

Chapter 1

The 1980s: Critical Challenges and New Resolve

1. INTRODUCTION

Background and Context

The 1980s opened to critical challenges for the discipline and the Association. The period of “decline and retrenchment” which began in the mid-1970s continued well into the 1980s: The recession of 1978 to 1982 severely reduced employment opportunities for sociologists, the pool of research funds contracted, and the number of sociology majors dropped dramatically between 1974 and 1985. To many, these conditions created a generally pessimistic picture for the future of sociology.

These crises affected the Association as well. In 1982, William Form observed that, “ASA has gone into debt even as members call for more and more expensive services Some Sections of the Association think that they are being done in by the Program Committee. Traditionalists insist that the Association should focus exclusively on academic concerns while others think that more emphasis should be given to teaching. Attendance at the annual meetings is down and the costs of meetings are rising.” (*Footnotes*, August 1982:1) President Alice Rossi wrote in 1983 that the profession “may have ‘crested’ in terms of numerical size” resulting in potentially new complexities in balancing goals and providing services to ASA membership in the future (*Footnotes*, December 1983:3). ASA priorities were also shifting as graduate enrollments in sociology declined, and an increasing number of people holding sociology degrees found employment in non-academic settings.

The Association responded to these challenges with determination and focus. The changing needs of sociologists were addressed by enhancing existing programs and designing and implementing new initiatives. Organizational and governance structures of the Association were improved to better serve the membership. A major change occurred in 1984 when the Executive Office was restructured, leading to more effective and efficient operations. Council and the Executive Office also worked aggressively to achieve fiscal stability for the ASA—even as they sought to improve and expand services for the membership. The Executive Office operations were greatly enhanced in this respect by new information technologies and systems, which facilitated the continuing professionalization of services provided by ASA.

Special attention during the 1980s was focused on the needs of sociologists who were facing hardships as a result of the economic downturn. The ASA sponsored a major workshop on applied sociology in late 1981 that signaled its new interest and commitment to sociologists working in

non-academic settings. In January 1982, Edna Bonacich presented a statement to Council on the “Crisis in the Occupation of Sociology,” with recommendations on how to respond to this serious challenge. A high priority on professional opportunities for un- and underemployed and the “independent scholar” was also expressed through initiatives advancing sociological practice, and through various committees with mandates on related issues (e.g., the Committee on Employment, which was established to deal specifically with problems of unemployment and underemployment of sociologists).

To a considerable extent, shifts in public policies and societal and global changes of the 1980s exacerbated the difficulties which sociology was experiencing. Under the Reagan administration, federal agencies reduced levels of support for research and scholarship in the social sciences, and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) proposed eliminating social research altogether. Some agencies, like the National Institute of Education (NIE) were heavily shaped by political agendas, and others, such as the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) had their very existence threatened. Budget cuts in social programs, increasing social inequality, homelessness, racism, discrimination, and policies on education and the environment posed serious challenges. Public support for dealing with AIDS and its consequences was slow in coming. Human rights violations, which continued to threaten the lives of many around the world, resulted in the persecution or death of sociologists in several countries, most notably in El Salvador.

By the mid-1980s, prospects for employment opportunities for sociologists had improved somewhat, membership in the Association was climbing again, attendance was up at the Annual Meetings, and, by 1990, the ASA had four straight years of budget surplus. ASA worked closely with the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), the National Humanities Alliance (NHA), and the Council of Professional Associations for Federal Statistics (COPAFS), which contributed substantially to reversing or reducing the effects of cutbacks in federal funding programs. New relationships were forged with sociologists in China and other places around the world and old ties were strengthened through various initiatives. The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 made possible new collaborations with colleagues in Eastern Europe.

By the end of the decade, new challenges appeared in the form of movements to downsize or eliminate departments of sociology. As experienced in other disciplines as well, some sociology departments confronted challenges from external factors (e.g., the faltering economy affecting academic institutions); others experienced internal challenges (e.g., faculty conflicts, insufficient planning for retirements) that made them targets of opportunity at their institutions. The issue emerged earlier in 1981 with the public inquiry that threatened to lead to the closing of the sociology department at Duke University. In 1990, the Department of Sociology at Washington University in St. Louis was closed over protests and considerable efforts by ASA, sociologists nationwide, and other social science organizations to encourage a reversal of the decision.

ASA Priorities in the 1980s

The major focus of the Association during the 1980s was to accomplish its major objectives by (1) supporting basic research and publications, (2) advancing programs to support sociological practice, and (3) enhancing the teaching of sociology. These goals were achieved through committees and initiatives of ASA Council as well as a variety of programs carried out by the Executive Office, such as the Professional Development Program (PDP), the Certification Program, the Public Information Program, and the Teaching Services Program (TSP).

Promoting Diversity and Inclusivity

ASA also continued its strong commitment to promoting diversity in the discipline and the profession through support of the Minority Fellowship Program (MFP) and other policies and initiatives

aimed at greater representation and inclusivity. The Status Committees of ASA Council—the Committee on the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in Sociology (CSREMS), and the Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology (CSWS) worked to promote awareness of and improve the situation for minorities and women in the ASA and in sociology. Both CSREMS and CSWS, for example, strongly urged that minorities and women have a larger role in the activities and programs of the ASA, that data be collected on such activities, and that analytic reports be published periodically about these issues.

Discrimination against homosexuals was also a recurring theme in Council meetings since the mid-1970s, and Council consistently showed support for rights of homosexuals. In 1979, Council created a Task Group to examine the situation of homosexuals in academia, and in 1982, ASA published the Report of the ASA's Task Group on Homosexuality in *The American Sociologist* (TAS). In accepting the Report, Council also appointed a new task force to make recommendations on how to combat discrimination against homosexuals. The Committee on Society and Persons with Disabilities also became a standing committee in February 1985 and contributed to ASA policies and practices for improvements with respect to persons with disabilities in the Association, in the profession, and in the discipline.

Committees of Council also urged that a greater effort should be made to include in ASA activities members who are affiliated with smaller colleges and universities, private and governmental agencies, and foundations. In sum, throughout the 1980s, there were intentional efforts to work toward greater inclusiveness at all levels of ASA with respect to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, and employment status and context.

2. ASA MEMBERSHIP TRENDS AND FISCAL STATUS

During the 1980s, significant progress was made toward routine collection of data on the ASA membership as part of the process of compiling information for the *Directory of Members*. Also, through ASA Council resolutions, an emphasis was placed on collecting systematic data on minority participation in the ASA and in the discipline of sociology in general. The application of computer technologies, as well as the focused efforts of the Committee for Research on the Profession after 1988 advanced the opportunities in this area.

Membership

Change in Definition of Membership

The 1982 Council made two important changes to membership practices, by changing (a) the definition of Association membership, and (b) the dues structure. The objective of the membership change was to “shift the focus of membership qualifications away from the ‘status’ or ‘credentials’ criteria to commitment to the purposes of the Association” (*Footnotes*, March 1982:1). Prior to 1982, eligibility for membership was based on individuals having a PhD in sociology or in closely-related fields, or evidence of near attainment of that status. An Associates Membership was open to “any person interested in the field of sociology.” In addition, sociology students in degree-granting institutions were eligible for Student Associate, and persons who were both non-citizens and non-residents of the U.S. could become International Members.

According to the 1982 summary of Council actions in *Footnotes*, membership in the Association was defined as follows: “Persons subscribing to the objectives of the Association may become Members. Those subscribing to the objectives of the Association, but desiring fewer membership services may become Associate Members. Students enrolled in undergraduate or graduate institutions can become Student Members.” Also, Council, as the elected representatives of the members, voted to place authority with Council to set dues for the membership up to cost of living

adjustments, with only increases above cost of living requiring approval of members through a mail ballot. These Council changes were implemented after amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws were approved by voting members (see below).

The shift in membership classification eliminated the need for the Committee on Classification and greatly reduced the work of the Membership Services Department of the Executive Office, necessary to verify the credentials of prospective members.

The Membership Committee

The Association pursued innovative campaigns to increase ASA membership (with particular emphasis on recruiting graduate students), and library subscriptions for its journals. Through an active Membership Committee, chaired by John Schnabel, and initiatives directed by Carla Howerly at the Executive Office, ASA sought to make the renewal process more efficient by introducing use of credit cards for payment of dues, special discounts for early renewal, user-friendly approach to those slow to renew, and special brochures and other materials to better acquaint members and prospective new members about the ASA. The Committee explored options such as a dues structure based on a fee-for-services principle, alliances with regional associations, dues breaks for multiple association membership, and an introductory ASA membership fee. The Membership Committee articulated goals of “recruitment, retention, and research” in its strategy to stabilize and increase membership in ASA.

Membership Trends During the 1980s

Membership declined each year from 1980 when it was 12,868 to 1984 when it reached a low point at 11,223. From 1985 to 1990 membership again climbed steadily so that by the end of 1990, the membership stood at 12,841 (Appendix 12).

In an analysis of membership trends from 1984 to 1990, Executive Officer D’Antonio noted that: (1) most of the growth in membership was in the student membership category, (2) regular membership increased by only about 600, and (3) numbers in the emeriti category increased significantly. This analysis also revealed shifts in membership among income categories. In 1983, due to the dire effects of the recession, more than two-thirds of the ASA regular members were in the two lowest income categories (Less than or equal to \$20,000). By 1990, there were significant increases in membership in the two highest categories (\$40,000–\$49,999 and \$50,000+), and a dramatic decrease in the number reporting incomes in the ranges from \$15,000 through \$29,000. The number in the low dues category (under \$15,000) remained steady at about 1,000 (*Footnotes*, February 1991:2).

Profile of ASA Members and Minority Participation in ASA in 1981

In the summer of 1981, ASA for the first time collected certain demographic information on its membership as part of the process of compiling information for the 1982 *Directory of Members*. Also, data were collected on characteristics of faculty and students through “audits” of 238 departments of sociology (audits had also been conducted from 1972–74). A report on the analysis of these data was presented by Paul R. Williams in the December 1982 issue of *Footnotes*. Williams emphasized that the results from the membership survey should be viewed as estimates because of several methodological issues—most notably the substantial nonresponse rates on certain key questions (16 percent of the members, for example, did not provide information on race/ethnicity). Nevertheless, Williams wrote that some general statements on the sex and racial/ethnic composition of ASA’s membership were possible from these analyses.

These data indicate that in 1981, ASA membership was largely male (67 percent male and 33 percent female) and predominately white: Of those members who reported on race/ethnicity, 91

percent were white, 5 percent Asian, 3 percent black, 1 percent Hispanic, and less than 1 percent Native American (see Appendix 13). In 1981, more than half of ASA members in the student category were women; and except for the international category, which had large numbers of Asians, students were more likely to be minorities. Audits of graduate departments of sociology also show that numbers of minorities and women increased substantially from 1970 to 1981.

In terms of employment, the data show that ASA members were overwhelmingly employed full-time in the academy. Both white males and minority males were more likely to work in universities and have a higher income. Women were more likely to be employed in the federal government and in non-profit organizations, and minority women were more likely to work in two- and four-year colleges. Minority women were also more disadvantaged both in terms of income and educational attainment.

Williams also examined trends in the participation of minorities and women in ASA leadership activities from 1970 to 1981. Comparisons of the 1981 data with those from an earlier study (published by Joan R. Harris in *Footnotes* in January 1975) show that women ASA members made substantial gains in ASA positions (i.e., as elected officers, on Council, on elected committees, via Council/Presidential appointments, as elected section officers and on section councils) during this time—to reach levels representative of their proportions in the Associations (the exception being on editorial boards). Minorities gained in some areas, but lost ground overall from the mid-1970s: There was one black member of Council on the 1982 Council, and minority representation in other governance areas had generally declined. Minority representation on committees of Council was considerably higher than their levels in the Association, but minorities were concentrated in committees such as the Committee on the Minority Fellowship Program, the Dubois-Johnson-Frazier Award Committee, and the Committee on Racial and Ethnic Minorities.

Budgets and Fiscal Policies

The budget of the ASA grew dramatically during the 1980s. At the end of 1980, the income of ASA was \$1,161,886, with expenditures totaling \$1,175,124; by the end of 1990, the income of ASA more than doubled to \$2,632,649, with expenditures at \$2,523,222. The total operating budget at the end of 1990 was \$2,915,897, and reserves stood at \$649,662 or about 25 percent of expenditures. In 1990, the value of ASA's equity was \$1,371,071, and real estate taxes at the time suggest that the Association's property (its headquarters building) was worth about \$1.4 million (*Footnotes*, May 1981 and August 1991).

