

The Committee on the Status of Women in The Economics Profession

The first decade of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP) has seen little, if any, progress for women economists in academe. According to a matched sample of forty Ph.D. granting departments, the number of women full professors increased from nine women in 1978–79 to ten women in 1981–82. This net gain of one woman over the four-year period did not represent a percentage gain. Instead, the percentage held constant with women comprising 1.8 percent of all persons holding full professor rank. The percentage of women associate professors did, however, increase from 4.2 percent in 1978–79 to 5.4 percent in 1981–82 and represented a net increase of six women in these departments. Counteracting somewhat the gains at the associate professor level is a slight decline in the percentage of women assistant professors from 13.1 percent to 12.6 percent in this four-year sample. This decline occurred despite a near doubling of both the number and percentage of women granted Ph.D.s in economics over this period. Even the small net gain represented at the associate professor level may not reflect accurately our status at all departments, since there may be some self-selection among the responding schools. The matched sample may well reflect schools that have a better record with respect to women than the nonanswering departments.

Viewing status from the vantage point of the top academic departments of economics, only M.I.T. among the top six departments (as ranked by F. M. Boddy in December 1981) has a woman economist at the tenured level. The economics departments at Chicago, Harvard, Stanford, Princeton, and Yale have no tenured women, although one of these schools has a tenured woman economist in a noneconomics department. Indeed, in 1981–82, these departments had fewer women in the assistant professor rank than in any year in the recent past. Two of the departments have no women economists in any professorial rank. Thus, women are repre-

sented more poorly in the top economics departments than they were four years ago.

In other dimensions, each year brings with it one or two more visible gains for women economists. Women economists have been appointed to a number of senior positions in government, including one at the cabinet level. A few women economists have moved into officer ranks in business, banking, research and consulting firms or into administrative positions in academe. Women economists have become more widely represented in the annual meetings. In the 1982 annual meetings, for example, over two dozen sessions were chaired by women, and roughly 45 percent of the sessions had a woman participating. In addition, a number of women have been elected to positions of responsibility in the American Economic Association. Thus, in honorific dimensions within academe and in the nonacademic job market, women economists are making some progress. In the bread-and-butter dimensions of jobs in academe, both in being hired and promoted, women do not appear to be making progress and the base remains at a low level.

As we embark on the second decade of CSWEP's existence, CSWEP must make renewed efforts to fulfill its desired function of improving the status of women in the academic work environment. To respond to this challenge, CSWEP has a new chair, Barbara Bergmann. Barbara has a history of advocacy for women which should serve her well as she faces the task ahead. The statistics indicate that economics is attracting larger numbers of women Ph.D.s. In the four-year matched sample of forty Ph.D.-granting departments, the number of women receiving their doctorates almost doubled (from 22 to 42). These figures highlight the fact that the female faculty which now exists is relatively junior. The statistics also show, however, that the percentage of women Ph.D.s who turn toward academe is below that for men and has declined from 58.8

percent in 1978–79 to 52.0 percent in 1981–82. This trend may be due to a recognition by women that opportunities for promotion are poor in academe. Certainly, there must be a strong thrust in CSWEP's second decade to insure that academic women have the same opportunities for career advancement as do their male counterparts.

As my term as chair comes to a close, I feel the greatest accomplishment for the Committee during my period of stewardship has been the publication of the CSWEP Roster. Nancy Ruggles has overseen the production and distribution of the Roster of Women Economists. The format is attractive and easy to use. The Roster is useful in locating women by field of research interest as well as by employer. For example, it reveals that over a dozen women economists are employed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and by the World Bank. The Roster lists phone numbers and makes it easy for members to contact other women when giving a seminar at a distant university. The Roster thus serves a networking function in addition to its value in searching for women for job opportunities or for appearances on programs. I am glad that this new service from CSWEP has been added to our thrice-yearly newsletter and to our sponsorship of sessions on women's issues at all of the major regional and national association meetings.

