



# COSSA Washington Update

Consortium of Social  
Science Associations

May 30, 2005

Volume 24, Issue 10

## DECADE OF BEHAVIOR AWARD-WINNERS DISCUSS DEMOCRACY ON CAPITOL HILL

---

Last week, an impending showdown over the Senate filibuster (narrowly avoided by last-minute bipartisan negotiations) served as an appropriate and topical backdrop for the 2005 Decade of Behavior Research Award Symposium, which focused on democracy this year. Six award-winning scholars joined the academic community, researchers, organizations, Congressional Members and staff on May 23 to discuss what defines, challenges, and sustains democracy and democratic institutions across the globe.

COSSA Executive Director Howard Silver moderated the seminar, whose panelists each received awards for their ground-breaking research from the Decade of Behavior, an initiative encouraging interdisciplinary cooperation and bringing social and behavioral scientists together to advance and inform policymaking.

### **Creating Lasting, Legitimate Democratic Institutions: Challenges in the U.S. and Abroad**

The first session centered around the work of James Gibson, a political scientist from Washington University, St. Louis and Judith Torney-Purta, a psychologist from the University of Maryland. Gibson spoke about the prevalent factors enabling countries to become longstanding and stable democracies, using primarily the former

(Continued on Next Page)

## NSF RECEIVES THREE PERCENT INCREASE FROM HOUSE PANEL

---

The House of Representatives continues moving the FY 2006 appropriations process forward. Four bills have now passed the full House and three more have moved through subcommittee and/or full committee consideration. The Senate will begin the committee markup process when it returns from the Memorial Day recess on June 6.

On May 24, the Science, State, Justice and Commerce Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Frank Wolf (R-VA), recommended \$5.64 billion for the National Science Foundation (NSF) in FY 2006, a \$171 million, or approximately three percent increase above its FY 2005 level and \$38 million above the President's request. The panel

(Continued on Page 3)

### *Inside UPDATE...*

- **SENATE DEBATES CONSUMER PRIVACY AND IDENTITY THEFT**
- **CENSUS TO PRODUCE WORKFORCE INDICATOR DATA**
- **POLICYMAKERS INSIST ON MORE SUPPORT FOR WOMEN IN SCIENCE**
- **OLSEN NOMINATED AS NSF DEPUTY DIRECTOR**
- **UPDATE ON TWO SURVEYS**



## **DECADE (Continued from Page 1)**

Soviet Union and South Africa as examples. Overall, he emphasized, majoritarianism, or majority rule, coupled *with* minoritarianism, defined as the institutionalized opportunity for the minority to attempt to become the majority, need to be present in order for an environment to exist that is conducive to democracy. In the former USSR, for example, while he found that most of the citizens were highly in favor of majority-rule democratic practices, he found that the citizens' political culture and attitudes were largely intolerant of ideas that were incongruent with their own. Gibson also argued that the emergence and survival of democratic institutions depend upon four conditions: wealth, economic equality, cultural homogeneity, and the colonial question, "have you ever been British?" While the latter two may seem either outlandish or counter-intuitive, he insisted that both factors show up consistently in his studies. Gibson also spoke about the reconciliation process after the demise of Apartheid in South Africa, touting the use of amnesty to elicit truth, reconciliation, and democratic consolidation. While the process has not been perfect, he argued, after the first decade of reconciliation efforts, almost half of the population is considered highly reconciled; an amazing feat given the disparities that previously existed.

Torney-Purta shifted the scope back to the U.S., discussing popular misconceptions about U.S. adolescents and their perceptions of democracy. She focused on the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) Civic Education Study, an ongoing survey of international school children conducted since the early 1990's. Torney-Purta began by giving a non-U.S. point of reference, discussing data about Chilean 14-year-olds, whose perceptions of democratic ideals were within a reasonable range of the international average, but whose perceptions of "threats" to democracy were significantly below the international average for students their age.

She segued into the U.S. results, which showed that while American students were the most adept at interpreting political communication, their scores were only mediocre in understanding the concepts and ideals of democracy. She found that voting ranked highest on U.S. students' lists of their own expected future civic engagement, but only third on their list of beliefs about what a U.S. citizen *should* do. Volunteering and participating in the community ranked highest on their list of ideal citizen behaviors, with "joining a political party" ranking last. Based upon the data, Torney-Purta concluded that simply building student knowledge of civics in the classroom is insufficient to ensure

engagement and participation. She advocated for more participatory experiences as part of the classroom curriculum, as well as citizenship competency education beginning in middle school or earlier.

