

**From:**

**American Economic Association**

**Committee on Equity, Diversity and Professional Conduct (Sam Allgood, Lee Badgett, Amanda Bayer, Marianne Bertrand, Sandra E. Black, Nick Bloom and Lisa D. Cook)**

## **AEA Professional Climate Survey: Final Report**

**September 15, 2019**

### **Introduction**

In April 2018, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Professional Climate in Economics recommended that the AEA conduct a professional climate survey to assess the status quo in the profession, and repeat this survey at regular intervals to monitor changes over time. The AEA charged a new standing committee, the Committee on Equity, Diversity and Professional Conduct, to carry out this work.

A survey was designed to gather critical information about the professional climate in economics, with particular focus on aspects that limit inclusiveness, demean and/or harass individuals, or otherwise engender incivility in work environments. The survey was sent to all current members of the AEA (as of December 2018) as well as all individuals who had been AEA members at any point in the prior 9 years.

This report summarizes the Committee's work. The report is organized as follows. In Section 1, we describe the survey methodology, survey population and response rate, and data collection procedures; we also include a discussion of possible survey response bias. Section 2 summarizes the main findings of the survey in a set of tables. Among other things, we report on the perception of the overall climate in economics, experiences of discrimination in and outside of academia, behavioral changes to avoid discrimination and unfair treatment, and experiences of exclusion and harassment. Section 3 provides brief descriptions of the key findings along the following dimensions: gender, race and ethnicity, LGBT status, disability, ideology and religion; whenever possible, we use comments provided by survey respondents to provide concrete examples of the experiences of, and concerns raised by, members of the Association. Section 4 highlights some of the patterns of responses to an open-ended question on the climate within the profession and attempts to summarize some of the most commonly expressed views. These views include frequent references to the elitism of the field of economics, a dimension of the climate the survey instrument did not otherwise cover. Finally, Section 5 offers comparisons of some of the survey results to those obtained in similar climate surveys carried out by other professional associations.

## 1. Survey Methodology

NORC at the University of Chicago conducted the survey on behalf of the American Economic Association in the winter of 2018-19, in collaboration with the AEA.

NORC developed the survey in close consultation with the AEA, adapting questions from existing surveys where possible, including the following sources: University of Chicago Spring 2016 Diversity Survey<sup>1</sup>, University of California System 2013 Campus Climate Survey<sup>2</sup>, and San Diego Community College District 2011/2014 Cultural Climate Surveys.<sup>3</sup> In addition to adapting questions from these sources, NORC worked in consultation with the AEA to create new survey items to cover the desired topics. The final survey instrument is included in Appendix A.

### Survey Population and Response Rate

The survey population included any individual who was a current member of the AEA (as of December 1, 2018) or had been a member in the last nine years, including students, faculty, and those working outside of academia. In total, 45,435 invitations to complete the survey were sent.

There was an overall response rate of 22.9% (using a threshold of roughly 10% or more of the survey completed).<sup>4</sup>

The response rate was much higher among current AEA members: 32.8% of those with an AEA membership expiration date in 2019 or later participated in the survey.

The table below provides additional information:

<b>Membership Expiration</b>	<b>Total Invited to Participate</b>	<b>Responded to Survey</b>	<b>Response Rate</b>
2009-2011	3,600	431	12.0%
2012-2014	6,049	743	12.3%
2015-2017	10,095	1,581	15.7%
2018	5,660	1,085	19.2%
2019	13,894	4,286	30.8%
2020	3,112	1,123	36.1%
2021 and later	3,025	1,157	38.2%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>45,435</b>	<b>10,406</b>	<b>22.9%</b>

<sup>1</sup> <https://climatesurvey.uchicago.edu/spring-2016-survey-materials/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://diversity.berkeley.edu/initiatives/survey-results>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.sdccd.edu/about/departments-and-offices/student-services-department/institutional-research-andplanning/research-reports/surveys.aspx>

<sup>4</sup>The dataset used for this final report differs from the dataset used to produce the March 2019 preliminary report in two important ways. First, NORC had subjected the interim data it released to the AEA for the preliminary report to a suppression review and had removed all cases with small demographic counts. Second, the March data only contained information from fully complete surveys; in contrast, the final dataset also contains information from incomplete surveys if these surveys had approximately 10% or more of the items answered.

## **Data Collection Procedures**

The survey used a self-administered web survey tool for data collection efforts that occurred in two phases: (1) current and past (dating back nine years) AEA members and (2) recently registered members. Because the survey was made available only to AEA members, the AEA provided interested individuals an opportunity to become a new member and access the survey. The data collection period began on November 14, 2018 for all existing and former members with a soft launch to approximately 1% of the sample. Data collection for the 271 new members began on December 13, 2018. The survey was closed on January 31, 2019 for the existing and former members and February 28, 2019 for all new members.

NORC sent all survey invitations and follow-up emails to potential participants to protect participant confidentiality. The invitation and follow-ups contained a unique survey URL that identified each participant, enabling NORC to track who had completed the survey and target follow-ups accordingly. The link between survey URL and identifying information was maintained on NORC's secure servers and was never shared with the AEA. No incentives to participate were offered.

Table 1 summarizes respondents' characteristics. Women represent 30% of the sample. The share of respondents that are White is 79%; Asians account for the majority of the non-White share (15% of the overall sample). The mean respondent is 47 years old. About 6% of respondents are classified as LGBT; 10% report some disability. A little less than 2/3 of survey respondents reside in the United States and 6% of survey respondents were students at the time of the survey completion. Four-fifth of survey respondents are married. Among those employed, three-quarters are employed by a college or university; the main employer types outside of academia are for-profit organizations (7% of those employed), not-for-profit organizations (5%) and the U.S. federal government (5%).

## **Data Delivery**

Throughout the data collection period, NORC provided three interim data deliveries that included all fully completed surveys to-date. This allowed the AEA to monitor progress, as well as begin a review for preliminary findings.

Upon completion of data collection, NORC conducted a thorough disclosure review of respondent-provided open-response values. This review sought any information that may disclose the identity of the respondent and replaced it with the substring "<redacted>."

For the final delivery, NORC provided the AEA with a de-identified data file for analysis. While the prior interim delivery files only contained fully complete survey data, this file also contained data from incomplete surveys for those surveys that had approximately 10% or more of the items answered.

## **Potential Issues of Sample Response Bias**

One obvious concern with analyzing the survey results is potential sample response bias. In particular, participants that responded to the survey may have had different experiences or may

hold different views than non-respondents. Because the AEA does not maintain systematic demographic information about its current and past members, we unfortunately cannot directly compare respondents to non-respondents based on such demographics.

We can however get some insight into potential response bias by looking at the results by response date. The survey was open for about 2.5 months after it was launched. As Figure 1 shows, responses were bunched over the beginning two days, and in the couple of days after each of the 5 reminders NORC sent out.

Evaluating responses over these periods provides one way to evaluate potential response bias. In particular, do survey responses received in the first two days look different from those that were elicited after two months following multiple reminders? It seems plausible that the latter group would represent more “marginal” respondents, so a gradient of response outcomes over time would be indicative of a potential response bias issue.

To evaluate this, we first generate an overall climate score. In particular, for each respondent, we average responses to the first 16 questions on the climate in the economics profession used in Table 2 below. These questions range from “*I am satisfied with the overall climate within the field of economics*” to “*My ideas and opinions are often ignored at my institution/place of employment*”. Each of these 16 question scores was ordered from 1 (most positive) to 6 (most negative) and averaged, to generate an overall index which ranged from 1 to 6 across individuals. Figure 2 plots this average across the 9670 survey respondents who provided responses to all 16 questions. Not surprisingly, this shows a spread of opinions.

Figure 3 plots this climate score over time for days with 50+ responses, which covers 92% of responses. Days with fewer than 50 responses have a substantially higher variance, so excluding these makes it easier to evaluate potential trends. Figure 3 shows no obvious trend in the reported climate opinion over time. For example, responses received in the first day the survey opened are very similar (mean of 2.93) to those received on day 64 (2.92) after the fifth and final reminder. We also tested this formally, regressing the mean score on the days since the start of the survey, which was insignificant (0.0007 coefficient and 0.0005 standard-error), and separately on a full set of day dummies which were also insignificant (F-stat p-value of 0.094).

We also tested each of the 16 individual questions on a time trend and saw no material trends in response values over time. For example, Figure 4 shows the individual question with the highest t-statistic, “*I am satisfied with the overall climate at my institution/place of employment,*” and there is no visible material trend.

We also looked at the questions about 11 possible experiences of exclusion and harassment reported in Table 8 below. These possible experiences range from feelings of social exclusion and disrespect to experiences of attempted and completed sexual assaults. Again, we created an unweighted mean overall score and studied trends over time in this overall score. Again, we saw no obvious (or statistically significant) trend over the reporting window. For example, Panels A and B of Figure 5 show the response frequency of reporting an attempted assault or assault – the two most extreme experiences in Table 8 – over the period of the survey; no trends can be detected.

Overall, we conclude that within the 2.5-month period the survey was open, there is no evidence for any trend in the average climate reports or frequency of events reported. This of course does not rule out response bias, but it does suggest that at least those who responded immediately versus those who took 5 reminders to respond look similar. In other words, the evidence we have been able to glean given the data constraints does not raise a significant red flag with regard to overall response bias.

## **2. Tabulation of Main Findings**

The main findings of the survey are reported in Tables 2 to 12. The layout of these tables is as follows:

### **General climate**

Table 2 summarizes answers to the general climate questions (Section 1 of the Survey). We report overall results as well as results by: gender, race, LGBT status<sup>5</sup> and disability. Reported in each cell is the *share of respondents that agree or strongly agree with each statement*. Other possible answers were: strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree.

Table 2A contrasts results across different groups of women broken down by: marital status, presence of dependents, and employer type (college or university vs. other).

Table 2B further breaks down race/ethnicity into: Black/non-Black, Asian/non-Asian, Latino/non-Latino.

Table 2C reports statistics by: employer type (college or university vs. other), age (less or more than 44 years old, 44 being the median age among respondents), position on economic issues (conservative vs. liberal), and position on social issues (conservative vs. liberal).

Table 2D reports statistics by religion.

### **Experiences of discrimination**

Table 3 reports on experiences of discrimination or unfair treatment based on various personal attributes. Each cell reports the share of respondents that report having *personally experienced* such discrimination or unfair treatment over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 3A reports on the share of respondents who have *witnessed* discrimination or unfair treatment based on various personal attributes (similar time frame as above).

### **Experiences as a student**

---

<sup>5</sup> Note that the results in the preliminary report issued in March 2019 instead tabulated answers by sexual orientation. The construction of the LGBT status variable is described in Section 3.

Table 4 reports on experiences of discrimination or unfair treatment while a student. Reported in each cell is the share of respondents who answered “yes” to the question. Overall results are reported, as well as results by: gender, race, LGBT status and disability.

### **Experiences in academia**

Table 5 reports on experiences of discrimination or unfair treatment in various aspects of work. The sample is restricted to individuals that report being employed as a faculty member.

We report overall results as well as results by: gender, race, LGBT status and disability.

Table 5A contrasts results across different groups of women broken down by marital status and presence of dependents.

Table 5B further breaks down race/ethnicity into: Black/non-Black, Asian/non-Asian, Latino/non-Latino.

Table 5C reports statistics by: age (less or more than 44 years old), position on economic issues (conservative vs. liberal), and position on social issues (conservative vs. liberal).

Table 5D reports statistics by religion.

### **Experiences outside of academia**

Table 6 reports on experiences of discrimination or unfair treatment in various aspects of work. The sample is restricted to individuals who report *not* being employed as a faculty member.

Each cell reports the share of respondents who report having *personally experienced* discrimination or unfair treatment in the listed aspect of work over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years). We report overall results as well as results by: gender, race, LGBT status and disability.

Table 6A contrasts results across different groups of women broken down by marital status and presence of dependents.

Table 6B further breaks down race/ethnicity into: Black/non-Black, Asian/non-Asian, Latino/non-Latino.

Table 6C reports statistics by: age (less or more than 44 years old), position on economic issues (conservative vs. liberal), and position on social issues (conservative vs. liberal).

Table 6D reports statistics by religion.

### **Avoidance**

Table 7 reports on actions respondents may have taken to avoid possible harassment, discrimination, or unfair or disrespectful treatment by one or more economists. Each cell reports the share of respondents who report having taken the listed action over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in

the field of economics for less than 10 years). We report overall results as well as results by: gender, race, LGBT status and disability.

Table 7A contrasts results across different groups of women broken down by marital status and presence of dependents.

Table 7B further breaks down race/ethnicity into: Black/non-Black, Asian/non-Asian, Latino/non-Latino.

T7C reports statistics by: age (less or more than 44 years old), position of economic issues (conservative vs. liberal), and position on social issues (conservative vs. liberal).

T7D reports statistics by religion.

### **Exclusion and harassment**

Table 8 reports on experiences of exclusion, harassment and physical assault. Each cell, except for the last column, reports the share of respondents who report having *personally experienced* such treatment over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years). The last column of Table 8 reports the *number* of respondents who report having *personally experienced* such treatment over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 8B contrasts results across different groups of women broken down by: marital status, presence of dependents, and employer type (college or university vs. other).

Table 9 provides additional information on assaults or attempted assaults. In particular, we tabulate all reported information related to attempted assault episodes, assault episodes and other episodes of uncomfortable physical touching.

### **Perception and opinions**

Table 10 summarizes answers to various questions on opinions and perceptions. (Section 5 of the survey.) We report overall results as well as statistics by: gender, race, LGBT status and disability. Each cell reports the *share of respondents who agree or strongly agree with each statement*. Other possible answers were: strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree.

Table 10A contrasts results across different groups of women broken down by: marital status, presence of dependents, and employer type (college or university vs. other).

Table 10B further breaks down race/ethnicity into: Black/non-Black, Asian/non-Asian, Latino/non-Latino.

Table 10C reports statistics by: employer type (college or university vs. other), age (less or more than 44 years old), position on economic issues (conservative vs. liberal), position on social issues (conservative vs. liberal).

Table 10D reports statistics by religion.

## **Field-level analysis**

Table 11 summarizes the general climate (Section 1 of the Survey) by research field. Each cell reports the *share of respondents who agree or strongly agree with each statement*. Other possible answers were: strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree. Table 11 only lists fields where there were 100 respondents or more. All other fields have been combined into the “Other” category.

Table 11A summarizes the general climate by research field for female respondents.

Table 11B summarizes the general climate by research field for male respondents.

Table 12 summarizes experiences of exclusion and harassment by research field.

## **Multivariate analysis**

Tables 13 and 14 report regression analyses for the variables related to the general climate and to experiences of exclusion and harassment, respectively.

## **3. Group-Specific Experiences**

### **Women**

While Table 1 shows that approximately 30% of our sample is female, female representation varies systematically across age cohorts. We broke the sample into three different cohorts: a youngest cohort, which includes all individuals less than 35 years of age, a middle cohort, which includes individuals between 35 and 54, and an oldest cohort, which includes individuals 55 and over. When we examine the gender composition across these three cohorts, we see that 13% of our sample is younger men and 8% of our sample is younger women; 31% of the sample is middle-aged men, while 15% of our sample is middle-aged women; finally, only 5% of our sample is older women while 24% is older men. This suggests a ratio of approximately 2 men to 1 woman for the younger and middle-aged cohorts but a ratio of almost 5 men to 1 woman for the oldest cohorts. Besides age, race is another correlate of gender: 55% of our sample is white male, 22% is white female, 14% is non-white male, and 7% is non-white female. In other words, women are particularly under-represented among white respondents.

Women very clearly have a different perception of the climate in the economics profession (see Table 2). It is particularly notable that, when asked about satisfaction with the overall climate within the field of economics, men were twice as likely as women to agree or strongly agree with the statement “I am satisfied with the overall climate within the field of economics” (40% of men vs. 20% of women). This large gender disparity is consistent across a variety of related statements about the field broadly: women are much less likely to feel valued within the field, much less likely to feel included socially, and much more likely to have experienced discrimination in the field of economics. While this gender disparity in climate perception is also apparent when asking about an individual’s specific institution (rather than the field of economics overall), the differential



seemed more muted there. In fact, overall, both male and female respondents report higher satisfaction with the climate at their own institution compared to the climate in the profession.

Further analysis reveals some interesting patterns by cohort. Among men, the youngest cohort is least satisfied with the climate in the profession, with only 30% saying that they agree or strongly agree with the statement above. Among the middle-aged cohorts, 37% are satisfied, and 48% of the oldest cohort of men are satisfied with the climate in the profession. Among women, only 17% of the youngest cohort is satisfied with the climate in the profession. The gap between male and female satisfaction increases with cohort age; the gap is 4% larger for the middle-aged cohort and is 15% larger for the oldest cohort. Note that, in levels, women's satisfaction level is increasing slightly with age, although the gap between men and women is also increasing.

It is important to note that, throughout this section, we cannot distinguish between differential experiences, differential selection, or differential persistence (with women non-randomly leaving the AEA and/or the profession) across age cohorts.

These patterns are not driven by women with children or those caring for other dependents. When we allow for differential experiences for women who are married/non-married or with dependents/without dependents, we find no significant differences in overall satisfaction with the climate of the profession across these subsets of women (Table 2A).

When we break the sample into white and non-white, we see that white men and nonwhite men are equally satisfied with the overall climate in the profession (40%). Non-white women report a 24% satisfaction rate while white women report only an 18% satisfaction rate.

While women are at least as likely to experience all types of discrimination as men (see Table 3), there are some notable patterns. Not surprisingly, women are much more likely to experience sex discrimination. But women are also substantially more likely to experience discrimination based on marital status/caregiving responsibilities, age, place of employment, and based on research topics. We do not find much difference in the patterns in Table 3 across age cohorts.

Many men and women have witnessed gender discrimination in the profession: 44% of women and 33% of men say that they have witnessed gender-based discrimination (Table 3A).

Female respondents are also much more likely to report having experienced discrimination or unfair treatment as students with regard to access to research assistantships, access to advisors, access to quality advising, and on the job market (see Table 4). The differential between men and women is larger in all cases than the differential between white and non-white individuals. When we break the sample by cohort, we see that the relative experience of women vs. men is quite similar for the youngest and middle-aged cohorts across all these outcomes; however, the gender gap in experiences in graduate school is significantly more pronounced in the older cohort.

Some respondents talk about their graduate school experiences in their answers to the open-ended questions. For example:

*“Early in graduate school (first two years mostly) I was excluded from some social activities outside of the office where my male classmates and the male faculty formed some early informal*

*bonds. Nobody thought to include me - I'm a woman. When it came time to choose an advisor, I had substantial issues finding one. Also, I was less likely to be promoted to "coauthor" from RA than my male classmates, even for the same work."*

When we examine experiences of discrimination in academia (Table 5), we see that, again, women face significantly more discrimination or unfair treatment than men along all dimensions (again, this gap is larger than the gap in discrimination faced by non-whites relative to whites). Most notably, women are much more likely to report personal experiences of discrimination or unfair treatment in promotion decisions and compensation, 27% and 37% respectively, compared to only 11% and 12% for men. Women are also significantly more likely to report personal experiences of discrimination or unfair treatment in teaching assignments and service obligations, course evaluations, publishing decisions and funding decisions.

