

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

During the past year the Committee has widened the market for economists, increased the effective supply of women economists, served as a model for the efforts of other professional associations, and added to information about the economics profession.

1. Over one thousand women economists have received four Newsletters during 1973. They list not only employment opportunities but requests for articles, conference planners and participants, referees and reviewers, etc. Over the past year women economists have appeared on more programs, advisory boards, and the like than previously; the Ford Foundation, typical of nonacademic institutions, reports that many more women have applied for their openings; at the December 1973 meetings of the American Economic Association (*AEA*), women were interviewed in large numbers for positions they had previously applied for. The Committee does not take full credit for these happenings and other evidence that women economists are beginning to enter the market of ideas and of employment; nevertheless, we think the Newsletter has paid off. The impact of our publicity has been to widen the market for all economists for two reasons. First, the Committee has not restricted its information to women (male graduate students were grateful to obtain at the meetings copies of our job listings). Second, the Committee reports *all* opportunities, whether these come to us directly or indirectly. From Ohio State University we hear, "I think that the attempt to fulfill employment agency functions is commendable. My experiences with the labor market for economists during the past five years suggests that the profession is too

bound by tradition and cronyism. The efforts of the Committee in this area may well help break up some of the invidious segmentation which characterizes this labor market."

2. The growing roster compiled by the Committee is our mailing list for the women economists receiving the Newsletter. It currently numbers about 1400, compared to about 300 in early 1973. In effect, we have increased the supply of women economists by finding them. The roster has been computerized, following authorization by the Executive Committee, to provide information, for each woman listed, on her field, education, experience, availability, etc. At its March 1973 meeting, the Executive Committee agreed to operate the roster for employment purposes once it had been set up. At its November meeting the Committee decided to provide lists to prospective employers and others of women economists, sorted by field. One inquirer for such a list remarked, "It will be very useful to have a roster such as yours. . . . everyone knows a few women economists, but nobody knows many—and your list . . . is a great improvement on my colleagues' recollection of ex-fellow students." At its December meeting, the Committee decided that it should not provide this service on a zero-price basis, and anyone requesting such a list in the future will be asked to help defray costs.

3. The survey of academic economists conducted in the fall of 1972 has been widely used by the Committee and others. Some findings were quoted in the Carnegie Commission report, *Opportunities for Women in Higher Education* (which also commended this Committee's work on

TABLE 1—DEPARTMENTS OF ECONOMICS
SURVEY RESULTS BY SIZE^a

Number of Students	Questionnaires Sent	Questionnaires Returned	Response Rate (In Percent)
1- 499	145	3	2
500- 999	333	53	16
1,000- 1,499	238	53	22
1,500- 1,999	122	38	31
2,000- 2,999	117	40	34
3,000- 4,999	143	49	34
5,000- 9,999	165	78	47
10,000-14,999	68	42	62
15,000-24,999	56	38	68
25,000 or more	22	20	91
TOTAL	1,409	414	29
10,000 or more	146	100	68

^a Size refers to the number of students, both graduate and undergraduate.

opening up the job market). Our figures on the percentage of women enrolled for higher degrees have enabled many institutions to set up goals for affirmative action programs and have encouraged others to recruit more widely for faculty and graduate school applicants. There is a clear need for another follow-up survey, given this year's results which are summarized below.

4. The findings, recommendations, and conclusions of the Committee, with respect to implementing the resolutions adopted by the Association at its December 1972 business meeting, appeared in the December 1973 *American Economic Review*. We hope that the guidelines set forth in the article will be widely used in academic and nonacademic organizations. Entitled "Combatting Role Prejudice and Sex Discrimination," this statement was discussed at the session sponsored by the Committee on December 28, 1973. We are grateful to George Stigler, David Gordon, and Elizabeth Clayton for reviewing the article at that time. Reprints of the article (for our cost of \$2.50) and tapes of the session (for our cost of \$15) can be purchased from the

Executive Secretary, Helen Bolln Munzer, 131 Kent Street, Brookline, Mass. 02146.

5. The Committee has served as a model for other professional associations which have sought help from us on a variety of problems. The Executive Secretary has provided technical advice about surveys, statistical tabulations, compiling and operating a roster, cataloging employment opportunities, making referrals, and so on. The Chair has talked with many people, most of whom were referred to us by others, about such committees and about the role of professional associations in dealing with questions of discrimination. We take these inquiries as recognition of our accomplishments; we also note with pleasure the overwhelming support from women economists in general. Almost all professional associations have set up some program on behalf of women, and we have been in touch with most committees, commissions, and the like. In many professional associations, a women's caucus or other dissident group of women members has appeared, presumably because the formal efforts seem obviously *pro forma*. That such a group has not appeared within the *AEA* may be an endorsement of our attempts to deliberately plan for effective action and to provide a normal channel for the expression of legitimate grievances.

