## 2009 Report of the <br> Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

The Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession was established by the American Economic Association to monitor the status of women in the profession and to engage in other efforts to promote the advancement of women in economics. This report presents results from our annual survey of economics departments and CSWEP’s activities over the past year.

## Data on Women Economists ${ }^{1}$

The 2009 CSWEP surveys were sent to 119 economics departments with doctoral programs and 148 non-Ph.D. departments. Most of schools represented in the non-Ph.D. survey came from the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (2000 Edition) "Baccalaureate Colleges - Liberals Arts" list as less than ten are schools with economics departments offering an undergraduate and Masters only economics degree.

Only two Ph.D. granting departments did not respond to any question on the survey. Information on academic appointments by rank and gender were collected from the web for these two departments. Five departments answered only these same questions. A new question was added to the Ph.D. granting department survey about the number and the gender of senior undergraduate economics majors. This question was already included in the non-Ph.D. survey. $75 \%$ of all Ph.D. granting departments answered this new question. The response rate to all other questions on the Ph.D. granting department survey is $94 \%$. The $52.7 \%$ response rate ( 78 departments) for our non-Ph.D. programs survey is typical for that survey.

Figure 1 and Tables 1 through 4 summarize the trends in women's representation in Ph.D. granting departments over the past decade, tenured/tenure track vs. non-tenure track statistics for 2009, and job market placements for the most recent job market. The figure is labeled as female economists "in the pipeline" to show the progression of women through the ranks from newly minted Ph.D.s to tenured full professors. The fraction of first-year Ph.D. students and newly completed Ph.D.s in all Ph.D. granting departments who are women is about one-third; in both cases these fractions decreased somewhat between 2008 and 2009. Assuming four-five years to complete a doctorate in economics this suggests that on average the pipeline is not very leaky at least through completion of the doctorate.

The female shares of Assistant Professors and tenured Associate Professors are essentially constant between 2008 and 2009 at close to $28 \%$ and $22 \%$ respectively. The female share of tenured Full Professors up ticked to $9.7 \%$, an all-time high for this survey.

[^0]The most interesting continuing aspect of the survey is changes in the tenured Associate Professor fractions relative to changes in the other two fractions. In 1997, the rule of onehalf applied almost exactly. The rule came from the observation that the percent of tenured female Associate Professors (13.4\%) as a fraction of the percent of untenured female Assistant Professors (26.0\%) was very close to one-half. In addition, the percent of tenured female Full Professors (6.5\%) as a fraction of the percent of tenured female Assistant Professors (13.4\%) was also very close to one-half. In 2000, the rule was perturbed by the increase in the female tenured Associate Professor percent. The Associate to Assistant Professor fraction jumped to 0.76 and remained in the 0.65 to 0.84 range through 2009. The Full Professor percent has not yet apparently shown the impact of the Associate Professor percent changes although enough years (nine) have passed for promotion to reasonably begin to occur. However, arguably it is still a bit early to see a significant impact beyond the 9.7\% peak in the Full Professor percent in 2009.

Among all Ph.D. granting economics departments in the United States, the female share of non-tenure track faculty is more than double that for the female share of all tenured/tenure track faculty ( $36.1 \%$ versus $16.9 \%$ ). Between 2008 and 2009 the female share of non-tenure track faculty rose by two point seven percentage points and the share of all faculty in non-tenured positions fell by almost one percentage point. In 2009 13.8\% of all faculty in Ph.D. granting departments are non-tenure track faculty.

Women were more likely to obtain a U.S. based job than men. The U.S. based job market placement shares for women by type of job differ from those for men by about three percentage points. However among those women who obtained a foreign job, the share of women obtaining an academic job was significantly higher than the share of men obtaining an academic job.

