

The Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

This year marks the tenth anniversary of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP). The decade has not been successful in terms of improvement in the status of women in the academic labor market. Accumulating evidence continues to indicate that there is an overwhelming underrepresentation of women in the top ranks of the profession of economics. The single most important indicator of status, that is, the representation of women among the senior economics faculty of major Ph.D. granting institutions, continues to be abysmal. It was disproportionately small a decade ago and has remained small and constant for many years. This critical failure is a source of great concern.

The evidence yields a bleak picture. According to Universal Academic Questionnaire data, there were 22 women economists at the rank of associate and full professor at the 42 of the 43 major Ph.D. granting universities that filed reports in academic year 1972–73. In spite of the fact that the pool of women Ph.D.s from the Chairperson's Group has averaged about 40 women per year for the reporting universities, the number of women in the top professional ranks has not increased. Nine years later, there are only 19 women economists at the 43 of the 65 major Ph.D. granting universities that reported in 1980–81. Now, as then, the representation of women among the ranks of senior economics faculty continues to hover between 1 and 2 percent.

The Universal Academic Questionnaire for 1979–80 and 1980–81 provides grim statistics. Our hope that a substantial number of the new generation of women assistant professors would be given tenure at the major Ph.D. granting universities is not being realized. In the Chairman's Group of Universities, out of the pool of individuals who received tenure at the rank of associate professor, plus those not rehired as assistant professors, only 17 and 13 percent, respectively, of the women have been given tenure

as contrasted with 42 and 43 percent of the men. A man has thus been about three times more likely than a woman to receive tenure at these universities in the past two years. Other measures yield similar results. Over the past four years, 84 men received tenure at ranks of associate or full professor in the Chairman's Group in contrast to 4 women. Reporting members of the Chairman's Group over the past four years hired 72 men and only 2 women at the full and associate professor ranks. Women economists thus constitute from 3 to 5 percent of the new hirings or promotions to top ranks whereas they have consistently comprised 8–12 percent of new Ph.D.s and of the new hirings at the assistant professor level.

The Executive Committee of the American Economic Association unanimously adopted the following resolution on December 27, 1981:

The Executive Committee notes with concern the Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession, which finds a remarkable continuing low rate of promotion to tenure in major universities.

The Executive Committee urges all departments (1) to make renewed efforts to promote and hire qualified women to positions of tenure, (2) to cooperate with the Committee on the Status of Women in its studies of the causes of the lack of women's progress in academic careers in economics, and (3) to improve the flow of information about women candidates for tenure positions.

The Executive Committee will also search for other ways to accelerate the development and recruitment of women for tenured academic positions.

CSWEP is pleased that the American Economic Association, through its Executive Committee, continues to have a strong commitment to enhancement of the status of

women. The active cooperation and support of the Association has led to a marked improvement in the participation and visibility of women economists in professional activities over the past decade. The members of the Association as a group have also been supportive. Four women economists have been elected as Vice Presidents and five as members of the Executive Committee during this period. Eight women economists have served on the Editorial Board of the *American Economic Review*. There has been a substantial increase in the number of women chairing sessions and presenting papers in both regional economic association meetings and in the annual meetings of the American Economic Association. But the leadership of the Executive Committee and the rank and file of the Association are not enough. The cooperation of university administrations and leading departments are required to assist in identifying candidates and in making senior faculty appointments. These efforts must succeed if outstanding senior women are to be in a position to provide guidance to men and women alike, and if the younger women now being attracted to economics in increasing numbers are to be given adequate opportunities for the future.

I. CSWEP Activities

As in previous years, CSWEP has continued 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 information for women in our profession. The chief change in this information source has been a decision to downplay job descriptions, particularly those at a junior level since these are provided more promptly in *Job Openings for Economists (JOE)*. The committee plans to continue descriptions of job openings at senior levels, since members who may be interested in such job opportunities may well not be seeking new employment actively, and hence may not subscribe to *JOE*.

The highlight of CSWEP's information activities this year is the publication, in directory form, of our Roster. For a number of years CSWEP has maintained a computerized Roster of Women in Economics, based on a questionnaire sent to all women economists. A printout of the coded computer file has been available to employers and others wishing to purchase it. However, the bulkiness of the printout and the encoding of the entries have made it difficult to use in the past. The edition of the Roster that has been prepared this year is, for the first time, being issued in the form of a directory. Entries are in plain English, not codes, and include name, address, and telephone number(s); publications, fields of specialization, and current research interests; and current availability. Indexes by specialty and location also appear. The Roster directory has been distributed to all dues-paying members and associate members of CSWEP as a benefit of membership. The directory is also being made available to educational and nonprofit institutions.