6. Typical of the ongoing efforts of the Committee have been the letters sent to presidents and program chairmen of regional economic associations and other allied associations, as well as to editors of economic journals, urging their appointment of women to policy positions. We have also urged the editor of the *Journal of Economic Literature*, who has agreed, to commission a survey article on the literature about the economic status of women. The Committee has a close liaison with the Federation of Organizations for Professional Women, which may succeed in centralizing the efforts of a good many pro-

TABLE 2—NONRESPONSE TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Departments of Economics With More Than 10,000 Students	
University of Akron ¹	Memphis State University ¹
Arizona State University	University of Miami
Brigham Young University ¹	University of Nebraska—Omaha
California State College—Los Angeles	City University of New York
California State University—Northridge	CUNY—City College
Central Michigan University	CUNY—Queens College
Central Missouri State College ¹	Newark State College ¹
Central State College—Oklahoma ¹	Ohio University
University of Connecticut—Storrs	Oklahoma State University
Eastern Michigan University	Old Dominion University ¹
Florida State University	University of Puerto Rico ¹
Fordham University	Rochester Institute of Technology ¹
George Washington University ¹	San Francisco State College ¹
Georgia State University	University of South Florida ¹
University of Georgia	University of South Carolina
Hofstra University	Temple University ¹
Illinois State University	University of Tennessee
University of Illinois—Chicago Circle	University of Texas—Arlington ¹
Long Island University—Greenvale ¹	University of Utah
Long Island University, C. W. Post Center ¹	Virginia Commonwealth University ¹
University of Maine—Bangor	Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Mankato State College ¹	Walla Walla College ¹
Marquette University ¹	Wisconsin State University—Oshkosh

¹ Also did not return last year's questionnaire.

fessional associations, as well as looser ties with Women's Equity Action League, American Association for the Advancement of Science, etc. etc. etc.

7. We have received only three requests for direct intervention on behalf of women economists—two involving individuals and the other a textbook. In the latter case, we pointed out offensive passages and style to the author, who has assured us of substantive revision. Guidelines for writers, especially of elementary texts, should clearly be on our agenda. As for the other two cases, one individual requested that we take no action, after we had indicated to her the avenues of redress available through American Association of University Professors (*AAUP*), Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (*EEOC*), and Office of Contract Compliance and had offered to ask for explanation from the officials involved. The other case has not yet been settled. The Committee's func-

tion has been chiefly to inform the parties concerned of the resolutions of the *AEA* about discrimination, of the remedies available through *AAUP*, *EEOC*, and the Wages and Hours Division of the Department of Labor. It is also true that this particular complainant has received significant upward adjustment in rank, salary, and privileges. The Committee believes firmly that the Association can be most helpful not by acting as *amicus curiae* in a court suit but by emphasizing the professional responsibility to cooperate fully with both law and procedure. We also believe that the threat of adverse publicity remains a strong inducement to compliance.

7. Accordingly, we present some summary figures on the employment of women economists on faculties of universities and colleges and on the enrollment of women students. The figures are not directly comparable to those of last year because

TABLE 3—STUDENTS AND FACULTY IN ECONOMICS
Full-time and Part-time Totals, Women as Percent of Totals, January 10, 1974

Faculty	All Departments				New Cartel				Old Cartel				Noncartel			
	Full-time (Total) (Per- cent)		Part-time (Total) (Per- cent)		Full-time (Total) (Per- cent)		Part-time (Total) (Per- cent)		Full-time (Total) (Per- cent)		Part-time (Total) (Per- cent)		Full-time (Total) (Per- cent)		Part-time (Total) (Per- cent)	
All Ranks	4,262	7	574	13	1,533	5	185	12	1,224	5	152	14	2,729	8	389	14
Professor	1,439	3	70	9	714	2	39	5	592	2	32	6	725	4	31	13
Associate	1,074	6	34	9	325	3	7	0	239	3	7	0	749	7	27	11
Assistant	1,371	9	64	19	430	9	29	24	357	9	23	26	941	9	35	14
Instructors	292	14	116	17	36	17	19	5	12	17	14	7	256	14	97	20
Lecturers	86	16	290	12	28	29	91	14	24	29	76	16	58	10	199	11
Staff (not included in totals)	100	94	66	58	67	96	29	55	55	96	19	74	33	91	37	59
Students	All Departments				New Cartel				Old Cartel				Noncartel			
	Full-time (Total) (Per- cent)		Part-time (Total) (Per- cent)		Full-time (Total) (Per- cent)		Part-time (Total) (Per- cent)		Full-time (Total) (Per- cent)		Part-time (Total) (Per- cent)		Full-time (Total) (Per- cent)		Part-time (Total) (Per- cent)	
Senior Majors	9,423	15			3,065	11			1,951	12			6,358	17		
Ph.D. Candidates	4,379	12	648	9	3,631	12	419	9	3,240	12	268	9	748	13	229	9
M.A. Candidates	2,724	14	1,585	15	1,199	12	703	13	860	12	209	17	1,525	15	882	16
Scholarships	563	17			455	12			434	11			108	35		
Fellowships	1,009	16			803	13			704	14			206	27		
Assistantships	2,294	15			1,588	13			1,327	13			706	19		