When we examine patterns by cohort, we see that older cohorts of female respondents experienced significantly more discrimination in promotion, pay, teaching, and service. In terms of teaching evaluations, publishing, and funding decisions, there are no statistically distinguishable experiences across cohorts.

Answers to the open-ended questions provide some examples of these dynamics of discrimination:

*"Women and POC may not be overtly treated poorly, but they are not encouraged and supported as are white men. This lack of encouragement could take many forms, including lack of enthusiasm for one's research efforts, failure to provide support and information about research leaves and conferences, and a simple lack of respect for one's opinion at faculty meetings. Department service is de jure equal and de facto unequal. Teaching and advising well are rewarded poorly, or even viewed negatively, as a sign of lack of interest in research."*

*"...I have seen female faculty colleagues routinely "mommy-tracked" into adjunct status after childbearing, while males with significant childcare responsibilities were supported in their tenure-track roles. I have observed deserving female faculty colleagues overlooked for awards, chairs and other honors, while being impressed into enormous amounts of low-level, time-consuming committee work, as required by guidelines for gender balance."*

*"...Coming back from maternity leave, I experienced a change in the attitudes of my male colleagues toward me and my research...They basically gave up on me. They also questioned my productivity and "ability to publish", just because I did not have any papers published in the 2 years following the birth of my son. Of course I published multiple papers at once the following year. I felt that my 2 years with no publications (2 years that included my maternity leave) were judged negatively simply due to my personal family situation..."*

Personal experiences of discrimination are also quite common among women working outside of academia (Table 6). In particular, 31% of female respondents working outside of academia report personal experiences of discrimination or unfair treatment with regard to promotion decisions, compared to 14% of male respondents. About the same gender gap emerges with regard to experiences of discrimination or unfair treatment in compensation.

Among women not working in academia, the primary sectors of employment are for-profit organizations (24%), non-profit organizations (21%) and the U.S. federal government (24%). The equivalent figures for men are 29%, 17% and 21%, respectively. Women report somewhat lower experiences of discrimination in promotion decisions in for-profits than in not-for-profits or the federal government. There is no meaningful difference in reported experiences of discrimination in compensation between these three sectors. Men report very similar experiences of discrimination in promotion decisions and compensation whether they work for for-profit organizations, not-for-profits, or the US federal government.

A large share of female respondents report having altered their behavior in ways that might be counter-productive for their career to avoid possible harassment, discrimination, or unfair or disrespectful treatment by other economists (Table 7). These include not having applied or taken a particular employment position, not presenting ideas or views, or giving up on a research topic. For example, close to a quarter of female respondents report not having applied for or taken a particular employment position to avoid unfair, discriminatory or disrespectful treatment, compared to 12% of male respondents.

A somewhat larger share of non-white women than white women report having engaged in such avoidance practices. For example, 27% of non-white women report having not applied or taken a particular employment position, compared to 23% of white women; also, 14% of non-white women report having changed the content, method or conclusion of a research paper, compared to 9% of white women.

Some of these avoidance practices appear more common among the youngest cohorts. Most strikingly, 17% of women in the youngest cohort report not having applied for or accepted admission at a particular graduate school to avoid harassment and discrimination, compared to 9% in the middle-age cohort and 5% in the oldest cohort. Also, 28% of women in the younger cohort report not having applied for or taken a particular employment position, compared to 24% in the middle-aged cohort and 19% in the older cohort.

Experiences of exclusion are strikingly common in economics, *both* among male and female respondents (Table 8). For example, 65% of female respondents report feeling of social exclusion at meetings or events in the field; 63% report having felt disrespected by economist colleagues; 69% report feeling that their work was not taken as seriously as that of their economist colleagues; 59% report feeling that the subject or methodology of their research was not taken seriously. The corresponding shares among men are smaller but still strikingly large: 40%, 38%, 43% and 40%, respectively.

White women report somewhat stronger feelings of exclusion and disrespect. For example, 71% of white women report feeling that their work is not taken seriously compared to 61% of non-white women. There is no clear age-cohort gradient in the reports of feelings of exclusion and disrespect among female economists. If anything, these negative feelings are somewhat more intense among the middle-aged cohort. For example, while 60% of younger women feel disrespected, the share is 65% among middle-aged cohort women and 57% among older-aged cohort women.

Answers to the open-ended questions offer some clues as to the sources of this strong feeling of exclusion among women. For example:

*“Economics is very bro-y, leading to women feeling excluded, primarily in access to coauthors and in social settings. I think it is important to evaluate the networking and even research records of women differently, given the importance of connections in the field and the additional hurdles that women face in forming connections in a discipline whose social norms are largely formed by men.”*

*“Very difficult to characterize being excluded from large male social groups as discrimination, however end result is negative in terms of being "out of the loop" from soft information about the profession / exchanges of ideas etc. in these groups.”*

*“Because economics is a male-dominated field with many male researchers, editors, and reviewers, I feel the direction of the field is set by their idea of what is important. Men decide what research topics are interesting, which papers are publication-worthy, and who should stay in the profession.”*

*“Economics is still a male-dominated field, and it isn't just numbers. The research topics that are respected, the institutions that dominate the field, the expectations for publishing, etc. all originate from a male-dominated past. Physics-envy persists!!”*

*“I find the behavior of many economists in seminars and conferences to be disrespectful to the presenters, with many concerned more with showing how clever they are than listening and debating. This is especially the case when the presenters are young and/or female. It is more of an issue in North America but has crept into Europe in recent years. This is in contrast to other disciplines such as management and political science. The intensely competitive environment may turn off promising young researchers.”*

Sadly, experiences of sexual harassment and attempted and completed sexual assaults are not rare for women in economics (Table 8). Looking back at the last 10 ten years, 23% of female respondents report that another economist or economics student made unwanted attempts to establish a dating, romantic, or sexual relationship despite their best efforts to discourage it; 6% of female respondents report attempted sexual assaults and 2% report having being sexually assaulted; 13% report other forms of touching that made them uncomfortable. Experiences of attempted assaults and other physical touching are somewhat more common among white women than non-white women. Women from the younger- and middle-aged cohorts report similar experiences. Experiences of attempted assaults, assaults and other physical touching over the last ten years are less common among the older-aged cohort.

Table 9 shows that experiences of attempted assaults, assaults and other physical touching happen both at places of employment as well as at conferences. Most of these experiences involve someone the respondent knows. A large share of these experiences go unreported.

Some female respondents discuss these experiences in the open-ended questions:

*“I think men don't realize the negative externality of using the pool of junior female economists as a dating pool--it might seem like not a big deal to flirt with a student or a junior faculty member when an individual man does it, but when every man makes that choice, the climate of going to conferences and informally networking is very uncomfortable for young women in economics. I have personally avoided participating in networking and informal social events because of the discomfort of having people flirt with me or hit on me when I think we're discussing research. It's one reason I'm happy to be aging!”*

*“I answered "NO" to some questions about what happened in terms of certain sexual behavior and assault because it is more than 10 years ago and I am older (and, presumably, less attractive) now; they happened, and how, more than 10 years ago ... up to stalking, unwanted touching, more or less forced sexual intercourse, etc. Conferences, and often the smaller, more specialized conferences with more social interaction (all, theoretically, good features), are particular breeding grounds for that behavior. I suspect that many people (men and women) in certain fields can even name the typical offenders but wouldn't think of watching out for junior female faculty attending. At one conference, in particular, that I attended for many years, it seems to have been a sport among some of the leading male faculty, who would manage to "get" how many of the junior women and when one person would have "gotten" the first one during that conference. When asking about why not say anything about incidents that happened - you left out one important answer option - not to cause a wave, not to single oneself out any further; I never talked about one very insistent suitor at a conference because he was very well known and I was very junior - I would never have wanted or survived that kind of spotlight on me, at a time when there were hardly any women in my field (and there are still not that many).”*

*“I was hesitant to report or pursue legal action (even within the university) after an economics student in my program attempted to assault me precisely because I knew the field was very small, word gets around, and the male-preferential culture of economics would be biased against survivors. This meant I faced a trade-off between career success and justice or even protection within my institution, which nobody should have to face. I have known other women in the field who faced the same trade-off. Until the culture of economics changes, predators at conferences and in the classroom will continue to operate.”*

More than 80% of female respondents and 60% of male respondents agree that economics would be a more vibrant discipline if it were more inclusive (Table 10). Nearly all female respondents and close to 90% of male respondents feel that the AEA should expend more effort to improve diversity among its ranks.

While a clear minority, some explain in the open-ended questions why they disagree with the idea that the AEA should expand more effort to make economics more diverse. For example:

*“Devoting any time or attention to "diversity" and "inclusion" and "climate" is a ridiculous "politically correct" waste of time in the field of economics, as in most if not all fields of academia and workplaces generally. While there are certainly cases of sexual harassment, these should not be lumped together with non-existent problems and non-existent issues. The profession should instead focus attention on real issues, such as the suppression of free speech on many campuses.”*

*“I am saddened by the AEA's decision to undertake such a survey, with such loaded questions that seem aimed at a predetermined outcome, namely that we allegedly need to focus on anything other than determining economic truths, as best we can. I am concerned that the push that lies behind this survey will alter the climate in economics in a negative fashion, by discouraging the field's long-standing emphasis on challenging our colleagues to defend their work in seminars, etc... The temperament behind this survey is not that of the discipline I entered almost ... years ago, which had earned the title of Queen of the Social Sciences. Rather, the temperament behind this survey is that of the degraded, politicized, non-disciplinary departments and programs which have either been invented or corrupted over the last several decades....”*

A few respondents also voice in the open-ended questions some concerns about the possible negative side effects of a “#metoo”-type moment for the economics profession. For example:

*“...Separately and in general, I live with a low-level underlying fear of having well-intentioned interactions with women in the profession being interpreted negatively and then used in a way that could be very damaging to my career. E.g., I believe it is healthy to develop social ties with graduate students -- it is in the spirit of cultivating a better sense of how people are feeling and doing in life, and an ability to support people in stressful situations. Yet these social ties are often built in settings that can send ambiguous signals, like having a drink at a bar. For this reason, and for my own career risk-mitigation in the #metoo era, I feel I have to approach interactions with male and female graduate students differently.”*

There is a large gender gap in the perception that women are respected in the field. While only 16 percent of women feel their gender is respected in economics, 51% of men feel that women are respected.

Answers to the open-ended questions reveal that perceptions of “reverse discrimination” among some men may explain part of this gender gap. For example:

*“While it seems likely that discrimination (adverse to minorities) must exist within the profession, my experience is that minority status is a positive characteristic for job applicants (especially in academe) because white males are so common. Females (and black females, in particular) are rare and generally must decide among competing offers.”*

*“Some of the male graduate students on the job-market have complained about reverse discrimination (and in hiring decisions we definitely favor women PhD and faculty now). I am not sure what the right policy is - this is a tricky issue as historically women have been discriminated against at many levels - but it is clear that all else equal for a job-market candidate it is easier to get a job as a female. Is this appropriate?”*

*“I am worried that diversity efforts going too far become discrimination by another name. As a white, male researcher, I already experience the flip-side of affirmative action when my applications for some positions don't stand a chance through no fault of my own.”*

There is also a gender gap in the perception that men are respected in the field, but it is much smaller, with 88% of men feeling that their gender is respected compared to 96% of women feeling that men are respected.

## People of Color

Respondents were asked to select their race from the following list, with the ability to select multiple options: White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, or other. The small number of people that reported multiple races (e.g. White and Asian, or White and Black) were included in the means' calculations for each of the racial group they reported belonging to.<sup>6</sup> Respondents were also asked whether they were of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin (Yes/No). Latinx below will refer to Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish origin; those identifying as Latinx can be of any race.

While survey respondents are overwhelmingly White (79%), 15% report being Asian, 10% Latinx, 3% Black or African American, 0.5% Native Alaskan or Native American and 0.1% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander; 5% report "other" race or ethnicity.<sup>7</sup> The share of respondents by race and ethnicity is broadly consistent with their shares among U.S. degree recipients and faculty reported in 2017 for Blacks and Native Americans; the share of Latinx respondents is higher in the climate survey than among degree recipients and faculty.<sup>8</sup>

With respect to climate in the economics profession, the experiences of these racial and ethnic groups are frequently as heterogeneous as the groups themselves. When asked whether they feel intellectually included in the field of economics, there is no significant difference between Asian and non-Asian, Black and non-Black, and Latinx and non-Latinx respondents (Table 2B). In contrast, in response to the question of whether they had been discriminated against within the economics profession, there is a 15 percentage points difference between Black and non-Black respondents but only a 6 percentage points difference between Asians and non-Asians and a 4 percentage points difference Latinx and non-Latinx respondents.

Nearly half (47%) of Black economists report being discriminated against or treated unfairly in the profession based on their race, in comparison to 24% of Asians, 16% of Latinx, and 4% of White survey respondents.

The data suggest similar patterns apply among students in economics, Black respondents more frequently report having experienced discrimination with respect to access to research assistantships, advisors, quality advising, and while on the job market than other racial/ethnic groups, and Asian and Latinx respondents report this more often than whites as well. For example, 35% of Black respondents report personal experiences of discrimination or unfair treatment in the job market, compared to 29% of Asian respondents, 22% of Latinx respondents and 18% of White respondents.

Asian respondents report feeling substantially less valued at their institutions relative to their non-Asian peers (10 percentage points difference), and in comparison to their Black and Hispanic peers (Table 2B).

---

<sup>6</sup> Eighty-four respondents reported being White and Asian; 16 reported being White and Black; 6 reported being Asian and Black.

<sup>8</sup> *AEA Committee on the Status of Minority Groups in the Economics Profession Annual Report 2018*. The CSMGEP data are restricted to U.S. institutions and U.S. citizens and permanent residents, which may explain a higher share of Latinx respondents among AEA climate survey respondents. There are no comparable data in the CSMGEP report on Asians.

In the open-ended comments, several respondents were direct in their observations of the climate for racial and ethnic minorities in the economics profession:

*“How many black people do we have in the profession? Open any undergraduate macro textbook and check for structural unemployment in the USA. You would find many reasons for structural unemployment but NOT race? This is despite the US having a BIG structural problem with black unemployment. Why do textbooks ignore it? Because economics is dominated by people who have little concern about the consequence of racism, and people who have the concern are excluded. Urgent for economics to attract black talent.”*

*“I would not recommend my own (black) children to go into this field. It was a mistake for me to choose this field. Had I known that it would be so toxic, I would not have...”*

Along all dimensions of discrimination examined in the climate survey, Asians, Blacks, and Latinx economists report having substantially worse experiences than their White counterparts. This is true both among those employed in academia (Table 5B) as well as among those employed outside of academia (Table 6B). For example, personal experiences of discrimination or unfair treatment in promotion decisions in academia are reported by 26% of Black respondents, 24% of Latinx respondents, and 19% of Asian respondents, compared to 15% of White respondents (Tables 5 and 5B). Also, 34% of Black respondents report personal experiences of unfair treatment in publication decisions, compared to 29% of Latinx respondents, 25% of Asian respondents and 20% of White respondents.

Survey-takers shed more light on the types of racial and ethnic discrimination experienced or witnessed in answers to the open-ended questions:

*“The system of citations and dependence on citations for promotion and prizes in the economics profession is flawed. There is a growing body of evidence to suggest that underrepresented minorities and women are under-cited and that publication lags are longer for them. How will the lack of diversity and inclusion in this fundamental system in economics allow for greater diversity and inclusion in Nobel, John Bates Clark, and other awards with such a structural flaw in the system? Very good economists are being and will be passed over while this structure is in place.”*

*“To the best of my knowledge, no African American has ever been the editor of a “major” journal in economics (or any other American social science journal). I’ve noticed that white scholars can publish articles that do not cite black scholars or scholars who’ve published in “non-major” journals. But, black scholars cannot get away with not citing an important paper by a white scholar.”*

*“Bias against Asians is clear and pervasive. There is paltry representation of blacks and Latinos (departments should not consider the hiring of upper class Latin American immigrants as a fix for this problem, as they are not under-represented in the profession like Latinos from the US are; both African American and immigrants from Africa are unseen in the profession, with the former a particularly egregious oversight given the country we live in). The perspectives of people of*



*working class backgrounds are few and far between in the profession, and, this clearly colors research priorities.”*

When asked about whether people of their race or ethnicity are respected in the economics profession, there is a 56 percentage points difference between Black and non-Black respondents (Table 10B). Large gaps also appear between Asian and non-Asian as well as Latinx and non-Latinx respondents.

Economists hailing from racial and ethnic minorities report taking a variety of measures to avoid harassment and discrimination relative to their White peers (Table 7B). The largest difference in responses between Asians and non-Asians pertain to deciding not to attend work-related social events (6 percentage points gap). Among Latinx economists, the largest difference is with respect to deciding not to present a question, idea, or view at school or place of work (6 percentage points gap). Among Blacks, not taking a particular job and not attending social events were the relatively most commonly used means of avoidance: 32% of Black respondents report not having applied for or taken a particular employment position to avoid harassment, discrimination or unfair treatment, compared to 15% of non-Black respondents; 41% of Black respondents report not having attended social events, compared to 25% on non-Black respondents (Table 7B).

For many Asian, Black, and Hispanic economists, experiences related to harassment are similar to that of the rest of the population. However, feelings of exclusion are more common among racial and ethnic minorities. Compared to their White peers, 46% of whom report feeling socially excluded (Table 8), 56% of Blacks, 52% of Asians, and 50% of Latinx report that feeling.

A number of people identify with more than one minority group within the economics profession. Particularly relevant is the intersection of race and gender: 1% of survey respondents are Black women, 2.6% are Latina, and 5.5% are Asian women. Women who are members of racial and ethnic groups historically underrepresented in the U.S. bear a double burden of race- and gender-based discrimination. They may experience discrimination or unfair treatment based on racial/ethnic identity more often than their male counterparts do, and they experience discrimination based on gender identity at least as often as white women do. For example, as seen in the tabulation below, 62% of Black women economists and 58% of Latina report experiencing either racial discrimination or gender discrimination or both.

## Experiences of discrimination and avoidance activities, by race and gender

	White Men	White Women	Asian Men	Asian Women	Black Men	Black Women	Latino Men	Latina Women
Have you ever been discriminated against, or treated unfairly based on:								
Racial/ethnic identity	0.04	0.05	0.22	0.28	0.43	0.53	0.13	0.22
Sex	0.04	0.49	0.03	0.39	0.03	0.49	0.02	0.54
Either or both	0.06	0.50	0.22	0.44	0.43	0.62	0.15	0.58
Number of different types of actions taken to avoid possible harassment, discrimination, or unfair or disrespectful treatment (see Table 7)								
	1.5	3.4	2.2	3.3	3.4	4.4	2.4	4.0

Note: Consistent with the rest of the report, this table includes all respondents regardless of country of residence and allows respondents to identify more than one race/ethnicity category. For example, “white” includes Latinx as well as non-Latinx respondents.

Women from historically underrepresented racial and ethnic groups more often modify their activity to avoid possible harassment, discrimination, or unfair or disrespectful treatment. Of the thirteen different types of avoidance activities listed in Table 7, Black and Latina women take 4.4 and 4.0 different types on average, compared to an average 1.5 for White men and 3.4 for White women.

