

The Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

In establishing the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP) in 1971, the American Economic Association recognized that women were not sufficiently represented in the economics profession and gave official sanction to efforts to increase their role and participation in economics. To this end, CSWEP has undertaken a number of activities aimed at increasing the number of women active in the profession and has attempted to monitor their role and activities in economics. Thus this report will briefly discuss CSWEP's activities and the status of women in the academic labor market for economists.

I. CSWEP Activities

CSWEP's activities fall into two major groups: those aimed at enhancing the workings of the labor market for economists, particularly with respect to women; and those aimed at increasing the visibility of women and women's issues in the economics profession.

In terms of informational activities, the maintenance of the roster and publication of the *Newsletter* are the most important. CSWEP maintains a roster of all women economists who have registered with it. Each listing on the roster states the highest degree earned, current job, and fields of interest. Thus potential employers can obtain from the roster a list of all potential women candidates who fit a given job description (for example, economists specializing in money and banking with more than three years experience). Consequently, broad use of the roster should ensure that no potential woman candidate will be excluded from consideration for lack of information. Although the roster listings are sold at a modest fee, they are currently used by a relatively small number of academic departments and government agencies. Hence one of CSWEP's activities this past year has

been an analysis of roster usage to determine how it could be used more effectively. Ideally, no job should be filled without reference to the roster to determine if there are qualified women available. Thus a major goal of CSWEP in the coming year is to increase the usage and effectiveness of the roster.

While the roster primarily serves the needs of potential employers to ensure that they have full information about the pool of women candidates, the list of jobs in the *Newsletter* serves the needs of potential candidates. Although much of the job information in the *Newsletter* is also in the Association's publication of *Job Openings for Economists*, it is felt that the additional listings in the *Newsletter* are worthwhile. This is particularly true for people who are not actively looking for a job, but might learn of a suitable opening through the *Newsletter* listings. The *Newsletter* also provides information about issues of concern to women economists.

In addition to trying to improve the workings of the job market by enhancing the flow of information, CSWEP has attempted to increase the participation of women in the economics profession at the annual meetings of the Association. To this end, it has initiated discussions by the Executive Committee of the Association concerning ways in which participation in the annual meetings could be broadened. While these discussions are still at a preliminary stage, CSWEP is hopeful that ways can be found to increase the participation of less established members of the profession in all aspects of the annual meetings.

Acting more directly, CSWEP has also attempted to increase the participation of women in the annual meetings by sponsoring sessions at these meetings. Although these sessions do not exclusively focus on women's issues, they attempt to focus on topics that might be of concern to women and in which women could be expected to

be working. In addition, since the papers in these sessions are contributed rather than invited, the CSWEP sessions provide an outlet for less-established economists, either male or female, at the annual meeting of the Association. At the annual meeting in 1979, the CSWEP session was entitled "Consequences of the Growth of the Two-Earner Family." The topic planned for the 1980 meetings will focus upon the impacts of macro-economic activity (particularly inflation) upon women and minorities.

CSWEP has recently extended its activities to the meetings of the regional associations. During the academic year 1979-80, CSWEP sessions have been held in the meetings of the Southern Economic Association, the Midwestern Economic Association, and the Eastern Economic Association. In this connection, CSWEP has established regional representatives who plan the CSWEP program at each of the regional meetings and encourage the participation of women economists at these sessions.

At each of the meetings of the economic associations, CSWEP also holds an open meeting and maintains a hospitality suite as a means of encouraging people to exchange their concerns about the role of women in the economics profession and discuss alternative ways to improve the role of women in the profession.

In this connection, during this past year CSWEP has taken an active role on behalf of those members of the Association who felt that it was inappropriate for the Association to hold its meetings in states that have not ratified the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA). Since the Association repeatedly refused to consider moving the site of the 1979 meeting from Atlanta,¹

¹CSWEP made presentations before the Executive Committee of the Association in December 1977 and March 1978, urging it to move the December 1979 annual meeting from Atlanta. In both instances, the Executive Committee refused to vote to change the meeting site, citing as reasons: 1) the nonpolitical charter of the AEA; 2) the fact that such an act would constitute a secondary boycott; and 3) existing contractual obligations. The issue was raised again in the Association's Open Business Meeting, at Chicago in August 1978, and it was narrowly defeated by the members of the Association who were present at that

CSWEP decided that it would be appropriate to use the 1979 meetings to focus on the issue of the ERA. To this end, it sponsored a session at the meetings entitled "Women's Place in the Labor Market: Will ERA Matter?" In addition, it sponsored an advertisement in the *Atlanta Constitution*, which listed some 900 economists who went on record in support of the ERA and held a press conference in support of the ERA at which Robert Solow, the president of the Association, spoke. Finally, it also sponsored an ERA reception, at which William Baumol, the president-elect of the Association, spoke as well as individuals active in the Georgia ERA movement. Consequently, CSWEP provided a vehicle for individual members of the Association to voice their support for ERA since the Association could not make such a stand.

