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

The participation of women faculty in the academic community remains on the same plateau it reached at the beginning of the last decade of the 20th century. Today's data on faculty composition from all the respondents in Ph.D.-granting institutions show that the female proportion of new Ph.D.'s is approximately 27 percent, while 31 percent of the economists reported to have obtained jobs in the United States this past year were women. However, the proportion of women among assistant professors in these institutions is lower by about 4 percentage points (at 23 percent). Women comprise approximately 17 percent of all tenured associate professors and are now about 9 percent of all full professors in these schools. To further illustrate the serious shortfalls that exist in the Ph.D.-granting institutions, the liberalarts colleges report that approximately 40 percent of the assistant professors, 34 percent of associate professors, and 14 percent of full professors in those reporting schools are women. This past year about 26 percent of Ph.D.'s in economics who obtained jobs in Ph.D.-granting institutions were women, and about 42 percent of those hired by liberal-arts colleges were women.

The dynamics of these numbers, however, tell us even more about what is happening to women economists once they have joined the academic workplace. More women entering the academic arena as assistant professors take positions at a Ph.D.-granting institution that is not among the top 20 or go to liberal-arts colleges. Additionally, the proportion of women among tenured faculty at the associate and full professor level is highest among the lower 10 of the top $20 \mathrm{Ph} . \mathrm{D}$. granting institutions ( 16 percent) and the liberal-arts colleges (21 percent). ${ }^{1}$

[^0]These numbers are described in detail in the rest of this report, as are the activities of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession that focused on improving women's professional careers.

## The Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP)

CSWEP is a standing committee of the American Economic Association (AEA), with a charter to monitor the position of women in the profession and undertake professional activities to improve their position. Formed 30 years ago, the committee has continued to monitor the status of women economists and has provided opportunities for women to come together in ways that focus on the interests of women and help to improve their status. In addition to maintaining a directory of women economists, with information on their major fields, current addresses, and their employment status, CSWEP activities have mentored and promoted women within economics through sponsored sessions at the AEA's annual meetings and the annual meetings of the four regional economics associations. CSWEP provides opportunities for women to gather and discuss issues of common concern and uses its newsletter to disseminate a steady flow of advice and information on issues such as publishing, teaching, and funding.

## Data on Women Economists

## Status of Women in Economics

As noted above, data collected by CSWEP this year showed that women economists continue to be a substantial minority in academic economics departments and are a smaller share of the tenured faculty at the full professor level than would be predicted by the share of Ph.D. degrees women earned in the past 20 years. These data supplement data that CSWEP has presented on the status of women economists each year in the American Economic Review,
using data from the AEA's Universal Academic Questionnaire, the CSWEP survey data obtained from CSWEP contacts and representatives at Ph.D.-granting economics departments in the United States, and recently, the CSWEP survey data obtained from questionnaires sent to more than 100 liberal-arts colleges. Past CSWEP reports noted the increase in the share of assistant professor positions held by women in Ph.D.granting institutions-from approximately 7 percent in 1974 to 21 percent nearly 20 years later (1992). ${ }^{2}$ In 1993, the CSWEP survey reported an increase in the proportion of women at the assistant-professor level in Ph.D.-granting institutions to about 24 percent, but that share has not changed significantly since that time, and it is currently 23 percent.

Since the early 1990's, the proportion of women among tenured associate professors increased slightly, from about 14 percent to 17 percent in 2002. ${ }^{3}$ The share of women among tenured full professors is still less than 10 percent but has increased from about 6 percent in 1994. Overall, women are nearly 11 percent of all tenured faculty in Ph.D.-granting institutions.

Data in 2002 for the top 10 Ph. D.-granting institutions show a different picture when compared to the data for all Ph.D.-granting institutions. ${ }^{4}$ The share women hold among the top ten Ph.D.-granting schools' assistant professors is only 16 percent-less than the share women hold in all Ph.D.-granting institutions (at 23 percent) and less than their share in liberal-arts colleges (at 40 percent). Women's share of tenured positions among the top ten is approximately 7 percent-less than half their 16.2percent share of tenured positions in the next ten Ph.D.-granting institutions and also lower than

[^1]women's 11-percent share of tenured positions in all Ph.D.-granting institutions. ${ }^{5}$ The largest proportion of women among tenured faculty (21 percent) occurs in liberal-arts colleges.

