



H

uman Subjects, Local IRBs, and Social Science Data Archives¹

FEDERAL REGULATIONS GOVERNING RESEARCH PROJECTS BASED ON PUBLIC USE DATA FILES ARE open to different interpretations, and thus college and university IRBs must make decisions concerning their responsibilities with respect to this type of research. This article provides information on this complex issue and some suggestions for ways that ICPSR can influence the IRB exemption process.

Frank M. Howell
Mississippi State University

A recent article by Jonathan Moreno (2001) is titled, "Goodbye to All That: The End of Moderate Protectionism in Human Subjects Research." The title of the article captures the spirit of the times for many of those engaged in the process of social science research. Researchers are facing increasing scrutiny of projects involving the collection of data from human subjects. Indeed, as a result of alleged noncompliance with human subjects regulations, federal funds have been sequestered at a number of prestigious universities, with terminations of personnel in a few instances.²

This has occurred at a time when technological barriers to sharing data are lower than ever and information-related technology has spawned substantially greater capacity for social science researchers to tackle ever more complex problems. The Internet is an important element in this new era of

Frank M. Howell is Professor of Sociology at Mississippi State University. He has served for over 12 years on Institutional Review Boards at two universities and teaches the Data Management and Security portion of the MSU IRB Principal Investigator Certification Program. He can be contacted through e-mail at fmh1@ra.msstate.edu.

NOTE FROM ICPSR

As a result of discussions with ICPSR Council and Official Representatives, ICPSR has created a set of Web pages to assist IRBs in making determinations about exempt status of ICPSR public-use data and to provide additional information regarding confidentiality and disclosure in archived data. Included in these pages is ICPSR's Statement on Safeguarding Confidentiality:

ICPSR considers the protection of confidentiality in archived data to be of paramount importance in its service to the social science research community. Since its inception in 1962, ICPSR has routinely subjected all data deposited in the archive to rigorous examination with respect to disclosure risk. All data collections acquired by ICPSR undergo stringent confidentiality reviews to determine whether the data contain any information that could be used — on its own or in combination with other publicly available information — to identify respondents. Should such information be discovered, the sensitive data are altered after consultation with the principal investigator to create public use files that eliminate the risk of disclosure.

Also included in the ICPSR Web pages are guidelines for IRBs, information on ICPSR confidentiality procedures and requirements, and additional resources bearing on these important topics.

In an effort to further assist IRBs, ICPSR plans a mailing to IRBs on member campuses containing relevant information to facilitate the process of certifying archived data as exempt for research purposes.

We welcome local IRB members, ORs, researchers, and others with an interest in these subjects to visit the ICPSR Web site at www.icpsr.umich.edu and to contact us with any questions or comments at netmail@icpsr.umich.edu.

social science research. Large-scale social science data archives like ICPSR provide access to a wealth of research data over the Internet, pushing the replication and extension of studies forward and facilitating the work of researchers in a wide variety of institutional settings.

Given the declaration by Moreno of the end of "moderate protectionism" in human subjects, are we facing increasing barriers in the sharing of social science data due to forces of "extreme protectionism" of human subjects? Many believe so, and professional associations like the American Sociological Association (Levine 2001; Sharpe 2001) have encouraged efforts to dissuade local IRBs from applying Federal law to existing human subjects data. A two-year committee established by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), the National Human Research Protections Advisory Committee (NHRPAC), was impaneled in June 2000 to examine the current system for human subjects protection and to report its recommendations to the Secretary of DHHS. A subcommittee of NHRPAC, the Social and Behavioral Science Working Group, was established to focus on a number of discipline-specific issues, including the secondary analysis of "public-use" data files in social science research. This Working Group seeks to clarify the status of social science data residing in data archives and on publicly available Web sites maintained by federal agencies and not-for-profit organizations.

Much confusion exists regarding research use of archived data, and a thorough discussion of the issues is critical to ensuring that research moves forward. In this article, I review current Federal law and guidance by the Office of Human Research Pro-

tection pertinent to using existing human subjects data in social science research. I also illustrate the issues as implemented in one university IRB, offer observations on some aspects of how local IRBs operate, and outline the implications of these issues for large-scale data archives like ICPSR. Finally, I suggest a near-term solution for providing legitimate access to most archived data on human subjects that is consistent with Federal law and existing OHRP guidance.

Federal Law and "Guidance" by OHRP

The two most germane elements of law and governing practice for local IRBs are a section of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) and periodic guidelines (or "guidance") issued to local Regulatory Compliance Officers and IRBs.

The CFR Title 45 Subpart 46.101(b) states as follows:

(b) Unless otherwise required by Department or Agency heads, research activities in which the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following categories are exempt from this policy:

[(1)–(3) omitted]

(4) Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

At face value, this part of the CFR suggests that existing or archived data are “exempt” from the policy requiring approval of the research protocol by local IRBs. This rather straightforward reading of Federal law governing human subjects protection evokes strong feelings on the part of many social science researchers, who believe that their local IRBs are “meddling” where Federal law suggests that they should not.

However, the Office of Human Research Protection issues “guidance” to local IRBs and Regulatory Compliance Officers regarding various matters involving the interpretation of the CFR and other related regulations. One such guideline provides for an important redirection of Federal law back into the hands of local IRBs. OHRP Guidance No. 27, Compliance Activities: Common Findings and Guidance, dated September 1, 2000, states:

(27) Procedures for Determining Exemptions. OHRP recommends that institutions adopt clear procedures under which the IRB (or some authority other than the investigator) determines whether proposed research is exempt from the human subjects regulations [see 45 CFR 46.101(b)]. Documentation should include the specific category justifying the exemption.

[<http://ohrp.osophs.dhhs.gov/references/findings.pdf>]

Thus, OHRP guidance acknowledges what the CFR exemption states but takes the interpretation of the exemption out of the hands of the researcher and places it with the IRB or its designee. An example of how this policy guidance is carried out by a local IRB might help to illustrate this shift in burden from the researcher to the local IRB.

Example Implementation of OHRP Guidance: Mississippi State University

The following narrative is excerpted from the *MSU Compliance News* (Fall 2001), the campus newsletter for regulatory compliance, and illustrates one local IRB’s attempt to implement both the CFR statement and OHRP’s Guidance No. 27:

Is IRB review required when using existing or secondary individual-level data?

The Federal regulations governing human subject research define “human subject” to include “identifiable, private information.” Therefore, IRB review is required if the data is not publicly available or if the information accessed will contain identifiers.