In addition, Asian women, Black women, and Latinas typically report more often that they have encountered discrimination in promotion and pay. While 26% and 36% of White women report promotion and pay discrimination respectively, the equivalent figures are 28% and 36% for Asian women, 29% and 38% for Black women and 32% and 40% for Latinas.

A comment by one of the survey-takers illustrates this intersectional experience:

*"As a black and female lecturer, I believe I have sometimes received less respect from students compared to a white male professor. I am good at teaching, and I believe my student/course evaluations would be higher if I were white and/or male. The majority of my students are white students, and some of them still (in my opinion) have a problem in seeing a Black woman as an expert/authority figure. Thankfully, there are students who see past race and gender and do tell me I am a great lecturer."*

Some survey respondents offer recommendations as to how to strengthen the pipeline for racial and ethnic minorities in economics:

*“We need a stronger pipeline for underrepresented groups - particularly, Blacks and Latinx individuals. We all know this, but we need to focus on colleges with large populations of underrepresented groups and start teaching the intro economics courses in a way that students with weaker high school backgrounds can grasp AND get excited by. Teaching the intro courses in lectures of hundreds of students with ONLY multiple choice homework and exams is doing a serious disservice to the students and to our profession. We will not get a more diverse profession if we cannot target college students more effectively.”*

## **LGBT Population**

To measure the gender identity of individuals, we used two separate questions. The first question asked the gender of the respondent: female, male, or non-binary/agender/something else. The second question asked respondents whether they consider themselves to be transgender. There were three affirmative responses: “yes, transgender, male-to-female,” “yes, transgender, female-to-male,” and “yes, transgender, gender nonconforming.” We used the two questions to create a single measure that captures whether someone indicates either a transgender identity or a non-binary identity in one or both of those questions.<sup>10</sup> Overall, 63 people (0.6% of those reporting a gender) indicated that they identified as non-binary, transgender, or both.<sup>11</sup>

The sexual orientation question asked respondents whether they considered themselves to be heterosexual/straight, gay/lesbian, bisexual, or something else/unsure.

We created the LGBT variable used in the above tables as follows. Anyone identifying as non-binary or transgender was assigned a “1” for LGBT. Anyone identifying as gay/lesbian, bisexual, or something else was also assigned a “1.” Note that those identified as LGBT include a small number of transgender/non-binary people who identify as heterosexual. Individuals who were heterosexual and cisgender were coded as zero. Overall, 570 people (5.5%) identified as non-heterosexual, transgender/non-binary, or both.

Another variable, SOGI, was created to further categorize LGBT people into transgender, lesbians, gay men, bisexual women, bisexual men, “something else” women, and “something else” men. That variable excludes people who are cisgender and heterosexual. Of the 569 LGBT people reporting a gender category, 11.1% were transgender or non-binary (n=63), 8.4% lesbian (n=48), 36.6% gay men (n=208), 14.4% bisexual women (n=82), 14.1% bisexual men (n=80), 5.5% women whose sexual orientation was something else or unsure (n=31), and 10.0% men whose sexual orientation was something else or unsure (n=57).

LGBT people were more likely to report having experienced discrimination within the field of economics than were non-LGBT people (Table 2). While 18% of the whole sample reported discrimination, 27% of LGBT people reported discrimination. The higher rate is mostly because

---

<sup>10</sup> Cisgender respondents, those who identified as their male or female birth gender and did not identify as transgender, were assigned a male or female gender identity accordingly.

<sup>11</sup> This prevalence rate for being transgender or non-binary is similar to the 0.6% population estimate reported by Jody L. Herman, Andrew R. Flores, Taylor N.T. Brown, Bianca D.M. Wilson, and Kerith J. Conron, “Age of Individuals Who Identify as Transgender in the United States,” Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law, 2017, <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/TransAgeReport.pdf>.

of higher than average reports by women: 44% of lesbians and bisexual women and 42% of women who are something else/unsure reported discrimination in economics, along with 22% of gay men and 30% of men who are something else/unsure. Only 12% of bisexual men and 17% of transgender/non-binary people reported discrimination.

When asked specifically about discrimination based on gender identity, 20% of transgender/non-binary people reported discrimination, compared with 3% of cisgender people (74% of whom were cisgender women). When asked specifically about sexual orientation discrimination, 18% of non-heterosexual people reported discrimination, compared with less than 1% of heterosexuals (Table 3). The highest rates of reporting sexual orientation discrimination were by lesbians (26%) and gay men (31%), compared with 11% or less for the other SOGI groups.

Looking back on their time as students (Table 4), LGBT economists reported higher rates of discrimination than non-LGBT people in getting research assistantships (15% for LGBTs vs. 10% for non-LGBTs), access to advisors (15% vs. 10%), access to quality advising (17% vs. 11%), and in the job market (28% vs. 20%). In general, cisgender women reported the highest rates of discrimination as students among the different SOGI groups.

The most common kinds of discrimination experienced by academic economists are in promotion decisions, compensation, service obligations, publishing decisions, and invitations to professional settings, with at least one in five LGBT faculty reporting those experiences (Table 5). LGBT women had higher rates of discrimination than transgender people or gay/bisexual men for promotion, compensation, teaching, service, course evaluations, publishing decisions, funding decisions, sabbatical time, access to coauthors, and invitations to professional events. In general, transgender people had similar or lower rates of discrimination than cisgender people for different types of discrimination, with the exception of course evaluations (22% vs. 20%).

For LGBT non-academic economists (Table 6), publishing decisions and professional development opportunities were the most common kinds of discrimination. Sample sizes of the different LGBT groups were quite small, preventing a more detailed comparison of rates.

Answers to several questions indicate consistently that LGBT economists feel more excluded from the field than non-LGBT economists. Only 34% of LGBT economists agreed or strongly agreed that they feel valued, compared with 40% of non-LGBT economists (Table 2). However, 49% of transgender/non-binary economists felt valued. Non-heterosexual women felt the least valued within the LGBT group—only 28% of lesbians and 20% of bisexual women agreed they felt valued.

Feelings of social inclusion were also lower for LGBT economists than non-LGBTs (29% vs. 37%), as were levels of intellectual inclusion (35% vs. 42%). In both cases LGBT women felt the least included.

In other responses (Table 8), 59% of LGBT economists reported that they had ever felt socially excluded at a meeting or event in economics (compared to 47% of non-LGBT economists), including 79% of lesbians, 73% of bisexual women, and 71% of women reporting something

else/unsure for sexual orientation. Also, 56% of LGBT economists have ever felt disrespected by economist colleagues, and 60% have felt their work wasn't taken seriously.

Finally, only 29% of LGBT people agree or strongly agree that "people of my sexual orientation are respected within the field," compared with 91% of non-LGBT people.

A gay man reported some of these feelings in the open-ended questions:

*"I found and find myself extremely isolated. This was enhanced by not having a partner or only casual relationships which is common among gay men and itself in my view is the reflection of engrained homophobia in society, especially for those from previous generations. This also made me not conforming. I cannot express it much better and it is hard to do so in a few lines, but the sense of alienation and suffering that I brought since childhood because of this widespread feeling in society became if anything more acute in this profession. This contrasts with friends and partners in more creative occupations where gays typically concentrate. They could rely on a sense of sharing and belonging, role models, no need to hide one's sexuality, affection and life."*

Questions about sexual harassment and assault reveal higher rates of reporting for LGBT people than for non-LGBT people, as shown in Table 8. The most commonly reported form was inappropriate sexual remarks or other conduct that made one uncomfortable: 37% of LGBT people vs. 21% of non-LGBT people. Rates were much higher for LGBT women than LGBT men for each of these forms of treatment. Rates were similar for non-heterosexual people and transgender/non-binary people for inappropriate sexual conduct, feeling threatened, being stalked, attempted assault, actual assault, and uncomfortable touching.

If we look at those who report at least one experience of harassment or assault, we find 38% of LGBT people and 24% of non-LGBT have had such experiences. Disaggregating LGBT people shows that 35% of transgender/non-binary people, 54% of lesbians, 32% of gay men, 61% of bisexual women, 24% of bisexual men, 51% of "something else" women, and 28% of "something else" men have had at least one such experience. In other words, every subgroup of LGBT people has a higher rate of harassment or assault than non-LGBT people.

While the numbers of attempted assaults are relatively small for LGBT people (5% report one), about half occurred at a university (48% for LGBT people, 54% for non-LGBT people). For LGBT people, 59% of perpetrators were "another economist or student that I know," and another 37% were someone with authority or a co-worker. LGBT were more likely (52%) than non-LGBTs (31%) to report the attempted assault to anyone.

Turning to the actual assaults against 4% of LGBT respondents, 65% were reported to have occurred at a university (49% for non-LGBTs). For LGBTs, 45% were someone in authority or a coworker. Again, LGBTs were more likely to report the assault than non-LGBT people: 53% vs. 35%.

One possible strategy for LGBT economists to avoid discrimination, harassment, or assault linked to bias based on sexual orientation or gender identity is to not tell anyone about their status. A survey question asked generally about the degree of disclosure about sexual orientation ("Have you told others of your sexual orientation?"). One in five LGBT economists (22%) has not told

anyone their sexual orientation, 34% have told only those who are closest to them, and 42% say they have “told most people” or that they “do not actively refrain from disclosing this information.” Lesbians are the most open, with 87% reporting they have told most people and only 2% saying they have told no one. Two thirds of gay men (67%) have told most people, and only 4% have told none. Bisexual economists are mostly disclosing only to those closest to them—57% of bisexual women and 50% of bisexual men. And 48% of transgender/non-binary people have disclosed their sexual orientation to most people, with 25% disclosing to no one. There was no similar question about disclosure related to gender identity.

One question offers an insight into motivations of LGBT people to manage disclosure of their identities, asking whether they have ever avoided disclosing gender identity or sexual orientation because of “fear of negative consequences, harassment, or discrimination.” Among non-heterosexual people, 63% report ever avoiding disclosure of their sexual orientation because of fear. Almost half (49%) of transgender people have avoided disclosure their gender identity because of such fears.

One respondent pointed to the realization of that fear:

*“Once I came out, people dropped me from grants. Administrators took advantage of me. At ...one of the national meetings, my ideas were dismissed by a prominent economist by saying Keynes was a homosexual and therefore his ideas were not worthy of consideration.”*

Another respondent reported seeing a fellow graduate student forced to leave their program “...because of a bias by his major professor because of his sexual orientation. As a result, I had to actively hide my sexual orientation from the same major professor because he was the only professor who supervised dissertations of the kind I planned to write. I do believe the professor’s suspicions during my graduate studies meant I received less support than an otherwise heterosexual student.”

Relatedly, the rate of reporting sexual orientation discrimination increases with the degree of openness: 8% of those who have not told anyone reported discrimination, contrasted with 13% of those who have told those closest to them and 26% of those who have told most people.

We can also see avoidance and disengagement in response to concerns about unfavorable treatment (Table 7). In each case, LGBT people are more likely to have used avoidance strategies than non-LGBT people, such as not applying for jobs or visiting at certain places, not asking a question or presenting a view, and not attending social events are fairly common. These behaviors might not only be related to sexual orientation or gender identity, though, and in general LGBT women were more likely to use them than were LGBT men.

A different perspective on LGBT people’s experiences comes from witnesses of discrimination and from the opinions about how LGBT economists are respected within the field. With respect to gender identity discrimination, 9% of cisgender people report having witnessed such discrimination, along with 22% of transgender/non-binary people. With respect to sexual orientation discrimination, 9% of heterosexual and 24% of non-heterosexual people have witnessed such discrimination (Table 3A).

One witness related this experience:

*“I’ve observed hiring decisions influenced by marital status, sexual orientation, and pregnancy related considerations. There was no dislike towards these categories, but rather speculation on the person’s demand for the position based on these criteria, which did influence decisions to make offers.”*

Two other questions asked whether respondents believed that transgender and gender non-conforming people are respected within the field of economics and whether people who are not heterosexual are respected. Only a third (32%) of cisgender people agree or strongly agree that transgender/non-binary people are respected within the field; 36% of transgender/non-binary people agree. More than half (59%) of heterosexual agree that non-heterosexual people are respected, while only 28% of LGB people agree.

### **People with Disabilities**

One of the questions asked respondents whether they had a health condition that affects their work or studies. 9.9% of respondents reported having such a condition. We refer to people with disabilities as PWD for short.

A quarter of PWD agreed or strongly agreed that they feel they have been discriminated against in economics (Table 2). In addition, 14% of PWD say they have experienced discrimination or have been treated unfairly because of their disability status (Table 3). Looking at discrimination against PWDs by race, the rate varied only slightly: 10% for Latinos, 14% for Whites, 16% for Blacks, and 15% for Asian Americans. The rate of disability discrimination was higher than average for LGBT respondents at 22% and at 23% for women. The rates for those below age 44 and 44 and up were similar (15% and 13%, respectively).

The most common forms of discrimination against students with disabilities were in the job market (30%; Table 4). Table 5 shows that the most common forms of discrimination against faculty with disabilities were in course evaluations (30%), service obligations (25%), publishing decisions (27%), and invitations to professional settings (26%). About one quarter of economists outside academia who have disabilities report discrimination in promotion decisions, compensation, and professional development opportunities (Table 6).

The survey did not ask about discrimination related to accommodations for disabilities, but several respondents reported this kind of treatment in the open-ended question. One student respondent made this observation:

*“I have personally found that Ph.D. programs do not accommodate temporary or permanent disabilities, with or without official leave of absences. The field is focused on ‘what year you are in the PhD program’ regardless of medical leave and obstacles. Academic progress is based on ‘your year in the program,’ and thus so are funding opportunities.”*

Another economist had a similar experience:

*“Throughout the entirety of my graduate experience it felt that seeking accommodation for learning disabilities was frowned upon. This started at the very beginning. When I first started to*

*seek accommodation for a disability, the response was both critical and suspect. ...I failed a comprehensive exam as a result of a non-accommodated, yet medically documented, learning disability...*

One economist connects a promotion decision to a disability:

*"I have gotten no support for my disability and indications are that it led to me being denied promotion."*

A former faculty member points to a disability as a primary reason for leaving academia:

*"I acquired a mental health disability following childbirth and, given the stigma surrounding such disabilities, dealing with it appropriately was not a possibility within the confines of a tenure track position."*

Economists with disabilities feel less included and more excluded than those without disabilities. In Table 2, only 30% of those with disabilities reported feeling valued in economics, compared with 41% of those without a disability. Similarly, only 29% of PWD felt included socially and 35% felt included intellectually in the field of economics. More than half of economists with disabilities (60%) have felt socially excluded and 58% have felt disrespected at some point within economics (Table 8).

Table 8 also shows that economists with disabilities are somewhat more likely than average to report hearing inappropriate sexual remarks (29% vs. 21% on average). Rates of attempted sexual assault, actual sexual assault, and other sorts of unwanted activity were one or two percentage points higher than average for economists with disabilities.

Overall, 39% of people with disabilities reported that they had ever avoided disclosing their disability status because of fear of negative consequences, harassment, and discrimination. Economists with disabilities also reported that they sometimes avoided or disengaged from professional activities to avoid harassment, discrimination, or disrespectful treatment (Table 7). The most common actions reported were not presenting a question idea or view (45%, compared with 30% of economists without a disability), not attending social events (39%), or not speaking at a conference or seminar (36%).

In the open-ended question, several respondents reported hiding their disabilities because of stigma:

*"Professors made me feel like I was not cut out to be an economist because I was dealing with mental health issues. They did not understand how challenging mental health treatment can be, because they did not experience it themselves, and I could not discuss my condition openly. The stigma needs to end."*

*"I actively hide my disabilities because I am able to manage them. I have seen other students who have disabilities that require accommodations be criticized. [A current administrator] at my institution has been heard by multiple people actively ridiculing and making derisive comments about students (using their names) who have disabilities and need accommodations."*



## Political Orientation

We define as economically liberal individuals that answered “very liberal” or “liberal” to the question “*How would you characterize your political views with regard to economic issues?*”; others are classified as economically conservative. Similarly, we define as socially liberal individuals that answered “very liberal” or “liberal” to the question “*How would you characterize your political views with regard to social issues?*”; others are classified as socially conservative.

Economically and socially conservative economists report higher satisfaction than the overall climate in economics than more liberal ones (Table 2C). For example, 45% of socially conservative economists report being satisfied with the overall climate in economics compared to 30% of socially liberal economists.

Race and gender might be important confounding factors behind this pattern. For example, we find that the share of women among socially (economically) conservative economists is 23 (27)% compared to 32 (33)% among socially (economically) liberal economists. Yet, when we restrict the sample to white men, we still find difference in satisfaction in the overall climate in economics by ideology: 32% of economically liberal white men are satisfied with the overall climate, compared with 46% of economically conservative white men; 37% of socially liberal white men are satisfied with the overall climate, compared with 49% of socially conservative white men.

Conservative economists also feel somewhat more valued in the field of economics (41 vs. 37% along the economic ideology divide; 44 vs 38% along the social ideology divide).

Feeling of social and intellectual inclusion in the field of economics are also somewhat higher among conservative economists. For example, 47% of socially conservative economists feel intellectually included within the field of economics, compared to 40% of socially liberal economists. However, when we restrict the sample to white men, the gap is much smaller with 50% of socially conservative white men feeling intellectually included compared to 48% of the socially liberal ones.

About 10% of economically conservative economists report having experienced discrimination based on their political views, compared to 8% of economically liberal economists. Close to 14% of socially conservative economists report experiences of discrimination based on political views, compared to 8% of the more socially liberal types.

We do not observe much systematic differences between conservative and liberal students in terms of graduate school experience. For example, 20% of economically conservative economists report experiences of unfair treatment in the labor market compared to 22% of economically liberal ones; 22% of socially conservative economists report unfair treatment in the job market compared to 21% among the more socially liberal.

Similarly, we do not observe much systematic difference in experiences of discrimination or unfair treatments between liberals and conservatives employed in academia (Table 5C). If anything, experiences of discrimination are somewhat more common among the more economically liberal than economically conservative while somewhat more common among the more socially conservative than socially liberal. The same overall patterns hold when we restrict the sample to

white men. For example, 24% of economically liberal economists report discrimination or unfair treatment in publishing decisions compared to 20% of economically conservative economists; the gap is reverse (but smaller) along the social ideology divide (22% vs. 23%). Also, 16% of economically liberal economists report experiences of discrimination or unfair treatment in funding decisions compared to 13% of the more economically conservatives; again, the gap is reverse along the social ideology divide (13% vs 16%).

Similarly, experiences of discrimination outside of academia are quite similar by political ideology (see Table 6C). The largest gap is with respect to professional development opportunities, with 20% of economically liberal economists having experienced discrimination or unfair treatment on this dimension, compared to 15% of economically conservative economists. This gap is however much smaller when we restrict the sample to white men (11% vs 10%).

Not surprisingly given the above patterns, there is limited evidence of differential use of avoidance practices to avoid discrimination, harassment or unfair treatment based on political ideology (Table 7C).

