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ADDITIONS TO THE NEWSLETTER

At the last annual conference, a number of suggestions were made for adding to the format of the Newsletter. This issue includes a Calendar of Events, and beginning with the Fall 1982 issue, a regular Book Review column, a Personal column and a bi-annual section of data abstracts from John Kolp's SSDATA will be added.

The Calendar will cover conferences, courses, events, etc., and notices should be sent to the editor. Book Review information is located on page ii. The Personal Column is designed to be a place where one can request information, advertise skills, jobs, or services, etc. Space is free to members, but space is limited. Items for any of these sections are welcome.

CALENDAR

This is a new addition to the Newsletter. Please send all notices of upcoming events with dates, locations and contact persons to the editor.

October 14-15, 1982
Association of Public Data Users Conference
Contact: Rick Bender
APDU Secretariat
Princeton University
87 Prospect Avenue
Princeton, New Jersey 08544
U.S.A.

October 17, 1982
American Society for Information Science (ASIS)
Pre-conference workshop on designing useful numeric data base systems

October 19-22, 1982
Society for American Archivists
Annual Conference
Contact: Society of American Archivists
330 S. Wells Street
Suite 810
Chicago, IL 60606

November 4-6, 1982
Social Science History Association 1982 Annual Meeting
Contact: Elyce J. Rotella
Economics Department
Bullantine Hall
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405
U.S.A.
November 12, 1982

IASSIST West Coast Regional Meeting
Seminar on the 1980 Census

Contact: Elizabeth Stephenson
Institute for Social Science Research
Room 11252 Bunche Hall
University of California
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90024
U.S.A.

Los Angeles, California
(213) 825-0716
(213) 825-0711

November 17-19, 1982

National Conference on Local Networks

Contact: Conference Manager
U.S. Professional Development Institute
12611 Davan Drive
Silver Spring, MD 20904
U.S.A.

Washington, D.C.
(301) 622-5696

November 24-26, 1982

ESOMAR Seminar on Research and Prediction

Contact: Barry Hedges
SCPR
35 Northampton Square
London, ECIV OAX
ENGLAND

Amsterdam, Holland

December 28-30, 1982

Annual Conference: American Economic Association

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

May 19-22, 1983

IASSIST Annual Conference

Contact: Judith Rowe
Princeton University
87 Prospect Avenue
Princeton, New Jersey 08544
U.S.A.

New Brunswick, New Jersey

June 10-12, 1983

International Conference in Data Bases in the Humanities and Social Sciences

Contact: Professor Robert F. Allen
Room 427
Alexander Library
Rutgers, The State University
New Brunswick, NJ 08903
U.S.A.
August 11-14, 18-21, 1983
International Time-Series Meetings
Contact: O. D. Anderson
9 Ingham Grove
Lenton Gardens
Nottingham NG7 2LQ
ENGLAND

August 15-18, 1983
Annual Meeting: American Statistical Association

August, 1983
International Federation of Social Science Organizations (IFSSO)
International Colloquium on the Rationale and Basis for the Allocation of Public Funds to Social Science Research
Contact: SSHRCC, Mr. Fortier, President
255 Albert Street, Box 1610
Ottawa, Ontario KIP 6G4
CANADA

August - September, 1983
ESOMAR/WAPOR Conference
Contact: Robert Worcester
MORI

1983
International Computing Symposium
Contact: Herr Professor D. H. Wederkind
Universität Erlangen - Nürnberg
Lehrstuhl Informatik VI
Martenstrasse 3
D-8520 Erlangen
GERMANY
RIGHTS OF RESEARCHERS AND GOVERNMENTS TO NATIONAL RECORDS

The articles which follow are drawn from the papers presented at the 1982 Annual Conference and focus on the rights of researchers and governments to national records. Both present an overview of the policies and legislation which determines ownership and utilization of information in the United States and Great Britain. This is the first of a two-part issue on the subject. The Fall 1982 Newsletter will be devoted to a follow-up article on the U.S. and to contributions from Germany and Sweden.

WHO OWNS CONTRACT AND GRANT DATA AND WHO CAN USE IT?: A LOOK AT THE U.S.A.

BY

Thomas Elton Brown
National Archives and Records Service
United States of America

The opinions expressed in this article are solely those of the author and in no way reflect the official position of the National Archives and Records Service.

Information management policies for machine-readable data include two fundamental questions. The first concerns the disposition of the information. This can involve long-term retention of the data by its creator, destruction whether willful or inadvertent, or transfer to another organization or individual. The decision on the disposition is the responsibility of the person or organization who legally owns the information. The second area of concern is who has access to the information and under what conditions. Obviously, the disposition can affect the access. If the data is destroyed, no one has access. Since different organizations and individuals can differ widely on access procedures, legal and physical custody can determine whether data is available. However these issues are addressed, the main goal of the information management policies should be the best and most efficient use of the information.

In the United States, the ownership and disposition of materials in the hands of Federal agencies are regulated by the Records Disposal Act. This legislation defined records as "all books, papers, maps, photographs, machine readable materials or other documentary materials, regardless of physical form or characteristics, made or received by an agency of the United States government under Federal law or in connection with the transaction of public business..." Under this act, the agency may not destroy or otherwise dispose of those records without the approval of the National Archives and Records Service. For those computer records which the Archives appraises as having continuing value, agencies are required to transfer them to the National Archives as soon as they become inactive.
Access to government information is controlled by the country's Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) as amended in 1974. It requires the prompt release of "agency records" unless they fall under one of nine exemptions. If one of these exemptions applies, the agency must release "any segregable portion of the record". However Congress failed to define "agency records" in the FOIA.3