First, let’s discuss “publicly available.” Publicly available data is available to anyone. If you must sign an agreement, produce credentials or describe data usage to gain access to the data, it would not be considered “publicly available” and therefore, requires IRB review. Next, let’s address “identifiers.” While most of us would agree, names or social security numbers are identifiers, other variables in existing datasets may be used to identify individuals. If the dataset includes any variables that, combined with the specific characteristics of the dataset, could be used by anyone to identify subjects individually, the dataset contains identifiers and requires IRB approval.

It is true, in many cases, such studies may be reviewed through administrative or expedited processes. Yet, some datasets may require Full

Board review. A flow chart has been placed on the IRB website to help you determine whether IRB review is required. In addition to the flow-chart, a special IRB application form has been developed for existing data studies and is available online. If you have any doubts as to whether your project requires IRB review, please feel free to contact us. (p. 5)

This good-faith effort by one IRB may not be typical, but it illustrates the dilemma faced by those in charge of regulatory compliance for human subjects in a university setting. Basically, the Regulatory Compliance Officer, the Chair of the IRB, or perhaps the full IRB, makes an educated judgment on each prospective study involving human subjects data, even if it involves “public-use” versions of existing data. It is the tendency to err on the side of over-regulation that creates a “better safe than sorry” atmosphere for social science researchers (e.g., the tendency to send “everything” to the IRB and let them sort it out).

Observations on How Local IRBs Operate

Since local IRB judgment is a pivotal aspect of current compliance policies regarding human subjects protection, it is helpful to take a more in-depth look at the structure and internal dynamics of IRBs, with observations about the consequences of these characteristics.

The CFR determines a basic structure for IRB composition. The following section of 45 CFR 46 articulates membership on these boards:

§46.107 IRB membership. *Each IRB shall have at least five members, with varying backgrounds, to promote complete and adequate review of research activities commonly conducted by the institution.*

The IRB shall be sufficiently qualified through the experience and expertise of its members, and the diversity of the members, including consideration of race, gender, and cultural backgrounds and sensitivity to such issues as community attitudes, to promote respect for its advice and counsel in safeguarding the rights and welfare of human subjects.

In addition to possessing the professional competence necessary to review specific research activities, the IRB shall be able to ascertain the acceptability of proposed research in terms of institutional commitments and regulations, applicable law, and standards of professional conduct and practice. The IRB shall therefore include persons knowledgeable in these areas.

If an IRB regularly reviews research that involves a vulnerable category of subjects, such as children, prisoners, pregnant women, or handicapped or mentally disabled persons, consideration shall be given to the inclusion of one or more individuals who are knowledgeable about and experienced in working with these subjects.

Thus, the principle of structured diversity in the composition of IRBs offers “checks and balances” on the vested interests of scientists in the conduct of research and reflects the values of the community in which the research is conducted (Levine 1986: 355). Research subjects, such as prisoners, minors, etc., who may

not be able to fully consent to being subjects, particularly benefit from greater protection through this type of IRB structure.

There are some sociological consequences to this legally mandated IRB composition for protocols involving survey and related datasets. Only one or two IRB members are likely to be actual users of micro-level survey data. (By comparison, there are often only one or two physicians on social and behavioral IRBs to evaluate direct health risks.) Among IRB members not familiar with survey data, there is often a “Big Brother” perception that the identification of subjects from public-use survey datasets is inevitable.³ This should not be too surprising as a national survey of U.S. adults during 2000 found that respondents viewed the government as the biggest threat to personal privacy (see U.S. GAO 2001: 16). IRB members with end-user experience in secondary survey data often appear to the rest of the IRB members to be biased, since experienced survey data users continually find themselves trying to educate others on the board about the realistic limits to subject identification.

The risk of subject identification in survey data is a more nebulous potential risk than, say, a known 1-in-10,000 chance of an infarction. However, the differential between a vague, ad hoc definition of potential risk and one for which empirical estimates are readily available can often produce a “boomerang” effect in terms of the level of caution invoked by an IRB toward a particular protocol. I have seen these group dynamics push an IRB toward a more cautious stance on a protocol involving the potential risk of subject identification than for one with the “known”

specific risk of heart attack. It is the diversity in the composition of IRBs, however, that helps to prevent scientists from losing perspective on the protection of human subjects.

It is also the case that many social scientists face radically different standards for exemption status of projects involving secondary analysis under 45 CFR 46.101(b)(4).⁴ This leads to confusion and frustration on the part of researchers and, consequently, to lower levels of compliance with human subjects protection. Researchers become frustrated by interpretive variations across sessions of the local IRB, across investigators (e.g., are those investigators appearing frequently before IRBs perceived as “better risks” by IRB members due to familiarity?), and across campuses. Thus, compliance with human subjects regulations may well be reduced as a result of the perceived inconsistencies by researchers appearing before them.

Implications for Large-Scale Data Archives Like ICPSR

The NHRPAC Social and Behavioral Science Working Group has recently released its recommendations on public-use datasets (ASA 2002). They recommend a “top-down” shift in both the regulations and the definition of human subjects’ data. They argue that a “lack of understanding” about the nature of public-use social science data is associated with increased scrutiny of data that should be exempt from IRB review. This NHRPAC subcommittee also recommends that when the supplier of a public-use dataset has obtained local IRB approval, this should suffice for all

future use of that public-use dataset. They further suggest that “certain organizations,” such as ICPSR and the Murray Research Center, should be able to certify data files as “de-identified” and that this declaration obviates local IRB review. The group has identified several areas in current Federal law and guidelines from OHRP that are problematic, both for researchers and for the realized protection of human subjects.

The prognosis for how these recommendations to the Secretary of Health and Human Services will change Federal law and OHRP policy is uncertain at this point. However, I would like to provide my own observations and thoughts in this regard, all of which may prove to be wrong. These remarks are offered to encourage a deeper consideration by us all of what we often take for granted in our daily research involving existing data, especially those from large-scale archives like ICPSR.

An intentionally pessimistic view is that the NHRPAC Social and Behavioral Science Working Group draft recommendations on public-use data have a low probability of being implemented *carte blanche* for several reasons. Some of their recommendations violate the principle of local IRB control over human subjects participation in that they would preempt the capacity of local IRBs to make their own determinations. This principle is not likely to be put “at risk” itself. A key aspect of human subjects’ protection involves the principle of local determination of conditions and risks (Levine 1986).