Figure 2 and Table 5 present data on the status of women in economics departments located in liberal arts institutions over the past seven years, which is for all years that data exists. Here the pipeline is much less leaky with the share of female economics majors, assistant professors, and tenured associate professors being very similar. The share of tenured full professors in liberal arts institutions who are women is more than double that in Ph.D. departments and has been rising over time to $21 \%$ in $2009 .{ }^{2}$

This is the first year that comparisons can be made between the percent of senior economics majors who are female in Ph.D. granting departments versus the percent who are female at liberal arts schools. The Ph.D. granting department percent at $28.9 \%$ is seven percentage points lower than the comparable figure for liberal arts schools.

## The Committee's Recent Activities On-going Activities

[^1]One of CSWEP's major activities is the production of our thrice-yearly newsletter. In addition to reporting on the annual survey of departments, the Winter newsletter, coedited by Fiona Scott Morton, included articles on what you do and choices you make after you receive tenure. Marty Olney co-edited the Spring Newsletter that included articles on harassment, discrimination, and advice from a lawyer. This issue also included an interview with the 2008 Carolyn Shaw Bell award winner, Anne Carter, and listed top ten tips on how to get funding. The Fall newsletter was co-edited by Julie Hotchkiss and featured a discussion on navigating the job market as dual career economists. It also included an interview with 2008 Elaine Bennett Research Prize winner Amy Finkelstein. These newsletters would not be possible without the tireless efforts of Deborah Barbezat.

As part of its ongoing efforts to increase the participation of women on the AEA program, CSWEP organized six sessions for the January 2010 ASSA meetings in Atlanta. Linda Bell organized two sessions on personnel economics and Julie Hotchkiss organized three sessions on gender-related issues. CSWEP also co-hosted a panel session with CSMGEP on the impact of AEA and NSF mentoring programs.

For the first time CSWEP’s business meeting at the American Economic Association Annual Meeting was a luncheon event. At the business meeting Barbara Fraumeni presented results on the annual department survey and summarized CSWEP activities over the past year. During this meeting, the 2009 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award was presented to Elizabeth E. Bailey of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania. The Carolyn Shaw Bell award is given annually to a woman who has furthered the status of women in the economics profession through her example, achievements, contributions to increasing our understanding of how women can advance through the economics profession, and mentoring of other women. The Chair thanks Trish Mosser, Amy Schwartz and Fiona Scott Morton for their service on the 2009 Carolyn Shaw Bell Awards Committee. This prize was established in 1998 to recognize and honor outstanding research in any field of economics by a woman at the beginning of her career.

As part of our ongoing mentoring efforts CSWEP sponsored one regional and one national mentoring workshop for junior faculty in economics in 2009-10. The regional mentoring session was held in conjunction with the Southern Economic Association meeting in November 2009. Participants were enthusiastic in their exit survey about the quality and usefulness of the panels and overall activities of the workshop. The national mentoring workshop was held after the January 2010 American Economic Association meetings in Atlanta. We thank all the mentors who participated in these workshops and especially organizers KimMarie McGoldrick, Donna Ginther and Terra McKinnish. The American Economic Association is funding one more regional workshop in 2011 and one more national mentoring workshop in 2012. Hopefully the American Economic Association will agree to fund these workshops on a more permanent basis given the success of the national workshop as documented in a Blau, Croson, Currie, and Ginther paper to be published in the May American Economic Review papers and proceedings volume. (See "From the Chair.") In addition, we are continuing a Summer Fellows initiative in 2010 supported by CSWEP/AEA and run jointly with CSMGEP. Since the
program was created in 2007 the number of fellows placed has grown from six in 2007 to 18 in 2009 and the number of participating or cooperating institutions has increased from four in 2007 to 21 in 2010. The purpose of this program is to increase the participation and advancement of women and underrepresented minorities in economics. The fellowship allows the fellow to spend a summer in residence at a sponsoring research institution such as a Federal Reserve Bank, Federal statistical agency, other public agencies, and think-tanks.

