

The Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

Women are a growing presence in economics classes and in the economics profession. Among undergraduate economics majors and in undergraduate economics courses, 30 percent of the students are now women, as compared with 15 percent 10 years ago, in 1973. Women are now 21 percent of the graduate students pursuing the Ph.D. degree, as compared with 12 percent ten years earlier. Some progress is also being made in faculty representation for women economists. However, it is still the case that the higher one looks in the professional hierarchy, the fewer women one finds. In academe, where we

have information in some detail, the situation can be summarized:

Women as a Percentage of:	1973	1983
All undergraduates	44	52
In Economics:		
Undergraduate majors	15	30
Ph.D. students	12	21
Ph.D. degrees awarded	8	14
Assistant Professors	9	16
Associate Professors	6	11
Full Professors	3	4

Some of the current disparity in the extent of women's representation in the bottom as opposed to the top of the hierarchy is caused

TABLE 1—DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME FACULTY, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION, ACADEMIC YEAR 1982-83

	Chair'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
Existing												
Professor	634	14	2.2	921	25	2.7	223	19	8.5	349	26	7.4
Associate	256	18	7.0	470	30	6.4	319	89	27.9	313	19	6.1
Assistant	343	44	12.8	512	68	13.3	215	56	26.0	401	66	16.5
Instructor	52	11	21.2	80	19	23.8	111	15	13.5	119	25	21.0
Other	40	7	17.5	50	7	14.0	117	94	80.3	38	4	10.5
New Hires												
Professor	5	0	0	6	0	0	3	0	0	8	0	0
Associate	11	1	9.1	5	2	40.0	4	0	0	14	0	0
Assistant	58	7	12.1	90	13	14.4	36	5	13.9	76	16	21.1
Instructor	16	2	12.5	33	5	15.2	9	3	33.3	19	11	57.9
Other	4	1	25.0	7	1	14.3	6	3	50.0	13	0	0
Promoted To Rank (1981-82)												
Professor	21	1	4.8	31	2	6.5	16	1	6.3	19	2	10.5
Associate	31	4	12.9	45	7	15.6	18	4	22.2	31	3	9.7
Assistant	3	0	0	9	0	0	2	1	50.0	21	4	19.0
Tenured at Rank (1981-82)												
Professor	2	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	41	35	85.4
Associate	22	3	13.6	32	3	9.4	12	3	25.0	38	12	31.6
Assistant	2	1	50.0	3	2	66.7	4	1	25.0	17	1	5.9
Other	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Not Rehired												
Professor	27	0	0	35	1	2.9	9	2	22.2	9	1	11.1
Associate	10	1	10.0	17	1	5.9	6	1	16.7	6	1	16.7
Assistant	40	2	5.0	55	5	9.1	27	8	29.6	46	6	13.0
Instructor	10	3	30.0	21	5	23.8	2	1	50.0	21	4	19.0
Other	6	1	16.7	6	1	16.7	0	0	0	9	3	33.3

TABLE 2—PREVIOUS ACTIVITY OF NEW HIRES AND CURRENT ACTIVITY OF THOSE NOT REHIRED BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION AND SEX, ACADEMIC YEAR, 1982-83

	Previous Activity of New Hires				Current Activity of Not RehiRED			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Chair's Group	88	100.0	18	100.0	76	100.0	3	100.0
Faculty	20	22.7	4	22.2	36	47.4	3	100.0
Student	59	67.1	12	66.7	2	2.6	0	0
Government	3	3.4	1	5.6	12	15.8	0	0
Bus., Banking, Research	4	4.6	0	0	15	19.7	0	0
Other	2	2.3	1	5.6	11	14.5	0	0
Other Ph.D.	137	100.0	31	100.0	108	100.0	9	100.0
Faculty	40	29.2	7	22.6	57	52.8	7	77.8
Student	83	60.6	20	64.5	6	5.6	1	11.1
Government	7	5.1	2	6.5	13	12.0	1	11.1
Bus., Banking, Research	4	2.9	1	3.2	15	13.8	0	0
Other	3	2.2	1	3.2	17	15.7	0	0
M.A. Departments	52	100.0	13	100.0	41	100.0	8	100.0
Faculty	20	38.5	3	23.1	23	56.1	0	0
Student	20	38.5	9	69.2	3	7.3	1	12.5
Government	3	5.8	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bus., Banking, Research	3	5.8	0	0	8	19.5	1	12.5
Other	6	11.5	1	7.7	7	17.1	6	75.0
B.A. Departments	158	100.0	44	100.0	77	100.0	14	100.0
Faculty	56	35.4	8	18.2	35	45.5	3	21.4
Student	74	46.8	27	61.4	6	7.8	2	14.3
Government	5	3.2	0	0	5	6.5	0	0
Bus., Banking, Research	18	11.4	7	15.9	10	13.0	2	14.3
Other	5	3.2	2	4.6	21	27.3	7	50.0

