

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

During the past year the Committee has improved the operation of the market for economists, added to the information about the economics profession, and increased the effective supply of women economists.

The unique nature of this Committee should be noted. It is a "working committee," which this year has produced better information flow in the current job market, collected new, needed data, produced research results, planned and conducted a session at the *AEA* annual meeting, is in the process of producing a national research conference on occupational segregation, and has offered encouragement and support to women economists who have registered with us. The number of registered women economists is close to 1,400.

The need for this Committee, unfortunately, is far from being met. In recognition of this fact and the productiveness of the Committee, the Executive Committee of *AEA* in March 1974 changed the status of this Committee from that of an *ad hoc* one to a standing committee. On behalf of our Committee members, I wish to thank the Executive Committee for this expression of appreciation of our work and of faith in our continued performance.

I also want to thank the individual members of our Committee who have so diligently carried out the mandate of this Association. The Committee deliberately was made larger than some *AEA* committees and consists of ten members. It was designed carefully to have diversity by geographic location, age, sex, stage of professional development, and type of home-base institutions, including business, government, and academic.

On behalf of the total Association, I

also wish to thank the Ford Foundation for its two grants to the *AEA* over the past three years which have enabled the rapid growth of this Committee's work. With this support, the Committee has been able to undertake important projects in line with its charge from the *AEA*. The nature of the experiment that the Ford Foundation financed was that this was to be part of the regular *AEA* structure; it was to pursue the goals set by *AEA* for the benefit of the total Association; and, if the experiment worked, the Committee and its activities would be continued by *AEA*. As we come to the end of the three-year start-up period, it is appropriate to recognize that this goal has been met and to recognize again the tremendous help that the Ford Foundation has been in making this quantum leap possible.

More specifically, the work of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (*CSWEP*) during this past year has included the following:

1. Four *CSWEP Newsletters* have been written during 1974 and sent to nearly 1,400 women economists. The newsletter is one way the Committee improves the working of the market by listing job openings for economists submitted by prospective employers. This activity fills a need most appreciated by agency and department heads, as our voluminous correspondence shows. The *CSWEP Newsletter* also lists requests for articles, conference and program plans and participants, grant and fellowship opportunities, and notices of regional activities of 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.

2. The roster of women economists developed and computerized by this Committee has been maintained this year and used as the basis for mailing the *CSWEP Newsletter*. It just recently has been updated by sending to all persons 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, 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 field, degree, and rank, although it is not known whether they are currently in the job market. (Whether they are or not may well depend on the opportunity.) The prospective employer may write to these economists, ask them to supply career data, and then follow up with interviews if desired. On an interim basis this service is currently being provided for a fee to help defray costs.

A special list of all women economists from the new *AEA Directory of Members* is in process of being run and will be used to add any new names to the roster list. Based on survey returns, the Committee feels that the number of women who have joined *AEA* has increased, directly or indirectly, because of Committee activity.

3. For the previous two years, the survey of academic economists was conducted by the Committee, and the survey results have been widely used. This year, on recommendation of this Committee, the collection of such data was transferred to the Nashville office of *AEA* and combined with the requests for other information from academic departments of economics into the Universal Academic Questionnaire. We participated actively in the development of the new survey and have continued as before to analyze the data related to the supply and demand for women

economists. The preliminary results from this survey are presented below. Subsequent work will link these data to the previous data so as to begin to examine change, if any, over the three-year period of the life of this Committee.

4. A special survey of women and men economists in 1974-75 and their work histories is one of our major activities this year. The preliminary results from 710 women respondents and the first returns from a matched sample of male economists have been prepared. These results served as the basis for three research papers presented and discussed at the Annual Meeting session planned and conducted by the Committee. The male sample is still being developed, based on a random sample selected from the *Directory* to match the women respondents.

5. A national, working research conference on Occupational Segregation to be held in May 1975 is being sponsored and organized by this Committee. The conference is being held at the Center for Research on Women in Higher Education and the Professions at Wellesley College and is being financed by a grant from the Carnegie Foundation. Development and execution of this commitment will continue to involve much of our time. Publication plans are now being considered.