## **Changing U.S. Demographic May Alter the Nature of Elections**

The next panel of presentations included William A.V. Clark, a geographer at the University of California, Los Angeles, as well as David Epstein and Sharyn O'Halloran, political scientists from Columbia University. Clark discussed the changing demography of the nation and its impact upon U.S. politics in terms of voting and funding allocation in the next 40 years. He contended that the three most significant changes will be: continuing migration and growing diversity, the increasing age of the population, and regional changes. Soon, he argued, there will be a large-scale growth in "gray heads," heralding the "silver century," where the chances of meeting a 65 year-old in 2045 will be one in four (in 1990, the probability was one in ten). Continuing immigration will not only increase the population of the U.S., he said, it will also contribute to a jump in ethnic diversity. These changes will bring about necessary adjustments in the political "rules" of conduct and the power dynamics of politics in the U.S. For example, ethnic population concentrations and retired citizens will gain more power as time goes on, and several major juxtapositions will come to the forefront, perhaps sparking a "society of rules" versus undocumented immigration debate, or a discussion about metropolitan versus non-metropolitan power.

Moreover, Clark argued that we may see a shift in one of two major directions: either continuing immigration and the relative high fertility of some immigrant groups will possibly create stronger ethnic voting blocs, or a "monochrome society" will start to emerge, with high levels of intermarriage and the beginnings of a non-race-based organization of society. At the end of his presentation, the New Zealand-born researcher posed several questions that have yet to be answered, including whether our society ought to begin moving away from race-based policies, and whether the youth and aged will somehow coalesce, despite their often-disparate needs.

Epstein, giving the presentation on behalf of himself and O'Halloran, spoke extensively about the future of the Voting Rights Act (VRA) and of minorities in politics. Many questions have been raised on Capitol Hill about the VRA's future, with

some high-profile, non-political figures asserting that the entire 1965 act will expire in 2007, causing alarm among constituents. Epstein spent the initial half of his presentation clarifying the major sections of the VRA, paying special attention to Section 5, one of the only major provisions in the Act expected to expire. This section outlines the jurisdictions that need federal approval before redistricting or changing laws that might affect voting, most of which are in the Southeastern region of the U.S. in areas that were particularly notorious during the civil rights era for obstructing minority voting rights. He pointed out that the standard for “preclearing” bills that could alter voting procedures or Congressional districts is whether the law would be “retrogressive” in nature; the new law cannot not be a “step backwards” in terms of reducing the number of minorities in a given district or reducing the number of minority-held districts.

Having explained the VRA, Epstein expanded upon his theory of Black electoral success. He explained that majority-minority districts are necessary in order to ensure that minorities remain represented, and that currently, there is no apparent trade-off between descriptive representation (raw number of minorities elected to office) and substantive representation (votes for minority-supported legislation). To illustrate the conflict between Section 5 and the question of descriptive or substantive representation, Epstein cited the *Georgia v. Ashcroft* case, which originated in 2000 and was taken to the Supreme Court. Georgia had redistricted to increase the amount of districts that could be won by minorities, while sacrificing the absolute majority in some cases. This made several marginally less “safe win” districts for minorities. The Department of Justice denied them preclearance on the basis that the move was “retrogressive” in reducing the number of “safe” districts. In a 5-4 decision, the Supreme Court ruled that retrogression constitutes more than simple descriptive representation, and that minorities ought to be allowed to trade off descriptive and substantive representation if they so choose. Epstein went on to point out that through his and O’Halloran’s research, they found that the point of “equal opportunity” for minorities in majority-white districts is 40%, while the point of maximized minority electoral success falls at 62%.

Epstein concluded that the most important factor in ensuring minority representation is to focus upon creating an environment conducive to coalition-building instead of fixating on descriptive representation.