Most Federal officials assumed that the definition in the Records Disposal Act applied to the FOIA. In 1978, however, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ruled otherwise in Golan and Skidmore v. Central Intelligence Agency et al. The Appeals Court pointed out that Congress "had ample opportunities" to refer to the Records Disposal Act's definition, but had not done so. Since the ruling did not provide an alternative definition, it suggested that the meaning of "agency records" would be decided on the individual facts of each case.4

Two years later, the Supreme Court in Forsham v. Harris moved toward using the Records Disposal Act's definition for FOIA purposes. The Court noted that both the Records Disposal Act and another related statute associated the creation or acquisition of materials with the concept of the status of "records" and concluded that this association had significance "in this case". Before drawing this conclusion, the Court warned "these definitions are not dispositive of the proper interpretation of the congressional use of the word [records] in the FOIA."5

To discuss the impact of the Records Disposal Act and the FOIA on information created under government grants and contracts, one must distinguish between the two. Before 1977, government agencies often used grants and contracts interchangeably for administrative convenience to get work done. In that year, a new law required agencies to discriminate between the two forms of Federal funding. Grants are intended to support a private organization or individual whose functions have a public or general purpose. In contrast, a contract is the result of a procurement process through which the government buys something for its own use. This can include the purchase of information or services.6

In 1978, the United States House of Representatives committee investigated the ownership, maintenance, access, and disposition of information produced under United States government grants and contracts. The committee reported that the national government had no consistent policy or guidelines concerning such data.7 For example, the committee asked the Executive Departments for their policies on ownership, use, and disposition of data assembled by contractors. The response ranged from the Department of Commerce claiming ownership and the right to control distribution to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare vesting ownership in the contractor of all information including that specified for delivery.8

Since this congressional investigation, the Supreme Court clarified some of the issues regarding grant records. In the previously mentioned Forsham decision, a group of researchers had sued under the FOIA to gain access to raw data in the hands of a grantee. The Court denied access:

Congress undoubtedly sought to expand public rights of access to government information when it enacted the Freedom of Information act, but that expansion was a finite one. Congress limited access to "agency records"... With due regard for the policies and language of the FOIA, we conclude that data
generated by a privately controlled organization, which has received grant funds from an agency (hereafter a "grantee"), but which has not at any time been obtained by an agency, are not "agency records" accessible under the FOIA.

This decision rested on the fact that the granting agency, the National Institutes of Health, consistently maintained that the records were not government property and had never received a copy of the raw data with the final reports. After equating creation or acquisition as the "threshold" for records status in this case, the Court determined that a private organization had made the records and that no Federal agency had ever received them. Records retained by a grantee seemingly are beyond the scope of the Records Disposal Act for disposition and the FOIA for access. In this situation, the grantee has almost total control over access and disposition of the information, subject only to the specific provisions of the grant. The implication in this reasoning is that whatever information an agency does receive from a grantee is an "agency record" under both statutes.

In light of this decision, researchers may be able to obtain data from the grantee in two fashions. First, some grants contain clauses which give the government agency the right to access the data assembled by the grantee. If the agency exercises this right, then seemingly the disposition and access questions would be governed by the statutes and not the grantee. Secondly, several granting agencies concerned with supporting research specify that the data be made available to other researchers. For example, the National Endowment for the Humanities' guidelines for Basic Research proposals advise:

Please provide evidence of other scholar's readiness to make use of your data, if you anticipate such use, and discuss your or your institution's plans to make the data available to other researchers.10

In these cases, the grantee appears to retain the authority for determining access and disposition.

While Forsham clarified some aspects concerning grant data, the decision noted the Congressional distinction between grants and contracts. Thus the questions about contract data remain unanswered. A clear example of this is to look at the table of contents in the Federal Procurement Regulations in the Code of Federal Regulations. In this thousand-plus-page volume which outlines the regulations which civilian agencies must follow, not one word has been included in the section reserved for "data".11 Instead, each agency has developed its own internal guidelines with varying approaches and degrees of specificity for use in each contract. The Department of Agriculture candidly reported, "Most of the contracts awarded by this Department do not contain clauses specifying who owns the data, how it can be used, and the ultimate disposition of the data."12

Whatever the agencies general guidelines are, they are put into the specific clauses of the contract. In almost all contracts which provide services or information to the government, "Rights in Data" clauses define the mutual rights of the government and the contractor to the information. There are three basic approaches:

1.) all data delivered under the contract is acquired with limited rights;

2.) all data is acquired with unlimited rights, and
3.) specified data is acquired with unlimited rights.

Implied in the rights-in-data clauses is the authority of the government to order delivery of the data. A recent development in such rights-in-data clauses is the "deferred ordering and delivery of data" provision. Several agencies--Department of Defense, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Department of Education, and Department of Housing and Urban Development--are using standard clauses to require delivery of the information created during the contract for two or three years after the termination of the contract. This right to order data extends to the entire Federal government, not just the contracting agency.13

If a Federal agency orders and receives the data from a contractor, then the information is seemingly subject to the Records Disposal Act. This is the position of the National Science Foundation regarding its research centers operated by contractors. If a center transfers any material to the Foundation, the records become government property and subject to the government's records management policies regarding disposition.14 While the FOIA would probably control access to the delivered data as well, this is less certain.

Are the records which the contractor retains subject to the Records Disposal Act? To rephrase the question, is a government agency "making" the records when it awards a contract to an organization or individual for the contractor to perform a service or gather information? The question is unresolved. Possibly the key to this question is whether the contractor is performing a function which the Congress has specifically mandated the agency to perform. This position may receive support in the section of the Records Disposal Act which requires:

The head of each Federal agency shall make and preserve records containing adequate documentation and proper documentation of the organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, and essential transactions of the agency. . .15

Since the questions of disposal and access are separate, does the FOIA apply to the records retained by the contractor? This too is unanswered. The Courts have been reluctant to apply the FOIA to contractor records. But these cases generally have concerned the housekeeping material incidental to the administration of the contract and not to the raw data collected for the government.

