

Women in Political Science: Some Preliminary Observations¹

Victoria Schuck
Mount Holyoke College

A systematic study of the role of women academics in political science waits to be done. Evidence compiled from documentary sources, the results of a recent questionnaire sent to political science department chairmen, and statistics provided by biographical information in the 1968 *Directory* of the APSA suggest a certain patterning in the educational and academic life. But the gross statistics also raise questions which deserve further research.

Women have always been a part of the profession of political science. One present member of the APSA reports having received her Ph.D. in 1910, seven years after the Association was founded. Data on dissertations reveal that the first generation of female political scientists constituted a rather exclusive band who sought graduate work and published along with their male fellow scholars. Between 1912 and 1920 women wrote seven of the 125 dissertations in political science which were published. From one or two a year published in that period, the number increased to four or five, or a total of 11.7 percent, in the decade of the '20s and early '30s (1920-1933).²

The first generation of women political scientists came of age with the successful drive for women's suffrage and the flourishing of women's colleges. Having achieved doctoral degrees and gained academic positions, they concluded that a woman henceforth need only qualify herself professionally to win recognition commensurate with her qualifications and abilities. They believed by the end of the '20s that sex discrimination was buried; what counted were the qualifications of the individual.³

Two developments in the '30s and '40s coupled with a changed view of woman's role in the society in the late '40s and throughout the '50s, led to "the great withdrawal" of professional women from

academic pursuits generally and political science specifically. First there was the depression when resources for graduate financing were scarce, and when career expectations for women were often nonexistent because of the one-job-per-family rule and that normally for the male. Secondly there were the distractions of the war, and finally in its aftermath developed the attitude that the role of women should be to return to "real values" and "real femininity" — that women were greater powers for good when exerting their influence on children and the home rather than competing with men.⁴

The proportion of women receiving doctorates in political science from the mid '30s through the '50s would seem to corroborate these conclusions. It is true that in terms of absolute numbers — and they are always small — no diminution has taken place in the total number of women awarded Ph.D.'s in political science in any decade.⁵ Indeed, except for the twenty-year period 1930-1949, when numbers barely increased, the total number of women awarded degrees in political science doubled and redoubled in each ten-year period. At the same time, the ratio of women to men receiving doctorates fell from the peaks of 9.7 percent in the second half of the '20s and 10.0 in the first half of the '30s to 5.8 in the '50s and remained substantially below the proportion of women awarded Ph.D.'s in all fields, political science and other.⁶ (See Table 1.)

The arresting in the '60s of the decline in political science degrees awarded to women is attributable to the number of women receiving doctorates in 1967 and 1968, which is within a percentage point of the total proportion of Ph.D.'s awarded to women in all fields.⁷ The increasing numbers have come at a time of resurgence in radical politics coincidentally supporting a stronger role for women. A result has been greatly increased pressures for women to act as a group. Unlike the women of the '20s, the women of the '60s do not wish to leave the role definition of women in political science solely to individuals.⁸ They wish to define the role collectively.

- 1 The writer is indebted to James M. Bruce and Marjorie S. Childers of the Sociology Department at Mount Holyoke College for their suggestions on the presentation of the data; to Mae C. King, Staff Associate of the APSA for obtaining statistics on women members of the Association from the 1968 *Biographical Directory*; and to Nan W. Bauer, Sandra K. Borys, Susan A. Shapiro, Holly Sidford, and Gill B. Singer, Mount Holyoke undergraduates for assisting in the processing of the questionnaire.
- 2 The total includes theses listed in political science, international law and relations, and public administration. Institutions awarding Ph.D.'s customarily required publication until the early '30s when the practice began to wane. The Library of Congress list of printed doctoral dissertations began in 1912 and is used as a source through 1933.
- 3 The testimony of several faculty women, American and European, who received their Ph.D.'s in the 1920's.

4 See Jessie Bernard, *Academic Women*, Pennsylvania Park, Pennsylvania, The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964.

5 The median number of Ph.D.'s won by women 1940-1949 was 5, minimum 1 and maximum 14. For 1950-1959, median 11.5, maximum 15 and minimum 7. For 1960-1968, median 21, maximum 65, and minimum 12.