This undertaking, which is the culmination of a decade of painstaking work, has been handled by Nancy Ruggles, who has provided a permanent home for the Roster files at Yale University. As a result of her work, and that of her predecessors in this task, we now have files on over 2,000 women economists. The master file on each woman is sufficiently open ended and flexible to permit easy addition of new material. In addition, the files are readily adapted to computer analysis. The chief shortcoming of the files at present is the absence of information about women graduate students in economics. CSWEP has recently sent a letter to all major Ph.D. granting universities requesting them to send a list of their current female graduate students, and a follow-up letter will be sent to these students, so that we can have current information about the youngest women economists as well.

Joan Haworth of our committee has begun to investigate the usefulness for analysis of the American Economic Association (AEA) directory file of 20,000 records, and the *Journal of Economic Literature* tapes of articles

and their authors which include about 10,000 records per year. She is finding that while the AEA information is suitable for directory purposes, it is not valuable for CSWEP analysis since the sex indicator is missing in over 40 percent of the records. Thus, it appears that any analysis we undertake will have to compare women in the CSWEP file with all economists (including women) in the AEA file.

In addition to information activities, CSWEP sponsored the first in what we hope will be a series of annual seminars and workshops on specific topics related to econometric methods and economic theory. Jean Shackelford of our committee has been the driving force behind this activity, arranging for funding from the Avon Foundation, the Exxon Education Foundation, and the RCA Foundation. The first session took place all day, April 12, 1981, following the Eastern Economic Association meetings in Philadelphia. Zvi Griliches of Harvard University presented a program entitled "The Analysis of Panel Data." A token fee of \$20 was charged to CSWEP members, which included lunch. The seminar had nearly three dozen participants, who were enthusiastic about our concept of an in-depth seminar to explore a specific theoretical or econometric method that is pertinent to research activities typically undertaken by our members.

Another concern that engaged the attention of CSWEP this year is the small number of women involved in the Econometric Society's activities and the Society's response to allegations of discrimination against women and other minority groups. There appear to be three parts to the problem—the small number of women who have published in *Econometrica*, the small number of women participating in Econometric Society activities, and the limited representation of women in the prestigious Econometric Society of Fellows. Because of the importance of encouraging women to enter the statistical and quantitative fields within the profession, the Committee has asked Robert Eisner and Irma Adelman to: 1) encourage the Society to send invitations to women to join the Society and to offer to provide address labels

for women in appropriate fields; 2) suggest that the Society advertise in the CSWEP Newsletter; 3) attempt to increase the number of women organizers of Econometric Society sessions; and 4) secure the endorsement of prominent fellows for the nomination of female fellows during the next few years.

Another substantive initiative by CSWEP this year has been its support of an economics task force being set up by our affiliate group, the Washington Women Economists. This task force will be available to legislators, policymakers, and news media as a resource on critical economic issues as they affect women. The task force, under the leadership of Gail Wilensky, will be preparing position papers on current economic issues and commentary on pending legislation. The task force is trying to locate women economists who are working in areas likely to be considered in the current and next sessions of Congress. These include: changing minimum Social Security benefits; changes in eligibility for food stamps and other public entitlement programs; the effects of high interest rates on the availability of credit to women; economic implications of reductions in legal aid services; the relationship between economic slowdowns and employment of various population groups; etc. CSWEP members who are willing to assist in this work should send their names, addresses, areas of work, and copies of any recent papers to Gail Wilensky of our committee. The effects of public programs on the status of women are also emphasized in the CSWEP sponsored session at this year's annual meetings, which is published elsewhere in these *Papers and Proceedings*.

The past two years have brought with them honors and awards to several women economists. Alice Rivlin was elected as Vice President of the AEA, and first I, and more recently, our former Chair, Ann Friedlaender, was elected to the Executive Committee. In addition, the Samuel Z. Westerfield Award given periodically to a black economist who has distinguished himself or herself through scholarly research, contributions to government and service to the community was

presented to former CSWEP committee member, Phyllis Wallace, by the National Economic Association on December 29, 1981. Finally, CSWEP is pleased that two new women economists were elected to the Econometric Society of Fellows this year, one a European, and the other, Anne Krueger, from the United States.