Answers to the open-ended questions confirm that experiences of discrimination based on political ideology go both ways. For example:

*“I know as a fact that my job market applications were rejected because of (1) my libertarian politics and (2) my blog's \*title\* (“<redacted>”). It's well known that academics are conservative prudes. I have also experienced it.”*

*“Sometimes I feel that there is a strong dominance of liberal views in economics. Speaking out against illegal immigration or holding conservative views is not something I would feel comfortable sharing with other economists that I don't know.”*

*“Economists who lean politically conservative (especially, but not only, white men), seem always to feel completely free to state their political views as economic fact, when in fact these issues often are the matter of ongoing debate in the literature. Examples that I have witnessed include rent control, the minimum wage, environmental regulation of various types, and the dogma of random experiments. Yes, in an extremely simple, Econ 101 model government policies can adversely affect efficiency. But not necessarily in the real world, where such policies are often pursued with subtle variations that are not appreciated by the right-leaning mainstream of economists. More to the point, economists--like other scientists--should follow the evidence wherever it leads, even (or especially) when the evidence brings theoretical conclusions into doubt. Of course there are left-leaning economists, but it is the right-leaning ones who seem to take all the air-space for themselves.”*

*“Being shut down at conferences when discussing differing political points of view on economic issues. Most economists are very conservative and use “scientific evidence” to try to make one feel dumb for expressing liberal, or radical points of view.”*

*“The biggest diversity issue is that conservatives are strongly discriminated against in universities. Even as a libertarian (not a conservative) in a business school, I have felt this discrimination, but outside of business schools it is absolutely intolerable. It would be impossible for me to have a*

*professional career without being 100% "in the closet" among my peers if I was outside a business school. Business schools are considerably more tolerant than the rest of the campus, though, so I am quite happy where I am at."*

*"Our dean refuses to hire faculty who do not share his conservative political views."*

Table 10C reveals the largest differences by ideology. In particular, economically and socially conservative economists are less likely to agree that economics would be a more vibrant field if it were more diverse. For example, 50% of socially conservative economists agree that more diversity will make economics more vibrant, compared to 72% of socially liberal economists. Economically and socially conservative economists are also more likely to think that minority groups are respected within the field of economics and that discrimination is rare within the field of economics today. Much of these differences remain when we restrict the sample to White men. For example, 37% of socially conservative White men agree that more diversity will make economics more vibrant, compared to 64% of socially liberal White men. Also, 70% (69%) of socially conservative white men feel that women (non-Whites) are respected in economics compared to 49 (52) % of socially liberal White men.

## **Religion**

Muslim economists report by far the greatest rate of discrimination based on religious identity, with more than a quarter of them reporting such experience. In contrast, only 6% of Christians report discrimination based on religious identity, 7% of Jews, 5% of members of other religion.

Muslim economists are also much more likely to have experienced discrimination or unfair treatment in graduate school: 26% experienced unfair treatment with respect to access to research assistantships, 26% with respect to accessing quality advising and 38 % report discrimination on the job market. The equivalent shares among Christian students are 10, 12 and 21% respectively. The equivalent shares among Jewish students are 6, 9 and 16% respectively.

Among those employed in academia, Muslim economists report the highest experiences of discrimination with regard to, among other things (Table 5D): promotion decisions (27%), invitation to research conferences and networks (32%), publishing decisions (37%), access to graduate students (17%), course evaluations (31%) and access to co-authors (27%). There are no large or systematic differences between other religious (and non-religious) groups, except for Jewish economists reporting somewhat lower experiences of unfair treatment or discrimination.

Muslim economists also appear to experience more systematic discrimination or unfair treatment outside of academia (Table 6D). However, their negative experience is matched by Buddhists. Overall, Jewish and atheist economists employed outside of academia report the least amount of discrimination or unfair treatment outside of academia.

Not surprisingly given the above, changes in behavior to avoid harassment, discrimination or unfair treatment are somewhat more common among Muslims (Table 7D). Most strikingly, 28% of Muslim economists report not having applied for or taken a particular employment position to avoid possible harassment, discrimination or unfair treatment, compared to 16% of Christian economists, 11% of Jewish economists and 19% of members of other religion (including

Buddhists). Also, 25% of Muslim economists report not have participated in a conference to avoid possible harassment or discrimination; the highest percentage among other groups is Buddhist and other religion (16%). Overall, Muslims, Buddhists and members of other religion report engaging in more avoidance practices than agnostic, atheist, Christian or Jewish individuals.

Interestingly, while reporting higher rates of experiences of discrimination, Muslim economists are among the most satisfied with the overall climate in economics (Table 2D; 40%) and the most likely to agree with the statement that it is not important for the field of economics to be inclusive towards people with different background (Table 10D).

Answers to the open-ended questions provide some anecdotes of experiences of religious discrimination:

*“I come from a Muslim background with a Muslim name but I am agnostic. I got tired of people in economics constantly putting me in the Muslim box and treating me differently just because of my name.”*

*“When I was on the job market an interviewer remarked that members of my religion were not intellectually curious. I also had two professors in graduate school make jokes about my religion (while knowing I was present and my religious affiliation).”*

#### **4. Other Comments on Climate**

The next to last item on the survey (question 46) is an open-response question that asks *“Do you have any comments or ideas to share about the climate of the field of economics as it relates to diversity, inclusion, harassment, and professional conduct?”* An anonymized file with 2,729 responses was provided by NORC. Of these, many were blank, contained only a “-”, or contained a word or phrase indicating no response (e.g., no, n.a.). After removing these responses, the result is a sample of 2,426 responses. Each response was read. Many of these responses are quoted in the preceding sections. It is not possible to reflect all the opinions and experiences that were shared in the responses. The following attempts to provide some of the most commonly expressed views. Phrases in quotes reflect direct quotation of written responses.

A large number of individuals (about 940) used the opportunity to articulate problems or issues seen in the profession. Women identifying problems that arose because of their sex was the most common type of problem (about 330); this includes issues related to pregnancy. Over one hundred make mention of discrimination explicitly, as well as reference to harassment and sexual harassment. The other issues raised reflect the complexity of the problem. One set of comments reflected that biology (women bear children) and cultural norms (women are still more likely to be primary care-givers for children) place women at a disadvantage, and the profession seems unwilling to account for this. This can impact time-to-degree in graduate school or the amount of time needed to obtain tenure. As one respondent stated *“The field of economics...has not sorted out how to support women as they bring children into the world.”* This can also impact a woman’s

ability to interact with colleagues as they will be less likely to attend functions outside of normal business hours.

There is also a sense that women must be better than men in order to have the same success. A common reframe was that “women are taken less seriously” and that men will talk over women or provide a harsher critique of their work efforts. Respondents also feel that women are excluded from networking opportunities because of the nature of the activity (“men ask men to lunch”) or because the situation can become uncomfortable because of behavior (e.g., drinks in bar). These problems begin in graduate school in developing relationships with advisors. The implications reverberate throughout a career since they impact co-authors or potential access to feedback on research. Many respondents referenced the seminar culture in economics referring to it as “combative” and “confrontational.” Some viewed that as simply unproductive and impolite. Others saw this as a bigger issue if this environment drives away younger economists and those from under-represented groups who might feel less comfortable already.

There was also a set of comments (about 110) opining that economics is not open to heterodox approaches or views, or that in general there is a small set of fields within economics that matter. If you are not in one of these fields, or do not use the prescribed research methods, you are not taken seriously. The impact can stifle the profession: “There is too much homogeneity in thought about new techniques/approaches. Presenting innovative ideas is often frowned upon.” Perhaps more relevant to the discussion here is a sense that the less valued fields are more populated by under-represented groups, “fields within economics that are more populated by women...are, not coincidentally, devalued or labeled as not ‘core’ economics.” In general, the view was that a more open discipline will yield better science and a more diverse economics profession.

This last comment ties into what was likely the second largest theme in the written responses (about 250 comments). There was a frequent reference to the elitism within the field. There is a strong sense that the AEA, the NBER, and the top journals – and de facto the profession – are controlled by economists from the top institutions. Many comments (about 60) reference that there is a network and you are either in or out, and if you are out your chances of success in the profession are greatly diminished. As one commenter stated “Those outside the top ten tend to be discounted, dismissed, and not taken seriously.” Furthermore, the view of the profession as a closed-network has a negative impact on inclusivity “Elitist nature of the profession is magnified if you are a minority.” By backward induction, if a successful career requires attending an elite Ph.D. program, the chances of this happening are much higher if one attends an exclusive undergraduate school, and this may not be an available option for many minorities, “It takes a lot of money, connections, and concerted effort in education for a person’s whole life to be a top economist.” Even if one makes it to such an institution, the feeling is that it is a “good old boys network” that only lets in other boys. It is worth noting that this sense of exclusion pervades the profession: those at teaching institutions feel dismissed by those at Ph.D. institutions, those at 2-year institutions feel ignored, and there is a strong feeling that those that obtained their degree, or work, outside the U.S. are not given the appropriate level of respect.

More examples include the following:

*“Economics is very elitist. Elitism may make some people feel excluded, but it is not necessarily discrimination.”*

*“The NBER is a particularly non-inclusive and not entirely meritocratic institution. Once in the club members rarely leave, even if low productivity. Entry into the club is correlated with productivity and quality, but extremely noisy. As a result, many good people are systematically excluded while many less good people remain.”*

*“Try attending an NBER meeting if you are not a fellow/associate or co-author/buddy of a fellow/associate. I'm an outgoing person and I've never felt so out of place anywhere than there. I attended a summer institute meeting once and never felt the desire to seek an invitation again. It feels way too clubby. It does not look good and makes people feel that publications in the top 5 are rigged (editors and the reviewers they invite get to see papers presented to them before people submit them to those journals). Social networks have way too much weight.”*

*“The most common form of exclusion in economics is related to subject matter; our field simply ignores or even actively discriminates against non-mainstream schools of thought. Heterodox economists are not respected. At the University of ..., heterodox economists (all...of us) were excluded from committee assignments, hiring committees, and generally disregarded from department decisions.”*

*“Discrimination in economics is based on topic of research, membership in the "Top 5" club, and having a PhD from an exclusive set of universities. Race, gender, age, etc. are not an issue. This survey completely misses the problem.”*

*“One aspect of economics that may be important to consider is how the nature of the discipline creates and uses intellectual hierarchy among individuals, which then reinforces horizontal inequities among groups and also empowers some individuals to abuse others. Of course, all fields have some intellectual hierarchy, but it seems to me that economics is unusually winner-take-all in that someone who is really good at one aspect of economics is often also really good at other aspects of economics, so they can dominate other economists in a more general way than they might in other fields. In economics, people routinely think about rankings such as "X is our department's 3rd strongest job market candidate this year", whereas I think other fields may have less hierarchy because their people do different kinds of things. To the extent that all of economics is just one thing, people really can be ranked and we end up with more intellectual inequality. My point is that intellectual inequality might contribute to social exclusion and risk of abuse by empowering those at the top, and by frustrating everyone else -- including especially women and minorities, who are uniquely vulnerable, but also white male faculty who soldier on despite being unlikely ever to publish in top-5 journals or be invited to elite things. My impression is that, in economics, EVERYONE other than the top-ranked people are made to feel weak and excluded to some degree, so the remedy may be to do things that help everyone feel more included. In sum, I wholeheartedly agree that becoming more inclusive and welcoming for women and minorities is a top priority, because they face uniquely harmful kinds of barriers. I hope this survey will help reveal the extent and nature of those problems, and that inclusion for some means inclusion for all.”*

Many other concerns were raised about the profession and it is not possible to present them all here. But some of the other more commonly made points were:

- The profession does not handle mental health issues well, “Be more tolerant of mental health issues.”
- Although alluded to above, many women expressed the view that they are talked over or ignored when discussing research, “men interrupting and talking over women, restating what a woman just said and take credit for it, marginalize women’s comments.”
- Many raised concerns about lack of visibility of black economists “If I don’t see people who look like me in leadership positions/positions of seniority, I can’t expect to belong there.”
- Economists from outside the U.S., or for whom English is a second language, often feel looked down upon, “I personally experience discrimination very frequently because English is not my native language.” This is reflected in perceived attitudes towards research “Researchers from Europe are a priori not taken very seriously by their American colleagues.”
- Academia is rife with power differences that can create “toxic workplace culture and workplace harassment issues, particularly between junior-senior faculty, faculty-students...” These power issues were also seen to be reflected in the behavior of journal editors as well, “the amount of disdain coming from anyone who is an editor in a journal is astounding.”

These examples still do not provide a comprehensive description of issues raised, but they hopefully help illustrate the variety of problems raised.

It should be noted that many respondents (about 260) took the opportunity to provide suggestions for improving the profession. A common theme is that leadership positions within the profession (AEA, NBER, journal editors) need to be more reflective of the profession as a whole and less concentrated among economists at a small number of institutions. Some examples of comments include:

*“What is there, like 20,000 economists in the US--most of whom don't work at elite schools, and yet the leadership group of the AEA is consistently represented by those from the same six schools?”*

*“The ‘representation’ of actual economists among the AEA leadership is a joke and changing it would be a necessary precursor to any real movement in the field.”*

*“...Another thing I've found super odd, on this topic, is when there are elections for AEA officers, the information on the candidates is basically just publications. I want to know what the candidates want to do, not that they came from Harvard, work at Berkeley, and were lucky enough to get 3 AERs. I think this elitism hits students and junior faculty hardest.”*

Many saw the publishing system as rife with problems, and they have suggested a return to double-blind referee process. Some requested an anonymous way of reporting discrimination or harassment and some requested the AEA employ an ombudsman. The underrepresentation of women and minorities was described as a supply problem. One solution offered was to update the

introductory classes, and the undergraduate curriculum, so that it is more reflective of modern economics and covers topics that will be of interest to a diverse set of students. Some noted that the profession needs to place a greater value on mentoring, and that without the incentive to serve as an advisor or mentor busy economists will not do it. Perhaps the simplest solution advocated was for economists to hold their colleagues accountable for their behavior. For example, an inappropriate remark by a colleague should not be ignored but it should be made known that it is inappropriate. This might be more likely if, following another recommendation, graduate students and young faculty receive training on appropriate behavior.

About one-third of the respondents offering written feedback (about 350) did not identify specific incidences regarding the climate, but they did acknowledge the existence of some level of problem with the profession with regard to diversity and inclusion. For example, one response stated “Women and people are still underrepresented” and another said “We need to do much better.”

A smaller number (about 180) did not believe that the profession has a climate problem (“The climate is good”), voiced some opposition to efforts to increase diversity and inclusion because of potential negative consequences (“White and Asian men are routinely discriminated against”), or had the belief that the focus should be on equality of opportunity.

## **5. Comparisons to Other Professional Associations**

We identified a set of climate surveys that were performed by other professional associations and enabled us to perform some (very limited) comparison of the climate in economics compared to the climate in these other professions. Because of differences in the wording of the questions, differences in survey methodology, sampling and response rates, and different “look-back” periods, the comparisons below must be interpreted with great caution.

With this important caveat in mind, a few take-aways emerge from the statistics below:

- Professional engineers are less likely to feel their ideas are respected than economists;
- Professional engineers experience higher rates of discrimination with regard to pay equality, promotion decisions, and professional assignments
- Linguistics has much lower rates of individuals avoiding social events after class, at work, or at conferences due to climate concerns
- Among men and women, astronomy has lower levels of individuals avoiding professional events such as not attending conferences or making professional visits, due to climate concerns
- Anthropology has somewhat lower levels of sexual teasing/remarks/looks/gestures. Among women, anthropology also has lower reported pressure for dates, pressure for sexual favors, and attempted/actual rapes and assault
- Many more economists have felt socially excluded at an event in the last 10 years than political scientists or historians have felt condescended to at annual meetings in 2013-2016.



## **Society of Women Engineers (SWE)<sup>12</sup>**

Note: the SWE survey used a 6-point Likert scale. To determine the “percent agreement,” SWE combined strongly agree, agree, and somewhat agree into the “agree” category. For the sake of comparison, we changed this number to percent disagree.

SWE: "I have been given the advancement opportunities and promotions I deserve."  
Percent disagree: Women: 38%, POC: 47%

AEA: “Have you personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment with regard to: Promotion decision”  
In academia: Women: 27%, Non-white: 22%  
Outside of academia: Women: 31%, Non-white: 27%

SWE: "My pay is comparable to my colleagues’ with similar qualifications and experience."  
Percent disagree: Women: 38%, POC: 43%

AEA: “Have you personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment with regard to: Compensation”  
In academia: Women: 37%, Non-white: 26%  
Outside of academia: Women: 32%, Non-White: 26%

SWE: "Having children did not change my colleagues’ perceptions of my work commitment or competence.”  
Percent disagree: Men: 20%, Women: 45%

AEA: “Have you ever been discriminated against, or treated unfairly based on: Marital status / caregiving responsibilities”  
Men: 4%, Women: 22%

SWE: "I have had the same access to desirable assignments as my colleagues.”  
Percent disagree: Women: 35%, POC: 45%

AEA: “Have you personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment with regard to: teaching assignments”  
Women: 28%, Non-white: 20%

SWE: “My suggestions or ideas are respected as much as my colleagues”  
Percent disagree: Women: 28%, POC: 33%  
AEA: “My ideas and opinions are often ignored within the field of economics”

---

<sup>12</sup><https://research.swe.org/climate-control/>

Women: 23%, Non-White: 24%

### **American Anthropological Association (AAA) 2016 Membership Survey<sup>13</sup>**

Note: AAA uses “current institutional context,” AEA asks about last 10 years,

AAA: “Experienced these behaviors in their `current institutional context:”

“Sexual teasing, jokes, remarks”

Overall 26%

Men: 15%, Women: 31%

“Sexual looks, gestures”

Overall 16%

Men: 8%, Women: 20%

AEA: “Another economist or economics student displayed, used, or distributed inappropriate sexual or suggestive materials; made offensive sexual remarks, either directed at you or overheard, including jokes or sexual stories; made remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities that made you uncomfortable; or made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you”

Overall 22%

Men: 13%, Women: 42%

AAA: “Experienced pressure for dates in your “current institutional context”

Overall: 5%

Men: 3%, Women: 7%

AEA: “Another economist or economics student made unwanted attempts to establish a dating, romantic, or sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it”

Overall: 9%

Men: 3%, Women: 22%

AAA: “Experienced actual/attempted rape, assault”

Overall: 1%

Men: 0.4%, Women: 1.4%

AEA: “Another economist or economics student attempted to fondle, kiss, or rub up against the private areas of your body; attempted to remove some of your clothes without your consent; attempted to put their penis, fingers, or other objects into your vagina and/or butt without your consent; and/or attempted to have oral sex with you without your consent”

Overall: 2%

---

<sup>13</sup>[http://s3.amazonaws.com/rdcms-aaa/files/production/public/FileDownloads/pdfs/MemberSurvey2016\\_Report5.pdf](http://s3.amazonaws.com/rdcms-aaa/files/production/public/FileDownloads/pdfs/MemberSurvey2016_Report5.pdf)

Men: 0%, Women: 6%

AEA: “Another economist or economics student fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of your body; removed some of your clothes without your consent; put their penis, fingers, or other objects into your vagina and/or butt without your consent; and/or attempted to have oral sex with you without your consent”

Overall: 1%

Men: 0%, Women: 2%

AAA: “Experienced (1) stalking, (2) letters, emails, calls, sexual materials”

Stalking

Overall: 5%

Men: 4%, Women: 5%

Letters, emails, calls, sexual materials

Overall: 6%

Men: 6%, Women: 6%

AEA: “Another economist or economics student watched or followed you from a distance; repeatedly waited for you outside of your workplace, classroom, meeting room when you didn’t want them to; spied on you; made unwanted phone calls to you or left you unwanted messages, emails or other electronic transmissions including via social media, or sent cards, letters, flowers, or presents when they knew you didn’t want them to”

Overall: 5%

Men: 2%, Women: 10%

AAA: “Experienced pressure for sexual favors”

Overall: 1.5%

Men: 1%, Women: 2%

AEA: “Another economist or economics student made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being romantically or sexually cooperative or implied you’d be treated better if you were sexually cooperative”

Overall: 3%

Men: 1%, Women: 7%

### **American Astronomical Association (AAS)<sup>14</sup>**

Note: 70% of the sample is female; 22% of sample is graduate students, 3% undergrads. AAS asked about skipping events in current position (and separately about previous position), and does not specify a time span vs. AEA’s past 10 years

---

<sup>14</sup> <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/2017JE005256>

AAS: “In your current position, how many classes/meetings/conferences/field work/opportunities/etc. have you skipped per month because of feeling unsafe?”