These legal questions about grant and contract data will become even more critical as Federal agencies increasingly rely on private organizations to perform Federal functions. The answers to these questions will define the information management issues about the contract and grant information. As the House committee stated in its previously cited report, "The point of a disposition policy is not for the Government to acquire all data from a Federal grant or contract, but for the best use to be made of the data." In searching for the key to this "best use", the committee concluded that "No single information management provision would be suitable for all Federal contracts or grants." And that "different types of information may require different types of management." Indeed this committee hoped that its report would produce discussions and more understanding about grant and contract data.16 Hopefully, those interested in the secondary analysis of data either as users or suppliers will join the discussion to clarify the issues and to find suitable disposition and access policies.
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WHO OWNS CONTRACT AND GRANT DATA IN THE U.K. AND WHO CAN USE IT?

BY

Cally Brown
School of Library Archive and Information Studies
University College London

Marcia Taylor
SSRC Data Archive
University of Essex

In 1980, a working group of the Social Research Association published a report on the "Terms and conditions of social research funding in Britain". (1) Issues singled out for special consideration included control over publication and ownership of data and copyright. The ensuant discussion was not as useful as it might have been, however, because the differences inherent in contract-funded research and grant-funded research were not always recognised. It therefore seems worthwhile here to start by distinguishing between these two concepts insofar as they relate to the British situation.

In grant-funded research, money is awarded by the commissioning body on a broad understanding as to the results of the research. The study is usually initiated by the researcher rather than by the funding body, and the funder does not normally see itself as the primary user or beneficiary of the results. Rather, the intended audience is seen to be other practitioners and theoreticians in the general field of the enquiry and, ultimately, 'the citizen'. Ownership of results---including both data collected and interpretations of those data---are usually left in the hands of the researcher.

In contract-funded research, money is awarded to the researcher for a specific study defined by the funder. The researcher may be pre-selected by a 'closed-tender' process, or chosen from a group invited to apply for the contract on a competitive 'open-tender' basis or, occasionally, appointed after public advertisement. A customer-contractor relationship is entered into where the commissioner purchases the researcher's services and is the prime user of the research results. The funder usually retains much clearer control over the research process than in the case of grant-awarding bodies, and usually claims rights of ownership over all material created during the activity of the enquiry. In effect, the contracted researcher is paid for his time and expertise but has no rights to the product of his labour.

As the Social Research Association report suggests, public funding of social research in the U.K. is organised in two ways: through government departments and quangos, and through more generally oriented independent bodies such as the Social Science Research Council (SSRC). Increasingly, government departments are using contracts to administer research, whilst the SSRC usually allocates research funds through a grant system.
The report also suggests that central government departments are increasing their direct support of social research whilst, at the same time, public funds made available for more general social research are being diminished.

With this picture in mind, we have first looked at the ways in which central government departments directly administer their research funds, paying special consideration to contract practice and how this affects ownership of, and access to, data; and then we have gone on to consider Britain's most prolific independent funding agency of social research, the SSRC. The examples used as illustration have generally been based on personal communication.

**PRACTICE IN CENTRAL GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS**

**Funding Conditions**

The extent of control exercised by government departments over externally conducted research initially depends on whether the funds have been awarded on a contract basis or on a grant basis. Practice varies considerable.

Those departments that usually employ a grant system for funding research do not, typically, have a tradition of internal research activity. This may be due to a variety of factors, but in particular, may be due to the nature of the policy area involved. For example, the Department of Education and Science and the Department of Health and Social Security are concerned with the school system and The National Health Service respectively. In both instances, the policy control is decentralised, and in both cases, the department favours a grant system as the most appropriate way of administering research funds.

Departments with a tradition of performing their own research and which have--or have had--internal research units, are most likely to work on a contract basis. The Department of Employment, the Department of the Environment and the Home Office, for example, all tend to put researchers under contract.

**Access to Research Results**

As we have already suggested, contract-funding can give the funder greater control over the research he has sponsored.

Under common law in the U.K., an employer has the right to claim ownership of all materials created by an employee during the period of employment, so long as this is stipulated in the employment contract. The employee's right to publish no longer applies although under the Copyright Act ownership of copyright arises from evidence of authorship. For example, in British universities, ownership of copyright material authored by researchers is usually claimed by the university in its employment contract. Whether the university subsequently exercises this power of ownership is another question.

Similarly, government departments can claim ownership of work performed by externally contracted researchers.
Her Majesty's Stationary Office, apparently, advises departments to include a specific clause in contracts making any written results of research subject to Crown Copyright, and the inclusion of a further clause claiming ownership of materials encoded in machine-readable forms. (Ownership of machine-readable data is particularly unclear in English law as this area is not addressed by the 1956 Copyright Act currently in force.)

The inclusion of such ownership clauses in government contracts is, however, left to the discretion of individual civil servants. This means that not only does contract practice vary between departments, but it can also differ within a department.

In some contracts, the most restrictive veto on publication is both stated and implemented. In others, the department reserves the right to prior publication—indeed, in one case where such a right was reserved, the sponsoring department used this right to delay publication of results, which meant that the researcher concerned was unable to publish his somewhat contradictory interpretation.

The publication veto is, however, usually more liberally interpreted by individual civil servants and although the formal contract appears to be restrictive, the researcher will often receive an accompanying letter of agreement relaxing any publication restrictions stipulated in the contract.

It can also be noted that contracts from a few departments place no conditions upon publication apart from requiring acknowledgment of sponsorship and a waiver of departmental responsibility.