I wish to thank all of the members of my Committee for their support during these last three and a half years. Without their willingness to share responsibility, we could not have accomplished as much as we have. I am particularly grateful to Nancy Ruggles for her willingness to serve a second term as we seek to find ways in which care of the Roster can be less burdensome for the Committee. I am grateful as well to Louise Curley for the fine job she did with the newsletter, and wish Aleta Styers well as she assumes this task for the next three years. Jean Shackelford departs the Committee after having initiated workshops on specific topics related to econometric methods and economic theory, and leaves us with funds for one more such workshop, which her replacement Cordelia Reimers should appreciate. Bob Eisner leaves

the Committee this year, after loyal service in which he provided much sensible advice as well as liaison services with the Econometrics Society. Joseph Pechman has agreed to replace him, and is already at work in seeking funding for a joint Brookings-CSWEP conference on men and women in the work place. The remaining members of the committee should serve to provide continuity for Barbara Bergmann during the transition period as she assumes her new position.

I. CSWEP Activities

CSWEP has become involved in two new initiatives this year. One of these is the planning for a joint conference with The Brookings Institution. Joe Pechman and Claire V. Brown are working together on this project. The idea would be to provide a forum for thoughtful and original research on issues relating to men and women in the work force, with the papers then coming out in a Conference Volume. CSWEP is quite excited about this new venture. We hope that the topics will cover a broad range of research on work place issues, and that young researchers and new research approaches will have an opportunity to receive constructive criticism from senior scholars. CSWEP was disappointed that the National Bureau of Economics Research backed away from participation in such a project, but is quite delighted at the interest shown by Brookings. We are looking forward to a warm and productive partnership.

A second initiative is one suggested by Simmons College. In this plan, there would be a collaboration between a leading women's college focusing on careers for women and the American Economic Association, dedicated to the improvement of information about the economics profession nationally. The project would use library services to develop materials and information packets about the economics profession, and would promote economic career forums throughout the nation for women undergraduates.

Other CSWEP activities this year have involved consolidation and continuation of ongoing projects. We continue an active collaboration, through Gail Wilensky, with

Washington Women Economists and with the Federation of Organizations of Professional Women. We continue to sponsor sessions at annual meetings of the American Economic Association (AEA) and of the regional associations. At the annual meetings in New York in December 1982, CSWEP sponsored two sessions—one on "Women and Health" and the other on "Comparable Worth: Does it Have any Economic Meaning." In addition, our annual business meeting continues to attract a large number of women, whose suggestions are greatly appreciated.

As in previous years, CSWEP continues to provide a flow of information to women economists. Our thrice-annual newsletter, under the direction of Louise Curley, presents calls for papers, summarizes committee activities, offers a plethora of announcements, publications, and generally useful in-

formation for women in our profession. The chief new addition to the newsletter this year is a section reporting on recent meetings and conferences of interest to women. Our thought here has been to permit all women to learn of the coalition strategies and concerns of a broad base of professional women, including those from other academic disciplines as well as those in economics.

This year has marked the publication of our second Roster of Women in Economics. The latest Roster came out in September 1982, timed to be available from the beginning of the recruiting season. As was true last year, entries are in plain English, not codes, and include name, address, and telephone numbers, publications, fields of specialization, and current research interests. Indexes by speciality and location also appear, along with a new index on place of employment. The Roster Directory has been distrib-

TABLE 1—DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME FACULTY, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION, ACADEMIC YEAR, 1981–82

