DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 126 SP 009 379

AUTHOR Krenkel, Noele; And Others
TITLE Ad Hoc Committee on the Role and Status of Women. AREA Final Report and Recommendations.
INSTITUTION American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 75
NOTE 217p.; A condensed version of this report appears in Educational Researcher; v4 n9 Oct 1975 and is available from American Educational Research Association, 1126 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($1.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$10.78 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Administration; *Committees; *Educational Research; *Educational Researchers; Females; Feminism; *Sex Role; *Working Women

ABSTRACT

This five-part report was prepared by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Role and Status of Women of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). Part 1 presents the committee resolutions recommended for adoption by AERA. Part 2 reports on the participation of women in the educational research community, and includes: a historical survey of women's participation in AERA activities; a demographic survey of the total membership conducted during 1975; and a sample survey of women and men which includes data on their participation in AERA, educational background, employment history, productivity and professional rewards. Part 3 presents the results of surveys of institutions of higher education and research and development organizations. Part 4 examines policies regarding other professional organizations with regard to the role and status of women. Policies examined included: (a) official statements; (b) affirmative action plans; (c) staff time devoted to women's issues; and (d) standing committees, reports, and so on. Part 5 examines the role that AERA might play in the development of affirmative action plans for the educational research community. (Author/JS)

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE ROLE AND STATUS OF WOMEN

American Educational Research Association

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

May 1975

Committee members:

Noele Kronkel
Jean Lipman-Blumen
Elizabeth Steiner Maccia
Patricia E. Stivers
Terry N. Saario
Carol Kehr Tittle, Chair
Joseph M. Cronin

CONTENTS

Foreword

Part I. Recommendations: Resolutions and Actions

Part II. Participation of Women in the Educational Research Community.

Jean Lipman-Blumen, Patricia E. Stivers, Ann R. Tickamyer, and Suzanne Brainard

Part III. Women in Educational Research: Their Status from Student to Employee.

Carol Kehr Tittle, Terry N. Saario, Elenor R. Denker

Part IV. A Survey of the Role and Status of Women in Other Professional Organizations.

Noele Krenkel

Part V. Women in Educational Research: Affirmative Action Plans.

Elizabeth Steiner Maccia

FOREWORD

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Role and Status of Women of the American Educational Research Association was appointed in 1974, following passage of a motion at the May, 1973, Council meeting:

> Motion (Clifford/Cronin). It is moved that a committee to investigate the status of women in educational research be formed, that its chairperson be chosen by the president of AERA with a panel of five candidates nominated by the Women's SIG, that the majority membership of the committee be women and that the findings and recommendations of this committee be printed and distributed to AERA membership.

The Committee held its first meeting in April, 1974, and planned the studies which are included in the present report. The Committee's work was reported briefly to the Association in a symposium on April 1, 1975 at the annual meeting.

The Committee report consists of five sections. Part I. presents the recommendations of the Committee. These recommendations are presented in the form of Resolutions that will be considered by the AERA Council on May 28 and 29, 1975. The resolutions, which are broad policy statements recommended for adoption by AERA, are given more substance by enumerating specific activities and actions to be undertaken by AERA in implementing these broad policies regarding women. It should be noted that the action responsibilities listed are illustrative, and are clearly not an exhaustive list of the actions that may be considered necessary by Council, by a standing Committee on the Role and Status of Women, or, more broadly, by a general plan for affirmative action with regard to women in AERA and in educational research.

The work of the Committee which gives support and lends urgency to the adoption of the policy resolutions appears in the studies undertaken by Committee members. In Part II. Jean Lipman-Blumen,

Patricia E. Stivers, Ann R. Tickamyer, and Suzanne Brainard report on the Participation of Women in the Educational Research Community, a study of individual men and women who are members of the Association. Data were collected in three areas: 1. an historical survey of women's participation in AERA activities, using records dating back to 1965; 2. a demographic survey of the total membership being conducted during 1975 (4,000 member's responses have been summarized to date); and 3. a random sample survey of women and men which includes data on their participation in AERA, educational background, employment history; productivity and professional rewards.

Part III. presents the results of surveys of institutions of higher education and R & D organizations. The study, Women in Educational Research: Their Status from Student to Employee, by Carol Kehr Tittle, Terry N. Saario, and Elenor R. Denker, describes enrollment, doctorates granted, job placement, and administrative policies for male and female students at institutions granting the doctorate in education. Information on faculty members at these institutions is included (rank, salary, and tenure). Data on women and men in organizations employing educational researchers are given for local school districts, state departments of education, and R & D organizations.

Part IV. is A Survey of the Role and Status of Women in Other Professional Organizations by Noele Krenkel. Professional organizations were surveyed to determine their policies with respect to women. Policies examined included: official statements, affirmative action plans, staff time devoted to women's issues, standing committees, reports, and so on. Part V. is Women in Educational Research: Affirmative Action Plans by Elizabeth Steiner Maccia. This paper examines the role that

AERA might play in the development of affirmative action plans with respect to educational research, and the need for statements of goals and timetables. Two basic concepts of affirmative action plans, non-discrimination and affirmative action, are supported on the basis of John Rawls' principles of social justice.

The Committee wishes to acknowledge with thanks the support of several organizations, as well as the many individuals who contributed their time by completing the survey questionnaires. The institutions who assisted the Committee's work in various ways were the Center for Advanced Study in Education of the Graduate School/University Center of the City University of New York, the Ford Foundation, and the National Institute of Education. The Committee especially acknowledges the assistance of the staff of the American Educational Research Association itself.

It is particularly fitting the the report of the Committee is being presented in 1975, International Women's Year. The American Educational Research Association, both through official policies and the actions of individuals, can contribute to assuring that women have equal and full opportunity to participate in the Association and in the conduct of educational research.

Part I.

RECOMMENDATIONS: RESOLUTIONS AND ACTIONS

Part I. Resolutions and Actions

Resolutions

I. Be it resolved that women have full opportunity for participation in the activities of the American Educational Research Association.

II. Be it resolved that women have full opportunity for participation in research training institutions and research organizations.

III. Be it resolved that the Association establish a standing Committee on the Role and Status of Women in Educational Research.

The purpose of the Committee shall be to investigate the extent of conformity to the principles stated above (I., II.), to make recommendations for affirmative action, and to be advisory to the designated affirmative action staff member of the association.

IV. Be it resolved that the Association expand its professional staff to include an individual whose full time responsibility shall include the development and implementation of the affirmative action plans of the Association.

I. Be it resolved that women have full opportunity for participation in the activities of the American Educational Research Association.

Action responsibility: The Council of the Association has passed a resolution that women be appointed to committees and offices and nominated for elective offices commensurate with the number of women in the Association. However, responsibility for ensuring that the motion of the Council is carried out has not been designated. The Committee on Women recommends that the Executive Officer of the Association be designated this responsibility, in line with the earlier Council motion (5/73) that the Central Office is directed to report annually to Council on the number of women in the Association and to provide an analysis of the role of women in the various committees. An annual report of the Executive Officer on status and progress on equal opportunity within the Association should be published in the Educational Researcher.

In line with ensuring full participation of women in the activities of the Association, the Committee recommends a number of other actions be undertaken by the Council, AERA committees, and the Executive Officer. These actions include:

a. Adopt affirmative action policies for AERA staff, AERA journals and all other affairs of the organization. Affirmative action policies include formulating goals, timetables and plans to meet the goals.

b. Recommend that all organizations hiring AERA members adopt affirmative action plans (local school districts, state education departments, federal agencies, private profit and non-profit research organizations, as well as institutions of higher education).

c. Review job placement procedures and services in publications and at annual meetings to ensure that discrimination is eliminated.

d. Adopt the policy that the candidates for elected offices of the Association state their platforms; these position statements should be published in the Educational Researcher or with ballots.

e. Encourage expanded advertising in the Educational Researcher to eliminate the discriminatory practices of informal networks between colleagues. Publish annually a list of institutions who have placed notices in the Educational Researcher.

f. Direct the Executive Officer, with legal consultation, to monitor Federal legislation which will affect women and educational research, to indicate Association support, and to disseminate information on these issues. For example, Title IX regulations prohibiting discrimination based on sex in educational institutions will directly affect educational researchers in general, and women in particular.

g. Monitor lists of external experts submitted to federal agencies or other sources to ensure that women are included as consultants, panelists, and speakers; maintain vita files for recommendations, both for external and internal (Association) requests.

h. Adopt policies by AERA publications committee and journal editors to:

1. establish editorial guidelines for the elimination of discriminatory language usage and sex role stereotyping;

2. ensure that all reviewing of articles is blind reviewing;

3. establish a formal policy regarding the ethics, conduct and publication of research with a special emphasis on the subjects of sex role prejudice in research and sex discrimination in authorship (e.g., assistant's name may appear on unpublished reports but not on published articles).

4. ensure adequate coverage of issues relevant to sex bias in education, and support, by publication, research on sex differences and sex discrimination.

II. Be it resolved that women have full opportunity for participation in research training institutions and research organizations.

Action responsibility: A majority of the students and employees within the education industry are women. However, this majority does not hold within graduate institutions training at the doctoral level and women are under-represented both as students and faculty. The Association should actively encourage the study of education by women at the doctoral level, and particularly in quantitative specialties which are fundamental to the conduct of educational research. In order to eliminate sex discrimination among educational researchers, whether employed in colleges and universities, local, state or federal education units, or in private research and development organizations, the President and Executive Officer shall make known, by all available means, the Association's adoption of the above principle.

While the Association cannot regulate or enforce specific guidelines for individual institutions, agencies and organizations, it can encourage and provide guidance to promote the welfare of members of the Association. In the extreme, the Association can censor institutions violating the principles resolved here. The Committee recommends a number of actions to be undertaken by the President, Council and Executive Officer of the Association. The following actions are first steps in ensuring full opportunity for the participation of women in research training institutions and research training organizations:

Universities as educators:

a. Recruit and admit women into programs of quantitative methodology and educational leadership, as well as other areas of educational research.

b. Allocate financial support (both the type and amount) independent of marital status or sex.

c. Publicly affirm commitment to the employment of women in leadership positions, and actively promote the employment of female graduates.

d. Establish extensive counseling services, especially for female doctoral candidates who often lack role models and are unable to establish "protege" relationships.

e. Collect data to monitor access, progress and placement of women and men in doctoral programs.

Universities and colleges as employers

a. Adopt affirmative action policy statements and goals within specialty areas of doctoral programs and departmental units.

b. Actively recruit female applicants for all faculty positions.

c. Analyze personnel policies to eliminate any which directly or indirectly support discriminatory practices. These policies include, but are not limited to, those concerned with appointment, retention, promotion, tenure, anti-nepotism, maternity and paternity leave, leaves of absence, pregnancy, child-care services, and part-time appointment with benefits.

d. Assume responsibility for hiring or locating employment opportunities for the spouse of a new employee.

Governmental agencies and R & D organizations

a. Publicly identify, as an organizational priority, the elimination of discrimination against women.

b. Adopt affirmative action plans.

c. Actively recruit female applicants for positions at all levels.

d. Eliminate sex discrimination in terms of promotion, transfer, recruitment, salary, and selection for training, including apprenticeship.

e. Establish career ladders for personnel within the organization.

f. Analyze personnel policies to eliminate any which directly or indirectly support discriminatory practices, including policies for leaves of absences, pregnancy, part-time employment, and child-care services.

g. Assume responsibility for hiring or locating employment opportunities for the spouse of a new employee.

III. Be it resolved that the Association establish a standing Committee on the Role and Status of Women in Educational Research.

The purpose of this Committee shall be to investigate the extent of conformity to the principles stated above (I., II.), to make recommendations for affirmative action, and to be advisory to the designated affirmative action staff member of the Association.

Action responsibility: The standing Committee on the Role and Status of Women will provide a focus for the development and implementation of policies promoting equal opportunity for women within the Association and the educational research community. Educational researchers in educational institutions, government agencies and private organizations should help to disseminate the findings of the Committee and its policy recommendations.

The standing Committee will assist the Association by maintaining contact with federal agencies concerned with equal opportunity and liaison with other associations on issues related to women. The Committee will undertake positive activities related to women, including the following:

a. Review existing association policy and procedures for possible sex discrimination.

b. Monitor AERA's efforts to bring women into full participation in the Association (See resolution I).

c. Establish liaison with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Office of Civil Rights in order to monitor the progress of women in universities and other employment settings.

d. Assist in developing vita files or other procedures to include women in recommendations for advisory boards, consultantships, committees, etc.

e. Report yearly to the membership on activities undertaken by the Committee.

IV. Be it resolved that the Association expand its professional staff to include an individual whose full time responsibility shall include the development and implementation of the affirmative action plans and activities of the Association.

A commitment to equal opportunity for women to participate in the Association and the community of educational researchers can be judged by the steps the Association takes to implement equal opportunity. The commitment will be met when goals and timetables with respect to policy are developed and implemented. It is unrealistic to expect the present central staff to take on the additional activities required by a commitment to equal opportunity. The goals and timetables of affirmative action require a data base and monitoring of progress. The Ad Hoc Committee on the Role and Status of Women has pointed the direction for the necessary data base. As an association of individuals devoted to research, AERA can meet its commitment to equal opportunity for women by providing the staff and support necessary for the development and implementation of affirmative action plans and activities.

Part II.

PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN THE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH COMMUNITY

Jean Lipman-Blumen
National Institute of Education

Patricia E. Stivers
American Educational Research Association

Ann R. Tickamyer
National Institute of Education

Suzanne Brainard
National Institute of Education

PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN THE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH COMMUNITY

Jean Lipman-Blumen, NIE, Patricia E. Stivers, AERA,
Ann R. Tickamyer, NIE, and Suzanne Brainard, NIE.

(Paper prepared for presentation at the American Educational Research Association, annual meeting, Washington, D. C., 1975.)

The relationship between women's professional activity and their professional rewards recently has become a subject of major interest to social scientists. This emerging concern has received additional impetus from the women's political caucuses within the various social science associations. A major issue underlying this concern is whether or not women's professional activity, as well as their rewards for such activities, is commensurate with men's.

The present paper, prepared under the auspices of the AERA Committee on the Status of Women, attempts to address this question of the condition of women in the educational research community. It looks at the trend in female participation in AERA since 1965, as well as the productivity and rewards of these women compared to their male colleagues. Background factors also are examined in their relation to the primary research question, which asks, "What, if any, are the differences between men's and women's backgrounds, participation (including productivity) and rewards as members of AERA and the larger educational research community?"

This report is based upon three different types of data: 1) AERA records dating back to 1965; 2) a 1975 demographic survey of the total membership; and 3) a survey of approximately 7% of the AERA membership conducted in early 1975.

I. Historical Survey of Female Participation in AERA Activities

A count by gender was made of individual participation in Association activities from 1965 through 1974. Gender was assigned on the basis of first name. Individuals listed only by initials

were checked in available biographical directories to determine gender; those where no additional information could be obtained were omitted from the sample.

Prior to 1970 individuals listed by initials were assumed to be male; following the year 1970, we felt this assumption was no longer valid, and additional references were checked for a more complete name before gender was assigned for these individuals. Names where gender could not be identified were omitted from the totals. This occurred most often in annual meeting programs; even there, fewer than 2% of the names in any year were omitted.

A. Annual Meeting (Table 1)

Sizeable gains in the participation in the annual meeting have been made by females in the last decade. As we shall see, the annual meeting has been the area of most consistent increase. Females constituted 10 % of all annual meeting participants in 1965; 12.9 percent in 1967; 13.6% in 1969; 16.8% in 1971; 18.6% in 1973; and 22.2% in 1975.

Level of female participation in the various roles in the annual meeting, however, has varied. Among primary authors on the program, female rates have been slightly higher than the overall percentages: from 11.9% in 1965 to 23% in 1975. Among secondary authors, the levels have increased from 12.1% in 1965 to 27% in 1975. Females chaired considerably more sessions on the program than

10 years ago: from 2% in 1965 to 18.5% in 1975. But gains in the discussant role have been fewer: 4.3%in 1965 to 13.4% in 1975. As major invitational speakers, the pattern is erratic: one of 7 (14.3%) in 1965; none at all from 1966 through 1970; one each in 1971 and 1973 (about 5%); two in 1972 (9%); and three in each of the last two years (13% to 15%).

Authors in Periodicals (Tables 2 & 3)

Percentages of female authors among AERA periodicals vary considerably over the ten-year period. Female authors in the American Educational Research Journal for example, represented 17% of the total authors in 1965 and 3.6% in 1966. They rose to 9.3 %, 13% and 21% in the next three years, but dropped in 1971 and 1972 to 14% and 12.7% before peaking at 18% in 1973. In 1974 the percentage was off again to 16.3%.

Female authors in the Review of Educational Research were at an all-time high of 20.4% in 1965, then ranged from 12.5% to 17% during the years '66-'68, '70 and '73. However, they dropped to 8% in each of 1969, '71 and '72, and fell to zero in 1974.

B. Governing Boards and Appointments (Tables 4 & 5)

Female representation on the AERA Governing Council was nonexistent from 1965 through 1969, and has been six or twelve percent in each year since, depending on whether one or two women were elected.

Representation of women on standing Association committees--approximately 10% for the past two years--reached a record of 19% in 1972, up from 13% in 1971. That represents a considerable increase compared to the three and seven percent levels of previous years in the same decade.

Representation on ad hoc committees in the Association ranged from as low as 1.7% (of 57 persons) to 8.4% (of 59 persons) during the first seven years of the decade examined, a period when a proliferation of ad hoc committees actively worked on association programs. Since 1972, however, no more than one or two ad hoc committees have been in existence, two of which are the women's committee and the student's committee. In those years, female representation increased to 25% (of eight individuals); 54.5% (of 11 individuals) and 37.5% (of 16 individuals--including five out of six members on the women's committee).

Representation of women among editorships and on editorial boards was similarly weak. In the decade examined, there were no females at all on the editorial boards or among the major editorships of any of the three AERA periodicals. Nor were there any on the editorial boards of the two major reference works produced during that time: the Encyclopedia of Educational Research and the Handbook of Research on Teaching. At the same time, eight to ten percent of the contributors in both reference volumes were

women. However, the current review editor of the American Educational Research Journal is a woman, as was one of the volume editors for the seven-part Readings in Educational Research series.

Use of females as reviewers by the American Educational Research Journal did not occur until 1971 (two to three percent in 1971 and 1972), but it has increased to 15% and nearly 20% in the past two years. Reviewers and consulting editors for the Review of Educational Research included 34.4% women in 1965, during which year AERA published the last topical issue on early childhood education, an area of specialization for many women researchers. However, the percentage of women reviewers dropped to 14%, 16% and 12% in the next three years and has ranged from 6% to 8% in the most recent six-year period.

C. Women Among the Total Membership

Until recently, only scattered estimates from surveys sampling five to ten percent of the membership were available as guides to the number of women in the Association or the field. Preliminary results from the membership-wide demographic survey undertaken last fall by the Association now have provided the most reliable estimate to date. With more than 4,000 responses tallied from 9,000 members surveyed to date, we find that 26.3% of AERA members are female, 70.3% are male. An additional 3.4% did not indicate gender.

Major disciplines indicated among females in the major demographic survey are education: 56.9% (627); psychology: 19% (209); statistics, mathematics or research methodology: 9.6% (106). Another 10.2% indicated disciplines not listed on the questionnaire, and fewer

than 2% indicated sociology, anthropology, history, political science or philosophy.

Of 1105 females indicating their highest degrees, 714 (65%) held doctorates and 339 held master's degrees (31%).

Primary work responsibility reported by the females in the survey were: 36.3% teaching; 15.4% students; 11.9% research; 10.1% management and administration of other than R & D; 9% evaluation, and 5.1% management and administration of R & D.

An interesting parallel emerged between males and females in reporting primary affiliations (or place of employment): for both sexes, 69% are employed by colleges or universities; 11% are with school systems, and 7% are with R & D organizations.

D. Conclusions from Historical Data

The greatest level of participation by women in the field emerged in the most "grassroots" activity--the annual meeting--where a steadily increasing percentage of women in all roles has occurred. However, in committees and review boards, where participation is primarily by appointment, the involvement of women has been inconsistent and largely insignificant.

The greater percentage of females who report student status in the recent AERA demographic survey (15.4% of females compared to 7% of males) suggests that as more women advance in careers in this field, their visibility could lead to more frequent appointments in these roles and greater influence in the making of appointments.

II. 1975 Survey of AERA Members (7% Sample):

We turn now to the results of a sample survey conducted early this year.

A. Sample Selection

The sample was selected from the September 1974 membership records. Since the printout of members includes 28 listings per page, three random numbers were independently selected.

On each page of the galley, the listing corresponding to the first number was selected. The first run-through of the galley produced a sufficient number of males. A second complete run-through, using the second number, and a small partial run-through, using the third number, were necessary to locate a sufficient number of females.

A total of 650 (325 each males and females) were selected to allow for the probability that up to 25 in each category actually had dropped their membership.

The individual on the random line was included in the sample unless he or she had a foreign address (insufficient time to allow for returns) or a first name of indeterminate gender. In either of these cases, the next name listed (allowing the same consideration) was used. In several cases, as many as seven names had to be passed over due to numerous listing by initials. Husband/wife members were included on each portion of the sample and sent separate questionnaires.

After inactive members were eliminated from the sample, a total of 309 males and 318 females were sent questionnaires. Responses were received from 240 women and 203 men, representing 75.4% of the women and 65.7% of the men. The overall response rate was 71%.

B. Data Analysis

Two primary data analysis strategies were employed. The first was contingency table analysis, using differences in percentages and Chi Square with a .05 level of significance. On occasion Phi was used as a measure of strength of relationship. In some instances the introduction of multiple control variables resulted in reduction of the number of cases, so that meaningful analysis was impossible. To circumvent this problem and generally to permit a multivariate analysis of the data, linear multiple correlation and regression also were used.

C. Profile

1. General Demographic Features:

The final sample consists of 240 females (54.2%) and 203 males (45.8%). The age categories range from 20-24 to 60-64, with ages 30-34 the modal age category. The median age category was 35-39 years.

In terms of race and ethnicity, 89.2% of the respondents are Caucasian, 3.6% are Black, 1.6% are American Indian, and both the Oriental and Spanish surname groups contribute 1.4% each to the sample, with a residual ("other") category of 2.5%.

Our sample showed no significant differences between men and women in terms of ethnic and racial background.

There are no significant age differences between the female

and male groups, although there is some slight tendency for there to be more women in the "under 35" year group. This is probably related to the finding in the larger demographic survey that there are more women than men students.

When we look at marital status, women are significantly less likely to be married than men. Almost four times as many women as men have never been married (31% vs. 8%), and only 50% of the women compared to 88% of the men currently are married. In addition, 16% of the women (vs. 3% of the men) are currently widowed or divorced.

The low marrying rate of women is reflected in the limited number of children women in this sample have. Fifty-four percent of the women do not have children, compared to almost 22% of the men who are not parents. Among those respondents who are now or ever have been married, 89% of the men and only 66% of the women have children. And among those respondents who do have children, women have significantly fewer children than men.

2. Education:

Examination of educational background reveals that 80% of the men and only 65% of the women hold doctorates. (Interestingly enough, AERA members of both sexes in this sample are more likely to hold Ph.D.'s than Ed.D's, despite the fact that, as we shall see, the majority of respondents claim education as their primary discipline.) At the master's level, there are almost twice as many women as men (30% vs. 16%). The relationship between sex and highest degree is significant at the .001 level ($x^2_4 = 17.79$).

INSERT TABLE 6 HERE

Education, as alluded to above, is the primary discipline of 59% of the women and 54% of the men. Psychology is reported as the primary discipline by 25% of the men and 19% of the women, and statistics and mathematics are in third place, claiming 10% of both groups. Sociology, political science, anthropology, economics, history and philosophy are claimed by less than 4% of either sex. These figures mirror closely the larger demographic study and give us greater confidence in the sample.

Sex is clearly related to part-time enrollment in graduate school ($p = .03$). Sixty-nine percent of the women, compared to 59% of the men report part-time status during at least some period of their graduate study This is true despite the fact that women are less likely to have been married. One might speculate that the higher percentage of part-time students among women reflects the greater difficulty women have in obtaining educational funds from public monies as well as from family resources. Overall, 64% of the total sample report part-time enrollment, 36% full-time enrollment.

INSERT TABLE 7 HERE

3. Employment

At the time of the survey an overwhelming majority of respondents were employed. The modal pattern for both sexes is full-time employment; however, somewhat more men than women (92% vs. 83%) are employed full-time, and over twice as many women as men are employed part-time (12% vs. 5%). These differences are significant at the .02 level.

INSERT TABLE 8 HERE

In general, there is a strong relationship between sex and length of time in present organization. Men are more likely than women to be employed in their present organization for 5 or more years, and women are more likely than men to be in the two years or less category. ($p = .005$)

TABLE 9

LENGTH IN PRESENT ORGANIZATION

	1 yr. to 2 yrs.		3-4 yrs.		5 or more years		TOTAL
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Male	51	(26)	38	(19)	108	(55)	197
Female	95	(42)	44	(20)	86	(38)	225
	146		82		194		422

a. Work Setting and Responsibilities

Men and women are equally distributed across work settings. Sixty-seven percent of the women and 62% of the men list colleges and universities as their primary places of work. School systems claim 15% of the men and 16% of the women, while research and development organizations employ 9% of the men and 5% of the women.

Teaching is the major work responsibility of 46% of the women and 36% of the men, while research is cited by equal percentages of men and women.

Men and women are equally likely to report research and evaluation as their major function, but men are somewhat more likely to report that they are involved in R & D management and other kinds of administrative work.

4. Participation

Participation variables denoting professional activity can be broken down into two different types. The first type is participation in AERA, and the second includes other professional activities. In general, we find that overall participation is low, but this is especially true of AERA sponsored activities.

a. Participation in AERA

In examining the total range of AERA activity from the historical survey, we find that the participation rate for women was low in previous years. Although recently there appears to have been some improvement, a large gap still remains. It was expected that this differential also would show up in the sample data; however, it was not in fact apparent. It is true that there is a slight tendency for men to have a higher participation rate than women, but in almost no case is this statistically significant. Since the percentages involved are so small (frequently less than 5%) it would be misleading to place any emphasis on these differences.