In 1980, the equity of ASA was reported at \$740,082, and the general reserves stood at \$395,345 or about 34 percent of that year's expenditure. During 1980, 1981, and 1982, the Association sustained deficits of \$15,067, \$49,275, and \$83,253, respectively. Several factors, including inflation, loss of membership, and the recession of the early 1980s reduced the reserves from a high of \$410,000 in 1980 to \$262,817 in 1982.

By 1990, ASA had balanced its budget for four straight years in a row, permitting it to rebuild the reserves of the Association, which had been greatly depleted in the early 1980s. The goal was to have reserves equal to at least one half of the size of the annual budget—generally considered prudent fiscal policy for a non-profit association like the ASA.

ASA also established an investment policy that took into account prudent finances as well as social policies and concerns. As articulated by Secretary Michael Aiken and recorded in the August 22, 1987 minutes of Council, EOB "endorsed a flexible program according to the formula of at least 20–25 percent in money markets, 30 percent in diversified equities, and 45–50 percent in bonds, utilities and preferred stocks. Investments would be made with the following restrictions: no investments in (1) South African companies, (2) companies that are notoriously anti-labor, (3) that are primarily defense related, and (4) that discriminate against women and minorities."

In 1989, Secretary Aiken described “the ASA as having reached certain limits or plateaus—in assets, in membership size, and in Executive Office capability. Although the current budget provides some flexibility, he said that an annual surplus is needed just to account for normal growth.” (Council Minutes, January 1989)

3. THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE (EO)

The Executive Office of ASA evolved through several important transitions during the 1980s, including changes in leadership and a major reorganization of functions and operations. After the reorganization of the Executive Office in 1984, the functions and role of the professional staff grew significantly. The introduction of computer technologies also enhanced the operations of the Executive Office, and laid the foundation for a more streamlined delivery of services to the membership.

Transitions and Reorganization

Transitions

In August 1982, Executive Officer Russell R. Dynes left the ASA to become Chair of the Department of Sociology at the University of Delaware, and at present he remains professor emeritus on the faculty of the University. William V. D’Antonio, then Professor of Sociology at the University of Connecticut became Executive Officer in August 1982 and served until his retirement from ASA in August 1991. In 1993, D’Antonio joined the faculty of the Catholic University of America as an Adjunct Research Professor (his current position). Felice J. Levine who succeeded D’Antonio, also served as Executive Officer-designate from her appointment in May 1990 until she joined the ASA staff on August 1, 1991. Levine was Director of the Law and Social Science Program at the National Science Foundation before becoming Executive Director of the ASA.

Executive Office staffing changed in other ways during the early 1980s as well. In February 1981, long-time staff member Marjorie E. (Midge) Miles left her position as Administrative Officer and was succeeded by Jo Ann Ruckel. Also, Lawrence J. Rhoades, who had served as Executive Associate of the Association in 1974 and 1975 and from 1977 to 1981 left the Executive Office in 1981 for a position at the National Institute of Mental Health. Three sociologists joined the professional staff during 1981, including Bettina J. Huber, as Assistant Executive Officer, Carla B. Howery as Professional Associate with a focus on teaching, and Paul R. Williams, as Director of the Minority Fellowship Program.

Reorganization

A variety of staffing issues emerged in the Executive Office over the years. In his 1981 Report to the membership, Secretary Herbert L. Costner noted that, depending on how and when counting was done, the Executive Office had a professional staff of three to five people and an administrative/clerical staff of 12. He also reported that the EOB conducted a review of the Executive Office in 1979 and 1980 in response to the concerns raised by women and minority sociologists on how to better integrate them into the Executive Office. Concerns were also raised about the demand on Executive Office staff time by several of the interest groups within the Association. Costner wrote that one professional person was added to the staff at this time.

The complexities and tensions existing in Executive Office operations were described by outgoing ASA President James F. Short, who said that, “[the] [o]rganization of both sociologists and the staff, authority relations and the division of labor among them, were often ad hoc, with little rationale save personal preference or equally ad hoc precedent Over the years conflicts had arisen and remained unresolved, however, to the detriment of both interpersonal relationships within the office and of service to the Association.” (*Footnotes*, December 1984:1–2)

In October 1983, The Committee on the Executive Office and Budget (EOB) retained management consultants Robert Atwell and Madeleine Green to conduct a study of the Executive Office. In January 1984, Council approved an EOB recommendation to give broad authorities to the Executive Officer to “reorganize the Executive Office in order to improve efficiency and effectiveness” of operations. Secretary Theodore Caplow noted that recommendations were communicated to the Executive Office staff by the Executive Officer. The position of Administrative Officer was eliminated and new managerial positions were created.

The reorganization of the Executive Office included five new managerial positions: Convention and Meetings Manager, Governance Manager, Publications Manager, Business Manager, and Office Manager. At the time of the reorganization, the staff also consisted of a Membership Secretary, three staff sociologists, and a support staff of seven. The only other professional staff position added during the 1980s was that of Director for the Professional Development Program, which was established in 1986.

The reorganization of 1984 significantly affected the operations of the Executive Office. Key functional authorities were shifted from the Administrative Officer to the Executive Officer, thus laying the foundations for an administrative structure that could build professional services in the five managerial areas. The ASA staff (both professional and administrative) was thereafter able to focus attention in their respective functional areas, resulting in an enhancement in the quality and level of services to the membership. Programmatic activities were also realigned and institutionalized around the key areas established in the restructuring.

Other changes took place with respect to staffing in the early 1980s. Professional staff sociologists were appointed to positions for specific tasks, rather than for fixed two-year periods as had been the practice up to that time. The Executive Officer’s position also was extended to a second term. In 1988, an Ad Hoc EOB/Council Committee on Professional Staff Appointments formulated a detailed professional staff hiring and evaluation policy, which was adopted by Council with slight modifications in January 1990.

In February 1985, Council created the position of Ombudsperson for the Executive Office, and in August 1985, Joseph Scimecca of George Mason University became the first Ombudsman. The Ombudsman was charged with hearing staff grievances within the Executive Office not satisfied by the Executive Officer. Scimecca served from 1986 to 1988; no one was appointed for 1989, and William Anderson was Ombudsman from 1990 to 1992. (It appears that no staff person contacted Scimecca or Anderson, and the position was eliminated after 1992.)

In 1991, D’Antonio noted that during his nine-year tenure at ASA the staff grew from 17 to 19 full-time persons, and from two to six part-timers. However, while the staff increased by only a few people, the workload of the Executive Office increased substantially during that period through the addition of several new journals and programmatic services. (The issue of whether the ASA Executive Office was “overstaffed” was raised a number of times during Council meetings during the 1980s.)

ASA’s Headquarters

The housing situation at 1722 N Street NW in Washington, the headquarters of the Executive Office, was also assessed from time to time. During the early 1980s, ASA engaged in discussions to relocate to one building with two other social science associations in the Washington area, but, in January 1982, Executive Officer Dynes informed Council that this was deemed not feasible. The outdated condition of the 1722 N Street headquarters was observed by Council in January 1982, when the boiler blew out (fortunately without injuries). Council instructed the Executive Office in 1986 to explore alternatives for its housing. In 1989, Secretary Aiken noted that the ASA building was close to staffing capacity, in effect placing some limits on Association activities, and

he encouraged EOB “to remain open and to continue to review options for moving ASA to new quarters.” (Council Minutes, August 12, 1989)

Despite these constraints, in 1990, ASA entered into a five-year agreement to house the Population Association of America (PAA) at the ASA Executive Office at 1722 N Street when PAA’s office sharing arrangement with the American Statistical Association was discontinued. The PAA, with a membership of about 2,800 at the time, had close ties to the ASA through an overlapping membership, and collaborative arrangements of many of its members. Part-time administrative services to PAA were provided by two ASA staff members, and there was one full-time PAA staff member. In 1995, the PAA moved to a new location in the Washington, DC area when its lease and services agreement with ASA expired.

Application of New Information Technologies (IT)

Executive Office operations also gained in efficiency as a result of implementing new technologies and systems. The 1980s saw the rapid development of office computer systems, and ASA struggled to keep up with the opportunities they presented. Computer systems at the time however, required specially designed software programs, which took time and money, and the search for proper expertise.

In 1982, Council approved a special capital expenditure for the purchase of computer equipment for the Executive Office, and a Burroughs Convergent Technologies system was purchased and installed that year. This system, however, could accommodate a limited number of users and required considerable reprogramming to adapt to Association needs. Janet Astner of the Executive Office worked closely with the systems programmers to augment the software applications for membership records, subscriptions, accounting, and other ASA requirements. In 1986, ASA increased the capacity of its information system by adding ten computers for staff workstations.

Council also addressed the opportunities for adapting the new technologies to enhance communication among sociologists more generally. In 1985, Hans Mauksch, James Campbell, and Edward Brent wrote a proposal to establish an electronic bulletin board to link sociologists through a communications system at ASA, which Council approved in 1986. The Committee advocated moving slowly by developing a network for communications among research scholars in sociology, and between ASA committees and members of ASA sections.

Electronic enhancements to the ASA were also introduced during the late 1980s. The ASA Executive Office established Bitnet communications through a terminal linked to the George Washington University mainframe computer, with Karen Gray Edwards, Manager of Publications, monitoring traffic for staff. Edwards, working in close collaboration with Boyd Printing Company, ASA’s primary publisher, introduced innovations such as use of electronic media and formats into the publishing program of the ASA. Other innovations during the 1980s included publication of electronic addresses in the *Directory of Members* for the first time in 1988.

In January 1989, Executive Officer D’Antonio reported to Council that equipment problems “plagued the office,” and requested upgrades in some areas, noting that the main computer system would need to be updated. Later in 1989, D’Antonio reported that some equipment had been purchased, including a FAX machine, a personal computer for access to Bitnet, and a more advanced Xerox copier. In 1990, a more advanced phone system was also installed.

By the end of 1990, the ASA Executive Office had a computer system consisting of ten personal computer work stations with word processing and other office applications (Lotus, Harvard Graphics), networked to the Burroughs Convergent Technologies System (including its database system with basic accounting, subscription, and membership record information), several printers, and a network connection to Bitnet through George Washington University.

4. GOVERNANCE: CONSTITUTION/BYLAWS CHANGES AND COUNCIL POLICYMAKING

Changes to the Association Constitution or Bylaws require the approval of the voting members. While members have the official capacity to petition for such changes, during the 1980s, as throughout the history of the Association, members voted on such changes based on amendments proposed by ASA Council. As the primary elected body of the Association, ASA Council considers issues that may require changes to the Constitution and Bylaws, including alternations to the dues that exceed cost of living and revisions of the ASA Code of Ethics.

Only ASA Council has the authority to set the policies of the Association and issue policy statements on behalf of the Association. Such initiatives could originate with committees, sections or other groups established by Council; member resolutions, or from Council itself. During the 1980s, ASA Council clarified ASA policies and practices in several areas that do not require membership approval, including the Association's participation in amicus briefs, and awards bestowed by ASA. Council also adopted a number of member resolutions, thus signaling ASA support for these policies and issues.

The Bylaws also allow members to take actions otherwise within the powers of the Council. The process for doing so is specified in Article II, Section 8 and requires voting members' adopting a resolution advanced by at least three percent of the voting members of the Association. No such resolutions were advanced by the members during the 1980s.

The ASA Constitution and Bylaws

From 1980 through 1990, ASA Council approved the following changes to the Constitution and Bylaws (for a more complete statement of each change, see Appendix 15):

- The 1981 Council approved an amendment to the Bylaws increasing the minimum number of members required to establish a new section from 200 to 250, and keeping the existing limit to retain section status at 200 members.
- The 1982 Council made two important changes to membership practices, by changing (a) the definition of Association membership, and (b) the process for increasing the dues structure (see preceding section on Membership).
- The 1983 Council approved emeritus membership for persons 70 years of age or older, who would be entitled to all rights of active membership except journals, without further payment of annual dues, provided that at the time of application, they were dues paying members of the Association for the preceding 10 years.
- The 1985 Council approved changes in the structure of the Program Committee to increase its membership from 9 to 11 members.
- The 1988 Council amended the ASA Constitution by adding the current President and Past President as voting members of the Committee on the Executive Office and Budget (EOB).
- The 1989 Council voted to adopt an eight-district proposal for revising the ASA election system. A five-district system for nominating procedures for ASA elections had been instituted in 1965, but demographic shifts and the decision of Canadian sociologists to form their own national association had made the districts uneven in size. In January 1987, Council appointed a subcommittee to "examine ASA redistricting, with the objective of creating a more equitable system based on geography and the distribution of the ASA membership." A December 1988 *Footnotes* article summarized the pros and cons of a five- versus eight-district system.
- The 1990 Council adjusted the qualifications for the emeritus category, by removing the existing restrictions of age 70 and consecutive ten-year membership prior to that age.