## **Jamieson: Conflict-based Media Coverage Damages Spirit of Healthy Debate**

Following the presentations, Reps. Brian Baird (D-WA) and Dan Lipinski (D-IL) presented the award winners with their plaques. To finish the day, Kathleen Hall-Jamieson from the Annenberg School of Communications at the University of Pennsylvania gave a rousing talk on the relationship between media and politics. Often, she argued, media shapes our perceptions of politics. Some things, she said, are not only less interesting to the public and media when they are off of the main “radar screen,” but the American public is often ill-equipped to understand things going on outside of their immediate locale. It is primarily the “dramatic, conflict-driven visuals” that give the issues context, rather than facts and thoughtful background, she added. Whether it is Congress, public schools, teen suicide, or retirement, she pointed out that most issues enter the audience’s living room through a “conflict frame” that is strategically drawn by the media. Jamieson also pointed out that it is difficult for us to expect our children to exhibit tolerance and respect for healthy political discussion when the preponderance of the political debate they see on television is a “disrespectful” model of dialogue. Finally, she emphasized the important role of academics in conveying more thoughtful news and dialogue, arguing that they can provide better “framing” for audiences as well as help journalism to better and more ethically play the role of “guardian of fact.” Jamieson’s talk, in addition to the other panelists’, served as a poignant reminder that the bedrock of democracy is an informed citizenry. For more information, see: [www.decadeofbehavior.org](http://www.decadeofbehavior.org).

## **NSF (Continued from Page 1)**

provided \$4.38 billion, \$157 million above FY 2005, for the Research and Related Activities account, which includes funding for the research directorates such as the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences (SBE) Directorate. The Subcommittee gave the Education and Human Resources Directorate \$807 million, \$70 million above the request, but \$34 million below its FY 2005 appropriation.

The same Subcommittee also allocated funding for the U.S. Census Bureau programs. It recommended a total appropriation of \$832.3 million for the Census Bureau, about \$87.5 million above FY 2005, but roughly \$45 million below the President’s request. Periodic Censuses and Programs would receive \$624.2 million if the Subcommittee’s recommendations stand, about \$85 million above last fiscal year, but \$33.1

million below the request. The Salaries and Expenses account, which covers many of the Bureau's ongoing data collections, goes up almost \$12 million from its FY 2005 level to \$208 million, leaving it \$12 million short of the Administration's request. Specific appropriations for 2010 census planning and the American Community Survey (ACS), both part of the Periodic Programs account, are not yet available.

The bill is expected to go before the full House Appropriations Committee on June 7 and proceed to the House floor one week later.

## SENATE DEBATES CONSUMER PRIVACY AND IDENTITY THEFT

Two Senate Committees recently held hearings to address what has become one of the most pressing issues in both homeland security and cyber security: identity theft. The impetus for these inquiries has been the egregious security breaches at several of the leading data brokerage firms, including Lexis Nexis and Choicepoint. Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Arlen Specter (R-PA) opened his hearing by recalling the rather ominous premonition of Chief Justice Earl Warren in a 1963 court opinion: "The fantastic advances in the field of electronic communications constitute a great danger to the privacy of the individual." The latest security breaches, which included a significant number of personal records from universities, have resurrected numerous questions about federal regulation in this area, bringing together policy makers, businesses, cyber security experts, investigators, and researchers.

While the Members in attendance may have changed between the Judiciary hearing and the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee hearing chaired by Senator Ted Stevens (R-AK) on the subject, it was clear that many of the questions and concerns about data brokerage services and citizens' privacy remained the same. The issues ran the gamut, including possible database opt-in and opt-out procedures for consumers, questions about who may specifically have access to sensitive citizen information, behavioral patterns of identity thieves, and the average knowledge threshold of consumers about the extent to which their personal information is being used by firms. But when the smoke cleared, three issues remained the most salient: First, who should ultimately be the authority on personal data protection, the federal government or the states? Second, in what manner and at what threshold should consumers be notified when a data security breach has

potentially compromised their information? Third, to what extent do consumers have a right to know what is being done with their information? The Judiciary Committee focused upon the two former, while the preponderance of the discussion in the Commerce Committee centered around the latter.

### Congress Urged Not to Step on States' Toes

As Senator Diane Feinstein (D-CA) made very clear during the Judiciary hearing, most of the proposed legislation in the Senate is grounded in a California law requiring data brokers and companies that house sensitive personal information to notify consumers when there has been a security breach that may affect them. Bill Sorrell, President of the National Attorneys General and the sitting Attorney General for the state of Vermont, argued that the "time for federal action is now." He expressed hope that Congress will follow the lead of California and 30 other states in considering disclosure laws to protect consumers: "... the quicker the notification goes out to consumers that their personal information has been accessed, then the [Federal Trade Commission (FTC)] studies show rather dramatically that the amount of loss can be significantly reduced." But he advised panel members to exercise caution in pre-empting state laws. When Specter questioned his rationale, Sorrell explained that as disclosure and credit security freeze laws are being pondered on the state level, companies that will be affected by the laws "... are very mindful of what's going on in the state houses and are in there lobbying. They want a single standard, which would be easier for them, but in our view in Vermont, Vermonters, if they want to go further, should be allowed to do so." When asked by Senator Tom Coburn (R-OK) as to the logistics of having state opt-in or opt-out choices for a federal statute, Sorrell expressed that the federal regulations should be a "floor as opposed to a ceiling."