Proportion that have skipped at least once per month

Overall: 11%

Men: 3%, Women: 13%

AEA: “Not participated in a conference to avoid possible harassment, discrimination, or unfair or disrespectful treatment”

Overall: 14%

Men: 11%, Women: 20%

AEA: “Not spoken at a conference or during a seminar presentation to avoid possible harassment, discrimination, or unfair or disrespectful treatment”

Overall: 27%

Men: 18%, Women: 46%

AEA: “Not made a professional visit to a particular place to avoid possible harassment, discrimination, or unfair or disrespectful treatment”

Overall: 10%

Men: 8%, Women: 16%

### **Linguistic Association of America (LSA)<sup>15</sup>**

LSA: “Have you avoided [\_\_\_] due to climate concerns.”

“Social events in your department”

Overall: 14.5%

“Conference/workshop dinner”

Overall: 6.7%

“Other social events at a conference/workshop”

Overall: 7.5%

AEA: “Have you ever done any of the following to avoid possible harassment, discrimination, or unfair or disrespectful treatment: Not attended social events after class, at work, or at conferences”

Overall: 25%

Men: 18%, Women: 43%

### **American Political Science/Historical Associations (APSA<sup>16</sup>/AHA<sup>17</sup>)**

---

<sup>15</sup> <https://sites.google.com/umich.edu/lingclimatesurvey/>

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.apsanet.org/Portals/54/journals/APSA%20EthicsCommitteeSexual%20Harassment%20Report%20Final.pdf?ver=2018-01-04-132931-660>

<sup>17</sup> <https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/october-2018/results-of-the-2018-aha-survey-on-sexual-harassment>

APSA/AHA: “At any APSA Annual Meeting you have attended in the past four years (2013-2016), has anyone attending the meeting ever done the following to you personally: Put you down or was condescending to you?”

APSA

31.7% of all respondents said yes

42% of women and 22% of men said yes

AHA

28% of all respondents said yes

AEA: “Thinking about your last 10 years in the field of economics, have you ever experienced any of the following - Felt socially excluded at a meeting or event in the field”

47% of all respondents said yes

66% of women and 40% of men said yes

---

Table 1: Survey Respondents' Characteristics

	N	Mean
Female	10,305	0.30
White	10,247	0.79
Black	10,247	0.03
Asian	10,247	0.15
Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin	10,299	0.10
LGBT	10,332	0.06
Transgender	10,128	0.00
With some disability	10,258	0.10
US resident	10,313	0.64
Student	10,264	0.06
Among employed, employer is:		
College or University	9,031	0.75
For-profit organization	9,031	0.07
Not-for-profit organization	9,031	0.05
US federal government	9,031	0.05
Age	9,974	47.32
Married	10,246	0.80
Liberal on economic issues	10,251	0.43
Liberal on social issues	10,256	0.73
Agnostic	10,109	0.24
Atheist	10,109	0.21
Christian	10,109	0.36
Jewish	10,109	0.07
Muslim	10,109	0.03
Buddhist	10,109	0.03
Among women:		
Married	3,042	0.75
With dependents	3,053	0.49
Among employed, employer is a college or university	2,706	0.78

Figure 1: Number of Survey Responses Over Time




Figure 2: Distribution of Overall Climate Indicator (1=most positive; 6=most negative)






Figure 3: Mean Overall Climate Indicator By Survey Response Day (Restricted to Days with 50+ Responses)




Figure 4: Mean Response to "I am Satisfied with the Overall Climate at My Institution/Place of Employment" By Survey Response Day  
(Restricted to Days with 50+ Responses)





Figure 5

Panel A: Mean of "Experienced Attempted Assault" by Survey Response Day  
(Restricted to Days with 50+ Responses)



Panel B: Mean of "Experienced Assault" by Survey Response Day  
(Restricted to Days with 50+ Responses)




Table 2: General Climate

Sample:	All	Male	Female	White	Non-White	No disability	With disability	LGBT	Non LGBT
I am satisfied with the overall climate within the field of economics	0.34	0.40	0.20	0.34	0.34	0.35	0.26	0.26	0.34
I am satisfied with the overall climate at my institution/place of employment	0.56	0.61	0.46	0.58	0.50	0.58	0.45	0.52	0.57
I feel valued within the field of economics	0.40	0.46	0.25	0.41	0.36	0.41	0.30	0.34	0.40
I feel valued at my institution/place of employment	0.63	0.67	0.54	0.65	0.55	0.64	0.52	0.58	0.63
I always feel included socially within the field of economics	0.37	0.43	0.21	0.38	0.32	0.38	0.29	0.28	0.37
I always feel included socially at my institution/place of employment	0.63	0.67	0.52	0.64	0.56	0.64	0.52	0.53	0.63
I always feel included intellectually within the field of economics	0.42	0.48	0.27	0.42	0.40	0.43	0.35	0.35	0.42
I always feel included intellectually at my institution/place of employment	0.64	0.69	0.53	0.66	0.59	0.65	0.53	0.58	0.65
I feel I have been discriminated against within the field of economics	0.18	0.13	0.30	0.16	0.25	0.17	0.25	0.27	0.18
I feel I have been discriminated against at my institution/place of employment	0.12	0.09	0.20	0.11	0.16	0.12	0.17	0.16	0.12
The work that I do is valued within the field of economics	0.40	0.43	0.33	0.40	0.41	0.41	0.33	0.35	0.40
The work that I do is valued at my institution/place of employment	0.63	0.65	0.56	0.64	0.58	0.64	0.53	0.58	0.63
I think I have a great deal of power within the field of economics	0.07	0.08	0.05	0.06	0.11	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.07
I think I have a great deal of power at my institution/place of employment	0.24	0.25	0.20	0.24	0.22	0.25	0.18	0.19	0.24
My ideas and opinions are often ignored within the field of economics	0.21	0.20	0.23	0.20	0.24	0.20	0.29	0.28	0.20
My ideas and opinions are often ignored at my institution/place of employment	0.13	0.12	0.14	0.12	0.15	0.12	0.19	0.13	0.13

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that agree or strongly agree with each statement.

Table 2A: General Climate - Female Respondents Only

Sample:	Married?		Dependents?		Employer is college or university?	
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
I am satisfied with the overall climate within the field of economics	0.19	0.21	0.20	0.21	0.21	0.20
I am satisfied with the overall climate at my institution/place of employment	0.44	0.47	0.46	0.46	0.54	0.45
I feel valued within the field of economics	0.24	0.25	0.25	0.24	0.25	0.25
I feel valued at my institution/place of employment	0.48	0.56	0.54	0.54	0.64	0.53
I always feel included socially within the field of economics	0.23	0.21	0.21	0.22	0.23	0.21
I always feel included socially at my institution/place of employment	0.48	0.54	0.53	0.53	0.58	0.53
I always feel included intellectually within the field of economics	0.27	0.28	0.27	0.28	0.27	0.28
I always feel included intellectually at my institution/place of employment	0.49	0.55	0.53	0.53	0.62	0.52
I feel I have been discriminated against within the field of economics	0.32	0.30	0.31	0.29	0.27	0.32
I feel I have been discriminated against at my institution/place of employment	0.23	0.19	0.20	0.20	0.18	0.20
The work that I do is valued within the field of economics	0.33	0.33	0.32	0.34	0.29	0.34
The work that I do is valued at my institution/place of employment	0.52	0.58	0.56	0.57	0.70	0.54
I think I have a great deal of power within the field of economics	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.04
I think I have a great deal of power at my institution/place of employment	0.15	0.22	0.18	0.22	0.30	0.19
My ideas and opinions are often ignored within the field of economics	0.24	0.23	0.25	0.22	0.23	0.23
My ideas and opinions are often ignored at my institution/place of employment	0.16	0.13	0.15	0.12	0.10	0.14

The sample is restricted to female respondents. Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that agree or strongly agree with each statement.

Table 2B: General Climate - Racial and Ethnic Breakdown

Sample:	Non-Black	Black	Non-Asian	Asian	Non-Latinx	Latinx
I am satisfied with the overall climate within the field of economics	0.34	0.36	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.31
I am satisfied with the overall climate at my institution/place of employment	0.57	0.50	0.57	0.50	0.57	0.54
I feel valued within the field of economics	0.40	0.39	0.40	0.36	0.40	0.35
I feel valued at my institution/place of employment	0.63	0.59	0.65	0.55	0.63	0.60
I always feel included socially within the field of economics	0.37	0.35	0.37	0.32	0.36	0.38
I always feel included socially at my institution/place of employment	0.63	0.57	0.64	0.56	0.63	0.61
I always feel included intellectually within the field of economics	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.41	0.42	0.40
I always feel included intellectually at my institution/place of employment	0.64	0.61	0.65	0.58	0.64	0.62
I feel I have been discriminated against within the field of economics	0.18	0.33	0.17	0.23	0.18	0.22
I feel I have been discriminated against at my institution/place of employment	0.12	0.19	0.12	0.14	0.12	0.14
The work that I do is valued within the field of economics	0.40	0.48	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40
The work that I do is valued at my institution/place of employment	0.63	0.62	0.64	0.57	0.63	0.61
I think I have a great deal of power within the field of economics	0.07	0.19	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.10
I think I have a great deal of power at my institution/place of employment	0.24	0.28	0.25	0.19	0.24	0.23
My ideas and opinions are often ignored within the field of economics	0.21	0.23	0.21	0.22	0.21	0.23
My ideas and opinions are often ignored at my institution/place of employment	0.13	0.15	0.12	0.14	0.13	0.13

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that agree or strongly agree with each statement.

Table 2C: General Climate - By Employer Type, Age and Ideology

Sample:	Employer is college or university?		Age		Economically:		Socially:	
	No	Yes	Less than 44	44 or more	conservative	liberal	conservative	liberal
I am satisfied with the overall climate within the field of economics	0.35	0.33	0.27	0.41	0.39	0.27	0.45	0.30
I am satisfied with the overall climate at my institution/place of employment	0.63	0.55	0.56	0.57	0.58	0.54	0.58	0.56
I feel valued within the field of economics	0.38	0.40	0.31	0.49	0.41	0.37	0.44	0.38
I feel valued at my institution/place of employment	0.70	0.63	0.61	0.66	0.64	0.62	0.61	0.64
I always feel included socially within the field of economics	0.36	0.36	0.32	0.42	0.39	0.34	0.41	0.35
I always feel included socially at my institution/place of employment	0.67	0.63	0.62	0.64	0.63	0.62	0.60	0.64
I always feel included intellectually within the field of economics	0.40	0.42	0.37	0.47	0.43	0.40	0.47	0.40
I always feel included intellectually at my institution/place of employment	0.70	0.64	0.63	0.66	0.64	0.64	0.62	0.65
I feel I have been discriminated against within the field of economics	0.16	0.19	0.21	0.15	0.17	0.20	0.18	0.18
I feel I have been discriminated against at my institution/place of employment	0.10	0.12	0.10	0.13	0.12	0.12	0.14	0.11
The work that I do is valued within the field of economics	0.36	0.41	0.35	0.45	0.41	0.39	0.44	0.39
The work that I do is valued at my institution/place of employment	0.73	0.61	0.62	0.64	0.63	0.63	0.60	0.64
I think I have a great deal of power within the field of economics	0.09	0.06	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.10	0.06
I think I have a great deal of power at my institution/place of employment	0.33	0.22	0.17	0.32	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24
My ideas and opinions are often ignored within the field of economics	0.20	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.20	0.23	0.21	0.21
My ideas and opinions are often ignored at my institution/place of employment	0.10	0.13	0.11	0.14	0.13	0.12	0.15	0.11

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that agree or strongly agree with each statement.

Table 2D: General Climate - By Religion

Sample:	Agnostic	Atheist	Christian	Jewish	Muslim	Buddhist	Other Religion
I am satisfied with the overall climate within the field of economics	0.28	0.32	0.39	0.33	0.40	0.34	0.33
I am satisfied with the overall climate at my institution/place of employment	0.56	0.58	0.59	0.59	0.54	0.43	0.50
I feel valued within the field of economics	0.36	0.40	0.42	0.46	0.42	0.35	0.36
I feel valued at my institution/place of employment	0.63	0.66	0.64	0.70	0.57	0.52	0.54
I always feel included socially within the field of economics	0.33	0.38	0.39	0.39	0.36	0.34	0.32
I always feel included socially at my institution/place of employment	0.61	0.65	0.64	0.64	0.59	0.53	0.56
I always feel included intellectually within the field of economics	0.38	0.43	0.44	0.43	0.45	0.43	0.38
I always feel included intellectually at my institution/place of employment	0.64	0.66	0.64	0.69	0.64	0.56	0.58
I feel I have been discriminated against within the field of economics	0.18	0.17	0.17	0.15	0.28	0.21	0.22
I feel I have been discriminated against at my institution/place of employment	0.12	0.09	0.13	0.10	0.17	0.13	0.16
The work that I do is valued within the field of economics	0.37	0.39	0.43	0.42	0.54	0.35	0.38
The work that I do is valued at my institution/place of employment	0.62	0.65	0.63	0.68	0.62	0.52	0.58
I think I have a great deal of power within the field of economics	0.05	0.05	0.09	0.09	0.16	0.07	0.08
I think I have a great deal of power at my institution/place of employment	0.22	0.22	0.26	0.28	0.29	0.17	0.21
My ideas and opinions are often ignored within the field of economics	0.21	0.21	0.19	0.20	0.21	0.24	0.25
My ideas and opinions are often ignored at my institution/place of employment	0.12	0.12	0.14	0.10	0.15	0.13	0.14

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that agree or strongly agree with each statement.



Table 3: Directly Experienced of Discrimination - By Type of Discrimination

Sample:	All	Male	Female	White	Non-White	No disability	With disability	LGBT	Non LGBT
Have you ever been discriminated against, or treated unfairly based on:									
Racial/ethnic identity	0.09	0.08	0.12	0.04	0.29	0.09	0.12	0.11	0.09
Sex	0.17	0.04	0.48	0.17	0.17	0.16	0.23	0.23	0.16
Sexual orientation	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.18	0.01
Disability status	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.14	0.05	0.02
Marital status / caregiving responsibilities	0.09	0.04	0.22	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.13	0.11	0.09
Religion	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.07	0.04	0.08	0.05	0.05
Political views	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.14	0.12	0.09
Age	0.09	0.06	0.16	0.08	0.12	0.08	0.16	0.09	0.09
Citizenship status	0.06	0.06	0.09	0.04	0.16	0.06	0.08	0.09	0.06
Place of employment	0.15	0.13	0.22	0.14	0.20	0.15	0.20	0.18	0.15
Research topics	0.16	0.13	0.23	0.15	0.20	0.15	0.23	0.24	0.16
Other factors	0.09	0.07	0.13	0.07	0.14	0.08	0.14	0.13	0.09

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having personally experienced these different types of discrimination or unfair treatment over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 3A: Witnessed Discrimination - By Type of Discrimination

Sample:	All	Male	Female	White	Non-White	No disability	With disability	LGBT	Non LGBT
Have you ever witnessed discrimination or unfair treatment based on:									
Racial/ethnic identity	0.23	0.19	0.33	0.22	0.28	0.23	0.29	0.35	0.23
Sex	0.37	0.33	0.44	0.38	0.30	0.36	0.40	0.46	0.36
Gender identity	0.09	0.08	0.12	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.11	0.19	0.08
Sexual orientation	0.09	0.08	0.13	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.13	0.24	0.09
Disability status	0.06	0.05	0.10	0.06	0.08	0.05	0.14	0.11	0.06
Marital status / caregiving responsibilities	0.18	0.13	0.31	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.23	0.22	0.18
Religion	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.12	0.09	0.12	0.13	0.09
Political views	0.23	0.22	0.22	0.23	0.22	0.22	0.26	0.29	0.22
Age	0.17	0.15	0.22	0.17	0.16	0.17	0.18	0.19	0.17
Citizenship status	0.15	0.13	0.19	0.14	0.20	0.14	0.20	0.21	0.15
Place of employment	0.19	0.17	0.24	0.19	0.20	0.19	0.23	0.26	0.19
Research topics	0.23	0.22	0.27	0.24	0.21	0.23	0.29	0.28	0.23
Other factors	0.09	0.09	0.11	0.09	0.12	0.09	0.13	0.14	0.09

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that have witnessed different types of discrimination or unfair treatment over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 4: Experiences of Discrimination and Unfair Treatment While Student

Sample:	All	Male	Female	White	Non-White	No disability	With disability	LGBT	Non LGBT
During your time as a student studying economics, have you personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment with regard to:									
Access to research assistantships	0.10	0.07	0.18	0.08	0.18	0.10	0.15	0.15	0.10
Access to advisors	0.10	0.06	0.20	0.08	0.17	0.10	0.15	0.15	0.10
Access to quality advising	0.12	0.07	0.23	0.10	0.19	0.11	0.18	0.17	0.11
Job market	0.21	0.15	0.36	0.18	0.31	0.20	0.30	0.28	0.20

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having personally experienced these treatments during their time studying economics.

