

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE ECONOMICS PROFESSION

Four years ago the American Economic Association (*AEA*) took a firm stand on the need (a) to support and facilitate equality of opportunity for women economists in all aspects of economists' professional activities and (b) to help eradicate any institutional or personal discrimination against women economists. In May of 1972 the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (*CSWEP*) came into being as an *ad hoc* committee of the Association, and in March of 1974, *CSWEP* was made a standing committee of *AEA* in recognition of the fact that the problems addressed by *CSWEP* require long-run efforts. Throughout the four years, it has been a very active committee. This year the committee size was reduced from 10 to 6 members as an economy measure, and we have rotated committee membership. The reduction in size has made it difficult to have as wide geographic representation in any one year as would be desirable and has increased the burden of members on the smaller committee. I want to thank the committee members who have worked so diligently in 1975 to carry out the mandate of the Association.

I want to thank the Carnegie Foundation for its \$21,600 grant to us to plan and execute a national, working research conference on occupational segregation and to disseminate the results. I also want to thank the German Marshall Fund of the United States for a \$1,500 grant to enable us to enrich the program at the *AEA* annual meeting this year by bringing Baroness Nancy Seear from the London School of Economics to speak on her re-

search on employment conditions in the United Kingdom with particular emphasis on the status of women workers.

The number of women economists identified by *CSWEP* and associated with our activities has continued to grow. By last year, we had identified nearly 1,400 women economists through questionnaires to all colleges and universities with economics departments, letters to government agencies and businesses, and information from the informal network. Then, in November 1974 the *AEA Directory of Members* came out. We requested a list of women from that source. A comparison of the two lists added 313 more names. We contacted these women, and only one or two asked not to be added to our roster of associate members.

We also obtained new names from the 1975-76 Universal Academic Questionnaire, wherein each fall new hires are reported as well as other data for an analysis of the academic labor market. Our analysis of the data by sex is in the final section of this report.

The total number of women economists now identified is about 1,800. Of these, 20 percent are in government and business (12 percent and 8 percent, respectively). We know that for the moment we have nearly all women members of the American Economic Association, plus an additional group of women economists who do not belong to *AEA*. About 20 percent of those on our roster do not belong to *AEA*. We suspect that there are still more women economists in the government and in business whom we have not identified. We are working on this. In Sep-

tember we met with members of the National Economists Club in Washington, D.C. to report on our research findings and to identify more women economists who would like to register with us. We encourage growth of local subgroups of women economists. Such groups identify more of the women economists, and increase *AEA* membership.

During the past year *CSWEP* has continued to improve the operation of the market for economists, has increased the effective supply of women economists, and has added to the research information on the status of women.

I. *CSWEP* Newsletter

Four *CSWEP Newsletters* have been written during 1975 and sent to 1,800 women economists. The newsletter improves the working of the market by listing job openings for economists submitted to us by prospective employers. This activity fills a need most appreciated by agency and department heads. The *CSWEP Newsletter* lists requests for articles, conference and program plans and participants, grant and fellowship opportunities, and notices of regional activities for women economists. It is also a mechanism by which the Committee can ask the reader for help in various *AEA* projects. The newsletter clearly has helped to widen the informal network and to support our women colleagues who often have felt isolated in our profession.

II. Roster

The roster of women economists developed and computerized by this Committee has been maintained this year. It has been updated by sending to all women economists listed copies of the material they had previously supplied us and asking for the most recent information on their area of specialization, highest degree

in economics, professional grade or rank, and address. The roster has been used to provide prospective employers with a list of women economists who meet specified criteria such as particular field of specialization, degree, and rank. The prospective employer may then write to these economists, ask them to supply detailed career data, and finally follow up with interviews if desired. This service is being provided for a fee to help defray committee costs, and its use is growing.