The variation in contract implementation practice within departments is perhaps best illustrated by two views independently expressed to us concerning the same department. One researcher stated that the department was "the best--very liberal" in its attitudes, whilst the other was emphatic that the department was "a bugger--always gives me trouble".

Machine-readable data are preserved, if at all, on the initiative of individual government departments or by the Social Survey Division of the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys. There is, at present, no Public Records Office machine-readable archive where records collected in this form by government research must be deposited. Although in March 1981 a review committee recommended to the Lord Chancellor that such an archive be established with the greatest possible speed (2), the future development of such an archive remains a matter for conjecture and discussion continue with the SSRC Data Archive as to the possible form this might take.

Meanwhile, public access to government-initiated data remains discretionary. Typically, data are made available through individual arrangement between researchers and civil servants. More general access is frequently provided through deposit in the SSRC Data Archive and localised access is sometimes made possible by deposit in one of the smaller data archives established in several British universities.

In the absence of legislation, access is often as haphazard as the interpretation of publication rights. Some examples may serve to illustrate this.
In one type of departmental contract, the data are provided by the department to the contracted researcher. In one such case, the researcher was obliged to sign The Official Secrets Act and was forbidden to allow anyone access to the data who was not specifically named in the contract. He was further required to return the data uncopied. In another case where the department supplied the data, however, the researcher was permitted to mount a copy on his local machine in perpetuity. Another contract reported to us stipulated that the data be destroyed or returned to the departments after use but constructed variables could be retained by the researcher.

An absolute lack of caution on the part of the department is illustrated by one somewhat incredible case where the researcher was supplied with a sample of highly confidential, individual records taken from a central register. Nowhere in the contract was reference made to the preservation of confidentiality or to subsequent use of the data.

In the other type of departmental research contract where data are collected by the contracted researcher, there are equally contrasting examples of departmental attitudes towards data access.

In one case, a seemingly non-controversial enquiry in the area of medical research, the researcher, himself, was very keen to deposit resulting data in the SSRC Data Archive. The funding body, however, remained adamant that the data should be withheld, effectively ensuring that no further access could be made to the data by the contracted researcher or secondary analysts.

In direct contrast to this, a well established research institute which conducts numerous social surveys of medical care under government contract, deposits data as a matter of course in the Data Archive.

The lack of any legislation defining public rights of access to data may have been a contributory factor in the last example where data were scheduled for deposit in the Data Archive following a project initiated during the life of one government but, with a change in administration, this decision was reversed and no further access was granted.

As we see it, where social research is administered directly by government departments on a contract basis, the government funds the research, specifies the research and has the power to control dissemination of the research results. There is, however, no consistency in practice and ownership and access conditions vary between contracts.

Current Developments

There is no automatic right of access by U.K. citizens to public records. Access is not governed by any written rule of law but is, as we said earlier, at the discretion of the government and, de facto, of individual civil servants.

There is, however, an indication that this situation may be changing and that the government is becoming aware of the need for some sort of coherent policy on public access to government data and--by extension--to government contracted research data.
In 1980, a review of the Government Statistical Services was carried out under the chairmanship of Sir Derek Rayner. It recommended, among other things, that government departments should seek less costly and more flexible means of enabling interested members of the public to have access to government figures, and that clear rules about the use of data should be published in order to enable more statistical research to be performed outside the civil service. (3)

Where this recommendation is acted upon, it may well help to increase the public availability of data collected under government contract. An indication of this already happening can be seen by the number of government department approaches made to the SSRC Data Archive in order to use the Archive's facilities for disseminating data and statistical series.

**PRACTICE IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL**

**Funding Conditions**

The Social Science Research Council (SSRC) was established in 1965 to promote and fund research activities within the social sciences and to provide a continuing overview. The bulk of its research funds are spent on grants.

The grant-awarding process is entirely responsive—that is, application is made to the Council at the initiative of the individual researcher. Proposals are reviewed by a committee appointed for this purpose by the Council, consisting of leading scholars in the field, and then put out for independent refereeing. This 'peer group assessment' is considered to be an essential part of the award process. Awards are typically made to institutions rather than to individuals, so that applications are subject to further scrutiny by the research committeess in applicants' home institutions.

**Access to Research Results**

Once a grant has been awarded, the researcher is usually left to his own devices to complete the research and submit his report. A copy of this report is usually deposited by the SSRC in The British Library Lending Division. Additional publications by the researcher are encouraged by the Council, and copyright rests with the investigator.

The SSRC aims to assure access to any machine-readable data generated during the study by making it a condition of the grant that a copy of the data be offered to the SSRC Data Archive for subsequent use by secondary analysts. Failure to do so may affect the success of any future grant application made by the researcher.

**Current Developments**

In recent years, responding to both a growing shortage of funds and to public pressure to make research more relevant to policy issues, the SSRC has allocated an increasing proportion of its grant budget to specific research initiatives defined by a specially appointed board of the Council.
Administration of these research initiatives more closely approximates the contracting methods used by government departments, where the procedures are more formalised and supervision is likely to be more stringent.

Whilst directing research may be an efficient way for the SSRC to administer its restricted resources, this trend towards a research-initiatives policy has led to an emphasis being placed on short-term, ad-hoc and specific policy-oriented research at the expense of more long-term, basic research.

In spite of the SSRC's moves towards initiating and directing research, there has been increasing criticism of the Council for supporting esoteric and irrelevant studies, culminating in demands in parliament and the press for its closure.(4)

However, the Rothschild Report published in May 1982, outlining the results of a review of the SSRC's functions and functioning, recommended that the Council should not only not be closed, but that it should be asked to return more diligently to its original remit of promoting the future development of social science research, particularly multidisciplinary research that will not only advance the understanding of current issues of public importance, but will also fundamentally question the working of society.(5)

The report stressed the importance of 'peer review' of social research, emphasising the need for independence from government departments in research initiation.

