

## Participation by Women in the 1987 Meetings

**Martin Gruberg**

University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

In a year that witnessed an explosion in the number of panels in both Program Committee sections and Organized Group sections, with attendant swelling of the ranks of papergivers and discussants, optimists can take relief that women have at least held their own. (Those less sanguine, however, may be dismayed that there was no advance.)

	Section Heads			Chairpersons		
	Total	Women	%	Total	Women	%
1987	27	7	25.9	309	50	16.2
1986	24	7	29.2	237	38	16.0
1984	20	6	30.0	215	44	20.5
1982	19	5	26.3	163	22	13.5
1980	18	3	16.7	139	29	20.9
1978	16	2	12.5	131	20	15.3
1976	18	4	22.2	126	24	19.0

  

	Paper Givers			Discussants		
	Total	Women	%	Total	Women	%
1987	1141	220	19.3	410	71	17.3
1986	904	175	19.4	314	61	19.4
1984	804	142	17.7	294	58	19.7
1982	557	109	19.6	184	28	15.2
1980	453	99	21.9	160	19	11.9
1978	500	99	19.8	210	35	16.7
1976	577	65	13.6	170	31	18.2

The author has monitored participation by women at our annual meetings since 1972. He has noted over and over that the chances for women being selected as program participants tend to be enhanced when other women serve as section heads or chairpersons. (This isn't always true. For example, the sections in 1987 on Great Issues in Politics and International Conflicts, though headed by women, did not disproportionately have women as paper givers or discussants.)

Women are also more likely to be found on panels where the subject matter deals with women or minorities (e.g., the section on Women and Politics Research had women as both program chairs, 8 of the 9 panel chairs, 24 of the 26 papergivers, and 13 of the 14 discussants).

Since 1984 my annual assessments have included not only the sections organized by the Program Committee but also the panels sponsored by the APSA Organized Sections and committees. As usual, those sets of panels organized by males were less likely to have female participants; however, the proportion of women participating in these adjunct meetings slightly exceeded their proportion on Program Committee's panels.

**Chairpersons**

		<b>Total</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>%</b>
Organized Sections and Committees	1984	47	10	21.3
	1985	73	15	20.5
	1986	101	15	14.9
	1987	176	29	16.5
Grand Total	1984	262	54	20.6
	1985	333	66	19.8
	1986	338	53	15.7
	1987	485	79	16.3

**Paper Givers**

Organized Sections	1984	158	24	15.2
	1985	255	37	14.5
	1986	292	52	17.8
	1987	576	115	20.0
Committees	1984	21	8	39.0
	1985	45	11	24.4
	1986	38	12	31.6
	1987	33	8	24.2
Grand Total	1984	983	174	17.7
	1985	1266	197	15.6
	1986	1234	239	19.4
	1987	1750	343	19.6

**Discussants**

Organized Sections	1984	46	6	13.0
	1985	56	12	21.4
	1986	95	15	15.8
	1987	140	30	21.4
Committees	1984	7	0	0
	1985	7	1	14.3
	1986	4	1	25.0
	1987	0	0	0
Grand Total	1984	347	64	18.4
	1985	383	65	17.0
	1986	413	77	18.6
	1987	550	101	18.4

In case of co-sponsored sections, to avoid doublecounting, I credited the panels to the section given principal mention in the program (e.g., all of the Political Methodology and Presidency Research sections were on a co-sponsored basis as well as almost all of the Political Organization and Parties section panels).

The seven official sections organized by women on the Program Committee had women as 23.3% (17 of 73) of the chairpersons, 26.4% (70 of 265) of the paper givers, and 26.7% (28 of 105) of the discussants. In other words, 34% of the chairs in the Convention's Program Committee-organized panels were found in the sections organized by women as were 31.8% of the female papergivers and 39.4% of the female discussants. Women-chaired panels had 30.9% female paper givers and 37.2% female discussants. In the Organized Sections where 16.7% of the panels were chaired by women, women constituted 39.1% of the paper givers and 65.2% of the discussants where women headed the panels. Once more women were ignored in selecting the evening plenary session and special lecture speakers (0 out of 9 slots).

The sections with the strongest female representation were those on Political Thought and Philosophy: Historical Approaches; Public Opinion and Political Psy-

## Association News

chology; Interests, Groups and Social Movements; Law, Courts and Judicial Process; Public Administration; Urban Politics; and Women and Politics Research.

The sections with the weakest female representation were those on Positive Political Theory; Methodology and Epistemology; Legislative Process and Politics; Political Executives; International Organization and Order; National Security Policy; and most organized section groups and APSA Committee sponsored panels.

Lopsidedly male panels in 1987 included those on Network Analysis: An Emerging Methodology; Regulation, Deregulation and Privatization: European Perspectives; Regime Types and Performance; Political Tolerance in Comparative Perspective; Puzzles in Partisanship: The Role of Ideology, Identification and Interests; Legislatures and Trade Policy; Balance of Power: Theoretical and Empirical Analysis; International Conflict; Power in the International System; Current Research in Artificial Intelligence; Political Conflict in Africa; Congressional Elections; and Policy Issues Confronting Outdoor Recreation.

Panels overwhelmingly female included The Structure of the Welfare States; Gender and Public Office (which made the Political Parties and Elections section not look as bad as it would otherwise); Equality Under the Constitution: Interest Groups Perspectives; and The New Federal Politics of Welfare. □

## Rawls, Kampelman and Nathan Receive APSA Awards

John Rawls of Harvard University, Max M. Kampelman of the U.S. Delegation negotiating on nuclear and space arms, and Richard Nathan of Princeton University were among those honored at APSA's 83rd annual meeting.

Rawls received the Benjamin E. Lippincott Award for his *A Theory of Justice*. The Lippincott Award recognizes a work of exceptional quality by a living political theorist that is "still considered significant after a time span of at least 15 years

since the original publication." Reading the selection committee's citation, David Rapoport of the University of California, Los Angeles, said *A Theory of Justice* was "the most important statement of liberal theory since John Stuart Mill."

Robert Betts of the Brookings Institution presented the Hubert H. Humphrey Award to Max M. Kampelman, Head, U.S. Delegation, Negotiations on Nuclear and Space Arms. On behalf of the selection committee Betts said that Kampelman was a worthy recipient of the Humphrey award for two reasons. Kampelman "amply fulfills the award's established criteria of notable public service by a political scientist." Also, Kampelman's "long-standing professional and personal relationship with Hubert Humphrey particularly distinguishes him as a candidate for the honor."

The last Charles E. Merriam Award was presented at the 1987 annual meeting to Richard Nathan of Princeton University. The award was established by the APSA Council in 1974 to be given annually to the person whose published work and career represents a significant contribution to the art of government through the application of social science research. The University of Chicago, the benefactor of the Merriam award, informed the



Richard Nathan (right) of Princeton University receives the Charles E. Merriam Award from Graham Allison of Harvard University.