	Chairman's Group			Other Ph.D.			Only M.A. Departments			Only B.A. Departments		
	Total	Female		Total	Female		Total	Female		Total	Female	
		No.	Percent		No.	Percent		No.	Percent		No.	Percent
Existing												
Professor	643	10	1.6	445	10	2.2	167	6	3.6	204	22	7.7
Associate	252	17	6.7	244	13	5.3	161	15	9.3	307	19	6.2
Assistant	353	44	12.5	223	33	15.8	148	20	13.5	395	57	14.4
Instructor	40	5	12.5	24	5	20.8	31	8	25.8	135	28	20.7
Other	32	6	18.7	21	6	28.6	5	1	20.	39	6	15.4
New Hires												
Professor	7	0	—	8	0	—	5	0	—	15	0	—
Associate	9	1	1.1	15	2	13.3	4	1	25.	20	4	20.
Assistant	76	6	7.9	57	6	10.5	32	10	31.2	148	15	10.1
Instructor	11	3	27.3	4	1	25.	12	3	25.	60	21	35.
Other	11	1	9.1	5	3	60.	1	0	—	16	11	68.7
Promoted to Rank (1980–81)												
Professor	20	1	5.	24	2	8.3	13	1	7.7	17	2	11.8
Associate	41	1	2.4	21	2	9.5	8	3	37.5	20	1	5.
Assistant	10	1	10.	0	0	—	1	0	—	12	2	16.7
Tenured at Rank (1980–81)												
Professor	2	0	—	6	0	—	2	0	—	2	0	—
Associate	25	1	4.	20	1	5.	7	0	—	14	0	—
Assistant	0	0	—	1	0	—	1	0	—	7	1	14.3
Not Rehired												
Professor	22	0	—	11	0	—	3	0	—	8	—	12.5
Associate	5	0	—	6	0	—	9	2	22.2	11	0	—
Assistant	45	6	13.3	16	4	25.	14	1	7.1	38	7	18.4
Instructor	9	2	22.2	6	0	—	6	1	16.7	18	4	22.2
Other	1	0	—	3	0	—	0	0	—	9	2	22.2

uted to all major university departments and is sent to all dues-paying members and associate members as a benefit of membership.

II. Status of Women Economists in Academe

Each year, the Universal Academic Questionnaire is distributed by the AEA to all department chairman and the responses are tabulated by Charles Scott of Marquette University. It is the most comprehensive source of information on the academic labor market in economics. However, responses are voluntary and in recent years, its information is often provided by only two-thirds or less of academic departments. Annual comparisons are difficult because the responding institutions vary from year to year. Hence, the data provided in Tables 1-6 provide a useful but not fully accurate view of the role of women in the academic labor market when

compared with their counterpart tables published in previous CSWEP reports. Fortunately, we do have this year a matched sample of forty Ph.D.-granting departments, who have for each of the last four years all consistently responded to the questionnaire. The results of this sample are given in Table 7, and provide a consistent comparative snapshot of our status in 1978-79 and in 1981-82. Whether or not this snapshot is fully accurate depends, unfortunately, on whether there is some self-selection in the responses. It may be that the departments with the poorest records with respect to women tend not to report.

Table 1 provides a summary of the distribution of academic jobs at the beginning of the academic year 1981-82. It presents information for four types of departments: the Chairman's Group; other Ph.D. departments; M.A. departments; and B.A. depart-

TABLE 2—PREVIOUS ACTIVITY OF NEW HIRES AND CURRENT ACTIVITY OF THOSE NOT REHIRED BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION AND SEX, ACADEMIC YEAR, 1981-82