- The 1991 Council passed a resolution giving students the right to vote and hold office, noting that students choosing the low-income category (at the same dues rates) already enjoyed full membership privileges.

Code of Ethics

On several occasions throughout the 1980s, Council stated that the ASA Code of Ethics should be viewed as a “living” document and revised periodically.

The Code was revised in 1980 and approved by Council and the membership in 1982. At the time, Council upheld the recommendation of the Committee on Professional Ethics (COPE) that the document be voted on by the membership in its entirety rather than section by section. In addition, a request was approved from the Ad Hoc Group of Sociology Editors to incorporate a statement on multiple submissions to journals, which had been deleted from an earlier version of the Code.

In 1983, Council accepted a recommendation by COPE for an implementation section to be included as part of the ASA Code of Ethics. Council also voted to clarify the extent of COPE’s enforcement jurisdiction, indicating that allegations of ethical violations of the Code could only be adjudicated against members of the Association.

A report by COPE in 1988 recommended updating the Code of Ethics to improve the form of the Code and to address ethical standards of those employed in sociological practice. New sections were also added on ethical standards on fair employment practices and on the rights of human subjects of research. After extensive discussion and feedback, Council approved the revised Code of Ethics in January 1989.

In August 1989, COPE reported that ethical standards for teaching responsibilities and ethnographic research were still problems, and approved changes relating to Item III of the Code on these issues.

Brajuha Case

A landmark case with wide implications for ASA as well as the ethics of conducting research in general was decided in 1984 in the federal courts. The case involved a graduate student in sociology at SUNY-Stony Brook, Mario Brajuha, who was ordered to turn over data he had been collecting for his dissertation while employed at a local restaurant. Brajuha’s research notes were subpoenaed after a suspicious fire at the restaurant.

On September 5, 1983, Council approved a motion upholding the applicability of the Association’s Code of Ethics in a situation where research notes are under subpoena. The ASA Council notified Brajuha’s lawyer that if research documents prepared under promise of confidentiality were provided by the sociologist, it would place him in violation of the ASA’s Code of Ethics. A decision by federal Judge Jack B. Weinstein of the Eastern District of New York on April 5, 1984 ruled that, “[s]erious scholars cannot be required to turn over their fieldnotes in a grand jury investigation when the government fails to establish ‘substantial need’ for them to do so.” (*Footnotes*, August 1984:11; *Footnotes*, December 1985:1,13)

On September 1, 1984, the prosecution appealed the Brajuha ruling, and ASA filed an amicus brief in support of the decision. Kai Erikson, the President of ASA in 1985, and William Foote Whyte, Past President of the ASA, appeared in court as witnesses on Brajuha’s behalf on February 13, 1985. Council appropriated \$2,500 in behalf of Brajuha’s defense, and ASA worked vigorously to raise awareness of the case and support on his behalf.

Judge Weinstein’s decision was reversed on appeal and the case was remanded back to the lower courts for additional evidence. At the same time, the Federal District Attorney’s Office went through an organizational change, and after several continuances, it accepted Brajuha’s redacted

notes as fulfilling the subpoena (as did the county District Attorney). While the case in general resulted in a positive solution, questions remained about what constituted “scholars privilege” and the types of research that may be protected (Hallowell, *Footnotes*, December 1985:1,13).

Husch Case

In 1988, Jerri Husch of Tufts University filed a complaint to the ASA Executive Office alleging that her dissertation had been plagiarized by Steven Barnes, who was then Dean of Fine Arts at Eastern New Mexico University. An Ad Hoc Committee of ASA Council investigated the matter and rendered a unanimous opinion that plagiarism had indeed occurred. In February 1989, Executive Officer D’Antonio wrote to the Edwin Mellen Press, the publisher of the Barnes book, requesting that certain actions be taken. Since he received no reply from the publisher, D’Antonio wrote to the University, asking that the University take action, and indicating that ASA would report the case to the *Chronicle of Higher Education* if no action were taken by May 1st. An article on the case appeared in the *Chronicle* on May 10, 1989.

The Eastern New Mexico University took up the case, and Barnes left the university in August 1989 following an internal faculty review. Edwin Mellen Press, however, refused to take action and published a second edition of the Barnes book with certain changes in attribution. With the strong support of the Committee on Publications, Council adopted a resolution in January 1990 urging the publisher to take appropriate actions, and outlined specific measures that would be taken against the Press, should it not comply. In March 1990, Herbert Richardson, publisher of the Mellen Press met with the Association, and worked out an agreement to withdraw the Barnes book from print, notify libraries and those known to have purchased the book that its contents were plagiarized, and refund money to those who returned the book. Richardson also agreed to write a letter of apology to Husch for the adverse publicity caused by the incident, and to write a letter to the ASA Council detailing the action taken by the Press, thus bringing the case to a close.

Amicus Briefs

ASA was involved in a legal case in 1989, which led Council to examine procedures for the Association signing on to future amicus briefs. In 1989, ASA became involved in the case of the Unification Church vs. Molko/Leal (No.88–1600), which involved two young adults who alleged that they were unwittingly coerced to join the Unification Church (often known as the “Moonies”). At issue for the ASA was whether or not the Association should remain as a signatory on the amicus briefs submitted to the U.S. Supreme Court. At a hearing at Council on August 12, 1989, Richard Ofshe, presented the argument against the ASA’s position on the case and John Lofland and Richard Anthony spoke in support of the ASA’s position. Council also raised questions about precedents for ASA actions in legal cases. Council voted to appoint a subcommittee to review the procedures by which the ASA should sign on to legal briefs, and also passed a motion that the ASA withdraw from the amicus brief in the Unification Church case. (Lawsuits brought by Ofshe and Margaret Singer in 1992 against the American Psychological Association, the American Sociological Association, principal officers of these organizations and others in 1989, were dismissed in 1994. Executive Officer Felice J. Levine and President William A. Gamson—in consultation with past officers—worked with the ASA legal counsel on settlement of the case.)

The Subcommittee on Legal Briefs reported back to Council on August 14, 1990. Wendy H. Baldwin reported for the Subcommittee and Council minutes note that, “[I]n the past ASA relied on the Executive Office to handle such matters, but an alternative structure with specific procedures would be preferable. Ideally, all decisions on legal briefs should be brought before Council. However, in between regular meetings of Council when action cannot wait, Baldwin proposed that a subcommittee should act on its behalf.” Council then offered some guidelines on how the Subcommittee would operate in deliberating on whether to join in legal cases.

At the request of Council, Executive Officer (William D'Antonio) and Executive Officer-designate (Felice Levine) jointly filed a report in January 1991 "affirming the adequacy of existing procedures as outlined in the Bylaws: Specifically, the Executive Officer, as chief administrative officer of the ASA, 'shall consult with the President and Secretary as questions of policy arise,' and may choose jointly to act on behalf of the Association, poll Council members by mail ballot, or defer action to the next regular meeting of Council." Council took no further action on this issue at that time (Council Minutes, January 1991).

Awards Policy

The ASA has made honorific awards to individuals since the 1950s. Concerned about the proliferation of new named awards, Council approved a new policy in March 1979, resulting in four categories of awards: General, Traditional, Section, and Special Awards and Monetary Prizes. According to the new policy, the General Awards were renamed (to the ASA Award for a Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship, and the ASA Career of Distinguished Scholarship Award), and the practice of naming ASA awards for individuals was eliminated. The policy also authorized sections to make awards within guidelines established by Council. Over the past quarter century, Council has looked to the Committee on Awards Policy for oversight of and guidance on policies and procedures for all awards. The Committee on Awards Policy (which has had various names) was first established in 1954.

Awards policy issues during the 1980s centered on the nature and timing of awards announcements, the presentation of awards (i.e., at what point during the Annual Meeting should the awards ceremony take place), and the proliferation of new awards. Two new awards were established: In 1985, Council approved the ASA Distinguished Career Award for the Practice of Sociology with Conrad Taeuber as its first recipient in 1986, and the Dissertation Award, first presented in 1989 to Richard Biernacki. Council also approved a recommendation by the Committee on Awards Policy that Award Committees name award recipients early enough for publication prior to the Annual Meeting. By the end of the 1980s, the Awards Ceremony was held at the same event as the Presidential Address.

Concerned about the proliferation of awards, and how to respond to the requests for special award nominations, Council approved a Committee in January 1991 consisting of the Past-President, President, President-Elect, and Executive Officer to handle such requests. At the same meeting, Council approved a Committee consisting of Barbara Reskin (Chair), Joan Aldous, Myra Marx Ferree, Jill Quadagno, and Executive Officer D'Antonio to develop guidelines for handling gifts and grants to the ASA and to assess the structure of and mandate to the Committee on Awards Policy (see Chapter 2).

Member Resolutions

ASA Council approved a number of resolutions passed by members at the Association's Business Meetings, which take place at each Annual Meeting. These include resolutions on human rights and international issues (see the discussion on International Activities), federal government policies and domestic issues, and issues relating to ASA policies and practices. For example, Council passed resolutions (1) urging the U.S. Government to direct all agencies to ban discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, (2) condemning violence against gays, (3) supporting rights for nonmarried domestic partners, (4) opposing any attempt to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, (5) supporting the Civil Rights Act of 1984, (6) encouraging support for research on AIDS, (7) urging the free flow of government information (which was to be submitted for vote by mail ballot), and (8) opposing the death penalty.

Member resolutions approved by Council relating to Association activities, included: (1) banning the Central Intelligence Agency from access to ASA employment services at Annual Meetings, (2)

urging ASA to undertake a survey of departments of sociology, (3) urging action to ensure equity for minorities and women at all levels of ASA, (4) calling on ASA to only use airlines that have collective bargaining arrangements, and (5) urging ASA and its membership to take action regarding the closing of departments of sociology.

5. GOVERNANCE: STRUCTURAL CHANGES

The Association accomplished its objectives through Council meetings, sections, committees, subcommittees of Council, commissions, task groups, and other ad hoc groups with specific charges and assignments. ASA also appointed official representatives to other professional and scientific societies. Major ASA committee work is considered elsewhere in this chapter under relevant functional or programmatic areas (e.g., Ethics, Publications, Certification, and Membership). Changes in key organizational entities (i.e., Sections) and other committees such as the Committee on Freedom of Research and Teaching (COFRAT), and the American Sociological Foundation (ASF) are discussed below. (See Appendix 16 for a detailed list of the ASA Committees and organizations to which ASA had official representation in August, 1990.)

ASA Sections

Sections, defined by specific areas of institutional interest, have consistently been affirmed by Council as a vital aspect of the Association, and an important part of membership in the ASA. Debates have surfaced occasionally, however, regarding various aspects of the Association's section structure, including sections': (1) proliferation, (2) viability, (3) role (and share of program sessions) at the Annual Meeting, and (4) internal governance structure (i.e., awards, dues, and so forth).

Section Growth in the 1980s

In 1980, ASA members held 9,006 memberships in 20 sections (ASA membership as a whole was 12,868). Section memberships declined from 1981 to 1985, reflecting the general trends in membership in the ASA during this period. Section memberships began climbing again in 1985 (with a slight dip in 1989) to a new high of 13,263 in 27 sections at the end of the 1990 membership year when ASA membership overall was 12,841 (see Appendix 14 for section membership counts for selected years).

At the January 1991 Council meeting, Executive Officer D'Antonio reported stability in the size of the ASA's 27 sections, with about one-half of the ASA membership belonging to at least one section, and more than 25 percent belonging to more than two sections. During the 1980s, about one-third of the sections showed growth in membership although two-thirds experienced declines, leading some Council members to request better data on section membership trends—especially for those members who drop and those who hold multiple memberships. Appendix 17 contains a table with years that sections attained full section status.

Significant Events Relating to Sections in the 1980s

An important change took place relating to section formation on January 23, 1981, when Council passed a resolution raising the minimum number of members required to establish a new section from 200 to 250, but kept the limit to retain section status at 200 members. The Committee on Sections also undertook a revision of the *Section Manual* to reflect changes in the Bylaws for the new procedures.