III. Research Function

An explicit charge to collect and analyze data relevant to the status of women economists and to further the theoretical and applied research related to the status of women in general helps set the work of the standing committee of *AEA* apart from caucuses in some other professional associations. This research dimension is one that *CSWEP* feels is vital for professional associations to undertake to help build a solid foundation for policy prescriptions related to reappraisal of women's place in society. I want to mention in particular this year work on four of our research projects.

Workshop Conference on Occupational Segregation. This was jointly sponsored in May 1975 by *CSWEP* and the Center on Research on Women in Higher Education and the Professions at Wellesley College and funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The idea to hold a workshop conference on this topic evolved from *CSWEP's* desire to make a research contribution to International Women's Year on a topic central to an improvement of the status of women in American society.

The papers which we commissioned for that conference plus some additional analysis will be published by the University of Chicago Press in a book supplement to

the new journal, *Signs*, in about March 1976, and subsequently as a separate book *Women in the Workplace, An Analysis of Occupational Segregation*, Martha Blaxall and Barbara B. Reagan (eds.). This will fulfill our promise to disseminate the research results beyond the small working group at the conference. We thank the Carnegie Foundation for making this effort financially possible. Clearly women's economic status in a macro sense is of critical importance to women economists, as well as to the nation. An improvement in women's economic status cannot be realized without a diminution of occupational segregation and a better understanding of the forces behind it. Even within our profession of economics, some fields of specialization are deemed more appropriate for men and others for women. Sexism in occupational segregation is pervasive down to micro levels.

1974-75 Survey of Economics. With the development of a roster of women economists and the new *AEA Directory of Members*, it became possible to conduct a survey of both male and female economists to compare educational attainment, employment history, and salaries. Preliminary results from the 1974-75 Survey of Economists were reported in the May 1975 *American Economic Review*. Subsequently, data collection from the men economists in the paired sample was completed. *CSWEP* is now in process of completing the study of 1,240 male and female economists who were paired by selecting a male economist from the same graduate class of a woman economist at the school from which she got her highest degree. The major finding so far is that salaries of women economists are substantially below those of their male counterparts even when their educational attainments and work histories are similar. Excluding the few who were not working, the average

income for the women in 1973-74 (7 years after their Ph.D.s) was \$15,310. For men in the comparable group of Ph.D.s who were working, it was \$19,025 or 24 percent higher. Only 16 percent of the women made more than \$25,000, whereas 30 percent of the men economists in the matched group did. Untangling the factors that might explain this income difference is obviously the next step. It clearly isn't difference in formal education in economics—either in amount or quality of school attended. Discrimination against women is morally and legally untenable.

The Committee feels that increased efforts on its part should be directed to reducing the existing discrepancies. The pending exemption of universities and colleges from the affirmative action regulations makes an increased effort on the part of the Committee and the Association even more imperative.

Other findings from the paired sample are of interest to those involved in training economists. For example, the length of time to complete the Ph.D. degree is not significantly different between women and men—15 percent of women and 15 percent of men finished in 3 years or less, 45 percent of the women and again 45 percent of the men finished in 4 or 5 years; 26 percent of the women and 24 percent of the men took 6 or 7 years; 8 percent of the women and 10 percent of the men took 8 or 9 years; and 7 percent of the women and 6 percent of the men took 10 or more years to finish. Considering the averages, women took 5.6 years and men took 5.5 years to complete the Ph. D.

Marriage and increasing family size, however, may contribute to a small delay in starting a Ph.D. The average number of years between the B.A. degree and the Ph.D. in economics was about 8 years for men but 9 years for women. A counterbalancing factor was that the women had

TABLE 1—DEGREES GRANTED IN ECONOMICS BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT AND SEX, 1974-75

(Departments reporting by December 10, 1975 on 1975-76 Universal Academic Questionnaire)

Degrees Granted in 1974-75	All Departments	Ph.D.		M.A.	B.A.
		Chairman's Group	Other Departments		
Number of departments reporting	375	38	27	38	272
Ph.D., number	501	398	103	—	—
Percent women	10.6	10.6	10.7	—	—
M.A., number	1,090	544	282	264	—
Percent women	18.3	18.9	20.2	15.1	—
B.A., number	8,402	2,219	865	710	4,608
Percent women	22.2	23.6	16.3	17.6	23.3
Other degrees from economics departments, number	69	50	2	8	9
Percent women	20.3	10.0	0	0	100.0

gotten their B.A. degrees at an age a year younger than the men had.