II. Status of Women Economists in Academe

Because of the experimental fall meeting of the American Economic Association, it was not possible to include Universal Academic Questionnaire data in the 1981 CSWEP annual report. Therefore, data of two years are included in this report. The Universal Academic Questionnaire is distributed by the AEA to all department chairmen and the responses are tabulated by Charles Scott of the AEA. 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 more difficult because the responding institutions vary from year to year. Hence, the data provided by the Universal Academic Questionnaire are by no means complete, and are occasionally contradictory. Thus, we unfortunately do not have a fully accurate view of the role of women in the academic labor market. We do, however, have ten years information that appears to be rather consistent in its description of the status of women economists in academe.

Tables 1-6 are similar to those published in the 1979 and 1980 CSWEP reports. Gail Wilensky and Abby Paine were most helpful to me in tabulating the data. Table 1, Panels A and B, provide a summary of the distribution of academic jobs at the beginning of the academic years 1979-1980 and 1980-81, respectively. These tables present information for four types of departments: the Chairman's Group; other Ph.D. departments; M.A. departments; and B.A. departments. The Chairman's Group consists of the 65 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 Chairman'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 exclusively concerned with undergraduate teaching.

According to Table 1, the participation of women in the academic side of the economics profession continues to be distressingly small. In the 37 departments reporting within the Chairman's Group in 1979-80 and the 43 in 1980-81, there are only 19 women who were full or associate professors in each year, and 46 and 48 women, respectively, who were assistant professors or instructors. The percentage of women among all full professors continues to be 2 percent or less, both for the Chairman's Group and for the other Ph.D. granting universities. Moreover, during 1979-80 and 1980-81, within the entire group of respondents from the Ph.D. granting universities, no woman was hired as a full professor and only one was promoted to full professor.

Perhaps the most distressing information yielded by Table 1 is obtained by calculating the sum of individuals newly receiving tenure at the rank of associate professor, plus those not rehired as assistant professors, and comparing the promotions to tenure for men and women over the last four years. During 1976-77 and 1977-78, previous CSWEP reports show that 25 and 33 percent, respectively, of the women in these categories received tenure, and 36 and 29 percent, respectively, of the men, numbers that are reasonably comparable. In contrast, during 1978-79 and 1979-80, 42 and 43 percent, respectively, of the men received tenure whereas only 17 and 13 percent, respectively, of the women were so fortunate. Yet, the pool of women in the latter two years (6 and

TABLE 1—DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME FACULTY, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION, ACADEMIC YEARS, 1979–81