6. On-going efforts of the Committee this year have included the encouragement of the commissioning of a forthcoming survey article for the *Journal of Economic Literature* on the economic status of women, informal cooperation with similar women's groups of other professional associations, maintaining liaison with the Federation of Organizations for Professional Women, consultation with individual women economists or department chairpersons who have been concerned about particular cases of possible sex discrimination, answering requests, and urging program chairpersons of regional eco-

conomic associations and journal editors to appoint women to policy positions. Groups of women economists have been encouraged to meet together locally, and often informally, on an on-going basis. Efforts this year particularly have been made to increase the known supply of women economists in business and government.

### Women in Academic Departments of Economics, 1974-75

Because no one knew how many women economists existed in academe or how many were currently being trained, this Committee for the last two years surveyed the academic departments of economics and agricultural economics. As noted above, this year similar data were collected under the direction of C. Elton Hinshaw by *AEA* in an expanded survey using the 1974-75 Universal Academic Questionnaire. The preliminary data that relate to women from the 1974-75 questionnaires returned to Nashville so far this year are summarized below. Only a few comparisons of overall totals from the three surveys are made; the data presented are not directly comparable because many departments did not provide data in all three years.<sup>1</sup> For example, last year's data related to 57 institutions in the *AEA*-designated Chairman's Group and this year's data to 47 in that group. Last year, in all, 414 departments with 4,262 full-time economics faculty members responded, and this year, so far, only 311 economics departments with 3,138 full-time faculty members have sent in their questionnaires.

In 1973-74, women comprised 16 per-

cent of the students awarded degrees in economics at the bachelor's level, 14 percent at the M.A. level, but only 8 percent at the Ph.D. level. (See Table 1.) The proportions of women among senior majors in economics and candidates for M.A.s had not changed from the previous year, but the proportion of women receiving Ph.D.s in economics is considerably lower than the 12 percent reported the last two years for women Ph.D. graduate students.<sup>2</sup> It cannot be said that all four points of this difference represent a downturn in women Ph.D.s but this possible decrease bears watching.

The most common forms of financial aid to doctoral students in economics this year are "tuition and stipend with services required," and "tuition and stipend with no services required." Women Ph.D. students received such aid in proportion to their numbers (Table 2). The next most usual kind of financial aid is "stipend only with services required," and considerably less common, "tuition only with no service required." Disproportionately fewer women received these two forms of aid.

The 1974-75 employment of women who received Ph.D.s in economics in 1973-74 is similar to that of the men Ph.D.s except that more women are employed in academic institutions (68 percent of the women versus 56 percent of the men) and fewer women work in the federal government or are employed outside the United States (Table 3). Hinshaw suggests that the proportion of last year's Ph.D.s and *ABDs* finding employment in academic institutions this year is down considerably from the previous level.

The proportion of undergraduate women majoring in economics in Ph.D.-granting departments is much lower than in departments where the highest degree granted is an M.A. or a B.A. (This was also true last

<sup>1</sup> In the fall of 1973, questionnaires were sent to 1,409 departments of economics; in the fall of 1974, they were sent to 1,453 departments. Findings from last year's survey were reported by Carolyn Shaw Bell. Other preliminary findings from the 1974-75 survey have been reported by Hinshaw.

<sup>2</sup> The two previous surveys obtained data on students enrolled rather than degrees granted.

