

Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

The American Economics Association (AEA) has charged the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP) with monitoring the position of women in the profession and with undertaking activities to improve that position. This report presents information on the position of women graduate students and faculty in academic economics departments and reports on the committee's activities during 1998.

Women Economists in and from Ph.D.-Granting Departments

For the past six years, CSWEP has worked on making and developing contacts in all (118) of the Ph.D.-granting economics departments in the United States. One of the tasks of CSWEP representatives in these institutions is to report on the status of women in their departments. In order to facilitate that reporting, a one-page questionnaire is sent every September to each representative to fill out and return by the end of November. Using its representatives, CSWEP has been able to acquire more complete and accurate data than is available currently through the AEA Universal Academic Questionnaire (UAQ), which is also mailed each fall to all department chairs.¹ The five most recent surveys for which results are complete and tabulated allow for a five-year trend analysis of the status of women graduate students, job applicants, and faculty members in Ph.D.-granting economics departments in the United States.

Information from the CSWEP Questionnaire on the Status of Women Graduate Students in Economics.—Table 1 provides information on the percentage of students who are female at various stages of their graduate

¹ CSWEP's sample contains only U.S. economics departments, while that of the AEA UAQ includes a few non-U.S. economics departments. The most recent versions of the AEA UAQ is much shorter and has received a much greater response rate.

careers. In 1993, 30.5 percent of all first-year students were women. In 1997, that percentage increased slightly to 31.3 percent. In 1993, 27.2 percent of all ABD students ("all but dissertation" completed) were women. In 1997, that percentage had decreased slightly to 26.8 percent. In 1993, the percentage of students earning a Ph.D. who were women was 24.2, and in 1997, that figure was up slightly to 25.0 percent. Overall, the attrition rate is small for female graduate students. Table 2 has the same set of percentages for the top 20 economics departments in the country.² There are a few discernable patterns in this table. First, all of the percentages of students who are women at various points in their graduate studies are lower than those found in Table 1. Second, although a smaller percentage of students who are women enter these programs, on average, a higher proportion of women graduate. Table 3 presents the same percentages for the top 10 economics departments in the United States.³ The one obvious trend is that over the last three years the percentage of students who are women graduating with a degree in economics has fallen off noticeably. In addition, all of the percentages are smaller than those found in Table 2, suggesting that the percentages of students who are women in the graduate programs of the top 10 departments are smaller than those at the remaining 10 schools in the top 20. In turn, the percentages of students who are

² The top 20 departments are Brown University, University of California-Berkeley, University of California-Los Angeles, University of California-San Diego, University of Chicago, Columbia University, Cornell University, Harvard University, University of Maryland, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, New York University, Northwestern University, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, University of Rochester, Stanford University, University of Wisconsin, and Yale University.

³ The top 10 economics departments are University of California-Los Angeles, University of Chicago, Columbia University, Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Minnesota, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, Stanford University, and Yale University.

TABLE 1—PERCENTAGE FEMALE FOR ALL DEPARTMENTS, 1993–1997

Pipeline	1993 (n = 81)	1994 (n = 111)	1995 (n = 95)	1996 (n = 98)	1997 (n = 95)
Graduate school					
First year	30.5	29.0	30.5	30.5	31.3
ABD	27.2	25.7	27.8	28.3	26.8
Ph.D.	24.2	26.8	23.2	24.1	25.0
Overall	27.7	27.4	27.8	28.2	27.7
Job market					
Academic Ph.D.	35.0	28.4	25.9	20.2	20.2
Academic non-Ph.D.	25.8	35.7	34.7	26.4	35.5
Public sector	31.1	25.8	28.7	29.5	35.5
Private sector	24.2	27.7	20.5	28.0	34.6
Non-U.S. academic	19.4	25.2	19.7	21.1	19.6
Non-U.S. nonacademic	13.6	12.3	11.9	16.7	8.6
No job	20.0	17.5	15.6	28.0	19.9
Overall	25.5	25.5	23.0	24.5	25.4
Academe					
Non-tenure-track full-time (U)	30.4	25.2	39.2	50.8	38.0
Non-tenure-track full-time (T)	16.7	6.8	13.3	0.0	0.0
Assistant professors (U)	24.0	22.9	24.2	23.8	26.0
Assistant professors (T)	34.6	24.5	11.8	30.8	17.9
Associate professors (U)	7.4	6.4	14.1	9.1	11.1
Associate professors (T)	14.5	13.6	12.9	15.4	13.4
Full professors (U)	12.1	2.9	0.0	18.2	0.0
Full professors (T)	6.7	6.3	7.5	8.4	6.5
Overall	13.5	12.0	13.3	14.8	13.0