6 Figures for Ph.D.'s completed do not always agree. In the '20s, '30s, and '40s, when reports were biennial, the annual figures were arrived at by interpolation. See "Earned Doctorates in the Social

Questionnaire

The APSA Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession, appointed in March 1969, sent a questionnaire to chairmen of political science departments and graduate schools last May. The Committee asked four questions: the number of faculty in political science and the distribution by rank and sex; the number of undergraduate majors by sex; the number of M. A. and Ph.D. candidates by sex; and the number of students applying for admission to graduate school for the fall term 1969-70 and the number accepted, by sex.

Replies to one round of mailing came from 473 chairmen or 51.4 percent of the total mailing list of the Association. In some geographic areas fewer colleges and universities responded than in

others. The greatest proportion of nonreplies came from the South and so called border states (59.1 and 54.7 percent respectively). Next in descending order of response were institutions located in New England (48.7 percent), the Middle Atlantic states (46.3), the Midwest (44.1), Southwest (43.7) and Mountain states (38.0). The Northwest produced the fewest nonreplies (36 percent).

In terms of size and character of departments, 59 percent of the nonreplies are from institutions with no faculty in political science (31.9 percent) or from institutions with faculty in combined departments (history and political science or social sciences, 27.3 percent). Although institutions with no political science or combined departments are statistically overrepresented, the no-department replies do not affect results of the present investigation. Those with combined departments are difficult to separate for analysis and have little effect on results. The only other category which is overrepresented comprises small institutions

Sciences . . . by Subject and Institution," *American Universities and Colleges* 8th-10th ed., 1966-1968, pp. 1692-1693; U. S. Library of Congress, Catalog Division, *A List of Doctoral Dissertations*. . . . Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1921 ff.; *Index to American Doctoral Dissertations, Combined with Dissertation Abstracts*. . . . Compiled for the Association of Research Libraries, University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1958 ff.; U.S. Office of Education, *Earned Degrees Conferred by Higher Educational Institutions, 1955-56*, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957; U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956 ff. If these sources were used, the percent of Ph.D.'s received by females in political science would look like this:
 1912-1920 5.9 (7) 1940-1949 6.4 (52)
 1921-1929 10.1 (19) 1950-1959 5.8 (113)
 1930-1939 8.8 (45) 1960-1968 8.6 (234)
 The percent of females receiving Ph.D.'s in the entire country would look like this:
 1912-1920 12.6 (647) 1940-1949 14.1 (4450)
 1921-1929 14.6 (1607) 1950-1959 9.8 (8239)
 1930-1939 14.7 (4035) 1960-1968 11.3 (15,550)
 For Table 1, the National Academy of Sciences tables were selected as the most consistent through 1961.

- 7 The proportion of women in political science was 9.7 percent in 1967; for the country at large 11.3 in 1967; 11.4 percent for political science in 1968; and 12.5 for the country in 1968.
- 8 The rejection of the "feminine mystique" and the ingesting of the middle aged woman into the labor force, both phenomena being forerunners of the present professional movements, began in the early '60's. Women in professional groups have sought and been sought by the radical left groups. A petition at the fall meeting of the Association in 1968 urged the APSA Council to establish a special commission for the study of the status of women within the profession. The Caucus for a New Political Science elected a woman to its governing offices in 1968. The Caucus submitted a resolution of the status of women for consideration of the APSA Council in the spring of 1969. A representative of the Caucus in consultation with the APSA Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession worked out a modification of the resolution, and this was approved with some additions at the business meeting of the Association in New York in September 1969. See as typical of popular discussion "Woman's Changing Role in America," in U.S. News and World Report, September 8, 1969, pp. 44-46; Sherry Petchul, "Woman's Liberation, the Longest Revolution?" in Christian Science Monitor, October 7, 1969.

Data on Women in the Profession from the National Register Survey*

Total Political Responses	5176
Women Responses	474
Degrees Held	
Ph.D.	207
M.A.	251
B.A.	14
No Report	2
Type of Employer	
Educational Institution	333
Federal Government	25
Other Government	14
Non-Profit	26
Business and Industry	7
Self-Employed	5
Military	1
Other	3
Not employed	51
No Report	9

Years of Employment and Salary

Years	Median Salary
1 or less	\$8200
2-4	8800
5-9	9500
10-14	11900
15-19	27
20-24	22
25-29	12
30-34	16
35-39	6
40+	7
No Report	61
Salary	\$9700
Overall Women	
Ph.D. Median	11000
M.A. Median	8500

*As part of the continuing series of reports of data from the APSA-NSF Register Project, the following information is provided to political scientists. An extensive article on the subject follows.