TABLE 1—DEGREES GRANTED IN ECONOMICS BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT AND SEX, 1973-74  
 Departments Reporting by January 10, 1975, on 1974-75  
 Universal Academic Questionnaire

Degrees Granted in 1973-74	All Depart- ments	Highest Degree Offered			
		Ph.D.		M.A.	B.A.
		Chairman's Group	Other		
Number of departments reporting	311	47	33	31	200
Ph.D., number	635	486	149	0	0
Percent women	8	8	9	—	—
M.A., number	1,348	691	418	239	0
Percent women	14	13	14	15	—
B.A., number	9,131	2,980	1,022	1,192	3,937
Percent women	16	12	10	23	18
Other degrees from economics de- partments, number	514	39	0	112	363
Percent women	14	13	—	17	13

TABLE 2—NUMBER OF FULL-TIME "ON-CAMPUS" GRADUATE STUDENTS REGISTERED FALL, 1974,  
 AND TYPE OF FINANCIAL AID, BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT AND BY SEX  
 Departments Reporting by January 10, 1975, on 1974-75 Universal Academic Questionnaire

Type of Department, Degree Sought, and Sex	Total	Receiving Financial Aid						No aid
		No Services Required			Services Required			
		Tuition only	Stipend only	Tuition and stipend	Tuition only	Stipend only	Tuition and stipend	
All departments:								
Ph.D. students, number	3,156	174	107	538	32	466	1,073	763
Female as percent of total	13	10	14	14	34	12	15	12
M.A. students, number	1,539	27	17	160	29	122	319	693
Female as percent of total	14	11	35	13	28	11	18	13
Chairman's Group:								
Ph.D. students, number	2,361	163	99	428	21	405	662	583
Female as percent of total	13	9	15	10	33	12	16	12
Ph.D., other departments:								
Ph.D. students, number	795	11	8	110	11	61	411	180
Female as percent of total	15	—	—	27	—	10	14	11
M.A. students, number	568	4	3	22	25	46	159	256
Female as percent of total	15	—	—	14	28	9	18	13
M.A. departments:								
M.A. students, number	186	12	13	29	4	1	38	78
Female as percent of total	17	17	46	10	—	—	24	8

TABLE 3—1974-75 EMPLOYMENT OF 1973-74 GRADUATES IN ECONOMICS  
BY LEVEL OF DEGREE, SEX, AND TYPE OF DEPARTMENT

Departments Reporting by January 10, 1975, on 1974-75  
Universal Academic Questionnaire

Type of Department and Kind of Employment	Ph.D. <sup>a</sup>		M.A.	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
All departments:				
Number	714	63	862	123
Percent	100	100	100	100
Percent employed as economist in United States:				
Educational institution	56	68	10	15
Business or industry	7	6	17	15
Federal Government	12	6	6	6
State/local government	3	5	6	6
Banking or finance	1	3	2	3
Percent employed outside United States:	12	1	14	7
Percent unemployed, seeking work	2	0	2	2
Percent not in labor force:				
Postdoctoral program	0	0	0	0
Entered or re-entered Ph.D. program	1	5	26	24
Not in school	3	5	2	7
Not known	2	0	15	9
Chairman's Group:				
Number	522	48	368	57
Percent	100	100	100	100
Percent employed as economist in United States:				
Educational institution	57	65	10	14
Business or industry	7	8	5	7
Federal government	11	8	6	4
State/local government	2	2	4	7
Banking or finance	1	2	2	4
Percent employed outside United States	11	2	14	12
Percent unemployed, seeking work	2	0	0	0
Percent not in labor force:				
Postdoctoral program	1	0	0	0
Entered Ph.D. program	1	6	35	28
Not in school	4	6	3	7
Not known	3	0	20	18

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

year.) This year the proportion is nearly 12 percent in Ph.D.-granting departments and nearly 20 percent in non-Ph.D.-granting departments. These overall data again suggest that the proportion of women undergraduate majors is positively correlated with the proportion of women faculty. The proportion of women among full-time faculty in tenure-track positions is 3 percent in Ph.D.-granting departments and 6 and 8 percent, respectively, in departments where the highest degree

granted is an M.A. or a B.A. (Table 4).