In January 1988, ASA Council voted to establish a committee to assess "the future course of relations between sections and the ASA, with Council liaison but composed of non-Council members familiar with other organizations and relevant fields of specialization." An Ad Hoc Committee on

ASA Future Organizational Trends was created, consisting of Randall Collins (Chair), John McCarthy, Marshall Meyer, Pamela Oliver, and Jonathan Turner. At the request of ASA President Herbert J. Gans, the Committee examined “relevant data from sociology and other social sciences to develop some scenarios about what the increasing number of sections and the rapid growth of membership in sections, will mean for ASA and sociology in the coming decade.” (*Footnotes*, October 1988:8)

The Committee delivered a Report to Council in January 1989, which addressed the nature and implications of section growth for the future of ASA and its governance structure. The Report reviewed the history of sections since the early 1970s, cited factors that might explain their popularity, and described their impact on the governance structure, as compared with other associations. In presenting the Report, Collins said that, “the ASA could be viewed as a ‘peak’ association with a number of options as to how it might relate to its sections, including curtailing sections, encouraging interlocking memberships, or becoming little more than a collection of sections. Extensive discussion ensued on topics such as who sections are serving, the characteristics of section members, the relationship to ASA voting patterns and such things as the demand for academic productivity, and how to interpret the growth and decline in sections.” (Council Minutes, January 1989) The 1989 Report was published in full in the September 1989 issue of *Footnotes*.

Committee on Freedom of Research and Teaching (COFRAT)

During the 1980s, the Committee on Freedom of Research and Teaching (COFRAT) continued to handle complaints by individual members against alleged infringement of academic freedoms and rights by institutions. For example, COFRAT heard the case of Nancy Stoller Shaw in her complaint against the University of California-Santa Cruz that her tenure review had procedural irregularities. When the University administration refused to reopen the case, Council censured UC-Santa Cruz in February 1985 on COFRAT’s recommendation for denying Shaw due process during her tenure and promotion review.

In the 1970s, COFRAT began to deal with and prepare reports on systemic issues underlying the cases brought before it, such as the *Guidelines for Initial Appointments in Sociology* (1978), which were widely circulated. COFRAT also prepared the *Guidelines for Employment of Part-Time Faculty in Departments of Sociology* (approved by Council in 1986). In 1989, COFRAT was asked by Council to examine the closing of the sociology departments at the University of Rochester and Washington University. COFRAT, however, reported back to Council in January 1990 that, as then constituted, “it was ill-suited to respond to institutional, as compared to individual cases.”

Throughout the 1980s, COFRAT increasingly became involved in complicated situations involving acrimonious interactions, including actions between ASA legal counsel and the institutions against which complaints were directed. One COFRAT chair reported intimidation. COFRAT was therefore finding itself in cases that raised questions about the appropriate role of the Association, how effective it could be, and what situations potentially placed it at legal risk. (1993 COFRAT Report). Council continued to discuss these issues during the 1990s (see Chapter 2).

The American Sociological Foundation (ASF)

In January 1983, Council approved in principle a resolution presented by Secretary-Elect Theodore Caplow for establishing a “Memorial Fund” (as the Endowment was initially called) for the ASA, with the goal of achieving an endowment of \$1 million. The purpose was to broaden the reserves of the Association, and use only the interest money from the fund to sponsor sociological initiatives in new directions. The Endowment, eventually structured as the American Sociological Foundation (ASF) in 1985, was incorporated as a separate, autonomous 501(c)(3) organization within the ASA, with decision-making authority entrusted to a Board of Trustees consisting of the five most recent past presidents of the ASA.

Council established the ASF to raise and provide funds for the long-range needs of sociology as a discipline and profession. When the fundraising campaign was launched in 1986, these needs were defined as follows: “The Foundation and its Endowment are responding to three particular crises of need and opportunity: first, increasing our minority fellowships and professional development at a time when outside support is plummeting; second, enhancing sociology’s public image and policy pertinence during a period when we have more to say but too few may be listening; and third, continuing to enrich our teaching, so that quality is not sacrificed to quantity during a period of increased enrollment competitions.” (*Footnotes*, February 1986:1)

The hard work of William Sewell and Jay Demerath especially did much to move the ASF forward. As Chair of the Endowment Campaign Committee, Demerath led the efforts from 1984 to 1986 to establish the Endowment and plan the fundraising campaigns. Other members of the Committee included Jack Riley, Beth Hess, Charles Willie, David Sills, and William Sewell.

In 1986, the ASF began an intensive three-year campaign to raise an endowment fund. By 1988, the Endowment Campaign had raised \$200,000 in gifts and pledges from more than 900 donors. A significant contribution of \$50,000 from Rev. Andrew Greeley was matched in a two-year (1987–88) Challenge Grant campaign directed at members. The Trustees of the ASF accepted the offer of a second challenge grant for a Congressional Fellowship program in 1990. In the early 1990s, however, a moratorium was placed on ASA’s acceptance of further challenge grants. The ASF made its first grant of \$10,000 (from interest earnings of the Endowment) to the Minority Fellowship Program summer institutes (later known as MOST I).

6. ASA PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

ASA programmatic activity grew dramatically during the 1980s. In the early 1980s, ASA had strong publications and Minority Fellowship (MFP) programs, and also developed a process for an institutional response in support of research. Programs on Teaching Services (TSP), Professional Development (PDP), Certification, Research on the Profession, and Public Information evolved over the course of the decade. The following section describes these core ASA programs and activities during the 1980s.

Research and Publications

A primary objective of ASA is to support basic research and to promote a program of publication that reports on and disseminates those research findings. Thus, the major part of ASA activities in this area during the 1980s was focused on activities such as:

- Monitoring federal funding agencies and providing information about their activities through articles in *Footnotes*, sessions at meetings, workshops and so forth;
- Responding to actions of federal agencies and Congress, both by advocating on behalf of social research programs and educating officials about the value and importance of social science research in the policy-making process;
- Taking initiatives in many areas affecting research, such as protection of human subjects of research, ethics, and regulation of research;
- Providing direct assistance through small grants, such as the Fund for the Advancement of the Discipline (FAD) which provides seed money for groundbreaking research projects. FAD was designed to support projects of direct relevance to the discipline, rather than the profession and Council approved use of the Fund to be restricted “for workshops, seminars or mini-courses whose aim is to upgrade the scholarly and research skills of ASA members as appropriate uses of the Fund.” (Council Minutes, September 9, 1982);

- Establishing a program of research on the profession;
- Undertaking modest data gathering and analytic projects by Executive Office Staff, ASA committees, task forces, and through other special initiatives of ASA Council; and
- Emphasizing a publications program that aims for excellence and wide dissemination of sociological research, but also recognizes the need for specific priorities and prudent management.

Collaborations with Other Associations

The major challenge for ASA during the 1980s was defending federal social science research programs from attacks by the Reagan Administration. At the NSF, budget cuts severely reduced the pool of funds for social research (the first Reagan budget threatened to cut the NSF budget by 75 percent). At the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) the Administration proposed to phase out social research altogether. These cuts had severe impacts on federal funding for social science research generally (sociology proposals for NIMH funding were down in the early 1980s), and directly threatened the Minority Fellowship Program, a core ASA program funded primarily by NIMH.

Some agencies, however, were supportive of social science research: The National Institute on Aging (NIA) was a consistent advocate of sociological research, and ASA was fortunate in this respect to have had Matilda White Riley as the Associate Director for Behavioral and Social Research at NIA from 1979 to 1991. Riley, the first Executive Officer of ASA (1949–60) and ASA President in 1986, was the founding NIA Associate Director, Senior Social Scientist from 1991 through 1997, and Scientist Emeritus, from 1998 until her death in 2004.

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS (COSSA)

ASA worked in close collaboration with other social science associations in support of the lobbying and education efforts for social science research, especially with the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), the Council of Professional Associations for Federal Statistics (COPAFS), and the National Humanities Alliance (NHA). Actions taken included making personal calls upon members of Congress and their staffs, providing testimony, holding seminars for Congressional staff, conducting letter writing campaigns, and generally raising awareness among associations' memberships and urging them to join in various campaigns.

COSSA played a major role in monitoring social research funding and in galvanizing the response to the federal budgetary policies. COSSA established its Washington Office with a two-person staff in May 1981. Under the direction of Roberta B. Miller, COSSA emerged as a significant force both in lobbying on behalf of the social sciences, as well as in educating policy makers on the relevance and significance of social scientific research. Executive Officer D'Antonio noted that there was a general consensus that the willingness of Congress "to add more dollars to Reagan Administration budget proposals for the social sciences . . . is in no small measure the result of the increasingly effective lobbying efforts of COSSA, COPAFS and NHA." (*Footnotes*, August 1984:13) The Association was an active member of COSSA, COPAFS, and NHA.

ASA and COSSA also cosponsored a series of Breakfast Seminars for Congressional leaders and their staffs around the general theme of "The Long Term Consequences of Unemployment"—with the support of Reps. Paul Simon (D-IL), Augustus Hawkins (D-CA), and James Jeffords (R-VT). In the summer of 1983, William Kornblum, Graduate Center of the City University of New York, and Paula Rayman, Brandeis University, were speakers at two such Congressional Seminars.

ASA was a major supporter of COSSA, and worked closely with it in its mission to advance the social sciences. Executive Officer Russell Dynes played a leading role in "activating COSSA," chaired the Executive Committee of COSSA in 1982, and represented COSSA and the NHA on the Executive Committee of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS). In 1984, Executive

Officer D'Antonio was chair of the Search Committee of COSSA to find a successor to Roberta Miller, and ASA President-Elect Kai Erikson was on COSSA's Executive Board. In 1990, D'Antonio completed four years as chair of COSSA's Executive Committee.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE (AAAS)

The Association also worked through the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) and the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) in support of research and professional activities—although there were tensions in the relationships with these organizations. With respect to the AAAS, there was a general feeling among social scientists that *Science* magazine did not give sufficient attention to the work of social scientists, that the social science presence at AAAS annual meetings was very limited, that social science involvement in the Section K (Section on Social, Economic, and Political Science) should be enhanced, and that, in general, the involvement of ASA in the AAAS needed to be expanded.

David Sills of the SSRC, who was Secretary of Section K in 1983, informed D'Antonio that the editor of *Science* had assured him that if "appropriate sociological topics were proposed to him, he would proceed to commission articles on them." D'Antonio reported that "Sills urges that sociologists inform him of ideas for articles that they think appropriate." (*Footnotes*, August 1983:9) In 1984, Council appointed a special Ad Hoc Committee (chaired by Matilda Riley, with members JoAnne Miller and James Zuiches), to work with the ASA representatives to Sections K and U (Statistics) to increase ASA participation in the annual meetings of the AAAS.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL (SSRC)

ASA's relationship with the SSRC was also complex. In August 1990, Executive Officer D'Antonio summed up for Council the existing tensions in the relationship between COSSA and the SSRC. A growing dissatisfaction with existing arrangements had prompted COSSA members to ask for reorganization of SSRC's Board to acknowledge all the social sciences, not just founding members. Since the SSRC Board had not acted on the proposed change, D'Antonio reported that the situation was at a standstill. D'Antonio added that the ASA representative to SSRC was not appointed by the ASA (it could only recommend candidates) and, as such, was under no obligation to report to Council.

Discussion in Council focused on four specific issues—the ASA relationship to SSRC, ASA Council relationship to its representative to SSRC, how this representative is appointed, and how ASA should support "sister associations" in their quest for more formal recognition within SSRC. Council also directed its attention, however, to the broader issue of assessing ASA's ties to all external organizations, and appointed a subcommittee to assess "the whole 'map' of organizational ties so that individual cases could be more clearly understood." (Council Minutes, August 15, 1990)

In January 1991, the Committee on ASA's Organizational Ties reported to Council, indicating that categories of ties may be summed up as lobbying, interprofessional, international, and interdisciplinary. In speaking for the Committee, W. Richard Scott noted that, while "there are difficulties in attempting to maintain the range of ties involved, Scott deemed it an appropriate effort and recommended no changes. Four Recommendations were offered, however, to improve the reporting, exchange and use of information," including through annual reports to ASA of representatives to such organizations and periodic meetings of such representatives with ASA officers (Council Minutes, January 1991). Scott and incoming Executive Officer Felice Levine hosted the first of such meetings at the Annual Meeting in August 1991.