These data illustrate the fact that women are not represented at the same rate among the new hires into the Ph.D.-granting institutions as their representation among the job-seekers, nor are they represented at similar rates in the higher faculty ranks. There is an approximate 5-percentage-point gap between the proportion of women among the U.S. job-seekers (31 percent) and those hired into the research institutions ( 26 percent). This gap is smaller among the top 10 departments (1 percent) and the same for the top 20 departments. When women become faculty members, however, their share of associate professor positions is still lower than their representation among assistant professors, even when one takes account of the increase in the proportion of women with Ph.D.'s in economics. This leakage in the pipeline is of serious concern.

## Graduate Student Progress

The 1990's showed a steady increase in the proportion of women in $\mathrm{Ph} . \mathrm{D}$. programs and in the proportion of women completing their doctoral degrees. These numbers, however, peaked in 1999-2000. In 2002 women comprised 34 percent of all first-year students, down from 39 percent in 2000. Twenty-seven percent of those who completed their degree in 2002 were women, as compared to a high of 34 percent in 1999. Even given the 5-7 years it takes for most students to complete the doctoral requirements, the entering classes would have yielded 30 percent among the graduates in 2002 if women had graduated at the same rate as male students.

The pipeline of graduate students from the top 20 Ph. D.-granting programs rose from 28 percent female to 32 percent between 1994 and 2002. The graduating classes' proportion of women dropped from 28 percent to 25 percent in that same period. The proportion of women

[^2]

Figure 1. Female Faculty at All Ph.D.-Granting Universities, 1994-2002
Notes:"T" denotes tenured; "U" denotes untenured.
among the first-year students at the top 10 Ph.D.-granting programs rose from 24 percent in 1994 to 29 percent in 2002. The women's share of new Ph.D.'s from these programs fluctuated downward from 28 percent in 1994 to 17 percent in 1997 and then rose to more than 30 percent in 2001 and was reported to be at 26 percent in 2002. The graduate classes of the top 10 and the top 20 schools did not provide the increase in women economists that the other schools produced during the nine-year period of fairly steady growth. The gap in graduation rates is the largest among those students who are in the second tier of the top 20 institutions. ${ }^{6}$ This leakage is another area of concern for women economists.

## Job-Market Decisions

In the past two decades the concern was that women with new Ph.D.'s were choosing nonacademic positions at a higher rate than graduating men. This is still true today. But it is also

[^3]clear that women are still not entering the Ph.D.-granting institutions at the same rate as men. Since 1995 the proportion of women hired into Ph.D.-granting institutions remained approximately the same (at about 25 percent) while the proportion of women in other academic positions increased, and the proportion of women among those hired into publicand private-sectors jobs was $5-10$ percent higher than among those hired into academic positions.

This year's job-market survey showed that women were 31 percent of those job-seekers who obtained a U.S. academic position in 2002 but were only 26 percent of those obtaining a position in a Ph.D.-granting institution. Women were 42 percent of the new hires in non-Ph.D. granting institutions. As shown in Figure 2, women were a larger share of the public-sector positions filled ( 35 percent) than their presence among new Ph.D.'s this year ( 27 percent) and a slightly larger proportion among students taking private-sector positions (29 percent). Women graduates were more likely to take a position in a non-Ph.D.-granting institution or a public- or private-sector organization than a position in a Ph.D.-granting institution.