There is also much political “hay” to be made over the careful scrutiny of science and scientists. Recall the continued media coverage

of former Senator Proxmire’s Golden Fleece award, often given to scientists during the period 1975–1988 for what Mr. Proxmire identified as unwarranted research investigations supported by public funds. Unfortunately, it is unlikely that these political dynamics will change in favor of the scientist in the near future.

On the other hand, the NHRPAC recommendations may serve as one critical step toward systemic change over a longer-term horizon. What may indeed happen is that OHRP will continue to issue “guidance” until the divergence between the CFR and how local IRBs operate grows great enough to warrant Congressional inquiries. As litigation involving human subjects inevitably grows, court cases will increasingly scrutinize what is written in Federal law and what the Federal OHRP requires involving the whole gamut of human subjects’ protection. Some of the key issues identified in the existing draft recommendations may well be re-examined in the courts, which could lead to changes in OHRP policy, revision of the CFR, or both. It is unknown how long this scenario of change might take, but clearly, it will not happen soon.

Recommendation for a Near-Term Solution

What can researchers and data archives like ICPSR do in the meantime? Right now, a “caveat emptor” atmosphere prevails, one in which individual researchers who employ public-use datasets without seeking local IRB approval run the risk of being in non-compliance with human subjects’ protection regulations at their institutions. Here is one strategy

— what I call a near-term solution involving public-use datasets — that I believe can be accomplished within the existing CFR regulations and OHRP guidelines.

Let NHRPAC push for a “top-down” change in OHRP and encourage individual scientists to support reasonable changes in current guidelines. At the same time, there is an existing mechanism that would minimize paperwork and streamline the process for public-use dataset usage, including most of those available from ICPSR. Local IRBs do not have the resources to make the public-use dataset determinations necessary under current guidelines. However, recall OHRP Guidance No. 27: “some authority other than the investigator” can determine the exemption status of a public-use dataset. *This “other authority” does not have to be the IRB itself, but can be an entity recognized by the IRB.* This follows the same logic as a friend-of-the-court petition by an outside expert in certain legal matters. That “friend,” in this case, could be the local ICPSR Official Representative.

The implementation of a precertification statement regarding micro-level datasets that meet public-use standards by ICPSR would facilitate the process. If ICPSR Official Representatives were willing to be involved in this way, they could petition local IRBs to declare ICPSR datasets as exempt from IRB review on that campus. The OR would petition the local IRB as follows: (a) the OR serves in the role of principal investigator for the campus; (b) the OR petitions the local IRB for exemption status of specific datasets on behalf of the campus community; and (c) ICPSR prepares an IRB-relevant statement about its datasets meeting standards for public-use status so

that local IRBs can make independent judgments about exemption status under 45 CFR 46.101(b)(4).

The ICPSR Web site could present a statement regarding the confidentiality procedures undertaken before the release of public-use datasets so that individual researchers and students would be cognizant of this issue. This denotation on the ICPSR Web site would amount to the "Underwriters Laboratory Seal of Approval" to local IRBs and would have the following benefits: (a) the public-use status seal would reduce confusion by researchers; (b) it would preserve local IRB jurisdiction but would address many of the concerns raised in the NHRPAC Social and Behavioral Science Working Group *Draft Recommendations*; and (c) it could be implemented quickly without waiting for "top-down" revisions of guidelines by OHRP. [Editor's note: ICPSR has prepared such a statement. See sidebar on page 2.]

This strategy puts ICPSR into a leadership role in addressing the public-use data issue. ICPSR's leadership would greatly assist schools with relatively small numbers of researchers or schools with IRBs that are not as proactive on these issues as others. However, some universities are addressing these issues on their own. An example of an individual campus taking the lead in a version of this strategy is the University of Wisconsin (see www.rsp.wisc.edu/humansubs/datasets.html). Their IRB-equivalent Human Subject Committee has "pre-approved" the exemption status of the datasets from the following archives: (1) Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR); (2) University of Wisconsin Data and Program Library Service

(DPLS); (3) University of Wisconsin–Madison Center for Demography and Ecology; (4) U.S. Bureau of the Census; (5) National Center for Health Statistics; (6) National Center for Education Statistics; and (7) National Election Studies.

References

- American Sociological Association. 2002. "NHRPAC takes actions vital to social science." *Footnotes* 30 (2): 1, 8.
- Brainard, Jeffrey. 2001. "The wrong rules for social science?" *Chronicle of Higher Education* (March 9): A21–A27.
- Koski, Greg. 2000. "Risks, benefits, and conflicts of interest in human research: Ethical evolution in the changing world of science." *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics* 20 (4): 330–331.
- Levine, Felice. 2001. "Weighing in on protecting human research participants: Let our voices be heard." *Footnotes* 29 (1): 2.
- Levine, Robert J. 1986. *Ethics and Regulation of Clinical Research, Second Edition*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Moreno, Jonathan D. 2001. "Good-bye to all that: The end of moderate protectionism in human subjects research." *Hastings Center Report*, 31 (3): 9–17.
- Sharpe, Angela L. 2001. "IOM hears concerns about human subjects' protection." *Footnotes* 29 (2): 1.
- Shea, Christopher. 2000. "Don't talk to the humans: The crackdown on social science research." *Linguafranca* 10 (6): 1–17.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. 2001. *Record Linkage and Privacy: Issues in Creating New Federal Research and Statistical Information*. GAO Report GAO-01-126SP, April.

Footnotes

¹ This is a revised version of a presentation given at the 25th Biennial Meeting of ICPSR Official Representatives, October 27, 2001. I am indebted to Tracy S. Arwood, Abner I. Harrison, Tracy B. Henley, and Jay T. Keehley, past and present colleagues on the Mississippi State University Institutional Review Board, for influencing my thinking about human subjects' protection. None of these colleagues, however, is responsible for errors of fact or interpretation in this article.

² Perhaps the most thorough coverage of these events can be found in the *Human Research Report*, published by the Deem Corporation, Omaha, NE (www.humansubjects.com). Leading Institutional Review Boards subscribe to this publication as part of their continuing education efforts to stay abreast of changing regulations and issues.

³ I have observed this puzzling aspect of IRBs for a number of years. Members without direct survey data-gathering experience sometimes have strongly held beliefs that, regardless of the purging of direct identifiers in a dataset, the equivalent of "survey hackers" can somehow find ways to identify anyone they desire and probably obtain a respondent's credit history in the bargain! The belief systems of IRB members represent an interesting opportunity for further study beyond the scattered personal observations of one sociologist.