Session at AEA Meetings. At the 1975 annual AEA meetings, a session on the economic status of women in the United States and in the United Kingdom was presented. Two papers surveying current research on employment of women were commissioned, and the policy implications of the research were discussed.

Academic Labor Market, 1974-75. For the first time in four years, the proportion of women among those receiving undergraduate degrees and M.A. degrees in economics increased.¹ In 1974-75, of the B.A.

degrees in economics 22 percent were earned by women. (See Table 1.) In the two previous years, women comprised only 16 percent of the economics undergraduate majors. The proportion of M.A. degrees earned by women in 1974-75 was 18 percent, compared with 14 percent the two previous years. This increase occurred in those departments that offer both Ph.D. and M.A. degrees. The proportion of Ph.D. degrees earned by women was 11 percent in 1974-75, compared with only 8 percent last year, and with 12 percent the two previous years.²

Nearly 75 percent of the full-time Ph.D. students received financial aid in the fall of 1975, and more than half of the full-time M.A. students received financial aid (Table 2). (The latter proportion is down somewhat from last year.) Women students at the Ph.D. level received financial aid approximately in proportion to their numbers, whereas women at the M.A. level received financial aid somewhat more often than proportional to their numbers.

¹In 1975-76 for the fourth year, data related to supply of economists and academic demand for them are available from a survey of academic departments of economics. The data from the 1975-76 Universal Academic Questionnaires have been collected under the direction of C. Elton Hinshaw of AEA, and the data classified by sex are analyzed here. The questions asked in the 1975-76 survey are for the most part comparable to the data published in the CSWEP Report last year in the *May American Economic Review*. The number of departments which had reported in time for this analysis is 375 this year, but was only 311 last year. Not all of the departments who reported last year reported again this year. Thus, comparisons of absolute numbers must be made with care. Percentages are more comparable, although, of course, they are subject to sampling error.

²The data in the first two years related to students enrolled in the programs, while in the last two years the data refer to degrees received.

TABLE 2—NUMBER OF FULL-TIME "ON-CAMPUS" GRADUATE STUDENTS REGISTERED FALL, 1975 AND TYPE OF FINANCIAL AID, BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT AND BY SEX

(Departments reporting by December 10, 1975 on 1975-76 Universal Academic Questionnaire)

Type of Department, Degree Sought, and Sex	Total	Full-Time Students Receiving Financial Aid			No Aid
		Tuition Only	Stipend Only	Tuition and Stipend	
All departments:					
Ph.D. students, number	2,237	158	469	1,039	571
Female as percent of total	12.9	14.6	12.2	13.5	12.1
M.A. students, number	1,227	54	196	397	580
Female as percent of total	17.8	29.6	21.4	19.9	14.3
Chairman's group:					
Ph.D. students, number	1,808	107	362	873	466
Female as percent of total	13.4	18.7	13.0	13.6	12.0
M.A. students, number	530	13	75	196	246
Female as percent of total	17.4	38.5	33.3	13.8	14.2
Ph.D., other departments:					
Ph.D. students, number	429	51	107	166	105
Female as percent of total	11.0	5.8	9.3	12.6	12.4
M.A. students, number	423	32	96	120	175
Female as percent of total	18.0	28.1	13.5	22.5	15.4
M.A. departments:					
M.A. students, number	274	9	25	81	159
Female as percent of total	18.6	^a	16.0	30.9	13.2

^a Percentage not shown when fewer than 10 in cell.

This was particularly true in departments in the Chairman's Group in 1975. The increase in financial aid in the fall of 1975 to women students at the M.A. level should help perpetuate the increase in the proportion of women receiving M.A.s from 1973-74 to 1974-75 noted above.