II. The Role of Women in the Economics Profession

While CSWEP actively attempts to promote the participation and visibility of women in the economics profession, the status of women within the profession must ultimately depend upon the kinds of jobs and responsibilities they undertake. As a primarily academic profession, this is best measured by the distribution of women economists among various types of academic institutions and the flow of young women economists into these institutions.²

The data presented in this report came from the Universal Academic Questionnaire, distributed by the Association

time. In addition, CSWEP made a presentation before the Association's Executive Committee in March 1979, urging it to consider splitting the job meetings from the annual meetings, since many graduate students felt strongly about going to non-ERA states. However, the Executive Committee felt that such a move would be impractical.

²Reagan (1979) has an interesting paper arguing that women economists appear to be subject to the "revolving-door syndrome" under which they are hired at junior levels but not retained at senior levels. Strober and Reagan (1978) also discuss income differentials between male and female economists.

TABLE 1—DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME FACULTY BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION,
ACADEMIC YEAR, 1978-79

	Chairman's Group			Other Ph.D. Departments			Only M.A. Departments			Only B.A. Departments		
	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent
Existing												
Professor	663	10	1.5	468	9	1.9	264	12	4.6	290	17	5.9
Associate	192	8	4.2	332	17	5.1	212	11	5.2	327	22	6.7
Assistant	340	39	11.5	287	32	11.2	238	21	8.8	403	46	11.4
Instructor	128	14	10.9	121	15	12.4	356	43	12.4	258	49	15.5
Other	131	16	12.2	90	16	17.8	183	23	12.6	153	55	36.0
New Hires												
Professor	11	-	-	9	-	-	4	-	-	6	1	16.7
Associate	13	-	-	18	-	-	3	1	33.3	26	1	3.9
Assistant	59	11	18.6	50	12	24.0	22	2	9.2	91	11	12.1
Instructor	30	2	6.7	60	7	11.7	29	5	17.2	111	5	4.5
Other	30	4	13.3	15	3	20.0	25	-	-	43	12	27.9
Promoted to Rank (1977-78)												
Professor	32	-	-	37	-	-	14	4	28.6	21	4	19.0
Associate	42	7	16.7	29	4	13.8	34	2	5.9	36	5	18.9
Assistant	9	2	22.2	4	-	-	4	2	50.0	18	2	11.1
Tenured at Rank (1977-78)												
Professor	5	-	-	8	1	12.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Associate	13	1	7.7	23	2	8.7	21	2	9.5	26	2	7.7
Assistant	5	1	20.0	5	-	-	4	-	-	10	3	30.0
Not Rehired												
Professor	22	-	-	27	1	3.7	7	-	-	12	1	8.3
Associate	15	1	6.3	15	-	-	3	-	-	11	1	9.1
Assistant	31	2	6.5	24	6	25.0	19	2	10.5	61	1	1.6
Instructor	16	3	18.8	23	2	8.7	20	5	25.0	28	3	10.7
Other	4	2	50.0	14	7	50.0	17	1	5.9	22	4	18.2

to all department chairmen and tabulated by the Association. As such it provides the most comprehensive information concerning the academic labor market available. Since, however, responses are voluntary, information is often fragmentary and incomplete, and annual comparisons are difficult to make since the responding institutions vary. Hence the data provided by the Universal Academic Questionnaire are by no means complete and are occasionally contradictory. Thus we unfortunately do not have a fully accurate view of the role of women in the academic labor market. One of the CSWEP's planned activities for the coming year is to improve the quality of these data and the accuracy of the information concerning the role of women in the various economics departments.