	Previous Activity of New Hires				Current Activity of Not RehiRED			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Chairman's Group	102	100.0	13	100.0	67	100.0	17	100.0
Faculty	26	25.5	3	23.0	45	67.1	9	52.9
Student	60	58.8	7	53.8	1	1.5	4	23.5
Government	1	1.	1	7.7	3	4.5	1	5.9
Bus., Banking, Research	2	2.	1	7.7	9	13.4	2	11.8
Other	13	12.7	1	7.7	9	13.4	1	5.9
Other Ph.D.	82	100.0	13	100.0	33	100.0	4	100.0
Faculty	23	28.4	3	23.0	18	54.5	2	50.
Student	39	47.6	5	38.5	1	3.0	0	—
Government	4	4.9	0	—	2	6.1	0	—
Bus., Banking, Research	9	11.	2	15.4	5	15.2	2	50.
Other	7	8.5	3	23.7	7	21.2	0	—
M.A. Departments	45	100.0	15	100.0	21	100.0	6	100.0
Faculty	19	42.2	6	40.	9	42.9	1	16.7
Student	14	31.1	7	46.7	2	9.5	0	—
Government	1	2.2	0	—	2	9.5	1	16.7
Bus., Banking, Research	9	20.	2	13.3	4	19.0	4	66.7
Other	2	4.4	0	—	4	19.0	0	—
B.A. Departments	143	100.0	44	100.0	79	100.0	43	100.0
Faculty	46	32.3	8	18.2	44	55.7	8	18.6
Student	70	49.	24	54.4	8	18.2	3	7.
Government	4	2.8	4	9.1	2	2.5	16	37.2
Bus., Banking, Research	16	11.2	3	6.8	16	20.3	14	32.6
Other	7	4.9	5	11.4	9	11.4	2	4.7

TABLE 3—DISTRIBUTION OF SALARY FOR WOMEN FACULTY BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT AND TIME IN RANK, ACADEMIC YEAR, 1981-82

Relative Salary for Rank	All Women		Time in Rank			
	Number	Percent	Total Percent	Above Median	At Median	Below Median
All Departments	307	100.0				
Salary above Median	104	33.9	100.0	43.2	34.6	22.1
Salary at Median	109	35.5	100.0	11.9	72.4	15.6
Salary below Median	94	30.6	100.0	15.9	19.1	64.8
Ph.D., Chairman's	85	100.0				
Salary above Median	26	30.6	100.0	34.6	50.	15.3
Salary at Median	28	32.9	100.0	10.7	82.1	7.1
Salary below Median	31	36.5	100.0	19.3	29.0	41.6
Ph.D., Other	64	100.0				
Salary above Median	25	39.0	100.0	56	28	16
Salary at Median	24	37.5	100.0	25	54.1	20.8
Salary below Median	15	23.4	100.0	13.3	26.6	60
M.A. Departments	55	100.0				
Salary above Median	17	30.9	100.0	41.1	35.2	23.5
Salary at Median	16	29.0	100.0	12.5	56.2	31.2
Salary below Median	22	40.0	100.0	22.7	4.5	72.7
B.A. Departments	103	100.0				
Salary above Median	36	35.	100.0	41.6	27.7	30.5
Salary at Median	41	39.8	100.0	4.8	82.9	12.2
Salary below Median	26	25.2	100.0	7.6	15.3	76.9

ments. The Chairman's Group consists of sixty-five departments that focus on research and the training of Ph.D.s in economics. In terms of stature, it is generally agreed that academic appointments at a department within the Chairman's Group carry the most prestige. Thus, this discussion will tend to focus upon the role of women in the Chair-

man's Group as a bellwether for the entire economics profession. The other Ph.D. granting departments focus primarily on undergraduate education, but also have a viable Ph.D. program. The M.A. departments, similarly, have their primary focus upon undergraduate education, but also have a Master's program. Finally, the B.A. departments are

TABLE 4—DEGREES GRANTED IN ECONOMICS BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT AND SEX, ACADEMIC YEAR 1981-82

Number of:	All Depts.	Ph.D. Departments			M.A. Depts.	B.A. Depts.
		Total	Chairman's	Other		
Departments	325	83	44	39	43	199
Ph.D.s	795	795	608	187	-	-
Female	122	122	97	25	-	-
Percent Female	15.3	15.3	16.0	13.4	-	-
M.A.s	1,359	1,113	632	481	246	-
Female	290	243	113	130	47	-
Percent Female	21.3	21.8	17.9	27.0	19.1	-
B.A.s	12,041	6,593	4,256	2,337	843	4,605
Female	3,967	1,933	1,223	710	226	1,808
Percent Female	32.9	29.3	28.7	30.4	26.8	39.3
Other	68	68	45	23	-	-
Female	17	17	7	10	-	-
Percent Female	25.0	25.0	15.5	43.5	-	-

exclusively concerned with undergraduate teaching.