Departments in the Chairman's Group have a low proportion of women among the full-time faculty in tenure-track positions at professor and associate professor levels (1 percent), but they have a much higher proportion of women at instructor and "other" levels (33 percent). The number of full-time faculty in non-tenure-track positions in the Chairman's Group is about the same as the number of part-time faculty members in those depart-

TABLE 4—NUMBER OF FACULTY BY RANK AND TYPE OF DEPARTMENT, 1974-75, BY SEX  
 Departments Reporting by January 10, 1975, on 1974-75  
 Universal Academic Questionnaire

Type of Appointment, Rank, and Sex	All Depart- ments	Highest Degree Offered			
		Ph.D.		M.A.	B.A.
		Chairman's Group	Other		
Number of departments reporting	311	47	33	31	200
Full-time faculty, tenure-track:					
All ranks, male and female, number	3,138	1,187	679	353	919
Professors	1,225	609	270	114	232
Associate professors	816	269	208	99	240
Assistant professors	955	297	181	127	350
Instructors	129	9	18	13	89
Other	13	3	2	0	8
Female, percent of total	5	3	4	6	8
Professors	2	1	2	3	6
Associate professors	5	1	4	8	9
Assistant professors	7	7	5	6	9
Instructors	11	33	6	8	10
Other	8	33	0	0	0
Full-time faculty, non-tenure-track:					
All ranks, male and female, number	266	108	62	26	70
Professors	11	6	3	2	0
Associate professors	25	16	3	0	6
Assistant professors	100	42	18	8	32
Instructors	67	19	21	8	19
Other	63	25	17	8	13
Female, percent of total	14	15	21	4	9
Professors	0	0	0	0	0
Associate professors	4	0	33	0	0
Assistant professors	14	17	17	0	12
Instructors	9	11	10	0	11
Other	24	28	41	12	0
Part-time faculty:					
All ranks, male and female, number <sup>a</sup>	418	110	59	72	177
Professors	36	11	11	0	14
Associate professors	18	5	3	0	10
Assistant professors	49	11	4	9	25
Instructors	131	35	20	29	47
Other	184	48	21	34	81
Female, percent of total <sup>b</sup>	18	16	22	15	20
Professors	11	9	9	0	14
Associate professors	6	0	33	0	0
Assistant professors	22	45	25	11	16
Instructors	18	11	20	14	23
Other	21	17	29	18	22

<sup>a</sup> In all departments, fourteen of these positions are tenure-track, seven as professors. All seven of the professors are in departments that are in the Chairman's Group.

<sup>b</sup> In all departments, five of these positions held by women are tenure-track, one at each rank.

ments, each about 8 percent of the total faculty. Women hold 15 and 16 percent of these two types of positions. The non-Ph.D. departments, on the other hand, depend much more on part-time faculty (15 percent of the total faculty) and have a relatively high proportion of women in the part-time positions (nearly 20 percent versus about 2 percent in the full-time but non-tenure-track positions).

The continued existence of all-male economics faculties is of particular interest. Considering full-time faculty, 30 percent of the departments in the Chairman's Group have no women faculty (a similar proportion to that reported last year), 45 percent of the other Ph.D.-granting departments have no women faculty, and nearly 70 percent of the non-Ph.D.-granting departments are all male (Table 5).

The proportion of departments with all-male part-time faculty (30 percent) exceeds the proportion with one or more women among the part-time faculty (18 percent).

Overall, the number of full-time economics faculty increased 2 percent from 1973-74 to 1974-75 (Table 6). This was an increase of eighty-six positions for the departments reporting, with thirteen of them being held by women (15 percent). Women represented 8 percent of the full-time faculty released (resignation, retirement, and nonrenewal of contract) and 9 percent of the new hires for full-time faculty positions. Of the overall net changes in full-time faculty, women represented a larger proportion of the increase in departments in the Chairman's Group than in other departments (23 versus 12 percent). This is

TABLE 5—DISTRIBUTION OF DEPARTMENTS OF ECONOMICS BY NUMBER OF WOMEN FACULTY MEMBERS, 1974-75

Departments Reporting by January 10, 1975, on 1974-75 Universal Academic Questionnaire