Table 5: Experiences of Discrimination in Academia

Sample:	All	Male	Female	White	Non-White	No disability	With disability	LGBT	Non LGBT
Have you personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment with regard to:									
Promotion decisions	0.16	0.11	0.27	0.15	0.22	0.16	0.22	0.21	0.16
Compensation	0.20	0.12	0.37	0.18	0.26	0.19	0.24	0.22	0.20
Teaching assignments	0.15	0.09	0.28	0.14	0.21	0.15	0.20	0.18	0.15
Service obligations	0.19	0.09	0.43	0.18	0.24	0.19	0.25	0.24	0.19
Access to time and funding to attend conferences and seminars	0.10	0.07	0.16	0.09	0.16	0.10	0.14	0.15	0.10
Access to graduate student researchers	0.08	0.05	0.15	0.07	0.13	0.08	0.13	0.10	0.08
Course evaluations	0.20	0.08	0.47	0.19	0.27	0.19	0.30	0.28	0.20
Publishing decisions	0.22	0.18	0.31	0.20	0.29	0.22	0.27	0.23	0.22
Funding decisions	0.14	0.12	0.20	0.13	0.20	0.13	0.22	0.17	0.14
Sabbatical time	0.05	0.04	0.09	0.04	0.08	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.05
Access to potential coauthors	0.11	0.06	0.21	0.09	0.16	0.10	0.16	0.14	0.10
Invitations to participate in research conferences, associations and networks	0.19	0.14	0.32	0.17	0.27	0.19	0.26	0.22	0.19

The sample is restricted to individuals that report being employed as a faculty member. Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment in these aspects of work over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 5A: Experiences of Discrimination in Academia - Female Respondents Only

Sample:	Married?		Dependents?	
	No	Yes	No	Yes
Have you personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment with regard to:				
Promotion decisions	0.29	0.27	0.23	0.30
Compensation	0.37	0.36	0.32	0.40
Teaching assignments	0.33	0.27	0.27	0.29
Service obligations	0.43	0.42	0.39	0.45
Access to time and funding to attend conferences and seminars	0.22	0.14	0.14	0.17
Access to graduate student researchers	0.17	0.14	0.14	0.16
Course evaluations	0.48	0.46	0.45	0.48
Publishing decisions	0.31	0.31	0.29	0.32
Funding decisions	0.25	0.18	0.18	0.21
Sabbatical time	0.13	0.08	0.07	0.10
Access to potential coauthors	0.25	0.20	0.21	0.21
Invitations to participate in research conferences, associations and networks	0.31	0.32	0.30	0.34

The sample is restricted to women that report being employed as a faculty member. Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment in these aspects of work over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 5B: Experiences of Discrimination in Academia - Racial and Ethnic Breakdown

Sample:	Non-Black	Black	Non-Asian	Asian	Non-Latinx	Latinx
Have you personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment with regard to:						
Promotion decisions	0.16	0.26	0.16	0.19	0.15	0.24
Compensation	0.19	0.32	0.19	0.23	0.19	0.24
Teaching assignments	0.15	0.23	0.15	0.18	0.15	0.21
Service obligations	0.19	0.25	0.19	0.22	0.19	0.24
Access to time and funding to attend conferences and seminars	0.10	0.19	0.10	0.13	0.09	0.17
Access to graduate student researchers	0.08	0.16	0.08	0.11	0.08	0.13
Course evaluations	0.20	0.32	0.19	0.26	0.20	0.23
Publishing decisions	0.22	0.34	0.22	0.25	0.21	0.29
Funding decisions	0.14	0.23	0.13	0.17	0.13	0.21
Sabbatical time	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.07
Access to potential coauthors	0.10	0.18	0.10	0.14	0.10	0.16
Invitations to participate in research conferences, associations and networks	0.19	0.32	0.19	0.24	0.19	0.26

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment in these aspects of work over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 5C: Experiences of Discrimination in Academia - By Age and Ideology

Sample:	Age		Economically:		Socially:	
	Less than 44	44 or more	conservative	liberal	conservative	liberal
Have you personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment with regard to:						
Promotion decisions	0.15	0.18	0.15	0.18	0.19	0.15
Compensation	0.18	0.21	0.19	0.21	0.20	0.19
Teaching assignments	0.16	0.14	0.14	0.17	0.17	0.15
Service obligations	0.20	0.18	0.19	0.20	0.19	0.20
Access to time and funding to attend conferences and seminars	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.11	0.14	0.09
Access to graduate student researchers	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.08
Course evaluations	0.24	0.16	0.19	0.22	0.18	0.21
Publishing decisions	0.26	0.18	0.20	0.24	0.23	0.22
Funding decisions	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.16	0.16	0.13
Sabbatical time	0.04	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.04
Access to potential coauthors	0.14	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.10	0.11
Invitations to participate in research conferences, associations and networks	0.23	0.16	0.18	0.21	0.20	0.19

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment in these aspects of work over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 5D: Experiences of Discrimination in Academia - By Religion

Sample:	Agnostic	Atheist	Christian	Jewish	Muslim	Buddhist	Other Religion
Have you personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment with regard to:							
Promotion decisions	0.15	0.13	0.18	0.14	0.27	0.19	0.22
Compensation	0.18	0.16	0.21	0.17	0.29	0.16	0.23
Teaching assignments	0.15	0.13	0.17	0.09	0.26	0.15	0.20
Service obligations	0.21	0.16	0.21	0.15	0.25	0.18	0.21
Access to time and funding to attend conferences and seminars	0.08	0.07	0.12	0.04	0.21	0.10	0.16
Access to graduate student researchers	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.04	0.17	0.07	0.13
Course evaluations	0.21	0.16	0.21	0.18	0.31	0.21	0.24
Publishing decisions	0.24	0.21	0.20	0.15	0.37	0.18	0.27
Funding decisions	0.13	0.12	0.15	0.07	0.27	0.10	0.17
Sabbatical time	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.10	0.08	0.08
Access to potential coauthors	0.10	0.09	0.11	0.05	0.27	0.06	0.15
Invitations to participate in research conferences, associations and networks	0.20	0.17	0.20	0.15	0.32	0.13	0.25

The sample is restricted to individuals that report being employed as a faculty member. Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment in these aspects of work over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).



Table 6: Experiences of Discrimination Outside of Academia

Sample:	All	Male	Female	White	Non-White	No disability	With disability	LGBT	Non LGBT
Have you personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment with regard to:									
Promotion decisions	0.18	0.14	0.31	0.16	0.27	0.18	0.26	0.20	0.18
Compensation	0.17	0.11	0.32	0.14	0.25	0.16	0.25	0.18	0.16
Professional development opportunities	0.17	0.12	0.29	0.15	0.24	0.16	0.27	0.21	0.17
Publishing decisions	0.18	0.15	0.24	0.16	0.23	0.17	0.22	0.23	0.17

The sample is restricted to individuals that report not being employed as a faculty member. Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment in these aspects of work over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

|

Table 6A: Experiences of Discrimination Outside of Academia - Female Respondents Only

Sample:	Married?		Dependents?	
	No	Yes	No	Yes
Have you personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment with regard to:				
Promotion decisions	0.37	0.29	0.27	0.36
Compensation	0.38	0.28	0.28	0.34
Professional development opportunities	0.31	0.29	0.25	0.33
Publishing decisions	0.24	0.24	0.21	0.27

The sample is restricted to women that report not being employed as a faculty member. Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment in these aspects of work over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 6B: Experiences of Discrimination Outside of Academia - Ethnic and Racial Breakdown

Sample:	Non-Black	Black	Non-Asian	Asian	Non-Latinx	Latinx
Have you personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment with regard to:						
Promotion decisions	0.18	0.33	0.17	0.26	0.18	0.23
Compensation	0.16	0.33	0.16	0.24	0.16	0.19
Professional development opportunities	0.17	0.23	0.16	0.25	0.16	0.23
Publishing decisions	0.17	0.25	0.17	0.23	0.17	0.26

The sample is restricted to individuals that report not being employed as a faculty member. Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment in these aspects of work over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 6C: Experiences of Discrimination Outside of Academia - By Age and Ideology

Sample:	Age		Economically:		Socially:	
	Less than 44	44 or more	conservative	liberal	conservative	liberal
Have you personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment with regard to:						
Promotion decisions	0.16	0.20	0.17	0.20	0.20	0.18
Compensation	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.18	0.16	0.17
Professional development opportunities	0.19	0.14	0.15	0.20	0.16	0.17
Publishing decisions	0.21	0.15	0.17	0.19	0.16	0.18

The sample is restricted to individuals that report not being employed as a faculty member. Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment in these aspects of work over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 6D: Experiences of Discrimination Outside of Academia - By Religion

Sample:	Agnostic	Atheist	Christian	Jewish	Muslim	Buddhist	Other Religion
Have you personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment with regard to:							
Promotion decisions	0.18	0.16	0.20	0.15	0.26	0.27	0.21
Compensation	0.16	0.15	0.16	0.14	0.27	0.21	0.21
Professional development opportunities	0.16	0.15	0.16	0.13	0.25	0.26	0.21
Publishing decisions	0.18	0.16	0.18	0.14	0.26	0.13	0.20

The sample is restricted to individuals that report not being employed as a faculty member. Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment in these aspects of work over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 7: Actions Taken To Avoid Possible Harrassment, Discrimination, or Unfair or Disrespectful Treatment

Sample:	All	Male	Female	White	Non-White	No disability	With disability	LGBT	Non LGBT
Have you ever done any of the following to avoid possible harassment, discrimination, or unfair or disrespectful treatment:									
Not applied for or accepted admission at a particular grad school	0.07	0.05	0.10	0.05	0.13	0.06	0.14	0.16	0.06
Paused or ceased enrollment at a particular grad school	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.06	0.02	0.05	0.04	0.02
Not applied for or taken a particular employment position	0.16	0.12	0.24	0.14	0.23	0.15	0.24	0.34	0.15
Not applied for or taken a promotion at your place of employment	0.07	0.05	0.12	0.06	0.12	0.07	0.10	0.10	0.07
Left a particular employment position	0.10	0.08	0.15	0.09	0.15	0.10	0.15	0.15	0.10
Not presented your question, idea, or view at your school or place of work	0.31	0.24	0.47	0.30	0.36	0.30	0.45	0.44	0.31
Not participated in a conference	0.14	0.11	0.21	0.13	0.20	0.13	0.23	0.20	0.14
Not spoken at a conference or during a seminar presentation	0.27	0.19	0.46	0.26	0.30	0.26	0.36	0.38	0.26
Not made a professional visit to a particular place	0.11	0.08	0.16	0.09	0.17	0.10	0.16	0.18	0.10
Not attended social events after class, at work, or at conferences	0.25	0.18	0.43	0.23	0.34	0.24	0.39	0.38	0.24
Changed the topic, content, or method of a class you teach	0.14	0.12	0.20	0.13	0.19	0.14	0.21	0.16	0.14
Changed the content, method, or conclusions of a research paper	0.09	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.13	0.08	0.14	0.14	0.08
Not started or continued research in a particular field	0.17	0.14	0.25	0.16	0.22	0.16	0.27	0.27	0.17

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having taken the listed action over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 7A: Actions Taken To Avoid Possible Harrassment, Discrimination, or Unfair or Disrespectful Treatment - Female Respondents Only

Sample:	Married?		Dependents?	
	No	Yes	No	Yes
Have you ever done any of the following to avoid possible harassment, discrimination, or unfair or disrespectful treatment:				
Not applied for or accepted admission at a particular grad school	0.14	0.09	0.11	0.09
Paused or ceased enrollment at a particular grad school	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.03
Not applied for or taken a particular employment position	0.28	0.22	0.23	0.23
Not applied for or taken a promotion at your place of employment	0.13	0.11	0.09	0.14
Left a particular employment position	0.21	0.13	0.15	0.15
Not presented your question, idea, or view at your school or place of work	0.51	0.46	0.47	0.47
Not participated in a conference	0.21	0.20	0.18	0.23
Not spoken at a conference or during a seminar presentation	0.45	0.45	0.44	0.47
Not made a professional visit to a particular place	0.17	0.16	0.14	0.18
Not attended social events after class, at work, or at conferences	0.44	0.42	0.41	0.44
Changed the topic, content, or method of a class you teach	0.21	0.19	0.18	0.21
Changed the content, method, or conclusions of a research paper	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.10
Not started or continued research in a particular field	0.28	0.24	0.24	0.25

The sample is restricted to female respondents. Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having taken the listed action over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 7B: Actions Taken To Avoid Possible Harrassment, Discrimination, or Unfair or Disrespectful Treatment - Ethnic and Racial Breakdown

Sample:	Non-Black	Black	Non-Asian	Asian	Non-Latinx	Latinx
Have you ever done any of the following to avoid possible harassment, discrimination, or unfair or disrespectful treatment:						
Not applied for or accepted admission at a particular grad school	0.06	0.21	0.06	0.10	0.06	0.11
Paused or ceased enrollment at a particular grad school	0.02	0.10	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.05
Not applied for or taken a particular employment position	0.15	0.32	0.15	0.20	0.15	0.19
Not applied for or taken a promotion at your place of employment	0.07	0.15	0.07	0.11	0.07	0.10
Left a particular employment position	0.10	0.19	0.10	0.13	0.10	0.13
Not presented your question, idea, or view at your school or place of work	0.31	0.40	0.31	0.34	0.31	0.37
Not participated in a conference	0.14	0.27	0.14	0.16	0.14	0.19
Not spoken at a conference or during a seminar presentation	0.26	0.33	0.26	0.28	0.26	0.32
Not made a professional visit to a particular place	0.10	0.24	0.10	0.15	0.10	0.14
Not attended social events after class, at work, or at conferences	0.25	0.41	0.24	0.30	0.25	0.28
Changed the topic, content, or method of a class you teach	0.14	0.21	0.14	0.16	0.14	0.18
Changed the content, method, or conclusions of a research paper	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.12	0.08	0.13
Not started or continued research in a particular field	0.17	0.29	0.17	0.19	0.17	0.21

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having taken the listed action over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).



Table 7C: Actions Taken To Avoid Possible Harrassment, Discrimination, or Unfair or Disrespectful Treatment - By Age and Ideology

Sample:	Age		Economically:		Socially:	
	Less than 44	44 or more	conservative	liberal	conservative	liberal
Have you ever done any of the following to avoid possible harassment, discrimination, or unfair or disrespectful treatment:						
Not applied for or accepted admission at a particular grad school	0.10	0.03	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.07
Paused or ceased enrollment at a particular grad school	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.02
Not applied for or taken a particular employment position	0.19	0.12	0.15	0.16	0.16	0.16
Not applied for or taken a promotion at your place of employment	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.06
Left a particular employment position	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.10
Not presented your question, idea, or view at your school or place of work	0.36	0.26	0.31	0.31	0.33	0.31
Not participated in a conference	0.15	0.13	0.14	0.15	0.16	0.13
Not spoken at a conference or during a seminar presentation	0.31	0.21	0.25	0.29	0.24	0.28
Not made a professional visit to a particular place	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.10
Not attended social events after class, at work, or at conferences	0.28	0.22	0.25	0.26	0.24	0.26
Changed the topic, content, or method of a class you teach	0.15	0.13	0.15	0.14	0.16	0.14
Changed the content, method, or conclusions of a research paper	0.11	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.08
Not started or continued research in a particular field	0.21	0.14	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.17

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having taken the listed action over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 7D: Actions Taken To Avoid Possible Harrassment, Discrimination, or Unfair or Disrespectful Treatment

Sample:	Agnostic	Atheist	Christian	Jewish	Muslim	Buddhist	Other Religion
Have you ever done any of the following to avoid possible harassment, discrimination, or unfair or disrespectful treatment:							
Not applied for or accepted admission at a particular grad school	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.04	0.12	0.10	0.09
Paused or ceased enrollment at a particular grad school	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.05	0.03	0.05
Not applied for or taken a particular employment position	0.16	0.14	0.16	0.11	0.28	0.19	0.19
Not applied for or taken a promotion at your place of employment	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.04	0.15	0.11	0.11
Left a particular employment position	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.07	0.18	0.11	0.13
Not presented your question, idea, or view at your school or place of work	0.31	0.29	0.33	0.25	0.34	0.33	0.35
Not participated in a conference	0.13	0.13	0.14	0.11	0.25	0.16	0.16
Not spoken at a conference or during a seminar presentation	0.28	0.25	0.27	0.23	0.30	0.26	0.29
Not made a professional visit to a particular place	0.10	0.09	0.11	0.08	0.18	0.15	0.15
Not attended social events after class, at work, or at conferences	0.26	0.22	0.26	0.22	0.31	0.29	0.30
Changed the topic, content, or method of a class you teach	0.14	0.13	0.16	0.11	0.17	0.16	0.17
Changed the content, method, or conclusions of a research paper	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.05	0.16	0.09	0.11
Not started or continued research in a particular field	0.17	0.16	0.18	0.13	0.26	0.18	0.20

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having taken the listed action over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 8: Experiences of Exclusion and Harrassment

Sample:	All	Male	Female	White	Non-White	No disability	With disability	LGBT	Non LGBT	N
Have you ever experienced any of the following:										
Felt socially excluded at a meeting or event in the field	0.47	0.40	0.65	0.46	0.53	0.46	0.60	0.59	0.47	4,601
Felt disrespected by your economist colleagues	0.45	0.38	0.62	0.45	0.45	0.43	0.58	0.56	0.44	4,356
Felt that your work was not taken as seriously as that of your economist colleagues	0.51	0.43	0.69	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.60	0.60	0.50	4,937
Felt that the subject or methodology of your research was not taken as seriously as that of your economist colleagues	0.46	0.40	0.59	0.46	0.46	0.45	0.55	0.54	0.46	4,464
Another economist or economics student displayed, used, or distributed inappropriate sexual or suggestive materials; made offensive sexual remarks, either directed at you or overheard, including jokes or sexual stories; made remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities that made you uncomfortable; or made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended	0.22	0.13	0.43	0.23	0.20	0.21	0.29	0.37	0.21	2,137
Another economist or economics student made unwanted attempts to establish a dating, romantic, or sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it	0.09	0.03	0.23	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.12	0.14	0.09	887
Another economist or economics student made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being romantically or sexually cooperative or implied you'd be treated better if you were sexually cooperative	0.03	0.01	0.08	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.03	306
Another economist or economics student watched or followed you from a distance; repeatedly waited for you outside of your workplace, classroom, meeting room when you didn't want them to; spied on you; made unwanted phone calls to you or left you unwanted messages, emails or other electronic transmissions including via social media, or sent cards, letters, flowers, or presents when they knew you didn't want them to	0.05	0.02	0.10	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.05	465
Another economist or economics student <u>attempted</u> to fondle, kiss, or rub up against the private areas of your body; <u>attempted</u> to remove some of your clothes without your consent; <u>attempted</u> to put their penis, fingers, or other objects into your vagina and/or butt without your consent; and/or <u>attempted</u> to have oral sex with you without your consent	0.02	0.01	0.06	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.02	214
Another economist or economics student fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of your body; removed some of your clothes without your consent; put their penis, fingers, or other objects into your vagina and/or butt without your consent; and/or attempted to have oral sex with you without your consent	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.01	107
Another economist or economics student touched you in a way, other than what was listed above, that made you feel uncomfortable	0.05	0.02	0.13	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.08	0.08	0.05	483

Reported in each cell, except for last column, is the share of respondents that report having personally experienced the stated treatment over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years). Reported in the last column is the number of respondents that report having personally experienced the stated treatment.