Table 1 provides a summary of the distribution of academic jobs at the beginning of the academic year 1978-79 and the promotions that took place between this and the previous year. This table presents information in terms of four types of departments: the Chairman's group; other Ph.D. departments; M.A. departments; and B.A. departments. The Chairman's group consists of the sixty-four departments that focus on research and the training of Ph.D.'s in economics. In terms of stature, it is generally agreed that academic appointments at a department within the Chairman's group carry the most prestige. Thus this discussion will tend to focus upon the role of women in the Chairman's group as a bellwether for the entire economics profession. The other Ph.D. granting departments primarily focus

on undergraduate education, but also have a viable Ph.D. program. The M.A. departments similarly have a primary focus upon undergraduate education, but also have a Master's program. Finally, the B.A. departments are exclusively concerned with undergraduate teaching.

According to Table 1, the existing participation of women in the academic side of the economics profession appears to be distressingly small. Within the forty-nine departments reporting within the Chairman's group, there are only ten women who are full professors, eight who are associate professors, thirty-nine who are assistant professors, and fourteen who are instructors, respectively representing 1.5 percent of the full professors, 4.2 percent of the associate professors, 11.5 percent of the assistant professors, and 10.9 percent of the instructors. Although the percentage of women in each category is slightly higher for the other departments, the figures of the Chairman's group are representative.

Since tenured positions carry the most prestige within the profession it is useful to focus on them. In this connection, it is interesting to note that as of 1978-79 the reporting departments within the Chairman's group apparently feel that there are only ten women whose research and publication records are sufficiently strong to merit their appointments as full professor and eight women whose records are sufficiently strong to merit their appointment as associate professors. Moreover, during 1977-78, within the Chairman's group no woman was hired as a full professor, promoted to full professor, or hired as an associate professor. However, within the Chairman's group one woman was tenured at associate professor and seven women were promoted to associate professor during this period. This last figure is particularly encouraging since this represents 16.7 percent of the promotion to rank at this level and indicates that women are being promoted through the academic ladder.³ It is also encouraging to

note that within the Chairman's group 22.2 percent of the promotions to assistant professor were women and that 18.6 percent of the new hires were women. Since these figures represent a larger percentage than the percentage of available women, it indicates that the Chairman's group is presently taking strong affirmative action with respect to women at the junior levels.

The situation with respect to the other departments is quite similar. Thus in 1978-79, the proportion of women in tenured or tenure track positions was distressingly small. Moreover, during this year only one woman was hired as a full professor by the B.A. departments and only one woman was hired as an associate professor by each of the M.A. departments and B.A. departments. On a more encouraging note, however, a total of eight women and seven women were, respectively, promoted to full professor and associate professor among the M.A. and B.A. departments during the previous academic year. Since only one woman left the ranks of professor and associate professor within the B.A. departments, this indicates a substantial net growth in the ranks of women faculty at the senior academic levels.

In terms of changes that are occurring within the academic labor market, it is useful to consider the previous activity of those who were newly hired and the present activity of those who were not rehired. Table 2 indicates that within the Chairman's group, the M.A. departments, and the B.A. departments, relatively fewer of the newly hired women were faculty at other institutions than their male counterparts. Moreover, with the exception of the Chairman's group,

professors in the Chairman's group during 1977-78 and 1978-79. However, the 1978-79 questionnaire also indicated that seven women were promoted to associate professor and that one was not rehired within this group. Hence there is a discrepancy of four women that cannot be accounted for. While part of this discrepancy may be due to differences in reporting institutions, part of it may be due to reporting errors. Given the small number of women economists in the academic labor market, it is important that their activities be recorded as accurately as possible. Hence one of CSWEP's goals is to improve the accuracy of the information in the Universal Academic Questionnaire.

³Some apparent contradictions should be noted with respect to the data on promotion to associate professor. The Universal Academic Questionnaire indicated that there were, respectively, six and eight women associate

TABLE 2—PREVIOUS ACTIVITY OF NEW HIRES AND CURRENT ACTIVITY OF THOSE NOT REHIRED BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION AND SEX, ACADEMIC YEAR, 1978-79

