tax cut, Kasich's path to a balanced budget will be more difficult. The Budget Committee staff has produced a document of "Illustrative Republican Spending Cuts" to achieve \$100 billion in reduced discretionary spending over the next five years to pay for the tax cut. Included in the suggestions are: reduce funding for NIH by 5 percent, terminate the NEH and NEA, eliminate funding for the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, reduce funding for the National Agricultural Statistics Service, eliminate "wasteful research and policy programs," eliminate HUD's policy development and research, reduce USIA educational and cultural exchanges by 50 percent, and refocus support for agricultural research and extension activities. These are just "illustrations" and as the staffers note, the authorization and appropriations committees "are responsible for the final decisions."

The House budget resolution may also include suggestions for restructuring the federal government. Some Republicans have talked for months about abolishing the Departments of Commerce, Education, Energy, and HUD. The Chairman of the House Science Committee has proposed a new Department of Science (see *Update*, April 3). What will happen to

#### 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

these recommendations, if they are indeed made, remains to be seen. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is examining the proposal of its chairman, Sen. Jesse Helms (R-NC), to collapse the USIA, Agency for International Development and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency into the State Department (see page four).

Finally, the Congress will proceed with such non-budgetary items as revising the crime bill (see *Update*, March 20), a new telecommunications policy, a new farm bill, regulatory reform, and perhaps even a modified health care reform bill. They have already passed a new Paperwork Reduction Act that reauthorizes the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs at the Office of Management and Budget. The new PRA emphasizes reducing the burdens government paperwork presents to business rather than the benefits government information collection provides the nation.

During the first 100 days Congress worked hard and late, took roll call votes on Mondays and Fridays, and generally exhausted members, staffs and lobbyists. The House promises a more "family friendly" place from now on, but as the Congress moves toward the actual appropriations decisions, with much pain anticipated, friendly may not be an accurate description.

### **HOUSE VOTES TO REQUIRE WRITTEN CONSENT FOR RESEARCH ON MINORS** MB

On April 4 the House of Representatives voted 379-46 to require prior written consent for broad categories of federally-supported research involving minors. The House vote was on an amendment to the Family Privacy Protection Act, a component of the House Republicans' Contract With America.

The amendment, sponsored by freshman Rep. Mark Souder (R-IN), returned the word "written" to the bill. COSSA and its allies had succeeded in removing the key word from the bill when it was before the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee (see *Update*, April 3), but pressure from the House GOP leadership led to the reversal. After adopting the Souder amendment, the House approved the legislation, H.R. 1271, on a 418-7 vote.

Souder acknowledged that his amendment would hurt research, but said it was necessary to "safeguard family privacy unless and until the government has a legitimate reason to intrude upon it." Noting the concerns of researchers and federal agency officials (see *Update*, March 20), he said, "They are really saying science and data are now more important than the family. Is this what we call family values?" Souder read to his colleagues questions to middle school students regarding sexuality and alcohol and drug use from the Department of Health and Human Services' Youth Risk Behavior Survey.

Speaking against the amendment, Rep. Cardiss Collins (D-IL) said that it is currently standard practice for the federal government to require some form of parental consent for surveying minors, but that the Souder provisions would "undercut the effectiveness of critical federal surveys." She cited the recent congressional testimony of Lloyd Johnston of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, saying that prior written consent would make national samples less representative, place undue burdens on school administrators, and increase research costs.

Rep. Pat Williams (D-MT) spoke of the importance of sexual behavior surveys in efforts to protect youth from AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases. He read into the record a list of organizations that opposed the amendment, including COSSA, the American Anthropological Association, the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Sociological Association, and other health and research groups. The legislation now moves to the Senate.

### **COSSA TESTIFIES BEFORE HOUSE PANEL ON NSF FUNDING** WJ

Advocating strong federal support for research, COSSA Executive Director Howard J. Silver testified before the House VA, HUD, Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee on April 5. The Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Jerry Lewis (R-CA), heard from a large number of witnesses supporting the continued financial health of the National Science Foundation.