	Chairman's Group			Other Ph.D.			Only M.A. Departments			Only B.A. Departments		
	Female			Female			Female			Female		
	Total	No.	Percent	Total	No.	Percent	Total	No.	Percent	Total	No.	Percent
A. 1977–80												
Existing												
Professor	530	9	1.7	448	9	2.0	239	13	5.4	237	17	7.2
Associate	188	10	5.3	300	10	3.3	230	25	10.9	251	8	3.2
Assistant	248	34	13.7	242	32	13.2	214	26	12.2	287	34	11.9
Instructor	51	12	23.5	53	4	7.5	29	7	24.1	96	20	20.8
Other	21	3	14.3	22	3	13.6	5	4	80.0	13	1	7.7
New Hires												
Professor	8	—	—	4	—	—	4	1	25.0	3	1	33.3
Associate	7	1	14.3	10	—	—	5	1	20.0	11	1	9.1
Assistant	59	7	11.9	47	5	10.6	49	5	10.2	66	8	12.1
Instructor	19	—	—	25	4	16.0	15	3	20.0	54	15	27.8
Other	4	—	—	—	—	—	4	3	75.0	3	1	33.3
Promoted to Rank (1978–79)												
Professor	14	1	7.1	24	—	—	15	1	6.7	18	1	5.6
Associate	27	3	11.1	29	3	10.3	31	7	22.6	25	—	—
Assistant	4	—	—	8	2	25.0	5	2	40.0	12	3	25.0
Tenured at Rank (1978–79)												
Professor	1	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Associate	18	1	5.6	20	1	5.0	9	1	11.1	22	1	4.6
Assistant	2	—	—	2	—	—	6	1	16.7	6	—	—
Not Rehired												
Professor	20	—	—	5	—	—	10	—	—	8	—	—
Associate	13	1	7.7	12	1	8.3	8	—	—	10	—	—
Assistant	29	5	17.2	23	2	8.7	32	5	15.6	45	4	8.9
Instructor	5	—	—	12	3	25.0	9	2	22.2	21	2	9.5
Other	4	—	—	1	—	—	1	1	100.0	3	—	—
B. 1980–81												
Existing												
Professor	600	8	1.3	49	10	2.0	240	7	2.9	307	20	6.5
Associate	221	11	5.0	305	15	5.0	221	23	10.4	324	20	6.2
Assistant	325	41	12.6	251	31	12.6	248	23	9.4	379	41	10.8
Instructor	33	7	21.2	32	5	15.6	45	15	33.3	133	29	21.8
Other	38	10	26.3	26	4	15.4	4	3	75.0	10	3	30.0
New Hires												
Professor	6	—	—	4	—	—	5	—	—	10	—	—
Associate	10	1	10.0	11	2	18.1	12	1	8.3	19	2	10.5
Assistant	58	6	10.3	38	7	18.4	66	9	13.6	85	12	14.1
Instructor	22	5	22.7	8	2	25.0	14	4	28.5	61	12	19.7
Other	7	—	—	10	1	10.0	3	2	66.7	1	—	—
Promoted to Rank (1979–80)												
Professor	16	—	—	33	—	—	21	2	9.5	29	5	17.2
Associate	26	1	3.9	26	2	7.7	19	2	10.5	46	5	10.9
Assistant	6	1	16.7	3	—	—	1	—	—	17	5	29.4
Tenured at Rank (1979–80)												
Professor	6	—	—	1	—	—	3	—	—	4	2	50.0
Associate	21	1	5.0	17	1	5.9	13	1	7.7	27	3	11.1
Assistant	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	10	1	10.0
Not Rehired												
Professor	23	—	—	17	—	—	2	—	—	5	—	—
Associate	13	—	—	7	—	—	8	—	—	16	5	31.3
Assistant	34	7	20.6	28	4	14.2	26	3	11.5	49	5	10.2
Instructor	6	—	—	6	—	—	7	2	28.6	26	4	15.4
Other	9	2	22.2	8	3	37.5	1	1	100.0	1	—	—

8 women, respectively) was about double that in the earlier two years (4 and 3 women, respectively). This means that the affirmative action programs in these universities which conferred additional assistant professorships to women do not seem to be carrying over to the tenure decision. Indeed, a man has been roughly three times more likely to obtain tenure in each of the past two years as has a woman.

In all fairness, this analysis is readily subject to criticism. The year-to-year variations in percentages may well be misleading because of the small numbers problem. But, even if we deal only with the entire four-year period, we see that only 4 of 21 women received tenure (19 percent) as against 65 of 174 men (37 percent). One can also criticize the definition of the pool of individuals which was adopted. However, alternative measures of women's status have also been examined, and the story they tell is consistent with that given here. One alternative is to tally those individuals who received tenure at ranks of associate or full professor in the Chairman's Group over the last four years. There were 84 such men and 4 women. Thus, not quite 5 percent of the tenured posts went to women. The promotions to rank of associate or full professor yield a similar story, with 13 of 214 promotions going to women over the past four years. New hiring at the ranks of associate and full professor has encompassed 72 men and 2 women over these same years. Thus, however the figures are viewed, it appears clear that promotion and tenure decisions are disproportionately low in terms of the pool of men and women who have been hired at the assistant professor and instructor ranks over the last decade (see, for example, the Table 4 data in these and in previous years).

About the only progress shown for women over the recent four-year period has been an increase in the percentage of women full professors in only B.A. departments which rose from 4.7 to 6.5 percent from 1977-78 to 1980-81. A similar climb is apparent for women associate professors at only M.A. departments, with the percent growing from 3.4 to 10.4 over these four years. These changes are consistent with a hypothesis that

there may be growing occupational segregation within the profession. One hopes it will not be proved true that the less prestigious the academic situation, the more possible it is for women to achieve full rank there. Improvement in status should be possible in both the more- and the less-prestigious economics departments.

It would be most instructive to have a fuller history of the pool of individuals who have been considered for promotion or tenure over the period, and to undertake a more complete study to determine whether women have been treated unequally in decisions to grant promotion or tenure. It would also be helpful to know if women have encountered more problems than men in receiving appointments at colleges and universities of lesser academic rank within the Chairman's Group when they have been turned down by their current institution. CSWEP is eager to encourage research on this subject. Data from the Universal Academic Questionnaire simply do not address these issues adequately. The percentage of reporting universities is low and it seems difficult to get a matched sample (universities which have reported consistently) over a number of years. Moreover, it is not clear from the data who the pool of individuals are that have come up for tenure or promotion decisions in a given year. For example, of the 23 full professors and the 13 associate professors not rehired in 1980-81, there is no information about how many left voluntarily and how many left as a result of a decision not to grant tenure. Only if a study of greater depth is carried out can balanced conclusions be drawn about the nature of the continuing difficulties women economists seem to be encountering in achieving tenure and promotion in proportion to their numbers, particularly at the major Ph.D. granting institutions.