Table 1—The Percentage of Economists in the Pipeline Who Are Female

| Position | Percentage female |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
| All Ph.D.-Granting Departments: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First-year students | 29.0 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 31.3 | 32.2 | 35.6 | 38.8 | 31.9 | 33.9 |
| ABD | 25.7 | 27.8 | 28.3 | 26.8 | 28.2 | 33.0 | 32.3 | 30.2 | 30.6 |
| New Ph.D. | 26.8 | 23.2 | 24.1 | 25.0 | 29.9 | 34.2 | 28.0 | 29.4 | 27.2 |
| Assistant Professor | 22.9 | 24.2 | 23.8 | 26.0 | 25.9 | 27.8 | 21.4 | 22.5 | 23.2 |
| Associate Professor (U) | 6.4 | 14.1 | 9.1 | 11.1 | 15.9 | 27.3 | 17.2 | 10.0 | 17.2 |
| Associate Professor (T) | 13.6 | 12.9 | 15.4 | 13.4 | 14.0 | 15.1 | 16.2 | 15.3 | 17.0 |
| Full Professor (T) | 6.3 | 7.5 | 8.4 | 6.5 | 6.1 | 6.5 | 7.4 | 5.8 | 8.9 |
| Number of departments: | 111 | 95 | 98 | 95 | 92 | 77 | 76 | 69 | 83 |
| Top 10 Ph.D.-Granting Departments: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First-year students | 23.8 | 24.5 | 26.5 | 20.3 | 27.2 | 29.6 | 29.5 | 26.9 | 28.5 |
| ABD | 20.2 | 24.1 | 23.9 | 25.0 | 22.0 | 25.2 | 25.2 | 26.6 | 27.0 |
| New Ph.D. | 27.9 | 19.6 | 18.6 | 16.5 | 25.9 | 24.3 | 23.0 | 30.5 | 25.7 |
| Assistant Professor | 18.8 | 14.1 | 21.1 | 20.0 | 17.7 | 14.7 | 18.2 | 18.8 | 15.8 |
| Associate Professor (U) | 6.7 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 36.4 | 45.5 | 30.8 | 13.3 | 7.7 |
| Associate Professor (T) | 18.6 | 12.0 | 20.0 | 12.5 | 7.7 | 28.6 | 36.4 | 23.5 | 28.6 |
| Full Professor (T) | 2.9 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 3.65 | 3.9 | 7.1 | 6.3 | 5.6 |
| Number of departments: | 10 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 9 |
| Top 20 Ph.D.-Granting Departments: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First-year students | 27.8 | 26.1 | 30.2 | 21.5 | 28.8 | 31.1 | 32.8 | 30.5 | 31.9 |
| ABD | 22.6 | 26.8 | 26.4 | 28.6 | 24.1 | 25.4 | 26.2 | 27.2 | 27.2 |
| New Ph.D. | 28.4 | 21.8 | 22.7 | 24.9 | 27.1 | 28.1 | 24.6 | 26.8 | 24.7 |
| Assistant Professor | 18.9 | 17.5 | 18.2 | 17.8 | 16.4 | 21.6 | 17.7 | 18.8 | 21.5 |
| Associate Professor (U) | 5.0 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 36.4 | 46.2 | 26.7 | 13.3 | 13.3 |
| Associate Professor (T) | 10.7 | 12.1 | 16.7 | 16.0 | 8.3 | 16.3 | 12.8 | 19.6 | 22.9 |
| Full Professor (T) | 4.2 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 5.9 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 7.4 | 7.0 | 9.0 |
| Number of departments: | 20 | 19 | 19 | 17 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 18 | 18 |

Note: $\mathrm{ABD}=$ "all but dissertation."

There are some differences in the type of job obtained by graduates from the top 10 economics departments, compared to the entire group of job-seeking new Ph.D.'s. About 60 percent of students in the top 10 economics departments obtained jobs in U.S. Ph.D.-granting academic institutions, and an additional 6 percent of those graduates obtained a position in some other academic institution. About 56 percent of the job-seekers from the rest of the top 20 economics departments obtain jobs in academic institutions, including 17 percent in non-Ph.D.-granting institutions. However, only 42 percent of the entire Ph.D. class of job-seekers last year found a position in a Ph.D.-granting institution, and another 18 percent found positions in other
U.S. academic institutions. The rest of the graduates were hired into public- or privatesector positions.

## Cohort Institutions from 1995 to 2001

It might be thought that the fact that the institutions that report each year are not always identical could have affected these results. We can restrict the data to the institutions that are in the CSWEP sample from 1995 to the present in order to avoid the contamination of a changing sample each year. These data show a slight decline in the composition of assistant professors from 1995 ( 23 percent) to the present ( 22 percent) and an increase in female composition


Figure 2. Percentage Female by Job-Market Sector
at the associate- and full-professor levels. The patterns and the numbers are not significantly different from those shown in the above subsection on the status of women in the field of economics. Unlike most other social sciences, women have not increased substantially their representation among faculty at research institutions in a way that is consistent with the increase in women's enrollments in graduate economics programs.