If the recommendations in this report are implemented, the main thrust of SSRC funding can be expected to return to a grant-awarding system with its more liberal copyright and data access arrangements. It can reasonably be expected that independence from government control of data access will be assured by the Council's continued commitment to the broadest possible airing of research results.

Conclusion

In the volatile and often contradictory situation we have described, it is difficult to envisage specific suggestions which could be made to guarantee the public availability of government-funded data.

The Social Research Association has begun drawing up a list of "desirable and undesirable contract conditions", and it recommends that "steps be taken to secure agreement to such a list". (1) Whilst we feel that the first of these tasks is formidable and the second - monumental, nevertheless we feel that such an exercise is a necessary pre-requisite to any further action.

We also echo the Association's view that many of the difficulties surrounding ownership of, and access to, data would be "alleviated if there were greater harmonisation of contract conditions". (1)

We would add, in conclusion, that until data protection regulations and freedom of information legislation are in force in the U.K., little progress can be made towards any consistent or just policies to ensure access to data.
1982 ANNUAL CONFERENCE REPORT

The IASSIST 1982 Annual Conference and Workshops were held May 27-30, at the Hotel del Coronado in San Diego, California, U.S.A. According to only moderately biased reports, the conference was considered a huge success by those attending. The site was fantastic, the program participants were well prepared and the hospitality suite closet bar was a different experience.

Conference attendance highlights include:

- Ninety-five participants over the four day period.
- Good workshop participation. Fifty-three percent of those attending the conference attended a workshop.
- Significant Canadian, European and Australian representation. Over 22% of the participants were not from the United States.
- Sporadic participation by the hotel police force in the post mid-night session of the Turkey Action Group. The police comprised about 10% of the group.
- Amazing representation at Sunday's business meeting. Thirty-seven percent or 35 people appeared.

Approximately 50% of the conference participants were not previously IASSIST members. Twenty-four or 25% of those individuals subsequently became members. Only 44% of the conference participants were from California.
Program

The conference was officially opened on Friday, May 28 by Alice Robbin, the past president of IASSIST. After thanking those individuals who had assisted her during her term in office, she cautioned that the next few years would be critical ones for IASSIST and would require energy and commitment from its newer members. Sue Gavrel, the new president, was then introduced.

The Plenary Session, chaired by Judith Rowe, Princeton University, brought Wilfried M. Podehl, Director, CANSIM Statistics Canada, and James Wetzel, Acting Associate Director for Demographic Fields, U.S. Bureau of Census, together to discuss the distribution policies and practices of each of their respective agencies. Members of the audience then commented on statistical policies in their own countries during an open exchange with the speakers.

The remaining seventeen paper and discussion sessions were distributed over five time periods. Within each time period, three sessions occurred: one with a data services orientation, one focusing on data processing, and one concerning data utilization. Each session consisted of three presentations with an acting chair. Approximately fifty different individual presentations were given on Friday and Saturday.

The banquet speaker, Robert L. Patrick, a recognized expert in computer technology, discussed the pitfalls inherent in the computerization of large complex surveys. The real difficulties are associated with the use and interpretation of such data and not with the technical problems of documentation or linkage noted Mr. Patrick.

Workshops

Three technical workshops were offered the day before the conference began. Fifty individuals attended.

The presentations were instructional in nature and entitled:

- CENSUS/CENSPAC: The Content of the 1980 U.S. Census Software System of Data Access
  Ilona Einowski, University of California, Berkeley, U.S.A.
  Jackie McGee, The Rand Corporation, U.S.A.

- Automated Archive Administration: MLD Data Bases and the ASTRID Language
  Karsten Boye Rasmussen, Danish Data Archives, Denmark

- Archive and Data Management Using SAS: Problems and Solutions
  Sally Carson, The Rand Corporation, U.S.A.
  Jeffrey Garfinkle, The Rand Corporation, U.S.A.

Each workshop ran an entire day and focused on specific procedures and applications within the topical area.
Random Comments

Overall, the 1982 conference was a success both substantively and economically. IASSIST coffers showed a $1,300 profit.

A larger U.S. attendance had been anticipated but local and Federal government agencies were still adjusting to radical budget cuts. Many previously accepted participants in paper sessions were forced to cancel because of lack of institutional support.

The following general observations may be of interest.

- Individuals presenting papers are somewhat casual about submitting their abstracts prior to the conference.
- Between 35% and 45% of all presentations are in the end solicited by the program committees.
- Coffee and tea are one of the more expensive conference items. The banquet is the most expensive.
- Information exchange is helped if the opportunity and facilities to get together informally after scheduled sessions are provided.
- Participants always take longer than their allotted time.
- The importance of technical contacts and discussions probably exceeds the importance of the papers acquired.

The attempt to programmatically mix archivist, librarians, programmers, and researchers within the topical area of the generation, transfer, retrieval and use of machine-readable social science data was considered important to the conference's success. Many new perspectives and ideas emerged.

A significant part of the value of belonging to any professional, voluntary organization is in participating in its annual conferences. IASSIST members are encouraged to attend and participate in the 1983 conference in Philadelphia.

As a postscript, the 1982 committee found the experience challenging, rewarding and real pain, so remember to "support your local program committee".