Silver, who also chairs the Coalition for National Science Funding, expressed support for NSF's vital role in supporting basic research and developing scientific talent. He cautioned against any structural changes in the nation's science agencies, such as a proposed Department of Science, (see *Update*, April 3). He lauded the independence and integrity of NSF, particularly the merit review process.

Acknowledging the tough budget year, Silver lamented the demise of the days of Presidents Reagan and Bush proposing double digit increases for NSF. He supported the small (3 percent) increase proposed in President Clinton's FY 1996 budget.

He agreed with NSF's choice to emphasize the research and related activities function of the budget, which is slated for an 8 percent increase in the FY 1996 proposal. Silver spoke of the need to maintain support for graduate fellowships and traineeships, particularly with the possible elimination of the Department of Education's Harris and Javits fellowships. He urged the Subcommittee to accept NSF's request to allow the Education and Human Resources Directorate time to absorb the large increases of the past ten years and to evaluate programs begun with this new money.

Turning to the importance of basic research in the social and behavioral sciences, Silver noted the role of NSF-supported game theory and experimental economics research in the recent auction of the electromagnetic radio spectrum by the Federal Communications Commission (an example also used by Neal Lane before the Senate Science, Technology and Space Subcommittee on March 30). Silver also mentioned the research that developed geographic information systems as a tool that has transformed urban planning. He noted the crucial role still played by the three major social science data bases supported by NSF -- the Panel Study on Income Dynamics, the National Election Studies and the General Social Survey -- in providing data for social and economic analysis and as teaching tools.

Finally, he reminded the Congress that they rely on the research conducted by social and behavioral scientists. Silver related that on this particular day 25 social scientists were presenting testimony before congressional committees on such topics as immigration reform, the Earned Income Tax Credit, the flat tax, the minimum wage and the nation's gun

laws. He suggested that each of these witnesses' testimony was grounded in research that merited federal support.

## **MERGER OF FOREIGN POLICY AGENCIES WOULD AFFECT EXCHANGES**

AK

The House International Relations Committee, chaired by Rep. Ben Gilman (R-NY), recently held a hearing to examine possible overlapping of functions among federal agencies with foreign affairs functions. The hearing was prompted by a proposal of Sen. Jesse Helms (R-NC), Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to merge the U.S. Agency for International Development, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency into the State Department, with the goal of consolidating overlapping bureaucratic and programmatic functions and reducing spending.

The directors of these agencies testified that under the Vice President's National Performance Review, popularly known as "Reinventing Government," they had found areas to consolidate and streamline within their own agencies. They concluded, however, that the interests of the United States would be served best by maintaining independent agencies. They argued that the Helms plan would hinder these agencies' programs by subordinating them under several new layers of bureaucratic hierarchy. Additionally, they argued that much of the proposed savings would be at the expense of program capabilities.

The impact of the Helms plan for foreign exchange programs remains unclear. Helms has called for the complete elimination of the U.S. Information Agency and the transfer of exchange and broadcast functions to a new Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy. This Under Secretary would coordinate all federal spending on exchange programs, but it is unclear what impact this would have on spending levels.

At the hearing, USIA Director Joseph Duffey argued that administering these programs "consistent with, but separate from, the conduct of the nations' official diplomacy" remains the best way of encouraging contact and understanding among important, but "unofficial," leaders in the U.S. and abroad. When asked by Rep. Donald M. Payne (D-

NJ) about the benefits of exchange programs, Duffey responded that they are a very effective way of providing assistance abroad and that USIA is currently preparing a report addressing this question in greater detail.

## OERI ANNOUNCES PRIORITIES FOR R&D CENTERS RS

The Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) has published seven research priorities in the April 10, 1995 *Federal Register*. These priorities will guide the work of OERI's new research and development centers. OERI is accepting written comments on the priorities by May 25, 1995.

The proposed priorities are:

- 1) Promoting the Cognitive and Social-Emotional Development of Children;
- 2) Improving Student Learning and Achievement;
- 3) Improving Student Assessment;
- 4) Meeting the Educational Needs of a Diverse Population;
- 5) Increasing the Effectiveness of State and Local Education Reform Efforts;
- 6) Improving Postsecondary Education and the Preparation of Adults for Work; and
- 7) Improving Adult Learning and Literacy.