by inevitable lags, as the increased number of women economists starting their professional lives move through their professional life cycle. However, we would be naive if we were to believe that this disparity will cure itself in time without special effort. We have the unhappy example of some of the other professions, where, unlike economics, women have always been well represented at the bottom and where they continue to have poor representation at the top.

The importance of increasing the pitifully small number of women economists in the top ranks of the profession is well expressed in the following comment by Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, the sociologist who has been the closest student of the place of women in the professions:

Until some reasonable ratio is developed, the tiny number of women who have been successful are destined to be regarded as pathological and gender

anomalies. In addition, because women are not generally counted among the successful, all women are regarded as deficient. Thus, women outside as well as inside the professions and occupations are regarded as second-class citizens, as incompetents dependent on males to make the important decisions; as giggling magpies who will contaminate the decorum of the male luncheon clubs and bars; as persons who can't be trusted to be colleagues.

One event taking place in 1983 was the completion of Alice Rivlin's term of service as Director of the Congressional Budget Office. Rivlin took over as Director on the first day of the CBO's existence, and built it up from scratch into a respected source of competent, timely and unbiased analysis and information for the Congress and, indeed, for all those interested in government policy-making. In a profession under fire, she was

TABLE 3—DISTRIBUTION OF SALARY FOR WOMEN FACULTY BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT AND TIME IN RANK, ACADEMIC YEAR, 1982-83

Relative Salary for Rank	All Women		Time in Rank			
	Number	Percent	Total Percent	Above Median	At Median	Below Median
All Departments	406	100.0	100.0	30.5	42.1	27.3
Salary above Median	137	33.7	100.0	52.6	27.7	19.7
Salary at Median	131	32.3	100.0	14.5	73.3	12.2
Salary below Median	138	34.0	100.0	23.9	26.8	49.3
Ph.D., Chair's Group	75	100.0	100.0	33.3	45.3	21.3
Salary above Median	23	30.7	100.0	43.5	30.4	26.1
Salary at Median	25	33.3	100.0	16.0	68.0	16.0
Salary below Median	27	36.0	100.0	40.7	37.0	22.2
Ph.D., Other	143	100.0	100.0	35.7	36.4	28.0
Salary above Median	51	35.7	100.0	54.9	25.5	19.6
Salary at Median	38	26.6	100.0	18.4	71.1	10.5
Salary below Median	54	37.8	100.0	29.6	22.2	48.1
M.A. Departments	60	100.0	100.0	33.3	41.7	25.0
Salary above Median	23	38.3	100.0	65.2	30.4	4.3
Salary at Median	19	31.7	100.0	21.1	63.2	15.8
Salary below Median	18	30	100.0	5.6	33.3	61.1
B.A. Departments	128	100.0	100.0	21.9	46.9	31.3
Salary above Median	40	31.3	100.0	47.5	27.5	25.0
Salary at Median	49	38.3	100.0	8.2	81.6	10.2
Salary below Median	39	30.5	100.0	12.8	23.1	64.1

virtually unique in the respect accorded her work. Rivlin and the staff she organized and directed were able unerringly to thread the political minefields of Capital Hill without compromise to their professional performance on the technical level.

While CSWEP is proud of Rivlin's performance as an economist, we also wish to call attention to her exemplary performance as an employer of economists. Out of a CBO professional staff of 166, women currently hold 58 professional jobs, or 35 percent.

Rivlin will be the Director of Economic Studies at The Brookings Institution, where she will have ample scope to improve the representation of women economists.

We commend to Rudolph G. Penner, Rivlin's successor as Director at CBO, the keeping of the now-established CBO tradition of open opportunities for women economists. We are pleased to report that among his initial acts has been the promotion of Rosemary Marcuss to be Assistant Director for Tax Analysis. At the Assistant Director level, Marcuss joins Nancy M. Gordon, who is Assistant Director for Human Resources and Community Development.