Hopefully, next year, the increase in women receiving Ph.D.s will also continue to surpass the previous levels. However, the selected data available now do not suggest that this will occur. The proportion of women receiving M.A. degrees in 1973-74 who entered doctoral programs in 1974-75 was only 12 percent compared with 20 percent of the men (Table 3). In the previous year's survey the proportion of women with M.A. degrees from the year before who entered the Ph.D. pro-

gram was 24 percent. This was nearly as high as the proportion among the men. Thus, the decrease in doctoral students entering from the M.A. level occurred for both sexes, but more often among women.

Women who received their Ph.D. degrees in economics in 1974-75 found jobs in academic institutions less often than was true for the class of the previous year. While 57 percent of the men Ph.D.s in the 1974-75 class found employment as economists in academia, only 33 percent of the women did.³ In the previous year, 68 percent of the women with new Ph.D.s were employed in academic institutions. The decline in the academic market thus

³ If the women whose current occupation was not reported are distributed, the proportion rises to over 40 percent.

TABLE 3—1975-76 EMPLOYMENT OF 1974-75 GRADUATES IN ECONOMICS BY LEVEL OF DEGREE, ALL DEPARTMENTS AND CHAIRMAN'S GROUP, BY SEX

(Departments reporting by December 10, 1975, on 1975-76 Universal Academic Questionnaire)

Type of Department and Kind of Employment	Ph.D. ^a		M.A.	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
All departments:				
Number of 1974-75 graduates	620	123	605	116
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percent employed as economist in United States:				
Educational institution	57.2	33.3	6.8	10.3
Business or industry	4.2	2.4	10.9	9.5
Federal government	9.8	4.9	6.4	5.2
State/local government	3.4	3.3	7.1	7.8
Banking or finance	2.6	1.6	5.0	3.4
Consulting/research	6.3	4.1	3.3	2.6
Percent employed outside United States	6.6	21.1	18.5	19.8
Percent unemployed, seeking work	2.1	2.4	2.3	0.9
Percent not in labor force:	3.4	4.1	22.7	19.0
Entered postdoctoral program or Ph.D. program	0	0	20.2	12.1
Other	3.4	4.1	2.5	6.9
Percent not known	4.4	22.8	17.0	21.5
Chairman's Group:				
Number of 1974-75 graduates	460	70	250	58
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percent employed as economist in United States:				
Educational institution	56.8	40.1	4.0	8.6
Business or industry	3.7	2.8	13.2	13.8
Federal government	9.3	7.1	7.2	1.7
State/local government	2.8	1.4	5.6	1.7
Banking or finance	2.6	4.2	7.6	6.9
Consulting/research	4.1	8.6	4.0	1.7
Percent employed outside United States	11.8	25.8	17.2	17.2
Percent unemployed, seeking work	1.5	2.9	1.2	0
Percent not in labor force:	2.1	0	25.6	32.7
Entered postdoctoral or Ph.D. program	0.4	0	23.2	20.7
Other	1.7	0	2.4	12.1
Percent not known	5.3	7.1	14.4	15.7

^a Includes graduate students who have not completed their dissertations, if they entered the labor market seeking full-time employment as economists.

hit the women Ph.D.s very hard. Over 20 percent of the women with new Ph.D.s found employment outside the United States.

As last year, fewer women with new Ph.D.s than men found employment in the federal government. In other respects, the employment patterns of men and women with new Ph.D.s were roughly

similar. Five percent of the men and 6 percent of the women with new Ph.D.s were unemployed or out of the labor force. The differences between men and women in the proportions unemployed and in the proportions not in the labor force were small.