The Research on the Profession

Herbert J. Gans, ASA President in 1988, initiated efforts to establish a capacity for ASA to do "some practical sociological research about itself." (*Footnotes*, October 1988:2) On August 28, 1988,

Council passed a resolution creating an Ad Hoc Committee for Research on the Profession the mandate of which was to prepare a plan of action “toward developing a coherent research capacity for the ASA.” By 1989, under the guidance of the Committee, preparations were under way for a survey of graduate departments and an RFP had been issued for data collection and analysis services. Discussion at the first 1990 Council focused on the importance of having a research capacity and the need for an advisory committee to establish priorities. The Research Program on the Discipline and the Profession was instituted as one of the core ASA Programs in 1992 (see Chapter 2).

Human Subjects of Research

ASA also contributed to the process of refining the federal regulations relating to the protection of human subjects in research. In January 1981, Council minutes note that, “the final version of the regulations amending basic HHS [Department of Health and Human Services] policy for the protection of human subjects of research has been completed and is to appear in the Federal Register on January 26, 1981. The chair of ASA’s Standing Committee on Regulation of Research indicated that the final regulations are responsive to the concerns expressed by the Association in that the regulations apply only to federally funded research, and certain types of social science research will no longer require review of human subjects to meet Federal requirements.” (Council Minutes; *Footnotes*, November 1981:1,7)

Research-Related Social Policy Issues

Following a “spirited discussion” led by Amitai Etzioni at the January 1984 meeting of the ASA Council, the Association created a special Commission on Sociology and Society with the general mandate “to examine the interrelationship of sociological analysis and the public policy process and to investigate how each might have a more beneficial impact on the other.” (Council Minutes, August 30, 1984) Discussion of the Commission’s report on August 30, 1984 led Council to conclude, “that a committee of Council was not the appropriate vehicle for pursuing the intellectual direction charted by the Commission. Council cannot effectively define directions the discipline should take.” As a result, the Commission on Sociology and Society was dissolved at that meeting.

In 1990, Edna Bonacich presented a preliminary report of the Subcommittee on the ASA and the Needs of the Poor and Dispossessed showing how ASA could demonstrate leadership in setting policy agendas on major social issues relating to inequality (class, race, gender) based on social science research. The ASA President appointed a Blue Ribbon Committee (consisting of Ivar Berg, Edna Bonacich, Troy Duster, and Jill Quadagno) to act on issues raised by the Subcommittee. Council, however, deferred action in this area on August 15, 1990 pending a decision on the Cornerhouse Fund proposal (which was being prepared at the time).

Cornerhouse Fund

Informed by the Cornerhouse Board of Trustees in 1989 that Fund operations would cease, ASA and The Center for Advanced Study at Stanford were invited to write proposals to receive all remaining monies held by the Fund. The Cornerhouse Fund awarded a variety of grants, primarily in the form of support of dissertation research for minority students (See Minority Fellowship Program). It was established in 1969 as a provision of the will of sociologist Sydney S. Spivack, faculty member at Princeton University. (For further background on the Cornerhouse Fund and Spivack’s career, see *Footnotes*, September 1991.)

In 1989, the Cornerhouse Board of Trustees consisted of Charles Glock (President), Spivack’s widow Dorothy Eweson, Marvin Bressler, Melvin Tumin, Clara Shapiro, and Joan Waldron. In 1990, ASA was awarded a planning grant of \$25,000 for the purpose of preparing a full proposal on how the ASA would manage and disperse such a gift. A Committee, chaired by Cora Marrett, and in-

cluding Wendy Baldwin, Ivar Berg, Robert Dentler, Reynolds Farley, Marvin Olsen, Jill Quadagno, Matilda White Riley, Joan Waring, and William Julius Wilson was formed to prepare the proposal. Executive Officer D'Antonio (joined in 1990 by Felice Levine, the incoming Executive Officer), participated in writing the proposal. The initial set of proposals were directed to identifying projects that might be attractive to the Cornerhouse Board; Levine and D'Antonio shifted the orientation in 1990 to propose the establishment of a fund to create a lasting program connecting sociological research and social policy to honor Sydney S. Spivack. The ASA Council closely monitored this process throughout.

ASA proposed to create a program in applied social research and social policy, which would have two interdependent goals: to advance applied social policy, and to foster the use of sociological knowledge in social policy. It would have the broadest definition of institutions of modern society—including government, law, business, family, religion, health, welfare, and education. Building on existing research and various programs in applied sociology that had been developed over the prior decade, ASA outlined a range of possible initiatives on topics covering issues such as homelessness, poverty, health care, crime prevention, gender inequality, aging, discrimination, and environmental degradation. A point of emphasis in ASA's proposal was that sound policies should be based on sound research and knowledge, that sociology has a long tradition of substantial contribution in this area, and that ASA has in place mechanisms to pursue program goals effectively.

The proposal was accepted by the Cornerhouse Trustees, and the funds were awarded to ASA in February 1991 to establish the Sydney S. Spivack Program in Applied Social Research and Social Policy. The award, valued at \$750,000 at the time, was formally presented by Eweson at the Awards Ceremony and Presidential session at the August Annual Meeting in Cincinnati. (See Chapter 2 on Spivack Program.)

Publications

The Association placed a high priority during the 1980s on supporting a publications program focused on excellence and enhancement of the discipline of sociology, while being attentive to prudent decisions on managing such a program. The publications program accounted for the largest expenditure and revenue stream in the Association budget and, therefore, was consistently a priority on the Council's agenda.

From 1984 to the present, the Publications Program has been directed at the Executive Office by Karen Gray Edwards, who has managed and coordinated its activities (including representation of ASA with journal editors, Committee on Publications, and Boyd Printing Company) through a complex period of enormous change in technologies related to publication processes. Edwards also produced the Association newsletter, *Footnotes*, the *Employment Bulletin*, and handled most other aspects of ASA's publishing needs—such as those relating to the Annual Meeting.

Scope of Publications

At the end of 1990, ASA was publishing nine journals: the *American Sociological Review (ASR)*, *Contemporary Sociology (CS)*, *Journal of Health and Social Behavior (JHSB)*, *Social Psychology Quarterly (SPQ)*, *Sociology of Education (SOE)*, *Teaching Sociology (TS)*, *Sociological Theory (ST)*, and *Sociological Practice Review (SPR)*, *Sociological Methodology (SM)*, several guides and directories, as well as the *Employment Bulletin (EB)*, and the Association newsletter, *Footnotes*. The ASA added 24 volumes to the *Rose Monograph Series* from 1980 through 1990, published by the Cambridge University Press (see Appendix 18).

In January 1986, Council formalized a *Presidential Series* for publications of ASA presidents with the provision "that no president be required to publish in the Series and that editorial control by

publishers not be permitted.” (see Appendix 19) The *Series* consisted of volumes produced by presidents drawn primarily from the Thematic and Plenary Sessions of their Annual Meetings. Council terminated the Executive Office’s involvement in the *Presidential Series* at the conclusion of the Sage Publication Inc. contract in 1991 because of low publisher interest in the project.

Changes in the Publication Program During the 1980s

During the 1980s, several important changes took place in the ASA publications program. In 1982, after a lapse of eight years, the Executive Office again published the *Biographical Directory of Members* (the *Directory of Members* was published for each of these eight years, but not with biographical entries). *The American Sociologist (TAS)* was phased out in 1982 (the last issue was published in November 1982) after considerable debate, including discussion on possibly incorporating *TAS* into *ASR*.

In 1986, three ASA journals evolved through major transitions: (1) After almost two years of negotiations with Sage Publications, ASA purchased *Teaching Sociology* in 1985, and began publication of *TS* in 1986. The *Teaching Newsletter* was also incorporated into *TS* at this time. (2) The journal *Sociological Theory*, previously published as an annual review by Jossey-Bass, became a semi-annual journal published by the ASA. (3) The 1986 volume of the annual *Sociological Methodology* was published by the ASA after it was purchased from Jossey-Bass. In addition, the 15-year *Cumulative Index* for *ASR*, *CS*, *JHSB*, *SPQ*, *SOE*, *TAS*, *SM*, and *ST* (and including the *American Journal of Sociology* and *Social Forces*) was also published in 1986. In 1989, ASA Council approved a recommendation from the Committee on Publications for a contract with Basil Blackwell for the publication of *SM* and *ST*.

One new journal, *Sociological Practice Review (SPR)*, was added to the ASA’s family of journals on a three-year experimental basis. In January 1987, Council approved a resolution to establish *SPR* and directed that a campaign be undertaken to raise funds to help launch it. In 1989, Robert Dentler was chosen as the first editor. After publication of two issues in 1990, *SPR* was published quarterly in 1991 and 1992, and discontinued at the end of 1992 because of low subscriptions (see Chapter 2).

Attention was also focused on the production quality and appearance of ASA journals. In 1985, Council approved a Committee on Publication’s request that the quality of paper used for journals be upgraded, because libraries were complaining “that bound volumes of ASA journals are falling apart due to the use of low quality paper.” (Council Minutes, August 31, 1985) Journal covers were also upgraded, type size increased, page numbers added to journals, and shrink-wrapping introduced for mailings.

Council also took action to formalize certain legal aspects of its publishing program. In 1982, Council accepted a copyright statement for inclusion in ASA journals. In 1985, Council approved trademarking its journals, and passed a resolution that ASA not lend its logo to outsiders but that it publish its own journals. Council also issued a policy statement that ASA regard all publications as experimental and conduct periodic reviews of them. In addition, Council passed a resolution giving Irving Horowitz (on behalf of Transaction Publishers) the right to use the name *The American Sociologist* for a new publication, with the stipulation that the name reverts to ASA if publication does not move forward or ceases to exist.

By the end of the 1980s, electronic and desktop publishing emerged as an option for producing publications, although in January 1990, “Council expressed concern for any shifting of the burden for editorial cost to individual authors, many of whom have fewer office resources available for manuscript preparation. There was sentiment that electronically submitted manuscript should be optional.”

General Policies and Priorities

Over the years, especially through its Publications Committee, ASA dealt with a wide range of policy issues affecting the publishing program. A comprehensive review of ASA's publishing program took place in 1980 and 1981 resulting in a 145-page report of analysis, alternative publication models, and recommendations. At the end of the decade, Secretary Michael Aiken "praised the action of the Publication[s] Committee in establishing a five year plan to define other goals and targets." (Council Minutes, August 12, 1989)

Some of the recurring themes emerging from these policy reviews include determining appropriate responses to: (1) members' enthusiasm for publications (especially the startup of new ones)—while dealing with the scarce resources of ASA, (2) Association responsibility and support for specialty journals, (3) the need to conduct periodic reviews of all ASA journals, (4) procedures for evaluating submissions to publications, (5) procedures for setting editorial policies, (6) sound governance structures, (7) circulation growth and the viability of journals, and (7) questions about relevance of journals, especially of *ASR* and its content.

A few other examples of issues and debates pertaining to publications from the 1980s include the following: In February 1986, Council resolved that, at this time, it would not publish a social issues journal; that the voting members of the Committee on Publications should continue the practice of meeting separately; and that the position of "editor-designate" be created to deal with problems in transitions between editors on ASA journals. In January 1991, Council rejected a request from the Committee on Publications for jurisdiction over *Footnotes*. Council also appointed a subcommittee of Council to conduct a review of *Footnotes*, including the identification of appropriate criteria for evaluating the newsletter.

Also, several times during the 1980s criticism was raised in Council about the relevance and representativeness of *ASR*. In January 1982, some Council members noted that, over the years, *ASR* "has not changed much." Council members were encouraged to conduct a "minisurvey" on why authors do or do not choose to publish articles in *ASR* (Council Minutes, January 1982, and September 9, 1982). A Report of the Committee to Evaluate the *ASR* was also produced in 1984. Again, on August 28, 1988, Council member Edna Bonacich asked for formation of a committee to review *ASR* in response to "continuing indications of dissatisfaction." A resolution was passed authorizing President Joan Huber, in consultation with the chair of the Committee on Publications, to jointly develop a mechanism for review of *ASR*.

A Subcommittee of the Committee on Publications (COP) consisting of Maureen T. Hallinan (Chair), Jeylan T. Mortimer, Teresa A. Sullivan, and Douglas W. Maynard was appointed in 1989 to evaluate *ASR*. The Subcommittee produced a report in the fall of 1989, which was circulated to Council (along with a packet of 23 letters compiled by Bonacich from section officers who responded to a call for input on the issue) in December 1989. The Report was presented to Council at the January 1990 meeting: "At issue was whether or not the *ASR* did or should represent the diversity of topical interests in the discipline, as well as theoretical and methodological orientations." After considerable discussion, (and defeat of a motion that the next editor "be strongly sympathetic to qualitative work"), a consensus emerged that publication of special issues of *ASR* which would reflect diversity of the discipline should be further explored by the Committee on Publications.