This generally low participation rate may explain the discrepancy between the sample data and the figures for the universe of AERA activities in the historical survey. Since we have concluded that it is only a very small group of people who are active, a sample of 443 out of approximately 9000 may not adequately represent the distribution of participation. Therefore, in the case of participation in AERA activities, the historical survey probably represents a more accurate picture of participation by sex within that small group of participants.

There are, however, several areas where there are interesting differences by sex in the sample survey. One of these is in length of membership in the AERA. Men are more likely to be members for a longer period of time. This probably is due in part to the very slight tendency for men to be older, and the greater number of female students.* (We also have confirmation from the demographic data that women do not have quite as high an educational level as the men do.) The same percentages of men and women have been members less than 1 year, however.

Other areas of interest are in session participation and paper presentation to the annual meeting during the past 5 years. Fourteen percent of the men participated as session chairpersons or discussants at least once, compared to 8% of the women. However, when it comes to presenting papers, there is less difference. Twenty-four percent of the men gave at least one paper compared to 21% of the women. It appears that men must participate more in other ways. There is some additional evidence for this in the figures for several other activities. For example, 11% of the men were program chairpersons, compared to 7% of the women; 6% of the men participated in an invited symposium, compared to 2% of the women. It should be emphasized, however, that these figures are not statistically significant, and, in any event, should be interpreted with much caution because of

*Information about student status is derived from the larger demographic survey.

the small numbers involved. Furthermore, if one examines the breakdown of total number of AERA presentations by sex, the difference is again very small. Thirty-two percent of the men and 27% of the women have participated at least once in these activities.

When we examine the data for governance activities, there is practically no participation at all. Very few men or women have been on any of the various governance committees or have been involved in any policymaking positions, including editorial or proposal review boards. There is a statistically significant relationship between sex and serving on AERA Division Committees ($p = .03$), AERA editorial boards ($p = .05$), and serving as AERA periodical reviewers ($p = .05$), with men more frequently doing all three. However, the numbers involved are very small. Therefore, it is impossible to draw any firm conclusions about these activities, other than that they are run by a very small group of people.

INSERT TABLES 10, 11, 12

b. Non-AERA Participation

If we now turn to participation other than in the AERA, slightly higher rates are found for both men and women. Ninety-six percent of the men and 89% of the women belong to professional societies other than AERA ($p = .01$). This is the only statistically

INSERT TABLE 13

significant difference between men and women in terms of participation in non-AERA groups. Similarly, 81% of the men and 84% of the women attended at least one other meeting last year. These figures decrease

when it comes to number of presentations; nevertheless, they are fairly high compared to the AERA presentation rate of the past five years. The percentages of men and women are fairly stable over different types of meetings. Forty-nine percent of the men and 43% of the women have given at least one presentation at a national meeting. Regional meetings have similar figures (49% and 42%), and invited conferences also are in the same general range, although slightly lower (41% vs. 35%). There is little difference between the sexes, especially when one collapses the variables into no presentations vs. at least one. If, however, one examines the data using the full number of possible presentations, then it can be seen that men have a slight edge in the higher numbers of presentations. The actual number of people involved is so small, however, that these trends should be interpreted cautiously. In general, we conclude that the participation rates for non-AERA professional activities do not vary significantly by sex.

The higher participation rates in non-AERA meetings suggest that a large number of AERA members do not consider AERA their only or major professional organization. And it is true that in answer to the question "Do you consider AERA your primary professional association?" only 33% of both the men and the women responded "yes." Twice as many people have a primary identification with other groups, compared to those who consider AERA their primary professional organization.

The lack of differences by sex in this variable, combined with the lack of differences in participation by sex, makes it unnecessary to pursue these relationships further; however, it was considered possible that primary affiliation might be related to general participation rates. Significant relationships exist between primary affiliation and number of other professional societies ($p = .002$), number of professional meetings attended last year ($p = .0001$), and service on non-AERA committees ($p = .001$). Even though there no statistical significance for the number of regional meetings, national presentations, and invited conference presentations, the same trend may be observed--non-AERA participation was greater than AERA participation.

It is not surprising that people who do not consider AERA their primary organization are more active in other groups. If we examine the relationship between primary affiliation and AERA participation, the trend is clear --at least in terms of the activities that have enough participants to consider. People who identify AERA as their primary organization attend more AERA meetings ($p = .0002$), and more often have given at least one paper ($p = .001$). Once again, however, there are too few participants in the other activities to draw serious conclusions.

As indicated above, these trends generally held up when broken down by sex. It can be concluded here that although there is an obvious relationship between primary affiliation and type of participation, neither this variable, nor sex, makes much difference in terms of overall participation.

c. Participation and Education

If we now control for highest degree obtained, we find that in almost all cases there are still no significant differences by sex in participation, either in AERA or non-AERA activities. Two new relationships do emerge, however, in AERA activities. One is between sex and the number of AERA annual meetings attended during the past five years, for Ed.D.'s only. Forty-three percent of the women, compared to 21% of the men, have not attended any meetings ($p=.03$). The other finding is that, controlling for education, the relationship between sex and being a

INSERT TABLE 14 HERE

reviewer of AERA articles or periodicals holds up only among Ph.D.'s. Eleven percent of the men with Ph.D.'s, compared to 2% of the women, have been reviewers during the past five years ($p < .01$).

INSERT TABLE 15 HERE

Significance does not appear when controlling for highest degree on any of the other activities, including those few which were statistically significant previously. However, once again the numbers involved are often very small, especially after the introduction of this third variable.

If we examine the tables for their general direction, we find that it is similar to the direction of unstratified relationships between sex and participation. Men in general have a slight tendency to be more active, although women at the M.A./M.S. are somewhat more active than the corresponding men. For example, 33% of these women, compared to 41% of the men, have not attended any AERA annual meetings

in the last five years (the opposite of the situation mentioned above for Ed.D.'s and slightly different from the general trend as well). Another example is that a greater percentage of these women presented at least one paper at an annual meeting in the last five years (11% compared to 9%). This is hardly a large or significant difference, but, in view of the general trend, it is worth noting parenthetically.

It can be seen that in a few cases of significant differences in participation by sex, educational level may be the key variable. In several other cases, differences appear when controlling for education which were not previously apparent. Interestingly enough, these were at higher degree levels. In general, however, education does not appear to affect participation by sex.

5. Productivity

Productivity is measured by publications of various sorts. These include books, workbooks, chapters in books, monographs, articles in professional journals, other articles, and technical reports. Publications are counted separately for primary and secondary authorship.

Collapsing publications into categories of none or at least one, there are significant relationships between sex and primary authorship for edited books ($p = .004$), book chapters ($p = .05$), monographs ($p = .05$), journal articles ($p = .003$), and technical reports ($p = .05$). The only significant relationship for secondary authorship is for journal articles ($p = .02$).

INSERT TABLES 16-21 HERE

In all of these cases, men are more productive than women, although it is important to emphasize that in no case is the relationship very strong . For example, looking only at primary authorship, we find the following: 11% of the men have edited at least 1 book, compared to 4% of the women (Ø = .15); 23% of the men compared to 15% of the women have written at least one chapter in a book (Ø = .10); 21% of the men compared to 14% of the women have written a monograph (Ø = .10); 66% of the men compared to 48% of the women have written a journal article (Ø = .18); 41% of the men compared to 32% of the women have written a technical report (Ø = .10). The strongest relationship here is the one between sex and journal articles; however, even this is not particularly pronounced.

These results should be interpreted with caution. In this analysis, we are differentiating between none and at least one publication. If we look at the full range of numbers of publications, the differences in the larger numbers are less pronounced. However, there are too few of these cases, and the marginals are too small to place much confidence in the uncollapsed data. It appears that the "none or some" distinction is a legitimate one, both conceptually and for purposes of analysis; however, the actual size of the differences should be kept in mind.

a. Productivity and Primary Professional Affiliation

If these same relationships are examined controlling for whether AERA is the primary professional affiliation, we find that on primary authorship of an edited book, chapters in books, and journal articles, the relationship between sex and productivity holds up only when AERA is not considered the major affiliation. The relationship between sex and technical report authorship, on the other hand, disappears for the non-AERA people and holds up for those who consider AERA their major affiliation.

In addition, two new relationships emerged. These are between sex and authorship of workbooks for AERA primary people and secondary authorship of other articles for non-AERA primary people. In all but the last case, the direction of the relationship favors men as more productive. It appears that the relationship between sex and productivity is contingent upon type of affiliation with AERA. Further, for most types of publications, this is true of non-AERA primary people and not AERA primaries.

INSERT TABLES 22 & 23 HERE

When we look at the zero-order relationships between AERA primary affiliation and productivity, we find that, although there are few statistically significant results, non-AERA primary people tend to be more active as primary authors. This trend reaches significance ($p = .02$) for authorship of journal articles and is generally true of other types of publications. When it comes to secondary authorship, the data vary, with some cases having greater productivity by AERA people and some showing

the reverse. This suggests that part of the difference between AERA and non-AERA primaries is due to the tendency toward low productivity among AERA people.

b. Productivity and Education

Controlling for educational level also depresses the relationship between sex and productivity. The only relationship remaining that even approaches statistical significance is between sex and primary authorship of journal articles among Ed.D.'s; (and this is not strictly within the accepted limits of significance $p = .06$). However, within most categories of authorship, the direction of the relationship between sex and productivity remains the same--men are slightly more productive than women. In some cases, however, women with M.A.'s or M.S.'s are slightly more likely to have at least one publication than are men of the same educational level. In some cases, the trend is also reversed when secondary, rather than primary, authorship is involved.

It appears, then, that differences in educational level also are an important part of the explanation of sex differences in productivity, but the tendency to maintain the direction of differences noted above when stratifying by highest degree indicates that this is not the entire explanation.

It is necessary at this point to investigate further the relationship between education and productivity. If educational level and primary professional affiliation are simultaneously controlled, only two statistically significant relationships remained. These are

both among Ph.D.'s only. The first is a significant relationship between sex and primary authorship of journal articles among non-AERA people ($p = .05$), with 84% of the men and 66.7% of the women having at least one. The second significant relationship is for secondary authorship of journal articles and this time it holds for AERA people only. Sixty-one percent of the men and 31% of the women have second authored at least one ($p=.05$). In other words, differences in sex tend to disappear when both education and professional affiliation are controlled for all publications except journal articles. Considering the importance of journal articles in establishing professional reputation, this is an important difference.

INSERT TABLES 24 & 25 HERE

6. Multivariate Analysis of Participation and Productivity Variables:

To avoid the problem of a reduced number of cases, while simultaneously examining a number of explanatory factors, a multivariate analysis approach was selected. This consisted of a multiple correlation and regression strategy, limited to a linear additive model. Once again, the relationships among various background factors and dependent variables denoting professional activity, including participation and productivity, were examined.

Previously we examined three types of indicators of professional activity. These were participation in AERA, other professional participation, and publications of various sorts.

For this analysis we devised indices of each of these concepts by constructing simple summated scales. After dichotomizing the relevant variables into categories of none or at least one of the items being measured, each of the measures of participation and productivity were added to give a cumulative index. The final result was an index of participation in AERA, an index of other professional participation, and indices of authorship, including total, primary, and secondary authorship. These then were used as dependent variables in the multivariate analysis simultaneously testing some of the relationships previously examined individually. (In addition, they are employed as exogenous variables in subsequent analyses.)

Both participation in AERA and in other professional activities were used as dependent variables in equations employing sex, age, educational level, length of time in present organization and occupational prestige as explanatory factors. Although both equations are statistically significant (AERA participation: $p = .01$; other participation: $p = .001$), neither can account for a very large proportion of the variance. For AERA participation, $R^2 = .057$. In the AERA participation equation, educational level and length of time in present work organization account for the largest amount of the total explained variance (the change in R^2 is .03 and .01, respectively) and only educational level is statistically significant ($p = .05$). Sex,

occupational prestige, and age each account for less than 1% of the explained variance in the dependent variable. Direction of the relationships are all as expected--high education and occupational prestige, extended employment in present organization, and male gender are all indicative of high participation.

INSERT TABLE 26 HERE

More of the total variance in other professional participation can be accounted for by these same independent variables; however, it is still less than 10%. Educational level remains the most important factor, explaining over 5.5% of the total variance, and it is the only statistically significant variable ($p = .01$). However, age is now the second most powerful indicator, with 2.5% of the total variance, when controlling for the other independent variables. These results are generally in accord with those of the contingency table analysis.

INSERT TABLE 27 HERE

Background factors related to productivity were examined next. With a scale of overall productivity, including both primary and secondary authorship, a total of 16% of the variance is accounted for using the same independent variables discussed above. The significance level was .001. Educational level and sex are the most important factors, explaining 13.3% and 2.3% of the total explained variance, respectively. Both

are statistically significant, the former at the .001 level and the latter at the .01 level. Direction is as expected, with a high educational level and male gender leading to high productivity.

INSERT TABLE 28 HERE

Publications are generally considered a key factor in professional activity and a good indicator of achievement, especially within the research community. Therefore, additional analysis on this item was considered worth pursuing. Separate scales were constructed for primary and secondary authorship, and additional independent variables were introducted into the equation. The total amount of variance that now could be explained by primary authorship was increased to almost 21%. Education and sex still are the most important explanatory factors, accounting for 9% and 5 1/2% of the total explained variance respectively. Current salary also contributes close to 4%. Current salary coupled with education are the only statistically significant factors ($p = .001$ for both). Age contributes 2% and marital status, number of children, and occupation prestige add virtually nothing.

INSERT TABLE 29 HERE

Using the scale of secondary authorship as a dependent variable, there were no statistically significant results, and only 4% of the total variance could be explained.

The results of these analyses tend to confirm the findings of the contingency tables. Sex plays no part in participation and a small, but significant, role in productivity.

7. Rewards: Salaries and Promotions:

a. Salary

Salary is used here as one operational definition of professional rewards. When we look at entering salaries, we note a significant relationship between sex and entering salary. In general, women are more likely to receive lower and men higher entering salaries. Forty-three percent of the women compared to thirty-two percent of the men received under $12,000 for an entering salary in their present jobs. At the $20,000 and above level, men were more than twice as likely as women (24% vs. 11%) to command this range as an entering salary in their current position (p = .001).

INSERT TABLE 30 HERE

When we control for highest degree respondent has, the relationship falls below the level of significance, but the trend is generally the same.

Among respondents with Ph.D.'s, men are more than twice as likely as women to receive $20,000 or above as an entering salary (19% men vs. 9% women). Among Ed.D. holders, men are more than four times as likely as women (21% vs. 5%) to receive $20,000 or more, while 11% more women than men with Ed.D.'s

entered below the $12,000 level. At the master's level, 14% of the men, compared to less than 2% of the women, entered at the $20,000 or above level, and women still outflank the men in the "under $12,000" level by 7%.

When we look at current salary, we see a similar pattern. Sex is strongly related to current salary, with 54% of the men and only 29% of the women earning $20,000 or more. Women exceed men in both of the lower salary categories ($12,000 - $20,000, and under $12,000).

INSERT TABLE 31 HERE

The relationship between sex and current salary, controlling for highest degree, remains intact at both the doctorate and masters levels. Among respondents who hold the Ph.D., 53% of the males, but only 39% of the females, earn $20,000 or above, while 56% of the women, compared to 39% of the men, earned between $12,000 and $20,000.

INSERT TABLE 32 HERE

Among Ed.D. holders, 66% of the men vs. 33% of the women currently earn $20,000 or more, and women again are more likely to be in the lower salary ranks. Sixty-two percent of the women Ed.D.'s vs. 32% of the men Ed.D.'s earn between $12,000 and $20,000, and more than twice as many women as men earn below $12,000 . At the master's level, the pattern is upheld, with men more than three times as likely as women to be earning $20,000 or more.

INSERT TABLES 33 & 34 HERE

When we introduce length of time in present organization into the relationship between sex and salary, we find the strength of the relationship changes, but the direction remains consistent. Among individuals who have been in their current employment setting two years or less, the relationship between sex and salary is no longer statistically significant. But for those individuals who have been with the organization three to ten years, sex is significantly related to current salary. For the small group (N = 67) who have been in their present organizations more than ten years, salaries are noticeably higher for both men and women (83% of the men and 81% of the women at $20,000 and above). For those long term employees, the differences at the lower salary levels are less than those observed among workers with shorter periods of employment.

When simultaneous controls were instituted for educational level and length of time in present organization, we note that the relationship between sex and current salary tends to weaken, but the trend persists. However, it is particularly noteworthy that for Ed.D. holders it remains strong throughout most time periods.

In an effort to pursue still further the sex and current salary relationship, we controlled for major responsibility (i.e., teaching, research, administration, etc.). Among those teaching at colleges and universities, when present

academic rank was controlled, the relationship between sex and current salary disappeared.

Among researchers, the relationship between sex and salary is somewhat stronger than the zero-order relationship. Forty-eight percent of the men vs. 16% of the women are the highest salary group ($20,000 and above), and 71% of the women vs. 38% of the men are in the mid-range ($12,000 - $20,000). At the lowest salary level, there were approximately equal proportions of men and women researchers. (But researchers tend to be concentrated in the under-40 year age group, while faculty are evenly divided by age.)

For respondents in R & D management and other primarily administrative jobs, the salary differences by sex did not reach the necessary level of significance, but the trend was in the same general direction. Managers, incidentally, tend to be concentrated in the over-40 age category.

If we next control for both primary responsibility and educational level simultaneously, there are more changes. Among Ph.D.'s who teach, the relationship between sex and current salary disappears. Among Ed.D.'s, however, the relationship becomes stronger and is significant at the .02 level.

INSERT TABLE 35 HERE

Among researchers with Ph.D.'s, men are more likely to earn high salaries, and women more likely to earn medium salaries. Both are equally likely to be on the low range of the salary continuum. There are too few researchers with Ed.D.'s to be able to draw any conclusions.

INSERT TABLE 36 HERE

When we look at administrators, however, we once again see that male and female Ph.D.'s earn comparable salaries, but that among Ed.D.'s there is a difference, with 83% of the men earning a high salary compared to 50% of the women. These results indicate that it is neither educational level, nor major responsibility alone, which causes salary differentials between the sexes. Sex differentials are especially pronounced among Ed.D.'s, although they appear elsewhere as well.

In general, at every educational level, men usually earn more than women. While women tend to have fewer doctorates than men, even when they do have them, men earn considerably more money, except as faculty members with equal rank. Thus, we might speculate that women's failure to pursue the doctorate as often as men may be due to their recognition that they do not have much to gain by doing so. And the Ed.D. degree particularly seems to favor men over women in salary.

For those individuals whose current salaries exceed their entering salaries, there is no indication that this represents a change in responsibilities for either men or women. This increase in salary is probably more likely due to length of time on the job.

This differential in salary levels is very interesting, particularly when we note that the age distribution for men and women is similar, and also that women are somewhat more likely than men to receive their doctorates before age 35 (combined Ph.D. and Ed.D. - 57% women vs. 49% men).

b. Promotions

Promotions served as our second index of rewards. The relationship between sex and most recent promotion indicates that women are almost twice as likely as men to have received no promotion during their entire employment period within their present organization (22% vs. 12%, p = .009).

INSERT TABLE 37 HERE

Controlling for length of time within present organization, we note there is no siginficant difference in promotions between men and women who had been in their present work setting less than one year. However, among those who had been employed 1-2 years in their present organization, men were 14% more likely than women to have received no promotion. But among the small group of promotion winners, men were more likely to have received promotions one to two years ago (29%

men vs. 17% women), while women are more likely than men to have been promoted within the past year (28% vs. 18%), (perhaps a reflection of recent affirmative action programs).

When we examine the ranks of individuals who have been in the same organization three or more years, women are more likely to have received no promotions whatsoever. Among promotion winners, women seem to have done somewhat better only within the past year, although the picture is not entirely consistent.

Controlling for educational level and major responsibility, we see a relationship between sex and time of most recent promotion similar to the one noted between sex and current salary. Among Ph.D.'s, there is no significant difference; however, among Ed.D.'s, males are more likely to have been promoted recently. This is significant ($p = .05$) among Ed.D.'s who teach. Among researchers or administrators, the same general trend occurs, but fails to reach the required level of significance.

INSERT TABLE 38 HERE

c. Occupational Prestige

Another indicator of rewards is occupational prestige. There are significant differences between sex and occupational prestige using the Laumann occupational code,* with

*Laumann, E. O. Prestige and Association in an Urban Community, New York: Bobb-Merrill Company, 1966.

women more often falling in the job categories considered "semi-professional" and men in the "professional" categories.

INSERT TABLE 39 HERE

Among academics, men are more often full professors and department chairs, whereas women have a slight edge on associate and assistant professorships. These differences are not statistically significant however.

8. Multivariate Analysis of Reward Variables

a. Salary

Salary, as noted above, may be conceived as one operational definition of professional rewards. Employing multivariate techniques to examine the various factors that contribute to current and entering salaries, the findings of the previous analysis are confirmed and extended.

With current salary as the dependent variable, and sex, age, marital status, number of children, educational level, length of time in organization, time of most recent promotion, tenure, entering salary, productivity, and AERA affiliation as independent variables, a total of 53.5% of the variance can be explained. This is significant at the .001 level. The major contributing factors are age, entering salary, and sex (change in R^2 is .177, .126, and .107, respectively), each of which is significant at the .001 level. As might be expected, older age, male gender, and a high entering

salary correlate with high current salary. High educational level and an extended time in present organization each contribute approximately 3% of the total explained variance and are significant at .01 and .001 levels. Other factors that are statistically significant are having tenure and not considering AERA one's primary professional affiliation. These, however, do not contribute much to the total explained variance. It is interesting to note that productivity, defined in terms of primary authorship, contributes less than 1% to salary. This result calls into question the general assumption that publications are a major component in professional achievement and rewards, at least in this group.

INSERT TABLE 40 HERE

Since entering salary is such a large component of current salary, it was used as a dependent variable in a separate analysis. However, the most variance that can be accounted for is less than 6% of the total. Number of children (negatively correlated) and productivity (positively related) make the only significant (but small) contributions.

b. Other Rewards

Three other indicators of professional rewards are promotions, tenure, and occupational prestige. Only the analysis using tenure provided interesting results. Looking only at people affiliated with organizations where tenure was available, over 46% of the variance can be accounted for; and almost 44% of this is explained by length of time in

the organization. Another 1.7% is accounted for by age. All other factors are negligible, including productivity.

INSERT TABLE 41 HERE

Similarly, using time of most recent promotion as a dependent variable, length of time in present organization is also the most important factor. However, in this case, it accounts for only 3 1/2% of the total explained variance out of less than 8%. Another 2% is due to primary authorship, followed by age with 1.8%. Longevity, then, is once again of importance, although productivity also plays some part. Of course, it should be remembered that the multiple R^2 is very small, and the portions of the total explained variance these variables explain are correspondingly minute.

INSERT TABLE 42 HERE

The last indicator of professional rewards, occupational prestige, is not significant and almost none of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables. Once again these results are congruent with those of the contingency table analysis.

9. Summary:

In summation, among the very limited group in AERA who participate in governance and other association activities, the proportion of women is increasing, if somewhat erratically. But activity in AERA generally is limited to a very small group of women and men.

Productivity differences between men and women are slight. In cases where they reach statistical significance, the strength of the relationships is usually limited.

While participation and productivity rates of men and women show only slight differences, the reward system is clearly differentiated by sex. This is influenced most by level of education and length of time in the work organization. Admittedly, there is a greater proportion of males with doctorates, and more women than men have masters degrees. But even when women do hold the same degree as their male colleagues, their salary differences tend to persist, particularly among Ed.D. holders.

Some very recent gains by women--particularly within the last year--are noted in terms of promotions. And women who are long established in the field (i.e., in the same organization more than ten years) appear to do as well as men.

But women in the less advanced stages of their professional lives are disadvantaged compared to men at the same stages, at least in terms of salaries.

In an oversimplified way, we can answer our original research question by concluding that

1) the most meaningful demographic difference between women and male respondents is educational level;
2) participation and productivity differences are slight; but,
3) reward differentials between the sexes are substantial.

Clearly, more women must be encouraged to pursue doctorates, particularly Ph.D.'s. The Ed.D. degree seems to provide little protection against sex discrimination. Rewards need to be made more commensurate with professional activity and productivity levels. This is a serious situation whose remedy must be sought immediately and aggressively by educators and educational planners.