Considering all women economists employed in academic departments of eco-

TABLE 4—NUMBER OF FACULTY BY RANK AND TYPE OF DEPARTMENT, 1975-76, BY SEX
(Departments reporting by December 10, 1975, on 1975-76 Universal Academic Questionnaire)

Type of Appointment, Rank, and Sex	All Departments	Highest Degree Offered			
		Ph.D.		M.A.	B.A.
		Chairman's Group	Other Departments		
Number of departments reporting	369	38	27	38	266
Full-time faculty, tenure-track:					
All ranks, male and female, number	3,320	960	661	437	1,262
Professors	1,166	507	229	140	290
Associate professors	855	186	201	120	348
Assistant professors	922	212	149	131	430
Instructors	209	25	37	19	128
Other faculty ranks	44	15	8	7	14
Other	124	15	37	20	52
Female, percent of total	6.1	4.7	5.1	6.6	7.4
Professors	2.9	1.1	3.4	4.2	4.8
Associate professors	5.5	2.6	5.5	8.3	6.0
Assistant professors	8.6	10.2	6.7	5.3	8.8
Instructors	14.4	21.9	5.4	26.3	12.5
Other faculty ranks	11.4	16.6	^a	^a	0
Other	4.8	0	5.4	0	7.7
Full-time faculty, nontenure track:					
All ranks, male and female, number	185	33	63	18	71
Professors	5	0	0	3	2
Associate professors	16	3	4	1	8
Assistant professors	39	7	2	9	21
Instructors	43	10	10	2	21
Other faculty ranks	10	2	3	3	2
Other	72	11	44	0	17
Female, percent of total	8.1	12.1	1.6	22.2	7.0
Professors	^a	0	0	^a	0
Associate professors	6.2	^a	0	0	0
Assistant professors	10.2	^a	0	^a	14.3
Instructors	9.3	10.0	10.0	0	9.5
Other faculty ranks	10.0	^a	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Part-time faculty:					
All ranks, male and female, number	564	106	111	63	284
Professors	44	10	1	8	25
Associate professors	42	2	3	7	30
Assistant professors	84	3	9	13	59
Instructors	181	13	40	30	98
Other faculty ranks	167	73	42	5	47
Other	46	5	16	0	25
Female, percent of total	14.5	6.6	18.9	14.3	14.4
Professors	4.5	10.0	0	0	4.0
Associate professors	11.9	0	0	^a	13.3
Assistant professors	11.9	^a	^a	15.3	6.7
Instructors	14.4	7.6	15.0	16.7	14.3
Other faculty ranks	1.9	4.1	14.3	^a	23.4
Other	39.1	^a	37.5	—	28.0

^a Percentage not shown when fewer than 10 in cell.

TABLE 5—DISTRIBUTION OF DEPARTMENTS OF
ECONOMICS BY NUMBER OF WOMEN
FACULTY MEMBERS, 1975-76

(Departments reporting by December 10, 1975 on
1975-76 Universal Academic Questionnaire)

Number of Women on Faculty	All Depart- ments	Chair- man's Group
Number of departments reporting one or more full-time faculty	378	38
Percent distribution by number of women full-time faculty	100.0	100.0
All male	63.0	23.7
1 woman	27.4	55.3
2 women	6.1	13.1
3 or more women	3.5	7.9
Total number departments	392	38
Percent distribution of depart- ments by number women part- time faculty	100.0	100.0
No part-time faculty	50.5	36.8
1 or more part-time faculty	49.5	63.2
All male	35.8	44.8
1 woman	11.7	18.4
2 women	1.0	0
3 or more women	1.0	0
Total number of faculty	3,963	1,132
Full-time	3,409	1,028
Percent women	5.9	4.4
Part-time	554	104
Percent women	12.5	6.7

nomics, women comprised only 6 percent of all full-time faculty appointments in tenure-track positions—3 percent of the full professors, nearly 6 percent of the associate professors, 9 percent of the assistant professors, and 14 percent of the instructors (Table 4). This is an increase over last year's report, particularly at the instructor and assistant professor level. Departments in the Chairman's Group have improved their proportion of women at the assistant professor level (10 percent this year compared with 7 percent last year) and at the associate professor level (nearly 3 percent this year compared with 1 percent last year). Although the differences are small, the direction of the movement is important.