Table 2, Panels A and B, supply some information about the previous activity of those who are newly hired and the present activity of those who are not rehired. The tables do not yield a fully consistent picture of the current activity of those not rehired in Ph.D. granting universities. In 1979-1980, it appears that women not rehired in the Chairman's Group were more likely to have left

TABLE 2—PREVIOUS ACTIVITY OF NEW HIRES AND CURRENT ACTIVITY OF THOSE NOT REHIRED BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION AND SEX, ACADEMIC YEARS, 1979–81

	Previous Activity Of New Hires				Current Activity of Not Rehiired			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
A. 1979–80								
Chairman's Group	90	100.0	8	100.0	67	100.0	7	100.0
Faculty	21	23.4	3	37.5	37	55.2	2	28.6
Student	56	62.2	5	62.5	—	—	—	—
Government	3	3.3	—	—	5	7.5	2	28.6
Bus., Banking, Research	4	4.4	—	—	11	16.4	2	28.6
Other	6	6.7	—	—	14	20.9	1	14.2
Other Ph.D.	70	100.0	17	100.0	42	100.0	9	100.0
Faculty	23	32.9	3	17.6	20	47.6	4	44.5
Student	40	57.1	14	82.5	2	4.8	—	—
Government	1	1.4	—	—	5	11.9	1	11.1
Bus., Banking, Research	1	1.4	—	—	7	16.7	2	22.2
Other	5	7.4	—	—	8	19.0	2	22.2
M.A. Departments	82	100.0	18	100.0	55	100.0	12	100.0
Faculty	31	37.7	3	16.7	24	43.6	5	41.7
Student	32	39.0	9	50.0	10	18.2	2	16.7
Government	3	3.7	2	11.1	3	5.5	—	—
Bus., Banking, Research	13	15.9	3	16.7	7	12.7	1	8.3
Other	3	3.7	1	5.5	11	20.0	4	33.3
B.A. Departments	140	100.0	34	100.0	72	100.0	5	100.0
Faculty	44	31.4	9	26.5	41	56.9	3	60.0
Student	66	47.2	21	61.7	3	4.2	1	20.0
Government	3	2.2	—	—	5	7.0	—	—
Bus., Banking, Research	20	14.2	2	5.9	14	19.4	—	—
Other	7	5.0	2	5.9	9	12.5	1	20.0
B. 1980–81								
Chairman's Group	85	100.0	34	100.0	65	100.0	8	100.0
Faculty	26	31.3	11	34.4	38	58.4	5	62.5
Student	50	60.2	20	62.5	1	1.5	1	12.5
Government	2	2.4	—	—	11	17.0	2	25.0
Bus., Banking, Research	4	4.8	—	—	5	7.7	—	—
Other	3	3.3	1	3.1	10	15.4	—	—
Other Ph.D.	75	100.0	18	100.0	50	100.0	14	100.0
Faculty	31	41.3	1	5.5	23	46.0	2	14.3
Student	32	42.7	14	77.7	3	6.0	4	28.6
Government	3	4.0	—	—	9	18.0	3	21.4
Bus., Banking, Research	5	6.7	2	11.3	8	16.0	—	—
Other	4	5.3	1	5.5	7	14.0	5	35.7
M.A. Departments	88	100.0	16	100.0	44	100.0	5	100.0
Faculty	37	42.0	6	37.5	26	59.1	3	60.0
Student	37	42.0	10	62.5	—	—	1	20.0
Government	4	4.6	—	—	4	9.1	—	—
Bus., Banking, Research	5	5.7	—	—	8	18.2	1	20.0
Other	5	5.7	—	—	6	13.6	—	—
B.A. Departments	180	100.0	28	100.0	93	100.0	10	100.0
Faculty	64	35.6	11	39.3	48	51.6	5	50.0
Student	79	43.8	13	46.4	12	12.9	1	10.0
Government	13	7.3	—	—	13	13.4	—	—
Bus., Banking, Research	18	10.0	3	10.7	17	18.9	1	10.0
Other	6	3.3	1	3.6	3	3.2	3	30.0