TABLE 1

AERA Annual Meeting Participants

	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
PRIMARY AUTHORS	260 M 35 F	336 M 48 F	462 M 62 F	555 M 84 F	705 M 115 F	959 M 207 F	1029 M 233 F	1096 M 250 F	1200 M 309 F	1194 M 320 F	1194 M 356 F
Per cent Female	11.9	12.5	11.8	13.1	14	17.8	18.5	18.6	20.5	21.1	23
SECONDARY AUTHORS	58 M 8 F	119 M 27 F	138 M 37 F	208 M 25 F	229 M 60 F	313 M 55 F	418 M 106 F	431 M 93 F	529 M 127 F	536 M 179 F	476 M 176 F
Per cent Female	12.1	18.5	21.1	10.7	20.8	14.9	20.2	17.7	19.4	25	27
SESSION CHAIRS	78 M 2 F	88 M 8 F	117 M 13 F	156 M 14 F	196 M 15 F	314 M 30 F	329 M 42 F	334 M 47 F	365 M 56 F	338 M 70 F	312 M 71 F
Per cent Female	2.0	8.3	10	8.2	7.1	8.7	11.3	12.3	13.3	17.2	18.5
DISCUSSANTS & CRITICS	22 M 1 F	27 M 0 F	46 M 2 F	72 M 3 F	110 M 7 F	151 M 9 F	158 M 13 F	168 M 12 F	189 M 34 F	202 M 31 F	264 M 41 F
Per cent Female	4.3	0	4.2	4.0	6.0	5.6	7.6	6.7	15.2	13.3	13.4
SPEAKERS	6 M 1 F	10 M 0 F	8 M 0 F	11 M 0 F	14 M 0 F	14 M 0 F	16 M 1 F	20 M 2 F	21 M 1 F	19 M 3 F	17 M 3 F
Per cent Female	14.3	0	0	0	0	0	5.9	9.1	4.5	13.6	15
TOTAL	471	663	885	1128	1451	2052	2345	2453	2831	2892	2910
TOTAL Female	47	83	114	126	197	301	395	404	527	603	647
Per cent Female	10	12.5	12.9	11.2	13.6	14.7	16.8	16.5	18.6	20.9	22.2

Source: American Educational Research Association published Annual Meeting Programs, 1965-1975 (3/20/75)

TABLE 2

WOMEN IN AERA GOVERNANCE 1965-1974

	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
COUNCIL										
Total	10	11	12	12	13	14	15	16*	16	16
Female	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	2
Per cent female	0	0	0	0	0	7.1	13	12.5	6.2	12.5
STANDING COMMITTEES										
Total	43	60	56	NA	64	68	91	78	62	69
Female	0	2	4	NA	2	4	12	15	6	7
Per cent female	0	3	7	NA	3	5.8	13.2	19.2	9.6	10.1
AD HOC COMMITTEES										
Total	67	66	57	NA	111	38	59	8	11	16
Female	5	3	1	NA	5	2	5	2	6	6
Per cent female	7.4	4.5	1.7	NA	4.5	5.2	8.4	25	54.5	37.5

*One student

TABLE 3

EDITORS & EDITORIAL BOARDS

	Per cent female									
	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
RER										
Consulting Editors & Reviewers	34.4	14	16.7	12.2	7.1	6.3	7.4	7.0	7.7	8.3
Editorial Board	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - no females of five - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -									
Editors	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - no females - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -									
AERJ										
Consulting Editors & Reviewers	0	0	0	0	0		2.6	2.9	19.7	14.8
Editorial Board	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - no females of five (discontinued in 1970)									
Editor	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - no females - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -									
Review Editor	- - - - no females - - - -						0	0	1 of 1	1 of 1
ER										
Authors	0	0	0	0	0	6.8	9.1	0	9.7	20.8
Editorial Board	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - no females - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -									
Editors	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - no females - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -									

NOTES: Handbook of Research in Education (1973) Editorial Board - no females of nine
Contributors - six of 69 (8.7%)

Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1969) Editorial Board - no females of eight
Contributors - 20 of 192 (10.6%)

TABLE 4

WOMEN AUTHORS IN AERJ -- 1965-1974

	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
Single Authors	15 M 2 F	27 M 0 F	34 M 1 F	45 M 5 F	38 M 8 F	29 M 6 F	23 M 4 F	34 M 4 F	27 M 3 F	25 M 4 F
Per cent Female	11.8	0	2.9	10	17.4	17.1	14.8	10.5	10	13.8
Primary Authors	11 M 2 F	16 M 1 F	17 M 1 F	24 M 2 F	22 M 1 F	25 M 2 F	19 M 4 F	26 M 3 F	11 M 3 F	20 M 4 F
Per cent Female	15.4	5.9	5.6	7.7	4.3	7.4	17.4	10.3	21.4	16.7
Secondary Authors	13 M 4 F	13 M 1 F	18 M 3 F	28 M 3 F	31 M 5 F	27 M 14 F	29 M 4 F	34 M 7 F	11 M 5 F	25 M 6 F
Per cent Female	23.5	7.1	14.3	9.7	13.9	34.1	12.1	17.1	31.3	19.4
TOTAL Authors	47	55	75	108	108	105	86	110	61	86
Per cent Female	17	3.6	6.7	9.3	13	21	14	12.7	18	16.3

Author count includes articles, reviews, brief notes or comment.

Names of indeterminate gender omitted from yearly totals: 1 in each of 1967, 1968, & 1973; 2 each in 1970, 1972, 1974; 3 each in 1969 & 1971.

TABLE 5

WOMEN AUTHORS IN RER -- 1965-1974

	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
Single Authors	13 M 8 F	18 M 3 F	26 M 3 F	18 M 3 F	31 M 2 F	25 M 2 F	15 M 1 F	21 M 3 F	13 M 1 F	13 M 0 F
Per cent Female	38.1	14.3	10.3	14.3	6.1	7.4	6.3	12.5	7.1	0
Primary Authors	12 M 2 F	18 M 1 F	9 M 4 F	14 M 2 F	11 M 0 F	2 M 2 F	8 M 0 F	5 M 0 F	6 M 2 F	7 M 0 F
Per cent Female	14.3	5.3	30.7	12.5	0	50	0	0	25	0
Secondary Authors	12 M 1 F	16 M 4 F	12 M 2 F	16 M 3 F	14 M 2 F	6 M 1 F	9 M 2 F	9 M 0 F	7 M 3 F	8 M 0 F
Per cent Female	7.7	20	14.3	15.8	12.5	14.3	18.2	0	30	0
TOTAL Authors	54	61	58	57	50	40	36	38	34	28 M
Per cent Female	20.4	13.1	15.5	14	8	12.5	8.3	7.9	17.6	0

Names of indeterminate gender not included in totals for each year include: 1 in each of 1966, 1968 & 1971; two in each of 1965, 1967, 1970 & 1973.

TABLE 6

SEX BY HIGHEST DEGREE ATTAINED

	Ph.D.	%	Ed.D.	%	MA-MS	%	BA-BS	%	OTHER	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	110	54.2	53	26.1	32	15.8	1	.5	7	3.4	203	45.8
FEMALE	110	45.8	47	19.6	73	30.4	6	2.6	4	1.7	240	54.2
TOTAL	220		100	22.6	105	23.7	7	1.6	11	2.5	443	100.0

CHI square = 17.79296 with 4 degrees of freedom

Significance = .001

TABLE 7

SEX BY PART-TIME STUDENT STATUS

	PART-TIME	%	FULL-TIME	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	117	58.8	82	41.2	199	45.6
FEMALE	164	69.2	73	30.8	237	54.4
TOTAL	281	64.4	155	35.6	436	100.0

CHI square = 4.66667 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = .03

TABLE 8

SEX BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	FULL TIME	%	PART TIME	%	UNEMP.	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	185	91.6	11	5.4	6	3.0	202	46.0
FEMALE	196	82.7	28	11.8	13	5.5	237	54.0
TOTAL	381	86.8	39	8.9	19	4.3	439	100.0

CHI square = 7.56444 with 2 degrees of freedom

Significance = .02

TABLE 9

(See text, page 11)

TABLE 10

SEX BY SERVICE ON AERA DIVISION COMMITTEES

	NONE	%	AT LEAST ONE	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	192	94.6	11	5.4	203	45.8
FEMALE	237	98.8	3	1.3	240	54.2
TOTAL	429	96.8	14	3.2	443	100

CHI square = 4.95711 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = .02

TABLE 11

SEX BY MEMBERSHIP ON AERA EDITORIAL BOARD

	NONE	%	AT LEAST ONE	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	189	93.1	14	6.9	203	45.8
FEMALE	234	97.5	6	2.5	240	54.2
TOTAL	423	95.5	20	4.5	443	100

CHI square = 3.96419 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = .04

TABLE 12

SEX BY SERVICE AS AERA ARTICLE REVIEWER

	NONE	%	AT LEAST ONE	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	189	93.1	14	6.9	203	45.8
FEMALE	234	97.5	6	2.5	240	54.2
TOTAL	423	95.5	20	4.5	443	100

CHI square = 3.96419 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = .04

TABLE 13

SEX BY PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES OTHER THAN AERA

	NONE	%	AT LEAST ONE	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	9	4.4	194	95.6	203	45.8
FEMALE	27	11.3	213	88.8	240	54.2
TOTAL	36	8.1	407	91.9	443	100.0

CHI square = 5.96187 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = 0.0146

TABLE 14

SEX BY ATTENDANCE OF AERA ANNUAL MEETINGS DURING THE PAST 5 YEARS:

ED.D'S ONLY

	NONE	%	AT LEAST ONE	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	11	20.8	42	79.2	53	53.0
FEMALE	20	42.0	27	57.4	47	47.0
TOTAL	31	31.0	69	69.0	100	100.0

CHI square = 4.56152 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = .03

TABLE 15

SEX BY SERVICE AS AERA ARTICLE REVIEWER: PH.D.'S ONLY

	NONE	%	AT LEAST ONE	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	98	89.1	12	10.9	110	50.0
FEMALE	108	98.2	2	1.8	110	50.0
TOTAL	206	93.6	14	6.4	220	100.0

CHI square = 6.17892 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = .01

TABLE 16

NUMBER OF BOOKS PRIMARY EDITOR

	NONE	%	AT LEAST ONE	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	180	88.7	23	11.3	203	45.8
FEMALE	231	96.3	9	3.8	240	54.2
TOTAL	441	92.8	32	7.2	443	100.0

CHI square = 3.33180 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = 0.0039

TABLE 17

NUMBER OF CHAPTERS IN BOOKS PRIMARY AUTHOR

	NONE	%	AT LEAST ONE	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	156	76.8	47	23.2	203	45.8
FEMALE	203	84.6	37	15.4	240	54.2
TOTAL	359	81.0	84	19.0	443	100.0

CHI square = 3.79461 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = 0.0514

TABLE 18

NUMBER OF MONOGRAPHS PRIMARY AUTHOR

	NONE	%	AT LEAST ONE	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	160	78.8	43	21.1	203	45.8
FEMALE	207	86.3	33	13.8	240	54.2
TOTAL	367	82.8	76	17.2	443	100.0

CHI square = 3.76744 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = 0.0523

TABLE 19

NUMBER OF JOURNAL ARTICLES PRIMARY AUTHOR

	NONE	%	AT LEAST ONE	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	70	34.5	133	65.5	203	45.8
FEMALE	125	52.1	115	47.9	240	54.2
TOTAL	195	44.0	248	56.0	443	100.0

CHI square = 13.12040 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = 0.0003

TABLE 20

NUMBER OF TECHNICAL REPORTS PRIMARY AUTHOR

	NONE	%	AT LEAST ONE	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	119	53.6	84	41.4	203	45.8
FEMALE	163	67.9	77	32.1	240	54.2
TOTAL	282	63.7	161	36.3	443	100.0

CHI square = 3.71597 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = 0.0539

TABLE 21

NUMBER OF JOURNAL ARTICLES SECONDARY AUTHOR

	NONE	%	AT LEAST ONE	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	125	61.6	78	38.4	203	45.8
FEMALE	173	72.1	67	27.9	240	54.2
TOTAL	298	67.3	145	32.7	443	100.0

CHI square = 5.04732 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = 0.0247

TABLE 22

SEX BY PRIMARY AUTHORSHIP OF WORKBOOKS: AERA PRIMARY PROFESSIONAL ASSOC.

	NONE	%	AT LEAST ONE	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	57	86.4	9	11.3	66	46.2
FEMALE	75	97.4	2	2.6	77	53.8
TOTAL	132	92.3	11	7.7	43	100.0

CHI square = 4.6344 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = .03

TABLE 23

SEX BY SECONDARY AUTHORSHIP OF OTHER ARTICLES: NON-AERA PRIMARY PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATION

	NONE	%	AT LEAST ONE	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	130	96.3	5	3.7	135	46.6
FEMALE	139	89.7	16	10.3	155	53.4
TOTAL	269	92.8	21	7.2	290	100

CHI square = 3.77228 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = .05

TABLE 24

SEX BY PRIMARY AUTHORSHIP OF JOURNAL ARTICLES: PH.D.'S, NON-AERA PRIMARY PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATION

	NONE	%	AT LEAST ONE	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	12	16.0	63	84.0	75	51.0
FEMALE	24	33.3	48	66.7	72	49.0
TOTAL	36	24.5	111	75.5	147	100

CHI square = 5.06776 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = .02

TABLE 25

SEX BY SECONDARY AUTHORSHIP OF JOURNAL ARTICLES: PH.D.'S, AERA PRIMARY PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATION

	NONE	%	AT LEAST ONE	%	TOTAL	%
MALE	13	39.4	20	60.6	33	50.8
FEMALE	22	68.8	10	31.3	32	49.2
TOTAL	35	53.8	30	46.2	65	100

CHI square = 4.51426 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = .03

TABLE 26

REGRESSION OF PARTICIPATION IN AERA ON SELECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Independent Variable	R^2	R^2 Change	F	p
Education	.03025	.03025	5.620	.05
Length of Time in Present Organiz.	.04205	.01180		
Sex	.05034	.00829		
Occupation	.05554	.00521		
Age	.05727	.00172		

R^2 = .05727

F = 3.74180

p = .01

TABLE 27

REGRESSION OF OTHER PROFESSIONAL PARTICIPATION ON SELECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Independent Variable	R^2	R^2 Change	F	p
Education	.05701	.05701	10.524	.01
Age	.08204	.02503		
Length of Time in Present Organiz.	.08792	.00588		
Occupation	.09273	.00480		
Sex	.09439	.00167		

R^2 = .09430

F = 6.42047

p = .001

TABLE 28

REGRESSION OF TOTAL AUTHORSHIP ON SELECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Independent Variable	R^2	R^2 Change	F	p
Education	.13365	.13365	38.299	.001
Sex	.15717	.02351	7.684	.01
Length of Time in Present Organiz.	.16101	.00384		
Age	.16141	.00040		

R^2 = .16141

F = 14.86852

p = .001

TABLE 29

REGRESSION OF PRIMARY AUTHORSHIP ON SELECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Independent Variable	R^2	R^2 Change	F	p
Sex	.05476	.05476		
Age	.07671	.02195		
Marital Status	.07792	.00122		
Number of Children	.08001	.00209		
Education	.17076	.09075	23.083	.001
Current Salary	.20800	.03724	14.108	.001

R^2 = .208

F = 11.29306

p = .001

TABLE 30

SEX BY ENTERING SALARY

	$20,000 AND ABOVE		$12-20,000		UNDER $12,000		TOTAL	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
MALE	46	23.7	86	44.3	62	32.0	194	47.0
FEMALE	23	10.5	102	46.6	94	42.9	219	53.0
TOTAL	69	16.7	188	45.5	156	37.8	413	100.0

CHI square = 14.13033 with 2 degrees of freedom

Significance = .0009

TABLE 31

SEX BY CURRENT SALARY

	$20,000 AND ABOVE		$12-20,000		UNDER $12,000		TOTAL	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
MALE	106	54.1	72	36.7	18	9.2	196	46.9
FEMALE	65	29.3	121	54.5	36	16.2	222	53.1
TOTAL	171	40.9	193	46.2	54	12.9	418	100.0

CHI square = 26.75712 with 2 degrees of freedom

Significance = 0.0000

TABLE 32

SEX BY CURRENT SALARY CONTROLLING FOR HIGHEST DEGREE: PH.D.'S

	$20,000 AND ABOVE		$12-20,000		UNDER $12,000		TOTAL	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
MALE	56	53.3	41	39.0	8	7.6	105	49.8
FEMALE	42	39.6	59	55.7	5	4.7	106	50.2
TOTAL	98	46.4	100	47.4	13	6.2	211	100.0

CHI square = 5.92770 with 2 degrees of freedom

Significance = 0.0516

TABLE 33

SEX BY CURRENT SALARY CONTROLLING FOR HIGHEST DEGREE: ED.D.'S

	$20,000 AND ABOVE		$12-20,000		UNDER $12,000		TOTAL	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
MALE	35	66.0	17	32.1	1	1.9	53	54.1
FEMALE	15	33.3	28	62.2	2	4.4	45	45.9
TOTAL	50	51.0	45	45.9	3	3.1	98	100.0

CHI square = 10.43872 with 2 degrees of freedom

Significance = 0.0054

TABLE 34

SEX BY CURRENT SALARY CONTROLLING FOR HIGHEST DEGREE: MA/MS

	$20,000 AND ABOVE		$12-20,000		UNDER $12,000		TOTAL	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
MALE	11	36.7	10	33.3	9	30.0	30	32.6
FEMALE	7	11.3	31	50.0	24	38.7	62	67.4
TOTAL	18	19.6	41	44.6	33	35.9	92	100.0

CHI square = 8.34197 with 2 degrees of freedom

Significance = 0.0154

TABLE 35

SEX BY CURRENT SALARY: ED.D.'S WHO TEACH

	$20,000 AND ABOVE		$12-20,000		UNDER $12,000		TOTAL	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
MALE	10	50.0	10	50.0	0	0.0	20	45.5
FEMALE	3	2.5	20	83.3	1	4.2	24	54.5
TOTAL	13	29.5	30	68.2	1	2.3	44	100.0

CHI square = 7.80342 with 2 degrees of freedom

Significance = .02

TABLE 36

SEX BY CURRENT SALARY: PH.D.'S IN RESEARCH

	$20,000 AND ABOVE		$12-20,000		UNDER $12,000		TOTAL	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
MALE	10	47.6	9	42.9	2	9.5	21	46.7
FEMALE	3	12.5	19	79.2	2	8.3	24	53.3
TOTAL	13	28.9	28	62.2	4	8.9	45	100

CHI square = 7.17254 with 2 degrees of freedom

Significance = .02

TABLE 37

SEX BY TIME OF MOST RECENT PROMOTION

	PAST YEAR		PAST 1-2 yrs.		PAST 3-4 YRS.		PAST 5-6 YRS.		PAST 7-8 YRS.		MORE THAN 8		NONE		NOT APPL.		TOTAL	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
MALE	32	11.3	38	19.4	32	16.3	24	12.2	5	2.6	13	6.6	23	11.7	29	14.8	195	46.8
FEMALE	41	18.4	34	15.2	29	13.0	10	4.5	5	2.2	10	4.5	48	21.5	46	20.6	223	53.2
TOTAL	73	17.4	72	17.2	61	14.6	34	8.1	10	2.4	23	5.5	71	16.9	75	17.9	419	100.0

CHI square = 18.62901 with 7 degrees of freedom

Significance = .009

TABLE 38

SEX BY TIME OF MOST RECENT PROMOTION

FOR

ED.D.'S WHO TEACH

	Past Year		PAST 1-2 YEARS		PAST 3-4 YEARS		PAST 5-6 YEARS		MORE THAN 8 YEARS		NONE		NOT APPL.		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MALE	4	20.0	5	2.5	3	1.5	6	3.0	0	0	0	0	2	1.0	20	45.5
FEMALE	3	12.5	6	2.5	2	8.3	1	4.2	1	4.2	7	29.2	4	16.7	24	54.5
TOTAL	7	15.9	11	2.5	5	11.4	7	15.9	1	2.3	7	15.9	6	13.6	44	100.0

CHI square = 12.41079 with 6 degrees of freedom

Significance = .05

TABLE 39

SEX BY PRESENT OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE--LAUMANN CODE

	PROFESSIONAL		SEMI-PROFESS.		TOP BUSINESS EXEC.		ASS'T. MANAGERS		UNSKILLED LABOR		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
MALE	171	89.1	19	9.9	1	.5	0	0	0	0	191	46.5
FEMALE	176	79.6	42	19.0	0	0	2	.9	1	.5	221	53.5
TOTAL	347	84.0	61	14.8	1	.2	2	.5	1	.2	412	100.0

CHI square = 11.76587 with 5 degrees of freedom

Significance = .03

TABLE 40

REGRESSION OF CURRENT SALARY ON SELECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Independent Variable	R^2	R^2 Change	F	p
Sex	.10737	.10737	18.201	.001
Age	.28480	.17743	13.524	.001
Marital Status	.28486	.00006		
Number of Children	.28737	.00251		
Education	.31778	.03041	7.813	.01
Length of Time in Present Organiz.	.35192	.03414	14.945	.001
Time of Most Recent Promotion	.37132	.01940		
Tenure Available	.37456	.00324	6.034	.05
Have Tenure	.39481	.02024	12.242	
Entering Salary	.52157	.12676	71.535	.001
Authorship-Secondary	.52176	.00019		
AERA Primary Prof'l Affiliation	.53123	.00947	4.721	.05
Authorship-Primary	.53657	.00533		

R^2 = .53657

F = 26.27336

p = .001

TABLE 41

REGRESSION OF TENURE ON SELECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Independent Variable	R^2	R^2 Change	F	p
Length of Time in Present Organiz.	.43765	.43765	71.444	.001
Age	.45526	.01761	6.631	.01
Sex	.46129	.00603		
Number of Children	.46408	.00279		
Authorship-Primary	.46702	.00294		
Authorship-Secondary	.47210	.00019		
Education	.46730	.00008		

R^2 = .46730

F = 22.55692

p = .001

TABLE 42

REGRESSION OF TIME OF MOST RECENT PROMOTION ON SELECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Independent Variable	R^2	R^2 Change	F	p
Length of Time in Present Organiz.	.03535	.03535	13.098	.001
Authorship-Primary	.05600	.02065	6.028	.05
Age	.07434	.01834	4.992	.05
Occupation	.07856	.00422		
Authorship-Secondary	.07886	.00030		
Education	.07903	.00016		
Sex	.07909	.00006		
Number of Children	.07915	.00006		

R^2 = .07915

F = 3.23404

p = .01

Part III.

WOMEN IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH: THEIR STATUS FROM STUDENT TO EMPLOYEE

Carol Kehr Tittle
Queens College of the City University of New York

Terry N. Saario
The Ford Foundation

Elenor R. Denker
Graduate School of the City University of New York

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables	ii
Introduction	1
I. Student Questionnaire	9
II. Faculty Questionnaire	18
III. School Districts	22
IV. State Education Departments	32
V. R & D Organizations	39
VI. Summary and Recommendations	46
References	51
Appendices	
A. Sample List of Job Titles for Each Job Status Category 1 - 6	53
1. State Education Departments	
2. R & D Organizations	
3. School Districts	
B. List of Respondents and Non-Respondents	58
1. Universities	
2. School Districts	
3. R & D Organizations	
C. Copies of Survey Questionnaires	69

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Distribution of Percent of Men and Women Enrolled in Full Time Doctoral Study -- 39 Institutions	10
2	Distribution of Institutions by Size of Enrollment: Men, Women and Combined (Men and Women)	11
3	Type of Student Most and Least Likely to Succeed in Completing a Doctoral Program in Four Years	13
4	Number of Institutions with Differences (Between Percent Accepted and Percent Applied) for Men and Women -- 34 Institutions	15
5	Number and Percent of Men and Women Awarded Doctoral Degrees for 60 Institutions	16
6	Number and Percent of Male and Female Graduates Placed in Different Job Categories as Reported by 32 Institutions for the Past Two Years	17
7	Number and Percentage of Men and Women Holding Full Time Faculty Positions According to Rank at 69 Institutions	19
8	Mean of Median Salary and Standard Deviations for Institutions: Female and Male Full Time Professors According to Rank	20
9	Number and Percentage of Tenured and Nontenured Male and Female Faculty According to Rank at 58 Institutions	20
10	Median and Range of Salaries by Sex and Job Status Category for Small, Medium, and Large School Districts	25
11	Occupational Segregation by Size of District Within Job Status Categories	29
12	Assignment of Women to Management Responsibilities With Same Frequency as Men by Size of District	30
13	District Adoption of Affirmative Action Plans	30

Table		Page
14	District Adoption of Maternity Leave Plans, Paternity Leave Plans	31
15	Number of States Reporting Males only, Females only, or Both Males and Females in Job Status Categories	34
16	Number of Men and Women in Categories 1-5: SED's	34
17	Salary Median and Range for Men and Women in Job Status Categories: SED's	35
18	SED's with Maternity and Paternity Policies	36
19	Number of Recruitment Sources Marked "most useful" for Men and Women: SED's	38
20	Number of R & D Organizations Reporting Males only, Females only, or Both Males and Females in Job Status Categories	40
21	Number of Men and Women in Job Status Categories: R&D Organizations	41
22	Salary Median and Range for Men and Women in Job Status Categories: R&D Organizations	41
23	R & D Organizations with Maternity and Paternity Policies	43
24	Number of Recruitment Sources Marked "most useful" for Men and Women: R&D Organizations	44

INTRODUCTION

A resolution in favor of establishing a Committee on the Role and Status of Women for the American Educational Research Association was approved by the Council in 1973. The committee was formed in early 1974 and planning began for an analysis of the status of women and men within AERA and their respective roles. The data which follow are one part of that study. These data are based on responses to mail questionnaires which focused on the multiple roles of women in the educational research community, i.e., students in doctoral programs in education, women as faculty members in institutions which train educational researchers, and women as employees in research organizations -- local school districts, state education departments, and R & D organizations.

The sections of the report which follow are presented in the order of these roles. Section I presents the data obtained from the Student Questionnaires. Section II contains the results of the Faculty Questionnaire. Results of the Employee Questionnaire are presented in three sections: Section III, Local School Districts; Section IV, State Education Departments; and Section V, R & D Organizations.

The faculty and employee questionnaires were designed to obtain an estimate of the position and status of women as educational researchers in the major institutions employing educational researchers. The status of women in universities is especially important not only in terms of their own employment

The first two authors shared equally in the development and conduct of the present study, the third author was responsible for the analysis of the data. Appreciation is due Ms. Patricia Stivers and the staff of the Central Office of AERA who printed and mailed the questionnaires. A special thanks is due Ms. Carmen Ramos, of the Ford Foundation, for her assistance in all phases of the preparation of questionnaires and the manuscripts for the report.

status but also in terms of their potential influence as role models for both female and male students who will become professionals in the field. Position and status were defined in terms of job classification, salary level, and job-related responsibilities. As with earlier studies of the status of women in professional fields, the present study hypothesized that job dispersion would differ markedly for men and women within these employment settings. It was expected that women would be found in lower administrative or hierarchical ranks and would receive lower median salaries. Related questions examined the recruitment sources found to be useful by employers, and benefits provided to women and men.

A number of professional associations have undertaken similar surveys (e.g., American Psychological Association, 1972; American Sociological Association, 1973; American Economic Association, 1974) and analyzed the means of combating sex discrimination within a profession (American Economic Association, 1973). Similarly, the status of women within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been examined by the Women's Action Program (U.S. DHEW, 1972) and the American Association of University Women has prepared a Joint Statement on Women in Higher Education (AAUW, 1974) putting forth principles to guide the education and employment of women in institutions of higher education.