Notes: U = untenured; T = tenured. The number of departments reporting (n) is given at the top of each column.

women at various stages of graduate education in economics at the top 20 departments are less than those found at all the otherwise-ranked departments in the United States.

Information from the CSWEP Questionnaire on the Status of Women Job Applicants in Economics.—The fate of women in the job market is reflected in the averages found in the second section of Tables 1–3. As presented in Table 1, 35 percent of the jobs in Ph.D.-granting departments went to newly minted female Ph.D.'s in 1993. In sharp contrast, that percentage fell to 20.2 percent in 1997. Female Ph.D.'s received more than their fair share of new job offers in 1993, but they received less than their fair share in 1997. While women were receiving disproportionately fewer jobs at non-Ph.D.-granting departments in 1993, they were receiving disproportionately more in 1997.

In terms of public-sector and private-sector jobs, female Ph.D.'s in economics found a larger proportion of the new jobs in both sectors than did their male counterparts. In contrast, a disproportionately smaller percentage of novice female economists took non-U.S. jobs. Similarly, a disproportionately smaller percentage of female Ph.D.'s did not find a job.

Women graduating from the top 20 departments, as indicated by the percentages found in Tables 2 and 3, did not meet with more success. While the overall trends are the same as those found for the aggregate, they are exaggerated. For example, in 1993, recent female graduates from the top 10 departments received 27.8 percent of the new jobs in Ph.D.-granting departments and only 9.3 percent in 1997, as compared to the overall figures of 35.0 percent and 20.2 percent, respectively. Moreover, the percentage of women from the

TABLE 2—PERCENTAGE FEMALE FOR THE TOP 20 DEPARTMENTS, 1993–1997

Pipeline	1993 (n = 18)	1994 (n = 20)	1995 (n = 19)	1996 (n = 19)	1997 (n = 17)
Graduate school					
First year	21.9	27.8	26.1	30.2	21.5
ABD	23.4	22.6	26.8	26.4	28.6
Ph.D.	25.4	28.4	21.8	22.7	24.9
Overall	23.4	26.3	25.7	26.6	26.4
Job Market					
Academic Ph.D.	30.8	24.4	19.4	19.2	11.1
Academic non-Ph.D.	25.0	31.0	57.1	42.3	54.3
Public sector	26.9	25.6	20.4	32.5	47.5
Private sector	29.0	20.0	23.5	25.9	27.3
Non-U.S. Academic	16.7	29.3	15.2	9.8	15.2
Non-U.S. nonacademic	20.0	0.0	11.8	20.0	4.4
No job	16.7	12.8	11.8	31.2	27.5
Overall	24.9	22.1	20.7	24.7	26.1
Academe					
Non-tenure-track full-time (U)	40.0	19.0	57.1	50.0	39.1
Non-tenure-track full-time (T)	12.5	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Assistant professors (U)	20.4	18.9	17.5	18.2	17.8
Assistant professors (T)	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3
Associate professors (U)	5.0	5.0	5.9	0.0	7.7
Associate professors (T)	9.0	10.7	12.1	16.7	16.0
Full professors (U)	12.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Full professors (T)	3.8	4.2	5.4	5.5	5.9
Overall	10.3	9.4	11.1	11.1	11.0

Notes: U = untenured; T = tenured. The number of departments reporting (n) is given at the top of each column.

top 10 departments who found jobs in non-Ph.D.-granting institutions increased from 30.8 percent in 1993 to 42.9 percent in 1997. The second-tier departments act more like the remaining otherwise-ranked schools than do the top 10 departments. Nonetheless, there seems to be an overall trend, more pronounced at the top 10 departments, for women who are receiving Ph.D.'s disproportionately to find jobs in non-Ph.D.-granting institutions.