Table 8A: Experiences of Exclusion and Harrassment - Female Respondents Only

Sample:	Married?		Dependents?		Employer is college or university?	
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Have you ever experienced any of the following:						
Felt socially excluded at a meeting or event in the field	0.63	0.66	0.64	0.66	0.65	0.66
Felt disrespected by your economist colleagues	0.61	0.62	0.60	0.64	0.60	0.64
Felt that your work was not taken as seriously as that of your economist colleagues	0.64	0.70	0.65	0.72	0.66	0.71
Felt that the subject or methodology of your research was not taken as seriously as that of your economist colleagues	0.56	0.61	0.58	0.61	0.57	0.61
Another economist or economics student displayed, used, or distributed inappropriate sexual or suggestive materials; made offensive sexual remarks, either directed at you or overheard, including jokes or sexual stories; made remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities that made you uncomfortable; or made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you	0.45	0.42	0.42	0.43	0.39	0.44
Another economist or economics student made unwanted attempts to establish a dating, romantic, or sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it	0.29	0.20	0.23	0.21	0.21	0.23
Another economist or economics student made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being romantically or sexually cooperative or implied you'd be treated better if you were sexually cooperative	0.12	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.07
Another economist or economics student watched or followed you from a distance; repeatedly waited for you outside of your workplace, classroom, meeting room when you didn't want them to; spied on you; made unwanted phone calls to you or left you unwanted messages, emails or other electronic transmissions including via social media, or sent cards, letters, flowers, or presents when they knew you didn't want them to	0.13	0.09	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.11
Another economist or economics student <u>attempted</u> to fondle, kiss, or rub up against the private areas of your body; <u>attempted</u> to remove some of your clothes without your consent; <u>attempted</u> to put their penis, fingers, or other objects into your vagina and/or butt without your consent; and/or <u>attempted</u> to have oral sex with you without your consent	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
Another economist or economics student fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of your body; removed some of your clothes without your consent; put their penis, fingers, or other objects into your vagina and/or butt without your consent; and/or attempted to have oral sex with you without your consent	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.03
Another economist or economics student touched you in a way, other than what was listed above, that made you feel uncomfortable	0.14	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.10	0.13

The sample is restricted to female respondents. Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having personally experienced the stated treatment over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 9: Experiences of Assaults, Attempted Assaults and Other Physical Touching

	Attempted Assaults	Assaults	Other physical touching
<b>Where?</b>			
At my university	68	36	198
At another university	40	17	52
At my non-academic workplace	16	5	30
At an AEA conference or meeting, including travel to or from	6	3	18
At another professional conference or meeting	21	10	73
During a conference or meeting, but not at the conference or meeting itself	27	10	49
Online (via email or other electronic media)	0	1	0
Somewhere else	26	20	51
<b>Who?</b>			
My professor/boss/someone with authority	49	25	127
A co-worker at my institution or place of employment	48	18	96
Another economist or student that I know	93	48	194
Another economist or student that I do not know	8	3	36
Someone else	3	3	11
Did not know the identity or status of this person	4	3	6
<b>Told anyone?</b>			
Yes	70	39	127
No	137	62	345
<b>Who did you tell first?</b>			
A colleague	31	15	49
A friend of family member not associated with the field	22	14	53
University administration, including University HR	8	2	14
AEA or conference administration	0	1	1
Someone from the conference center or meeting place where this occurred	0	0	4
The police	1	0	1
Someone else	7	7	5
<b>If you did not make a report to some authority, why not? - Check all that applies (Yes=1)</b>			
	N=132	N=60	N=336
Didn't know who the right person was	14	9	37
Were concerned the situation would not be kept confidential	41	24	82
Did not need/want any assistance or any action taken	59	22	200
Were concerned the process and/or the outcome would be too difficult	35	20	78
Were concerned about retribution from the person who did this and/or others over reporting	52	24	103
<b>Did the experience led to...- Check all that applies (Yes=1)</b>			
	N=144	N=82	N=257
File an official charge of complaint with your employer	11	4	11
File an official charge with relevant government agency (such as police or nondiscrimination agency)	4	4	8
Consider leaving a project, committee, program, or other similar work endeavor	61	41	112
Be less productive or effective in your work	87	55	156
Consider leaving your position	50	31	81
Take leave, sick time, miss work unexpectedly, or other similar time away from work	32	24	38
Consider not attending future AEA meetings or conferences	22	15	34
Consider leaving the field of economic research	28	19	40
Consider leaving academia entirely	30	27	50
Consider taking legal action	26	15	27

Table 10: Opinions and Perceptions

Sample:	All	Male	Female	White	Non-White	No disability	With disability	LGBT	Non LGBT
It is <b>not</b> important for the field of economics to be inclusive towards people with different backgrounds.	0.07	0.08	0.05	0.06	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.07
Discrimination is rare within the field of economics today.	0.12	0.16	0.04	0.13	0.11	0.12	0.13	0.12	0.12
Economics would be a more vibrant discipline if it were more diverse.	0.66	0.60	0.82	0.65	0.73	0.66	0.67	0.77	0.66
The AEA should <b>not</b> expend much effort to improve diversity within its ranks.	0.08	0.11	0.03	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.08	0.08
People of my race/ethnicity are respected within the field	0.71	0.73	0.67	0.82	0.30	0.71	0.69	0.65	0.71
People who are not White are respected within the field	0.45	0.51	0.28	0.49	0.28	0.45	0.42	0.34	0.45
Men are respected within the field	0.90	0.88	0.96	0.94	0.78	0.91	0.89	0.92	0.90
Women are respected within the field	0.40	0.51	0.16	0.43	0.30	0.41	0.39	0.30	0.41
Transgender and gender non-conforming people are respected within the field	0.32	0.38	0.16	0.35	0.22	0.33	0.28	0.18	0.33
People of my sexual orientation are respected within the field	0.87	0.88	0.86	0.90	0.74	0.88	0.84	0.29	0.91
People who are not heterosexual are respected within the field	0.57	0.62	0.42	0.60	0.40	0.58	0.51	0.28	0.59
People of my disability status are respected within the field	0.52	0.58	0.36	0.56	0.42	0.65	0.34	0.38	0.54
People with a disability are respected within the field	0.58	0.63	0.40	0.60	0.45	0.60	0.39	0.39	0.59

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that agree or strongly agree with each statement.

Table 10A: Opinions and Perceptions - Female Respondents Only

Sample:	Married?		Dependents?		Employer is college or university?	
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
It is <b>not</b> important for the field of economics to be inclusive towards people with different backgrounds.	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Discrimination is rare within the field of economics today.	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.05
Economics would be a more vibrant discipline if it were more diverse.	0.82	0.82	0.83	0.81	0.83	0.81
The AEA should <b>not</b> expend much effort to improve diversity within its ranks.	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04
People of my race/ethnicity are respected within the field	0.62	0.69	0.67	0.67	0.69	0.68
People who are not White are respected within the field	0.28	0.29	0.26	0.31	0.29	0.29
Men are respected within the field	0.95	0.96	0.97	0.95	0.96	0.96
Women are respected within the field	0.17	0.16	0.17	0.16	0.18	0.16
Transgender and gender non-conforming people are respected within the field	0.16	0.17	0.16	0.18	0.20	0.18
People of my sexual orientation are respected within the field	0.82	0.88	0.85	0.88	0.89	0.86
People who are not heterosexual are respected within the field	0.37	0.44	0.40	0.45	0.39	0.44
People of my disability status are respected within the field	0.31	0.39	0.36	0.39	0.36	0.39
People with a disability are respected within the field	0.38	0.42	0.40	0.42	0.35	0.43

The sample is restricted to female respondents. Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that agree or strongly agree with each statement.

Table 10B: Opinions and Perceptions - Ethnic and Racial Breakdown

Sample:	Non-Black	Black	Non-Asian	Asian	Non-Latinx	Latinx
It is <b>not</b> important for the field of economics to be inclusive towards people with different backgrounds.	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.08
Discrimination is rare within the field of economics today.	0.12	0.10	0.13	0.10	0.12	0.12
Economics would be a more vibrant discipline if it were more diverse.	0.66	0.81	0.66	0.71	0.66	0.70
The AEA should <b>not</b> expend much effort to improve diversity within its ranks.	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.08
People of my race/ethnicity are respected within the field	0.73	0.17	0.77	0.34	0.74	0.46
People who are not White are respected within the field	0.45	0.23	0.47	0.29	0.45	0.37
Men are respected within the field	0.91	0.85	0.93	0.75	0.90	0.90
Women are respected within the field	0.41	0.31	0.42	0.28	0.41	0.37
Transgender and gender non-conforming people are respected within the field	0.32	0.25	0.34	0.21	0.33	0.25
People of my sexual orientation are respected within the field	0.88	0.79	0.89	0.73	0.88	0.85
People who are not heterosexual are respected within the field	0.57	0.42	0.59	0.39	0.58	0.50
People of my disability status are respected within the field	0.53	0.44	0.55	0.41	0.54	0.41
People with a disability are respected within the field	0.58	0.43	0.59	0.44	0.58	0.52

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that agree or strongly agree with each statement.



Table 10C: Opinions and Perceptions - By Employer Type, Age and Ideology

Sample:	Employer is college or university?		Age		Economically:		Socially:	
	No	Yes	Less than	44 or	conservative	liberal	conservative	liberal
			44	more				
It is <b>not</b> important for the field of economics to be inclusive towards people with different backgrounds.	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.10	0.05
Discrimination is rare within the field of economics today.	0.13	0.12	0.08	0.16	0.16	0.08	0.22	0.09
Economics would be a more vibrant discipline if it were more diverse.	0.67	0.66	0.72	0.61	0.59	0.76	0.50	0.72
The AEA should <b>not</b> expend much effort to improve diversity within its ranks.	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.10	0.12	0.04	0.18	0.05
People of my race/ethnicity are respected within the field	0.73	0.72	0.67	0.76	0.70	0.72	0.63	0.74
People who are not White are respected within the field	0.45	0.45	0.40	0.49	0.51	0.36	0.55	0.41
Men are respected within the field	0.91	0.90	0.91	0.90	0.89	0.92	0.84	0.93
Women are respected within the field	0.42	0.40	0.33	0.48	0.47	0.32	0.54	0.36
Transgender and gender non-conforming people are respected within the field	0.32	0.33	0.27	0.37	0.39	0.24	0.47	0.27
People of my sexual orientation are respected within the field	0.88	0.88	0.86	0.89	0.88	0.87	0.85	0.88
People who are not heterosexual are respected within the field	0.55	0.58	0.55	0.60	0.63	0.49	0.66	0.54
People of my disability status are respected within the field	0.50	0.54	0.48	0.56	0.55	0.48	0.56	0.51
People with a disability are respected within the field	0.53	0.59	0.53	0.61	0.63	0.50	0.66	0.54

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that agree or strongly agree with each statement.

Table 10D: Opinions and Perceptions - By Religion

Sample:	Agnostic	Atheist	Christian	Jewish	Muslim	Buddhist	Other Religion
It is <b>not</b> important for the field of economics to be inclusive towards people with different backgrounds.	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.12	0.07	0.08
Discrimination is rare within the field of economics today.	0.10	0.11	0.15	0.11	0.16	0.09	0.12
Economics would be a more vibrant discipline if it were more diverse.	0.69	0.68	0.61	0.65	0.79	0.66	0.71
The AEA should <b>not</b> expend much effort to improve diversity within its ranks.	0.07	0.07	0.10	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.08
People of my race/ethnicity are respected within the field	0.75	0.78	0.72	0.88	0.37	0.38	0.57
People who are not White are respected within the field	0.43	0.45	0.49	0.50	0.38	0.27	0.37
Men are respected within the field	0.92	0.95	0.91	0.96	0.79	0.65	0.82
Women are respected within the field	0.38	0.38	0.46	0.43	0.36	0.27	0.36
Transgender and gender non-conforming people are respected within the field	0.32	0.30	0.36	0.35	0.24	0.21	0.30
People of my sexual orientation are respected within the field	0.90	0.90	0.88	0.92	0.83	0.57	0.82
People who are not heterosexual are respected within the field	0.58	0.59	0.59	0.61	0.42	0.36	0.47
People of my disability status are respected within the field	0.52	0.58	0.52	0.64	0.53	0.37	0.42
People with a disability are respected within the field	0.56	0.58	0.59	0.64	0.55	0.39	0.53

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that agree or strongly agree with each statement.

Table 11: General Climate - By Primary Research Field

Field:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16
Agricultural and Natural Resource Economics / Environmental Economics	0.28	0.57	0.38	0.65	0.37	0.66	0.36	0.65	0.19	0.13	0.38	0.67	0.06	0.27	0.20	0.11
Business Administration/Business Economics	0.39	0.53	0.36	0.57	0.35	0.54	0.40	0.55	0.21	0.13	0.39	0.56	0.07	0.24	0.20	0.12
Economic Development, Innovation, Technical Change, and Growth	0.29	0.54	0.39	0.67	0.36	0.66	0.42	0.67	0.23	0.10	0.46	0.67	0.08	0.23	0.20	0.12
Economic History	0.26	0.50	0.34	0.61	0.32	0.61	0.40	0.64	0.24	0.15	0.31	0.59	0.05	0.20	0.26	0.17
Financial Economics	0.37	0.52	0.43	0.61	0.41	0.62	0.47	0.65	0.19	0.15	0.46	0.61	0.06	0.24	0.20	0.16
General Economics and Teaching	0.37	0.53	0.35	0.60	0.29	0.57	0.35	0.57	0.15	0.17	0.29	0.57	0.04	0.27	0.25	0.21
Health, Education and Welfare	0.23	0.56	0.26	0.61	0.25	0.62	0.29	0.63	0.19	0.12	0.32	0.62	0.03	0.20	0.20	0.11
Industrial Organization	0.39	0.57	0.49	0.65	0.42	0.66	0.50	0.67	0.17	0.11	0.49	0.64	0.08	0.22	0.17	0.10
International Economics	0.38	0.56	0.44	0.62	0.42	0.61	0.48	0.64	0.19	0.13	0.48	0.61	0.08	0.20	0.19	0.16
Labor and Demographic Economics	0.29	0.55	0.40	0.62	0.35	0.62	0.44	0.64	0.20	0.14	0.43	0.61	0.06	0.25	0.18	0.11
Macro and Monetary Economics	0.38	0.61	0.44	0.66	0.43	0.66	0.49	0.66	0.16	0.10	0.48	0.63	0.08	0.22	0.20	0.11
Mathematical and Quantitative Methods	0.39	0.57	0.51	0.64	0.39	0.63	0.52	0.67	0.16	0.13	0.48	0.63	0.10	0.29	0.19	0.17
Microeconomics	0.37	0.58	0.44	0.66	0.40	0.66	0.48	0.66	0.18	0.08	0.39	0.60	0.06	0.17	0.20	0.11
Public Economics	0.38	0.58	0.48	0.67	0.41	0.67	0.45	0.64	0.18	0.12	0.46	0.63	0.08	0.24	0.20	0.11
Urban Economics	0.37	0.53	0.41	0.62	0.36	0.64	0.41	0.65	0.16	0.07	0.39	0.64	0.08	0.19	0.13	0.11
Other	0.28	0.51	0.31	0.58	0.29	0.56	0.31	0.57	0.25	0.17	0.27	0.55	0.04	0.21	0.37	0.17

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that agree or strongly agree with each statement, by primary research area. Q1 to Q16 correspond to:

Q1 - I am satisfied with the overall climate within the field of economics

Q2 - I am satisfied with the overall climate at my institution/place of employment

Q3 - I feel valued within the field of economics

Q4 - I feel valued at my institution/place of employment

Q5 - I always feel included socially within the field of economics

Q6 - I always feel included socially at my institution/place of employment

Q7 - I always feel included intellectually within the field of economics

Q8 - I always feel included intellectually at my institution/place of employment

Q9 - I feel I have been discriminated against within the field of economics

Q10 - I feel I have been discriminated against at my institution/place of employment

Q11 - The work that I do is valued within the field of economics

Q12 - The work that I do is valued at my institution/place of employment

Q13 - I think I have a great deal of power within the field of economics

Q14 - I think I have a great deal of power at my institution/place of employment

Q15 - My ideas and opinions are often ignored within the field of economics

Q16 - My ideas and opinions are often ignored at my institution/place of employment

Table 11A: General Climate - By Primary Research Field - Female Respondents Only

Field:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16
Agricultural and Natural Resource Economics / Environmental Economics	0.12	0.47	0.18	0.58	0.16	0.63	0.20	0.59	0.39	0.20	0.26	0.64	0.01	0.24	0.29	0.13
Business Administration/Business Economics	0.24	0.45	0.30	0.45	0.16	0.34	0.31	0.45	0.35	0.21	0.41	0.50	0.06	0.16	0.23	0.19
Economic Development, Innovation, Technical Change, and Growth	0.18	0.47	0.27	0.57	0.27	0.55	0.32	0.55	0.32	0.13	0.40	0.59	0.05	0.19	0.21	0.13
Economic History	0.10	0.44	0.24	0.66	0.12	0.56	0.32	0.63	0.39	0.17	0.22	0.56	0.08	0.24	0.32	0.10
Financial Economics	0.22	0.39	0.25	0.50	0.20	0.44	0.32	0.48	0.32	0.27	0.42	0.56	0.05	0.19	0.22	0.21
General Economics and Teaching	0.30	0.49	0.28	0.58	0.26	0.55	0.28	0.54	0.23	0.18	0.27	0.53	0.04	0.33	0.26	0.20
Health, Education and Welfare	0.16	0.48	0.16	0.53	0.17	0.58	0.24	0.54	0.24	0.19	0.27	0.54	0.02	0.17	0.20	0.13
Industrial Organization	0.26	0.49	0.35	0.63	0.28	0.58	0.24	0.56	0.41	0.27	0.40	0.58	0.04	0.19	0.21	0.11
International Economics	0.25	0.37	0.27	0.48	0.24	0.48	0.32	0.50	0.33	0.24	0.42	0.50	0.05	0.15	0.20	0.18
Labor and Demographic Economics	0.22	0.46	0.25	0.50	0.22	0.52	0.29	0.55	0.31	0.23	0.34	0.56	0.05	0.24	0.22	0.12
Macro and Monetary Economics	0.16	0.41	0.26	0.54	0.23	0.57	0.28	0.53	0.35	0.18	0.40	0.55	0.04	0.14	0.23	0.14
Mathematical and Quantitative Methods	0.21	0.47	0.27	0.50	0.12	0.53	0.22	0.39	0.22	0.21	0.28	0.52	0.09	0.28	0.27	0.25
Microeconomics	0.21	0.44	0.27	0.51	0.19	0.57	0.30	0.52	0.36	0.14	0.33	0.50	0.04	0.13	0.21	0.13
Public Economics	0.21	0.45	0.31	0.58	0.23	0.52	0.33	0.48	0.32	0.18	0.41	0.54	0.05	0.19	0.19	0.11
Urban Economics	0.11	0.34	0.19	0.58	0.16	0.63	0.24	0.58	0.45	0.14	0.24	0.63	0.03	0.16	0.11	0.11
Other	0.16	0.42	0.20	0.46	0.16	0.45	0.18	0.45	0.40	0.24	0.20	0.43	0.02	0.16	0.42	0.16

The sample is restricted to female respondents. Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that agree or strongly agree with each statement, by primary research area. Q1 to Q16 correspond to:

Q1 - I am satisfied with the overall climate within the field of economics

Q2 - I am satisfied with the overall climate at my institution/place of employment

Q3 - I feel valued within the field of economics

Q4 - I feel valued at my institution/place of employment

Q5 - I always feel included socially within the field of economics

Q6 - I always feel included socially at my institution/place of employment

Q7 - I always feel included intellectually within the field of economics

Q8 - I always feel included intellectually at my institution/place of employment

Q9 - I feel I have been discriminated against within the field of economics

Q10 - I feel I have been discriminated against at my institution/place of employment

Q11 - The work that I do is valued within the field of economics

Q12 - The work that I do is valued at my institution/place of employment

Q13 - I think I have a great deal of power within the field of economics

Q14 - I think I have a great deal of power at my institution/place of employment

Q15 - My ideas and opinions are often ignored within the field of economics

Q16 - My ideas and opinions are often ignored at my institution/place of employment