Political Science Review of Journals

ASA journals received high ratings in a 1986 survey of political scientists, who were asked to evaluate journal quality. The survey undertaken by three political scientists was published in the American Political Science Association's *PS: Political Science and Politics* and reported in the December 1989 edition of *Footnotes*. Out of some 78 journals, the two leading general sociological

journals received very high scores: *ASR* was tied in second place with the American Political Science Association's flagship journal, the *American Political Science Review*; the *American Journal of Sociology* was tied in fourth place with the *American Journal of Political Science*. This strong showing of sociological journals in another social science field with its own journals and specialized content was significant in another respect: The 1986 evaluation was a replication of a 1975 study which produced similar high ratings for sociological journals.

Teaching Services Program (TSP)

A key component of the Association's activities during the 1980s was promoting excellence in teaching. ASA initiatives in these areas were complemented by joint efforts with regional associations, the critical support of ASA committees and past officers and, in some areas, collaborations with other social science organizations.

Core TSP Activities

The cornerstone of ASA's activity in this area was the Teaching Services Program (TSP), a multifaceted effort dedicated to improving and supporting teaching quality and effectiveness. Established in 1975 with grants from the Lilly Foundation and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), TSP was launched under the leadership of Hans Mauksch, Executive Officer during 1975 and 1976, who provided the vision and impetus for the Program. Lawrence J. Rhoades handled most project activities from 1978 to 1981; and Carla Howery, Assistant Executive Director and Director for TSP from 1981 to 1993, brought the program to fruition and provided it with continuing energy, guidance, and direction.

Originally located at Oberlin College, TSP became a part of ASA operations in the 1978 budget year. Hans Mauksch, who had coordinated the fieldwork of the Teaching Resources Group (TRG) from its inception, retired from the project in 1983. In 1985, Council moved the TRG to a campus location with a Field Coordinator appointed for three-year terms, with rotations among colleges and universities similar to that of journal editors. William Ewens of Michigan State University was named the first Field Coordinator (1985–88); he was succeeded by J. Michael Brooks, Texas Christian University (1988–91), and Jeanne H. Ballantine, Wright State University (1991–94).

The purchase by the ASA of the journal *Teaching Sociology* from Sage Publications in 1985 also marked a "culmination of a fifteen year period of activity designed to make teaching a central part of Association activities." (D'Antonio in *Footnotes*, August 1991:2) Theodore Wagenaar of Miami University was the first editor. The TSP had its own *Teaching Newsletter*, which was published bimonthly under the editorship (1982–85) of Carla Howery, who also managed all aspects of the publication. The *Teaching Newsletter* was merged with *Teaching Sociology (TS)* when ASA began publication of *TS* in 1986. The Section on Undergraduate Education also published a newsletter.

In the 1980s, the TSP consisted of three components:

- The Teaching Resources Center (TRC) distributed products written by and for sociologists to help them as teachers. By 1990, the TRC had produced more than 75 titles and in 1990 sold more than \$35,000 worth of teaching materials. Individual members of the Association and sections of the Association contributed extensively to materials in the TRC. The materials disseminated through the Center (which was located at the Executive Office) included manuscripts, modules, syllabi sets, curriculum development materials, discussions of specific teaching skills such as lecturing, guidelines for training graduate students, and other information that shapes effective teaching. (See Appendix 20 for a detailed list of TRC products offered in 1990.)
- The teaching workshop series consisted of seminars conducted throughout the year on a variety of topics of interest to teachers of sociology. Designed to enhance teaching skills, the

workshops were directed by the Field Coordinators with the advice and input of the Director of TSP. Workshop topics included discussions on teaching sexism and racism, and on substance abuse and prevention; and sessions on applied sociology, starting local research centers, academic leadership for chairpersons and deans, integrating internships in sociology programs, and using computers in teaching. (Appendix 20 contains a list of all workshops conducted in the series from 1980–91.)

- An ASA Teaching Resources Group (TRG) had members who were available for evaluating and advising departments seeking to improve their sociology programs. Hans Mauksch and Gail Woodstock, University of Missouri-Columbia, coordinated the first TRG Workshops in 1980–81. By the end of 1990, the TRG, which was also self-supporting, offered administrative reviews, diagnostic services, and self-improvement services. In 1990, site visits to more than a dozen campuses during the year were organized, calling upon a pool of some 60 scholars especially trained for these visits.

Both the Teaching Workshops and the TRG were largely financially and administratively independent of the Executive Office (site visit expenses were borne by the institution which hosted the event), although the Director of the TSP (Howery) was on the ASA staff, and budgets for the workshops were approved by the ASA.

In 1988, a Departmental Services Program was established at ASA to improve the distribution of ASA services and publications to departments through a nonvoting departmental membership in the Association. Packages of resources and materials were offered to sociology departments at discounted prices in a simplified ordering process. Brochures and other materials were also prepared and disseminated on ASA publications, resources, and services available to departments.

In 1992, the TSP became part of the Association's Academic and Professional Affairs Program (APAP) (see Chapter 2).

Other Projects on Education

Throughout the 1980s, ASA also focused attention on improving the quality of sociology education at the high school, undergraduate, and graduate levels. Stimulated by reports such as *A Nation at Risk* by the President's Commission on Excellence in Education, ASA collaborated with other social science associations and the National Council for Social Studies (NCSS) in outreach efforts aimed at the high school level "to transform the teaching of sociology and the other social sciences via a rigorous, more scientific approach to the social studies." (D'Antonio in *Footnotes*, August 1990:2)

ASA members also participated in discussions with AAAS leaders in evaluating Project 2061, an effort still ongoing by AAAS to rethink all facets about the teaching and curriculum of the physical and social sciences and mathematics. To assist the ASA to monitor and provide input to these new initiatives for sociology and the social sciences at the K-12 level, a new Task Force on Sociology in the Elementary and Secondary Schools was formed which included Paul Gray (Chair), Joseph DeMartini, Dean Dorn, Carla Howery, Paul Lindsay, Douglas Snyder, Jerold Starr, and Donna Wendel. The Task Force was charged to "examine and strengthen the role of the ASA in the areas of secondary and elementary education and the teaching of sociology at the precollege level." It presented its report to Council and was converted by Council to a standing committee on August 27, 1991.

In 1985, ASA participated in two national conferences on the "The Improvement of Undergraduate Education" at Wingspread in Racine, WI. The impetus for the conference was several national reports on the status of undergraduate education in the U.S. and, especially, the works of Ernest Boyer, President of the Carnegie Endowment for the Advancement of Teaching. The ASA participants included approximately 40 sociologists who reported on lessons learned from the TRG experiences.

In collaboration with eleven other disciplines, ASA was involved from 1988 to 1990 in an initiative to examine the undergraduate major. Sponsored by the Association of American Colleges (AAC), this three-year project on “Study in Depth” was designed to address issues such as the core concepts of disciplines and the sequencing of courses. A Task Force, consisting of Carla Howery, Paul Eberts, Zelda Gamson, Theodore Wagenaar, Kathleen Crittenden, Robert Davis, and Catherine Berheide was appointed in 1989 “to assess current practices and make recommendations on the undergraduate major in sociology.” Council endorsed ASA’s report, which was published as *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major* (Washington, DC: American Sociological Association, 1990), authored by Eberts et al. (Summaries of the report were published in *Footnotes* in January, February, and August 1991.) The report offered recommendations and guidelines for strengthening the undergraduate sociology major.

Efforts were also undertaken to assess graduate education. Under the leadership of 1989 ASA President Joan Huber, a Task Force on Graduate Education in the Year 2000 was established by ASA Council in 1988 to examine issues, trends, and curricula in light of new findings in research methodology and theory, major research directions, and recruitment needs. The Task Force consisted of Joan Huber (Chair), Michael Aiken, Lois DeFleur, Mayer Zald, Kenneth Land, Barbara Heyns, Stanley Lieberman, William J. Wilson, and William D’Antonio and worked closely with graduate department chairs. (See also Chapter 2.)

Professional Development Program (PDP)

A high priority during the 1980s was placed on advancing programs relating to “Sociological Practice,” a term used to refer to sociologists who worked in business, government, non-profit associations, or who were self-employed. This term was used, according to D’Antonio, because no other single term like “applied” or “policy-oriented,” adequately described the professional activities of sociologists in these work settings (*Footnotes*, August 1991:12).

ASA activities focused on expanding and enhancing the employment opportunities of sociologists working outside of the academy through three major programs: the Professional Development Program (PDP), the Certification Program, and the Public Information Program. To guide the work in this area, Council appointed four Ad Hoc Committees: the Committee on Certification of Sociologists; the Committee on Trends in the Occupation of Sociologists; the Committee on Restructuring Professional Opportunities in Sociology; and the Committee on Federal Standards for the Employment of Sociologists. There was also a special Task Force on Sociology and the Media, the interests of which overlapped with those of the other committees.

Sociological Practice: 1981–86

In December 1981, a major workshop was held on “Directions in Applied Sociology,” which signaled the importance of and the new commitment of ASA to sociological practice. Sponsored by the Committee on Professional Opportunities in Applied Sociology, and chaired by Howard Freeman, the workshop was held in Washington to a capacity audience. ASA Presidents Peter Rossi (1980) and William Foote Whyte (1981)—both of whom considered themselves applied sociologists—strongly supported ASA moves in this direction. The 1981 workshop and the volume emanating from it, *Applied Sociology* edited by Howard E. Freeman, Russell R. Dynes, Peter H. Rossi and William F. Whyte (Jossey-Bass, 1983), provided the inspiration for much of the growth and development in this area during the 1980s.

Bettina Huber directed the programmatic activities relating to sociological practice at the Executive Office from 1981 to 1986. She led efforts to prepare materials on job opportunities; organize professional development workshops; conduct surveys and analyze data trends of members who were employed in business, government and non-profit associations; and design seminars for

federal government personnel officers on the potential for sociological skills. Huber was also responsible for the Certification Program at the Executive Office.

Congressional Fellowships were also established to give sociologists the opportunity to put “theory into practice, and bring her/his scholarly knowledge to bear on a major issue confronting a congressional committee.” (*Footnotes*, March 1983:4) Carol Weiss (Harvard University) and William R. Freudenburg (Washington State University) were appointed ASA Congressional Fellows in 1983, and Raymond Russell received a fellowship in 1984 at the U.S. General Accounting Office.

In 1985, Council approved the establishment of the ASA Distinguished Career Award for the Practice of Sociology with Conrad Taeuber as its first recipient in 1986.

Sociological Practice: 1986–91

In 1986, on the recommendation of the Committee on Sociological Practice, Council authorized the appointment of an Assistant Executive Officer to head a program to advance and better serve the needs of sociologists working in practice settings. Council viewed this as an act “to institutionalize the practice of sociology.” Stephen Buff was appointed the first Director of the Professional Development Program (PDP) in July 1986. The Committee, chaired by Ruth Love, Bonneville Power Administration, had been at work for more than a year on an action plan for this new program that would focus on:

- Developing and disseminating career materials;
- Working with sociology departments to modify curricula so that graduates would be prepared for a wider range of job opportunities;
- Working with media to demonstrate the value of sociology and sociological skills;
- Making connections for sociologists with potential employers at all levels of government, business, industry and non-profit settings; and
- Serving as a general catalyst to help un- and underemployed sociologists find new venues for employing their skills.

The work of PDP was coordinated by the ASA Committee on Federal Standards for the Employment of Sociologists. The major forms of outreach of the PDP were seminars and other presentations (mostly at federal agencies), publications, and resource materials. See Appendix 21 for a detailed list of PDP projects, but from 1986 to 1990, major program activities included:

- Sponsoring 14 seminars at 18 federal agencies aimed at informing federal officials about the research and work skills of sociologists; for example, William Darrow (Centers for Disease Control) and Rosemary C. R. Taylor (Tufts and Harvard Universities) spoke on the AIDS epidemic for the U.S. Public Health Service; and John Kasarda (North Carolina-Chapel Hill) spoke before Branch Chiefs at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on “Dual Cities: People and Jobs on a Collision Course;”
- Publishing *The Internship Handbook* (with TRC), and “*How to Join the Federal Workforce and Advance Your Career*” along with other career materials and resources;
- Preparing a document for new standards for the classification of jobs in the federal government, which were adopted in 1989 and updated the 1960s federal standards for the employment of sociologists;
- Cooperating with CAFLIS, the Coalition of Associations for Foreign Language and International Studies, whose programs aimed at foreign language study and international education were of interest to many in sociology; and

- Working with the New York-based Sociologists in Business to produce a video on corporate sociologists in the advertising, banking, insurance, communications, and consumer research industries.