TABLE 3—DISTRIBUTION OF SALARY FOR WOMEN FACULTY BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT
AND TIME IN RANK, ACADEMIC YEARS, 1979–81

Relative Salary for Rank	All Women		Time in Rank			
	Number	Percent	Total Percent	Above Median	At Median	Below Median
A. 1979–80						
All Departments	280	100.0				
Salary above median	95	33.9	100.0	51.6	23.2	25.2
Salary at median	91	32.5	100.0	14.3	69.2	16.5
Salary below median	94	33.6	100.0	17.0	11.7	71.3
Ph.D. Chairman's	61	100.0				
Salary above median	18	29.5	100.0	77.8	11.1	11.1
Salary at median	13	21.3	100.0	23.0	46.2	30.8
Salary below median	30	49.2	100.0	16.7	13.3	70.0
Ph.D., Other	63	100.0				
Salary above median	24	38.1	100.0	54.2	29.1	16.7
Salary at median	16	25.4	100.0	12.5	81.3	6.2
Salary below median	23	36.5	100.0	13.0	8.7	78.3
M.A. Departments	64	100.0				
Salary above median	18	28.1	100.0	55.6	22.2	22.2
Salary at median	21	32.8	100.0	14.3	57.1	28.6
Salary below median	25	39.1	100.0	20.0	16.0	64.0
B.A. Departments	92	100.0				
Salary above median	35	38.0	100.0	34.3	25.7	40.0
Salary at median	41	44.6	100.0	12.2	78.0	9.8
Salary below median	16	17.4	100.0	18.8	6.2	75.0
B. 1980–81						
All Departments	336	100.0				
Salary above median	111	33.3	100.0	58.6	24.3	17.1
Salary at median	131	39.0	100.0	8.4	73.3	18.3
Salary below median	94	27.7	100.0	14.9	22.3	62.8
Ph.D., Chairman's	79	100.0				
Salary above median	27	34.2	100.0	51.9	33.3	14.8
Salary at median	20	25.3	100.0	15.0	65.0	20.0
Salary below median	32	40.5	100.0	9.4	28.1	62.5
Ph.D., Other	63	100.0				
Salary above median	23	36.5	100.0	43.5	26.1	30.4
Salary at median	23	36.5	100.0	13.6	60.3	26.1
Salary below median	17	27.0	100.0	29.4	29.4	41.2
M.A. Departments	76	100.0				
Salary above median	21	27.6	100.0	80.9	14.3	4.8
Salary at median	29	38.2	100.0	13.8	69.0	17.2
Salary below median	26	34.2	100.0	15.4	3.8	80.8
B.A. Departments	118	100.0				
Salary above median	40	33.9	100.0	60.0	22.5	17.5
Salary at median	59	50.0	100.0	1.7	83.1	15.2
Salary below median	19	16.1	100.0	10.5	31.6	57.9

academe than similarly situated men. However, this disparity disappeared in 1980–81 for the Chairman's Group, but appeared for the other Ph.D. granting departments. The M.A. and B.A. departments were rather consistent in this respect over both years. Perhaps one of the most interesting observations to emerge from Table 2 is that it seems to have been harder for women than for men in recent years to make the move into academe

from jobs in government, research, business, banking, and so forth. Whereas the Chairman's Group accepted 22 such male transferees in the past two years, in only one such instance was a woman hired. This contrasts with the 43 men and 4 women who transferred in the previous two years.

Table 3, Panels A and B, describe the salary distribution for women faculty by type of department and time in rank. In both

1979–80 and 1980–81, about one-third of women had salaries above the median, and for these women more than 50 percent had time in rank above the median. The Chairman's Group in both years had the dubious distinction of having the largest proportion of women who were paid salaries below the median. Since these women, for the most part, had time in rank below the median, the explanation may be that there was a disproportionately large hiring of women by these departments in the very recent past. Table 3 does not appear to indicate any gross discrepancies between the distribution of salaries and the distribution of time in rank. Thus, discrimination, if it exists, appears to consist more in preventing women from achieving comparable rank rather than in paying less to women within any particular rank.