⁴ I hasten to add that there is a good deal of "human subjects" research conducted by researchers trained in disciplines outside of the social sciences: engineers, biologists, and computer scientists all periodically submit protocols for review by social and behavioral IRBs.

A nnouncements

ICPSR to Move to New Location

ICPSR will be moving its headquarters during September 2002 to the Perry Building, a historic structure at the edge of the University of Michigan campus. Located at the intersection of Packard and Madison streets, the Perry Building was built in 1902 to house an elementary school, and in 1965 was purchased by the University of Michigan. The move to Perry will provide more square footage and growth space for ICPSR, which currently is occupying rental space in two locations.

Definitive dates for the move will be communicated as soon as they are available, as will new telephone and fax numbers. The move will most likely take place over a weekend, and only a brief interruption in data delivery is anticipated.

New Employees Join ICPSR Management Team

Two staff members have joined ICPSR in recent months. These new employees bring unique talents and experience to their positions and have already started to make significant contributions to ICPSR.

Rita Young Bantom is the new Human Resources Manager at ICPSR, with responsibility for personnel-related activities, facilities, and Council relations. Rita has a master's degree in Human Resources from Central Michigan University and most recently worked for a Global Human Resources consulting firm, specializing in recruiting and training. Rita is active in several professional organizations, including the Society of Human Resources, Human Resources Association of Greater Detroit, Employment Man-

agement Association, National Black MBA Association, and the Midwest Cooperative Education Association.

Cynthia Hoxey is the new manager of the Electronic Document Conversion unit. Cynthia previously held the position of Director of Data Systems at the University of Detroit, Mercy, and is currently working on a master's degree in computer information systems at that institution. She has a strong background in project management, database administration, and technical writing. Cynthia's initial goal will be to complete the retrofit conversion of paper documentation to Portable Document Format.

ORs to Take Sabbaticals at ICPSR

ICPSR is pleased to announce that it will host two Official Represen-

Census Activities Under Way at ICPSR

ICPSR has begun acquiring and distributing data from the 2000 Census (see related item on page 8). These data may be downloaded from the main ICPSR Web site or through ICPSR's Census 2000 site with its convenient clickable map interface (<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/CENSUS2000/>).

Census 2000 data available from ICPSR at press time include:

- Census of Population and Housing, 2000 [United States]: 1998 Dress Rehearsal, P.L. 94-171 Redistricting Data, Geographic Files for 11 Counties in South Carolina, Sacramento, California, and Menominee County, Wisconsin (ICPSR 2913)
- Census of Population and Housing, 2000 [United States]: Public Law (P.L.) 94-171 Data (ICPSR 3144)
- Census of Population and Housing, 2000 [United States]: Summary File 1, States (ICPSR 3194)
- Census of Population and Housing, 2000 [United States]: Summary File 1, Advanced National (ICPSR 3325)
- Census of Population and Housing, 2000 [United States]: Summary File 2, various states (ICPSR 13233-13284) [check Web site for available states]
- Census of Population and Housing, 2000 [United States]: Profiles of General Demographic Characteristics (ICPSR 3192)

tatives in Ann Arbor for the 2002 OR Sabbatical Opportunity program.

Michal Peleg, of the Israel Social Sciences Data Center, Hebrew University, will be joining ICPSR from April 3 to June 11. Michal will be working on reorganizing data processing procedures in view of the Web as a major distribution platform and growing user demands.

Jim Oberly, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, will visit ICPSR from May 15 to June 15. His focus will be the preparation of instructional datasets using ICPSR data. This relates to the role that Jim has played on the ICPSR Subcommittee for Instructional Materials and Information (SIMI).

Michal and Jim will report on their sabbaticals in the *ICPSR Bulletin* during the coming academic year.

ICPSR Receives New Grants

Census 2000

ICPSR has received word that its grant application to the National Science Foundation for funding Census 2000-related activities was successful. The Census 2000 project has six key activities:

- Acquisition and long-term archiving of substantially all data produced by the 2000 Census of Population and Housing
- Reformatting census data to facilitate use in statistical analysis programs
- Development of standardized documentation for census data that is compliant with the Data Documentation Initiative (DDI) standard

- Development of new data products, including special subsamples and special summary files, that serve the special needs of academic researchers
- Provision of Web-based access to the data. The Web-based system will include a data-finder and custom subsetting capabilities to allow researchers to find and acquire the data needed for specific research applications.
- Provision of training and outreach activities to encourage use of the data

Data Documentation Initiative

ICPSR and the Roper Center jointly have received a collaborative grant from the National Science Foundation to continue the activities of the Data Documentation Initiative (DDI) for an additional year. The DDI is an international program to produce a publicly available standard in XML for the metadata that describe social and behavioral science data.

National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (Renewal)

The continuation of this project, sponsored by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, will enable NACJD staff to augment and enhance this special topic archive, which is a national resource for research on crime and the criminal justice system. The NACJD provides assistance, training, and support services in the preparation, documentation, and use of crime and justice archival data for secondary analysis.

Instructional Modules Invited

The ICPSR Site for Instructional Materials and Information (SIMI) is being redesigned. The core of the site will consist of modules that can be downloaded and modified for classroom use. At present, there are modules on the sociology of religion and on macroeconomics. Instructors interested in contributing modules to the collection should contact John Korey at jkorey@csupomona.edu.

Interested users may visit the site at: http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/ORG/Other_Resources/SIMI/simi.html. The site also includes links to other instructional datasets in the ICPSR archives and to external sites providing teaching resources ranging from Java applets to online data analysis tools and comprehensive online textbooks.

Data Definition Statements Requested

In the course of their work to support local data users, Official Representatives often create SAS, SPSS, and Stata data definition statements for ICPSR studies that lack these auxiliary files. We encourage ORs to deposit such files with ICPSR to benefit the larger research community.

To deposit data definition statements, please send e-mail to deposit@icpsr.umich.edu to notify us of your intention. You will be provided with instructions for sending the files to ICPSR. Thank you in advance for your contributions.