## Regional Activities

CSWEP's regional representatives organized sessions at each of the regional association meetings -including the Eastern, Southern, Midwest, and Western Economic Association. Our thanks go to Kaye Husbands Fealing (Midwest), Linda Bell (Eastern), Julie Hotchkiss (Southern) and Marty Olney (Western), for their excellent programs and efforts to help women economists in their regions maintain and increase their professional networks. Abstracts of the papers presented at these association meetings are on the CSWEP web site.

## Membership Data Base and Web Site

We have undertaken a project to modernize the CSWEP data base and to locate it on the AEA server. In the short to intermediate run we will preserve the existing data base in part because it will take some time for those listed on the data base to enter or correct their information on the new data base. The data base includes all economists (most of them women) who register with us and incorporates data concerning their employer, their job title, their address, field of interest, and other employment related information into our roster. With the modernized data base its functionality and usefulness will be improved. The web site code is also being modernized. We particularly thank Donna Ginther, a member of the Committee, who has overseen these efforts.

## Additional Words of Thanks

The Chair would like to thank the membership chair, Joan Haworth and her staff, particularly Lee Fordham, for their essential contribution to our outreach mission. The terms of four of our Committee members ended in January 2010 - Linda Bell, Trish Mosser, Marty Olney, and Fiona Scott Morton. Linda and Marty as previously noted served as regional CSWEP representatives. Trish served on both the Summer Fellows and the Carolyn Shaw Bell award committee. Fiona Scott Morton attempted to track the status of female economists at top business schools and also served on the Carolyn Shaw Bell award committee. They and the continuing Committee members have all made outstanding contributions and we are enormously grateful to them for their willingness to serve. The Chair thanks new Committee members Susan Averett, Linda Goldberg, Jennifer Imazeki, and Terra McKinnish for agreeing to serve. CSWEP receives both financial and staff support from the American Economic Association. We are especially grateful for all the help we receive from John Siegfried and his staff -- particularly Barbara Fiser and Susan Houston. The Chair also warmly thanks Deborah Arbique from the Muskie School of the University of Southern Maine who has provided extraordinary and indispensable administrative support for the Committee over the last year. The Chair
also appreciates that the Muskie School and the University of Southern Maine is willing to continue to host CSWEP.

Barbara M. Fraumeni, Chair

Figure 1. Percentage of Economists in the Pipeline Who Are Female 2000-2009
All Ph.D. Granting Departments
$\leftrightarrows$ New Ph.D. $\quad \square$ Asst. Prof. (U) $=$ Assoc. Prof. $(\mathrm{T})=-$ Full Prof. $(\mathrm{T})$


Table 1: The Percent of Economists in the Pipeline Who Are Female, 2000-2009
$\begin{array}{llllllllll}2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005 & 2006 & 2007 & 2008 & 2009\end{array}$

| All Ph.D. Granting Departments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1st yr students | 38.8 | 31.9 | 33.9 | 34.0 | 33.9 | 31.9 | 31.0 | 32.7 | 35.0 | 33.5 |
| ABD | 32.3 | 30.2 | 30.6 | 32.7 | 33.1 | 33.9 | 33.6 | 32.7 | 33.7 | 33.5 |
| New Ph.D. | 28.0 | 29.4 | 27.2 | 29.8 | 27.9 | 31.1 | 32.7 | 34.5 | 34.8 | 32.9 |
| Assistant Professor (U) | 21.4 | 22.5 | 23.2 | 26.1 | 26.3 | 29.4 | 28.6 | 27.5 | 28.8 | 28.4 |
| Associate Professor (U) | 17.2 | 10.0 | 17.2 | 24.0 | 11.6 | 31.2 | 24.6 | 20.0 | 29.2 | 25 |
| Associate Professor (T) | 16.2 | 15.3 | 17.0 | 19.9 | 21.2 | 19.2 | 24.1 | 21.0 | 21.5 | 21.8 |
| Full Professor (T) | 7.4 | 5.8 | 8.9 | 9.4 | 8.4 | 7.7 | 8.3 | 7.9 | 8.8 | 9.7 |
| Assoc (T) \% as a \% of Assistant | 0.76 | 0.68 | 0.73 | 0.76 | 0.81 | 0.65 | 0.84 | 0.76 | 0.75 | 0.77 |
| Full \% as a \% of Assoc (T) | 0.46 | 0.38 | 0.52 | 0.47 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.34 | 0.38 | 0.41 | 0.44 |
| Full \% as a \% of Assistant | 0.35 | 0.26 | 0.38 | 0.36 | 0.32 | 0.26 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.31 | 0.34 |
| Number of respondents | 76 | 69 | 83 | 95 | 100 | 93 | 96 | 102 | 111 | 119 |
| Number of Ph.D. Granting Departments | 120 | 120 | 120 | 128 | 122 | 122 | 124 | 124 | 123 | $119^{*}$ |