Women in Political Science: Some Preliminary Observations

with faculty from one to five members, including especially the private women's college and private coeducational institutions. This group, representing 25.4 percent of the nonrespondents, might affect the sample if institutions not replying have no women faculty. But no evidence of this effect has appeared, nor is there reason to believe that the nonrespondents differ substantially from the sample.⁹

Replies have been classified by size of department and type of institution — whether private or public, coeducational, women's or men's, and whether offering undergraduate work only or both undergraduate and graduate degrees. Undergraduate and graduate enrollments for 1968-69 and admission figures for the fall of 1969 are also tabulated. The purpose is to determine whether these variables are related to the presence or absence of women faculty and women students.

The survey covers 473 departments of political science ranging from 0 faculty to 63, with a total of 4,401 members. (See Table 2.) Seven colleges report no faculty in political science. Public coeducational institutions make up 44 percent of the sample; private coeducational, 36; and private women's and men's institutions, about 16 percent. The "other" category includes public institutions for men when these are not specifically noted. If one looks first at the table indicating the number of departments with and without women members, one sees that more than half report none. As Table 3 indicates, women are by no means evenly distributed among institutions which do have female faculty (49.5 percent). The distribution depends on the type and size of college or university. Some 76 percent of the institutions having women are in the "small department" categories (0-15). There appears to be no significant difference between the percentages provided by public and private coeducational colleges in the "small

department" categories. But the larger the department, the more likely it is to have women. The largest public coeducational institutions — state universities and city universities — all report having women on the faculty. The major difference however is not one of size but type of institution; more all-women's colleges have women faculty than do all other kinds of institutions. On faculties of institutions exclusively for men, women are clearly underrepresented.

If one examines the table (see 4a) showing the ratio of women to men faculty members in all kinds of institutions, it is equally clear that the small departments have the highest proportion of women. The 1969 questionnaire shows women's colleges having two women faculty for every one elsewhere. In the same year the private men's college would seem to be almost impossible of access for a woman faculty member. Moreover the larger the department, the smaller the proportion of women in political science would seem to be. Table 4b reveals proportionately more women than men teaching in institutions which offer undergraduate work only. The table implies 44.4 percent of women in strictly undergraduate institutions, and 29.0 men faculty teaching undergraduates only.

What about the rank of women on college faculties? Tables 5 and 6 indicate that if most institutions do not have women to begin with, those that do usually have no more than one or two. The size of the institution makes little difference to the proportion. One might think that the larger the department, the more women in each rank, but with few exceptions this is not so. Most women, in all institutions, are concentrated in the lower ranks. Although the rank of instructor is disappearing, the ratio of women to men on this level is two to one. As numbers of all faculty in all ranks increase, it is still less and less likely that there will be more than one woman in each except in that of assistant professor. A woman who is a full professor is almost an exception; tenured positions at all levels appear to be a masculine preserve. In short, tokenism is the prevailing pattern, other than in the women's colleges, and in few of them do women constitute a majority in a department.¹⁰

9 The writer wishes to express appreciation to the Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession for use of the data which are available with the permission of the Committee.

The nonresponse from institutions in the 6-10 faculty group was 8.3 percent; in the 11-15 group, 2.5 percent; in the 16-25; 3.7 percent; and in the 26+, 92 percent. The faculty members in the nonresponding combined departments total 921 and in other nonresponding departments 1,101, making a grand total of 2,022. Faculty data on nonresponding departments, compiled from *American Universities and Colleges*, 10th edition, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1968. Seventy-five women's colleges, many of which are church related, did not respond. Some 47 of them have no political science faculty or have a combined department. Eighteen in the 1-5 faculty range did not respond.

10 It should be noted that the maximum number of women reported was seven at San Fernando Valley State College in California, which is in the 26+ grouping. Two institutions have six women: San Jose State College and Brooklyn College, each in the 26+ faculty category. Three institutions report five women each: Michigan State University in the 26+ category; California State College at Fullerton and the University of Minnesota School of Public Administration in the 16-25 group. Eleven institutions report 4 faculty women each: Georgetown,

The "differential access" to scholarship and teaching which the above paragraphs and tables bring out might be indicated by another measurement. If one takes the twenty departments described as "distinguished" or the ten producing the greatest number of doctorates, and compares the proportion of women by rank at these institutions with all others in the sample, the smaller proportion of women in the prestigious ten or twenty becomes apparent. (See Table 7.)

