TABLE 1
Annual Meeting Job Placement Service
Number of Applications, Employers and Jobs, 1975-1985

| Year | Location | No. of <br> Applications | No. of <br> Employers | No. of <br> Jobs |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1985 | New Orleans, LA | 300 | 116 | 179 |
| 1984 | Washington, DC | 465 | 84 | 127 |
| 1983 | Chicago, IL | 350 | 79 | 120 |
| 1982 | Denver, CO | 229 | 76 | 121 |
| 1981 | New York, NY | 340 | 96 | 131 |
| 1980 | Washington, DC | 326 | 86 | 112 |
| 1979 | Washington, DC | 427 | 106 | 134 |
| 1978 | New York, NY | 450 | 96 | 124 |
| 1977 | Washington, DC | 570 | 107 | 142 |
| 1976 | Chicago, IL | 518 | 95 | 154 |
| 1975 | San Francisco, CA | 512 | 91 | 142 |

TABLE 2
Demand and Supply of Applicants and Jobs, by Percent and by Category

| Applicants | Categories | Jobs |
| :---: | :--- | ---: |
| $27 \%$ | American Government and Politics | $26 \%$ |
| 12 | Public Policy | 11 |
| 7 | Public Administration and Organizational Behavior | 17 |
| 4 | Methodology | 6 |
| 14 | Political Theory | 4 |
| 18 | International Relations | 15 |
| 18 | Comparative Politics | 16 |
| - | Non-teaching (jobs only) | 5 |

Table 2 shows that there was a fairly even match between applicants and jobs by field with certain notable exceptions. For example, whereas $17 \%$ of the jobs listed were in the field of public administration, only $7 \%$ of the applicants listed that field. In the political theory field, on the other hand, there were $14 \%$ applicants and only $4 \%$ of jobs listed in that field.

## Participation by Women Dropped in 1985

Martin Gruberg<br>University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

Another year, another convention, one having a theme of political change. The
change for women was not, however, one for the better at this year's political science convention. Though there was a record number and percentage of women as section heads, the rates of female chairpersons, papergivers and discussants all declined (Table 1).

As usual, when women served as section heads or chairpersons, other women were more likely to be selected as program participants. However, this was not always true. Nor was it always the case that male gatekeepers passed over women for participation roles. The section on Political Thought: Analytical and Critical Approaches, for example, headed by a male, had one of the best malefemale ratios.
As indicated in my 1984 report, my annual assessments will have to include

TABLE 1

|  | Total | Women | \% |  | Total | Women | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Section Heads |  |  | Chairpersons |  |  |  |
| 1985 | 23 | 8 | 34.8 | 1985 | 260 | 51 | 19.6 |
| 1984 | 20 | 6 | 30.0 | 1984 | 215 | 44 | 20.5 |
| 1983 | 24 | 7 | 29.2 | 1983 | 196 | 35 | 17.9 |
| 1982 | 19 | 5 | 26.3 | 1982 | 163 | 22 | 13.5 |
| 1981 | 16 | 3 | 18.8 | 1981 | 137 | 16 | 11.7 |
| 1980 | 18 | 3 | 16.7 | 1980 | 139 | 29 | 20.9 |
| Paper Givers |  |  |  | Discussants |  |  |  |
| 1985 | 966 | 149 | 15.4 | 1985 | 320 | 52 | 16.3 |
| 1984 | 804 | 142 | 17.7 | 1984 | 294 | 58 | 19.7 |
| 1983 | 730 | 120 | 17.4 | 1983 | 272 | 50 | 18.4 |
| 1982 | 557 | 109 | 19.6 | 1982 | 184 | 28 | 15.2 |
| 1981 | 520 | 98 | 18.8 | 1981 | 161 | 28 | 17.4 |
| 1980 | 453 | 99 | 21.9 | 1980 | 160 | 19 | 11.9 |

from now on, not only the sections organized by the Program Committee, but also the panels sponsored by the APSA organized sections and committees. Except for the panels sponsored by
the Committee on the Status of Women, the latter sets of panels, all organized by males, had fewer female participants than did the Program Committee's panels (Table 2).