Table 4, Panels A and B, display the percentages of women obtaining degrees in eco-

nomics. There continues to be a gradual increase in the percentage of women majoring in economics at the undergraduate level (up now to 30 percent from 24 percent in 1976–77) as well as improvements in the percentages of women in both Masters and Ph.D. programs. In particular, in 1976–77, only 8.6 percent of Ph.D.s were women as contrasted to 12.3 percent in 1980–81, and the percentage of M.A.s has risen from 17.5 to 22.1 percent over the four-year period. This is an encouraging trend, for it indicates that there is an enhanced flow of female economists at all degree levels with the largest percentage improvements at the highest degree levels.

Table 5, Panels A and B, contrast the occupational choices of men and women Ph.D.s in 1979–81. In 1978–79, the percent of women Ph.D.s from the Chairman's Group that entered the academic labor market was 44.8, a number substantially lower than the 65.4 percent for their male counterparts. This

TABLE 4—DEGREES GRANTED IN ECONOMICS BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT AND SEX
ACADEMIC YEARS, 1979–81

Number of:	All Depts.	Ph.D. Departments			M.A. Depts.	B.A. Depts.
		Total	Chairman's	Other		
A. 1979–80						
Departments	376	80	37	43	46	170
Ph.D.s	512	508	367	141	4	—
Female	58	58	43	15	—	—
Percent	11.3	11.4	11.7	10.6	—	—
M.A.s	1171	898	497	401	273	—
Female	212	149	76	73	63	—
Percent	18.1	16.6	15.3	18.2	23.1	—
B.A.s	10,975	5,911	3,526	2,385	1,851	3,213
Female	2,675	1,377	788	589	298	1,000
Percent	24.3	23.3	22.4	24.7	16.1	31.1
Other	227	102	35	67	119	6
Female	68	22	7	15	40	6
Percent	30.0	21.6	20.0	22.4	33.6	100.0
B. 1980–81						
Departments	456	90	43	47	51	225
Ph.D.s	658	658	445	213	—	—
Female	81	81	57	24	—	—
Percent	12.3	12.3	12.8	11.2	—	—
M.A.s	1,319	1,061	559	502	258	—
Female	291	237	121	116	54	—
Percent	22.1	22.3	21.6	23.1	20.9	—
B.A.s	11,225	6,242	3,864	2,378	1,195	3,788
Female	3,391	1,762	1,103	659	330	1,299
Other	175	75	15	60	100	—
Percent	30.2	28.2	28.5	27.7	27.6	34.3
Female	41	17	3	14	24	—
Percent	23.4	22.7	20.0	23.3	24.0	—

TABLE 5—DISTRIBUTION OF ACTIVITIES OF NEW PH.D. DEGREES BY SEX AND TYPE OF DEPARTMENT, ACADEMIC YEARS, 1979–81

	All Depts.		Chairman's Group		Other Ph.D. Depts	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
A. 1979–80						
All Ph.D.s	464	100.0	337	100.0	137	100.0
Education	223	48.1	174	51.6	59	43.1
Government	45	9.7	33	9.8	12	8.8
Bus., Banking, Research	53	11.4	41	12.2	12	8.8
Int'l. Emp. Outside U.S.	102	22.0	54	16.0	48	35.0
Other	41	8.8	35	10.4	6	4.3
Male Ph.D.s	423	100.0	301	100.0	122	100.0
Education	204	48.2	155	51.5	49	40.2
Government	41	9.7	30	10.0	11	9.0
Bus., Banking, Research	51	12.1	39	13.0	12	9.8
Int'l. Emp. Outside U.S.	93	22.0	49	16.3	44	36.1
Other	34	8.0	28	9.3	6	4.9
Female Ph.D.s	41	100.0	36	100.0	15	100.0
Education	19	46.3	19	52.8	10	66.7
Government	4	9.7	3	8.3	1	6.7
Bus., Banking, Research	2	4.9	2	5.6	—	—
Int'l. Emp. Outside U.S.	9	22.0	5	13.9	4	26.6
Other	7	17.1	7	19.4	—	—
B. 1980–81						
All Ph.D.s	447	100.0	280	100.0	167	100.0
Education	249	55.7	167	59.7	82	49.1
Government	45	10.1	27	9.6	18	10.8
Bus., Banking, Research	47	10.5	36	12.9	11	6.6
Int'l. Emp. Outside U.S.	85	19.0	37	13.2	48	28.7
Other	21	4.7	13	4.6	8	4.8
Male Ph.D.s	394	100.0	245	100.0	149	100.0
Education	216	54.8	144	58.8	72	48.3
Government	40	10.1	24	9.8	16	10.8
Bus., Banking, Research	41	10.4	31	12.6	10	6.7
Int'l. Emp. Outside U.S.	81	20.6	36	14.7	45	30.2
Other	16	4.1	10	4.1	6	4.0
Female Ph.D.s	53	100.0	35	100.0	18	100.0
Education	33	62.3	23	65.7	10	55.6
Government	5	9.4	3	8.6	2	11.1
Bus., Banking, Research	6	11.3	5	14.3	1	5.5
Int'l. Emp. Outside U.S.	4	7.6	1	2.9	3	16.7
Other	5	9.4	3	8.5	2	11.1