Number of Women on Faculty	All Departments	Highest Degree Offered				
		Ph.D.			M.A.	B.A.
		Total	Chairman's Group	Other		
Number of departments reporting	297	73	44	29	31	193
Percent distribution by number of women						
full-time faculty	100	100	100	100	100	100
All male	59	36	30	45	48	70
1 woman	29	44	48	38	36	23
2 women	7	8	11	3	16	5
3 or more women	4	12	11	14	0	2
Percent distribution of departments by number of women part-time faculty	100	100	100	100	100	100
No part-time faculty	52	41	41	41	42	57
1 or more part-time faculty	48	59	59	59	58	43
All male	30	31	27	38	29	30
1 woman	14	21	23	17	26	10
2 women	3	5	9	0	3	2
3 or more women	1	2	0	4	0	2
Total number of faculty						
Full-time	3,404	2,036	1,295	741	379	989
Percent women	6	4	4	5	6	8
Part-time	418	169	110	59	72	177
Percent women	18	18	16	22	14	20

TABLE 6—NET CHANGE IN FACULTY POSITIONS FROM END OF 1973-74 TO 1974-75,  
BY SEX, ALL DEPARTMENTS AND CHAIRMAN'S GROUP

Departments Reporting by January 10, 1975, on 1974-75 Universal Academic Questionnaire

Item	All Ranks	Professors	Associate Professors	Assistant Professors	In-structors	Others
All departments:						
Faculty released end of AY 1973-74: <sup>a</sup>						
Full-time, number	313	57	35	145	60	16
Women as percent of total	8	5	0	11	7	6
Part-time, number	90	5	3	12	34	36
Women as percent of total	8	0	33	0	3	14
New hires, faculty, AY 1974-75:						
Full-time, number	399	39	37	193	100	30
Women as percent of total	9	5	8	9	7	23
Part-time, number	158	5	3	24	52	74
Women as percent of total	16	0	0	13	8	26
Net change, 1973-74 and 1974-75:						
Full-time, number	+86	-18	+2	+48	+40	+14
Women, number	+13	-1	+3	+2	+3	+6
Part-time, number	+68	0	0	+12	+18	+38
Women, number	+19	0	-1	+3	+3	+14
Chairman's Group:						
Faculty released end of AY 1973-74: <sup>a</sup>						
Full-time, number	111	33	14	47	11	6
Women as percent of total	5	6	0	4	0	17
Part-time, number	29	2	0	0	13	14
Women as percent of total	7	0	0	0	8	7
New hires, faculty, AY 1974-75:						
Full-time, number	137	19	18	75	17	8
Women as percent of total	8	5	0	9	12	12
Part-time, number	38	0	1	4	18	15
Women as percent of total	11	—	0	25	6	13
Net change, 1973-74 and 1974-75:						
Full-time, number	+26	-14	+4	+28	+6	+2
Women, number	+6	-1	0	+5	+2	0
Part-time, number	+9	-2	+1	+4	+5	+1
Women, number	+2	0	0	+1	0	+1

<sup>a</sup> Resignation, retirement, and nonrenewal of contracts.

primarily due to the fact that five women represented 18 percent of the net increase at the assistant professor level in the Chairman's Group, but the number of women at that level in the other departments actually decreased. It should be noted that there was a net increase of three women at the associate professor level in the other departments.

Considering part-time faculty for all departments, the new hires of women exceeded the number released by nineteen and was primarily at the "other" rank.

Most of this increase in part-time employment for women took place in departments that are not in the Chairman's Group.

The women employed as new hires for a given department this year tended to come less from other faculties, business, or government than did men, and to have come more from graduate students (Table 7). This is related to the fact discussed above that much of the increase in women hired has been for part-time jobs at lower faculty ranks. Among the women released

TABLE 7—PRIOR ACTIVITY OF NEW 1974-75 APPOINTMENTS AND PRESENT ACTIVITY OF "RELEASES" FOR 1973-74, BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT AND SEX

Departments Reporting by January 10, 1975, on 1974-75  
Universal Academic Questionnaire