the respondents differ. The "major institutions" cited have also changed. The so-called Chairman's Group identified by the *AEA* consisted last year of forty-three *U.S.* universities which graduated two-thirds of the Ph.D.s in economics plus one foreign university. This year the *AEA* enlarged this group. Our figures refer to fifty-seven *U.S.* universities, which presumably grant most of the Ph.D. degrees in economics. The new Chairman's Group also contains two foreign universities and eight nonuniversities, most of which are non-profit institutions. Obviously we wanted to compare last year to this year; just as obviously we want to distinguish between major institutions (even if "major" is defined differently) and others. The tabulations refer, therefore, to different groups of so-called major universities; the groups were not determined by this Committee, but by the *AEA*. We have used the term "Old Cartel" to refer to the 1972 list of institutions and "New Cartel" for the 1973 list.

As students at the graduate level,

women account for the same fraction of full-time Ph.D.s (12 percent) as last year; part-time Ph.D.s were more numerous among the men enrolled than among the women (9 percent of the total). Twelve percent of the candidates for M.A.s were women, but at this level women accounted for a larger number of part-time students (15 percent at all universities, 17 percent at the major schools). Figures on scholarships, fellowships, and assistantships show that the proportion going to women was about the same as the proportion of women in the student body. The most significant finding about women students of economics deals with undergraduate majors, where there is a sharp distinction between the cartel schools and the rest. At the major universities, women account for only 11 percent of the senior majors in economics; at the noncartel schools, they make up 17 percent of the senior majors.

Evidence from other disciplines suggests that the number of women students in a given field is strongly correlated with the number of women faculty; data from this

survey lend support to this hypothesis. Eight percent of the faculty at noncartel schools are women, compared to only 5 percent at the cartel schools. On the other hand, all-male faculties exist at 21 percent of the "old cartel" schools, 30 percent of the "new cartel" schools, and 60 percent of the noncartel institutions. Consequently, the 212 women faculty members outside the walls of the major universities are concentrated (if that is the right word) in only 142 schools, or 74 percent of the women economists are employed by 40 percent of the institutions. Prominent among these, of course, are women's colleges where both faculty representation and student enrollment in economics are impressively high.

One year is obviously too short a time to draw any conclusions about change. The only comparable data base consists of the forty-three universities termed the "old cartel." Last year eighteen of these institutions had no women faculty in economics; this year ten remain totally male. As a group, the old cartel increased its women faculty by fourteen percent (nine women). The net increase, however, resulted from hiring twenty women to these economics faculties.

Based on 414 respondents with 4,262 full-time economics faculty members, women accounted for 7 percent of the total, compared to 6 percent a year ago; this represented, however, 76 out of 1,533 faculty at the new cartel schools and 212 out of 2,729 everywhere else. For all re-

spondents, women were 3 percent of the professors, 6 percent of the associate, and 9 percent of the assistant professors, 14 percent of the instructors, and 16 percent of the special lecturers, with more women than last year holding positions on the tenure track. Women gained 8 percent of all promotions (20 of 250), although at the new cartel universities precisely three women were granted higher rank, one each as professor, associate, and assistant (3 of 74). These same universities hired twenty-four women faculty, but their net gain over last year was only nine women. Other questions about the new cartel schools revealed that about two-thirds have special procedures for hiring women, although most of them do not give entry-level appointments to their own Ph.D.s. Almost all have nepotism rules parallel to those of the *AAUP*, slightly under half allow husband and wife to share an appointment, and more than two-thirds of these institutions have reviewed their salaries for evidence of discrimination. As for part-time faculty, one-third of the institutions grant fringe benefits and a smaller number consider part-time faculty for tenure. On the other hand, over half have part-time faculty participating in department meetings. As for increasing their own supply of female students, about 25 percent of these major universities actively recruit women; about 75 percent have time limits within which the Ph.D. must be earned, but only one has an age limit for students.

CAROLYN SHAW BELL, *Chair*