Certification Program

The Association had grappled with issues relating to certification for nearly 30 years before Council officially launched the Certification Program in 1985. Several years earlier, in 1979, ASA responded to a revived interest in the issue by creating a Committee on Certification to explore establishing a program of certification. A report to Council in 1981 indicated that, “some sociologists feel that they are being blocked from entering some fields due to the lack of certification in sociology. Most frequently cited was the field of mental health where other disciplines [notably psychology] have established licensing laws which restrict the practice of others.” (Council Minutes, January 1981) Council, however, raised questions about the extent to which sociologists were being excluded from jobs because of lack of certification; and noted its reluctance to deal with certification issues in its meetings during 1981 and 82.

A report outlining the need for certification of PhD and MA sociologists was presented to Council on September 3, 1983. In January 1984, after nearly three years of work, Council approved a Certification Program and created a Committee on Certification consisting of Edgar F. Borgatta (Chair), Otto Larsen, Katherine Marconi, Barbara Williams, and Mayer Zald. It was charged with drafting a set of procedures for certifying sociologists at the MA and PhD levels. The procedures were subsequently presented to state and regional representatives during the 1984 Annual Meeting in San Antonio. Council also directed that the consequences of certification on the social and behavioral sciences be further studied, and that a clearinghouse be established for collecting information on certification for use by state monitors.

In the interim report of August 1984, the Committee concluded that the primary purpose of ASA’s certification program should be to “provide an additional qualification that will assist our graduates in dealing with the pressures of a highly competitive job market without adversely affecting academics or other sociologists who are not certified.” (Kennedy, *Footnotes*, November 1994:4) The Committee also recommended that six certification committees be appointed for various broad specialty areas (demography, law and social control, medical sociology, organizational analysis, social policy and evaluation, and social psychology).

Ultimately, there was very little demand for certification. The August 1990 report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluating the PhD Certification Program recommended that, because of low interest (only 62 persons had been certified in the first four years of that program), the “Oversight Committee be designated as the sole body to maintain and administer the program. This simplified structure would serve as a more cost-effective strategy in place of the existing seven committees.” (Council Minutes, August 14, 1990)

Public Information Program

A Public Information Program was established in 1985 to promote public understanding of sociology and the work of sociologists. In 1932, the American Sociological Society had formed a committee to consider means for disseminating important sociological research findings. Although it had only a two-year life span, ASA implemented some of this committee’s recommendation more than 50 years later (Howery, *Footnotes*, January 1985:1–2).

The Committee on Public Information, composed of Claude S. Fischer, William C. Martin, J. Ronald Milavsky, Rosalie Schram, Bernard Roshco, Lawrence J. Rhoades, and Michael Useem, presented a report to Council in January 1986 focused on the need to develop a public information program aimed at promoting an understanding of the discipline based on “scientific merit and

practical value” and on improving the image of the profession of sociology among policymakers, funding officers, the media, and others who shape public opinion.

The Public Information Program aimed to achieve its goals by coordinating with COSSA and other social science associations in sponsoring joint press conferences and other similar events, cultivating the Washington press corps (especially the wire services), monitoring ASA publications for topics of general interest, expanding and improving media coverage of the Annual Meeting, recognizing the professional contributions of sociologists whose work appears in the media, training sociologists to deal more effectively with the press, and emphasizing media coverage beyond the newspaper story.

Minority Fellowship Programs

The ASA has supported minority students through various programs, activities, and events continuously since the mid-1970s. The main programmatic activities in support of minority students during the 1980s were the: (1) Minority Fellowship Program (MFP), which was launched in 1974 with funds primarily from NIMH to support training of minority sociologists in mental health, (2) Cornerhouse Dissertation Grants (funded from 1974–86), (3) training fellowships in clinical work funded by an NIMH grant (1979–84), and (4) the Minority Opportunity Summer Training (MOST) Program of summer institutes for minority undergraduates funded by the Ford Foundation beginning in 1990.

The largest of these programs was the MFP, with about \$550,000 authorized each year from July 1984 through July 1989. By its 10th anniversary in 1984, MFP had funded 219 minority students, of whom 72 had obtained their PhDs (Appendix 23). The MFP program was under the direction of Paul Williams (1981–85) and Lionel Maldonado (1985–90).

Precarious Position of the MFP

The MFP was in a precarious position throughout much of the 1980s because of the drastic cuts in social research programs by the NIMH. The tenuous situation of the MFP led Council to consider new strategies for broadening the base of financial support for the program. MFP Council Liaison Michael Aiken presented the following goals for MFP to Council on August 30, 1984: “(1) a concerted effort to broaden the financial base of the MFP program beyond NIMH; (2) expansion of the program so that by the end of the decade there will be 20–25 new entrants annually and a total of 100–120 students receiving support; [and] (3) establishment of a task force to assist the MFP Committee in achieving the two objectives just outlined.”

Council approved the general goals as stated, and in 1985 appointed a Task Force consisting of Charles Willie (Chair), Margaret Andersen, James E. Blackwell, Bonnie Thornton Dill, Richard O. Hope, Cheryl Leggon, Clarence Y. H. Lo, Lloyd H. Rogler, William Sewell, and Howard Taylor. Lionel Maldonado who had been appointed Director of MFP that year was also on the Task Force, and Charles Bonjean succeeded Valerie Oppenheimer as Council Liaison in 1986. The Task Force met several times, developed strategies for new funding sources, and contacted foundations for funding the MFP, however, with little success.

In 1986, ASA received a \$27,000 planning grant from the Ford Foundation to review MFP and chart new directions for the program. The Ford Foundation also recommended that the Task Force focus its attention in several areas that have “historically plagued” many minority fellowship programs, including recruitment of undergraduate minority students into predoctoral studies, retention of students in graduate programs, and support in launching careers in the form of a postdoctoral component. Ford suggested that a fellowship program that incorporated all of these elements might appeal to foundations, and even serve as a model for other programs (*Footnotes*, March 1987:10). With Council’s approval, the MFP Task Force refocused its attention on revamping the MFP program.

MOST I

In January 1988, Council restructured the MFP to allow for expanding to undergraduates and post-doctoral initiatives, and authorized ASA's direct financial support for the director and administrative assistant, so they could devote full time to the expanded program. In 1990, under the leadership of MFP Director Lionel Maldonado, ASA launched the new initiative, named the Minority Opportunity Summer Training (MOST) Program, consisting of summer institutes for minority undergraduates. The purpose of the new program (which in 1993 became known as "MOST I") was "to promote quality training in sociology as a means to attract undergraduates of color to graduate education. ASA built the institutes around three key approaches: relevant and rigorous curriculum, research-based training, and faculty mentoring of undergraduates." (Levine, Rodriguez, Howery, Latoni-Rodriguez 2002:7)

MOST I was funded by a two-year award of \$185,000 from the Ford Foundation, which covered most of the costs for the first two institutes at the University of Delaware and the University of Wisconsin at Madison in 1990 and 1991. The Maurice Falk Medical Fund also gave \$20,000 to help pay the travel costs for the faculty of the Institutes, and the American Sociological Foundation made its first grant in the amount of \$10,000 to help cover other institute-related activities. The program was limited to 15 students per session at each university. MOST I continued with summer institutes in the summers of 1992 and 1993 at the University of Michigan and the University of California-Berkeley, and later evolved into the second MOST Program—a key ASA initiative during the 1990s, funded by the Ford Foundation.

Other Funding Sources

In addition to the NIMH funding, the MFP also received \$10,000–15,000 each year from the Cornerhouse Fund in support of dissertation research for minority students. A *Footnotes* article in October 1985 noted that, "[s]ince 1975, the Cornerhouse Fund has contributed \$172,000 to the Minority Fellowship Program. Grants from the Fund have supported 61 students, 45 of whom have received their doctorates." (October 1985:5) The article also reported that seven new Sydney Spivack dissertation awards from the Fund were made in 1985 and 1986. The Cornerhouse Fund discontinued its funding to MFP in 1986. As noted above (see Cornerhouse Fund), in 1991, all remaining monies in the Fund were awarded to the ASA to support sociological initiatives related to public policy in the Spivack Program (see Spivack Program in Chapter 2).

As ASA moved to improve the MFP, it worked vigorously to obtain new sources of support to compensate for the loss of NIMH funding. Assistance came in various forms. Graduate departments in which ASA fellows were enrolled gave tuition and fee waivers and/or remissions, as well as some matching stipends. A contribution of \$10,000 by members ensured continued dissertation support for 1986 and 1987. Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS) established a dissertation fellowship, which provided funds (1986–87); and Alpha Kappa Delta (AKD), the Association of Black Sociologists (ABS), the Eastern Sociological Association, Southwestern Sociological Association, the Mid-West Sociological Society, and the Mid-South Sociological Association made contributions to MFP. NIMH also awarded ASA a supplement of nearly \$25,000 that enabled MFP to make six dissertation grants for the 1987–88 academic year.

Maldonado noted in 1987 that the special drive helped to keep the program stable at 22 fellows a year, about half the size of ASA's stated goal of support for 40 students per year. To keep MFP stable beyond 1987, ASA increased its financial support of administrative costs to 40 percent for 1987 and 50 percent for 1988 and thereafter. Maldonado reported site visits to 11 campuses in 1988 to explain program guidelines, recruit applicants, develop closer ties between departments and the ASA, and press for permanent funding arrangements for ASA fellows.

MFP was reviewed formally in 1989 by an NIMH-appointed panel, and earned a near-perfect priority score of 115. MFP was again renewed for three years by NIMH at the level of \$350,000

annually, and was supplemented by tuition and stipend support from many of the universities cooperating in the program (D'Antonio, *Footnotes*, August 1990:2). This grant also provided some support for the Program Director and the Administrative Assistant, as well as for special dissertation awards. Maldonado reported restoration of the full amount of the 1992 NIMH grant to graduate fellowships following cuts in 1991.

7. OTHER ASA PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

ASA continued to promote and advance collaborative relationships with regional and other sociological associations, to develop sources of support for sociologists—such as the Teaching Endowment Fund, and the Fund for the Advancement of the Discipline (FAD)—and to strengthen programs that focused on students. In addition, ASA directed considerable attention to activities on international issues. This section describes the Honors and FAD Programs and ASA's participation in international programs and activities as illustrative of some of these other Association commitments.

ASA Honors Program

On August 13, 1989, Council approved the Honors Program as an official program of the ASA. Founded in 1974 by John H. Shope of Salisbury State College as a undergraduate teaching demonstration for introductory sociology, the ASA Honors Program was not an official function of the ASA until 1989. Indeed, its name derived from the Program's focus on the participation of undergraduates in the ASA Annual Meetings, and for the honor and recognition received by the outstanding students who were selected for the Program. Professor William Brown directed the Program in 1978 and 1979 and Burton Wright of the University of Central Florida (UCF) was Director from 1980 to 1989.

At the suggestion of then ASA President William Foote Whyte, Honors Program students were invited to become participant-observers at the 1981 Annual Meeting in Toronto. Students attended Annual Meeting sessions, kept detailed accounts of impressions and insights, and wrote a formal paper about their experiences. Program participants were expected to pay their own way (including tuition to UCF) and received transfer credits at their home institution.

In December 1988, Wright met with Executive Office staff and suggested that ASA formally adopt the Honors Program after his retirement the following year. In January 1989, Council appointed an ad hoc committee to further explore the issue, and later that year, voted its formal approval. A subcommittee of Council was appointed to oversee the Program, which was administered by the Executive Office. No appropriations were requested from ASA for the Program.

Fund for the Advancement of the Discipline (FAD)

Origins

At its June 1973 meeting, Council established a Committee on the Problems of the Discipline (POD) to “. . . facilitate efforts by small groups of sociologists (probably three to six persons) to meet periodically, to exchange ideas, and to produce working papers . . . focused on basic theoretical and methodological issues in sociology . . .” (Council Minutes, June 1973). It consisted of Hubert T. Blalock (Chair), Matilda White Riley, and Gary T. Marx, and became a full Subcommittee of Council by 1977. The idea for such an effort emanated from a Council subcommittee in the early 1970s co-chaired by Blalock and James Davis, which explored possible committee initiatives on core problems of the discipline.