But before one labels all of this discrimination by sex, it should be noted that the "withdrawal" of the '40s and '50s meant almost a couple of generations of women lost to research and teaching in political science. Then too the greater proportion of jobs in the small colleges means that women have heavier teaching schedules and less and less time as well as facilities for research.

Several explanations may account for the higher ratio of women in the lower untenured ranks: the recency of their appointments, their possession of fewer advanced degrees, and their youth. About as many have received doctorates in the present decade as in all the years from 1910 to 1959 (246 to 257).¹¹ Information presented in the *Biographical Directory* suggests the youthfulness of the women in the Association holding Ph.D.'s:¹²

Number and Years in Which Women Received Doctorates

Year	Number	%
1967-1960	117	56.0
1959-1950	52	24.9
1949-1940	16	7.7
1939-1930	17	8.1
1929-1920	7	3.3
(1910)	(1)	
	<u>209</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Florida State, American, University of Maryland, Indiana University, UC at Berkeley, and the City University of New York, in the 26+ group; Montana State College of Mineral Science and Technology in the 11-15 group; and Barnard, Trinity College, and Tennessee State University at Nashville in the 6-10 group. Six women's colleges indicate a majority of women in their departments.

- 11 The National Science Foundation, National Register Survey for 1968 gives the number of women holders of Ph.D.'s as 207 and M.A.'s as 251 (474 responses).
- 12 Almost 39 percent of the women listed in the *Directory* gave no information about themselves. The data were compiled by Mae C. King, staff associate, APSA. Also see "Women in the Political Science Profession," Washington, D.C., APSA, October 1968 (mimeograph) and "Women in the Political Science Profession — 1969 Addition to the October 1968 Report," APSA, October 1969 (mimeograph).

The total number of women in teaching, according to the 1968 *Directory*, is 404, or five percent of the entire professional membership — men and women. There is no knowing at this time how the Committee's sample, the membership data from the *Directory*, and the totals of women receiving graduate degrees as given in the Statistical Abstracts can be reconciled.

The pattern of appointments to academic positions may also be a reflection of the problem of meeting the requirements of a particular field. According to the *Directory*, the first fields of women in 1967 were:¹³

	Number	%
Public Administration	20	2.4
Political Theory — normative and historical	95	11.4
International Politics, Organization, Administration and Foreign Policy	113	13.6
American Government, Voting Behavior, Legislatures, Metropolitan Government, State and Local, Administration, Constitutional Law, etc.	113	13.6
Comparative Government and Political Development	<u>490</u>	<u>59.0</u>
	831	100.0

Whatever the reason — for example, the availability of foundation support and scholarships — which may have lured them into comparative governments and development, it has not always been easy to find the right women for teaching positions.

It is likely that the absolute numbers of professional women in political science, if not the proportion, will grow. The questionnaire produced the following totals of undergraduate majors which are indicative:¹⁴

Undergraduate Political Science Majors — Spring 1969

Number Females	Number Males	% Females	No Break-down	Total Given	Total Enrollment
11,670	38,661	23.2	8,051	58,381	

The number of women in graduate school is considerably less — 17.5 percent of the over-all

- 13 *Ibid.* The category "American Government . . ." is an ad hoc catch-all one, because the members in specific fields are too small to be meaningful otherwise. For comparisons with holders of doctorates in all fields see P.S. Winter 1969, vol. 2, pp. 12-13 and Summer 1969, vol. 2, p. 54. In 1963 Somit and Tanenhaus listed the proportion of political scientists in each field: American Government, 48 percent; International Relations, 20 percent; Comparative Government and Political Theory, each 12 percent. See Albert Somit and Joseph Tanenhaus, *American Political Science*, New York, New York, The Atherton Press, 1967, p. 54.
- 14 Eleven percent (53) of the institutions in the sample either listed "no major" (35) or omitted the number (18).