Overall, considering all levels of faculty

appointments, the 6 percent of the full-time faculty positions held by women (Table 5) was the same as last year. The proportion of women among those holding part-time faculty appointments fell to 12 percent this year. (Last year it was 18 percent.) The number of economics departments with all male full-time faculty has increased. In 1975-76, the proportion was 63 percent. Last year 59 percent of the departments had only male full-time faculty. This is an unfortunate regression. On the other hand, among departments in the Chairman's Group, the proportion with all male full-time faculty dropped to 24 percent. Last year it was 30 percent.

Among the 378 departments reporting in the 1975-76 survey, there were 3,409 full-time faculty positions and 554 part-time faculty positions as economists. The number of new faculty hired in 1975-76 exceeded the number of faculty released at the end of 1974-75 by only 36 full-time positions and 85 part-time (Table 6). This represented only a 1 percent increase in full-time positions and an 18 percent increase in part-time positions. In last year's survey only a 2 percent increase in full-time positions was reported and a 19 percent increase in part-time positions. Of the 38 net increase in the number of full-time positions this year, 8 were women. Of the new hires, 9 percent were women. Of those released, 8 percent were women. This is a tight market. Women at least held their small relative position. In last year's survey the net increase in the number of full-time faculty positions was 86, and 13 were women.

Among departments in the Chairman's Group, the net increase in the number of women with full-time faculty positions increased by 5 at the same time the total number of positions decreased by 4. The increases for women were at the lower faculty ranks. For men, the changes were

TABLE 6—NET CHANGE IN FACULTY POSITIONS FROM END OF 1974-75 TO 1975-76, BY SEX, ALL DEPARTMENTS AND CHAIRMAN'S GROUP

(Departments reporting by December 10, 1975 on 1975-76 Universal Academic Questionnaire)

Item	All Ranks	Professors	Associate Professors	Assistant Professors	Instructors	Other Faculty Rank	Others
All departments:							
Faculty released end of AY 1974-75: ^a							
Full-time, number	305	61	37	143	46	11	7
Women as percent of total	7.9	1.6	8.8	5.6	21.7	9.1	^b
Part-time, number	95	3	5	12	42	32	1
Women as percent of total	24.2	0	^b	25.0	23.8	25.0	0
New hires, faculty, AY 1975-76:							
Full-time, number	341	16	30	177	89	19	10
Women as percent of total	9.4	0	3.3	10.7	10.1	15.8	0
Part-time, number	180	2	4	38	69	45	22
Women as percent of total	20.0	0	0	36.8	14.5	22.2	10.0
Net change, 1974-75 and 1975-76:							
Full-time, number	+36	-45	-7	+34	+43	+8	-+3
Women, number	+ 8	- 1	-2	+11	- 1	+ 2	-1
Part-time, number	+85	- 1	-1	+26	+27	+13	+21
Women, number	+13	0	-2	+11	0	+ 2	+2
Chairman's group:							
Faculty released end of AY 1974-75: ^a							
Full-time, number	92	25	16	34	8	3	6
Women as percent of total	4.3	0	0	5.9	^b	0	^b
Part-time, number	20	1	0	1	2	16	0
Women as percent of total	20.0	0	—	0	^b	18.7	—
New hires, faculty, AY 1975-76:							
Full-time, number	88	5	4	48	14	9	8
Women as percent of total	10.2	0	0	10.4	14.3	^b	0
Part-time, number	31	0	0	4	7	13	7
Women as percent of total	3.2	—	—	0	^b	0	0
Net change, 1974-75 and 1975-76:							
Full-time, number	- 4	-20	-12	+14	+6	+6	+2
Women, number	+ 5	0	0	+ 3	+1	+2	-1
Part-time, number	+11	- 1	0	+ 3	+5	-3	+7
Women, number	- 3	0	0	0	0	-3	0

^a Resignation, retirement, and nonrenewal of contracts.^b Percentage not shown when fewer than 10 in cell.

net decreases at the professor and associate professor level, and net increases at the lower faculty ranks. The number of women with part-time faculty positions decreased by 3 at the same time the total number of part-time faculty positions in departments in the Chairman's Group increased by 11. For both men and women these changes were primarily at the lower ranks.