	Previous Activity of New Hires				Current Activity of Not-Rehired			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Chairman's Group	114	100.0	19	100.0	65	100.0	4	100.0
Faculty	43	37.7	5	26.3	32	49.2	3	75.0
Student	47	41.2	11	57.9	1	1.5	1	25.0
Government	3	2.6	1	5.3	5	7.7	-	-
Business, Banking,								
Research	4	3.5	2	10.5	11	16.9	-	-
Other	17	14.9	-	-	16	24.6	-	-
Other Ph.D. Departments	100	100.0	35	100.0	79	100.0	13	100.0
Faculty	32	32.0	16	45.7	29	36.7	2	15.4
Student	48	48.0	7	26.0	14	17.7	1	7.7
Government	4	4.0	1	2.9	2	2.5	-	-
Business, Banking,								
Research	5	5.0	1	2.9	6	7.6	3	23.1
Other	11	11.0	10	28.6	28	35.4	7	53.9
M.A. Departments	40	100.0	7	100.0	38	100.0	5	100.0
Faculty	19	47.5	3	42.9	13	34.2	1	20.0
Student	24	60.0	3	42.9	10	26.3	-	-
Government	-	-	-	-	1	2.6	-	-
Business, Banking,								
Research	-	-	1	14.2	4	10.5	3	60.0
Other	7	17.5	-	-	10	23.6	1	20.0
B.A. Departments	151	100.0	27	100.0	86	100.0	15	100.0
Faculty	81	53.6	12	44.5	49	57.0	6	40.0
Student	47	31.1	10	37.0	9	10.4	-	-
Government	3	2.0	-	-	1	1.2	-	-
Business, Banking,								
Research	9	6.0	1	3.7	9	10.4	3	20.0
Other	11	7.3	4	14.8	18	21.0	6	40.0

a significantly smaller proportion of women who were not rehired moved to other academic jobs than their male counterparts. Thus on balance, Table 2 indicates that women may have less academic mobility than men. However, the number of women involved in the groups of the newly hired and not rehired is sufficiently small to make it difficult to generalize from the available data.

On balance the information contained in Tables 1 and 2 is marginally encouraging. While the number of women in senior academic positions is distressingly small in all institutions, there does appear to be some evidence of increased numbers of promotions for women faculty members. If this is borne out by subsequent developments, it will indicate that the economics profession

is undertaking substantive efforts to improve the role of women in its academic departments.

Since tenure and promotion are heavily dependent upon publication, under the sponsorship of CSWEP, Marianne Ferber and Michelle Teiman undertook an analysis of the acceptance rate of journal articles authored by male and female authors.⁴ Although the number of responding journals was relatively few and hence the sample quite small, Ferber and Teiman found that the acceptance rate was significantly higher for women authors relative to male authors in journals that employed double-blind reviewing (i.e. the referee did not know

⁴Ferber and Teiman, "Are Women Economists at a Disadvantage in Publishing Journal Articles?," mimeo, December 1979.

TABLE 3—DISTRIBUTION OF SALARY FOR WOMEN FACULTY BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT AND TIME IN RANK, ACADEMIC YEAR 1978-79

Highest Degree Offered and Relative Salary for Rank	All Women		Time in Rank			
	Number	Percent	Total	Above Median	At Median	Below Median
All Departments	90	100.0				
Salary above median	43	47.8	100.0	62.8	18.6	18.6
Salary at median	25	27.8	100.0	12.0	64.0	24.0
Salary below median	22	24.4	100.0	27.3	4.5	54.5
Ph.D., Chairman's	17	100.0				
Salary above median	8	47.1	100.0	87.5	12.5	0.0
Salary at median	6	35.3	100.0	16.7	66.7	16.7
Salary below median	5	29.4	100.0	0	20.0	80.0
Ph.D., Other	34	100.0				
Salary above median	14	41.2	100.0	78.6	7.1	14.3
Salary at median	10	29.4	100.0	10.0	70.0	20.0
Salary below median	10	29.4	100.0	40.0	0.0	60.0
M.A. Departments	23	100.0				
Salary above median	14	60.9	100.0	35.7	28.4	42.9
Salary at median	4	17.4	100.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Salary below median	5	21.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
B.A. Departments	14	100.0				
Salary above median	7	50.0	100.0	57.1	42.9	0.0
Salary at median	5	35.7	100.0	20.0	60.0	20.0
Salary below median	2	14.3	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0

the names of the authors and vice versa) than in journals that employed single-blind reviewing (i.e., the authors did not know the name of the referee, but the referee did know the name of the authors). While the sample is admittedly too small to be conclusive, it does indicate that discrimination may exist with respect to women authors and that their work may be discounted because they are women per se. If true, this finding has considerable negative implications for the prospects of women for promotion and tenure. CSWEP hopes that more work can be done in this important area to determine if discrimination does in fact exist with respect to women in the refereeing process. In any event, Ferber and Teiman's preliminary analysis indicates that journals

should be encouraged to adopt double-blind reviewing procedures.