In contrast to CBO's hospitality to the talents of women economists was the action of Martin Feldstein, who in a well-publicized move, brought an all-male professional group with him to the Council of Economic Advisers. In both Democratic and Republican administrations in the past, the Council has employed a number of women economists as Council Members and on the senior staff. Feldstein's response to CSWEP's remonstrance was that he brought people he knew could do the job, and that if CSWEP could tell him of some women who could do the job he would be glad to consider them. We understand that CSWEP's protest has resulted in the subsequent hiring of a woman with a BA in economics onto the junior CEA staff.

Back at Harvard, where he was a professor, and the National Bureau of Economic Research, of which he was president, Feldstein left behind him two organizations in which women economists with senior roles are unusually rare, a fact possibly contributing to his lack of knowledge of women economists who can do the job. CSWEP is concerned about this rarity, and is consider-

TABLE 4—DEGREES GRANTED IN ECONOMICS BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT AND SEX, ACADEMIC YEAR 1982-83

Number of:	All Depts.	Ph.D. Departments			M.A. Depts.	B.A. Depts.
		Total	Chair's	Other		
Departments	377	120	44	76	45	212
Ph.D.s	867	867	378	489	—	—
Female	122	122	50	72	—	—
Percent Female	14.1	14.1	13.2	14.7	—	—
M.A.s	1,705	1,529	538	991	176	—
Female	403	368	122	246	35	—
Percent Female	23.6	24.1	22.7	24.8	19.9	—
B.A.s	18,712	12,579	5,206	7,373	1,124	5,009
Female	5,687	3,681	1,535	2,146	346	1,660
Percent Female	30.4	29.3	29.5	29.1	30.8	33.1
Other	287	280	39	241	2	5
Female	82	79	9	70	1	2
Percent Female	28.6	28.2	23.1	29.0	50.0	40.0

Note: Some departments do not report students by sex, and the figures in the table contain some allocations. The percentages, however, were not affected.

ing ways in which Harvard and NBER can be encouraged and assisted to allow more women economists into their valuable collegueship.

CSWEP is also concerned about women economists' access to publication in professional journals and to participation in the programs of professional meetings. Research has shown that professional articles do better in the refereeing process if they are signed with a male name. We therefore believe that the establishment of blind refereeing for abstracts and journal articles would improve the chance for women economists to communicate with the profession.

We noted with regret this year the formation of an all-male editorial board for the new *Journal of Labor Economics*, published by the University of Chicago Press. At this writing, the editor has not given us the courtesy of a reply to our letter, sent last summer. Other journals also merit our attention in this regard.

Joan Robinson died in 1983, her prodigious accomplishments uncrowned by a Nobel Prize.

Shirley Kallek, Associate Director of the United States Census for Economic Fields, who was in charge of all of the work of the Bureau except that relating to population, also died this year. Among her other accomplishments was the organization of a section

of the Bureau specializing in the economic analysis of microdata on business establishments. She was also Census liaison to the AEA Advisory Committee to the Census, a committee whose debates were instrumental in causing Census to end use of the term "head of household," to survey child support compliance, and to organize a conference on data needs for studying issues relating to women. A fellowship fund is being organized in her memory, and contributions to it may be made through CSWEP.

Another notable death this year was that of Beatrice N. Vaccara, who was Director in the Bureau of Industrial Economics of the Commerce Department. During the Carter Administration, she had served as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Domestic Economic Policy in the Treasury Department.

CSWEP Activities and Organization

CSWEP continued to debate this year how the organization could be most useful in furthering the recognition and prospects of women economists, whatever their specialty. The CSWEP sessions at the AEA and regional meetings tend to consist of papers concerning sex role issues in the economy and allied topics. While it is natural for CSWEP to have as one of its functions the furtherance of economic research on such