The Judiciary Committee's second topic of concern was when and in what manner to notify consumers about security breaches. Feinstein noted that her primary concern with allowing state opt-in and opt-out procedures lay with potentially having very different standards of notification. This could involve each state determining different thresholds for notifying consumers based upon the type of data compromised, what constitutes a "significant risk," and whether notification must be sent by postal mail or electronically. Both Sorrell and FTC Chairwoman Deborah Majoras agreed with Feinstein's principles, but cautioned against "overnotification," or "crying wolf" by inundating consumers with a constant stream of notices. All agreed that it would be necessary to

investigate the threshold at which consumers become “numb” to notifications.

But concern for consumers did not stop at security breaches alone. Above and beyond all else, Committee members and several cyber security and investigation specialists serving as witnesses in both hearings expressed alarm about the ease with which sensitive personal information can be attained for a modest fee over the Internet. Anecdotes abounded about citizens who have had not only their credit, but also their lives ruined because of identity theft committed in this manner. Larry Johnson, who heads the Secret Service’s Criminal Investigative Division, testified to the Judiciary Committee that with regard to information collection, especially over the Internet, the “wealth of available personal information creates a target-rich environment for today’s sophisticated criminals, many of whom are organized and operate across international borders.”

### **Sanford and Curling Take the “Hot Seat”**

Two popular witnesses for these hearings were Lexis Nexis President and Chief Executive Officer of U.S., Corporate and Federal Markets, Kurt Sanford, and Douglas Curling, President and Chief Operating Officer of Choicepoint, who testified before both panels. The two were similar in that during both their testimony and responses to Members’ angry questions, their standard line was to acknowledge the security breaches, inform the committee of reforms to rectify security loopholes, and agree wholeheartedly with the policy ideas and legislation set forth by Committee Members. However, the Senators still took the opportunity to direct some venom toward the two company chiefs for the roles that their companies may have played in compromising people’s data during the recent security breaches.

The companies received some much-needed defense when witness James Dempsey, head of Global Internet Policy at the Center for Democracy and Technology, argued that there was “no need to demonize the information service companies. The goal is not to put them out of business.” Dempsey, however, went on to advocate for consumers’ right to know about the contents of their data files: “... the concerns go beyond security and the harms go beyond identity theft. If people are being screened for employment or being denied jobs or screened by landlords and denied the ability to rent an apartment, those are real harms. People should have the right to see that information that’s used and the right to challenge it.”

Senator John Kerry (D-MA) asked about the difference between the information that data brokerage firms such as Lexis Nexis and Choicepoint sell and the information that is on a consumer’s credit record. Curling responded that “from a regulatory standpoint, there’s not a difference.” The Choicepoint President went on to add that most transactions are consumer-initiated when they apply for a loan, job, etc. Kerry was resolute in proving his point: “... should you be trafficking in their information and they have no participation in the process... they didn’t apply to have their information go to you, to be winning you a profit for the transfer of whatever their life is, did they?”

There were few definitive conclusions as to the logistics of resolving the central legislative issues related to identity theft; only resounding agreement as to what goals policy makers ought to be shooting for in terms of consumer protection. Panel members made it clear that more needs to be learned about how federal regulations would play out in what has been, up until this point, a state-controlled enterprise. They also confirmed the need to study consumer behaviors in order to determine the best way to go about notifying people when their data is vulnerable.

## **CENSUS TO PRODUCE WORKFORCE INDICATOR DATA**

In a continuing effort to examine the efficacy of data coming out of the Census Bureau, the House Government Reform Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census, chaired by Rep. Michael Turner (R-OH), held a hearing on May 10 entitled, “Life in the Big City: What is Census Data Telling Us About Urban America? Are Policymakers Really Listening?”