situation was not repeated in 1979–81, when similar percentages of men and women entered academe, and was reversed in 1980–81, when a greater percentage of female than male Ph.D.s from the Chairman's Group entered academe. It is encouraging to see that there is no long-term trend in which women Ph.D.s from the major departments are turning away in disproportionate numbers from the academic labor market.

It is also encouraging to see, as Table 6 shows, that women are continuing to do as well as men in graduate student support.

This continues a long tradition of equality of opportunity in this area.

We must conclude that, although economists have been ready to nominate and elect women to honorific posts in their professional organizations, no comparable advance occurred in movements up the academic ladder. Two years ago, Ann Friedlaender wrote in her CSWEP Report

...the real test of the commitment of the economics profession to enhance

TABLE 6—DISTRIBUTION OF PH.D. STUDENT SUPPORT, BY TYPE OF SUPPORT, SEX, AND DEPARTMENT
ACADEMIC YEARS, 1979–81

	All Ph.D. Depts.		Chairman's Group		Other Ph.D. Depts.	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
A. 1979–80						
All Students	3,232	100.0	2,423	100.0	809	100.0
Tuition Only	184	5.7	150	6.2	34	4.2
Stipend only	493	15.3	307	12.7	186	23.0
Tuition + Stipend	1,379	42.7	984	40.6	395	48.8
No support	861	26.6	704	29.0	157	19.4
No record	315	9.7	278	11.5	37	4.6
Male Students	2,689	100.0	2,013	100.0	676	100.0
Tuition only	146	5.4	119	5.9	27	4.0
Stipend only	406	15.1	255	12.7	151	22.3
Tuition + stipend	1,140	42.4	812	40.3	328	48.5
No support	723	26.9	579	28.8	144	21.3
No record	274	10.2	248	12.3	26	3.9
Female Students	543	100.0	410	100.0	133	100.0
Tuition only	38	7.0	31	7.6	7	5.2
Stipend only	87	16.0	52	12.7	35	26.3
Tuition + stipend	239	44.0	172	41.9	67	50.4
No support	138	25.4	125	30.5	13	9.8
No record	41	7.6	30	7.3	11	8.3
B. 1980–81						
All Students	3,718	100.0	2,625	100.0	1,093	100.0
Tuition Only	168	4.5	131	5.0	37	3.4
Stipend only	485	13.0	342	13.0	143	13.1
Tuition + Stipend	1,748	47.0	1,212	46.2	536	49.0
No Support	760	20.5	488	18.6	272	24.9
No Record	557	15.0	452	17.2	105	9.6
Male Students	3,077	100.0	2,162	100.0	915	100.0
Tuition Only	140	4.6	109	5.1	31	3.4
Stipend Only	395	12.8	275	12.7	120	13.1
Tuition + Stipend	1,407	45.7	963	44.5	444	48.5
No Support	659	21.4	419	19.4	240	26.2
No Record	476	15.5	396	18.3	80	8.8
Female Students	641	100.0	463	100.0	178	100.0
Tuition Only	28	4.4	22	4.7	6	3.4
Stipend Only	90	14.0	67	14.5	23	13.0
Tuition + Stipend	341	53.2	249	53.8	92	51.7
No Support	101	15.8	69	14.9	32	17.9
No Record	81	12.6	56	12.1	25	14.0

the status of women in its activities will occur in the next few years, when the presently nontenured women faculty come up for tenure and promotion. If a proportionate share of these women move up through the academic ranks, this will be a definite sign that the profession is serious about making women equal partners. If, however, a disproportionate share of young women economists are not retained, this will almost certainly be interpreted as a sign

that the economics profession will remain an essentially male bastion.

[p. 421]

It is my sad duty to report that two years of new data confirm Friedlaender's fears rather than her hopes. A disproportionate share of women economists are not being given tenure. The future of women economists in academe looks bleak indeed unless and until there is a reversal of this unfortunate trend.

ELIZABETH E. BAILEY, *Chair*