In terms of the public sector versus the private sector, the overall percentages indicate that women are receiving a disproportionately large share of both public and private jobs. However, women graduating from the top 20 departments are receiving a disproportionately large number of the public-sector jobs, indicating that a disproportionately large number of women graduating from the remaining tiers are finding jobs in the private sector. In contrast, a disproportionately large number of jobs

abroad are going to men in each tier and in the aggregate. Finally, while a smaller percentage of women are left with no job in the aggregate, a larger percentage of women graduating from the top 20 departments are left with no job.

Information from the CSWEP Questionnaire on Women Faculty in Economics.—Overall, as demonstrated in Table 1, the proportion of faculty who are women in non-tenure-track full-time jobs without tenure at Ph.D.-granting departments increased significantly over the past five years from 30.4 percent in 1993 to 50.8 percent in 1996 and back down to 38.0 percent in 1997. The percentage of assistant professors without tenure who are women is approximately equal to that of those earning a Ph.D.: 24–26 percent. However, a disproportionately large number of assistant professors who are women are not promoted to the associate-professor rank. The

TABLE 3—PERCENTAGE FEMALE FOR THE TOP 10 DEPARTMENTS, 1993–1997

Pipeline	1993 (n = 8)	1994 (n = 10)	1995 (n = 9)	1996 (n = 9)	1997 (n = 8)
Graduate school					
First year	19.5	23.8	24.5	26.5	20.3
ABD	20.0	20.2	24.1	23.9	25.0
Ph.D.	22.8	27.9	19.6	18.6	16.5
Overall	20.4	23.8	23.4	23.4	22.5
Job market					
Academic Ph.D.	27.8	20.5	17.2	19.6	9.3
Academic non-Ph.D.	30.8	16.7	57.1	30.8	42.9
Public sector	13.6	17.4	24.0	21.1	45.5
Private sector	32.0	21.1	23.8	25.0	27.3
Non-U.S. academic	21.4	36.0	12.5	12.0	11.8
Non-U.S. nonacademic	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	7.7
No job	14.3	14.8	5.6	28.9	26.5
Overall	22.9	20.0	18.1	22.6	23.0
Academe					
Non-tenure-track full-time (U)	33.3	21.5	50.0	45.5	44.4
Non-tenure-track full-time (T)	12.5	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Assistant professors (U)	22.5	18.8	14.1	21.1	20.0
Assistant professors (T)	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Associate professors (U)	6.7	6.7	6.7	0.0	12.5
Associate professors (T)	20.0	18.6	12.0	20.0	12.5
Full professors (U)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Full professors (T)	3.5	2.9	4.7	5.3	5.0
Overall	10.7	10.2	8.9	11.9	10.9

Notes: U = untenured; T = tenured. The number of departments reporting (n) is given at the top of each column.

percentage of associate professors who are women is only 13 percent. Similarly, the percentage of full professors who are women with tenure has not improved much over the past five years, remaining at around 6 percent. The percentage of faculty who are women holding appointments at the 118 Ph.D.-producing departments is 13 percent.

Table 2 exhibits the same trends as those illustrated in Table 1, but they are once again more pronounced. There are larger percentages of women in non-tenure-track full-time positions. The percentages of assistant, associate, and full professors who are women at the top 20 departments are all less than those of otherwise-ranked institutions.

The availability of women to serve the economics profession in academic institutions and in the public and private sectors depends on the pipeline of women being trained in economics departments around the country and on

their chances of being successful, receiving tenure, and getting a promotion. The data that CSWEP has collected indicates that women have hit a glass ceiling in academia. This information suggests that, while the pipeline of graduate students is flowing at about a 25–27-percent rate, the flow of women into the research positions at top Ph.D.-granting institutions is diminishing, and the flow into small state and private liberal-arts colleges and universities is increasing. While a greater percentage of young female economists are going into public and private careers outside of academia, there is no reason to suspect that they are being any more successful.