TABLE 2

|  |  | Total | Women | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chairpersons |  |  |  |  |
| Organized Sections and Committees | $\begin{aligned} & 1984 \\ & 1985 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47 \\ & 73 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.3 \\ & 20.5 \end{aligned}$ |
| Grand Total | $\begin{aligned} & 1984 \\ & 1985 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 262 \\ & 333 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54 \\ & 66 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.6 \\ & 19.8 \end{aligned}$ |
| Paper Givers |  |  |  |  |
| Organized Sections | $\begin{aligned} & 1984 \\ & 1985 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 158 \\ & 255 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & 37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.2 \\ & 14.5 \end{aligned}$ |
| Committees | $\begin{aligned} & 1984 \\ & 1985 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 11 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39.0 \\ & 24.4 \end{aligned}$ |
| Grand Total | $\begin{aligned} & 1984 \\ & 1985 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 983 \\ 1266 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 174 \\ & 197 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.7 \\ & 15.6 \end{aligned}$ |
| Discussants |  |  |  |  |
| Organized Sections | $\begin{aligned} & 1984 \\ & 1985 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46 \\ & 56 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ 12 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.0 \\ & 21.4 \end{aligned}$ |
| Committees | $\begin{aligned} & 1984 \\ & 1985 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 14.3 \end{gathered}$ |
| Grand Total | $\begin{aligned} & 1984 \\ & 1985 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 347 \\ & 383 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64 \\ & 65 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.4 \\ & 17.0 \end{aligned}$ |

The eight sections organized by women had women as $34.1 \%$ of the chairpersons ( 30 of 88 ), 17.4\% of the paper givers ( 58 of 334 ), and $15.0 \%$ of the discussants (21 of 140). (That is, $38.9 \%$ of the women paper givers in the Convention's Program-Committee-organized panels were found in the sections organized by women as were $40.4 \%$ of the female discussants. In womenchaired panels were to be found $37.0 \%$ of the female paper givers at the meeting and $19.2 \%$ of the female discussants. Women-chaired panels had $29.0 \%$ female paper givers and $16.4 \%$ female discussants.)

There were no women on the panels of the two evening plenary sessions. The six speakers and both chairs were males.
The sections with the strongest female representation were: Political Thought: Historical Approaches; Political Thought: Analytical and Critical Approaches; Public Opinion and Political Psychology; Political Participation, Political Power, and the Politics of Disadvantaged Groups; Public Administration and Organization Theory; Policy Studies; Legislative Studies; and the Status of Women in the Profession.
The sections with the weakest female representation were those on Positive Political Theory; Empirical Theory and Research Methods; Electoral Behavior and Popular Control; Legislative Process and Politics; International Relations: Conflict Analysis and National Security; International Relations: Hierarchy and Dependence in the International System; The Practice of Political Science; Conflict Processes; and Law, Courts, and Judicial Process.
1985's lopsided stag panels included those on Approval Voting; Macro and Micro Perspectives; Political Crises, Violence and Terrorism; Party Realignment and Partisan Change; Processes of Partisan Transformation; Political Ambition and Electoral Politics; the Roundtable on Social Protest Movements; the Roundtable in Honor of Charles Hyneman; Studies in the Institutionalized Presidency; the Roundtable on the Reagan Presidency; the Roundtable on Humanities Teaching and Research by Political

Scientists; Formal Models of War; Executive Branch Influences and Constraints Upon the Federal Courts; Marketplace Strategies in Public Policy; Environmental and Energy Policy Problems; Intergovernmental Relations and Public Policy; and Urban Political Culture Under Fiscal Austerity. (The latter had a female chair but seven male paper givers and two male discussants.)
Panels overwhelmingly female included Political Participation of Women in the Third World; State Theories, Development and Women; Gender and Political Orientations; The Interdependence of Gender, Race and Class in American Politics; A Global Look at the Political and Economic Roles of Women; Reconsidering Some Myths of Public Administration; and Subtle and Not So Subtle Discrimination Against Women in Academic Institutions.
I recommend that the Association's Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession undertake a study of why the participation rate for women at the New Orleans meeting declined from that manifested in recent years.

## Council Reaffirms Commitment to Sullivan Principles

At its August 28 meeting APSA's governing body reaffirmed its commitment to the Sullivan principles. APSA's policy is not to invest in any company doing business in South Africa unless that company adheres to the Sullivan principles. Under these principles companies must not engage in racial discrimination in their employment practices and must work to end apartheid in South Africa.
The question arose at the Council meeting during a review of APSA investments that include mutual funds whose portfolios may include companies that do business in South Africa. Samuel P. Huntington, Nannerl Keohane and Donna E. Shalala prepared the following resolution,