Women in Political Science: Some Preliminary Observations

graduate enrollment. (See Tables 8, 9.) Not all institutions gave a breakdown of their figures, but it is clear that there are more candidates for the M.A. (20.6 percent) than for the doctorate (14.7 percent).

The proportion of women admitted to graduate work for the fall of 1969 seems to have increased, for returns to the questionnaire indicate that they were 22.9 percent of the acceptances (they were 20.8 percent of the applicants). Put another way, 43.2 percent of the male applicants were accepted and 48.9 percent of the female. The most likely explanation for this ratio of women to men is that it represents a hedge against the draft — an assurance that graduate departments will maintain full programs throughout the year. (See Table 10.)

Increasingly the question is being asked, why the great disparity in the proportion of men and women in graduate work? A recent HEW study points to marriage, work begun immediately after graduation, and competing fields such as law and urban studies as partial answers.¹⁵ It may well be inferred that many large graduate departments in political science have found women poor risks for limited fellowship money, because of the high drop-out rate for marriage. The very best women receive awards. But in the middle ranks, most departments place their bets on men.

There is the further question as to how much the socialization of the eventual graduate student in political science is dependent upon his having models among his undergraduate and graduate instructors in the field. Typically 50 percent of the graduate students in any field are drawn from undergraduate non-majors, and there is no information to indicate that graduate students in political science are any different.¹⁶ And yet it is often argued that a woman needs role models to cite women as a reference group. Young women, it is contended, find incentives to study and scholarship in joining faculty women as well as men at the undergraduate and graduate level. The evidence provided by the questionnaire suggests that in small departments more women on the faculty will lead to more undergraduate majors, but as departments become larger, this pattern does not hold. Data on graduate enrollment show certain inconsistencies, although it may be possible to say that there are slightly more women candidates in

departments where women are faculty members. (See Table 9.)

If the distribution suggests discrimination, this inference cannot be proved until more is learned from individual faculty members at every kind of institution about their experience in undergraduate and graduate school, and in teaching and research. More information is also necessary from graduate students about their backgrounds, characteristics, and education generally. Meanwhile, it may be remarked that the almost instinctive movement of women to form a Women's Caucus in the Association in the past year is a reaction to a minority position in the Association and also in the teaching ranks. But this minority status has a history and can be related to the age of women political scientists, their traditional minority status, and the kinds of institutions that appoint them. Over the years, the proportionate numbers of women in political science have dipped and then risen, so that they are now more in line with the proportion of doctorates granted over-all in the United States. The appointment of more than one or two women by some state colleges (albeit often converted teachers colleges) and by large state and city universities and the increased numbers admitted to candidacy for advanced degrees may well be more than straws in the wind. They may definitely presage alteration of the minority status for women. Only after further accumulation and study of all evidence and factors can the complexities of the whole question of women's role and prospects in political science be defined and met.

15 U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, *Special Report on Women and Graduate Study, Resources for Medical Research*, Report No. 13, June 1968, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office.

16 *Ibid.*

Table 1. Number of Women Receiving Ph.D.'s — 1912-1968

Ph.D.'s in Political Science				Total Ph.D.'s in U.S.		
Years	Female	Male and Female	% of Female	Female	Male and Female	% of Female
1912-19	7	118	5.9	4,525	554	12.2
1920-29	25	299	8.4	1,816	11,889	15.3
1930-39	53	568	9.3	3,763	25,586	14.7
1940-49	59	687	8.6	4,092	30,555	13.4
1950-59	113	1,953	5.8	8,208	82,814	9.9
1960-68	246	2,821	8.7	15,680	138,153	11.4

Source: National Academy of Science — National Research Council, *Doctorate Production in the United States Universities 1920-1962 . . . compiled by Lindsey R. Harmon and Herbert Soldz*, Washington, D.C., Publication No. 1142, National Academy of Sciences; U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964 ff.

Source: Office of Scientific Personnel, *Summary Report 1968 Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities*, prepared in the Education Employment Section, Manpower Studies Branch, OSP-MS-Z, Ap. 1969, Washington, D.C.