Women as graduate students have been the subject of several recent studies. Solomon (1973, 1974) reports that since 1950 women have received a slightly increasing proportion of the doctorates awarded in the U.S. (9.5% in 1950 to 14.4% in 1971). The 1973 Profile of Doctoral Scientists and Engineers in the United States (National Academy of Sciences, 1974) shows that women

received nine percent of the doctorates in science and engineering. Percentages of women doctorates are higher within the fields of psychology (20.5%), the social sciences (10.9%), and the nonsciences (11.6%). Centra (1974) cited data showing that 20% of the doctorate degrees in education awarded in 1968-69 went to women (13.1% of the total degrees across all fields were conferred on women). He also presented more recent data which showed that women received 16% of all earned doctorates in 1972 and 18% in 1973.

Studies have also considered the question of bias in admission to graduate school and in practices during graduate study. Solomon (1973) cited data from Stanford and UCLA which did not indicate bias in admission in education when the admission rate (admissions/applicants) is used as the standard. In a later study, Solomon (1974) reported data analyzed by schools classified on quality. In the top ranked schools a larger percentage of applications from men were accepted. This survey was based on responses from deans in doctorate-granting institutions, and had a response rate of about 66% (total sample of 240 schools).

Data on fellowships, scholarships, and teaching assistantships have also been examined by sex. Solomon (1973 and 1974) indicated that women did at least as well as men when the proportion of fellowships and scholarships awarded are compared to the number of applicants. Centra (1974) surveyed 3658 women and men who received the Ph. D. or Ed. D. in 1950, 1960, and 1968 (about 81% response rate). Over all fields, the women were slightly more likely than men to have received a scholarship/fellowship (61% vs. 56%). Men were somewhat more likely to have teaching assistantships (56% vs. 48%). In the field of education, there were no significant differences between women and

men in teaching assistantships (41% women and 41% men), research assistantships (21% women and 26% men) or fellowships/scholarships (46% women and 41% men).

Attitudes about graduate study were examined in two studies. Centra's study of women and men who had completed the doctorate found equal percentages of women and men who said there was a faculty member who took a special interest in their progress as graduate students (about 80%) and who said there was a faculty member who took a special interest in their professional career after they had earned the doctorate (about 42-44%). Respondents were given eight items dealing with problems in graduate studies, and two of those items dealt with sex discrimination. Of the 1968 graduates, 15% of the women (5% of men) said sex discrimination in admission to graduate school was "a very serious problem." And 23% of the women (10% of the men) said that sex discrimination which discourages women from completing graduate work was a "very serious problem."

Holmstrom and Holmstrom (1974) used data from the ACE/Carnegie Commission survey of 1969 to report sex differences on variables related to attitudes in graduate school. They concluded that, "generally, faculty attitudes toward students and faculty availability to students seem to be important determinants of student satisfaction and performance..." (p. 16-17).

The most extensive study of doctorates is that cited above by Centra. His study encompasses reports by women and men doctorates on graduate studies, first employment, current employment, publications, marriage and family life, and attitudes toward women's rights. Little difference between women and men was found in the location of first employment. Data on the 1968 graduates showed 63% of each group first employed in four year colleges

and universities. About eight percent were employed in elementary and secondary schools and 16% in private and non-profit companies or self-employed. Federal, state, and local governments employed another five percent, seven percent held postdoctoral fellowships, and two percent were first employed in two year colleges.

The analysis of rank or position for women and men currently employed full time in colleges or universities showed that more men than women were presidents, deans, department heads, or professors, about the same percentage of men and women were associate professors, and more women were concentrated in the lower ranks of assistant professor, instructor or lecturer, or research appointment without faculty status. As Centra points out,

> Although these differentials are nowhere near as great as for all teaching faculty regardless of degree earned, there are still more men at the senior rank and in administrative positions (p. 57).

Centra suggested that men employed in colleges and universities have been promoted more rapidly than women (p. 59).

The National Academy of Science 1973 Profile of Doctoral Scientists and Engineers shows sex differences favoring men in salary. The median salary for men in 1973 was $21,170 and for women $17,620. The median salaries for selected fields were: psychology--men $20,580, women $18,120; social sciences--men $20,610, women $17,460; and non-science--men $23,220, women $18,700. Median salaries were compared for age groups. The median salaries of men and women under forty years of age increased at an approximately similar rate over time. Between 40 and 50 years of age the rate of increase for males continues to rise while the rate of increase for women in this bracket "waned dramatically" (p. 24).

Centra's data showed similar differences in the annual income of women and men. The median income (salary, honoraria, and royalties) for women employed full time was $17,200, for men the median was $21,600. In education, the median for men was $21,700 and for women $18,100. When income was compared for men and women with the same number of years of work experience, the differences remained, and the size of the difference in income increased with the number of years of experience. With 5-6 years of work experience, the difference in median annual income was $2,500; with 13-14 years, the difference was $3,600, and with 22-23 years of work experience, the difference was $4,600. This pattern over all types of employment settings was repeated in the academic setting and within academic rank. "...men who were instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, professors or department heads tended to have higher incomes than women at the same rank" (p. 83). For example, women at the full professor level in universities had a median annual income of $20,600 while men had a median annual income of $24,200. The smallest difference between men's and women's incomes appeared for those employed by the federal government.

Malkiel and Malkiel (1973) examined salary differentials among 272 professional employees of a single corporation. This "micro-economic" case study was useful in studying discrimination because large numbers of men and women were hired to do the same range of jobs, and hence sex discrimination could be examined with occupation held constant. Secondly, the study was confined to highly educated professional employees, and therefore the sample was relatively homogeneous with respect to career interests and attachment to the labor force. The employer opened personnel records to examination so that

previous experiences and personal characteristics influencing salary differentials could be examined. Of the 272 employees in the study, 159 were male and 113 female. The rate of return to schooling was estimated at 8.1% for men and 6.6% for women. The researchers expanded the wage model to include estimates of individual productivity, the Ph. D., marital status, area of study (psychology, economics, etc.), and absence rate. These added variables improved the prediction of salary and accounted for about 75% of the variance in men's salary levels and over 80% of the variance in women's.

Discrimination was examined in two ways: (1) Do men and women in equal job levels, with the same characteristics, get equal pay? This question was answered positively. (2) Do men and women with equal characteristics get equal pay? This was answered negatively. Malkiel and Malkiel found that,

> ...women with the same training, experience, etc., as men tend to be assigned to lower job levels. ... We suggest that it is difficult for a discriminating organization to give male and female employees the same titles and pay them different amounts. It is far easier to assign women to lower job levels and then set up a pay structure by level that is the same for both sexes. Thus, our analysis of salary differentials including job levels should not be interpreted as indicating an absence of discrimination. The assignments to job levels can most plausibly be interpreted as the mechanisms by which the discrimination takes place. (Malkiel and Malkiel, 1973, p. 704)

Obviously a number of factors account for the discrimination found in the above surveys (differing experiences, productivity, and level of job assignments). Nevertheless, the resounding conclusion which can be drawn from these studies is that discrimination against women is evident in a variety of academic settings. Several recent studies support this conclusion, and substantiate the estimates obtained in the AERA survey which are reported herein. As is usual with mail surveys, the data which follow are based on

incomplete returns,[1] but they do provide information which confirms that found in most professional fields.

The appendices of the report provide a listing of respondents and non-respondents for each type of institution surveyed, a listing of job titles which occurred in each of the job status categories developed for this study (see Section III for a full explanation), and copies of the questionnaires which respondents completed. Despite the limitations inherent in the study, the consistency of these results with other findings provide us with a firm basis for the recommendations which the committee has developed for consideration by AERA.

1 Questionnaires were mailed in November 1974, with a followup mailing in December 1974.

SECTION I. STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES

The survey list of colleges and universities with doctoral programs in education was obtained from the publication, Earned Degrees Conferred 1970-71 Higher Education (Washington, D. C.: National Center for Educational Statistics). All institutions listed as granting doctorates in education were mailed a questionnaire (144 institutions). Eight of the 144 responded with an indication that the questionnaire was not applicable to their institution. Sixty-nine of the remaining 136 institutions responded with completed or partially completed questionnaires (51% response rate). The data which follow are based on less than 69 institutions in many cases. This occurred because respondents did not have data available by sex and by full vs. part time status, to answer several major questions -- number of applicants, acceptances and enrollments, and placements of new doctorates in various types of employing institutions.

In the majority of cases respondents completing the questionnaire were chief administrators at each institution (59 of the 69, 86%, were deans, associate deans, and department chairpersons). The organizational unit used as a basis for responses was either the school or department of education.

Number of Students in Graduate Study

Question 4 in the student questionnaire (See Appendix C) asked for the number of men and women students in full time and part time graduate study. Some institutions responded with total enrollments in both MA and doctoral programs. The table which follows is based on 39 institutions reporting data for full time doctoral students only. The table entries are read as follows: two institutions had student enrollments which were 90-99% female, four institutions

had enrollment which was 80-89% male.

Table 1

Distribution of Percent of Men and Women Enrolled in Full Time Doctoral Study -- 39 Institutions

Percent Enrolled	Number of Institutions Men	Women	
90-99%	--	2	
80-89	4	--	
70-79	6	--	
60-69	6	3	
50-59	15	7	
40-49	4	13	
30-39	2	4	
20-29	--	9	
10-19	--	1	
0- 9	2	--	
Total number of Institutions	39	39	
Total Number of Students	3388 (57%)	2552 (43%)	5940 (100%)
Mean Number Enrolled	86.9	65.4	152.3 (total M&F)
Median Number Enrolled	61	40	89
Range	2-314	1-243	4-537

As can be seen from the data on the mean and median, the distribution of the size of enrollments is skewed and influenced by a smaller number of institutions with large enrollments. The distribution of institutions by enrollment size is given in Table 2.

Table 2

Distribution of Institutions by Size of Enrollment: Men, Women, and Combined (Men and Women)

Number Enrolled	Number of Institutions Men N	Men %	Women N	Women %	Combined Enrollment (Men and Women) N	Combined Enrollment (Men and Women) %
351 and above	--		--	--	6	15
301-350	1	3	--	--	--	--
251-300	1	3	--	--	3	8
201-250	2	5	3	8	3	8
151-200	4	10	2	5	3	8
101-150	5	13	5	13	3	8
51-100	8	20	5	13	11	28
1- 50	18	46	24	61	10	25
Total Number of Institutions	39	100%	39	100%	39	100%

The distribution of number and percent enrolled by sex in Tables 1 and 2 indicate that women tend to be underrepresented in more institutions than do men. The total number of students enrolled shows a smaller absolute difference between males and females -- 57% male enrollment and 43% female enrollment. This ratio is certainly favorable when compared with data on women recipients of doctorates over all fields: 85.6% doctorates in 1971 were awarded to men, 14.4% were awarded to women (Solomon, 1973). Education as a field awarded a slightly higher percentage of doctorates to women -- 20.4% in 1969-1971 (Solomon, 1973). In view of these doctoral data, and our own presented later, the over all ratio of enrollments are likely to be inflated (perhaps as a function of selective response of institutions), although it is not possible to say by how much. Some increase in the percentage of women doctoral students has probably occurred over the last several years. For example, one institu-

tion specifically commented on sex bias in recruiting by noting that sex is no longer a criteria in recruitment, and that "N.B. This is a change from ten years ago when recruitment efforts focused on males.".

A summary of the data in Table 1 on enrollment of men and women students indicates that 31 of the 39 institutions report a higher ratio of men enrolled in doctoral programs; sixteen of these institutions report a male enrollment of 60% to 89%.

Admission, Recruitment, and Support

Three questions dealt with age, marital status, and sex as part of the admission and recruitment processes. Almost all institutions said that there was no age limit for admission to graduate study. Two institutions indicated age limits of 45 and 55, which apply to both men and women. All institutions stated that marital status was not a criterion in admission. However, the responses to question 7 indicated somewhat differing attitudes or expectations regarding completion of "a doctoral program within the average four year period."

Question 7 asked respondents to rate which of the listed groups of students "do you feel are most likely to complete a doctoral program within the average four year period? (Rank order the groups from 1-most likely to 6-least likely.)" The groups were: single males, married males, married males with children, single females, married females, and married females with children. The responses have been grouped into two categories -- ranks 1-3, most likely and ranks 4-6, least likely, and are reported for the categories of students in Table 3.

Table 3

Type of Student Most and Least Likely to Succeed in Completing a Doctoral Program in Four Years

Type of Student	Most Likely N*	Most Likely %	Least Likely N**	Least Likely %
Married Males	39	87	6	13
Single Females	34	76	11	24
Single Males	33	73	12	27
Married Males with children	15	33	30	67
Married Females	14	31	31	69
Married Females with children	7	16	38	84

N* Number of times ranked 1-3
N** Number of times ranked 4-6
Rankings by 45 respondents; 6 respondents indicated no difference in expectations among the six categories, two that no data were available, and the remainder did not rate or indicated they had no basis for ranking.

As shown in Table 3, the rankings of most likely to complete the program were given in the order: married males, single females, single males, married males with children, married females, and married females with children (ranking from a high of 87% rating married males most likely to complete, to a low of 16% for married females with children). For this group of ratings, married females, with or without children, are considered least likely to complete the doctoral program in four years.

Question 8 asked if departments attempt to recruit different percentages of male and female students. Sixty-seven of the 69 respondents indicated that "no attention is paid to sex in recruitment activites." As noted earlier, one institution said this was a change from the policy of ten years ago when recruitment efforts focused on men. Two institutions responded that they did not recruit for their doctoral programs, since they always have more applicants

than they can admit.

Two questions dealt with financial aid for students -- whether aid was restricted to full time students and whether marital status and/or parenthood disqualified students for financial aid. Over half of the respondents (40 institutions, 58%) said financial aid was restricted to full time students. At most institutions (59, or 86%), marital status and/or parenthood did not disqualify students for financial aid. Question 11 asked about the median stipends (teacher/research assistant or fellowship/scholarship) awarded to men and women. Fifty-three (77%) of the institutions said there were no differences in amount of stipend in either category for men and women. Four institutions reported median stipends higher for men than women, and one institution indicated that men received less than women.

Question 10 asked about child care facilities available to students and faculty. A minority of the institutions rated child care facilities available to faculty (7 institutions, or 10%) and to students (8 institutions, 12%) as "fully adequate." Most of the institutions indicated that no facilities were available for faculty (37 institutions, 54%) or for students (31, 45%). The remainder indicated that "partial" facilities were available for children of faculty and students.

Doctoral Applications and Doctorates Awarded

Institutions were asked to give the number of applications, acceptances, and enrollments in their doctoral programs during the last academic year. These data were analyzed for differences between number of applicants and number of acceptances for men and women as shown in Table 4. The differences in percent accepted and percent applied were obtained for men and women

(i.e., percent accepted minus percent applied were computed for men and women). The distribution of positive differences in percents indicates a larger number of one sex than the other in terms of acceptances, compared to their number in the applicant group.

Table 4

Number of Institutions with Differences (Between Percent Accepted and Percent Applied) for Men and Women -- 34 Institutions

Percent Difference (Accepted Minus Applied)	Number of Institutions Where Number Accepted is Greater Than Number Applied	
	Men	Women
10% (and above)	-	2
9	1	1
8	-	1
7	-	3
6	2	2
5	-	1
4	1	3
3	2	2
2	-	5
1	3	2
0	3	3

The distribution of differences in Table 4 shows three institutions (9%) with no differences between men/women percents of accepted and applied. There are nine institutions (26%) with higher percents of men accepted than applied, and 22 institutions (65%) with women accepted in higher percents than they applied. There are various reasons the differences may have occurred (quality of applicants, different criteria). Nevertheless, a continuation of these small percentage increments would gradually increase the ratio of women to men receiving doctorates in education.

The number of doctorates awarded to education students in the 1972-73 and 1973-74 academic years were reported by 60 institutions. The mean number of doctorates per institution awarded to men in 1972-73 was 38.1 and to women 14.7. The averages in 1973-74 were 36.8 for men and 16.9 for women. Table 5 presents summary data on the doctoral degrees awarded to men and women.

Table 5

Number and Percent of Men and Women Awarded Doctoral Degrees for 60 Institutions

	Men		Women		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1972-73	2285	72%	884	28%	3169	100%
1973-74	2208	69%	1011	31%	3219	100%

The institutions were compared for differences in percent of doctorates awarded men and women in the two years. For 35 of the institutions there were increases in the percent of women doctorates from 1972-73 to 1973-74 (ranging from 1 percent increases to one instance of a 37% increase). Twenty institutions showed a decrease in percent of women doctorates between the two years (ranging from a 1 percent decrease to a 50% decrease). Five institutions showed no difference between the two years.

The data for the institutions responding to this survey show a higher percent of women receiving doctorates than are reported in earlier data cited by Solomon (1973). His data showed that women received 20.4% of the doctorates in education as a field, for the years 1969-71.

Placement

Thirty-two of the 69 institutions were able to provide data on placement of male and female graduates into various job categories. These data are reported in Table 6 below.

Table 6

Number and Percent of Male and Female Graduates Placed in Different Job Categories as Reported by 32 Institutions for the Past Two Years

Job Placement Category	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
University/College faculty position	530	45	229	50	759	47
Post-doctoral Fellowships	18	2	9	2	27	2
Industry, non-profit organization or self-employed	51	4	21	5	72	4
School System	388	33	126	28	514	31
State Agency	74	6	23	5	97	6
Federal Agency	41	3	10	2	51	3
Other Positions*	75	7	35	8	110	7
Total	1177	100%	453	100%	1630	100%
*Employer unknown	205		110		315	

The data in Table 6 show a very similar distribution for different job placement categories for males and females as reported by the 32 institutions with follow-up data available on their graduates. The primary difference between men and women is in the absolute numbers reported.

SECTION II. FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRES

Faculty questionnaires were sent to 144 schools of education in the country. Because of the Committee's mandated interest in the position and status of women in the field of educational research, the sample was restricted to only those schools with a doctoral program in education. At first, the responses to the questionnaires were categorized according to the size of the doctoral program, i.e., according to the number of doctorates awarded in 1971. This disaggregation by size was initially maintained in order not to mask potential variation by the size of doctoral program. Once the data were examined, however, size was not found to be a significant variable. Therefore, all tables included here are summary tables. As with the student questionnaires, 69 institutions form the basic sample (51% response rate). Since not all institutions answered each question, the size of the sample varies for the data which follow.

The purpose of this questionnaire was to obtain an estimate of the participation of women on faculties in schools of education. It was hypothesized that women would disproportionately be found at the lower levels of faculty rank, but would receive approximately the same pay as men in those positions since salaries are most often based upon a salary schedule which applies without regard to sex. Most of the individuals who completed the questionnaires were either deans, assistant deans, or department chairpersons. The organizational unit which was used as a basis for completion of the questionnaire was either the school of education or the department of education.

Professorial Level, Salary, and Tenure Status

Question 4 requested a listing of men and women in the four ranking

levels of professorial staff within the school or department: full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and lecturer or instructor. As Table 7 reveals, men and women are approximately equally distributed at the instructor level, 55% of the instructors are women and 45% are men. A noticeable shift in the opposite direction occurs at the next rank of professorial standing. Sixty-seven percent of the assistant professors are men and 33% are women. The dispersion in favor of males becomes even more noticeable at the associate and full professor levels. Eighty-two percent of the associate professors and 88% of the full professors are men.

Table 7

Number and Percentage of Men and Women Holding Full Time Faculty Positions According to Rank at 69 Institutions

Rank	Men N	Men %	Women N	Women %	Total N
Full Professor	1506	88	208	12	1714
Associate Professor	1149	82	254	18	1403
Assistant Professor	976	67	485	33	1461
Instructor	213	45	256	55	469
Total	3844	76%	1203	24%	5047

Table 8 offers the mean and standard deviation of the median salary for male and female faculty members according to rank. As had been predicted, the mean salary differences between men and women is not large since most universities adhere to a public salary schedule. The only time when salary differences might occur between men and women would be at the point of initial negotiation of salary and rank. The data were not controlled for salary and rank at initial contact with the university and hence nothing can be said in this regard.

Table 8

Mean of Median Salary and Standard Deviation for Institutions: Female and Male Full Time Professors According to Rank

Rank	Males Mean Salary	S. D.	N*	Females Mean Salary	S. D.	N*
Full Professor	$21,200	2.9**	49	$20,300	2.85**	39
Associate Professor	$16,900	1.9	48	$16,300	1.6	43
Assistant Professor	$14,300	1.45	48	$13,700	1.2	42
Instructor	$11,900	2.26	28	$10,800	1.8	26
Total	$16,600	4		$15,700	3.8	

*Number of institutions
**$2,900, $2,850, etc.

Table 9 presents the tenured and nontenured status of male and female faculty members according to rank. As would be expected, most of the tenured faculty are found in the upper ranks of professorial standing. Since few women are found in those ranks, few women hold tenured positions. In fact, only 11% of the women in the entire sample are tenured as compared to 50% of the men.

Table 9

Number and Percentage of Tenured and Nontenured Male and Female Faculty According to Rank at 58 Institutions

Rank	Males Tenured N	%	Nontenured N	%	Females Tenured N	%	Nontenured N	%	Total N
Full Professor	1467	84	58	3	204	12	17	1	1746
Associate Professor	942	67	202	14	224	16	37	3	1405
Assistant Professor	210	15	761	53	130	9	337	23	1438
Instructor	30	4	327	45	22	3	343	48	722
Total	2649	50%	1348	25%	580	11%	734	14%	5311

Hiring Policies, Maternity/Paternity Policy, and Recruitment Sources

Question 7 shows that the old rule against nepotism has fallen by the wayside. Seventy-eight percent (53 of 69) of the responding institutions indicate that husband and wife may be appointed in the same department or school. In question 10, most respondents said that women publish with the same frequency as men (45 of 69, 65%).

Ninety-one percent of the respondents (63 out of 69) indicate that their university has adopted an affirmative action plan. Figures on the adoption of a maternity and/or paternity leave are also quite revealing. Fifty-three of the 69 (77%) responding institutions (with 7 indicating the question was not applicable) have adopted a maternity leave without loss of benefits or position, while only 6 out of 69 (9%; 9 not applicable) of the responding institutions have adopted a paternity leave.

Recruitment of men and women to a university faculty is done in exactly the same way, according to most of the institutions within the sample. Faculties rely most heavily for recruitment upon their friends and colleagues in other institutions. Second in importance for recruitment purposes are the job advertisements posted in graduate schools. This is followed by the placement service at professional meetings, and lastly, placement offices at universities, The Chronicle of Higher Education, and applicant letters of inquiry. Again this appears to be a domain where practices are not patently discriminatory; their results, however, appear to be. As shown earlier, in Table 7, 76% of the full time faculty members are men and 24% women.

SECTION III. SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Questionnaires were sent to 189 school districts in the country. This sample was drawn from the listing of school districts ranked by size of student population in the Education Directory: Elementary and Secondary Education, 1973-74, Public School Systems (DHEW (OE) 74-117101). All districts with student populations of 25,000 or above received a questionnaire. Of the 84 questionnaires returned, 15 were received from districts with a student population of 100,000 or above (hereafter labeled large districts in the sample), 33 were received from districts with a student population of 50,000 to 99,999, (hereafter labeled a medium sized district within the sample), and 36 were received from districts with a student population of 25,000 to 49,999, (hereafter labeled a small sized district within the sample). A complete listing of all participating school districts has been included in Appendix B.

A series of six job categories defined according to rank of job title and magnitude of an accompanying salary were constructed from the responses to the questionnaire. These categories were used for the analyses of data from all organizations employing educational researchers (i.e., state education departments, local school districts -- large, medium, and small, and federally or privately supported research organizations). Even though the list of job titles and salary ranges varies by the type of organization analyzed, a hierarchical commonality appeared across these organizations, and hence the categories were consistently applied throughout.

The coding of the six categories used the title and salary of the chief administrator as a baseline. Titles and salaries most clearly indicating chief management responsibility were ranked "1." The categories which fell below

"1" in the hierarchy were established by comparing the salary differences and implicit rank differences by job title between the "1" position and the next. The salary ranges and job titles used to establish the other categories were:

Category 2 - Category 1 minus up to $3,999, and middle level administrative authority or senior research authority within the organizational unit;

Category 3 - Category 1 minus $4,000 - $7,999, and research staff position without administrative authority;

Category 4 - Category 1 minus $8,000 - $11,999, and a secondary research position;

Category 5 - Category 1 minus $12,000 - $15,000, and a staff assistant position; and

Category 6 - Category 1 minus $16,000 or more, and again a staff assistant (no clerical or secretarial positions were coded).

It is not possible to extrapolate educational requirements for these positions from these data and hence one cannot assume that a doctorate in educational research is a required or preferred requisite for any of these positions. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to assume that many of the individuals who hold these positions may be members of AERA, and, therefore, of interest to the Committee on Women.

Most of the individuals (approximately 80%) who completed the questionnaires hold positions with administrative authority within the research and development offices in the school districts. A representative listing of these

titles, as well as those for R&D organizations and State Education Departments, can be found in Appendix A.

The organizational unit which was used as a basis for completion of the questionnaires was either the evaluation or research and development office in 77 of the cases. Only in the smaller school districts did a shift to the entire central office staff occur. In 7 of these, the response was based upon the entire staff.

Salary and Job Category

Responses to questions 4 and 5 have been combined for the purpose of this analysis. Question 4 asked for the number of men and women within job categories. Question 5 requested the median salary of women and men in the job categories listed in question 4. The categories as described above, range from 1 (highest) to 6 (lowest) in rank of status and salary.

A summary containing the median salaries by sex and category can be found in Table 10. Disaggregations of small, medium, and large sized districts were maintained in order to display the variability that exists between these sizes. With the exception of category 3, the small districts quote smaller salaries within job categories. Unfortunately, there was no control on longevity within position or on different salary schedules (e.g., state versus teacher scales) and therefore an interpretation of the reversal in pattern at category 3 cannot be suggested.