According to Table 1, at the forty-four departments in the Chairman's Group who responded this year, one woman was brought in as a new hire at the associate level, and one woman was promoted to each of the ranks of associate and full professor, respectively. The gains were twice as good in the other Ph.D. departments, with two women appearing in each of the three categories. Thus, there does appear to be some gain for women in 1981-82. The overall percentage of women full professors remains at about two percent in the Ph.D. departments, which is about the level it has been throughout the last decade. The percentage of women associate professors appears to be improving somewhat.

Table 2 supplies some information about the previous activity of those who are newly hired and the present activity of those who have not been rehired. As in previous periods, there is some indication that women are more likely than men to choose nonacademic careers when they have not been rehired by their academic department.

Table 3 describes the salary distribution for women faculty by type of departments and time in rank. Table 3 indicates that women are doing worse in relative salary treatment in the Chairman's Group than in the other Ph.D. granting universities. For example, 30 percent of the women in the Chairman's Group received salaries above the median in contrast to 39 percent of the women in the other Ph.D.-granting universities. Of the women who do receive a salary above the median in the Chairman's Group, however, two-thirds have time in rank at or below the median so the rising stars, as it were, are receiving relatively favorable salary treatment at the Chairman's Group.

Table 4 displays the percentages of women obtaining degrees in economics. There continues to be a strong increase in the percentage of women majoring in economics at all degree levels. At the Ph.D. level, the percentage has almost doubled from 8 to 15 percent in the past four years.

Table 5 contrasts the occupational choices of men and women Ph.D.s in 1981-82. It reveals that roughly half of both men and women Ph.D.s entered the academic labor

TABLE 5—DISTRIBUTION OF ACTIVITIES OF NEW PH.D. DEGREES BY SEX AND TYPE OF DEPARTMENT, ACADEMIC YEAR 1981-82

	All Depts.		Chairman's Group		Other Ph.D. Depts.	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
All Ph.D.s	561	100.0	411	100.0	150	100.0
Education	289	51.5	209	50.9	80	53.3
Government	45	8.0	37	9.0	8	5.3
Bus., Banking, Research	67	11.9	49	11.9	18	12.
Int'l. Emp. Outside U.S.	129	23.	100	24.3	29	19.3
Other	31	5.5	16	3.9	15	10.
Male Ph.D.s	504	100.0	368	100.0	136	100.0
Education	261	51.8	187	50.8	74	54.4
Government	40	7.9	33	9.	7	5.1
Bus., Banking, Research	53	10.5	40	10.9	13	9.6
Int'l. Emp. Outside U.S.	125	24.8	97	26.4	28	20.6
Other	25	5.	11	3.	14	10.3
Female Ph.D.s	57	100.0	43	100.0	14	100.0
Education	28	49.1	22	51.1	6	42.9
Government	5	8.8	4	9.3	1	7.1
Bus., Banking, Research	14	24.6	9	20.9	5	35.7
Int'l. Emp. Outside U.S.	4	7.0	3	7.	1	7.1
Other	6	10.5	5	11.6	1	7.1