A

dditions to Holdings

**ABC News/Washington Post
Anthrax Poll #2, October 2001**
— ABC News/The Washington Post
(ICPSR 3320)

**ABC News/Washington Post Poll,
July 2001** — ABC News/The
Washington Post (ICPSR 3287)

**ABC News/Washington Post War
Poll #1, November 2001** — ABC
News/The Washington Post
(ICPSR 3322)

**ABC News/Washington Post War
Poll #2, November 2001** — ABC
News/The Washington Post
(ICPSR 3364)

**ABC News/Washington Post War
Poll #3, December 2001** — ABC
News/The Washington Post
(ICPSR 3365)

**Aging, Status, and Sense of Control
(ASOC), 1995 and 1998: [United
States]** — John Mirowsky and
Catherine E. Ross (ICPSR 3334)

**Alcohol and Drug Services Study
(ADSS), 1996–1999: [United
States]** — United States
Department of Health and
Human Services. Substance
Abuse and Mental Health Services
Administration. Office of Applied
Studies (ICPSR 3088)

**American Housing Survey, 1999:
National Microdata** — United
States Department of Commerce.
Bureau of the Census (ICPSR 3204)

**CBS News California State Poll, July
2001** — CBS News (ICPSR 3347)

CBS News Call-Back Poll, June 2001
— CBS News (ICPSR 3348)

**CBS News Monthly Poll #1,
October 2000** — CBS News
(ICPSR 3216)

**CBS News Monthly Poll #3,
October 2000** — CBS News
(ICPSR 3225)

**CBS News Monthly Poll #1,
November 2000** — CBS News
(ICPSR 3232)

**CBS News Monthly Poll #2, April
2001** — CBS News (ICPSR 3343)

CBS News Monthly Poll, May 2001
— CBS News (ICPSR 3350)

**CBS News Monthly Poll, August
2001** — CBS News (ICPSR 3346)

**CBS News Monthly Poll #1,
September 2001** — CBS News
(ICPSR 3351)

**CBS News Monthly Poll, November
2001** — CBS News (ICPSR 3377)

**CBS News New Hampshire Primary
Call-Back Poll, January 2000**
— CBS News (ICPSR 2921)

**CBS News New Hampshire Primary
Poll #2, January 2000** — CBS
News (ICPSR 2923)

**CBS News Pre-Debate #2 Poll,
October 2000** — CBS News
(ICPSR 3217)

**CBS News Post-Debate #2 Poll,
October 2000** — CBS News
(ICPSR 3218)

NEW AT ICPSR

**ABC News/Washington Post Anthrax
Poll #2, October 2001** — ABC News/The
Washington Post (ICPSR 3320)

This special topic poll, conducted October 24, 2001, was undertaken to assess respondents' reactions to and feelings about the recent anthrax attacks involving letters contaminated with anthrax bacteria being distributed through the mail. Respondents were asked to describe their reaction to the anthrax threat, and their concern that a close relative, friend, or they themselves would contract anthrax. Those queried were asked if they thought that the mail they received at home was safe, if they were satisfied with the way the government was handling the anthrax situation, whether the anthrax situation was an isolated incident or the first of a continuing series of cases, how confident they were in the government's ability to respond to a large-scale biological or chemical attack on the United States, whether the government was as prepared as it reasonably could have been to deal with a biological attack like the anthrax situation, and if the United States was doing all that it reasonably could to prevent further biological attacks. In addition, respondents were asked if they approved of the way the Office of Homeland Security was handling its job, and whether the news media was exaggerating the danger in the anthrax situation. Respondents were asked if, since September 11th, anyone in their household had bought a supply of antibiotics in case of biological attack, spoken with a doctor about anthrax or some other biological attack, started to exercise caution in opening mail, gathered information about what to do in case of an anthrax or other biological attack, started avoiding crowded places such as shopping malls because of the chance of terrorism, or tried to reduce the amount of mail they handled by asking people to send e-mail instead. With respect to exercising caution with the mail, respondents were asked whether someone in their household was currently looking over mail more carefully than usual, throwing away unfamiliar mail without opening it, wearing gloves or a mask when handling mail, washing their hands after handling the mail, or doing anything else with the mail to take precautions. Background information on respondents includes gender and political party.

NEW AT ICPSR

Alcohol and Drug Services Study (ADSS), 1996–1999: [United States] — *United States Department of Health and Human Services. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Office of Applied Studies* (ICPSR 3088)

The Alcohol and Drug Services Study (ADSS) was a national study of substance abuse treatment facilities and clients. The study was designed to develop estimates of the duration and costs of treatment and to describe the post-treatment status of substance abuse clients. ADSS continues and extends upon data collected in the Drug Services Research Survey (DSRS) and the **Services Research Outcomes Study, 1995–1996: [United States]** (ICPSR 2691). The study was implemented in three phases. In Phase I a nationally representative sample of treatment facilities was surveyed to assess characteristics of treatment services and clients including treatment type, costs, program capacity, number of clients served, waiting lists, and services provided to special populations. In Phase II records were abstracted from a sample of clients in a subsample of Phase I facilities. This phase included four sub-components: (1) the Main Study, an analysis of abstracted records to assess the treatment process and characteristics of discharged clients, (2) the Incentive Study, which assessed the impact of varying financial payments on follow-up interview participation among non-methadone outpatient clients, (3) the In-Treatment Methadone Client study (ITMC), which assessed the treatment process of methadone maintenance, and (4) the comparison study of Early Dropout clients (EDO), which provided a proxy comparison group of records from substance abusers that went untreated. Phase III involved follow-up personal interviews with Phase II clients who could be located. This interview sought to determine post-treatment status in terms of substance use, economic condition, criminal justice involvement, and further substance abuse treatment episodes. Urine testing was conducted to validate self-reported drug use. Drugs included in the survey were alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, crack cocaine, heroin, barbiturates, benzodiazepines, amphetamines, non-prescribed use of prescription medications, abuse of over-the-counter medications, and other drugs.

Additions to Holdings (continued)

CBS News Pre-Debate #3 Poll, October 2000 — CBS News (ICPSR 3220)

CBS News Post-Debate #3 Poll, October 2000 — CBS News (ICPSR 3221)

CBS News Pre-Presidential Address to Congress Poll, February 2001 — CBS News (ICPSR 3276)

CBS News Post-Presidential Address to Congress Poll, February 2001 — CBS News (ICPSR 3277)

CBS News Vermont State Poll, August 2001 — CBS News (ICPSR 3345)

CBS News/New York Times Florida State Poll, October 2000 — CBS News/*The New York Times* (ICPSR 3223)

CBS News/New York Times Monthly Poll #2, October 2000 — CBS News/*The New York Times* (ICPSR 3222)

CBS News/New York Times Monthly Poll #2, November 2000 — CBS News/*The New York Times* (ICPSR 3233)

CBS News/New York Times Monthly Poll, June 2001 — CBS News/*The New York Times* (ICPSR 3349)