The data in Figure 3 show improvement at the associate professor rank among institutions that have reported continuously in the past seven years but a leveling off at the full professor rank. The participation of women at the assistant professor rank is still not as high as it was four or more years ago, consistent with the patterns shown when all reporting institutions are included.

## Women in Liberal Arts Colleges

As the data above indicate, women were more likely to take positions in academic positions that were not in Ph.D.-granting departments. Approximately 42 percent of those taking this type of academic position were women. CSWEP surveyed faculty in liberal-arts col-
leges this year and found that assistant professors are 40 -percent female and tenured associate professors are 34-percent female. Approximately 14 percent of the full professors are women.

## Expected Distribution of Women on Graduate Faculty

Following the same simulation methodology described in Rebecca Blank's report in 1994, we find that the expected female proportion of associate professors, if decisions to advance assistants to associate rank have not decreased in recent years, would be approximately 20 percent and the full professor ranks would be about 9 -percent female. The latter is consistent with the actual data, but advancement to the tenured associate professor rank has lagged for women. These models suggest that women are not advancing to the associate professor rank, but once they make that transition, they have moved into the full professor position as projected.

## Conclusions

Women are not participating in research faculties at the level we would predict from their


Figure 3. Cohort Summary: Female Ph.D. Students, Graduates, and Faculty, All Ph.D.-Granting Universities
Notes: The sample is restricted to institutions that have reported continuously since 1995. "T" denotes tenured; "U" denotes untenured.
graduation from Ph.D.-granting institutions. Women graduated from the programs at a slightly lower rate than they entered the programs and continued to drop out of the research academic community at each level. Over the past decade, women's share of full professor positions has remained below 10 percent, despite the fact that they have been between 13 percent and 17 percent of tenured associate professor positions for the past nine years. Projections based upon assumptions concerning the time it takes to advance from one rank to another, in light of the promotion and tenure decisions made, suggest that the share of associate professor positions would have been between 3 percent and 10 percent higher than it was in 2002.

## The Committee's Activities

## CSWEP Ongoing Activities

CSWEP continues to work to provide opportunities for women economists to earn tenure, promotion, and recognition in economics. Committee members edited three CSWEP Newsletter issues in 2002. The winter Newsletter,
co-edited with KimMarie McGoldrick, focused on the economics of gender by incorporating versions of the research presented at the ASSA meetings in CSWEP-sponsored sessions. Caren Grown co-edited the spring Newsletter, which focused on work done in research institutes as well as sources of funding for various research efforts. The articles in the fall Newsletter, coedited by Rachel Willis, provided articles on the value of mentoring in nonacademic markets and the legal issues of pay equity and sexual harassment. These newsletters also provide information on upcoming regional and national association meetings, calls for papers, and news about women economists' accomplishments.

The Board continues to be concerned with ways to encourage and support women graduate students and seeks to identify and develop a network for the graduates each year. In addition, the committee maintains a roster of the more than 4,000 women economists with whom we currently have contact. This roster is available to potential employers and professional groups in electronic form to assist in recruiting and selecting women economists. Approximately half of the women economists in this group are faculty in academic institutions, and the rest are
working in private- and public-sector positions. This year we moved the CSWEP web site 〈www. cswep.org〉 from a university server that changed each time the chair changed to the AEA's server. The web site was redesigned, thanks in large part to Claudia Goldin's efforts and guidance, and serves as a wonderful resource for all of us to learn of new opportunities for women economists.

As part of its ongoing efforts to increase the participation of women on the AEA program, CSWEP members organized six sessions for the January 2002 ASSA meetings. Robert Pollak organized three sessions on gender-related issues, and Bronwyn Hall organized three sessions on Technology and Innovation. CSWEP held its usual business meeting in which reports were made to its associates and other interested AEA members concerning its activities, and suggestions were heard from those present for future activities.

During the 2002 business meeting the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award was presented to Francine Blau, Frances Perkins Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University and Marianne Ferber, Professor Emerita, Department of Economics at the University of Illinois. Both of these women have had outstanding careers as economists and were founding members of organizations that were focused on women's issues. Both have written on the economic status of women and have been instrumental in bringing the gender issue into the mainstream of economic research. Fran Blau was a founding member of CSWEP and on the original board. Marianne Ferber wrote one of the first books on Feminist Economics. Both were cited by those recommending them for their willingness to mentor others and their abilities as researchers and teachers. These economists are excellent representatives of this award, which is given annually 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. The winner of that prize receives not only the public recognition for her accomplishments but is also given a $2^{\prime} \times 3^{\prime}$ plaque with her name and that of previous win-
ners on it to display prominently at her place of work.