Table 2. Number and Percent of Departments of Political Science by Size Responding to Questionnaire

Number of Faculty Members	Number of Departments	% of Sample	Number of Faculty Members	% of Faculty Members	Faculty Average Size
0 - 5	230	48.6	685	15.6	3.0
6 - 10	102	21.6	749	17.0	7.3
11 - 15	65	13.7	827	18.8	12.7
16 - 25	39	8.3	786	17.8	20.2
26+	37	7.8	1,354	30.8	36.6
Total	473	100.0	4,401	100.0	9.3

Number of Institutions by Size of Department and Type of Institution

Size of Department	Public Coeducational		Private Coeducational		Private Women's College		Private Men's College		Other		Total
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	
0 - 5	63	27.4	108	47.0	31	13.5	16	6.9	12	5.2	230
6 - 10	46	45.1	30	29.4	8	7.8	14	13.7	4	3.9	102
11 - 15	43	66.2	16	24.6	1	1.5	5	7.7	0	—	65
16 - 25	29	74.4	10	25.6	0	—	0	—	0	—	39
26+	27	73.0	6	16.2	0	—	3	8.1	1	2.7	37
Total	208	44.0	170	35.9	40	8.5	38	8.0	17	3.6	473

Table 3. Number and Percentage of Departments With Women on the Faculty

Size of Department	Public Coeducational		Private Coeducational		Private Women's College		Private Men's College		Other		Total	
	With Females	%	With Females	%	With Females	%	With Females	%	With Females	%	With Females	%
0 - 5	22	34.9	35	32.4	18	58.1	4	25.0	2	16.7	81	35.2
6 - 10	24	52.2	17	56.7	6	75.0	2	14.3	1	25.0	50	49.0
11 - 15	34	79.1	11	68.8	1	100.0	1	20.0	0	—	47	72.3
16 - 25	19	65.5	5	50.0	0	—	0	—	0	—	24	61.5
26+	27	100.0	4	66.7	0	—	1	33.3	0	—	32	86.5
Total	126	60.6	72	42.4	25	62.5	8	21.1	3	17.6	234	49.5

Women in Political Science: Some Preliminary Observations

Table 4a. Number of Faculty Members by Size of Department and by Type of Institution

Size of Department	Public Coeducational		Private Coeducational		Private Women's College		Private Men's College		Public Men's College		Other		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
0 - 5	183 86.3	29 13.7	267 87.5	38 12.5	51 70.8	21 29.2	47 90.4	5 9.6	13 100.0	0 —	29 93.5	2 6.5	590 86.1	95 13.9
6 - 10	315 89.5	37 10.5	193 91.0	19 9.0	49 74.2	17 25.8	93 97.9	2 2.1	6 100.0	0 —	17 94.4	1 5.6	673 89.9	76 10.1
11 - 15	494 90.0	55 10.0	183 92.0	16 8.0	12 85.7	2 14.3	65 100.0	0 —	0 —	0 —	0 —	0 —	754 91.2	73 8.8
16 - 25	570 94.4	34 5.6	175 96.1	7 3.9	0 —	0 —	0 —	0 —	0 —	0 —	0 —	0 —	745 94.8	41 5.2
26+	909 92.7	72 7.3	191 94.6	11 5.4	0 —	0 —	114 97.4	3 2.6	54 100.0	0 —	0 —	0 —	1,268 93.6	86 6.4
Total	2,471 91.6	227 8.4	1,009 91.7	91 8.3	112 73.7	40 26.3	319 97.0	10 3.0	73 100.0	0 —	46 93.9	3 6.1	4,040 91.6	371 8.4

Table 4b. Distribution of Faculty by Department Size, Type of Institutions, and Undergraduate and Graduate Offerings