CBS News/New York Times Monthly Poll #2, September 2001 — CBS News/*The New York Times* (ICPSR 3352)

CBS News/New York Times Monthly Poll #2, October 2001 — CBS News/*The New York Times* (ICPSR 3378)

CBS News/New York Times Monthly Poll, December 2001 — CBS News/*The New York Times* (ICPSR 3379)

CBS News/New York Times New Jersey State Poll, October 2000 — CBS News/*The New York Times* (ICPSR 3219)

Census of Population and Housing, 2000 [United States]: Summary File 1, Advanced National — United States Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census (ICPSR 3325)

Current Population Survey, June 1971 — United States Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census (ICPSR 3330)

Current Population Survey, May 1989: Unemployment Benefit Compensation Supplement — United States Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census (ICPSR 3332)

Current Population Survey, November 1989: Unemployment Benefit Compensation Supplement — United States Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census (ICPSR 3333)

Current Population Survey, February 1990: Unemployment Benefit Compensation Supplement — United States Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census (ICPSR 3329)

Elementary and Secondary General Information System (ELSEGIS): Public Elementary-Secondary School Systems — Finances, School Year 1968–1969 — United States Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics (ICPSR 2234)

Eurobarometer 55.1: Globalization and Humanitarian Aid, April–May 2001 — Thomas Christensen (ICPSR 3361)

Eurobarometer 55.2: Science and Technology, Agriculture, the Euro, and Internet Access, May–June 2001 — Thomas Christensen (ICPSR 3341)

Evaluating Anti-Gang Legislation and Gang Prosecution Units in Clark and Washoe Counties, Nevada, 1989–1995 — Terance D. Miethe and Richard C. McCorkle (ICPSR 2753)

Evaluating the Impact of Alternative Placement Programs for Juveniles in a Southwestern State, 1983–1995: [United States] — Michael Fendrich (ICPSR 2991)

Gambling Impact and Behavior Study, 1997–1999: [United States] — National Gambling Impact Study Commission (ICPSR 2778)

Impact of Community Policing at the Street Level: An Observational Study in Richmond, Virginia, 1992 — Stephen D. Mastrofski and Jeffrey B. Snipes (ICPSR 2612)

Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practice of Contraception in Taiwan: Fifth Province-Wide Fertility Survey (KAP V), 1979 — Te-Hsiung Sun and Ming-Cheng Chang (ICPSR 6866)

Linked Birth/Infant Death Data, 1983 Birth Cohort: [United States] — United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3264)

Linked Birth/Infant Death Data, 1984 Birth Cohort: [United States] — United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3265)

Nativity Detail File, 1968: [United States] — United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3241)

Nativity Detail File, 1969: [United States] — United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3242)

Nativity Detail File, 1970: [United States] — United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3244)

Nativity Detail File, 1971: [United States] — United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3243)

Nativity Detail File, 1972: [United States] — United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3245)

NEW AT ICPSR

Census of Population and Housing, 2000 [United States]: Summary File 1, Advanced National — *United States Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census* (ICPSR 3325)

Summary File 1 contains 100-percent United States decennial Census data, which is the information compiled from the questions asked of all people and about every housing unit. The Advance National component of Summary File 1 describes the entire United States. Population items include sex, age, race, Hispanic or Latino origin, household relationship, and group quarters occupancy. Housing items include occupancy status, vacancy status, and tenure (owner-occupied or renter-occupied). There are a total of 171 population tables ("P") and 56 housing tables ("H") provided down to the block level, and 59 population tables provided down to the census tract level ("PCT") for a total of 286 tables. In addition, 14 population tables and 4 housing tables at the block level and 4 population tables at the census tract level are repeated by major race and Hispanic or Latino groups. The data present population and housing characteristics for the total population, population totals for an extensive list of race (American Indian and Alaska Native tribes, Asian, Native Hawaiian, and Other Pacific Islander) and Hispanic or Latino groups, and population and housing characteristics for a limited list of race and Hispanic or Latino groups. Population and housing items may be crosstabulated. Selected aggregates and medians also are provided.

NEW AT ICPSR

Survey of Program Dynamics (SPD) First Longitudinal File: Data Years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, and 1997 — *United States Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census* (ICPSR 3315)

The Survey of Program Dynamics (SPD) First Longitudinal File is a fully edited file that provides socioeconomic data for the calendar years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, and 1997. It is intended for longitudinal analyses of the effects of welfare reform on individuals, families, and households. The file can be linked to the **SPD 1998** (ICPSR 2917), the **SPD 1997 Bridge** (ICPSR 2797), and the **SIPP panel files** for 1992 (ICPSR 6429) and 1993 (ICPSR 6886). The file contains basic demographic, economic, and social characteristics data for each member of the household for four or five years depending on the panel. The 1992 panel contains data for 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, and 1997. The 1993 panel contains data for 1993, 1994, 1996, and 1997. The subject matter is described as follows: demographic data (age, sex, race, ethnic origin, marital status, household relationship, education, and veteran status), economic data (work experience, employment status, occupation, industry, weeks worked and hours per week worked, total income, and income components), income data (income from jobs, net income from business, farm or rent, pensions, dividends, interest, and Social Security payments), and data covering noncash income sources (food stamps, the school lunch program, employer-provided group health insurance plan, employer-provided pension plans, Medicaid, Medicare, CHAMPUS or military health care, and energy assistance). The file contains codes for 41 individual states, plus the District of Columbia. However, the sample is not designed to produce state estimates. The SPD sample in the nine remaining states is identified in three groups for confidentiality reasons. The three groups are as follows: Maine and Vermont; Iowa, North Dakota, and South Dakota; and Alaska, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming.