TABLE 6—DISTRIBUTION OF PH.D. STUDENT SUPPORT, BY TYPE OF SUPPORT, SEX, AND DEPARTMENT
ACADEMIC YEAR 1981-82

	All Ph.D. Depts.		Chairman's Group		Other Ph.D. Depts.	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
All Students	4,233	100.0	3,079	100.0	1,154	100.0
Tuition Only	220	5.2	177	5.7	43	3.7
Stipend Only	404	9.5	182	5.9	222	19.2
Tuition + Stipend	1,755	41.5	1,377	44.7	378	32.8
No Support	1,075	25.4	807	26.2	268	23.2
No Record	779	18.4	536	17.4	243	21.0
Male Students	3,395	100.0	2,514	100.0	881	100.0
Tuition Only	179	5.3	145	5.8	34	3.9
Stipend Only	325	9.6	140	5.6	185	21.
Tuition + Stipend	1,419	41.8	1,122	44.6	297	33.7
No Support	869	25.6	642	25.5	227	25.8
No Record	603	17.8	465	18.5	138	15.7
Female Students	838	100.0	565	100.0	273	100.0
Tuition Only	41	4.9	32	5.7	9	3.3
Stipend Only	79	9.4	42	7.4	37	13.6
Tuition + Stipend	336	40.0	255	46.9	81	29.7
No Support	206	24.6	165	29.2	41	15.0
No Record	176	21.0	71	12.6	105	38.5

TABLE 7—MATCHED SAMPLE OF FORTY PH.D.-GRANTING DEPARTMENTS, 1978-82

	1978-79			1981-82				
	Total	Women	Percent	Total	Women	Percent		
Distribution of Full-Time Faculty								
Professor	494	9	1.8	541	10	1.8		
Associate	214	9	4.2	276	15	5.4		
Assistant	289	38	13.1	317	40	12.6		
Instructor	57	6	10.5	38	3	10.7		
Other	51	8	15.7	48	8	16.7		
Degrees Granted in Economics								
Ph.D.s	291	22	7.6	347	42	12.1		
M.A.s	497	85	17.1	551	130	23.6		
B.A.s	2,558	576	22.5	3,455	1,032	29.9		
	1978-79				1981-82			
	Men	Percent	Women	Percent	Men	Percent	Women	Percent
Distribution of Activities of New Ph.D. Degrees								
Education	195	67.7	10	58.8	120	56.6	13	52.
Government	35	8.7	2	11.8	26	12.3	4	16.
Bus., Banking, Research	22	7.6	3	17.6	23	10.8	6	24.
Int'l. Exp. Outside U.S.	37	12.8	2	11.8	40	18.9	0	0.
Other	9	3.1	0	0.	3	1.4	2	8.
Distribution of Ph.D. Student Support								
Tuition Only	97	6.2	17	5.5	82	4.8	17	4.7
Stipend Only	288	18.5	50	16.1	160	9.3	44	12.2
Tuition + Stipend	680	43.7	126	40.5	793	46.0	179	49.7
No Support	424	27.3	94	30.2	356	20.6	63	17.5
No Record	66	4.2	24	7.7	334	19.3	57	15.8

market in 1981–82. The percentages of men and women going into government declined slightly from previous years, but remains in the usual 8–10 percent range. Nearly 25 percent of women Ph.D.s entered business, banking, and research firms, up substantially from previous years.

Table 6 continues to show that women are doing as well as men in graduate student support. No discernable evidence of decreased support for graduate study in general is yet in evidence.

Perhaps the most interesting evidence on the status of women appears in Table 7, which summarizes the results of a matched sample of forty Ph.D.-granting departments over the four academic years 1978–79 to 1981–82. These are all departments who consistently answered the questionnaire. The data indicates some growth in the number of women associate professors, as some of the bulge of women assistant professors hired in the mid-1970's receive promotions. The data indicate some decline in the percentage of

women in the assistant professor rank, despite the substantial increase in the percentage of women majoring in economics at all degree levels. The data suggest some movement away from academic employment by both men and women, and a consistently lower proportion of women than men in choosing academic careers. This would seem to indicate rational behavior on the part of women since expectation of success in the academic environment is not very high. In the area of graduate student support, the data indicate a greater level of support for all students in 1981–82 as compared with 1978–79, with women graduate students faring particularly well.

I must conclude then that the status of women economists in academe is plodding along at a whimper. A whimper is better than a silent standstill, but where, oh where, is our bang?

ELIZABETH E. BAILEY, *Chair*