Highest Degree Offered by Department and Activity of Faculty	New Hires in 1974- 75 <sup>a</sup> by Prior Year Activity		Those Released for 1974-75 by Present Activity <sup>a</sup>	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
	(In Percent)		(In Percent)	
All departments	100	100	100	100
<i>U.S.</i> business and industry	5	0	13	9
Fed./state government in United States	3	0	15	4
Outside United States	1	0	6	0
Faculty at another school	34	31	40	52
Graduate student	54	59	8	13
Research leave	0	3	4	9
Retired	1	0	7	0
Other	2	8	7	13
Chairman's Group				
<i>U.S.</i> business and industry	2	0	7	0
Fed./state government in United States	3	0	20	0
Outside United States	3	0	7	0
Faculty at another school	32	16	43	83
Graduate student	55	62	4	0
Research leave	0	6	7	0
Retired	2	0	7	0
Other	3	16	5	17
Ph.D., other				
<i>U.S.</i> business and industry	8	0	17	29
Fed./state government in United States	1	0	14	14
Outside United States	1	0	2	0
Faculty at another school	41	45	41	29
Graduate student	47	55	9	14
Research leave	0	0	3	0
Retired	0	0	9	0
Other	1	0	5	14
M.A.				
<i>U.S.</i> business and industry	8	0	21	0
Fed./state government in United States	5	0	3	0
Outside United States	0	0	3	0
Faculty at another school	32	33	45	0
Graduate student	55	66	15	0
Research leave	0	0	0	0
Retired	0	0	3	0
Other	0	0	9	0
B.A.				
<i>U.S.</i> business and industry	6	0	14	0
Fed./state government in United States	3	0	16	0
Outside United States	0	0	8	0
Faculty at another school	31	33	33	50
Graduate student	57	56	9	20
Research leave	1	0	2	20
Retired	0	0	7	0
Other	2	11	10	10

<sup>a</sup> Includes full-time and part-time faculty.

last year by the reporting departments, none had retired (compared with 7 percent retirees among the released men). Relatively fewer women than men who were released went to business or industry or to positions outside the United States, but relatively more women went to other faculty positions. This pattern is similar to that reported above for types of employment for women with new Ph.D.s.

The economics departments reporting were asked this year 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 below the median time at that rank for departmental faculty. Such estimates ignore how much the woman's salary is above or below the median. In these days when sex discrimination in pay is illegal, there undoubtedly is reluctance

to report lower salaries for women. Nevertheless, the data reported reflect the situation as seen by department chairpersons or their reporting agents. For all departments, 36 percent of the women faculty were reported to have salaries more than \$250 below the median (Table 8). When time in rank is also considered, 10 percent were below the median salary even though they were at or above the median time in rank. At the other end of the distribution, 20 percent of the women had salaries above the median with time in rank at or below the median time.

Women obtained 5 percent of all promotions (twelve of the 232), whereas they comprised 6 percent of all full-time faculty (Table 9). The promotions reported for women included one to professor and one to associate professor in the Chairman's Group (two out of sixty-nine, or nearly 3 percent), one to associate profes-

TABLE 8—RELATIVE SALARIES FOR RANK AND TIME IN RANK OF FEMALE FULL-TIME ECONOMISTS, 1974-75, BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT  
Departments Reporting by January 10, 1975, on 1974-75  
Universal Academic Questionnaire

Highest Degree Offered by Department and Relative Salary for Rank	All Women	Time in Rank		
		Above Median	At Median	Below Median
		(In Percent)		
All departments	100	24	33	43
Salary above median	31	19	6	8
Within \$250 of median	33	3	21	6
Salary below median	36	2	5	29
Ph.D., Chairman's Group	100	22	34	44
Salary above median	26	18	4	4
Within \$250 of median	28	2	20	6
Salary below median	46	2	10	34
Ph.D., other	100	12	19	69
Salary above median	23	4	4	11
Within \$250 of median	36	0	12	23
Salary below median	41	8	4	34
M.A.	100	39	33	28
Salary above median	50	39	6	6
Within \$250 of median	22	0	22	0
Salary below median	28	0	6	22
B.A.	100	26	36	38
Salary above median	39	20	9	9
Within \$250 of median	34	5	26	3
Salary below median	27	0	1	26