Additions to Holdings (continued)

Natality Detail File, 1973: [United States] — United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3246)

Natality Detail File, 1974: [United States] — United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3247)

Natality Detail File, 1975: [United States] — United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3248)

Natality Detail File, 1976: [United States] — United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3249)

Natality Detail File, 1977: [United States] — United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3250)

Natality Detail File, 1978: [United States] — United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3251)

National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, 1999 — United States Department of Health and Human Services. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Office of Applied Studies (ICPSR 3239)

National Judicial Reporting Program, 1998: [United States] — United States Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics (ICPSR 3316)

Neighborhood Revitalization and Disorder in Salt Lake City, Utah, 1993–2000 — Barbara B. Brown and Douglas D. Perkins (ICPSR 3261)

New York Times New Jersey State Poll, October 2001 — *The New York Times* (ICPSR 3375)

New York Times New York City Poll #1, October 2001 — *The New York Times* (ICPSR 3373)

New York Times New York City Poll #2, October 2001 — *The New York Times* (ICPSR 3374)

North Dakota Health Insurance Survey, 1998 — Alana Knudson-Buresh (ICPSR 3313)

Russian Election Study, 1995–1996 — Timothy Colton (ICPSR 3323)

Survey of Program Dynamics (SPD) First Longitudinal File: Data Years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, and 1997 — United States Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census (ICPSR 3315)

Vital Statistics: Divorce Detail [United States], 1987 — United States Department of Health and Human Services. National Center for Health Statistics (ICPSR 3178)

Vocational Education [United States]: Crosswalk Between the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) and Handbook VI, 1981 — United States Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics (ICPSR 2375)

Washington Post Virginia Governor Poll, October 2001 — *The Washington Post* (ICPSR 3321)

R

evisions and Updates

American National Election Study, 2000: Pre- and Post-Election Survey — Nancy Burns, Donald R. Kinder, Steven J. Rosenstone, Virginia Sapiro, and the National Election Studies (ICPSR 3131)

Assessment of a Multiagency Approach to Drug-Involved Gang Members in San Diego County, California, 1988–1992 — Susan Pennell, Roni Melton, and Darlanne Hctor (ICPSR 2022)

Census of Population and Housing, 2000 [United States]: Summary File 1, States — United States Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census (ICPSR 3194)

Central and Eastern Euro-Barometer 3: Political Disintegration, October–November 1992 — Karlheinz Reif and George Cunningham (ICPSR 6106)

Community Tracking Study Physician Survey, 1998–1999: [United States] — Center for Studying Health System Change (ICPSR 3267)

Drinking and Driving: A Survey of Licensed Drivers in the United States, 1983 — John Snortum (ICPSR 8356)

Employee Stock Ownership Plans, 1982–1991: [United States] — Eric S. Sheppard and Stephen J. Smela (ICPSR 2600)

Eurobarometer 47.2: Women and Cancer, the European Parliament, and Expectations of the European Union, April–June 1997 — Anna Melich (ICPSR 2090)

Eurobarometer 47.20VR: Young Europeans, April–June 1997 — Anna Melich (ICPSR 2091)

Eurobarometer 52.0: European Parliament Elections, the Single European Currency, and Financial Services, October–November 1999 — Anna Melich (ICPSR 2892)

Eurobarometer 52.1: Modern Biotechnology, Quality of Life, and Consumers' Access to Justice, November–December 1999 — Anna Melich (ICPSR 2893)

European Survey About Teachers and Cancer Prevention, 1989 — Jacques-Rene Rabier (ICPSR 9407)

Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practice of Contraception in Taiwan: First Province-Wide Fertility Survey (KAP I), 1965 — L.P. Chow, Hsiao-Chang Chen, and Ming-Cheng Chang (ICPSR 6862)

Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practice of Contraception in Taiwan: Second Province-Wide Fertility Survey (KAP II), 1967 — L.P. Chow, Hsiao-Chang Chen, and Ming-Cheng Chang (ICPSR 6863)

Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practice of Contraception in Taiwan: Third Province-Wide Fertility Survey (KAP III), 1970 — Te-Hsiung Sun and Ming-Cheng Chang (ICPSR 6864)

Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practice of Contraception in Taiwan: Fourth Province-Wide Fertility Survey (KAP IV), 1973 — Te-Hsiung Sun and Ming-Cheng Chang (ICPSR 6865)

Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practice of Contraception in Taiwan: Sixth Province-Wide Fertility Survey (KAP VI), 1986 — Te-Hsiung Sun, Ming-Cheng Chang, Mei-Ling Lee, and Hui-Sheng Lin (ICPSR 6867)

Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth, 1976 — Jerald G. Bachman, Lloyd D. Johnston, and Patrick M. O'Malley (ICPSR 7927)

Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth, 1977 — Lloyd D. Johnston, Jerald G. Bachman, and Patrick M. O'Malley (ICPSR 7928)

Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth, 1978 — Jerald G. Bachman, Lloyd D. Johnston, and Patrick M. O'Malley (ICPSR 7929)

Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth, 1979 — Lloyd D. Johnston, Jerald G. Bachman, and Patrick M. O'Malley (ICPSR 7930)

Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth, 1980 — Jerald G. Bachman, Lloyd D. Johnston, and Patrick M. O'Malley (ICPSR 7900)

Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth, 1981 — Lloyd D. Johnston, Jerald G. Bachman, and Patrick M. O'Malley (ICPSR 9013)

Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth, 1982 — Jerald G. Bachman, Lloyd D. Johnston, and Patrick M. O'Malley (ICPSR 9045)

Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth, 1983 — Lloyd D. Johnston, Jerald G. Bachman, and Patrick M. O'Malley (ICPSR 8387)

Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth, 1984 — Lloyd D. Johnston, Jerald G. Bachman, and Patrick M. O'Malley (ICPSR 8388)

Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth, 1985 — Lloyd D. Johnston, Jerald G. Bachman, and Patrick M. O'Malley (ICPSR 8546)

Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth, 1986 — Jerald G. Bachman, Lloyd D. Johnston, and Patrick M. O'Malley (ICPSR 8701)

Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth, 1987 — Lloyd D. Johnston, Jerald G. Bachman, and Patrick M. O'Malley (ICPSR 9079)

Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth, 1988 — Jerald G. Bachman, Lloyd D. Johnston, and Patrick M. O'Malley (ICPSR 9259)

National Youth Survey [United States]: Wave VII, 1987 — Delbert Elliott (ICPSR 6542)

Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 1997 — United States Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics, and United States Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Prisons (ICPSR 2598)

Uniform Crime Reports [United States]: Supplementary Homicide Reports, 1976–1994 — James Alan Fox (ICPSR 6754)

P ublication-Related Archive (PRA)

Dollarization As a Monetary Arrangement for Emerging Market Economies — Gaetano Antinolfi and Todd Kliester (ICPSR 1250)

Equity Financing of the Entrepreneurial Firm — Frank A. Schmid (ICPSR 1249)

Not Your Father's Pension Plan: The Rise of 401(k) and Other Defined Contribution Plans — Leora Friedberg and Michael T. Owyang (ICPSR 1253)

Persistence, Excess Volatility, and Volatility Clusters in Inflation — Michael T. Owyang (ICPSR 1251)

Presidential Uses of Force During the Cold War: Aggregation, Truncation, and Temporal Dynamics — Sara McLaughlin Mitchell and Will H. Moore (ICPSR 1254)