Considering all the departments of economics, the women faculty employed as

new hires this year tended to come less from business than did men (Table 7). This was also true last year. However, this year there was a small reversal in the previous pattern in that a slightly higher proportion of women than men came from other faculties and a slightly lower proportion of women than men came from graduate school. Among departments in the Chairman's Group, more of the women among the new hires came from government and business this year than did men,

TABLE 7—PRIOR ACTIVITY OF NEW 1975-76 APPOINTMENTS AND
PRESENT ACTIVITY OF "RELEASES" FOR 1974-75, ALL
DEPARTMENTS AND CHAIRMAN'S GROUP, BY SEX

(Departments reporting by December 10, 1975 on
1975-76 Universal Academic Questionnaire)

Highest Degree Offered by Department and Activity of Faculty	New Hires in 1975-76 ^a by Prior Year Activity		Those Released for 1975- 76 by Present Activity ^a	
	Male Percent	Female Percent	Male Percent	Female Percent
All departments	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Faculty at another school in U.S.	22.5	24.0	39.5	32.7
Graduate student	57.3	54.0	8.8	12.2
Post-doctorate	2.2	2.0	0	0
Research institution in U.S.	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.0
Bank or finance in U.S.	0.8	0	1.3	2.0
Business and industry in U.S.	7.2	2.0	10.1	10.2
Federal/state government in U.S.	5.0	6.0	14.3	14.3
Outside United States	1.7	0	6.3	8.2
Retired	0	0	10.5	6.1
Unemployed	0.8	6.0	0.8	8.2
Unknown	0	4.0	5.9	4.1
Chairman's Group	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Faculty at another school in U.S.	12.6	9.1	44.1	16.7
Graduate student	81.0	63.6	13.0	25.0
Post-doctorate	4.2	0	0	0
Research institution in U.S.	0	0	0	8.3
Bank or finance in U.S.	0	0	1.3	0
Business and industry in U.S.	0	9.1	15.6	16.7
Federal/state government in U.S.	1.1	18.2	10.4	25.0
Outside United States	1.1	0	0	0
Retired	0	0	10.4	8.3
Unemployed	0	0	1.3	0
Unknown	0	0	3.9	0

^a Includes full-time and part-time faculty.

and a lower proportion of the women than of men were selected from graduate students.

Of the women faculty released, 8 percent were unemployed compared with only 1 percent of the men. Fewer of the women released found employment on the faculty at another university than did men.

This year as last, the persons reporting for the economics departments were asked to rank women full-time faculty by whether their salaries were above or below the departmental median for the particular rank and whether their length of service in that rank was above or be-

low the median time at that rank for departmental faculty. Such estimates ignore how much the woman's salary is above or below the median. From other evidence we know that with increases in experience, women's salaries tend to lag behind men's. For all departments, 31 percent of the women had salaries more than \$250 below the medians for their ranks (Table 8). When time in rank is considered, 8 percent of the women had salaries more than \$250 below the median even though their time in rank was at or above the median length of experience for that rank in the department. It must be remembered that

TABLE 8—RELATIVE SALARIES FOR RANK AND TIME IN RANK OF FEMALE FULL-TIME ECONOMISTS, 1975-76, BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT

(Departments reporting by December 10, 1975 on 1975-76 Universal Academic Questionnaire)