Program Committee

Ilona Einowski, UC Berkeley, Co-Chair
Jackie McGee, Rand, Site Arrangements
Elizabeth Stephenson, UCLA, Workshops
Don Trees, Rand, Co-Chair and Autobiographer
**FRIDAY, (May 28)**

Welcome/Introduction:

Plenary Session:

Distribution Policies and Practices of National Statistical Producing Agencies

Chair: Judith S. Rowe, U.S.A.
Princeton University

James Wetzel, U.S.A.
Acting Associate Director for Demographic Fields
Bureau of Census

Wilfried M. Podehl, Canada
Director, CANSIM
Statistics Canada

Concurrent Session:

A. Issues in Archive Management and Development

Chair: Alice Robbin, U.S.A.
University of Wisconsin

Sue Gavrel, Canada
Public Archives
"Constructing Inventories of Available Data"

Erika von Brunken, Sweden
Medical Information Center
"Problems in Integrated Information Supply"

Jane Henson and Alice Robbin, U.S.A.
University of Indiana and University of Wisconsin
"File and Record Preservation and Maintenance Techniques"

Marilyn Nasatir, U.S.A.
Online Computer Library Center
"Increasing Availability of Machine-Readable Data Files Through Computerized Networks"

B. Rights of Researchers and Governments to National Records

Chair: Carolyn Geda, U.S.A.
University of Michigan
Thomas E. Brown, U.S.A.  
National Archives  

Laine Ruus, Canada  
University of British Columbia  

Cally Brown, United Kingdom  
University College London  

Erwin K. Scheuch, Germany  
Zentralarchiv fur Emperische Sozialforschung  

C. On-Line Socio-economic and Demographic Data Bases  

Chair: Deane Merrill, U.S.A.  
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory  

Connie Zuga, U.S.A.  
DIALOG  

Dean Stoecker, U.S.A.  
National Planning Data Corporation  

George Boomer, U.S.A.  
Data Resources, Inc.  

Concurrent Session:  

A. Users Critique National Statistics  

Chair: Judith Rowe, U.S.A.  
Princeton University  

Peter J. Johnson, U.S.A.  
Princeton University  
"Current Status of Latin American Public Sector Socio-economic Data"  

Trevor Jones, Scotland  
University of Edinburgh  
"Developments in Public Sector Machine-Readable Data Availability in the United Kingdom"  

Judith Rowe, U.S.A.  
Princeton University  
"Future Problems with U.S. National Statistics"  

B. Health Data: Statistics and Research  

Chair: Erika von Brunken, Sweden  
Medical Information Center
Elizabeth Stephenson, U.S.A.
University of California, Los Angeles
"Organization and Content of Available Health Data"

Sandy Smith, U.S.A.
National Center for Health Statistics
"Collection and Distribution of Health Data"

Anne Coulson, U.S.A.
University of California, Los Angeles
"Issues of Health Research"

C. Software for Managing Large Social Science Data Bases

Chair: Pat Doyle, U.S.A.
Mathematica Policy Research

Celia A. Allard, U.S.A.
Montana State University
"GRASP: A Package for Efficient Management and Analysis of Large Socioeconomic Databases"

Deane Merrill, U.S.A.
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
"SEEDIS: Socio-Economic Environmental Demographic Information System"

Joel Kibbee, U.S.A.
Southern California Association of Governments
"Heiter System for Processing Census Summary Tapes Using SAS"

Roundtables:

A. Educating Data Archivists

Chair: Laine Ruus, Canada
University of British Columbia

B. Effects of Data Collection Methods on Data Quality

Chair: Terence W. Beed, Australia
Sample Survey Center

**SATURDAY, (May 29)**

Concurrent Session:

A. Reconstructing Historical Data

Chair: Sue Gavrel, Canada
Public Archives
Herbert Reinke, Germany
Zentrum fur Historische
Sozialforshung E.U.
"The Impact of Data Management in Historical Social Research on Data Archiving"

Edward H. Hanis and S. Paula Mitchell, Canada
University of Western Ontario
"Methods and Software Systems for the Creation of a Machine-Readable Edition of the 1881 Census of Canada"

Ann Cooper, U.S.A.
University of Wisconsin
"Census Reconstruction for 1940 and 1950"

B. Data Evaluation Methods

Chair: David Nasatir, U.S.A.
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Robert G. Orwin, U.S.A.
Northwestern University
"Furthering the Integrity, Credibility, and Utility of Quantitative Research Integration"

Don Trees, U.S.A.
The Rand Corporation
"Criteria for Evaluating Data Quality"

David Cordray, U.S.A.
Northwestern University
"Charterizing the Research Quality of Primary Studies: Issues and Options for Meta-Analysis"

C. Geographically Oriented Data Bases

Chair: Frederic Bon, France
University des Sciences Sociales, Grenoble

R. J. Stimson, Australia
Flinders University of South Australia
"A Computer Spatial Data Base for Urban Planning"

Lee Johnson, U.S.A.
Criterion, Inc.
"Using Geographic Information Systems for District and Site Location Planning"

Herve Guillorel, France
Institute de Politique Internationale at Europeenne
University of Paris X-Nantene
"Developing Software: Collaboration Between Research Center and Computing Center"
Concurrent Session:

A. Available Subject Area Data Bases

Chair: Ilona Einowski, U.S.A.
University of California, Berkeley

Jackie McGee, U.S.A.
The Rand Corporation
"Major Available U.S. Social Science Machine-Readable Data Bases"

Midi Cox, U.S.A.
The Rand Corporation
"Linking Educational Data Files"

Nancy Minter and Wayne Bannister, U.S.A.
County of Los Angeles
"Income Tax Returns as a Demographic Data Source"

B. Ecological Data Analysis Problems

Chair: R. J. Stimson, Australia
Flinders University of South Australia

Atle Alvheim, Norway
Norwegian Social Science Data Services
"An Evaluation of Solutions to the Problem of Boundary Changes When Analyzing Long-Term Relationships on Aggregate Data"

Robin S. Liggett and Michael Hollis, U.S.A.
University of California, Los Angeles
"The Ecological Fallacy and the Use of Spatially Aggregated Data"

Frederic Bon, France
University des Sciences Sociales, Grenoble
"How to Organize Statistical Software for Ecological Data Processing: The Example of French Electoral Data"