Table 10

Median and Range of Salaries by Sex and Job Status Category for Small, Medium, and Large School Districts

Job Status Category 1

Size of District	Men N	Men Median Salary	Men Range	Women N	Women Median Salary	Women Range
Large	12	$24,385	$20,105-34,000	3	$19,000	$12,200-26,000
Medium	31	$23,901	$16,000-37,700	7	$21,842	$12,000-25,598
Small	28	$23,259	$17,000-32,470	5	$21,139	$17,800-25,000
	71			15		

Job Status Category 2

	Men N	Men Median Salary	Men Range	Women N	Women Median Salary	Women Range
Large	14	$21,850	$16,500-29,796	9	$19,500	$14,175-24,000
Medium	19	$20,300	$10,000-28,858	4	$19,749	$10,500-26,300
Small	13	$18,810	$16,500-25,000	9	$19,855	$18,000-25,000
	46			22		

Job Status Category 3

	Men N	Men Median Salary	Men Range	Women N	Women Median Salary	Women Range
Large	11	$20,057	$15,000-24,492	9	$18,330	$14,281-24,492
Medium	22	$17,118	$13,000-23,818	11	$14,625	$ 9,160-23,225
Small	13	$17,015	$14,000-20,269	7	$17,550	$13,000-22,000
	46			27		

Job Status Category 4

Size of District	Men N	Men Median Salary	Men Range	Women N	Women Median Salary	Women Range
Large	3	$13,402	$10,000-27,176	5	$14,744	$13,000-19,000
Medium	9	$15,500	$11,000-18,892	6	$14,422	$10,500-19,676
Small	5	$12,000	$ 9,900-15,044	7	$12,295	$ 9,000-15,044
	17			18		

Job Status Category 5

	Men N	Men Median Salary	Men Range	Women N	Women Median Salary	Women Range
Large	2	$14,044	$12,000-16,188	1	$12,000	$12,000-
Medium	2	$11,500	$ 9,000-14,000	2	$ 9,500	$ 7,000 12,000
Small	4	$ 8,680	$ 8,070-12,000	6	$ 9,430	$ 7,000-12,000
	8			9		

Seventeen percent of the districts report women holding category 1 positions. The median differences in male/female salaries in this category range from $5,385 in large districts (favoring men) to $2,059 in medium sized districts (favoring men) to $2,120 in small sized districts (again favoring men). (N. B.: only a small number of districts report women at this level and therefore the salary differentials may be skewed.) Female salaries range from a low of $12,000 to a high of $26,000 while male salaries range from a low of $16,000 to a high of $37,700.

Thirty-two percent of the districts report women holding category 2 positions. The median differences in male/female salaries in this category range from a difference of $2350 in the large districts to $551 in medium districts (favoring men) to $1045 in the small districts (favoring women). (Again the reader is cautioned to note the small cell sizes.) Female salaries range from a low of $10,500 to a high of $26,300 while male salaries range from a low of $10,000 to a high of $29,796.

Twenty-nine percent of the districts report women holding category 3 positions. The median differences in male/female salaries in this category range from a difference of $1727 in large districts to $2493 in medium districts (favoring men) to $535 in small districts (favoring women). Female salaries range from a low of $9,160 to a high of $24,492 while male salaries range from a low $13,000 to a high of $24,492.

Fifty-one percent of the districts report women holding category 4 positions. The median differences in male/female salaries in this category range from $1342 in large districts (favoring women) to $1078 in medium districts (favoring men) to $295 in small districts (favoring women). Female salaries range from a low of $9,000 to a high of $19,676 while male salaries range from a low of $9,900 to a high of $27,176.

Fifty-three percent of all the districts report women holding category 5 positions. The median differences in male/female salaries in this category range from a difference of $2044 in large districts to $2000 in medium districts (both favoring men) to $750 in small districts (favoring women). Female salaries range from a low of $7,000 to a high of $12,000 while male salaries range from a low of $8,070 to a high of $16,188.

The hypothesis that women are found more frequently than men in the lower ranking positions in a R&D or evaluation office in a school district is substantiated for our sample of school districts. In addition, in each category, women's salaries fall within a lower range than did men's. While the median differences in salaries between men and women are not great within most categories, these figures have not been controlled for longevity within position and therefore caution must be used in interpreting their significance.

Another perspective on occupational dispersion within each category for men and women is offered in Table 11. This table displays those districts which report solely males, solely females, and females and males jointly in each job category. As the data above suggest, most districts within category 1 and 2 report only men in these positions. This trend is reversed in the lower job classifications.

Table 11

Occupational Segregation by Size of District
Within Job Status Categories

	Males Only		Females Only		Both M & F		Total	
CATEGORY 1	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Large	9	75	2	17	1	8	12	100
Medium	23	77	3	10	4	13	30	100
Small	28	85	4	12	1	3	33	100
CATEGORY 2								
Large	5	36	2	14	7	50	14	100
Medium	13	76	0	-	4	24	17	100
Small	11	69	3	19	2	12	16	100
CATEGORY 3								
Large	0	-	1	13	7	87	8	100
Medium	7	44	1	6	8	50	16	100
Small	9	56	4	25	3	19	16	100
CATEGORY 4								
Large	1	17	3	50	2	33	6	100
Medium	3	33	2	22	4	45	9	100
Small	1	17	1	17	4	66	6	100
CATEGORY 5								
Large	1	50	0	-	1	50	2	100
Medium	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	3	100
Small	3	38	4	50	1	12	8	100

Responsibility, Affirmative Action, and Benefits

Most school districts (55 of 84, or 85%) report the assignment of women to management responsibilities with the same frequency as men (Table 12). Many school districts have adopted affirmative action plans (57 of 90, or 60%, see Table 13).

Table 12

Assignment of Women to Management Responsibilities With Same Frequency As Men by Size of District

Size of District	Yes	No	No Answer
Large	13	-	2
Medium	21	7	5
Small	21	3	12
Total	55 (85%)	10	19

Table 13

District Adoption of Affirmative Action Plans

	Yes	No	No Answer
Large	7	5	3
Medium	22	9	2
Small	22	12	2
Total	51 (69%)	26	7

While all (100%) districts have adopted a maternity leave plan without loss of benefits, less than half (26 of 84, or 31%) of the districts report a paternity leave program.

Table 14

District Adoption of Maternity Leave Plans, Paternity Leave Plan

	Maternity Leave			Paternity Leave		
	Yes	No	No Answer	Yes	No	No Answer
Large	15	-	-	7	8	-
Medium	33	-	-	10	21	2
Small	36	-	-	9	25	2
Total	84 (100%)			26 (31%)	54	4

Most districts report that men and women are recruited into new positions through the same channels. Listed most frequently as sources for new personnel were friends or colleagues, university placement offices, and advertisements posted in graduate schools.

SECTION IV. STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS

Questionnaires were sent to each of the fifty state education departments (SED) and the education departments of six territories. Twelve states returned blank questionnaires or letters marked not applicable, no educational researchers, or indicated no job titles as educational researchers (Alabama, Alaska, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Louisiana, Missouri, *New Hampshire, Vermont, Washington, Wyoming, and the Canal Zone). No responses were received from the states of Colorado, Hawaii, Kansas, Maine, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin, or from the territories of American Samoa, Puerto Rico, and the Marianna Islands. The response rate for the questionnaire was 73% (41/56), but the effective sample for analysis was based on the education departments of 28 states and two territories (54%). These 30 SED's provided job titles and salaries which the education departments themselves defined as "educational researchers."

The majority of the persons completing the questionnaires were in management or supervisory positions, as indicated by job titles of Director, Associate Director, Assistant Superintendent, etc. (78%). The organizational unit used as a basis for response varied, from bureaus, divisions, office of research, evaluation and planning, to the nine states which responded on the basis of all professional education staff in the state education department. Despite the disparity in size, the questionnaires have been analyzed as one group. While total numbers of individuals are sometimes given in the analyses, the

* Completed questionnaires received after data analysis completed.

focus is on the percents within state organization, which provides a basis for comparison across organizations regardless of the number of individuals involved.

Job Titles and Median Salaries

Respondents were asked to give the number of full and part time professional male and female educational research staff by job title and to show the median salaries for each job title. The data which follow are based on full time positions (only three states noted part time educational research positions, primarily consultants). The same categories described previously (pg. 23) for school districts were used in this analysis: one (highest in status and salary) to five (lowest in status and salary). (No category 6 positions were reported.)

Table 15 shows the number of states reporting males only, females only, or both males and females in each category of the job status hierarchy. Table 16 presents the number of men and women in each job status category.

Table 15

Number of States Reporting Males only, Females only, or Both Males and Females in Job Status Categories

Job Status Category	Males Only N	%	Females Only N	%	Both Males and Females N	%	Total N (of States) N	%
1 (highest)	22	81	1	4	4	15	27	100
2	7	44	1	6	8	50	16	100
3	8	38	3	14	10	48	21	100
4	2	17	3	25	7	58	12	100
5 (lowest)	1	20	3	60	1	20	5	100
Total	40	49%	11	13%	30	37%	81	100%

Table 16

Number of Men and Women in Categories 1-5: SED's

Job Status Category	Men N	%	Women N	%	Total of Individuals N	%
1 (highest)	52	85	9	15	61	100
2	69	81	16	19	85	100
3	179	63	105	37	284	100
4	24	59	17	41	41	100
5 (lowest)	2	15	11	85	13	100
Total	326	67%	158	33%	484	100%

Table 17 presents the median and range of salaries for men and women by job status category. The medians are based on the number of different salaries reported by states with employees in the job category. *

Table 17

Salary Median and Range for Men and Women in Job Status Categories: SED's

Job Status Category	N*	Men Median	Men Range	Women Median	Women Range
1	27	$21,200	$15,000-28,577	$19,625	$15,000-25,000
2	16	$17,840	$13,660-24,000	$18,000	$12,840-24,000
3	21	$16,250	$12,000-21,000	$15,000	$10,800-21,240
4	12	$12,773	$10,329-18,000	$12,000	$ 9,612-16,900
5	5	$10,450	$10,200-10,700	$10,000	$ 8,726-10,200

Tables 15, 16, and 17 show a consistent trend: in most states, women are in low rather than high status jobs in terms of salary and job titles. There is only one state in which a female educational researcher holds the highest job status category, compared to 22 states (81%) where men are exclusive holders of the highest status and salary reported for educational researchers. In terms of absolute numbers (Table 16), men are consistently found in higher status job categories, with 85% of the top job status category male and 15% female. This ratio is exactly inverted for the lowest category. Over all job categories reported in this survey, there are three men employed in SED's for every woman (326 men and 158 women).

Table 17 shows the median salary for men in the highest job status category as $21,200, with the range in that category from $15,000 to $28,577. The median for women in the same category is $19,625, with the range $15,000-25,000.

*Based on states' rather than individuals, since the state as a unit is more representative (i.e., the data using individuals is weighted heavily by 3 or 4 states having large numbers of individuals in a particular category).

Even though data on number of years experience for individuals were not collected, the absolute data on numbers of women in the top job status categories and the salary differences can stand on their own as evidence of present or past discrimination.

Responsibilities, Affirmative Action and Maternity/Paternity Policies

SED's were asked whether "female members of your professional staff (are) assigned program/project management responsibilities with the same frequency as male members of your professional staff?" A majority, 21 (70%) of the 30 SED's said yes, one said no, and 8 did not check a response. These responses are not consistent with the data on job status and salary distributions for women.

Ninety percent (27 SED's) indicated their department has adopted an affirmative action plan. Three states (Georgia, Guam, and Virgin Islands) answered no, and two states indicated the affirmative action plan is informal or in the process of being adopted (Maryland and Illinois).

Question 9 asked whether there were maternity and paternity leave policies. Table 18 shows the responses.

Table 18

SED's with Maternity and Paternity Policies

	Yes		No		No Answer		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Maternity Leave?	24	80	2	7	4	13	30	100
Paternity Leave?	5	17	18	60	7	23	30	100

Maternity leave policies (without loss of status and benefits) are generally available for women. However, these policies do not apply equally to men; only five SED's said that paternity leave policies are available for men.

Recruitment Sources

Table 19 shows the recruitment sources which SED's have found most useful for recruiting "new, entry level, male and female members of your staff" (during the past two years). Twenty-four (of the 30) states answered this question, marking from one to three sources for men and women separately.

Table 19

Number of Recruitment Sources Marked "most useful" for Men and Women: SED's

Source	Men N	Women N	Total N	%
Friends or colleagues in universities	17	18	35	38%
Placement offices	14	12	26	29%
Placement Services-professional meetings	5	3	8	9%
Responses to job ads -circulated to major graduate schools of education	5	4	9	10%
- disciplinary journals	1	--	1	1%
-Educational Researcher	--	1	1	1%
-Chronicle of Higher Education	--	--	--	--
Other*	7	4	11	12%

Friends or colleagues in universities are still the source considered most useful by SED's. The states show some reliance on state personnel and civil service offices.

*State Personnel Division, walk-in applications, State Civil Service, Affirmative Action Posting.

SECTION V. R & D ORGANIZATIONS.

The sample of research and development organizations employing educational researchers was developed from the National Institute of Education's list of R & D labs and centers and by searching the addresses of members of AERA given in the 1971-72 Directory. Of the 59 questionnaires mailed (20 R & D labs and centers, 39 other research organizations), replies were received from 35 organizations (59%). Ten organizations stated they were not basically in educational research, did not have adequate staff to provide salary data, or that salary data was not available because of company policy. The latter were not included in the analysis, and the data which follow are based on the questionnaires completed by 25 R & D organizations (42% of the original mailing). Respondents and nonrespondents are listed in Appendix B.

The persons completing the questionnaires were at the management level, as indicated by titles of Director, Associate Director, and Coordinator of Research and Evaluation. The organizational unit used to provide data varied from the entire organization to the research and development division, to smaller units, e.g., policy analysis service.

Job Titles and Median Salaries

Question 4 requested the number of full and part time professional educational research staff by job title, and question 5 asked for median salaries by job title for males and females. Because of the limited number of employees in part time classifications, the data which follow are based on full time positions only. Six job status categories ranging from one (highest in status and salary) to six (lowest in status and salary) are reported on the basis of these

data. (See page 23 for a description of the categorizing procedure.)

Table 20 below shows the number and percent of R & D organizations with job titles in each category of the job status hierarchy held by males only, females only, or both males and females

Table 20

Number of R & D Organizations Reporting Males only, Females only, or Both Males and Females in Job Status Categories

	Males Only		Females Only		Both Males and Females		Total N of R & D Org.	
Category	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 (highest)	7	35	1	5	12	60	19	100
2	4	21	1	5	14	74	17	100
3	5	28	1	6	12	66	17	100
4	4	21	2	11	13	68	17	100
5	--	--	4	40	6	60	9	100
6 (lowest)	--	--	1	33	2	67	3	100

Table 21 presents the number of individuals, men and women, in each category of job titles.

Table 21

Number of Men and Women in Job Status Categories:
R & D Organizations

Category	Men N	Men %	Women N	Women %	Total Number of Individuals N	Total Number of Individuals %
1 (highest)	207	88	28	12	235	100
2	278	74	97	26	375	100
3	197	69	87	31	284	100
4	192	40	290	60	482	100
5	30	29	73	71	103	100
6 (lowest)	10	19	42	81	52	100
Total	914	60%	617	40%	1531	100%

Table 22 describes the median and range of salaries reported for men and women by job status category.

Table 22

Salary Median and Range for Men and Women
In Job Status Categories:
R & D Organizations

Job Status Category	N*	Men Median	Men Range	Women Median	Women Range
1 (highest)	20	$30,000	$20,000-38,200	$26,200	$17,262-31,743
2	19	$22,164	$17,600-32,400	$18,700	$13,500-27,600
3	18	$17,500	$13,620-26,000	$15,950	$ 8,922-20,750
4	19	$13,350	$ 9,800-22,500	$12,368	$ 7,320-19,500
5	10	$10,200	$ 8,640-13,000	$10,852	$ 6,900-15,241
6 (lowest	3	$ 9,625	$ 8,474-11,957	$ 9,156	$ 8,400-12,492

*Number of R & D agencies with individuals in the job category.

The data in Tables 20, 21, and 22 present a consistent picture of lower status and salaries for female as compared to male employees within the R & D organizations. Table 20 shows that there are seven R & D organizations with males only in job status category 1; conversely, at the bottom of the job status categories there are five R & D organizations with females only in categories 5 & 6 (none with males only). Most organizations do have both men and women in each job category, but where there are men only and women only, women are found in the lower ranks in employment status salaries.

In terms of absolute numbers, there are 914 male (60%) and 617 female (40%) employees in the R & D organizations in the sample. The proportions of men and women within the job status categories do not reflect the overall 60-40 ratio, however. The percentage of men in the highest job status category is 88% and the percentage of women is only 12%. There is a consistent decrease in the percentages of men for each category, to a low of 19% for category 6, and a corresponding increase in the percentages of women for each category, to 81% in category 6.

Similarly, the salary data in Table 22 are unfavorable for women when compared with men. With only one exception (in category 5) the median salaries reported for males within categories are higher than those for females. In category 1, for example, the male median salary is $30,000 and the female median salary is $26,200. The salary ranges reported also tend to favor men consistently within each job status category (with the exception of the two lowest job status categories, 5 & 6).

Responsibilities, Affirmative Action, and Maternity/Paternity Policies

When asked whether "female members of your professional staff (are) assigned program/project management responsibilities with the same frequency as male members of your professional staff," sixteen R & D organizations said yes (64%), six said no, and three did not check a response. These are not consistent with the data on job status and salary distributions for women.

Twenty-one of the organizations (84%) stated their organization has adopted an affirmative action plan. Two organizations indicated the policy was not written or was unofficial, one said no, and one organization did not respond to this question.

Question 9 asked whether there were maternity and paternity leave policies (without loss of status and benefits). Table 23 shows the responses.

Table 23

R & D Organizations with Maternity and Paternity Policies

	Yes		No		No Answer		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Maternity Leave?	20	80	2	8	3	12	25	100
Paternity Leave?	5	20	17	68	3	12	25	100

Maternity leave policies are typically available for women. However, these policies do not apply equally to males.

Recruitment Sources

Table 24 shows the recruitment sources which R & D organizations found most useful for recruiting "new, entry level, male and female members

of your staff" (during the past two years). Twenty-one (of the 25) R & D organizations answered this question, marking from one to three sources for men and women separately.

Table 24

Number of Recruitment Sources Marked "most useful" for Men and Women

Source	Men N	Women N	Total N	Total %
Friends or colleagues in universities	17	17	34	29
Placement offices	11	11	22	19
Placement Services - professional meetings	9	9	18	15
Responses to job ads - -circulated to major graduate schools of education.	10	10	20	17
-disciplinary journals	1	1	2	2
-Educational Researcher	2	1	3	3
-Chronicle of Higher Education	4	3	7	6
Other*	5	5	10	9

The four most useful sources for recruitment are friends and colleagues in universities, placement offices, circulation of notices to major graduate schools of education, and placement services at professional meetings. These sources of recruiting did not differ for men and women. The major thrust of affirmative

*Affirmative action office, local newspaper

action policies is to provide wider sources of recruitment, and these do not appear to be useful or else are not in use by R & D organizations in educational research. The Educational Researcher is the one publication received by every AERA member, yet it is rarely used by major employers of R & D personnel.

SECTION VI. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major findings of the survey of the status of women as students in doctoral programs in education, the status of women on the faculties of institutions which train educational researchers, and the status of women as employees in R & D and research organizations, local school districts and state education departments can be summarized briefly:

Women as students. Most institutions do not report discriminatory practices in their admission or recruitment processes. Nevertheless, fewer women than men enroll in these programs. Once enrolled, men and women appear to qualify equally for financial aid. In 1973-74, 69% of the doctorates awarded were granted to men and 31% were granted to women. Thus, the labor pool for women with the doctorate in education is, by definition, smaller than for men.

Women as faculty. Twenty-four percent of all faculty members in the schools of education in this survey are women. While they make $1,000 a year less than their male counterparts in most faculty ranks, they move up the faculty ranks and earn full professorial standing with tenure far less frequently than do their male colleagues.

Women as employees. Data from school districts, state departments of education and major R & D organizations show that women consistently fall in the lower job ranks as determined by responsibility and by salary. Even within job categories, including those at the lower end of the rankings, women were paid less than their male counterparts.

Most employers of educational researchers have adopted affirmative action plans, and yet the discrepancy between the adoption of these plans and acting upon their intent is more than academic in each instance. It is interesting to note that only 60% of the local school districts have adopted such plans. This is a slight aberration caused by a void in state and federal requirements. Except in those instances where a particular categorical aid program requires affirmative action plans, local school districts have been exempt to date from such requirements.

The heavy reliance upon friends and colleagues in universities or other research organizations for the recruitment of personnel is also patently discriminatory for one cannot guarantee equal access with these measures. Given that most of the graduates of doctoral programs in education are men, recruitment practices should be based on techniques which assure the prospective employer of a fair number of qualified female candidates for each position for which they recruit. Roster systems, the public listing of all positions in journals which educational researchers read, and aggressive searches for women and minority candidates ought to become common practice for all employers of educational researchers.

Women are in the minority in representation and in status in the educational research community -- a major irony when one considers that 60% of all those engaged in the 75 billion dollar business called education are women. Even granted the inadequacies of survey research, the present investigation indicates that the position of women in this field is resoundingly low.

The recommendations to be drawn from the data compiled in this study, including those suggestions contained in the open-ended portions of the questionnaires, follow:

1. AERA should:

a. Adopt affirmative action policies for its own staff, journals, and all other affairs of the organization (its nominees for offices, boards, committees, journal editors, and reviewers).

b. Recommend that all organizations hiring AERA members should adopt affirmative action plans, including state and local school districts as well as research organizations.

c. Institute a standing committee on the education and employment of women in educational research.

d. Designate a central-staff AERA individual to be responsible for information on women.

e. Establish training sessions concerning sexism in education with regard to employment and programs/policies.

f. Review job-placement proccdures and services in publications and at conventions to insure that discrimination is eliminated.

g. Maintain a list of any national data banks of qualificd candidatcs for positions, e.g., in state departments of education, in educational administration, etc. A listing of data banks available for use by individuals and employers can be published annually in the ER.

h. Encourage expanded advertising in ER to eliminate the discriminatory practices of informal networks between colleagues.

i. Recommend that lists of external experts submitted to federal agencies and other requests include women as consultants, panelists, speakers, etc.

2. AERA Journals should:

a. Establish editorial guidelines for discriminatory language, usage and sex role stereotyping (e.g., McGraw Hill).

b. Insure that all reviewing of articles is blind reviewing.

c. Insure adequate coverage of issues relevant to sex bias in education.

d. Establish a formal policy statement regarding the ethics, conduct and publication of research with a special emphasis on the subject of authorship.

3. Employers of Educational Researchers should:

a. Publicly identify, as an organizational priority, the elimination of discrimination against women.

b. Adopt affirmative action plans.

c. Actively seek female applicants for positions at all levels.

d. Eliminate sex discrimination in terms of promotion, transfer, recruitment, salary status, selection for training including apprenticeship.

e. Establish career ladders for personnel within an organization.

f. Analyze all personnel policies and eliminate any which directly or indirectly support discriminatory practices, including policies concerned with leaves of absence, pregnancy, part-time employment, and child-care services.

4. Universities as employers should:

a. Adopt affirmative action policy statements and goals within specialty areas of doctoral programs.

b. Actively seek female applicants for all faculty positions.

c. Analyze all personnel policies and eliminate any which directly or indirectly support discriminatory practices, including policies concerned with leaves of absence, pregnancy, part-time employment, maternity and paternity leaves, and child-care services.

d. Accept responsibility for hiring or locating employment opportunities for the spouse of a new employee.

5. Universities as educators should:

a. Recruit women into educational leadership programs as well as programs of quantitative methodology.

b. Allocate financial support independent of marital status.

c. Publicize their commitment to the employment of women in leadership positions.

d. Establish and maintain extensive counseling services, especially for female doctoral candidates who often lack role models and are unable to establish 'protegé' relationships.

e. Collect data to monitor access, progress, and placement of males and females in doctoral programs.

References

American Association of University Women. Joint Statement on Women in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: AAUP, March 20, 1974.

American Economic Association. Combatting role prejudice and sex discrimination. The American Economic Review, 1973, 63, 1049-1061.

American Economic Association. Annual Report to the American Economic Association from the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession. May 1974.

American Psychological Association. Report of the Task Force on the Status of Women in Psychology, Washington, D.C.: APA, September 1972.

American Sociological Association. The Status of Women in Sociology 1968 - 1972. Washington, D.C: ASA, 1973.

Bickel, P.J., Hammel, E.A. and O'Connell, J.W. Sex bias in graduate admissions: Data from Berkeley. Science, 1973, 187, 398-404.

Centra, J.A. Women, Men and the Doctorate. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1974.

Fosburgh, L. Berkeley Plan could end hiring bias in 30 years. New York Times, Wednesday, March 6, 1975.

Holmstrom, E. I. and Holmstrom, R. W. The plight of the woman doctoral student. American Educational Research Journal, 1974, 11, 1-17.

Malkiel, B. G. and Malkiel, J.A. Male - female pay differentials in professional employment. The American Economic Review, 1973, 63, 693-705.

National Academy of Sciences. Doctoral Scientists and Engineers in the United States: 1973 Profile. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1974.

Sells, L. B. Availibility Pools as the basis for Affirmative Action. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association Scottsdale, Arizona, May 1973.

Solomon, L. C. Do women graduate students get a raw deal? Paper presented at the Meeting of the Public Choice Society, New Haven, Connecticut, March 21, 1974.

Solomon, L. C. Women in doctoral education: Clues and puzzles regarding institutional discrimination. Research in Higher Education, 1973, 1, 299-332.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Report of the Women's Action Program. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, January 1972.