The Committee's Activities

CSWEP Ongoing Activities.—CSWEP is involved in a wide range of activities to help promote women in the profession and to

increase the probability that they will be successful. As part of its ongoing efforts to increase the participation of women on the AEA program, CSWEP organized six sessions for the January 1999 ASSA meetings. Catherine Eckel and Maureen Cropper organized three sessions on gender-related issues, and Henry Farber and Joyce Jacobsen organized three sessions on non-gender-related issues in labor economics. In addition, CSWEP organized a roundtable discussion on "Furthering Women's Careers in Economics: It Takes a Grant?" to highlight its efforts to further the careers of women economists over the last year. CSWEP also will hold a business meeting to report to its associates and other interested AEA members about its activities and to hear suggestions from those present for future activities. To encourage networking and to support junior women meeting senior women, a hospitality suite will be provided every morning and afternoon at the meeting; the suite will be staffed by members of the Committee.

New CSWEP Initiatives.—Last year's meeting was particularly important for CSWEP. We celebrated the 25th anniversary of its founding, initiated a new mentoring program, and created two national awards for women economists. The 25th-anniversary celebration was celebrated in grand style. The originally appointed members of CSWEP were invited to come and talk about the events that led up to the creation of CSWEP. Walter Adams, Carolyn Shaw Bell, Francine Blau, Colette Moser, Barbara Reagan, and Myra Strober were all present. Kenneth Boulding and Phyllis Wallace were the two deceased members of the original committee. John Kenneth Galbraith who was president of the AEA and an ex officio member of the original committee was not present either. In addition, every past and present member of CSWEP was invited to attend the birthday party. Over 75 past and present board members were present.

The second initiative was a team-mentoring program, "CCOFFE: Creating Career Opportunities for Female Economists," which was funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF). The purpose of the initiative is to increase the chances of earning tenure for

women economists in the pipeline. The first two-day CCOFFE workshop took place after the national meetings. The workshop brought eight senior women economists and 40 junior women economists from the top universities to work cooperatively on each other's projects as teams. In addition, there are sessions on publishing, grant-writing, networking, and balancing life choices.

Andrea Ziegert (Denison University) and KimMarie McGoldrick (University of Richmond) helped with the logistics of the workshop. Beth Allen (University of Minnesota), Rebecca Blank (Northwestern University), Elizabeth Hoffman (University of Illinois at Chicago), Beth Ingram (University of Iowa), Kala Krishna (Pennsylvania State University), Marjorie McElroy (Duke University), Valerie Ramey (University of California-San Diego), and Michelle White (University of Michigan) served as senior mentors. Kathryn Anderson (Vanderbilt University), Hali Edison (Federal Reserve), Barbara Fraumeni (Northeastern University), Joni Hersch (University of Wyoming), Joyce Jacobsen (Wesleyan University), Daphne Kenyon (Simmons College), Arleen Leibowitz (University of California-Los Angeles), and Susan Pozo (Western Michigan University) served as facilitators. A CCOFFE reunion is scheduled for the 1999 meetings.

Finally, two national awards for women economists will be given at the 1999 AEA meeting for the first time. Barbara Fraumeni organized the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award. This award will be given to a woman who has furthered the status of women in the economics profession, through her example, through her achievements, through increasing our understanding of how women can advance through the economics professions, or through her mentoring of other women. Catherine Eckel headed up another committee that founded the Elaine Bennett Research Award. This award was given in memory of Elaine Bennett and was generously funded by her husband William Zame (University of California-Los Angeles). The prize is intended to recognize and honor outstanding research by a young woman in any area of economics. The recipient will give a 45-minute lecture after CSWEP has a brief business meeting.