Following the comment period and a review by the new National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board, OERI will publish final priorities and will hold a grants competition for national research and development centers with awards planned in early 1996. OERI will continue its support for three other centers: Research on the Education of Students Placed At-Risk; a National Reading Research Center; and a National Research Center on Gifted and Talented Children and Youth.

For further information on the priorities and the comment period contact Jacqueline Jenkins at (202) 219-2079.

## COSSA SEMINAR LOOKS AT POVERTY RESEARCH MB

At a March 24 Capitol Hill briefing, *Overcoming Poverty: What the Research Demonstrates*, three distinguished social scientists discussed their research

results concerning poverty in America. The event was sponsored by COSSA and drew an audience of over 50 congressional and federal agency officials.

Sheldon H. Danziger, Professor and Director of the Research and Training Program on Poverty, the Underclass and Public Policy at the University of Michigan, gave an overview of research on poverty, arguing that slow economic growth and rising inequality, and not behavioral issues, are at the root of the problem. He cited data showing that for two decades there has been very little growth in family incomes, and that this growth has been unequally shared. Because of a widely held belief that welfare recipients are those who do not take responsibility for their lives, economic and social policies are viewed as independent of each other, he said.

Danziger said that if the average living standard in the U.S. had doubled in the last two decades, as it had in the previous two decades, there would be little poverty today. Comparing those two time periods, there was a 99.3% increase in median family incomes from 1949 to 1969 but only 3.4% in the following twenty years. He offered data showing that during the first period income growth was evenly distributed throughout society, something that has not occurred in the latter period where there is a decline for the middle class and significant increases for the upper class. Danziger added that labor market changes have led to the inability of low-skilled workers to get jobs and keep their families out of poverty. Refuting the notion that poverty is a problem caused by the behavior of minorities, he said that similar economic patterns exist across racial lines.

He said the specific cause of these changes varies between economists, but that it usually relates to structural changes such as increased use of technology, declining manufacturing jobs, and global competition. In any instance, Danziger said, the current economy offers welfare recipients few opportunities even in times of low unemployment. He said that attaining a low-wage job would take an individual off of welfare, but that those wages would still put the family below the poverty line and on food stamps. Danziger concluded that what is needed is a combination of making work pay for the working poor, access to quality education and medical care, and equal opportunity.

Katherine Newman, Professor of Anthropology at Columbia University, outlined her research on the working poor, the segment of society she said tends to get overlooked in discussions of welfare and poverty. Newman cited deep reservoirs of belief about the work ethic and responsibility in American culture which she said "assuage a middle class whose own economic insecurity has been growing in this changing economy." Newman recently completed a two-year study of service sector workers in central Harlem, an area with an unemployment rate of 18%. In this neighborhood, she said, there are fourteen applicants for every \$4.25 per hour job. If welfare is so comfortable, why are so many pursuing these jobs? According to Newman there are four reasons: an escape from the violence of the underground economy, a strong belief in the value of work, financial aid for post-high school education, and a means of survival for poor households. In the face of this desire to work, opportunity is very scarce, she said.

Newman's research compared those hired with those rejected from fast food jobs in central Harlem. The results showed that older workers were preferred to younger ones, African Americans were the least preferred of all racial and ethnic groups even among African American employers, outsiders were likely to be chosen over neighborhood residents, those with contacts within the industry stood a better chance of getting hired, immigrants were preferred over native born, and individuals with no welfare utilization in their homes were also preferred to those who had received benefits.

Newman concluded her remarks by saying that her research shows that "it is sheer folly to believe that the problems of poverty have to do with morals and values. The problem of poverty is a problem of too few jobs, or too few jobs that pay too little to support a family." She urged policymakers to ensure that the efforts of the working poor lead somewhere beyond poverty. A specific example she offered was that of an Employer Consortium to link low-wage jobs to training programs for higher paying jobs in a form of a job chain that seeks to promote upward mobility.