Appendix A

Sample List of Job Titles for Each Job Status Category (1 through 6)

1. State Departments of Education

Category 1

Bureau Chief
Supervisor, State Research
Supervisor, Federal Research
Director of Research
Associate State Superintendent
Assistant State Superintendent
Assistant Director of Special Education
Director of Educational Research & Statistics
Assistant Superintendent - Statistical Services & Information
Director - Planning, Research & Evaluation

Category 2

Assistant Bureau Chief
Specialist, Planning, Research & Evaluation
Education Planner
Education Evaluator
Consultant in Measurement
Consultant in Evaluation, Title I
Coordinator, Vocational Education Research
State Aid Supervisor
Data Processing Supervisor
Evaluation Coordinator
Research Supervisor
Coordinator of Statistics

Category 3

Administrative Assistant
Research Associate
Education Staff Specialist
Management Analyst
Educational Counselor
Educational Specialist
Statistician
Planning Coordinator
Test Coordinator
Educational Research Associate

Category 4

Public Information Officer
Research Assistant
Educational Specialists
Research Consultant
Research Analyst
Educational Assessment Specialist

Category 5

Research Associate
Statistics Researcher
Specialists
Data Analyst

Category 6

(none)

2. R & D Organizations

Category 1

Coordinator of Research & Evaluation
Director of Evaluation Division
Principal Research Scientist
Research Division Director
Senior Research Associate
Institute Director
Senior Staff Scientists

Category 2

Social Scientist
Operations Research Specialist
Associate Director
Research Scientist
Senior Associate
Evaluators
Research & Development Associates
Principal Investigators
Senior Scientist
Senior Staff Technicians

Category 3

Program Analyst
Program Consultant
Staff Associate
Research Writer
Research Associate
Research Scientist
Technicians

Category 4

Research Assistant
Writer
Evaluation Specialist
Staff Specialist
Artists-Media Specialists
Programming Specialist
Test Development Specialist
Assistant Research Statistician

Category 5

Research Assistant
Research Specialist
Statistical Assistant
Senior Research Assistant
Senior Technical Aide

Category 6

Staff Assistant
Staff Specialist
Research Programmer
Laboratory Assistant

3. School Districts

Large School Districts

Category 1

Director
Supervisor
Director of Research

Category 2

Assistant Director
Research Associate
Senior Specialists
Program Specialist
Supervisor
*Assistant Director - Planning & Research
*Associate Director - Evaluation Services
Supervisor Federal Program Evaluation

Category 3

Junior Specialists
Consultant Teacher
Research Consultant
Program Evaluator
Research Associates

Category 4

Research Intern
Program Evaluator
Professional Specialist

Category 5

Evaluator
Planning Assistant

Category 6

Specialist
Administrative Aide

*These two positions are in the same district.

Medium School Districts

Category 1

Divisional Director
Assistant Superintendent
Research Associate
Supervisor
Director of Research
Director of Research & Evaluation

Category 2

Research Associates
Administrator of Title I Research
Coordinator of Educational Information Systems
Associate Coordinator
Evaluators
Assistant Director of Research
Supervisor, Evaluation

Category 3

Research Associate
Supervisor, Testing
Planning Specialist
Coordinator of Research & Evaluation
Project Evaluator
Curriculum Advisor
Evaluation Specialist

Category 4

Evaluation Specialist
Teacher on Special Assignment
Specialist in Data Management & Analysis
Specialist in Statistics
Specialist in Evaluation

Category 5

Secretary/Analyst
Secretary/Evaluator
Coordinator
Resource Teacher

Category 6

Coordinator

Small School Districts

Category 1

Director, Curriculum Planning & Evaluation
Director of Management Information Services
Associate Superintendent - Research & Development
Director, Planning, Research & Development
Director of Research & Federal Programs

Category 2

Assistant Director, Planning & Evaluation
Assistant Director, Pupil Accounting & Research
Coordinator of Testing & Reporting
Educational Evaluator
School Data Analyst
Research Supervisor
Coordinator, Research & Evaluation
Director of Evaluations Assessment

Category 3

Evaluation Specialist
Evaluation/Disseminator
Supervisor of Testing
Measurement Specialist
Research Analyst
Program Evaluator
Evaluation Coordinators
Accountability Specialist

Category 4

Research Specialist
Research Assistant
Federal Programs Evaluator
Evaluation Assistants

Category 5

Evaluation Assistant
Research Assistant
Research Aides
Statistical Evaluator

Category 6

Evaluation Technicians

Appendix B

List of Respondents and Non-Respondents

1. Universities - Respondents

University of Alabama, Birmingham
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
California State University, Los Angeles
California State University, San Francisco
Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California
Stanford University, Stanford, California
University of California, Berkeley
University of California Los Angeles
University of California, Santa Barbara
University of Southern California, Los Angeles
University of Denver, Colorado
American University, Washington, District of Columbia
Catholic University of America, District of Columbia
Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida
University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida
Georgia State University, Atlanta
University of Georgia, Athens
*University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho
Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois
Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
University of Chicago, Illinois
University of Illinois, Urbana
Indiana State University, Terre Haute
University of Notre Dame, Indiana
University of Iowa, Iowa City
Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas
University of Kentucky, Lexington
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge
McNeese State University, Lake Charles, Louisiana
Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Springfield College, Springfield, Massachusetts
University of Massachusetts, Boston
Michigan State University, East Lansing
Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, Mississippi
University of Missouri, Kansas City
Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri
University of Montana, Missoula
New Mexico State University, Las Cruces
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque
CUNY Graduate Center, New York, New York
Columbia University, New York, New York
SUNY at Cornell, Ithaca, New York (College of Agriculture)

SUNY at Cornell, Ithaca, New York (College of Human Ecology)
Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York
SUNY, Albany, New York
Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York
University of Rochester, Rochester, New York
North Carolina State University, Raleigh
University of North Carolina, Greensboro
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks
Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio
Kent State University, Kent, Ohio
Ohio State University, Columbus
Ohio University, Athens
Oklahoma State University, Stillwater
*University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma
University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Oklahoma
Oregon State University, Corvallis
University of Oregon, Eugene
Drexsie University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania State University, University Park
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee
North Texas State University, Denton
Texas Women's University, Denton
University of Texas, Austin
Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah
Utah State University, Logan
University of Virginia, Charlottesville
Washington State University, Pullman, Washington
University of Wisconsin, Madison
University of Wyoming, Laramie

Universities - Responding But Incomplete Information

University of Connecticut, Storrs
George Washington University, District of Columbia
Nova University, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida
Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia
University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland
University of Maryland, Baltimore
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

*Completed questionnaires received after data analysis.

List of Respondents and Non-Respondents

1. Universities - Non-Respondents

Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama
Arizona State University, Tempe
University of Arizona, Tucson
US International University, San Diego
University of the Pacific, Stockton, California
Colorado State University, Fort Collins
University of Colorado, Boulder
University of North Colorado, Greeley
University of Florida, Gainesville
Illinois State University, Normal
Northern Illinois University, DeKalb
Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana
Indiana University, Bloomington
Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana
Iowa State University, Ames
University of Kansas, Lawrence
Northeast Louisiana University, Monroe, Louisiana
Northwestern State College, Natchitoches, Louisiana
University of Maine, Orono
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts
Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan
Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan
University of Mississippi, University
University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri
University of Missouri, Columbia
Montana State University, Bozeman
University of Nebraska, Lincoln
Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey
Fordham University, Bronx, New York
New York University, New York, New York
St. John's University, Jamaica, New York
SUNY, Buffalo, New York
Yeshiva University, New York, New York
Duke University, Durham, North Carolina
Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio
University of Akron, Akron, Ohio
University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio
University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio
University of Portland, Portland, Oregon
Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia
University of South Carolina, Columbia

University of South Dakota, Vermillion
George Peabody College, Nashville, Tennessee
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
Baylor University, Waco, Texas
East Texas State University, Commerce, Texas
Texas A & M University, College Station
Texas Tech University, Lubbock
University of Houston, Houston, Texas
University of Utah, Salt Lake City
University of Washington, Seattle
West Virginia University, Morgantown
Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

List of Respondents and Non-Respondents

2. School Districts - Respondents

Large

New York City Schools, New York
Los Angeles Unified Schools, California
Philadelphia City Schools, Pennsylvania
Dade County Schools, Miami, Florida
Hawaii State Schools, Honolulu, Hawaii
Cleveland City Schools, Ohio
Fairfax County Schools, Fairfax, Virginia
Memphis City Schools, Tennessee
San Diego City Unified Schools, California
Baltimore County Schools, Maryland
Milwaukee City Schools, Wisconsin
St. Louis City Schools, Missouri
Hillsborough County Schools, Tampa, Florida
Columbus City Schools, Ohio
Orleans Parish Schools, New Orleans, Louisiana

Medium

Atlanta City Schools, Georgia
Boston City Schools, Massachusetts
Jefferson County Schools, Louisville, Kentucky
Pinellas County Schools, Clearwater, Florida
Denver City Schools, Colorado
Orange County Schools, Orlando, Florida
Albuquerque City Schools, New Mexico
Nashville-Davidson County Schools, Tennessee
Anne Arundel County Schools, Annapolis, Maryland
San Francisco Unified Schools, California
Cincinnati City Schools, Ohio
Clark County Schools, Las Vegas, Nevada
Jefferson County Schools, Denver, Colorado
Seattle City Schools, Washington
Tulsa City Schools, Oklahoma
Kansas City Schools, Missouri
Palm Beach County Schools, Florida
Long Beach Unified Schools, California
Jefferson Parish Schools, Gretna, Louisiana
Buffalo City Schools, New York
Omaha 001 Schools, Nebraska
Oakland City Unified Schools, California
El Paso ISD, Texas
Fresno City Unified Schools, California
Oklahoma City Schools, Oklahoma
Polk County Schools, Bartow, Florida
Birmingham City Schools, Alabama

Wichita 259 Schools, Kansas
San Juan Unified Schools, California
Greenville County Schools, South Carolina
Charleston County Schools, South Carolina

Small

Dayton City Schools, Ohio
Norfolk City Schools, Virginia
Forsyth Co-Winston Salem City, Winston-Salem, North Carolina
Corpus Christi ISD Schools, Texas
Shawnee Msn 512 Schools, Kansas
Des Moines Independent Community Schools, Iowa
Tucson Elementary 001 Schools, Arizona
Richmond City Schools, Virginia
Compton Unified Schools, California
Rockford City Schools, Illinois
San Bernardino City Unified Schools, California
Colorado Springs Schools, Colorado
Pasadena ISD Schools, Texas
Huntsville City Schools, Alabama
Prince William County Schools, Manassas, Virginia
Tacoma City Schools, Washington
Spokane District 81 Schools, Washington
Madison City Schools, Wisconsin
Lubbock ISD Schools, Texas
Kansas City 500 Schools, Kansas
Grand Rapids Schools, Michigan
Stockton City Unified Schools, California
Lansing City Schools, Michigan
Evansville-Vanderburg SC Schools, Indiana
Newport News City Schools, Virginia
Jackson Mun Sep Schools, Mississippi
Worcester City Schools, Massachusetts
Wake County Schools, Raleigh, North Carolina
Washoe County Schools, Reno, Nevada
Hartford City Schools, Connecticut
Pasadena Unified Schools, California
Syracuse City Schools, New York
Township HS Schools, Mt. Prospect, Illinois
Edmonds City Schools, Lynwood, Washington
Newport-Mesa Unified Schools, California
Springfield R-12 Schools, Missouri

List of Respondents and Non-Respondents

2. School Districts - Non-Respondents

Large

Puerto Rico Schools, Hato Rey, Puerto Rico
Chicago City Schools, Illinois
Detroit City Schools, Michigan
Houston ISD, Texas
Baltimore City Schools, Maryland
Prince George County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland
Dallas ISD, Texas
Washington D. C. Schools
Brevard County Schools, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida
Montgomery County Schools, Rockville, Maryland
Duval County Schools, Jacksonville, Florida

Medium

Indianapolis Schools, Indiana
DeKalb County Schools, Decatur, Georgia
Ft. Worth ISD, Texas
Mecklenburg County Schools, Charlotte, North Carolina
Newark Schools, New Jersey
San Antonio ISD, Texas
E. Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana
Pittsburgh City Schools, Pennsylvania
Portland OIJ Schools, Oregon
Mobile City-County Schools, Alabama
Grande Schools, Salt Lake City, Utah
*Brevard County Schools, Titusville, Florida
Toledo Schools, Ohio
Minneapolis Schools, Minneapolis
*Jefferson County Schools, Birmingham, Alabama
Austin ISD, Texas
Garden Grove Unified Schools, California
Akron Schools, Ohio

Small

*Mt. Diablo Unified Schools, Concord, California
Virginia Beach City Schools, Virginia
Escambia County Schools, Pensacola, Florida
Cobb County Schools, Marietta, Georgia
St. Paul 0625, Minneaplis
Louisville City Schools, Kentucky
Rochester Schools, New York
Gary CSC, Indiana
Flint Schools, Michigan
Ft. Wayne Community, Indiana
Richmond Unified Schools, California

Spring Branch LDS, Houston, Texas
Jersey City Schools, New Jersey
Muscogee County Schools, Columbus, Georgia
*San Jose Unified Schools, California
Ca[illegible]ieu Parish Schools, Lake Charles, Louisiana
Ana[illegible]im Union High, California
Ysleta 15D, El Paso, Texas
Montgomery City Schools, Alabama
*Torrance Unified Schools, California
*Richland County 01, Columbia, South Carolina
Fayette County Schools, Lexington, Kentucky
*Hacienda-LaPuente Unified Schools, La Puente, California
Chatham County Schools, Savannah, Georgia
Livonia Schools, Michigan
Davis County Schools, Farmington, Utah
Volusia County Schools, Atlanta, Georgia
Knoxville City Schools, Tennessee
Greater Anchorage Area, Alaska
Trust Territory of Pacific, Marshall Island, T.T.
*Fremont Unified Schools, California
Henrico County Schools, Highland Springs, Virginia
South Bend CSC, Indiana
Cumberland County Schools, Fayetteville, North Carolina
*Grasten County, Gastonia, North Carolina
Marford County Schools, Bel Air, Maryland
Richmond County Schools, Augusta, Georgia
Hampton City Schools, Virginia
Richardson ISD, Texas
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified Schools, California
Warren County Schools, Mississippi
Racine Schools, Wisconsin
*Caddo Parish Schools, Shreveport, Louisiana
*Bibb County Schools, Macon, Georgia
Salt Lake City Schools, Utah
Springfield Schools, Massachusetts
Hamilton County Schools, Chattanooga, Tennessee
Clayten County Schools, Jonesboro, Georgia
Lincoln 001, Nebraska
Anoka Schools, Maine
North East ISD, San Antonio, Texas
Yonkers Schools, New York
Orange Unified Schools, California
Jordan Schools, Sandy, Utah
Lafayette Parish, Louisiana
Aldene ISD, Houston, Texas
Rapides Parish, Alexandria, Louisiana
Hayward Unified Schools, California
Greensboro City Schools, North Carolina
Santa Ana Unified Schools, California

*Paterson Schools, New Jersey
Phoenix Union High, Arizona
*Seminole County, Sanford, Florida
Guam Department of Education, Agana, Guam
Pulaski County Special, Little Rock, Arkansas
Amarillo ISD, Texas
Riverside Unified Schools, California
Pueblo City Schools, Colorado
Robbinsdale Schools, Minnesota
Okaloosa County Schools, Crestview, Florida
Highline Schools, Seattle, Washington
Washington Elementary 006, Phoenix, Arizona
*Northside ISD, San Antonio, Texas
*Parma Schools, Ohio
Chesapeake City Schools, Virginia

*Signifies an incomplete response was received, i.e., blank questions, letter explaining no researchers, etc.

List of Respondents and Non-Respondents

3. R & D Organizations - Respondents

ETS, Princeton, New Jersey
AEL, Charleston, West Virginia
Center for Educational Policy & Management, Eugene, Oregon
Center for Social Organization of Schools, Baltimore, Maryland
Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh
NWREL, Portland, Oregon
Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
R & D Center for Teacher Education, Austin, Texas
Southwest Regional Laboratory, Los Alamitos, California
Stanford Center for R & D, T, Stanford, California
Wisconsin R & D Center for Cognitive Learning, Madison, Wisconsin
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Ontario
American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.
Educational Turnkey Systems, Washington, D.C.
National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C.
ACT, Iowa City, Iowa
AIR, Washington, D.C.
Teaching Research Division, Monmouth, Oregon
Education Development Center, Newton, Massachusetts
National Council for Accdn. of Teacher Education
HUMRRO
Silver Burdett Company (General Learning Company)
Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California
National Assessment of Education Progress, Denver, Colorado
Learning Institute of North Carolina, Durham, North Carolina

Responding But Not Participating R & D Organizations
(These had either insufficient information or no Educational Researchers)

IDEA, Los Angeles, California
Stanford Research Institute
Far West Laboratory, San Francisco
Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, Michigan
CTB/McGraw-Hill, Monterey, California
Learning & Instruction R.& D Bell Labs
Russell Sage Foundation, New York City
IBM Corporation, Poughkeepsie, New York
Brookings Institution, Washington, District of Columbia
College Entrance Examination Board

Appendix B

List of Respondents and Non-Respondents

3. R & D Organizations - Non-Respondents

CEMREL, St. Louis, Missouri
Center for Occupational Education, Raleigh, North Carolina
Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Columbus, Ohio
Center for Study of Evaluation, Los Angeles, California
McRel, Kansas City, Missouri
NLHE, Durham, North Carolina
NPECE, St. Louis, Missouri
SEDL, Austin, Texas
NCHEMS at Wiche, Boulder, Colorado
Westinghouse Learning Corporation, New York City
Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York City
Science Research Associates
Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Massachusetts
The Psychological Corporation, New York City
Educational Research, Cleveland, Ohio
American Association of School Administration, Washington, D.C.
National Merit Scholarship Corporation, Evanston, Illinois
IBM, Palo Alto, California
Cybernetics Research Institute, Washington, District of Columbia
Bureau of Applied Social Research, New York City
ABT Associates, Cambridge
Branch NICHD, Bethesda, Maryland
Center for Applied Linguistics, Arlington, Virginia
Center for Study of Institute & Research Division - NEA, Washington, District of Columbia

Appendix C

Copies of Survey Questionnaires

american educational
research association

November 1, 1974

TO: Deans of Education

Dear Sir or Madam:

The American Educational Research Association has appointed a committee to explore the role and status of women in educational research. The enclosed survey questionnaires will assist the Committee in describing the status of men and women in institutions which train and employ educational researchers at the doctoral level. We will appreciate your taking the time to see that the questionnaires are completed and returned at your earliest convenience, but in any event by December 1, 1974. Extra copies of these questionnaires are provided in case you wish to send them to department chairpersons.

The AERA Council has directed that the final report and recommendations of the Committee be disseminated to the membership of the Association. In order to improve the usefulness of the final document, we plan to include an appendix listing those institutions which cooperated in providing data. The responses to the questionnaires will be summarized and individual responses will not be associated with any institution.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this questionnaire for AERA. We look forward to receiving the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

Sincerely yours,

Robert L. Thorndike
President, AERA

Carol K. Tittle, Chair
Committee on the Role and Status
of Women

Committee members:
Joseph M. Cronin
Noele Krenkel
Jean Lipman-Blumen
Elizabeth Steiner Maccia
Terry N. Saario

1126 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W. • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • 202/223-9485

QUESTIONNAIRE ON STUDENTS

American Educational Research Association

The following questions pertain to policies regarding student admission, finances, part time study, participation in school governance, sponsorship, and job placement in your doctoral programs in education.

1. Name of institution _____

2. Position of person(s) completing this questionnaire _____

_____

3. Please indicate the source and size of the organizational unit you will use to answer these questions: (e.g., school of education, department of education, research division, etc.) _____

4. Please complete the table below indicating number and percent of students in full and part time graduate study.

	Full time	Part time
Males	_____N	_____N
	_____%	_____%
Females	_____N	_____N
	_____%	_____%
Total	_____N	_____N
	100%	100%

5. Do you have an age limit for admission to graduate study? ____No ____ Yes. If Yes, give age limit for ____Males ____Females.

6. Is marital status a criterion in admission? ____No ____ Yes. If Yes, then check if for _____ Males ____ Females.

7. Which of the following groups of students do you feel are most likely to complete a doctoral program within the average four year period? (Rank order the groups from 1-most likely to 6-least likely.)

_____Single males	_____Single females
_____Married males	_____Married females
_____Married males with children	_____Married females with children

8. In your department, what percentage of male and female students do you attempt to recruit?

_____Males(%) _____Females(%) _____No attention is paid to sex in recruitment activities

9. Is financial aid restricted to full time students? ___ No ___ Yes. Does marital status and/or parenthood disqualify students from receiving financial aid? ___ No ___ Yes. If Yes, then for ___ Males ___ Females

10. To what extent are child care facilities available for

(a) Children of faculty: ___none ___ partial ___fully adequate

(b) Children of students: ___none ___ partial ___fully adequate

11. Please indicate the number of applications, acceptances, enrollments and stipend support awarded in your doctoral program during the last academic year.

	Number Applied	Number Accepted	Number Enrolled
Males	_____	_____	_____
Females	_____	_____	_____
Total	_____	_____	_____

	Median Stipend: Teacher/Research Assistant	Median Stipend: Fellowship/Scholarship
Males	$_____ per _____	$_____ per _____
Females	$_____ per _____	$_____ per _____

12. Now many students participate in the governance of your department?

Males _____N Females _____N

_____% _____%

_____ Total in department _____

13. Please indicate the number of male and female students sponsored by or who are proteges of the 3 most prestigious male members of your faculty. Males ___ Females ___

Please indicate the number of male and female students sponsored by, or who are proteges of, the 3 most prestigious female members of your faculty. Males ___ Females ___

14. Please indicate the number of doctorates awarded to your education students in the 1972-73 academic year and the 1973-74 academic year.

	1972-73	1973-74
Males	_____	_____
Females	_____	_____

15. Please indicate the number of your student graduates who were placed in the following job categories during the last two years:

	Males	Females
University/College Faculty position	____	____
Post-doctoral fellowships	____	____
Industry, non-profit organization or self employed	____	____
School System	____	____
State Agency	____	____
Federal Agency	____	____
Other Positions	____	____
Employer not known	____	____
TOTAL GRADUATED	____	____

Please use the reverse side of this page or attach additional page to answer this last question.

Is there anything else that we have not asked you which you think is important to share with us (e.g., have you noted differences between your male and female students in their contributions to classes and the school, in their age at entrance or in their prior qualifications, in their length of time in the program, in their ability to find employment, etc.)? Also, if studies have been conducted at your institution which are pertinent to this survey, please return a copy with this questionnaire or a reference for our information.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON FACULTY

American Educational Research Association

This set of questions deals with the status of, and policies which affect, your graduate faculty (men and women) who train doctoral students in education.

1. Name of Institution _____

2. Position of person(s) completing this questionnaire _____

_____

3. Please indicate the source and size of the organizational unit you will use to answer these questions (e.g., school of education, department of education, research division, etc.): _____

_____

4. Please indicate the number of full and part time faculty by rank. Include split or joint appointments in the appropriate column. I. e., if a joint or split appointment constitutes a part time faculty member in your department, count that individual in the part time column. If a joint or split appointment constitutes a full time faculty member in your department, count that individual in the full time column.

	MALES		FEMALES	
	Full time	Part time	Full time	Part time
Instructors, lecturers or equivalent status	____	____	____	____
Assistant Professors	____	____	____	____
Associate Professors	____	____	____	____
Professors	____	____	____	____
Research appointments without teaching duties (non-student)	____	____	____	____

5. Please indicate the median salaries of your faculty in the table below. Base the figures for each category on the counts given in Question 4 above.

	MALES		FEMALES	
	Full time	Part time	Full time	Part time
Instructors, lecturers or equivalent status	$____	$____	$____	$____
Assistant Professors	$____	$____	$____	$____
Associate Professors	$____	$____	$____	$____
Professors	$____	$____	$____	$____
Research appointments without teaching duties (non-student)	$____	$____	$____	$____

6. Please indicate the number of tenured and nontenured faculty by rank.

	MALES		FEMALES	
	Tenured	Nontenured	Tenured	Nontenured
Instructors, lecturers or equivalent status	____	____	____	____
Assistant Professors	____	____	____	____
Associate Professors	____	____	____	____
Professors	____	____	____	____
Research appointments without teaching duties (non-student)	____	____	____	____

7. Can both husband and wife be granted full time faculty appointments within your department/school? Yes___ No___. Within your institution? Yes___ No___

8. What is the mean number of years that the present full time faculty spent between Assistant and Associate levels and Associate to Full Professor?

	Mean number of years	
	MALES	FEMALES
Assistant to Associate	____	____
Associate to Full Professor	____	____

9. Please indicate how many of your faculty serve on departmental or institutional committees.

	Number on Committees	
	Department	Institution
Males	____	____
Females	____	____

10. Do the female members of your faculty publish with the same frequency as the male members? Yes ___ No___

11. Has your school or department adopted an affirmative action plan? Yes___ No___, if Yes, please attach a copy or a brief statement of the goals or intent of the plan.

12. Does your institution have a maternity leave (without loss of status and benefits)? Yes___ No___. A paternity leave (without loss of status and benefits)? Yes___ No___

13. During the past two years which three of the following sources were most useful for recruiting new, entry level, male and female members of your faculty? (Check the three most useful sources for males and females in the columns below.)

	MALES	FEMALES
Friends or colleagues in other institutions	___	___
Placement office	___	___
Placement Services at Professional meetings	___	___
Job advertisements		
--circulated to major graduate schools of education	___	___
--placed in disciplinary journals	___	___
--placed in the Educational Researcher	___	___
--placed in the Chronicle of Higher Education	___	___
Applicant advertisements	___	___
Applicant letter of inquiry	___	___

Please use the reverse side of this page, or attach steets to respond to these last questions.

14. What plans have you made to improve the status of women students and faculty in your institution?

15. Do you have suggestions for the Committee on Status of Women in terms of recommendations you feel the Committee should make to AERA and its membership?

16. If you know of or have copies of studies conducted at your institution pertinent to this survey, please include them or references to them for our information.

17. Is there anything that we have not asked you which you think is important to share with us (e.g., any subjective feelings you may have about the situation at your institution)?

american educational
research association

November 1, 1974

TO: Employers of Educational Researchers

Dear Sir or Madam:

The American Educational Research Association has appointed a committee to explore the role and status of women in educational research. The enclosed survey questionnaire will assist the Committee in describing the status of men and women employed as educational researchers. We will appreciate your taking the time to see that the questionnaire, as it pertains to educational researchers employed in your organization, is completed at your earliest convenience, but in any event by December 1, 1974.