Notes: U refers to untenured and T refers to tenured. ABD indicates students who have completed "all but dissertation." *In 2009, the information for two schools was collected from the web.

Table 2: Tenure and Untenured Faculty Data 2009 All Ph.D. Granting Departments

|  | Women | Men | Percent <br> Women |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All tenured/tenure track |  |  | 2393 |
| Other (non-tenure track) | 165 | 292 | 36.9 |

Table 3: Job Market Employment Shares by Gender 2009* All Ph.D. Granting Departments

| (Share of all individuals by gender) | All Ph.D. Granting Departments |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men |
|  | 62.4 | 58.5 |
| Academic, Ph.D. granting department | 40.7 | 43.3 |
| Academic, Other | 23.0 | 20.7 |
| Public sector | 16.7 | 19.3 |
| Private sector | 19.6 | 16.7 |
| Foreign Job obtained (Share of all individuals by gender) | 24.8 | 29.0 |
| Academic | 74.7 | 65.4 |
| Nonacademic | 25.3 | 34.6 |
| No job found (Share of all individuals by gender) | 12.8 | 12.5 |
| Number of individuals | 5,807 | 14,309 |

* Shares by detailed type of job, e.g., academic, public or private sector, sum to 100, except for rounding.

Table 4: Ph.D. Students Data 2009
All Ph.D. Granting Departments

|  | Women | Men | Percent <br> Women |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Students (2009-2010 Academic Year) |  |  |  |
| First-year Ph.D. students | 561 | 1113 | 33.5 |
| ABD students | 1196 | 2371 | 33.5 |
| Ph.D. granted (2008-2009 Academic Year) | 329 | 670 | 32.9 |

Figure 2. Percentage of Economists in the Pipeline Who Are Female 2003-2009 Liberal Arts Departments
$\rightarrow$ Asst. Prof. (U) $\quad \triangle$ Assoc. Prof. (T) $\quad=$ Full Prof. (T) $\quad$ Student Majors


Table 5: The Percent of Economists in the Liberal Arts Schools Pipeline Who Are Female, 2003-2009

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Student Majors | 44.2 | 37.6 | 35.7 | 32.8 | 39.7 | 32.8 | 35.9 |
| Asst. Prof. (U) | 36.9 | 38.9 | 38.3 | 35 | 39.1 | 33.1 | 38.2 |
| Assoc. Prof. (T) | 38.5 | 37.3 | 43.1 | 33.7 | 34.9 | 33.5 | 33.1 |
| Full Prof. (T) | 16.7 | 16.2 | 18.1 | 19.9 | 21.0 | 20.3 | 21.1 |
| Number of Respondents | 64 | 74 | 78 | 88 | 77 | 86 | 78 |
| Number of Lib. Arts. Depts. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Responding | 143 | 143 | 143 | 143 | 143 | 143 | 148 |
| Notes: U refers to untenured and T refers to tenured |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Tables showing survey results for the top ten and top twenty departments will be made available at a later date in a newsletter and on the web.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Because of the historically substantially lower response rate to the liberal arts department survey than to the Ph.D. granting departments survey, there is less confidence in year-to-year trends and overall results in the liberal arts department survey. In early 2009 efforts will be made to obtain responses from a higher fraction of liberal arts departments.