With respect to salary, it is important to note that the salary distribution of women faculty members appears to be in line with that of their male colleagues. This can be seen from Table 3, which gives the distribution of salary of women faculty by type of department and time in rank. In general, salary appears to be related to time in rank, with those whose time in rank is above the median having a salary that is above the median.⁵ Although data are lacking to compare the distribution of male and female

⁵It should be noted, however, that the number of women faculty members considered in Table 3 is substantially less than the number of women faculty members given in Table 1. This implies that a substantial

TABLE 4—DEGREES GRANTED IN ECONOMICS BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT AND SEX, ACADEMIC YEAR 1977-78

	All Departments	Ph.D. Departments			M.A. Departments	B.A. Departments
		Total	Chairman's	Other		
Number Departments	373	104	49	55	57	212
Number Ph.D.s	753	753	454	299	—	—
Number female	63	63	43	20	—	—
Percent female	8.4	8.4	9.5	6.7	—	—
Number M.A.s	1,420	1,119	712	407	301	—
Number female	387	270	131	139	117	—
Percent female	27.3	24.1	18.4	34.2	38.9	—
Number B.A.s	11,547	6,676	4,192	2,484	1,402	3,469
Number female	2,684	1,414	918	496	283	988
Percent female	23.2	21.2	21.9	20.0	20.2	28.5
Number Other	^a	239	10	299	85	^a
Number female	^a	55	1	54	10	^a
Percent female	^a	63.0	10.0	23.6	11.8	^a

^aNot applicable.

salaries, Table 3 does not indicate the existence of any gross discrepancies between the distribution of salaries and the distribution of time in rank.

Ultimately, however, if more women are to play an active role in the economics profession, more women must be trained as economists. In this connection, Table 4 is interesting and indicates a rather sizable attrition rate between the granting of the B.A. degree and the Ph.D. degree. Specifically, in 1978-79, while 23.2 percent of all B.A. degrees were received by women, only 8.4 percent of Ph.D. degrees were received by women. Although it takes four to five years to turn a B.A. into a Ph.D., these figures are quite representative of the past four or five years⁶ and clearly indicate that relatively fewer women who receive economics training at the B.A. level chose to go on to graduate school and obtain a Ph.D. than do their male counterparts. Whatever the reasons for this decline, it is clear that the flow of new female Ph.D.s must be substantially increased if the proportion of women in academic jobs is to increase substantially.

number of departments did not give the salary information on which Table 3 is based. Since it is unlikely that departments would fail to give information if women faculty member's salaries were on parity, it is likely that Table 3 overestimates the level of female faculty salaries.

⁶See CSWEP reports in *Proceedings* issues 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, and 1978.

Table 5 provides information on the jobs taken by new Ph.D.s in 1978-79 and indicates that relatively fewer women Ph.D.s took academic jobs overall than their male counterparts. This was particularly true among the Chairman's group where only 44.8 percent of women Ph.D.s took academic jobs in contrast to their male counterparts of whom 65.4 percent took academic jobs. Since the Chairman's group is the primary source of Ph.D.s who take academic positions, it is somewhat discouraging to note that the majority of new women Ph.D.s from these institutions did not enter the academic labor market. Moreover, it is important to note that the total number of women who entered the academic labor market was only twenty-eight, a figure that is hardly sufficient to change the distribution of academic positions held by women. This is shown by Table 6, which indicates that only 8.9 percent of the academic jobs taken by new Ph.D.s were held by women. Moreover, within the Chairman's group only 5.0 percent of the academic jobs taken by new Ph.D.s were held by women. These figures indicate that new women Ph.D.s tend to turn away from the academic labor market. Whether this is due to perceptions of lack of opportunity is, of course, unclear.