Size of Department	Public Coeducational		Private Coeducational		Private Women		Private Men		Public Men		Other		Total Faculty				
	Undergraduate	Undergraduate and Graduate Total	Undergraduate	Undergraduate and Graduate Total	Undergraduate	Undergraduate and Graduate Total	Undergraduate	Undergraduate and Graduate Total	Undergraduate	Undergraduate and Graduate Total	Undergraduate	Undergraduate and Graduate Total					
0-5	Male Number	155	28	183	243	24	267	47	4	51	47	13	0	29	590		
	Male Percent	84.7	15.3	100.0	91.9	8.9	100.0	92.2	7.8	100.0	91.5	8.5	100.0	100.0	100.0		
	Female Number	26	3	29	36	2	38	20	1	21	4	1	5	0	2	95	
Female Percent	89.7	10.3	100.0	94.7	5.3	100.0	95.2	4.8	100.0	80.0	20.0	100.0	—	100.0	100.0		
6-10	Male Number	164	151	315	134	59	193	44	5	49	74	19	93	6	17	673	
	Male Percent	52.1	47.9	100.0	69.4	30.6	100.0	89.8	10.2	100.0	79.6	20.4	100.0	100.0	64.7	35.3	100.0
	Female Number	25	12	37	14	5	19	14	3	17	1	1	2	0	1	0	76
Female Percent	67.6	32.4	100.0	73.7	26.3	100.0	82.4	17.6	100.0	50.0	50.0	100.0	—	100.0	—	100.0	
11-15	Male Number	93	401	494	23	160	183	12	0	12	22	43	65	0	0	0	754
	Male Percent	18.8	81.2	100.0	12.6	87.4	100.0	100.0	—	100.0	33.8	66.2	100.0	—	—	—	—
	Female Number	17	38	55	3	13	16	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Female Percent	30.9	69.1	100.0	18.8	81.2	100.0	100.0	—	100.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
16-25	Male Number	0	570	570	0	175	175	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	745
	Male Percent	—	100.0	100.0	—	100.0	100.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Female Number	0	34	34	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Female Percent	—	100.0	100.0	—	100.0	100.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
26+	Male Number	0	909	909	0	191	191	0	0	0	114	114	54	0	54*	0	1,268
	Male Percent	—	100.0	100.0	—	100.0	100.0	—	—	—	100.0	100.0	100.0	—	100.0	—	—
	Female Number	0	72	72	0	11	11	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	86
Female Percent	—	100.0	100.0	—	100.0	100.0	—	—	—	100.0	100.0	—	—	—	—	—	
Total	Male Number	412	2,059	2,471	400	609	1,009	103	9	112	139	180	319	73	0	73	4,030
	Male Percent	16.7	83.3	100.0	39.6	60.4	100.0	92.0	8.0	100.0	43.6	56.4	100.0	100.0	—	100.0	100.0
	Female Number	68	159	227	53	38	91	36	4	40	5	5	10	0	3	0	371
Female Percent	30.0	70.0	100.0	58.2	41.8	100.0	90.0	10.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	100.0	—	—	—	100.0	

*U.S. Military Academy

Women in Political Science: Some Preliminary Observations

Table 5. Number of Departments and Number of Faculty Women by Rank

Number of Females on Faculty	Instructor Number of Departments	% of Total	Assistant Professor Number of Departments	% of Total	Associate Professor Number of Departments	% of Total	Full Professor Number of Departments	% of Total	Other Number of Departments	% of Total
0	393	83.1	373	78.9	417	88.2	426	90.1	445	94.1
1	69	14.6	83	17.5	54	11.4	43	9.1	19	4.0
2	9	1.9	15	3.2	2	.4	3	.6	3	.6
3+	2	.4	2	.4	0	0.0	1	.2	6	1.3
Total	473	100.0	473	100.0	473	100.0	473	100.0	473	100.0

Table 6. Distribution of Male and Female Faculty by Rank and Size of Department

Size of Department	Male			Female			Total
	Instructor Number	%	Total	Instructor Number	%	Total	
0-5	91	15.4	590	25	26.3	95	2.2
6-10	105	15.6	673	23	30.3	76	7.9
11-15	105	13.9	754	20	26.3	73	—
16-25	55	7.4	745	24	32.9	41	—
26+	101	8.0	1268	19	19.5	86	—
Total	457	11.3	4030	93	25.1	371	2.2

Table 7a. Male and Female Faculty by Rank in "Distinguished" Departments Compared With all Other Departments in the Sample

Rank	Instructor		Assistant Professor		Associate Professor		Full Professor		Other		Total	
	M	F % Females	M	F % Females	M	F % Females	M	F % Females	M	F % Females	M	F % Females
Departments	19	1 5.0	156	11 6.6	107	5 4.5	255	3 1.2	80	7 8.0	606	27 4.3
Distinguished*	438	92 17.4	1131	110 8.9	707	53 7.0	973	50 4.9	156	31 16.6	3424	344 9.1
Other**	*18 institutions: Yale, Harvard, California (Berkeley), Chicago, Columbia, Princeton, Wisconsin, Stanford, Michigan, Cornell, Northwestern, California (UCLA), Indiana, North Carolina, Minnesota, Illinois, Johns Hopkins, Duke. (Syracuse and MIT omitted — did not respond to questionnaire.) For classifications see Albert Somit and Joseph Tanenhaus, <i>The Development of Political Science from Burgess to Behaviorism</i> , Boston, Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1967, p. 164.											
	**455 institutions.											