The business meeting also served as a forum for a discussion of future workshops to continue the mentoring program begun with the CCOFFE program ("Creating Career Opportunities for Female Economists"). This year the Committee, under the leadership of Rachel Croson, Janet Currie, KimMarie McGoldrick, and Fran Blau completed a proposal for funding the continuation of mentoring opportunities as part of our continued commitment to the promotion of women in economics. The proposal is now being considered by various funding agencies, and we hope to be able to solicit participants by the middle of the summer of 2003. To encourage networking and to support junior women meeting senior women, our hospitality suite was staffed every morning and afternoon at the annual meeting by members of the Committee and staff.

## CSWEP's Regional Activities

CSWEP's regional representatives also organized sessions at each of the regional association meetings-including the Eastern, Southern, Midwest, and Western Economic Association. The work of our regional representatives has been substantial this year. Our thanks go to Jean Kimmel in the Midwest, Rachel Croson in the East, Rachel Willis in the South, and Janet Currie in the West, for their excellent programs and efforts to help women economists in their region maintain and grow their professional networks. Abstracts of the papers presented at these association meetings are presented in the Newsletter each year. CSWEP continues its efforts to reach women economists throughout the country by encouraging regional activities by all associates and their representative.

## Several Words of Thanks

The CSWEP Board thanks particularly the President of the AEA, Robert Lucas, and the Secretary-Treasurer, John Siegfried, and his staff, especially Edda Leithner and Norma Ayres, for their continued support and commitment to CSWEP and its mission. John Siegfried has been especially helpful in assisting us with the
mentoring proposal, and we greatly appreciate those efforts. Four of our Committee members' terms ended in December: Robert Pollak, Jean Kimmel, Caren Grown, and Rachel Willis. The quality of their work and the amount of time and energy expended has been outstanding throughout their terms, and we are grateful to them for their willingness to serve. We could not have continued to be as effective as we have been if they had not been part of our group. This year we were joined by Barbara Fraumeni, who brings much experience to the Committee, and Judy Chevalier, an Elaine Bennett Prize winner. We are pleased to have their energy and creativity on the Board for three-year terms. The Chair also thanks the other members of the committee who worked so hard this year to continue the development and growth of our programs and outreach efforts. Our regional representatives developed programs to enhance our presence at each of the regional association meetings. Various members have worked to develop better internet and outreach capabilities,
and other associates throughout the economics profession have continued to assist in our efforts to collect information and reach out to women economists. This past year Board members and other associates also worked on selection committees for the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award and the Elaine Bennett Prize as well as committees to select papers that should be published from the ASSA/AEA annual meetings' sessions sponsored by CSWEP.

Finally, the Chair of CSWEP would like to thank Lee Fordham for her administrative support of the Chair and the Committee, as well as her work in preparing for each of our meetings throughout the year. Additional thanks goes to ERS Group for supporting the work of CSWEP with office space, paper, telephones, and other resources. 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.

Joan Gustafson Haworth, Chair


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The top ten institutions used in this and prior reports are (in alphabetical order) Harvard University, MIT, Northwestern University, Princeton University, Stanford University, University of California-Berkeley, University of Chicago, University of Pennsylvania, University of Wisconsin, and Yale University.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ See, for example, the "Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession" by Rebecca M. Blank in the 1994 AEA Papers and Proceedings [American Economic Review, May 1994, 84(2), pp. 491-95].
    ${ }^{3}$ My thanks to Edward Flaherty, for his assistance in preparing the analyses and charts in this report.
    ${ }^{4}$ The top 20 institutions include all of the top 10 plus the following: UCLA, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, California Institute of Technology, Columbia University, University of Rochester, Cornell University, University of California-San Diego, Carnegie Mellon University, and New York University.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ These data are available from the CSWEP Chair. Tenured positions included in these counts include all associate and full professors reported to hold tenure.

[^3]:    ${ }^{6}$ See Table 1 for the percentage women among economists each year from 1994 through 2002.