CSWEP's Regional Activities.—To assist women in the profession who cannot make it to national meetings, CSWEP organizes sessions at the Eastern, Southern, Midwest, and Western Economic Association meetings. As at the national meetings, sessions are on gender-related research and on a non-gender-related field to showcase the work of younger women economists. CSWEP is increasing its efforts to broaden the base of its organization by encouraging a closer liaison between the regional governing boards and the formation of regional CSWEP committees to attend to the work of the region associations.

Andrea Ziegert and Susan Pozo organized a CCOFFE workshop for the Midwest Economic Association meeting in Chicago in March. Beth Allen (University of Minnesota), Marianne Ferber (University of Illinois), and Jean Kimmel (W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research) served as senior women for the junior women at this workshop. Andrea Ziegert, KimMarie McGoldrick, and Catherine Eckel organized a CCOFFE workshop at the Southern Economic Association meeting in Baltimore in November. Beth Allen (University of Minnesota), Barbara Bergmann (University of Maryland and American University), Catherine Eckel (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University), Nancy Lutz (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University), Jennifer Reinganum (Vanderbilt University), and Eugenia Toma (National Science Foundation and University of Kentucky) served as senior women for the junior women at this workshop. Similar workshops are planned for the Eastern and Western Economic Association meetings next year. By the end of 1999 the NSF/AEA-CSWEP CCOFFE workshops will have increased the chances of over 100 junior women economists to earn tenure within the next six years.

Several Words of Thanks

The Committee thanks several people who have made major contributions to its effort. First, CSWEP thanks all the former chairs and board members who made extra efforts to attend the 25th-Anniversary celebration and

made it such an historic and special event to so many people. The efforts and commitments of these people laid the foundation for CSWEP to embark upon its next 25 years of promoting the interest of women in the economics profession. Second, CSWEP thanks all of the senior women who helped with the CCOFFE workshops and the junior women who participated in them. Everyone gave of their talents and expertise in the first concerted effort to catapult women into the upper ranks of the academy.

As always Joan Haworth, the Membership Secretary, and her staff have served CSWEP well by maintaining the Roster, sending out annual membership reminders, and creating customized listings for potential employers.

Four CSWEP members will leave at the end of 1998. Daphne Kenyon has served tirelessly, writing the mission statement and policies for CSWEP sessions and organizing the upcoming Eastern Economic Association CCOFFE workshop with Barbara Fraumeni. Joyce Jacobsen has also served the Committee well. She kept the newsletter on target with helpful reminders of due dates of promised articles. She too helped write the CSWEP session policy statement with Daphne Kenyon. Both Daphne and Barbara hosted a CSWEP meeting in Boston and served as facilitators at the national CCOFFE workshop. Olivia Mitchell hosted one of our meetings at Wharton and served as a general adviser to the Chair. Her insights were always appreciated. Hali Edison (Federal Reserve) served not only as a regular committee member but also as our U.K. representative. She helped solidify connections to our British counterparts, allowing CSWEP to officially go international. Hali also arranged for the committee to meet at the Fed for one of its meetings and served as a facilitator at the national CCOFFE workshop. Finally, Susan Pozo took on the task of organizing the first regional CCOFFE workshop. She also took the lead on maternity issues and providing the board with information on what is done around the country. All of these committee members also organized sessions for the national meetings and edited an issue of the Newsletter. All of them deserve our deepest thanks for a job well done.

Finally, CSWEP thanks Sally Scheiderer for keeping the Committee and all of its paper and

cyber work on track. Denison University, the Department of Economics, the Department of Women's Studies, and the Laura C. Harris Chair have all contributed to the work of CSWEP with office space, paper, telephones, and postage. Mary Winer and her staff at the AEA offices also deserve a word of thanks for all of their help with budgets and general information. Marlene Hight was also a tremen-

dous help in arranging for meeting rooms at the national meetings and with the logistics of the national CCOFFE workshop. All of these people have been wonderful to work with, and the Committee could not have been as successful and productive as it was without their dedication.

ROBIN L. BARTLETT, *Chair*