TABLE 9—PROMOTIONS AND TENURE DECISIONS FROM 1973-74 TO 1974-75  
BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT AND SEX

Departments Reporting by January 10, 1975, on 1974-75  
Universal Academic Questionnaire

Highest Degree Offered by Department and Rank	Promotions to Rank		Given Tenure at Rank	
	Total Number	Female as Percent of Total	Total Number	Female as Percent of Total
All departments	232	5	148	3
Professor	77	8	22	0
Associate professor	118	3	86	3
Assistant professor	36	3	35	3
Ph.D., Chairman's Group:				
Professor	29	3	8	0
Associate professor	40	2	30	0
Assistant professor	4	0	3	0
Ph.D., other:				
Professor	14	0	6	0
Associate professor	25	4	18	0
Assistant professor	5	0	4	0
M.A.:				
Professor	10	20	2	0
Associate professor	12	0	9	0
Assistant professor	2	0	8	0
B.A.:				
Professor	24	13	6	0
Associate professor	41	5	29	10
Assistant professor	25	4	20	5

sor in the other Ph.D.-granting departments, and six promotions in departments where a B.A. is the highest degree granted.

Effective affirmative action at the department level is probably more a matter of action by men of good will and sensitivity who try to act in good faith to open opportunities to women economists and to change traditional attitudes so as to offer better educational opportunities for women than it is a matter of coerced action. Undeniably, however, the threat of coercion has increased men's awareness. In some educational institutions, Affirmative Action (AA) offices at the central administrative level have been effective in increasing awareness of legal and moral responsibilities and in facilitating implementation of AA plans. At the department level, perception of the effectiveness of AA offices may well be a combination of the particular experiences of the economics de-

partment and a projection of the values of the department chairman or his agent who answers the questionnaire. In all, 71 percent of the departments were in institutions with AA offices (Table 10). Of these, 80 percent had been in some type of contact with the office. Of these, 55 percent found the AA office useful, 35 percent found it "not at all useful," and 10 percent found it a "damned nuisance." Among the Chairman's Group, all departments were in institutions with AA offices, and 91 percent had been in contact. Of these 35 percent found the AA office to be useful, 42 percent "not at all useful," and 23 percent, a "damned nuisance." Resentment of AA appears to be greater among department chairpersons in the Chairman's Group than in other departments of economics.

It is not often that authors of an article have a chance to quantify the proportion

TABLE 10—AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND ECONOMICS DEPARTMENTS, FALL 1974  
 Departments Reporting by January 10, 1975, on 1974-75  
 Universal Academic Questionnaire

Item	All Depart- ments	Highest Degree Offered			
		Ph.D.		MA	BA
		Chairman's Group	Other		
Number of departments reporting Departments in institutions with Af- firmative Action (AA) Office:	301	47	32	31	191
Number	213	47	25	30	111
Percent	71	100	78	97	58
Percent of departments in institu- tion with AA office who have been in contact with AA office	80	91	88	83	72
Percent in contact finding services of AA office—					
Very useful	11	12	22	10	8
Somewhat useful	44	23	39	59	68
Not at all useful	35	42	35	17	37
Damned nuisance	10	23	4	16	5
Percent of department heads who have read December 1973 <i>Amer. Econ.</i> <i>Rev.</i> article, "Combatting Role Prej- udice and Sex Discrimination"	41	49	41	67	38
Of these, percent who have used any of the suggestions of the ar- ticle	68	64	67	50	75

of department chairpersons who have read a given article. In the December 1973 issue of the *American Economic Review*, Kenneth E. Boulding and Barbara B. Reagan on behalf of this Committee wrote an article, "Combatting Role Prejudice and Sex Discrimination." (Informally among Committee members this article was referred to as

guidelines for good guys.) Over 40 percent of all department chairpersons and nearly 50 percent of the Chairman's Group reported that they had read this article, and 68 and 64 percent, respectively, said that they had used suggestions of the article.

BARBARA B. REAGAN, *Chairperson*