TABLE 5—DISTRIBUTION OF ACTIVITIES OF NEW PH.D. DEGREES BY SEX AND TYPE OF DEPARTMENT, ACADEMIC YEAR 1982–83

	All Ph.D. Depts.		Chair's Group		Other Ph.D. Depts.	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
All Ph.D.s	772	100.0	353	100.0	419	100.0
Education	422	54.7	194	55.0	228	54.4
Government	67	8.7	31	8.8	36	8.6
Bus., Banking, Research	117	15.2	55	15.6	62	14.8
Int'l. Emp. Outside U.S.	113	14.6	51	14.4	62	14.8
Other	53	6.9	22	6.2	31	7.4
Male Ph.D.s	664	100.0	305	100.0	359	100.0
Education	357	53.8	164	53.8	193	53.8
Government	57	8.6	27	8.9	30	8.4
Bus., Banking, Research	103	15.5	48	15.7	55	15.3
Int'l. Emp. Outside U.S.	107	16.1	49	16.1	58	16.2
Other	40	6.0	17	5.6	23	6.4
Female Ph.D.s	108	100.0	48	100.0	60	100.0
Education	65	60.2	30	62.5	35	58.3
Government	10	9.3	4	8.3	6	10.0
Bus., Banking, Research	14	13.0	7	14.6	7	11.7
Int'l. Emp. Outside U.S.	6	5.6	2	4.2	4	6.7
Other	13	12.0	5	10.4	8	13.3

matters, some members have felt that a parallel way should be found to get exposure for women economists in other specialties.

In this regard, CSWEP is working to inform women economists of the mechanics of organizing sessions on the non-CSWEP part of the programs, and will be monitoring the degree of success women who attempt to do this meet with. Women economists who have made proposals to organize sessions at any meetings should inform the CSWEP Chair of the outcome.

We also continue to wrestle with ways to answer requests of prospective employers claiming to be looking for women candidates and asking us to help publicize their vacancies. Notices in the Newsletter are costly, and tend not to be timely. Moreover, the applications they encourage may be ignored. Lists of women who have faculty appointments currently, and lists of recent publications by women authors or coauthors are in process of compilation. Although these lists may prove useful, it is possible that other methods might prove worthwhile, and we continue to be on the lookout for them.

On the occasion of last spring's request for dues, we asked if members would like to volunteer for activities with CSWEP. We got

a very encouraging response. A number of members will help out at the AEA convention, but we feel that there are many other possibilities which we have yet to organize or initiate. One possibility might be a clearinghouse for the provision of expertise for testimony before Congress and the State Legislatures, as well as in court proceedings. This would have to be done in a way consistent with AEA's nonpartisan and tax exempt status.

Committee W of the American Association of University Professors has sent letters to CSWEP and to all of the women's caucuses in the other academic professions, asking "what, if anything, is being done to review undergraduate texts and curricula for sex bias, and what is being done to introduce women's issues into the curriculum." In the coming year, CSWEP will consider how we might act to move this work forward in economics.

Nancy Ruggles has earned our sincere thanks for her supervision of computer work on the CSWEP membership list and the production of the CSWEP Roster. The Roster continues to provide an invaluable means of locating women economists by area and specialty. Ruggles is passing this work to Joan

TABLE 6—DISTRIBUTION OF PH.D. STUDENT SUPPORT, BY TYPE OF SUPPORT, SEX, AND DEPARTMENT, ACADEMIC YEAR 1982-83

	All Ph.D. Depts.		Chair's Group		Other Ph.D. Depts.	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
All Students	7,248	100.0	3,254	100.0	3,994	100.0
Tuition Only	401	5.5	185	5.7	216	5.4
Stipend Only	560	7.7	220	6.8	340	8.5
Tuition + Stipend	3,333	46.0	1,506	46.3	1,827	45.7
No Support	2,034	28.1	948	29.1	1,086	27.2
No Record	920	12.7	395	12.1	525	13.1
Male Students	5,740	100.0	2,597	100.0	3,143	100.0
Tuition Only	306	5.3	141	5.4	165	5.6
Stipend Only	464	8.1	179	6.9	285	9.1
Tuition + Stipend	2,606	45.4	1,182	45.5	1,424	45.3
No Support	1,632	28.4	761	29.3	871	27.7
No Record	732	12.8	334	12.9	398	12.7
Female Students	1,508	100.0	657	100.0	851	100.0
Tuition Only	95	6.3	44	6.7	51	6.0
Stipend Only	96	6.4	41	6.2	55	6.5
Tuition + Stipend	727	48.2	324	49.3	403	47.4
No Support	402	26.7	187	28.5	215	25.3
No Record	188	12.5	61	9.3	127	14.9

Haworth, who has been one of CSWEP's most active and valued members. Also leaving the committee this year are Irma Adelman, Monique P. Garrity, and Janet C. Goulet, to whom much thanks are owed. Coming onto the committee will be Sharon Megdall of the University of Arizona-

Phoenix, Lourdes Beneria of Rutgers University-New Brunswick, Bernadette Chachere of Hampton Institute, Michelle J. White of the University of Michigan, and Mary Fish of the University of Alabama.

BARBARA R. BERGMANN, *Chair*