Highest Degree Offered by Department and Relative Salary for Rank	All Women		Time in Rank		
	Number	Percent	Above Median, Percent	At Median, Percent	Below Median, Percent
All departments	222	100.0	29.7	36.9	33.3
Salary above median	69	31.1	21.1	5.0	5.0
Within \$250 of median	85	38.3	4.1	27.9	6.3
Salary below median	68	30.6	4.5	4.0	22.1
Ph.D., Chairman's Group	50	100.0	24.0	26.0	50.0
Salary above median	14	28.0	16.0	2.0	10.0
Within \$250 of median	19	38.0	4.0	24.0	10.0
Salary below median	17	34.0	4.0	0	30.0
Ph.D., other departments	40	100.0	22.5	17.5	60.0
Salary above median	5	12.5	5.0	0	7.5
Within \$250 of median	11	27.5	5.0	12.5	10.0
Salary below median	24	60.0	12.5	5.0	42.5
M.A.	29	100.0	17.2	58.7	24.1
Salary above median	7	24.1	17.2	6.9	0
Within \$250 of median	12	41.4	0	38.0	3.4
Salary below median	10	34.5	0	13.8	20.7
B.A.	101	100.0	37.6	44.6	17.8
Salary above median	41	40.6	29.6	8.0	3.0
Within \$250 of median	43	42.6	5.0	33.6	4.0
Salary below median	17	16.8	3.0	3.0	10.8

more than two-thirds of the women faculty members in economics covered in the 1975-76 survey reported here are at the assistant professor or lower ranks. In general, entrance level faculty positions in universities have little or no difference between men and women in salary.

Women received 9 percent of the promotions for 1975-76 (19 of the 214), whereas as noted above they comprised 6 percent of the faculty (Table 9). Of the 19 promotions for women, 5 were to full professor, 7 were to associate professor, and 7 were to assistant professor. None of the promotions of women to full professor included awarding of tenure. This may well be because the women already had tenure as associate professors. Six women were awarded tenure at the associate professor level (compared with 7

promotions to this rank). Only 1 promotion and 1 tenure award to women in the professor and associate professor level were among departments in the Chairman's Group.

Many factors affect the workings of the academic labor market and positive improvements in the opportunities opened to women economists. Critical to achieving improvements are actions by men of good will and sensitivity who help change traditionally narrow views of women's role potential and help open opportunities so women can have better educational and employment opportunities. Many of the improvements needed to combat role prejudice and sex discrimination in universities involve opening the informal network to women colleagues and greater investment in on-job training opportunities

TABLE 9—PROMOTIONS AND TENURE DECISIONS FROM 1974-75 TO 1975-76,
BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT AND SEX(Departments reporting by December 10, 1975 on
1975-76 Universal Academic Questionnaire)

Highest Degree Offered by Department and Rank	Persons Promoted to Rank		Persons Given Tenure at Rank	
	Total Number	Female as Percent of Total	Total Number	Female as Percent of Total
All departments:	214	8.9	126	6.3
Professor	73	6.8	17	0
Associate professor	111	6.3	73	8.2
Assistant professor	26	26.9	33	6.1
Other ranks	3	0	2	0
Ph.D., Chairman's Group:				
Professor	25	0	6	0
Associate professor	22	4.5	14	7.1
Assistant professor	3	^a	1	0
Other ranks	2	0	0	—
Ph.D., other departments:				
Professor	13	7.7	2	0
Associate professor	26	3.8	15	13.3
Assistant professor	3	^a	3	^a
Other ranks	0	—	0	—
M.A.:				
Professor	15	13.3	3	0
Associate professor	16	12.5	6	0
Assistant professor	4	0	4	^a
Other ranks	1	0	0	—
B.A.:				
Professor	20	40.0	6	0
Associate professor	47	6.4	38	7.9
Assistant professor	16	8.5	25	0
Other ranks	0	—	2	0

^a Percentage not shown when fewer than 10 in cell.

for women. *CSWEP* will continue to work on behalf of the total Association to improve the operation of the total market for economists, including the academic market, and to improve the quality of education for women students in economics.

Central to the latter goal is an increase in opportunities for women faculty at higher levels in the university so as to better utilize the capabilities of women educators.

BARBARA B. REAGAN, *Chairperson*