The AERA Council has directed that the final report and recommendations of the Committee be disseminated to the membership of the Association. In order to improve the usefulness of the final document, we plan to include an appendix listing those institutions which cooperated in providing data. The responses to the questionnaire will be summarized and individual responses will not be associated with any institution.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this questionnaire for AERA. We look forward to receiving the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Thorndike

Robert L. Thorndike
President, AERA

Carol K. Tittle

Carol K. Tittle, Chair
Committee on the Role and Status
of Women

Committee Members:
Joseph M. Cronin
Noele Krenkel
Jean Lipman-Blumen
Elizabeth Steiner Maccia
Terry N. Saario

1126 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W • WASHINGTON, D C 20036 • 202/223-9485

QUESTIONNAIRE ON EMPLOYEES

American Educational Research Association

The following set of questions deals with the status of and policies which affect those of your employees who are educational researchers.

1. Name of organization _____

2. Position of person(s) completing this questionnaire _____

_____

3. Please indicate the source and size of the organizational unit you will use to respond to these questions: (e.g., research division, entire professional staff--M.A./Ph.D., other)

_____

4. Please indicate the number of full and part time professional educational research staff by title within your organization. (Because each organization uses unique job title and classifications, please write in your job titles in the left hand column.)

	MALES		FEMALES	
Job Titles	Full time	Part time	Full time	Part time
_____	____	____	____	____
_____	____	____	____	____
_____	____	____	____	____
_____	____	____	____	____
_____	____	____	____	____

5. Please indicate the median salaries of your staff in the table below. (Please use the same job titles you used in the table above.)

	MALES		FEMALES	
Job Titles	Full time	Part time	Full time	Part time
_____	$____	$____	$____	$____
_____	$____	$____	$____	$____
_____	$____	$____	$____	$____
_____	$____	$____	$____	$____
_____	$____	$____	$____	$____

6. Indicate how many of your staff serve on departmental or organizational committees.

	Department	Organization
Males	____	____
Females	____	____

7. Are the female members of your professional staff assigned program/project management responsibiiities with the same frequency as the male members of your professional staff? Yes____ No____

8. Has your organization or department adopted an affirmative action plan? Yes___No___

9. Does your organization have a maternity leave policy (without loss of status and benefits)? Yes___ No___. A paternity leave (without loss of status and benefits? Yes___ No___

10. During the past two years which three of the following sources were most useful for recruiting new, entry level, male and female members of your staff? (Check the three most useful sources for males and females in the columns below.)

	MALES	FEMALES
Friends or colleagues in universities	____	____
Placement offices	____	____
Placement Services at Professional meetings	____	____
Responses to job advertisements		
-circulated to major graduate schools of education	____	____
-placed in disciplinary journals	____	____
-placed in the Educational Researcher	____	____
-placed in the Chronicle of Higher Education	____	____

Please answer these last questions on separate pages, and attach to this questionnaire.

1. What plans have you made to improve the status of women employees in your organization?

2. Do you have suggestions for the Committee on Status of Women in terms of recommendations you feel the Committee should make to AERA and its membership?

3. Is there anything that we have not asked you which you think is important to share with us (e.g., any subjective feelings you may have about the situation at your organization)?

4. If you know of or have copies of studies conducted at your organization pertinent to this survey, please include them or references to them for our information.

Part IV.

A SURVEY OF THE ROLE AND STATUS OF WOMEN IN OTHER PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Noele Krenkel
San Francisco Unified School District

AN INFORMATIONAL PAPER ON ACTIVITIES OF WOMEN'S COMMITTEES IN A SAMPLE OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Noele Krenkel
Committee on the Role and Status of Women
American Educational Research Association

The data found in this reportare part of a study undertaken by the Committee on the Role and Status of Women for the American Educational Research Association during its first year of operation, 1974. The purpose of this report is, through examining activities of women's committees in a sample of other professional associations, to provide information to AERA's committee on women which would enhance the effectiveness of its activities.

Associations examined include the American Anthropological Association (AAA), American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), American Association of University Professors (AAUP), American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA), American Political Science Association (APSA), American Psychological Association (APA), American Sociological Association (ASA) and the National Education Association (NEA). Information on our own association, American Educational Research Association (AERA), is also included.

It is hoped that the data within this report will give the Committee on the Role and Status of Women assistance in determining future activities of the committee and suggest recommendations to be enacted into policy by AERA.

I. Gathering of Information

Questionnaires were mailed to ten (10) professional associations. All questionnaires were returned, though two were eliminated from this report: one because the association's relevancy to AERA was questionable; and the second, because the organization is not legitimately classified as a professional association. Thus, the data from eight associations are reported as well as data available from AERA. Respondents completing the questionnaires were either chairpersons or staff for women committees, or chairpersons of independent women caucuses. In one case a staff person not associated with either the committee or the caucus responded.

Questions were asked as to the membership count of the association by sex, the existence and length of existence for the women's committee and independent women's group, availability of studies done on the participation of women within the association's affairs and the status of women within the profession, and policy statements enacted by the association on women's issues. Respondents were also asked to designate the person to whom incoming calls or correspondence on women's issues are referred. Documents were also enclosed by the respondents on studies and policy undertaken by the associations.

II. Statistics on Association's Membership, Existence of Women's Groups, Policy Enactment and Availability of Studies

Columns 1-3, Table I, display information given on membership count, with male and female breakdowns where available.

Table I
Statistics on Association's Membership, Existence of Women's Groups, Policy Enactment and Availability of Studies

Column No.	1 Female # & %	2 Male # & %	3 Total	4 official women's committee or facsimile	5 # yrs operation of Col. 4	6 independent women's pressure group	7 # yrs operation of Col. 6	8 status of person receiving incoming questions	9 hours/wk paid Col. 8	10 studies done by Col. 4 on women participation in association	11 studies done by Col. 4 on women status in profession	12 policy on women enacted by association	13 other official women groups within association
American Anthropological Association	NA	NA	9,741	yes	2/70 3+	yes	3+	Vol	-	yes*	yes	yes	-
American Association for the Advancement of Science	NA	NA	119,000	yes	3	yes	1 '74	Pd	40	yes	no	yes	-
American Association of University Professors	18,500 25%	56,500 75%	75,000	yes	2/70 3+	yes	3 '72	Pd	40	yes	yes	yes	yes
American Educational Research Association	3,000 25%	9,000 75%	12,000	yes	1 '74	yes	2 '73	Vol	-	yes*	yes*	yes	yes
American Personnel and Guidance Association	NA	NA	35,000	yes	2	yes	1	Pd	40	no	no	yes	-
American Political Science Association	966 7%	2,834 93%	13,800	yes	3/69 3+	yes	9/69 3+	Vol	-	yes	yes	yes	yes

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
American Psychological Association	9,085 23%	30,415 77%	39,500	yes	9/69 3+	yes	9/69 3+	Pd	15	yes	yes	yes	yes
American Sociological Association	2,120 15%	12,047 85%	14,173	yes	12/70 3	yes	6/69 3+	Pd	40	yes	yes	yes	-
National Education Association	1,072,000 67%	528,000 33%	1.6m	yes	'73 2	yes	3+	Pd	30	yes	yes	yes	yes

*: ongoing

NA: not available

Pd: Paid

Vol: Volunteer

Columns 4 and 6 indicate whether the association has an official women's committee, or a resembling committee, and an independent women's pressure group, respectively. Columns 5 and 7 indicate the existence, in years, of each of these groups. The work status and hours of the person receiving incoming calls and correspondence on women is indicated in columns 8 and 9. Columns 10 and 11 indicate whether or not the association has undertaken studies on the status of women in the participation of association affairs and the status of women in the profession, respectively. Column 12 indicates whether the association has enacted policy on women's issues and column 13 specifies other subgroups on women existing in the association.

Every association examined had some official body which was delegated the business of addressing itself to women's issues. In two-thirds of the associations, these groups existed for three or more years. (AAUP's Committee W on the Status of Women in the Academic Profession is a reactivated committee, resuming activity after 42 years of dormancy. It was first established in 1918). Of the remaining committees, one-third are two years or younger in age; the AERA's committee being the youngest with NEA and APGA following.

All of the professional associations had independent women's pressure groups. (The first women's caucus was formed in the ASA during the academic year 1968-69). Oltman[1] had observed that generally, the action of independent groups of women activists within the professional associations resulted in the formation

---

[1]Oltman, Ruth M. Women in the Professional Caucuses. Amer. Behav. Sci., Vol. 15, #2, Nov.-Dec 1971, Pg 281-303.

of official women's committees and that these independent groups, composed usually of the more liberal members, continue to function as a pressure group once the official women's committees are formed. Oltman also observed that usually there is much interaction between the independent groups and the official committees.

For most associations, incoming questions and correspondence on women issues are handled by paid staff persons. For example, AAAS has an Office of Opportunity in Science with both a director and a paid staff assistant funded by AAAS. An intern is paid through outside funds. This office handles both women and minority issues. AAUP refers its questions to the paid Associate Counsel who also spends time on other issues as collective bargaining. APGA refers its incoming questions to the Project Director of the Sex Equality Guidance Opportunities Project. This project is funded by the Office of Education and staffed with three persons. APA funds a staff liaison with the Committee on Women in Psychology. ASA funds an Executive Specialist for both minorities and women; a method similar to AAAS. NEA usually refers its questions to the Assistant Manager of Human Relations. The remaining three associations refer their incoming calls to the chairs of the official committees - volunteers.

All but one of the associations had undertaken an examination of the participation of women within their association's affairs; APGA being the exception. Only two of the nine associations had not undertaken an examination of the status of women within the profession: AAAS and APGA. AAAS has over 280 affiliate societies, some of which have undertaken studies on the status of women in

their fields.

All of the associations have enacted policy on women ranging from a few policy statements for some associations to a voluminous amount for others.

Over half of the associations have other official groups addressing themselves to women: AAUP has state and local committees on women as does NEA. APSA has regional committees on women. APA has a division on the Psychology of Women, and AERA has a Special Interest Group on Women and Education.

II. Contact Persons for Incoming Questions, Official Women's Committees, and Independent Pressure Groups

Table II presents the names and addresses for each association, the names and addresses for persons receiving incoming questions, the contact person for the official women's committee, and the contact person for the independent pressure group.

III. Stated Purpose for Official Women's Committees or Resembling Committee

The following statements capsulize the purpose of some of the various committees as alleged from respondents:

AAAS, Committee on Opportunities in Science: "to IMPLEMENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION for WOMEN and MINORITIES in the science field."

AAUP, Committee W on the Status of Women in the Academic Profession: "to SURVEY LITERATURE being developed and MAINTAIN a CLEARINGHOUSE of information on studies and reports."

AERA, Committee on the Role and Status of Women: "to DESCRIBE THE STATUS of women in educational research and to MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS for the attainment of their role as fully enfranchised members of the educational research profession."

Table II
Contact Persons for Incoming Questions,
Official Women's Committees and Independent Pressure Groups

I. Organization	II. Referral of Incoming Questions	III. Contact Person for official women's committee	IV. Contact Person for independent women's pressure group
American Anthropological Association 1703 New Hampshire NW Washington, D.C. 20009 202-232-8800	Carol Vance Anthro. Dept. Lehman College Bronx, NY 10468 212-960-8128	Chairperson, Committee on the Status of Women in Anthropology SEE COLUMN II	Women's Caucus Ruth Benedict Collective Esther Newton SUNY College, Purchase, NY
American Association for the Advancement of Science 202-467-4496	Janet Brown Director, Office of Opportunities in Science AAAS office	Committee on Opportunities in Science Claire Nader 1875 Conneticut Ave Suite 1220, NW Washington, DC 20009	Ad hoc Women's Caucus Beatrice Bain Univ. of Calif. Assit. to Univ. Provost 736 Univ. Hall Berkeley, Ca. 415-642-1638
American Association of University Professors one Dupont Circle Washington, D.C. 20036 202-466-8050	Carolyn Polowy Assoc. Sec., & Assoc. Counsel AAUP office	Assoc's Committee W on the Status of Women in the Academic Profession Mary W. Gray AAUP office	Women's Caucus (address not available)
American Educational Research Association 1126-16th St, NW Washington, D.C. 20036 202-223-9485	Carol Tittle 305 East 86th St 2 D East New York, NY 212-354-2255	Chair, Committee on the Role and Status of Women SEE COLUMN II	Women Educator's Mary Craig Psych. Dept. St. Cloud State College St. Cloud, Mn 56301
American Personnel and Guidance Association 1607 New Hampshire Washington, D.C. 20009 202-483-4633	Mary Ellen Verheyden-Hilliard Sex Equality in Guidance Opportunities Project APGA office	Commission for Women Margaret Blake Univ. of No. Colorado McKee Hall Greeley, Color. 80631	Women's Caucus Lynn E. Haun ED 411 Calif. State Univ. Sacra., Ca. 95819

American Political Science Association 1527 New Hampshire, NW Washington, D.C. 202-483-2512	Carole Parsons APSA office	Chairperson, Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession SEE COLUMN II	Women's Caucus Ruth Cowan Mount Vernon College 2100 Foxhall Rd NW Washington, D.C.
American Psychological Association 1200-17th St., NW Washington, D.C. 20036 202-833-7593	Nancy Felipe Russo Staff liaison, Committee on Women in Psychology APA office	Chairperson, Committee on Women in Psychology Tena Cummings Cooperative College Registry one Dupont Circle, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036	Assoc. for Women in Psychology Leigh Marlowe 180 West End Ave. New York, NY 212-787-8276
American Sociological Association 1722 N St, NW Washington, D.C. 202-833-3410	Joan Harris Executive Specialist for Minorities & Women ASA office	Committee on the Status of Women Charlotte Wolf Chairperson Sociology Dept. Ohio Wesleyan Univ. Delaware, Ohio 614-369-4431 X800	Sociologists for Women in Society Arlene Kaplan Daniels President Sociology Dept. Northwestern Univ.
National Education Association 1201-16th St, NW Washington, D.C. 20036 202-833-4303	Shirley McCune Assist. Manager, Human Relations NEA office	Chairperson, Women's Rights Task Force Lithangia Robinson 2880 Valley Heart Dr. NW Atlanta, Geo. 30318	Women's Caucus Virginia Paul 11701 Inter Laaken Dr SW Tacoma, Wn. 98498 206-584-3825

APSA, Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession: "to recommend ways of ENHANCING the PROFESSIONAL POSITION of women and of ENCOURAGING WOMEN TO ENTER the profession."

NEA, Women's Rights Task Force: "to RECOMMEND POLICY; to GATHER EVIDENCE to support recommendations."

The stated purposes of NEA and AERA are quite similar, for they both see two essential components: gathering evidence on the status of women and making recommendations for policy to enhance women's position. AAUP's committee has a more educational task, with an emphasis on retrieval of information on studies and reports. AAAS is concerned with both women and minorities. APSA is concerned not only with enhancing the professional position of women but of encouraging women to enter the profession.

IV. A Sampling of Activities of Women's Committees

Table III summarizes a sampling of activities undertaken by the various women's committees as indicated by respondents and organizational literature (APGA, ASA, NEA are not examined).

Table III
Sampling of Activities of Women's Committees in Professional Associations

---

AAA, Committee on the Status of Women in Anthropology:
1. collects information on status of women in anthropology;
2. disseminates information on status of women in anthropology;
3. refers sex discrimination complaints to proper agencies;
4. publishes roster of women in anthropology.

AAAS, Committee on Opportunities in Science:
1. delegates programs/activities to staff in Office of Opportunities in Science, e.g., maintaining roster of women and informal vitae file;
2. makes recommendations for resolutions for organizational action;
3. recommends women to advisory committees;

AAUP, Committee W on the Status of Women in the Academic Profession:

1. reviews existing AAUP policies and guidelines to assure equal opportunity for academic opportunity, e.g., anti-nepotism, maternity leave, part-time appointments, etc.;
2. examines participation of women in AAUP affairs (officers, staff, council nominations, elected members, nat'l committees) using a time series sampling of every five years (1916-70);
3. serves as clearinghouse for information on women in academe for persons both inside and outside the academic community;
4. acts as liaison with OCR in DHEW and EEOC to keep in touch with developments in enforcement programs of these agencies;
5. compiles data for Academic Women on the Move funded by Russell Sage Foundation (a study which describes status of women students in higher education, analyzes reports on status of women in academic profession and discusses efforts to change status);
6. monitors antinepotism rulings;
7. establishes regular communications with known Committee W's at state and local level;
8. conducts workshops at annual meetings;
9. works to identify and propose ways of dealing with issues of special concern to women in graduate education;
10. makes annual reports to membership through AAUP Bulletin.

AERA, Committee on the Role and Status of Women:

1. collects information on status of women in educational research;
2. collects information on status and activities of women's committees in other professional organizations to provide additional data from which to derive ideas for activities and association policy;
3. collects information on participation of women within AERA association affairs;
4. recommends policy to association pertaining to women.

APSA, Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession:

1. maintains a roster of women in political science;
2. recommends women for positions;
3. surveys the status of women graduate students;
4. surveys the status of women post-graduate professionals in the discipline;
5. participates in International Women's Year;
6. reports activities on a regular basis in membership newsletter;
7. maintains liaison with regional associations;
8. collects data on participation of women in the association affairs.

APA, Committee on Women in Psychology:

1. monitors position of women in psychology;
2. acts as resource for women nominations to boards and committees;

3. acts as catalyst for change in various programs of APA;
4. surveys women membership for concerns, e.g., interest in the creation of a division on the study of women;
5. provides information on grievance procedures to women who desire assistance;
6. "watchdogs" APA with respect to women's status;
7. identifies areas of possible concern for other boards and committees;
8. distributes a roster of women in psychology;
9. distributes a biographical directory of women in pscyhology;
10. maintains a talent bank for resources to boards, etc.

From examining Table III at least one of the groups is doing one or more of the following:

1. collecting information on the status of women in the profession;
2. collecting information on the participation of women in the association's affairs;
3. acting as a clearinghouse for information on women in profession;
4. surveying women membership for concerns;
5. making annual reports to membership;
6. maintaining roster of women in profession;
7. delegating activities to staff;
8. reviewing existing association policy and guidelines for possible sex discrimination;
9. making recommendations for policy;
10. monitoring programs aimed at rectifying sex discrimination;
11. acting as catalyst for change in various association programs;
12. providing assistance to women in graduate education;
13. providing information on grievance procedures;
14. recommending women for positions;
15. refering sex discrimination complaints to proper agencies;
16. maintaining liaison with govern't agencies and other women's groups;
17. establishing communications with association's subgroups;
18. conducting workshops;
19. participating in International Women's Year.

V. Studies/Documents on Participation of Women in Association's Affairs

Associations would be in an embarrassing position to reprimand educational institutions and other employers for not improving the status of women, while the associations themselves show a

smaller proportion of women participating in the structural positions of the association than women represented in the total membership.

Table IV lists studies/documents and rosters compiled by the women's committees which address themselves to the participation of women in the association's affairs. (Rosters usually serve as a referral system for appointments on boards, etc.):

Table IV
Sampling of Studies/Documents on Participation of Women in Association's Affairs

AAA: 1. Project in progress for assessing participation of women in association's structure;
2. Roster of Female Anthropologists (AAA, $3).

AAAS: 1. Roster of Women and Minorities in Science
2. Office maintains informal vitae file and a card file of about 200 persons which is used for recommendations to advisory committees and panels;
3. Projected that the 1975 April issue of Science will summarize the activities of the Office of Opportunities in Science and will include data on the participation of women in the association's structure.

AAUP: 1. A.S. Rossi, Report of Committee W, 1970-71. AAUP Bulletin. (Summer). pg. 215-220.

AERA: 1. "Policy to eliminate inequities in the status of women within AERA and educational research" (to be released);
2. M. Brown. Participation of women in the 1974 AERA Annual Meeting, Educational Researcher, December 1974, pg. 14-16;
3. "An informational paper on activities of women's committees in a sample of professional associations." (to be released);
4. Survey of AERA members including officers, committees, etc. (to be released).

APGA: no studies

APSA: 1. Third Edition of the Roster of Women Political Scientists (APSA, $2.50);
2. Victoria Schuck. Femina Studens Ref Publicae: Notes on her professional attainments. PS, Spring 1970, pp. 622-629;
3. Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession. Final Report and Recommendations. PS, Summer 1971, Vol. IV, #3, P. 461;
4. Ana Finifter. The professional status of women political scientists: some current data. PS, 1973, pp. 406-419.

APA: 1. Report on the Task Force of Women in Psychology (APA);
2. 1971-72 Roster of Women in Psychology (APA);
3. 1973 Biographical Directory (APA);
4. a talent bank is maintained in order to appoint women to APA's publication editorships, boards and committees;
5. Monitor, 5, #3.

ASA: 1. The Status of Women in Sociology 1968-1972 (ASA);

NEA: 1. Task Force and Committee Reports 1973-74, Fifty-third Representative Assembly of NEA, 1974.

Upon examining some of the data available, figures show that women are usually underrepresented in association's affairs when compared with the percentage or expected frequency based on female membership.

AAUP. Rossi[2] states that women have been very poorly represented in the AAUP structure. Committee W undertook a statistical summary showing women representation among offices, staff, council nominations, elected council members and national committees by a time series sampling every five years from the period 1916-1970. At most two women have appeared among the officers or the staff of the Association in any given year. The percentage of women among elected council members of the committees has rarely exceeded ten per cent. Table V shows the representation of women in the AAUP structure for the year 1970.

---

[2] A.S. Rossi. Chair. Report of Committee W, 1970-71, AAUP Bulletin, Summer 1971, p 215.

Table V
Representation of Women in AAUP Structure, 1970[3]

	Female		
	N	%	Base N
Officers	0	-	5
Staff	1	-	16
Nominations for Council	5	8	60
Elected Council Members	3	10	30
Nat'l Committees	17	9	186

AERA. Generally, figures for participation of women in AERA affairs show (with a noticeable exception for Special Interest Group program chairs) an underrepresentation of women.[4] Nominations for office in 1975 (president elect, divisional vice presidents, member at large, divisional secretaries) show the selection of only one woman out of twenty-one positions and that position was for a divisional secretary. (For update, refer to Part II of Committee's report)

Table VI
Participation of Women in 1974 AERA Annual Meetings and as AERA Special Interest Group Leaders[5]

	Male		Female					
			Observed		Expectancy		Difference	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Program Proposal Reviewers for Division	77	171	23	52	25		-2	
Invited Address Presentations:								
Association Sessions	-	6	5		-	3	-	+2
Divisions Sessions	-	23	2		-	6	-	-4

[3] Ibid

[4] Brown, M.V. Participation of women in the 1974 AERA annual meeting and as AERA Special Interest Group Leaders, Educational Researcher, Dec. 1974, p 14-16.

[5]

	Male %	Male N	Observed %	Observed N	Expected %	Expected N	Difference %	Difference N
Invited Symposium and Total Meeting Participation								
Chair	-	5	-	0	-	1.00		-1.00
Participant	-	16	-	0	-	4.00		-4.00
Discussant	-	4	-	0	-	1.00		-1.00
Leadership Positions in AERA Special Interest Groups								
Chair	-	27	-	5	-	8.00		--3.00
CoChair	-	6	-	0	-	1.50		--1.50
Secy/Treas	-	0	-	1	-	.25		+.75
Prog Chair	-	11	-	20	-	8.00		+12.00
Prog Co. Ch	-	0	-	2	-	.50		- 1.50

APA. APA examined the participation in the association's structure for the years 1969-1973.[6]

Table VII
Participation of Women in Associations Affairs for the Year 1973[7]

	Men N	Women Observed %	Women Observed N	Women Expected (23%) minus Observed
APA Council of Representatives	90	16	17	-7%
Members of APA Continuing Committees and Representatives to other Groups	101	14	17	-9%
APA Ad hoc Committees, Task Forces and Commissions	90	22	26	-1%
APA Standing Boards and Committees	86	21	23	-2%
Percentage of all governing units combined	82	18	-	-5%

ASA. In the 66 year old history of ASA only two women have been president. Until 1970, no women held elective office. The data collected by ASA shows that few women are nominated for office, thus making it difficult for women to gain elective offices.

---

[6] APA Monitor, 5, No.3.

[7] Ibid.

An ASA report examines the participation of women in the association for the years 1966-1972.[8] The latest figures are more encouraging when compared to those of other professional associations, though women participation is still low in Constitutional and Standing Committees.

Table VIII
Female ASA Committees and Elected Officers, 1972[9]

	Observed %	Observed N	Base N	Expected (15%) minus Observed
Elected Officers and Council	27	5	18	+2
Elected Committees	18	5	27	+3
Council or Pres. Appt.	18	36	195	+3%
Editorial Boards	16	20	123	+1%
Elected Section Officers	9	6	67	-6

Table IX
Female ASA Committee Members, 1968-71[10]

	Observed %	Observed N	Exp. (15%) - Obs.
Constitutional & Standing Comm.	5	30	-10%
Ad Hoc Committees	12	23	- 3%

Table X
Female Participation in Annual Meetings of the ASA, 1972[11]

	Observed %	Observed N	Exp. (15%) - Obs.
Total participants	15	143	0
Total session organizers	14	12	-1%
Total session chairp erson	14	17	-1%

---

[8] The Status of Women in Sociology. ASA, 1973.

[9] Ibid

[10] Ibid

[11] Ibid

Table XI
Women Authors in Two Leading Sociology Journals, 1967-72 (Amer. Soc. Rev. & Amer. J. of Soc.)[12]

	Observed %	Observed N	Exp. (15%) - Obs.
all women authors	11.5	79	-3.5%
single and senior women authors	10.3	50	-4.7%

NEA. Although women represent 67% of the membership of NEA, they are greatly underrepresented in NEA governance, both in elected and appointed positions. Staffing patterns of NEA and its affiliates also reflect an underrepresentation of women. Women represent 40% of the NEA professional staff and only 29% of the management staff, yet they comprise 67% of the membership.