The hearing’s first panel of witnesses consisted of Census Bureau Director Charles Louis Kincannon and Thomas M. Dowd, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for the U.S. Labor Department’s Employment and Training Administration (ETA). Kincannon’s testimony centered around the Bureau’s newest initiative, the Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) program, which he billed as the “next generation of data collection and dissemination for the Census Bureau.” The Bureau is currently collaborating with Labor Market Information agencies in 38 states as well as the ETA and the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) to produce “Quarterly Workforce Indicators.” These can track key labor market measures for each locale, including employment, hiring, job gains, job losses, turnover, as well as breaking down earnings over time by age, gender, industry, and county. Kincannon argued that merging the state and federal data

to create these indicators will greatly help local employers, policymakers, training institutions, workforce investment boards, and even those seeking jobs by showing where the jobs are, what types of workers are required, as well as earnings and payroll expectations. He also emphasized that the LEHD would augment and complement other data collection efforts such as the American Community Survey (ACS).

The Director pointed out that the Bureau is working with states to develop a Local Labor Market Mapping program, which is currently reimbursable in 12 states and would show the geographic distribution of workers and employers in a given locale. The tool would provide a more comprehensive picture of where workers live, workplaces, transit corridors, schools, childcare centers, and the industry distribution in each area. As Kincannon stated in his testimony, “A picture is worth a thousand words, and these maps are a powerful planning asset that can literally show the relationship between jobs and workers; the need for better transportation routes; and many other facets of a rapidly changing economy.” During his testimony, Dowd concurred, “Such understanding has tremendous potential for economic development, the deployment of workforce services and the design of family and community services.” While the President has requested funding for the LEHD program in FY 2006, Kincannon emphasized to Turner that it was still a “work in progress.”

The second panel of witnesses began with National Urban League’s President and CEO Marc H. Morial, who delved into the ways in which census data enable the League to produce its yearly *State of Black America Report*, a “barometer of the conditions, experiences, and opinions of Black America,” and the *Equality Index*, which compares the conditions of African Americans and Caucasians in the areas of economics, health, education, social justice, and civic engagement. Morial argued that census data have been crucial in attaining benchmarks for comparison and ideas for further research, but also emphasized the role that the National Urban League plays in serving as an intermediary to translate and frame complex data for the “average businessman.” The testimony of American Planning Association President and CEO W. Paul Farmer also lent support to the urban uses of census data as well as the ability of the LEHD’s Quarterly Workforce Indicators to address mismatches between job locations and available housing: “This imbalance is a major culprit in two of the most pressing problems confronting cities: transportation congestion and lack of affordable housing.”

## POLICYMAKERS INSIST ON MORE SUPPORT FOR WOMEN IN SCIENCE

In light of recent debates about the abilities and cerebral potential of women in the sciences, Women’s Policy, Inc. in collaboration with the co-chairs of the Congressional Caucus for Women’s Issues, Reps. Ginny (Virginia) Brown-Waite (R-FL) and Hilda Solis (D-CA), and the co-chairs of the House Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) Caucus, Reps. Vern Ehlers (R-MI) and Mark Udall (D-CO), and the American Psychological Association (APA), held a policy briefing on “Advancing Women in Science” on May 25.

The briefing was attended by a number of House Members, including: House Science Subcommittee on Energy Chair Judy Biggert (R-IL), Reps. Brown-Waite, Ehlers, Solis, and Udall, Rep. Rush Holt (D-NJ), Rep. Eddie Bernice Johnson, and former Rep. Patricia Schroeder, an 11-term Congresswoman from Colorado. Every Member who spoke reinforced their dedication to not only encouraging more women to enter into the sciences, but also the need to interest more youth in science-related careers, particularly in the physical and natural sciences.

The panel of speakers, chaired by Anne Kinney, the head of NASA’s Universe Division in the Office of Space Science, began with Nora Newcomb, a professor of psychology at Temple University, who cut to the core of the debate by discussing cognitive development and gender differences. Newcomb began by arguing that “differences *do* exist” between the genders, but only at the extreme ends of the cognitive spectrum. In fact, she emphasized that society’s obsession with these differences and the possibility of biological causality is revealing of how we analyze the issue. Why, she asked, does a person’s possible biological predisposition become their “brand” for life?