At the same June 1973 meeting, Council created a special Fund for the Advancement of the Discipline (FAD) at the request of the Executive Officer as a means whereby contributions could be

made by persons, including the assignment of book royalties, to support projects approved by the POD Program. Royalties from books by Blalock launched the Fund, but income from other sources (including a membership drive) contributed as well. By October, 1981 FAD had grown to nearly \$85,000 (Rossi Report, August 1982).

The Committee on POD began to administer a Small Grants Program in 1974, implementing the ideas expressed by Blalock and Davis in 1971. From 1974 to 1979, however, the funding for this Small Grants Program came from general ASA operating funds and not from the restricted FAD funds. Indeed, according to the Rossi Report, Blalock had put consistent pressure on Council to use general operating funds for the small grants program so that FAD funds could grow. FAD funds, however, were appropriated in 1979 for startup of the new journal *Sociological Theory* (Rossi Report 1982).

In 1980, Council approved the allocation of \$8,000 from FAD for each of three years for the POD Small Grants Program. Subsequently, funds from the FAD program were allocated to the Small Grants Program from 1982 to 1987, when new support was available from an award of \$45,000 by the National Science Foundation in support of a small grants program for 1987–89. Since 1987, ASA has matched the NSF awards in support of the Program—which then became known as the ASA/NSF Small Grants Program, and since the early 1990s, popularly known as the FAD Program. (See Chapter 2.)

FAD in the 1980s

Council affirmed that the small grants program supported by FAD was established with the explicit goal of advancing the discipline rather than the profession of sociology, and that the uses of FAD be restricted for “workshops, seminars or mini-courses whose aim is to upgrade the scholarly and research skills of ASA members as appropriate uses of the Fund.” (Council Minutes, September 9, 1982) Criteria for funding small grants under FAD were also discussed in considerable detail at the 1982 Council meeting (and again in February 1985). A proposal was also made to establish a Committee for the Advancement of the Profession, but the idea was not formally implemented.

From 1980 to 1990 up to eight grants were made under the POD Program each year—with the exception of 1983 and 1984 when FAD funded three Congressional Fellows. The POD awards were made for a wide range of research projects and conferences, including, for example: conceptual problems in the field of collective behavior, survey approaches to community organizations, research on the welfare state, equality and inequality in China, urban theory and policy, ethnicity and race, high school sociology, ideology and social organization, and case studies and organization analysis.

From 1980 to 1990, FAD was also used to support other types of ventures as well. In August 1982, Council allocated \$25,000 from FAD in support of the Consortium of Social Science Research Associations (COSSA). FAD funds (\$8,000) were also used to begin work on indexing the ASA journals.

International Issues and Human Rights

ASA focused attention on international connections in a number of ways during the 1980s, including through: (1) Annual Meeting themes and events, and support for foreign scholar participation; (2) formal and informal representation of ASA in international organizations and at international conferences and events; (3) actions of ASA Council, committees, and sections; (4) initiatives implemented through the Executive Office to establish collaborations with foreign scholars and provide assistance when solicited by sociologists in other countries; and (5) leadership and participation of many individual members of ASA in professional activities on cross-national issues.

ASA also addressed human rights violations of scholars and others through various Council and Executive Office actions, including resolutions, policy statements, and campaigns to raise awareness of and protest these situations.

Annual Meeting Events

President Melvin L. Kohn particularly focused on international connections through the theme "Cross-National Research As An Analytic Strategy" for the 1987 Annual Meeting. In his first Council meeting on September 6, 1986, President Kohn said "that his one substantive mission for the coming year was to strengthen the ties between U.S. and world sociology . . . emphasizing the strategic advantages of cross-national research and bringing to the attention of U.S. sociologists the value of the work being done by fellow sociologists in other countries." To support travel for scholars from Eastern Europe and the Third World, ASA obtained funds from NSF, the International Research Exchanges Board (IREX), and other sources. ASA also provided a contingency fund of \$10,000 for travel for foreign scholars, but Kohn noted on August 20, 1987 that this fund was not needed.

Formal Soviet-U.S. exchanges began at the 1985 ASA Annual Meeting, and were solidified in other ways over the next several years through joint ventures described more fully below.

Participation in International Organizations

The International Sociological Association (ISA), the major international organization of sociologists, holds its meetings every four years. Delegations representing ASA attended these meetings (in Mexico City in 1982, New Delhi in 1986, and Madrid in 1990). Individual members presented papers and/or served in organizing functions. ASA members also participated in activities of the International Institute of Sociology (IIS), which holds meetings every two years, and is organized along more fluid lines.

ASA obtained funds from NSF (and from the Smithsonian for the 1986 meeting in New Delhi) to help defray the cost of member travel to the meetings. ASA's relationship with the ISA reflected certain complexities and tensions. For example, questions arose in 1990 regarding an ISA statement condemning racist doctrines, but also asserting that, "sociologists who do not endorse the above statement are not welcome at the Congress." (D'Antonio, *Footnotes*, March 1990:2) Alejandro Portes, the ASA's new delegate to the ISA thought that, although the resolution was commendable, the last sentence amounted to a loyalty oath restricting freedom of expression of scholars, and requested guidance from Council on how to proceed. While Council took a strong stand against Apartheid, it voted its strong opposition to the sentence that was de facto a "loyalty oath."

ASA Committee Actions

The ASA has had committees focused on international issues since 1965. From 1975 to 1990 the Committee on World Sociology (which became the Committee on International Sociology in 1990) was actively engaged in projects and, in 1991, created "area liaison coordinators" for ten world regions.

In 1990 in a report on Exchanges with Foreign Scholars, Craig J. Calhoun, Louis W. Goodman, and Melvin L. Kohn presented Council with a "preliminary report on the whole range of international relations of the ASA and issues arising from the internationalization of sociology. The report detailed existing ASA capacities and experience in the international field, noting the role of the Committee on World Sociology, ASA Sections, formal and informal representation to various other organizations and agencies, and activities within the Executive Office. It also highlighted the dramatic increase in visiting foreign scholars and the ways in which ASA could facilitate the flow;

similarly the importance of integrating international knowledge into U.S. sociology was noted.” (Council Minutes, January 1990) Council took several actions relating to the Committee on World Sociology and reaffirmed the direction in which the Subcommittee was moving.

Other Forms of Collaborations

ASA members participated extensively in international conferences and other forms of collaborations. For example, in 1984, Alice Rossi headed a delegation to China that included William Parish, Nan Lin, and Shelby Stewman to establish contact with sociologists there. In 1990, Barry Wellman, Stanley Lieberman, and Thomas Pettigrew attended a small international workshop in Bulgaria on the ethnic crisis in Bulgaria.

ASA also supported evolving relationships with sociologists in the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries. In a program jointly sponsored by the ASA and the International Research and Exchange Board (IREX), and in cooperation with the Soviet Sociological Association, a series of five seminars brought together Soviet and U.S. sociologists to discuss the feasibility of the exchange of lecturers and graduate students and collaboration in research projects. These cooperative efforts involved a number of graduate departments in the United States, and in the fall of 1989, 17 Soviet graduate students entered U.S. graduate programs. In March 1990, a Soviet sociologist and four students from Russia, Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia addressed a gathering on Capitol Hill. Especially after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, joint projects also flourished with social scientists in Poland, Hungary, and throughout Eastern Europe.

The ASA supported the establishment of the U.S. Institute of Peace in 1984. Executive Officers Dynes and D’Antonio participated in coalition planning meetings at the National Peace Academy Foundation in Washington and sociologists James H. Laue and Elise Boulding served on the Foundation’s Board of Directors. In 1985, Council also approved William Gamson’s proposal that ASA jointly sponsor a conference on “Global Conflict and Cooperation: A Sociological Perspective,” with the Institute for Global Conflict and Cooperation at the University of California.

ASA’s commitment to advancing interest on international topics was manifested in other ways as well. *Footnotes* featured many articles on international issues and on ASA’s (and sociology’s) international connections. The December 1987 issue of *Footnotes* included a full-page letter from the School of Sociology at the University in Nicaragua and its petition for assistance. Many ASA Business Meeting resolutions at Annual Meetings raised awareness of international issues, and Council voted on a number of these, including opposition to apartheid, nuclear arms proliferation, and the 1991 Gulf War; and urging the U.S. to remain a member of UNESCO. Concern was raised frequently in Council on restrictions placed by governments on sociologists (and social scientists in general) in pursuing professional and scientific work—including formal protests against the U.S. government for not granting visas to visiting sociologists, or for pursuing policies of surveillance by intelligence agencies at ASA meetings and elsewhere.

Human Rights

The ASA lodged protests on behalf of sociologists in many places around the world for violations of their individual human rights, or for those detained or restricted in pursuing professional, scientific work (e.g., in Turkey, Korea, Malaysia, Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union, Taiwan, South Africa, and Japan). ASA also expressed its solidarity with Soviet scientists and Polish sociologists and raised awareness and a strong voice of protest at the murder of two sociologists in November 1989 in San Salvador. Members also expressed their opposition to human rights abuses generally through resolutions of the ASA Business Meeting—such as those calling for respect of the human

rights, civil liberties, and sovereignty of the peoples of Central America and for supporting the sanctuary movement for refugees from Guatemala and El Salvador.

Concern was expressed on the situation in South Africa in the form of anti-apartheid policies and direct calls for the release of Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners. Council responded directly by specifying in its investments policies that “no investment [would be made] in South African companies” (see discussion under Budgets and Fiscal Policies).

8. ANNUAL MEETING

The Annual Meeting grew in size and scope during the 1980s, with increasing levels of activity (i.e., number of instructional seminars, workshops, didactic seminars, and services to graduate students and others). In 1984, with the reorganization of the Executive Office, a Meetings Manager position was created, and Janet Astner was appointed to fill the position. Since 1984, she has had primary responsibility for directing all ASA meetings (with the Annual Meeting by far the largest event), and has directed ASA meetings through this period of growth and major changes in technologies and meetings support systems. During the 1980s, a number of temporary staff, summer interns, and consultants provided support for the Annual Meetings.

Certain issues and concerns relating to the Annual Meeting reoccurred during the 1980s, including: (1) how to present the *Preliminary Program* in the best way possible at the lowest cost, (2) the rationale behind the rotation schedule for Annual Meeting sites, and (3) criteria for site selection (e.g., disqualifying sites if they did not support the Equal Rights Amendment [ERA], or if they had anti-sodomy laws). Indeed, beginning with the 1980s, ASA began to implement policies regarding site selection for meetings based on consideration of factors such as support for the ERA amendment. Considerable emphasis was also placed on improving services in specialized areas including support for childcare, the disabled, and students.

Several Annual Meetings were memorable for the extraordinary challenges they presented. In 1985, three weeks before the meeting took place, a series of electrical fires at the Washington Hilton, where the meeting was to be held, closed down the hotel. A frantic search was made for alternate space over a five-day period, resulting in selection of the Washington Convention Center as the site for the meeting. Transferring operations at the last minute to a new location generated a host of problems and obstacles, especially at a time when technical support systems were not very flexible. However, under the direction of Executive Officer D’Antonio and Convention and Meetings Manager Janet Astner, the Annual Meeting of 1985 was a success—with a record number of sociologists in attendance.

There was also an unexpected relocation of the 1986 Annual Meeting from San Francisco to New York because of the building expansion and remodeling schedules at the San Francisco Hilton, but this occurred with enough advance notice for planning purposes.

Headed by ASA President Matilda White Riley, in 1985, the 1986 Program Committee reconfigured the open submission component of the Annual Meeting Program by reducing and broadening Regular Session topics. The session slots that were opened up by this change were then reserved for use by Regular Session organizers who received a high number of good submissions. This restructuring of the open submission process reached out more broadly to the scientific community and remains in effect today.

Other significant events relating to Annual Meetings in the 1980s include:

- In 1982, Council adopted a resolution that held organizers responsible for the preregistration of participants in their sessions, after discovering that 32 percent of program participants never registered for the 1982 Meeting.

- In 1983, a survey of the membership showed that cost, location, and dates were the three most important variables influencing decisions on whether to attend meetings. Members also indicated a preference for dates between August 10 and 25, and which avoided the Labor Day holiday, and for major tourist spots as sites.
- In 1988, Council reaffirmed its policy to restrict member participation in Annual Meetings to two places in the program.