Table XII
Women's Representation in the NEA and Affiliates, 1973-74

	Observed %	Observed N	Base	Expected	Expected minus Observed
Governance					
Executive Committee	-	4	10	6	-2
Board of Directors	26	28	107	67	-41%
Chairperson Standing Committees	-	1	5	3	- 2
Members, Standing Committees	-	6	25	16	-10
Chairpersons, Appt. Committees	-	4	18	12	- 8
Members, Appt. Com.	41	56	137	67	-26%
NEA Staff					
Executive	-	2	18	12	-10
Management	29	23	80	67	-38%
Professional	40	67	167	67	-27%
Affiliates					
Governance	31	17	52	67	-36%
Staff					
Exec. Sec. (State Assoc)		1	52	34	-33
Manag., Prof. Staff (State Affil.)	11	49	440	67	-56%

12 Ibid

13 Task Force & Committee Reports, 1973-74. Presented to the 53rd Representative Assembly of the NEA.

VI. Studies/Documents on Status of Women in the Profession

Table XIII lists a sampling of studies accomplished by the women's committees on the status of women within the association's profession.

Table XIII
Sampling of Studies/Documents on Status of Women within Profession

AAA: 1. A study has been completed titled "Sexual stratification in academic anthropology".

AAAS: no studies from AAAS; AAAS has 280 affiliate societies, some which have produced such documents, e.g., the American Physical Society, American Astronomical Society, American Chemical Society, American Society of Biological Chemists, American Society for Microbiology, etc.

AAUP: 1. A. Caswell Ellis, Chair, Preliminary Report of Committee W, on Status of Women in College & University Faculties, AAUP Bulletin, Oct., 1921, p. 25;
2. Rossi, A.S. & Ann Calderwood. Academic Women on the Move. Russell Sage Foundation, 1973.

AERA: 1. "Participation of women in the educational research community," (to be released);
2. "Role and status of women in training institutions and as employees," (to be released)

APGA: none

APSA: 1. P.E. Converse and J.M. Converse. The status of women as students and professionals in political science. PS Summer 1971, Vol. IV, #3, p. 328;
2. Victoria Schuck, Women in political science: some preliminary observations. PS, Vol. II, No. 4 (Fall 1969), pp. 642-653;
3. Victoria Schuck. Some comparative statistics on women in political science and other social sciences. PS, Vol. III, #3, (Summer 1970), pp. 357-361.
4. Women in political science: studies and report of the APSA Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession, 1969-71. (APSA).
5. Committee on the Status of Women. PS, Winter 1974, Vol. VII, No. 1.
6. Ada Finifter. The professional status of women political scientists: some current data. PS, 1973, pp. 406-419.

APA:
1. Report from the Task Force on Sex Bias in Psychotherapy. (APA);
2. Report of the Task Force on the Status of Women in Psychology. Amer. Psych. July 1973, p. 611;
3. Survey of Psychologists in U.S. and Canada. Doc. #463. (APA);
4. Recruitment of minority group students and women. Amer. Psych. Feb. 1974;
5. Survey of Women Members of the APA, 1971-72. (APA);
6. Survey of Depts. of Psych. 1972 & 1973. APA, 1974;
7. Report of the Task Force on the Status of Women in Psychology. Sept. 1972.

ASA:
1. The Status of Women in Sociology 1968-1972. (ASA).

NEA:
1. Task Force and Committee Reports, 1973-74. Presented to the 53rd Representative Assembly of the NEA.

VII. Policy Statements on the Status of Women Enacted by Various Professional Associations

Table XIV contains a sampling of policy statements enacted by the various professional organizations.

Table XIV
Policy Statements on the Status of Women

AAAS:
1. support of equal opportunity for both women and minorities (copies sent to affiliates asking for endorsement);
2. support for elimination of age discrimination in fellowships and grants;
3. directing AAAS to provide Science Education programs for women and minorities and placing highest priority on this activity;
4. directing AAAS to celebrate International Women's Year through appropriate activities.

AAUP:
1. faculty members not be penalized because of marital relationship with another member of faculty;
2. censorship of colleges and universities practicing discrimination on basis of age, sex, race, color, religion, national origin and marital status;
3. support of efforts in institutions of higher education to eliminate discrimination on basis of sex, race, etc. including support of affirmative action efforts and re-examination of salary structure and patterns of retention-promotion;
4. recommending colleges and universities to provide leaves of absence to faculty members for child-bearing, child-rearing, and family emergencies;
5. recommendations made by women's committee to pass the following resolutions: part-time appointments in higher education, avoidance of generic use of masculine

pronouns and the term "man," on grounds that such usage reinforces the imagery of women as subordinate and ultimately invisible persons seldom in positions of power and authority.

AERA:
1. resolution passed discontinuing joint program with PDK and PLT due to organizations sex discrimination practices;
2. resolution passed to form committee to investigate the status of women in educational research;
3. resolution passed that women be appointed to committees and nominated for elective office commensurate with the number of women in the association;
4. resolution passed directing the Executive Officer to report annually to the Council on the number of women in AERA with an analysis of their roles in the association;
5. resolution passed "AERA supports the policy of open recruitment and urges employers of educational researchers to cooperate in spirit and practice to end discriminatory patterns of hiring and recruiting."

APGA:
1. Resolution passed that the Strong Vocational Interest Blank is discriminatory and that the test be revised.

APSA:
1. affirmative action for political science profession;
2. disapproval of discrimination;
3. encouragement of active participation of women in association;
4. supports abolition of nepotism rules;
5. supports part-time employment;
6. supports equality of rates and benefits payment in public and private retirement plans;
7. directs that child care service be provided at annual mtg.;
8. directs that letters of recommendation not include references which discriminate on basis of sex, religion, or race;
9. supports open listing policy whereby all positions are listed in APSA newsletter;
10. directs search for funds to provide legal counsel;
11. directs continuance of women's committee.

APA: APA has passed many resolution on sex discrimination, notably the following:
1. resolution supporting abortion rights;
2. resolution supporting affirmative action;
3. resolution supporting gay rights;
4. resolution supporting day care

ASA: ASA has passed over 32 resolutions on sex discrimination. They include:

1. support of hiring and promotion of women;
2. equitably awarded graduate stipends;
3. women's study programs;
4. day care centers;
5. flexibility in teaching assignments;
6. open employment of faculty;
7. more women to advisory and governing boards of association.

NEA: The following recommendations were referred to NEA Board of Directors for implementation as feasible:

1. NEA and affiliates should reflect 50% female representation for elected, appointed and staffing positions;
2. collective bargaining should be utilized for attainment of women's rights;
3. NEA and affiliates develop training models in leadership skills for women in program development, management and administrative competencies;
4. NEA develop a slide show on "Women in the Education Profession" to be used to increase member awareness;
5. NEA develop information system to secure data on present employment status of women at national, local and state levels;
6. President to appoint advisory group of governance and staff to monitor sex discrimination in organization;
7. create program activities to create communications and support systems among racial and ethnic minority groups of women;
8. support of litigation of women's rights issues;
9. NEA and affiliates to develop national policy statement on sex stereotyping in schools and work for its inclusion in personnel policies of local educational agencies;
10. NEA and affiliates continue to work for strong regulations for enforcement of Title IX, assist in dissemination and inform students and teachers;
11. NEA and affiliates to work for passage and full funding of the Women's Education Equity Act;
12. NEA and affiliates to work for inclusion in state and federal funding sources programs directed at elimination on sex role stereotyping;
13. NEA and affiliates to work for inservice training programs in sex stereotyping in collective bargaining agreements with local agencies;
14. NEA and affiliates to provide training for affiliates and members in sex role stereotyping;
15. NEA and affiliates to develop curriculum materials for teachers to correct biased materials in classroom;
16. Build communications and coalitions with community groups and women's groups for collective action for eliminating sex role stereotyping;
17. Build coalitions with groups interested in early childhood education and day care;
18. Build coalitions with community groups on inservice
19. Build coalitions with minority women;

20. Build coalitions with older women;
21. support passage of ERA;
22. continue Women's Rights Task Force

VIII. Recommendations for AERA

The contents of this report suggest the following recommendations for the Committee on the Role and Status of Women to consider:

Association Affairs

1. recommend to association the continuance of the Committee on the Status and Role of Women;
2. recommend to association a study of the feasibility of a new division on minorities and women;
3. recommend association to pass resolutions on antinepotism, maternity leave, part-time appointments for educational researchers;
4. recommend association to celebrate International Women's Year with a suggested activity of honoring women educational researchers in a special issue of Educational Researcher;
5. recommend elimination of sexist language in association affairs;
6. recommend association to pass resolution condemning age discrimination in awarding fellowships and grants;
7. recommend association to pass resolution on revising test instruments with sex bias;
8. recommend association to provide child care service provisions at annual meeting;
9. recommend association to support open listing policy, with all listings placed in Educational Researcher;
10. recommend association to pass resolution on encouraging educational institutions to eliminate sex stereotyping;
11. recommend association to support Title IX;
12. recommend association to support Women's Education Equity Act;
13. recommend association to support ERA;
14. recommend association to support research in sex role stereotyping and sex differences/similarities.

Women's Committee Affairs

1. Committee should consider possibility of searching for funds for part-time staff person to handle women and minority projects in office;
2. Committee should maintain a clearinghouse on women in profession and organization with updated published list of studies/reports available to persons inside and outside academic done by committee and other persons;
3. Committee should develop a program to encourage women to enter educational research;

4. Committee should report yearly to the membership, activities undertaken by the committee. This report should be placed in Educational Researcher;
5. The committee should disseminate a booklet summarizing findings on women in profession and in organization;
6. The committee should publish a roster of women in educational research;
7. The committee should maintain a vitae file for recommendations to advisory boards and committees;
8. The committee should establish a liaison with OCR and EEOC;
9. Committee should establish relationships with other professional women's committees;
10. Committee should survey women membership for concerns and suggestions;
11. Committee should provide information on grievance procedure to women;
12. Committee should monitor AERA in respect to participation of women in organization;
13. Committee should reprimand AERA on not keeping to policy on nominating women commensurate with their number in the organization in the 1975 elections;
14. Committee should review existing association policy and guidelines for possible sex discrimination and sexist wording;
15. Committee should act as referral for sex discrimination complaints to proper agencies;
16. Committee should provide assistance to women in graduate education;
17. Committee should compile a listing of research done on sex stereotyping, sex differences/similarities.

REFERENCES

Brown, M. Participation of women in the 1974 AERA Annual Meeting and as AERA Special Interest Group Leader. Educational Researcher, Dec. 1974, pp. 14-16.

Finifter, Ana. The professional status of women political scientists: some current data. PS, 1973, pp. 406-419.

Oltman, Ruth M. Women in the Professional Caucuses. Amer. Behav. Sci., Vol. 15, No. 2, Nov.-Dec. 1971, pp 281-303.

Moniter. APA. 5, No. 3.

Report of Committee W, 1970-71. AAUP Bulletin. Summer pp 215-220.

The Status of Women in Sociology 1968-72. American Sociological Association, 1973.

Task Force and Committee Reports 1973-74. Forty-third Representative Assembly of NEA, 1974.

HELPFUL SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges. 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. Project compiles materials on the status and education of women in higher education.

Women Today. National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004. A bi-weekly newsletter on women in the news, as well as issues and current events of importance to women. $18/year.

AAUW, 2401 Virginia Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20037. Compiles a listing of women's caucuses and committees in professional associations.

Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education, 1156 15th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005. Publishes occasionally Research Action Notes.

Sex Equality in Guidance Opportunities Project, APGA, 1607 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. Provides technical assistance to help elemntary and secondary school counselors and related educational personnel to recognize and change detrimental effects of sex role stereotyping. Publications.

EMPLOYMENT RESOURCES

1. Federation of Organizations for Professional Women
   1346 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Rm 1122
   Wash., D.C. 20036
   (202) 833-1998

   *a comprehensive survey of registries of women in various professions; contains information on how to set up a registry as well as description of existing registries. $5.00

2. HERS: Higher Education Resource Services
   Brown University
   Providence, RI 02912
   401-863-2197

   *screens applicants for positions; acts as a nationwide clearinghouse for faculty and administration; founded by a Ford grant.

3. Cooperative College Registry
   National Center for Higher Education
   One Dupont Circle NW
   Washington, D.C. 20036

   *non-profit organization; introduces experienced faculty and staff personnel and new teachers to colleges and universities nationwide for positions in all areas.

4. CATALYST
   6 East 82nd St.
   New York, New York 10028
   212-628-2200

   *maintains a national, computerized roster of women age 24 and over, who have completed at least one year of college and who seek all types of employment.

5. Affirmative Action Register
   Affirmative Action Services
   10 S. Brentwood Blvd.
   St. Louis, Mo. 63105

Part V.

WOMEN IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS

Elizabeth Steiner Maccia
Indiana University

That women do not have equal opportunity to participate in the American Educational Research Association (AERA) is documented by the study of Jean Lipman-Blumen and Patricia Stivers. That women do not have equal opportunity to become educational researchers and to be educational researchers is documented by the study of Carol Kehr Tittle, Terry N. Saario, and Elinor Denker. That effective measures to rectify discrimination against professional women can be devised is documented by the study of Noele Krenkle. Consequently, in order to provide women educational researchers with equal opportunity, I propose that women's affirmative action plans with respect to educational research be instituted and that AERA play a central role in their institution.

A women's affirmative action plan with respect to educational research is a policy document that incorporates more than a passive stance of nondiscrimination against women who are educational researchers or are in the process of becoming educational researchers. It is a policy document that requires deeds that rectify inequality of educational research opportunity due to discrimination on the basis of female sex. Since women may be discriminated against within AERA as well as within the educational research training and/or research organizations to which AERA's members belong, a women's affirmative action plan for AERA as well as women's affirmative action plans for educational researchers of Indiana University, the San Francisco Unified School District, New York State Department of Education, Educational Testing Service, and the other affiliated educational research training and/or research organizations are required.

Turning first to the women's affirmative action plan for AERA, what is necessary is a statement of commitment to equal opportunity for women to

participate in the association. This commitment must be detailed through policies covering the main categories of associational activities: governance, publication, placement services, and meeting. With respect to governance, appointment to committees and offices and nominations should be treated. The following motion of the AERA Council in 1973, in response to a proposal of the women's caucus that representation should be equal to the number of women members, is an example:

> Motion (Ebel/Clifford). It is the sense of the Association Council that women should be appointed to committees and offices and nominated for elective offices commensurate with the number of women in AERA.

As to publication, policies relative to equal opportunity in editing and publishing as well as policies relative to non-sex bias in the content of publications should be stated. Guidelines, like McGraw-Hill's for their publications, would have to be developed. Policies relative to equal opportunity in the association's placement services need statement. A beginning is the Council's endorsement in 1974 of the following:

> AERA supports the policy of open recruitment and urges employers of educational researchers to cooperate in spirit and practice to end discriminatory patterns of hiring and recruiting.

Finally, as to meeting, policies relative to equal opportunity to receive rewards, read papers, etc., should be formulated. A noteworthy step in that direction was taken by the Council in 1973 upon the request of the women's caucus that consideration be given to discontinuing the joint AERA-PDK Award for Distinguished Contributions to Educational Research because of the discriminating practice of PDK.

> Motion (Cronin/Bidwell). It is moved that AERA withdraw from joint sponsorship with Phi Delta Kappa of the annual research award. (Carried, 8 for, 3 against).

In an affirmative action plan it does not suffice to detail commitment, goals and timetables with respect to policies must be projected. It should be pointed out that, even though it be granted that goals are quotas, affirmative action does not demand utilization of non-qualified persons. J. Stanley Pottinger, former Director of the Office of Civil Rights, argued that goals were not quotas.

> Quotas, on the one hand, imply a numerical level of employment that must be met. If quotas were required, they would be rigid requirements, and their effects would be to compel employment decisions to fulfill them, regardless of the compromising effect fulfillment might have on legitimate qualifications and standards, regardless of the good faith effort made to fulfill them, and regardless of the fact that quotas might have been set by arbitrary standards unrelated to the availability of capable applicants and the potential of the contractor to recruit them.
>
> Goals, on the other hand, signify a different concept and a different employment process. They are projected levels of achievement resulting from an analysis by a contractor of his deficiencies, and of what he believes he can do about them. Establishing goals signifies both that the contractor has made such an analysis, and that he has commited himself to good faith to meet them. (1)

Sidney Hook, however, argues that goals are quotas.

> What is the logical or cognitive difference between saying (1) "You are to aim at a quota of 20% redheads for your staff within two years," and (2) "You are to set as your goal recruitment of 20% redheads for your staff within two years"? Quotas are numerical goals. A "quota of 20%" is equivalent to "a numerical goal of 20%." The expressions are interchangeable. The cognitive meaning of neither sentence is altered if we substitute one expression for the other. (2)

He goes on to place his argument in the context of remarks such as Pottinger's.

> Spokesmen of HEW seek to absolve themselves of the guilt of seeking to impose a quota system by insisting on a distinction that makes no difference in fact or

> practice. "We don't demand," they plead, "that the numerical goals we set down actually be achieved. We ask only that a good faith effort be made to achieve it." How does this differ from saying, "We don't demand that the quotas actually be filled or reached, only that you honestly try"?

Stated this way, goals and quotas do not differ. But there is a difference between demanding compliance and calling for an honest try. While it might be, as Hook states it, "natural...to reduce standards in order to establish good faith in the quest for numerical goals or quotas," it is not demanded by affirmative action. Even its naturalness or what happens in practice is open to question. To call for an honest try is to give necessary leeway for not utilizing women who are not capable. Through projections of goals and timetables, therefore, good faith is shown in trying to carry out policies.

But goals and timetables depend upon a data base. Therein lies the importance of motions, as those of the Council in 1973, which directed the Executive Officer to report annually to the Council "on the number of women in the Association and to provide an analysis of the roles they are playing on various committees" and which instituted a Committee on the Role and Status of Women. The Committee on the Role and Status of Women through the efforts of Jean Lipman-Blumen and Patricia E. Stivers has secured data on women's participation in AERA. This data could be a basis for projection of goals and timetables for women's participation in AERA.

Two more dimensions must be added to any affirmative action plan, i.e. dissemination and evaluation mechanisms. To insure that policies will not remain inoperative, plans must delineate how others will be involved in carrying them out and how their success or failure will be determined so modification can occur.

To accomplish a complete women's affirmative action plan for AERA, a full time women's affirmative action officer needs to be appointed. Data collection, dissemination, and evaluation are not one-shot or part time affairs. The Committee on the Role and Status of Women can do no more than point AERA in the right direction. To mark off a path for full participation of women in AERA's activities and to stay on that path calls for the firm hand of a women's affirmative action officer. However, a standing committee, like the one on the role and status of women, should be instituted as advisory to that officer.

Turning next to the institution of women's affirmative action plans by educational research training and/or research organizations affiliated with AERA through its membership, obviously AERA cannot institute them. But AERA can play a role in their institution.

The women's affirmative action plans for educational research training and/or research organizations affiliated with AERA should contain the dimensions of any women's affirmative action plan for educational research: policies detailing the commitment to equal opportunity for women who are or are becoming educational researchers, goals and timetables supported by data, and dissemination and evaluation mechanisms. The essential difference between a women's affirmative action plan for AERA and such plans for educational research training and/or research organizations affiliated with AERA would be the kinds of policies to be detailed.

In the study by Tittle, Saario and Denker for the Committee on the Role and Status of Women which presents data on women in educational research training and/or research organizations, the following categories of these organizations were sorted out: colleges and universities

with doctoral programs in education, school districts, state departments, and research and development organizations. It is patent that programs for training educational researchers would be found in most cases in colleges and universities with doctoral programs. Consequently, colleges and universities should have, in their women's affirmative action plans for educational research, policies detailing equal opportunity for women becoming educational researchers. The facets explored in the Tittle, Saario and Denker study indicate the kinds of policy needed: policies on admission, recruitment, support and placement. All of the organizations sorted out above are research organizations and so should detail policies of equal opportunity for women educational researchers. Policy on the following should be stated: recruitment, hiring, anti-nepotism, placement, job classification, and assignment, promotion, salary and fringe benefits, conditions of work, leave, termination, and pregnancy, childbirth, and child care. All of these kinds of policy have been noted for colleges and universities in the Higher Education Guidelines, Executive Order 11246, and pertain likewise to school districts, state departments, and research and development organizations as the Tittle, Saario and Denker study points out.

Fortunately, there is a base of affirmative action plans upon which one can build those for women in educational research. Government, particularly federal government, has played an active role in the institution of affirmative action plans. For example, under Executive Order 11246, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has forced, according to their guidelines, plan formation by universities and colleges falling within the Federal domain due to their Federal contracts or sub-contracts. State governments too have regulated such plans. And progressive organizations have instituted their

own. Yet these plans are only a beginning in the institution of women's affirmative action plans with respect to educational research. The Tittle, Saario, and Denker study attests to this. Some educational research organizations do not have plans and those that do have incomplete ones.

AERA cannot regulate; it is not a government agency. Nevertheless, it can demand adherence to its guidance. It can censure. Thus, AERA has a role to play in instituting women's affirmative action plans for the educational research training and/or research organization to which its members belong. It can set forth guidelines and evaluate adherence thereto. If adherence does not occur, it can formally censure. Again, a firm hand of a full time women's affirmative action officer would be required.

But is the proposal of women's affirmative action plans a moral one? All would admit that we want to live in a just society. But all do not agree as to what a just society is. Some would hold utilitarianism and take the just society to be one in which its institutions maximize the net balance of satisfaction summed over all the individuals belonging to the group. But surely each individual has an inviolability that cannot be overriden by the welfare of the group. Also some would hold that all individuals should be treated equally. But surely there are differences in individuals. By accepting a Kantian position on justice, such as Rawls' (4), both inviolability and differences need not be set aside and communality is possible.

Kant's categorical imperative stated as the principle of universality:

> Act only on the maxim whereby thou canst at the same time will that it should become a universal law

sets forth that subjective choosing ought to be objective. Thus, this principle is a normal one for rational being. It is a requirement for being rational. The stating of the categorical imperative as the principle of autonomy:

> So act that the will could at the same time regard itself as giving in its maxims universal laws

makes clear that subjective choosing which is objective is also a will conditioning itself or a good will. Thus, this principle establishes liberty. It is a requirement for freedom. Finally, the stating of the categorical imperative as the principle of humanity:

> So act that in your own person as well as in the person of every other you are treating mankind also as an end, never merely as a means

makes subjective choosing which is objective respect for the self. Thus, this principle establishes inviolability. It is a requirement for communality. All together these principles are the categorical imperative which is the basis for rational conference and agreement, i.e., for fairness.

Rawls sets forth two principles of social justice that he takes to be chosen by human beings who are rational.

> First: each person is to have equal right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others.
>
> Second: social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) reasonably expected to be to everyone's advantage, and (b) attached to positions and offices open to all. (5)

Rawls restates the second principle to clarify that a difference principle operates as well as a principle of equality of opportunity:

> Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged and (b) attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity. (6)

These two principles set forth the policy for society's assignment of rights and duties and for the distribution of social and economic advantages.

Since affirmative action plans specify policy about the distribution of social and economic advantages, analysis will be in terms of Rawls'

second principle. This principle is not one of redress in the sense of requiring society to try to compensate for inequalities so that everyone on a fair basis could compete with everyone else. However, the second principle does demand recognition that the advantaged are not to gain because of their native assets or social circumstances but because of benefiting the disadvantaged. The advantaged are not deserving of greater social and economic rewards than the disadvantaged, inequalities of birth or station are not merited. Hence, no one should gain or lose from one's arbitrary place in the distribution of natural assets or social circumstances without gaining or receiving compensatory advantages in return. In other words, the second principle is an agreement to share in the benefits of the distribution of natural talents whatever it might be. Rationality, therefore, is non-supportive of either a meritocracy or a technocracy. These are unjust social arrangements. Still, the second principle does not perpetuate the status quo. Earlier generations owe to later generations the implementation of policies, including eugenic ones, which will, if it can be done, move the society toward equal talent.

Patently, affirmative action plans constitute policy that is moral as well as regulative. The second principle of justice is embodied in the two basic concepts of affirmative action plans, non-discrimination and affirmative action. Non-discrimination relates to the principle of equal opportunity, while affirmative action relates to the principle of difference. By not discriminating on the basis of characteristics non-qualifying for educational research, equal opportunity for participation within AERA and educational research training and/or research organizations is possible. By involving women qualified with respect to educational research training or research, talents formerly unavailable result in benefit for all.

Sidney Hook has called affirmative action plans immoral on the grounds that the affirmative action part of the plans is discriminatory.

> For some purposes--trade, immigration policy, rationing of scarce commodities, etc. -- a quota system may be legitimate. But when we are seeking the best qualified person or persons for a position it is never morally legitimate, particularly when we are on record as being opposed in principle to discrimination on grounds of race, religion, sex or national origin except when these are justifiably among the qualifications, e.g., sex for certain kinds of dancers or officers for women's detention centers, religion for service in house worship, etc. (7)

Obviously, Hook is mistaken. Affirmative action does not make sex or race or national origin qualifications for promoting learning. Women and minorities are scheduled to be hired to demonstrate that being a non-minority and male are not qualifications. But what if qualified non-minority men are not hired? For example, the Female and Minority Program at the University of Minnesota was discontinued due to complaints of reverse discrimination which were made to the state human rights commission. The F & M Program opened higher paying administrative and professional jobs first to women and minorities. In one year and a half, 133 F & M jobs were filled, and only 43 of them finally by white males. (8) Again the problem is not with affirmative action. Rather the problem is one of allocating resources to hire non-minority men as well as women and minorities.

Given the budgetary crunch in higher education, firing not hiring, whether it be affirmative action hiring or not, faces us. If a society and its associations cannot give opportunity to its members, then that society and its associations must be reordered for justice's sake. Policy relative to resource reallocation is required. Resources must be reallocated from that which is destructive of human spirit to that which is not. Only in the context of such policy can affirmative action plans further the just society and just associations.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Affirmative Action and Faculty Policy," The College Counsel, Vol. 11, 1972, No. 1, pp. 245-246.

2. "Semantic Evasions," College and University Journal, September, 1972 p. 17.

3. Ibid.

4. John Rawls, A Theory of Justice, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

5. Ibid., p. 60.

6. Ibid., p. 83.

7. Hook, op. cit., p. 17.

8. Charles J. Sugnet, "The Uncertain Progress of Affirmative Action," Change, May, 1974.