James Johnson, the E. Maynard Adams Distinguished Professor of Business, Geography, and Sociology and the Director of the Urban Enterprise Corps at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, discussed federal and state policies over the past fifteen years that he said have exacerbated poverty and

inequality in America. According to Johnson, the federal government's efforts to create a deregulated business environment to foster global competition has dramatically altered the structure of economic opportunity. Through large concentration of capital, many low-wage jobs have relocated outside of the U.S., he said. According to Johnson, these economic policies have taken low-wage manufacturing jobs out of the inner city, and new job growth has occurred in the suburbs that are not easily accessible to those in the ghetto. Johnson cited data on job loss and creation in the Los Angeles area to further demonstrate this situation. What job creation there has been in or near the traditional industrial core of South Central Los Angeles exists in the service sector or in craft specialty industries such as clothing or jewelry manufacturing. To remain competitive, these industries often structure their work forces illegally and have poor working conditions. Johnson said that state and local redevelopment efforts have concentrated on revitalizing downtown areas and have created jobs requiring higher levels of education and skills.

Johnson criticized the decline in federal aid to cities, particularly the cutbacks in education and community spending. He urged a government role in assisting poor communities, saying that attitude and behavior changes in these communities alone will not solve the problem. He urged the business community to acknowledge that poverty and inequality are bad for business, as they hinder the ability of society as a whole to compete in the global marketplace. He called for efforts to create major job generators to serve as anchors for a community, rather than the current focus on micro-enterprise creation. Citing research on job training that linked the effectiveness of a program to a specific job, he gave the example of job generators such as BMW and Mercedes Benz locating in depressed regions and their concurrent job training programs. He recommended social programs such as midnight basketball and supplied research data validating its effectiveness. He concluded by calling for a coordinated effort between business, philanthropies, community groups, and universities to address the question of poverty in America.

A lively question and answer period followed, with discussion on issues such as child care, urban enterprise zones, and school-to-work programs at inner city high schools. For a transcript of the event, contact COSSA at (202) 842-3525.

**SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: THE URBAN INSTITUTE** KC

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

**The Transition from Welfare to Work:  
Small Grants Program**

The Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Foundation for Child Development are pleased to announce that a number of small grants related to the transition from welfare to work will be awarded. The grants are intended to: (1) encourage the continued development of innovative service programs, (2) disseminate information on best-practices and exemplary programs, and (3) expand the base of knowledge through policy analysis and research.

**Category 1: Program Development and Innovation Grants**

Much of the innovation in assisting low-income individuals and families to achieve economic self-sufficiency has been developed at the state and local level. This year's grants will be limited to programs which focus on family-oriented employment assistance, strategies that promote long-term economic mobility, or strategies to alleviate long-term welfare dependency and/or intergenerational poverty.

**Category 2: Program Recognition and Dissemination Grants**

Many exemplary programs and models already exist, but administrators often lack visibility or have insufficient resources to disseminate information about their innovative efforts. The purpose of grants made in this category is to recognize promising programs by raising their visibility and providing means for the preparation and dissemination of materials and information about their program. This year's grants will be limited to programs which focus on family-oriented employment assistance, strategies that promote long-term economic mobility, or strategies to alleviate long-term welfare dependency and/or intergenerational poverty.

**Category 3: Policy Analysis and Research Grants**

Analysis and research in the area of poverty, welfare, labor market activity, and self-sufficiency supplements operational knowledge and program development. People are encouraged to apply for grants that can be used to fill current gaps in knowledge and make a timely contribution to policy development. A range of proposals will be considered for funding including quantitative or qualitative analysis or the synthesis of existing research on important policy issues.

**Eligible Applicants:** For categories 1 & 2 public, private and non-profit agencies and institutions are encouraged to apply. For category 3 proposals from any individual analyst, research or academic organization, or public agency.

**Budget:** Five grants of up to \$30,000 each will be awarded under each of the three categories.

**Deadlines:** For each category, there will be a two-stage application process with initial abstracts due May 15, 1995. Selected applicants will be invited to submit full proposals. To obtain guidelines for applying under any of the above categories please send your request and mailing address to Transitions, The Urban Institute, 2100 M Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037, Email "kolson@ui.urban.org" or call (202) 857-8734.

---

## 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

---