Table 7b. Male and Female Faculty by Rank in "Largest Producers of Doctorates" Compared With all Other Departments in the Sample

Rank	Instructor		Assistant Professor		Associate Professor		Full Professor		Other		Total	
	M	F % Females	M	F % Females	M	F % Females	M	F % Females	M	F % Females	M	F % Females
Departments	21	1 4.5	86	5 5.5	60	4 6.3	160	3 1.8	31	4 11.4	358	17 4.5
Largest Producers*	436	92 17.4	1201	116 8.8	754	54 6.7	1068	50 4.5	205	34 14.2	3672	354 8.8
Other**	*Institutions: Columbia, Chicago, Harvard, NYU, American, Yale, California (Berkeley), Princeton, Michigan. (Syracuse omitted — did not respond to questionnaire.) For classifications see Somit and Tanenhaus, <i>op. cit.</i> , p. 159.											
	**464 institutions.											

Women in Political Science: Some Preliminary Observations

Table 8. Graduate Enrollment in Political Science Classified by Size of Departments — Spring 1969

Total Graduate Enrollment*		M. A. Candidates		PH. D. Candidates	
Size of Department	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total
0 - 5	17	23.0	57	77.0	74
6 - 10	110	19.4	456	80.6	566
11 - 15	278	20.3	1,093	79.7	1,371
16 - 25	340	13.4	2,197	86.6	2,537
26+	879	18.6	3,851	81.4	4,730
Totals	1,624	17.5	7,654	82.5	9,278
No Breakdown			(11 institutions)		1,016 (9.9%)
Grand Total					10,294
Size of Department	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total
0 - 5	11	19.3	46	80.7	57
6 - 10	105	22.1	370	77.9	475
11 - 15	235	23.5	766	76.5	1,001
16 - 25	248	17.2	1,191	82.8	1,439
26+	532	21.2	1,982	78.8	2,514
Totals	1,131	20.6	4,355	79.4	5,486
No Breakdown			(13 institutions)		556 (9.2%)
Grand Total					6,042
Size of Department	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total
0 - 5	1	25.0	3	75.0	4
6 - 10	3	7.5	37	92.5	40
11 - 15	43	12.3	307	87.7	350
16 - 25	140	13.7	882	86.3	1,022
26+	352	15.7	1,887	84.3	2,239
Totals	539	14.7	3,116	85.3	3,655
No Breakdown			(13 institutions)		579 (13.7%)
Grand Total					4,234

*Total Graduate Enrollment includes persons not in a degree program.

Table 9. Graduate Enrollment in Political Science and Departments by Number of Females on The Faculty — Spring 1969

Number of Female Faculty	Graduates 462 Institutions			M. A. 460 Institutions			Ph. D. 460 Institutions		
	Male	Female	% Female	Male	Female	% Female	Male	Female	% Female
0	2,301	383	14.3	1,218	296	19.6	984	149	13.2
1	2,029	468	18.7	1,173	338	22.4	750	109	12.7
2	897	150	14.3	623	94	13.1	268	55	17.0
3+	2,427	623	20.4	1,341	403	23.1	1,114	226	16.9
Total	7,654	1,624	17.5	4,355	1,131	20.6	3,116	539	14.7

Table 10. Number of Male and Female Applicants Admitted to Graduate Study — Fall 1969

Size of Department	Number Male Applicants		% Male	Number Female Applicants		% Female	Total Applicants	Total Accepted	Total
	Male	Female		Male	Female				
0 - 5	238	45	18.9	21	8	38.1	259	53	20.5
6 - 10	423	323	76.4	184	143	77.7	607	507	76.8
11 - 15	738	393	53.3	228	114	50.0	966	466	52.5
16 - 25	1,875	905	48.3	387	187	48.3	2,262	1,092	48.3
26+	4,728	1,787	37.8	1,280	575	44.9	6,008	2,362	39.3
Total	8,002	3,453	43.2	2,100	1,027	48.9	10,102	4,480	44.3