U.S. State Turnout Rates for Eligible Voters, 1980–2000 — Michael P. McDonald (ICPSR 1248)

Voting Rights, Private Benefits, and Takeovers — Frank A. Schmid (ICPSR 1252)

Summer Program, 2002

For a catalog
and application,
contact:

ICPSR Summer Program

P.O. Box 1248

Ann Arbor MI 48106-1248

(734) 998-9888

sumprog@icpsr.umich.edu

<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/sumprog>

FIRST SESSION

(June 24–July 19)

Workshops

Quantitative Historical Analysis
Introduction to Statistics and Data Analysis I
Mathematical Models: Game Theory
Introduction to Regression Analysis
Regression Analysis
Advanced Multivariate Statistical Methods
Simultaneous Equation Models
Maximum Likelihood Estimation for
Generalized Linear Models
Bayesian Methods
Linear, Nonlinear, and Nonparametric
Regression
Quantitative Analysis of Crime and Criminal
Justice

Lectures

Mathematics for Social Scientists I
Mathematics for Social Scientists II
Introduction to Computing
Statistical Computing in S
*Advanced Topics in Social Research

2–5 DAY WORKSHOPS

(May 23–August 16)

Latent Growth Curve Analysis (5/23–25)
Multilevel Models (5/26–28)
Eurobarometers (5/29–30)
World Values (5/31–6/1)
Event History Analysis (6/3–7)
Minority Aging and Health (6/10–14)
Hierarchical Linear Models: Introduction
(6/10–14)
Mixed Models (6/17–21)
Census 2000 (6/24–28)
Spatial Analysis: Introduction (6/24–28)
Hierarchical Linear Models: Advanced
(7/8–11)
Network Analysis: Introduction (7/8–12)
Categorical Data Analysis (7/15–19)
“LISREL” Models (7/22–26)
Network Analysis: Advanced (7/29–8/2)
Spatial Regression Analysis (8/5–9)
Providing Data Services (8/12–16)

*Advanced Topics:

Missing Data Analysis
Causal Inference
Resampling Techniques: Bootstrap
Bayesian Modeling
Statistical Graphics for Univariate
and Bivariate Data

SECOND SESSION

(July 22–August 16)

Workshops

Scaling and Dimensional Analysis
Regression Analysis
Time Series Analysis
Mathematical Models: Rational Choice
Introduction to Statistics and Data Analysis II
Categorical Analysis
“LISREL” Models: General Structural
Equations
Longitudinal Analysis
Advanced Maximum Likelihood Estimation
Quantitative Methods in the Study of
Russia and Eastern Europe

Lectures

Complex Systems Models
Introduction to Computing
Matrix Algebra
*Advanced Topics in Social Research



P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

Moving? Please send us your new address,
along with your old mailing label.

ICPSR COUNCIL MEMBERS, 2002–2004

Ann Green, Chair, Yale University
ann.green@yale.edu

William Darity Jr., University of North
Carolina, Chapel Hill, and Duke University
darity@unc.edu

Ilona Einowski, University of California, Berkeley
ilona@ucdata.berkeley.edu

Elisabeth R. Gerber, University of Michigan
ergerber@umich.edu

Franklin Gilliam, University of California, Los Angeles
fgilliam@ucla.edu

John Handy, Morehouse College
jhandy@morehouse.edu

Mark Hayward, Pennsylvania State University
hayward@pop.psu.edu

John Korey, California State Polytechnic
University, Pomona
jlkorey@csupomona.edu

J. Scott Long, Indiana University
slong@indiana.edu

Steven Ruggles, University of Minnesota
ruggles@hist.umn.edu

James Sweet, University of Wisconsin, Madison
sweet@ssc.wisc.edu

Bo Wandschneider, University of Guelph
bo@uoguelph.ca

Margo Anderson, Past Chair, University of
Wisconsin, Milwaukee
margo@csd.uwm.edu

To reach *all* Council members:
council@icpsr.umich.edu

ICPSR ADMINISTRATION AND STAFF

Myron Gutmann, Director
gutmann@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 998-9911

Rita Bantom, Human Resources Manager
rybantom@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 615-9519

Stacey Kubitz, Business Manager
skubitz@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 998-9907

Bree Scesny, Administrative Assistant
bscesny@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 998-9911

ARCHIVAL DEVELOPMENT

Erik Austin, Director
erik@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 615-9522

Peter Granda, Assistant Archival Director
peterg@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 615-9522

Christopher S. Dunn, Assistant Archival Director
cdunn@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 998-9824

JoAnne McFarland O'Rourke, Director,
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Project
jmcfar@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 615-9522

James McNally, Director, Program on Aging
jmcnally@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 998-9790

Kenneth F. Ferraro, NACDA Resident Scientist,
Purdue University
ferraro@purdue.edu

COMPUTER AND NETWORK SERVICES

John E. Gray, Director
jgray@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 998-9920

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES

Henry Heitowit, Director
hank@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 998-9888

Dieter Burrell, Assistant Director
dburrell@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 998-9888

MEMBER RELATIONS

Henry Heitowit, Director
hank@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 998-9888

Michelle Humphres, Membership Coordinator
michelle@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 998-9911

TECHNICAL SERVICES

Janet Vavra, Director
jan@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 998-9799

Mary Morris, Assistant Director
morris@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 998-9799

WEB RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mary Vardigan, Director
maryv@icpsr.umich.edu (734) 998-9840

ICPSR BULLETIN, SUMMER 2002 — VOL. XXII, NO. 4

The Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), located at the Institute for Social Research in Ann Arbor, is the world's largest repository of computer-readable social science data. For 40 years, the Consortium has served the social science community by acquiring, processing, and distributing data collections on a broad range of topics. Researchers at the Consortium's member institutions may obtain any of these data collections at no charge; researchers at nonmember institutions may also use the data, after paying an access fee. To find out more about ICPSR's holdings or about a specific data collection, access the ICPSR Web site at: <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu>.

The *ICPSR Bulletin* is published four times during each academic year to inform Official Representatives at the member campuses, ICPSR Council members, and other interested scholars of activities occurring at ICPSR and at other member institutions, and to list the data collections most recently released or updated by ICPSR. For subscription information, contact the Editors.

Subscription Price: \$15 per year

ICPSR
Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-2321

Associate Editors: Ruth Shamraj and
Elizabeth Sikkenga

Phone: (734) 998-9900
Fax: (734) 998-9889
E-mail: netmail@icpsr.umich.edu



Printed on recycled paper