According to Newcomb, if the case for significant biological differences were debated, the primary issue would be whether the disparities in question affect women’s ability to succeed in the sciences. She argued, however, that this is only a debatable issue if the differences are immutable. But, as she pointed out, studies have shown that this is untrue – everyone, including women, can significantly improve their spatial and mathematical thinking by several standard deviations. Even if improvements are made, however, she pointed out that the existing “gap” may not close. Even so, past a certain threshold of cognitive ability, “success” in the sciences is comprised of a collection of intangibles, she added. In conclusion, Newcomb

cautioned the audience against being “dazzled” by brain images showing alleged cognitive differences between the genders. Often, if humans are socialized in different ways, as men and women often are, the ways in which they process information may be different. “These are corollaries,” she said, not necessarily causation that translates into conclusions about cognitive caliber.

Shirley Malcolm, head of the American Association for the Advancement of Science’s (AAAS) Directorate for Education and Human Resources Programs, spoke about the difficulties in bringing the “underrepresented majority,” namely women, minorities, and the disabled, into science. The current discussion on this issue, she argued, is fragmented. Malcolm believes that one of the highest barriers for women and minorities to overcome is a socialized “doubt” in their own ability to succeed in math and science. Institutions, she argued, must better encourage these underrepresented groups to engage in the sciences, lest the U.S. “cede power” by implementing “poor investment strategy.” In fact, it was mentioned that at a recent academic conference, Malcolm was forced to follow Harvard President Lawrence Summers’ now-notorious speech about the possible role that “innate differences” play in women’s failure to achieve parity with men in the sciences. While his comments, she said, “made us old-timers mad,” Malcolm acknowledged that comments such as Summers’ may only perpetuate “doubt” in younger women’s minds about their ability to succeed.

## OLSEN NOMINATED AS NSF DEPUTY DIRECTOR

On May 24, President Bush announced his intention to nominate Kathie Olsen, currently Associate Director for Science at the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), as Deputy Director of the National Science Foundation (NSF).

She would replace Joseph Bordogna, who has served as NSF’s Deputy Director since 1999, and its Acting Deputy Director during the three years prior. His nine years in the position make Bordogna the longest serving Deputy Director in NSF’s history. He will return to the University of Pennsylvania to teach engineering.

Olsen came to OSTP from NASA in 2002, where she was appointed Chief Scientist. Before joining NASA in 1999 she served as Senior Staff Associate for the Science and Technology Centers in NSF’s Office of Integrative Activities. For almost two years, she was a Legislative Fellow at the Brookings Institute and an NSF detailee to the Office of Senator Conrad Burns of Montana. She held a number of positions in NSF’s Biological Sciences Directorate, including Acting Director of the Division of Integrative Biology and Neuroscience. Before joining NSF, she held a faculty position at SUNY – Stony Brook.

Olsen received her B.S. in Biology and Psychology from Chatham College and a Ph.D. in Neuroscience at the University of California, Irvine. In 2003, she was a featured speaker at the COSSA Annual Meeting.

### CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS (COSSA)

Executive Director: Howard J. Silver  
Dep. Dir. Health Policy: Angela L. Sharpe  
Public Affairs: Tracey S. Lesetar  
Gov’t Relations: Julie A. Egermayer  
President: Myron Gutmann

The Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), an advocacy organization for Federal support for the social and behavioral sciences, was founded in 1981 and stands alone in Washington in representing the full range of social and behavioral sciences.

*Update* is published 22 times per year. Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for \$80; institutional subscriptions - \$160; overseas mail - \$160. 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

[www.cossa.org](http://www.cossa.org)

## UPDATE ON TWO SURVEYS

The Department of Labor has reinstated the National Agricultural Workers Survey. The Department had issued a stop funding order in early January (see *UPDATE*, January 24, 2005). Determined lobbying by COSSA and other groups caused Labor Secretary Elaine Chao to move the survey from the Office of Policy into the Employment and Training Administration (ETA) and to resume its funding.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) has asked OMB to approve its changes to the Current Employment Survey, including the elimination of the data on women workers and the expansion of the survey to include all workers (see *UPDATE*, January 24, 2005). Continuing to cite the burden on employers to report data on women workers, the BLS dismissed comments from numerous groups that implored it to maintain the women's data.

Representative Rosa DeLauro (D-CT) has introduced legislation to prohibit BLS from ending the data collection on women and has sent a letter to OMB signed by 65 of her House colleagues echoing that position. Another letter from 27 Senators has also arrived at OMB's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs seeking the retention of gender distinctions. OMB hopes to have a decision by the middle of next month.

Consortium of Social Science Associations  
1522 K Street, Suite 836, Washington, DC 20005