C. Software and Procedures for Data Management

Chair: Beverley C. Rowe, United Kingdom
International Statistical Institute

Karsten Boye Rasmussen, Denmark
Danish Data Archives
"A Data Base System for Archive Management"

Jeffrey B. Garfinkle, U.S.A.
The Rand Corporation
"A Structured Approach to Documenting Data Management Activities"

Ernie Hernandez, U.S.A.
Los Angeles County Sheriffs Department
"SPSS/SAS Systems for Data Base Management: A Personnel and Recruitment System"
Concurrent Session:

A. Documentation and Data Dictionaries
   Chair: Karsten Boye Rasmussen, Denmark
          Danish Data Archives

          Lynn Johnson, U.S.A.
          The Rand Corporation
          "Philosophy of Data Dictionary Systems"

          Beverly C. Rowe, United Kingdom
          International Statistical Institute, World Fertility Survey
          "Using a Data Dictionary to Interface Survey Files to Statistical
          Packages and Compilers"

B. Using Public Opinion Poll Data
   Chair: Don Trees, U.S.A.
          The Rand Corporation

          Terence W. Beed, Australia
          University of Sydney
          "Public Opinion Data Useage"

          Sue Dodd, U.S.A.
          University of North Carolina
          "A User Approach to Harris Survey Data"

          Ken Gross, U.S.A.
          California Survey Research
          "What Data User's Need to Know About Public Opinion Survey Quality"

C. Linking and Integrating Data
   Chair: Ernie Hernandez, U.S.A.
          Los Angeles County Sheriffs Department

          Lee G. Faulkner, U.S.A.
          Montana State University
          "Merging Data Sets: The Creation of the National County Data Base"

          Wayne Hansen, U.S.A.
          Demographic Research Company Inc.
          "Merging Census and Local Area Data: Problems and Solutions"

          Pat Doyle, U.S.A.
          Mathematica Policy Research
          "Resolving Family and Household Composition Problems in Linking Waves
          from a Longitudinal Household Survey"
Interest and Action Group Meetings:

Two action groups dealing with issues involved in "Classification and "Process-Produced Data" and the interest group concerned with "Data Services: Development and Management" met.

Banquet:

Speaker: Robert L. Patrick
Computer Specialist
"What We Can Do and What We Should Do--A Technician Looks at Collections of Social Science Data"

A reception with a no host; cash bar preceded the banquet.

TURKEY ACTION GROUP REPORT
(TEMAS, USAGE, AND RETRIEVAL OF CONTENT EVALUATION)

This action group was originally founded at the IASSIST-IFDO annual conference in Grenoble in 1981, and ratified at that time by the membership at the formal business meeting.

The objectives of the action group are as follows:

- to promote the examination of normal but non-formalized methodologies in inter-personal leisure time communications, with special emphasis on two main aspects: inter-cultural comparisons of common themas (as befits a group within an international association), and the components and functions of normal (as well as abnormal) environments in which such communications function. The primary emphasis of the Action Group will be on oral, natural language systems as opposed to more formalized, written derivatives. Emphasis will also be placed on thematic analysis of data generated by such communication systems, and the impact of such systems on other verbal and non-verbal communication systems.

During its first year the Action Group was chaired by:

Alek Gray, Strathclyde - chair for Europe
Laine Ruus, UBC - chair for the Americas
Terence Bede, ACPR - chair for the Antipodes

The 1982 IASSIST conference in San Diego was the occasion of the first official meeting of the TURKEY Action group. This meeting was, despite the awkward
hour of its convening, very well attended. The objectives of the Action Group were thoroughly tested, and no reason was found to alter them. Policy for future meetings and inter-meeting activities were planned--it should be noted here that among the policies established at this meeting was to restrict membership (i.e., it is not open, but must be earned) in order that the size of the group not become too unwieldy.

Further it was decided in an executive meeting of the Action Group that all members of the Group be required to bring to each meeting new items, within the sphere of interest of the Group, for general consideration. The establishment of a database is planned for the future.

The co-chairs were very much heartened by the enthusiastic response and obvious commitment of those attending the meeting. Plans are already in progress for the next meeting of the action group to be held in conjunction with the 1983 IASSIST conference.

For the period 1982-1983 the chairs to the TURKEY Action Group are as follows:

Laine Ruus, SSC - chair for Europe
Walter Piovesan, SFU - chair for the Americas
Terence Beed, ACPR - chair for Asia and the Antipodes

ANNOUNCEMENTS

IASSIST 1983 ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The 1983 Annual Conference will be held at the Warwick Hotel in Philadelphia, PA on May 19-22. The Warwick is an elegant hotel and both the sleeping rooms and public facilities are designed to contribute to a most enjoyable conference, even if there will be no palm trees. The planning committee was hosted by Kay Worel in New York on September 15th. Look in following issues of the NEWSLETTER for the Call for Papers and registration information.

THE "1983 INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON DATA BASES IN THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES"

This conference will be held at Rutgers University from June 10-12. Scholars are invited to send abstracts (in duplicate) of papers they would like to deliver at the conference, to Professor Robert F. Allen, Room 427, Alexander Library, Rutgers - the State University, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903 U.S.A.
A one-day seminar covering the machine-readable format of the 1980 Census will be held at UCLA on November 12th. The sessions will be conducted by Ilona Einowski, State Data Program, Berkeley, CA and by Jackie McGee, The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, CA.

The workshop is being sponsored jointly by the Institute for Social Science Research and the International Association for Social Science Information Services and Technology.