Although relatively fewer women who receive B.A. degrees in economics go on to obtain a Ph.D. than their male counterparts, it is important to note that this is probably not due to lack of graduate student support

TABLE 5—DISTRIBUTION OF ACTIVITIES OF NEW PH.D. DEGREES BY SEX AND TYPE OF DEPARTMENT, 1978-79

	All Ph.D. Departments		Chairman's Group		Other Ph.D. Departments	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All Ph.D.'s						
Total	555	100.0	407	100.0	148	100.0
Education	346	62.3	260	63.9	86	58.1
Government	56	10.1	33	8.1	23	15.5
Business, Banking, Research	63	11.4	41	10.1	22	14.9
Other	90	16.2	73	17.9	17	11.5
Male Ph.D.'s						
Total	506	100.0	378	100.0	128	100.0
Education	318	62.9	247	65.4	41	55.5
Government	52	10.3	30	7.9	22	17.2
Business, Banking, Research	52	10.3	33	8.7	19	14.8
Other	84	16.5	68	18.0	16	12.5
Female Ph.D.'s						
Total	49	100.0	29	100.0	20	100.0
Education	28	57.2	13	44.8	15	75.0
Government	4	8.2	3	10.3	1	5.0
Business, Banking, Research	11	22.4	8	27.6	3	15.0
Other	6	12.2	5	17.2	1	5.0

TABLE 6—ACTIVITIES OF 1977-78 PH.D.S BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT AND SEX

	Number of New Ph.D.s Employed in:				
	Total	Education	Government	Business, Banking, Research	Other
All Ph.D. Departments					
Total	555	346	56	63	90
Number female	49	28	4	11	6
Percent female	8.8	8.9	7.1	17.5	6.7
Chairman's group					
Total	407	260	33	41	73
Number female	29	13	3	8	5
Percent female	7.1	5.0	9.1	19.5	6.8
Other Ph.D. Departments					
Total	148	86	23	22	17
Number female	20	15	1	3	2
Percent female	13.5	17.4	4.3	13.6	11.8

on the part of the academic departments. This is shown clearly in Table 7, which indicates that although a slightly lower percentage of women students receive full support (tuition plus stipend) overall, the percentage of women students receiving some form of financial aid is virtually identical to that of male students. Thus it is likely that it is perceptions concerning their future status in the economics profession that makes women turn from graduate study in eco-

nomics rather than a lack of financial support per se.

In conclusion then, although the economics profession and its related institutions have made a conscious effort to recruit and encourage women economists in recent years, it appears that, on balance, progress is still quite slow. Women economists in academic institutions still comprise an extremely small percentage of the total, and the bulk of these women hold junior level,

TABLE 7—DISTRIBUTION OF PH.D. STUDENT SUPPORT, BY TYPE OF SUPPORT, SEX, AND DEPARTMENT, 1978-79

	All Ph.D. Departments		Chairman's Group		Other Ph.D. Departments	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All Students						
Total	3,764	100.0	2,644	100.0	1,120	100.0
Tuition only	254	6.7	177	6.7	77	6.9
Stipend only	683	18.1	482	18.2	201	17.9
Tuition + stipend	1,500	39.9	1,028	38.9	472	42.2
No support	1,050	27.9	802	30.3	248	22.1
No record	277	7.4	155	5.9	122	10.9
Male Students						
Total	3,107	100.0	2,192	100.0	915	100.0
Tuition only	186	6.0	126	5.8	60	6.6
Stipend only	564	18.2	396	18.1	168	18.4
Tuition + stipend	1,252	40.3	865	39.5	387	42.3
No support	868	27.9	650	29.6	218	23.8
No record	237	7.6	155	7.0	82	8.9
Female Students						
Total	657	100.0	452	100.0	205	100.0
Tuition only	68	10.4	51	11.3	17	8.3
Stipend only	119	18.1	86	19.0	33	16.1
Tuition + stipend	248	37.7	163	36.1	85	41.5
No support	182	27.7	152	33.6	30	14.6
No record	40	6.1	—	—	40	19.5

nontenured positions. Although there is some evidence that young women economists are receiving promotion to the associate professor level, it is still too early to determine whether the group of able young women who entered the academic labor market in the early and mid-1970's will move up the academic ladder along with their male colleagues. Thus the real test of the commitment of the economics profession to enhance the status of women in its activities will occur in the next few years, when the presently nontenured women faculty come up for tenure and promotion. If

a proportionate share of these women move up through the academic ranks, this will be a definite sign that the profession is serious about making women equal partners. If, however, a disproportionate share of young women economists are not retained, this will almost certainly be interpreted as a sign that the economics profession will remain an essentially male bastion. In this case, it is likely that able young women will increasingly turn away from economics and enter professions which they perceive will give them more attractive career opportunities.

ANN F. FRIEDLAENDER, *Chair*