The seminar will focus on the use of census data and participants will follow a manual prepared by the instructors. The topics which will be covered include:

- overview of census data and questionnaire content
- comparison of 1970 and 1980 censuses
- census geography and geographic hierarchy
- technical aspects of: non-sampling errors, allocation of codes, substitution, and suppression of data.
- use of data dictionaries and table outlines
- multiple record types
- MARF, GBF/DIME files
- CENSPAC, a software package designed to manipulate census data files

This workshop is a must for anyone using census data in any way. The seminar is open to all who are interested, and space limits size to fifty participants. The cost is $10.00 and it includes copies of the manual and other documentation used in the session. Participants must register by November 1st. Those who are interested should contact Elizabeth Stephenson, ISSR, Room 11252 Bunche Hall, UCLA, 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024 (213) 825-0716.
ANNOUNCING ISSC STEIN ROKKAN PRIZE IN COMPARATIVE RESEARCH

The International Social Science Council, in conjunction with the Conjunto Universitario Candido Mendes (Rio de Janeiro) announces that the next STEIN ROKKAN PRIZE will be awarded in November 1983.

The Prize is intended to crown a seminal contribution in comparative social science research written in English, French or German, by a scholar under forty years of age on 31st December 1983. It can be a manuscript or a printed book or collected works, in each case published after 1981.

Four copies of manuscripts typed double space or of printed works shall be delivered to the International Social Science Council before 15 February 1983, together with a formal letter of application with evidence of the candidate's age attached. Manuscripts and publications received shall not be returned. Works submitted shall be evaluated by the International Social Science Council with the assistance of appropriate referee or referees, under the supervision of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) and its chairman.

The AWARD shall be made by the ISSC General Assembly meeting in November 1983 on the recommendation of the ISSC Executive Committee. Its decision shall be final and not subject to appeal or revision.

The Prize is in the amount of U.S. dollars 2,000. It may be divided between two or more applicants, should it be found difficult to adjudicate between equally valuable works submitted.

For further enquiries, please write to:

The Secretary General
International Social Science Council
UNESCO - 1 rue Miollis
75015 Paris, France
TREASURER'S STATEMENT FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1981

A. Revenues: Membership Fees, Interest and Other
   1. Membership Fees (all fees received in 1981)
      | Region       | Amount   |
      |--------------|----------|
      | Asia         | $170.00  |
      | Canada       | $470.00  |
      | United States| $3,038.21|
      | Western Europe| $933.17  |
   Less: Uncollectable cheques and refunds       | $(110.48) |
   2. Interest (from IASSIST chequing accounts) | $165.86   |
   3. Balance from closed out W. Europe bank account | $100.00   |

SUBTOTAL A: Membership Fees, Interest and Other  $4,766.76

B. Net Revenues: Conferences, Workshops, and Meetings
   1. Revenues and Refund of $675.00, 1980 Annual Conference* $2,793.51
   2. Revenues; 1980 Conference Fee Received directly by the Treasurer 30.00
   3. Expenses, 1981 Annual Conference (359.12)

SUBTOTAL B: Net Revenues, Conferences, etc. 2,464.39

C. Operating Expenses
   1. Newsletter Typing, Printing and Postage Vol 4, nos. 1,2,3,4; Vol 5, nos. 1,2; (2,445.26)
   2. 184 Subscriptions to SS Data @ $3.00 (552.00)
   3. IASSIST Headquarter's Expenses (668.50)
   4. IASSIST President's Expenses (295.21)
   5. Bank Account Charges (13.65)
   6. Western Europe Secretariat's Expenses (100.00)

SUBTOTAL C: Operating Expenses (4,074.62)

D. Carry Forward from 1981 (A + B + C) 3,156.53

E. Cash Position as of December 31, 1981
   1. Carry Forward from 1981 3,156.53
   2. Carry Forward from Previous Years 5,547.40 $8,703.93

CAN$ Account Statement Balance 1,260.65
USA$ Account Statement Balance 7,443.28 $8,703.93

NOTES: * The amount, $2,793.51, was transferred to the Treasury in 1981 from a Washington bank account for the IASSIST 1980 Conference. The Washington bank records were also transferred to the Treasury. The amount is equal to the difference between deposits and charges against the bank account as presented in the bank statements.

Ed Hanis, Treasurer
April 29, 1982

cmf
ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

President: Sue Gavrel, Machine Readable Data Archives, Public Archives of Canada, 395 Wellington Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A ON4, Canada

REGIONAL SECRETARIES

Asia: Naresh Nijhawan, Indian Council of Social Science Research, Data Archive, Canada: Open

East Europe: Krzysztof Zagorski, Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii, Polskiej Academii Nauk, Nowy Swiat 72, Palac Staszica, 00-330 Warszawa, Poland

West Europe: Henk Schrik, Steinmetz Archives, Herengracht 410-412, 1017 BX Amsterdam, The Netherlands

United States: Judith S. Rowe, Computer Center, 87 Prospect Street, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, U.S.A.

MEMBERS-AT-LARGE

John de Vries, Department of Sociology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, K1S 5B6, Canada

Sue A. Dodd, Social Science Data Library, Manning Hall, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514, U.S.A.

Carolyn Geda, Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, P.O. Box 1248, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, U.S.A.

Jackie McGee, The RAND Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, California 90406, U.S.A.

Nancy Carmichael McManus, Social Science Research Council, 1755 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, U.S.A.

Ekkehard Mochmann, Zentralarchiv fur Empirische Sozialforschung, University of Cologne, Bachemerstrasse 40, D-5000 Cologne 41, Federal Republic of Germany

David Nasatir, California State University, Dominguez Hills, California 90747, U.S.A

Per Nielsen, Danish Data Archives, Niels Bohrs Alle 25, DK-5230 Odense M, Denmark

Laine G. M. Ruus, Swedish Social Science Data Service, Storgatan 13, S 411 24 Goteborg, Sweden

Don Trees, The RAND Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, California 90406, U.S.A.
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