Table 11B: General Climate - By Primary Research Field - Male Respondents Only

Field:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16
Agricultural and Natural Resource Economics / Environmental Economics	0.36	0.61	0.47	0.68	0.45	0.68	0.43	0.67	0.10	0.10	0.44	0.68	0.08	0.28	0.17	0.10
Business Administration/Business Economics	0.43	0.57	0.38	0.61	0.41	0.61	0.42	0.59	0.16	0.11	0.38	0.59	0.07	0.27	0.20	0.10
Economic Development, Innovation, Technical Change, and Growth	0.35	0.57	0.46	0.72	0.42	0.72	0.48	0.73	0.18	0.08	0.49	0.71	0.10	0.26	0.20	0.11
Economic History	0.32	0.52	0.38	0.59	0.40	0.62	0.43	0.64	0.18	0.15	0.34	0.60	0.05	0.18	0.24	0.20
Financial Economics	0.42	0.57	0.49	0.65	0.47	0.69	0.52	0.71	0.15	0.10	0.48	0.63	0.07	0.25	0.20	0.14
General Economics and Teaching	0.42	0.56	0.41	0.62	0.32	0.58	0.41	0.59	0.09	0.16	0.30	0.60	0.04	0.24	0.24	0.21
Health, Education and Welfare	0.30	0.64	0.36	0.69	0.33	0.66	0.35	0.72	0.13	0.06	0.36	0.70	0.05	0.23	0.21	0.10
Industrial Organization	0.42	0.60	0.53	0.66	0.46	0.68	0.57	0.70	0.10	0.07	0.52	0.66	0.08	0.22	0.16	0.10
International Economics	0.43	0.64	0.52	0.68	0.50	0.66	0.55	0.70	0.13	0.09	0.50	0.65	0.10	0.23	0.18	0.15
Labor and Demographic Economics	0.34	0.62	0.50	0.70	0.44	0.69	0.55	0.71	0.12	0.08	0.49	0.64	0.07	0.26	0.16	0.11
Macro and Monetary Economics	0.44	0.67	0.49	0.69	0.49	0.69	0.55	0.70	0.11	0.07	0.51	0.65	0.10	0.24	0.19	0.11
Mathematical and Quantitative Methods	0.42	0.58	0.56	0.66	0.44	0.65	0.58	0.72	0.14	0.12	0.51	0.66	0.10	0.29	0.18	0.16
Microeconomics	0.42	0.63	0.50	0.70	0.47	0.69	0.54	0.71	0.13	0.07	0.41	0.63	0.06	0.19	0.20	0.10
Public Economics	0.44	0.62	0.54	0.72	0.48	0.73	0.50	0.70	0.13	0.10	0.48	0.66	0.08	0.26	0.21	0.11
Urban Economics	0.44	0.58	0.46	0.63	0.41	0.65	0.46	0.67	0.08	0.06	0.44	0.64	0.09	0.19	0.14	0.11
Other	0.33	0.55	0.36	0.64	0.35	0.60	0.37	0.63	0.18	0.14	0.30	0.61	0.05	0.23	0.35	0.17

The sample is restricted to male respondents. Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that agree or strongly agree with each statement, by primary research area. Q1 to Q16 correspond to:

Q1 - I am satisfied with the overall climate within the field of economics

Q2 - I am satisfied with the overall climate at my institution/place of employment

Q3 - I feel valued within the field of economics

Q4 - I feel valued at my institution/place of employment

Q5 - I always feel included socially within the field of economics

Q6 - I always feel included socially at my institution/place of employment

Q7 - I always feel included intellectually within the field of economics

Q8 - I always feel included intellectually at my institution/place of employment

Q9 - I feel I have been discriminated against within the field of economics

Q10 - I feel I have been discriminated against at my institution/place of employment

Q11 - The work that I do is valued within the field of economics

Q12 - The work that I do is valued at my institution/place of employment

Q13 - I think I have a great deal of power within the field of economics

Q14 - I think I have a great deal of power at my institution/place of employment

Q15 - My ideas and opinions are often ignored within the field of economics

Q16 - My ideas and opinions are often ignored at my institution/place of employment

Table 12: Experiences of Exclusion and Harrassment - By Primary Research Field

Sample:	All				Women only										
	Socially excluded	Disrespected	Work not taken seriously	Subject/m methods not taken seriously	Socially excluded	Disrespected	Work not taken seriously	Subject/m methods not taken seriously	Inappropriate material/language/gestures	Unwanted advances	Threatened with retaliation	Stalked	Attempted Assault	Assaulted	Other touching
Field:															
Agricultural and Natural Resource Economics / Environmental Economics	0.52	0.54	0.60	0.60	0.72	0.72	0.78	0.70	0.50	0.19	0.07	0.11	0.06	0.02	0.14
Business Administration/Business Economics	0.54	0.48	0.58	0.55	0.73	0.64	0.76	0.68	0.45	0.24	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.03	0.16
Economic Development, Innovation, Technical Change, and Growth	0.55	0.50	0.55	0.52	0.67	0.67	0.68	0.63	0.43	0.23	0.04	0.09	0.05	0.01	0.09
Economic History	0.55	0.56	0.63	0.62	0.69	0.62	0.82	0.74	0.46	0.23	0.03	0.26	0.05	0.05	0.23
Financial Economics	0.50	0.43	0.48	0.39	0.69	0.64	0.68	0.48	0.55	0.29	0.09	0.13	0.12	0.08	0.15
General Economics and Teaching	0.44	0.43	0.51	0.41	0.54	0.48	0.61	0.51	0.43	0.22	0.09	0.16	0.05	0.03	0.06
Health, Education and Welfare	0.60	0.58	0.65	0.58	0.69	0.64	0.76	0.69	0.41	0.21	0.05	0.06	0.03	0.02	0.11
Industrial Organization	0.46	0.41	0.48	0.41	0.67	0.59	0.58	0.49	0.29	0.17	0.07	0.13	0.04	0.01	0.15
International Economics	0.45	0.44	0.52	0.43	0.64	0.68	0.75	0.58	0.38	0.25	0.08	0.11	0.08	0.03	0.12
Labor and Demographic Economics	0.55	0.52	0.58	0.51	0.66	0.63	0.71	0.64	0.43	0.21	0.06	0.08	0.06	0.03	0.16
Macro and Monetary Economics	0.43	0.41	0.42	0.38	0.70	0.68	0.67	0.54	0.57	0.32	0.14	0.20	0.08	0.03	0.16
Mathematical and Quantitative Methods	0.41	0.38	0.41	0.39	0.61	0.67	0.75	0.58	0.56	0.28	0.09	0.16	0.09	0.03	0.06
Microeconomics	0.46	0.44	0.50	0.44	0.63	0.64	0.70	0.59	0.48	0.29	0.10	0.14	0.06	0.04	0.19
Public Economics	0.43	0.44	0.50	0.46	0.60	0.62	0.73	0.59	0.45	0.25	0.09	0.12	0.07	0.03	0.08
Urban Economics	0.43	0.44	0.46	0.41	0.65	0.70	0.68	0.51	0.46	0.16	0.14	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.14
Other	0.49	0.52	0.65	0.66	0.67	0.63	0.79	0.76	0.43	0.20	0.06	0.09	0.05	0.02	0.13

Reported in each cell is the share of respondents that report having personally experienced the stated treatment over the last ten years (if in the field of economics for more than 10 years) or during of their time in the field of economics (if in the field of economics for less than 10 years).

Table 13: General Climate - Regression Analysis

Dependent variable:	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16
Female	-0.189*** [0.022]	-0.121*** [0.023]	-0.138*** [0.023]	-0.100*** [0.023]	-0.175*** [0.022]	-0.125*** [0.023]	-0.160*** [0.023]	-0.126*** [0.022]	0.160*** [0.018]	0.126*** [0.015]	-0.031 [0.023]	-0.046** [0.023]	-0.011 [0.012]	-0.013 [0.020]	0.019 [0.019]	0.020 [0.016]
LGBT	-0.041** [0.021]	-0.015 [0.022]	-0.015 [0.021]	-0.019 [0.022]	-0.057*** [0.021]	-0.077*** [0.022]	-0.028 [0.022]	-0.036* [0.021]	0.076*** [0.017]	0.043*** [0.014]	-0.034 [0.022]	-0.014 [0.022]	0.018 [0.012]	-0.014 [0.019]	0.068*** [0.018]	0.003 [0.015]
With disability	-0.081*** [0.016]	-0.130*** [0.017]	-0.109*** [0.016]	-0.130*** [0.016]	-0.086*** [0.016]	-0.120*** [0.016]	-0.078*** [0.016]	-0.122*** [0.016]	0.078*** [0.013]	0.058*** [0.011]	-0.069*** [0.017]	-0.112*** [0.016]	-0.008 [0.009]	-0.061*** [0.014]	0.086*** [0.014]	0.070*** [0.011]
Age is 44 or older	0.105*** [0.010]	-0.032*** [0.010]	0.144*** [0.010]	0.013 [0.010]	0.069*** [0.010]	-0.014 [0.010]	0.077*** [0.010]	0.001 [0.010]	-0.023*** [0.008]	0.052*** [0.007]	0.084*** [0.010]	-0.010 [0.010]	0.040*** [0.005]	0.140*** [0.009]	0.007 [0.009]	0.038*** [0.007]
Economically liberal	-0.066*** [0.010]	-0.031*** [0.011]	-0.011 [0.010]	-0.022** [0.010]	-0.018* [0.010]	-0.014 [0.010]	-0.007 [0.011]	-0.003 [0.010]	0.013 [0.008]	0.002 [0.007]	0.006 [0.011]	-0.007 [0.011]	0.010* [0.006]	0.003 [0.009]	0.028*** [0.009]	0.004 [0.007]
Socially liberal	-0.103*** [0.011]	-0.000 [0.012]	-0.029** [0.012]	0.046*** [0.012]	-0.023* [0.012]	0.051*** [0.012]	-0.040*** [0.012]	0.045*** [0.012]	-0.017* [0.009]	-0.038*** [0.008]	-0.029** [0.012]	0.040*** [0.012]	-0.033*** [0.006]	0.010 [0.010]	-0.017* [0.010]	-0.040*** [0.008]
Married	-0.006 [0.015]	0.044*** [0.016]	0.054*** [0.016]	0.066*** [0.016]	0.012 [0.016]	0.047*** [0.016]	0.050*** [0.016]	0.066*** [0.016]	-0.022* [0.013]	-0.026** [0.011]	0.060*** [0.016]	0.087*** [0.016]	0.004 [0.009]	0.062*** [0.014]	-0.047*** [0.014]	-0.024** [0.011]
With dependents	-0.015 [0.012]	0.003 [0.013]	-0.016 [0.012]	0.015 [0.012]	-0.005 [0.012]	0.025** [0.012]	-0.001 [0.012]	0.017 [0.012]	0.004 [0.010]	0.007 [0.008]	0.011 [0.012]	0.021* [0.012]	0.016** [0.007]	0.023** [0.011]	0.018* [0.010]	-0.004 [0.008]
Female*married	0.009 [0.026]	-0.033 [0.028]	-0.055** [0.027]	-0.003 [0.027]	-0.048* [0.027]	0.012 [0.027]	-0.043 [0.027]	-0.009 [0.027]	0.022 [0.021]	-0.017 [0.018]	-0.066** [0.028]	-0.034 [0.027]	-0.011 [0.014]	-0.015 [0.024]	0.043* [0.023]	0.023 [0.019]
Female*with deps.	0.023 [0.022]	-0.010 [0.023]	-0.004 [0.022]	-0.045** [0.023]	0.018 [0.022]	-0.049** [0.023]	0.008 [0.023]	-0.039* [0.022]	-0.007 [0.018]	0.011 [0.015]	-0.003 [0.023]	-0.025 [0.023]	-0.020 [0.012]	-0.011 [0.020]	-0.043** [0.019]	-0.024 [0.016]
Black	0.023 [0.027]	-0.060** [0.029]	0.015 [0.028]	-0.021 [0.028]	-0.003 [0.028]	-0.026 [0.028]	0.014 [0.028]	-0.018 [0.028]	0.135*** [0.022]	0.051*** [0.019]	0.100*** [0.029]	0.004 [0.028]	0.123*** [0.015]	0.061** [0.025]	0.010 [0.024]	0.016 [0.020]
Asian	0.017 [0.013]	-0.064*** [0.014]	0.009 [0.014]	-0.082*** [0.014]	-0.025* [0.014]	-0.057*** [0.014]	0.021 [0.014]	-0.048*** [0.014]	0.036*** [0.011]	0.014 [0.009]	0.031** [0.014]	-0.056*** [0.014]	0.036*** [0.008]	-0.023* [0.012]	0.001 [0.012]	0.010 [0.010]
Latinx	-0.021 [0.016]	-0.046*** [0.017]	-0.040** [0.016]	-0.053*** [0.017]	0.005 [0.016]	-0.030* [0.017]	-0.021 [0.017]	-0.037** [0.016]	0.049*** [0.013]	0.028** [0.011]	0.016 [0.017]	-0.041** [0.017]	0.036*** [0.009]	-0.001 [0.015]	0.021 [0.014]	0.005 [0.012]
Constant	0.463*** [0.017]	0.632*** [0.018]	0.382*** [0.017]	0.613*** [0.017]	0.425*** [0.017]	0.626*** [0.017]	0.438*** [0.017]	0.622*** [0.017]	0.138*** [0.014]	0.088*** [0.012]	0.346*** [0.018]	0.578*** [0.017]	0.056*** [0.009]	0.120*** [0.015]	0.211*** [0.015]	0.137*** [0.012]
Observations	9,648	9,620	9,633	9,607	9,591	9,602	9,619	9,610	9,576	9,602	9,579	9,603	9,616	9,600	9,512	9,571
R-squared	0.074	0.032	0.071	0.034	0.055	0.033	0.050	0.036	0.060	0.040	0.023	0.021	0.024	0.041	0.011	0.012

All variables are 0/1. Standard errors in brackets; \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1.

Q1 - I am satisfied with the overall climate within the field of economics

Q2 - I am satisfied with the overall climate at my institution/place of employment

Q3 - I feel valued within the field of economics

Q4 - I feel valued at my institution/place of employment

Q5 - I always feel included socially within the field of economics

Q6 - I always feel included socially at my institution/place of employment

Q7 - I always feel included intellectually within the field of economics

Q8 - I always feel included intellectually at my institution/place of employment

Q9 - I feel I have been discriminated against within the field of economics

Q10 - I feel I have been discriminated against at my institution/place of employment

Q11 - The work that I do is valued within the field of economics

Q12 - The work that I do is valued at my institution/place of employment

Q13 - I think I have a great deal of power within the field of economics

Q14 - I think I have a great deal of power at my institution/place of employment

Q15 - My ideas and opinions are often ignored within the field of economics

Q16 - My ideas and opinions are often ignored at my institution/place of employment

Table 14: Experiences of Exclusion and Harrassment- Regression Analysis

Dependent variable:	Socially excluded	Disrespected	Work not taken seriously	Subject/methods not taken seriously	Inappropriate material/language/gestures	Unwanted advances	Threatened with retaliation	Stalked	Attempted Assault	Assaulted	Other touching
Female	0.205*** [0.024]	0.206*** [0.024]	0.179*** [0.024]	0.149*** [0.024]	0.293*** [0.019]	0.244*** [0.014]	0.109*** [0.009]	0.096*** [0.010]	0.064*** [0.007]	0.029*** [0.005]	0.119*** [0.011]
LGBT	0.085*** [0.022]	0.096*** [0.022]	0.072*** [0.023]	0.070*** [0.023]	0.124*** [0.018]	0.031** [0.013]	0.022*** [0.008]	0.033*** [0.010]	0.029*** [0.007]	0.026*** [0.005]	0.025** [0.010]
With disability	0.135*** [0.017]	0.138*** [0.017]	0.102*** [0.017]	0.093*** [0.017]	0.066*** [0.013]	0.022** [0.010]	0.018*** [0.006]	0.025*** [0.007]	0.018*** [0.005]	0.017*** [0.004]	0.029*** [0.007]
Age is 44 or more	-0.138*** [0.010]	-0.098*** [0.010]	-0.108*** [0.010]	-0.087*** [0.011]	-0.101*** [0.008]	-0.041*** [0.006]	-0.012*** [0.004]	-0.015*** [0.005]	-0.007** [0.003]	-0.005** [0.002]	-0.012*** [0.005]
Economically liberal	0.011 [0.011]	0.004 [0.011]	0.024** [0.011]	0.035*** [0.011]	0.004 [0.009]	-0.010 [0.006]	-0.008** [0.004]	-0.007 [0.005]	-0.002 [0.003]	-0.000 [0.002]	0.001 [0.005]
Socially liberal	0.053*** [0.012]	0.046*** [0.012]	0.058*** [0.012]	0.057*** [0.013]	0.063*** [0.010]	0.013* [0.007]	-0.000 [0.004]	0.006 [0.005]	0.001 [0.004]	0.001 [0.003]	0.006 [0.005]
Married	-0.004 [0.017]	-0.012 [0.017]	-0.011 [0.017]	0.009 [0.017]	-0.013 [0.013]	-0.015 [0.010]	-0.004 [0.006]	-0.018** [0.007]	-0.003 [0.005]	0.000 [0.004]	-0.007 [0.007]
With dependents	0.061*** [0.013]	0.041*** [0.013]	0.038*** [0.013]	0.029** [0.013]	0.016 [0.010]	0.012* [0.007]	0.007 [0.005]	0.011* [0.006]	0.005 [0.004]	0.005* [0.003]	0.008 [0.006]
Female*married	0.053* [0.028]	0.020 [0.028]	0.052* [0.028]	0.037 [0.028]	-0.027 [0.023]	-0.072*** [0.016]	-0.062*** [0.010]	-0.015 [0.012]	-0.011 [0.009]	-0.002 [0.006]	-0.027** [0.012]
Female*with deps.	-0.045* [0.023]	0.013 [0.023]	0.028 [0.023]	-0.009 [0.024]	0.014 [0.019]	-0.007 [0.013]	-0.003 [0.008]	-0.013 [0.010]	-0.003 [0.007]	-0.012** [0.005]	0.018* [0.010]
Black	0.068** [0.029]	-0.026 [0.029]	0.021 [0.029]	-0.008 [0.030]	-0.064*** [0.023]	-0.017 [0.017]	-0.002 [0.011]	-0.025* [0.013]	-0.002 [0.009]	0.002 [0.006]	0.010 [0.013]
Asian	0.007 [0.015]	-0.072*** [0.015]	-0.053*** [0.015]	-0.043*** [0.015]	-0.083*** [0.012]	-0.027*** [0.008]	-0.000 [0.005]	-0.009 [0.007]	-0.001 [0.005]	0.009*** [0.003]	-0.013* [0.007]
Latino	0.027 [0.017]	-0.048*** [0.017]	-0.004 [0.017]	-0.016 [0.018]	0.003 [0.014]	0.006 [0.010]	0.010 [0.006]	0.017** [0.008]	0.006 [0.005]	0.005 [0.004]	0.005 [0.008]
Constant	0.384*** [0.018]	0.381*** [0.018]	0.426*** [0.018]	0.371*** [0.018]	0.142*** [0.015]	0.058*** [0.010]	0.019*** [0.006]	0.037*** [0.008]	0.006 [0.006]	-0.000 [0.004]	0.019** [0.008]
Observations	9,137	9,139	9,127	9,111	9,136	9,107	9,116	9,121	9,106	9,088	9,097
R-squared	0.090	0.077	0.080	0.051	0.142	0.107	0.039	0.038	0.035	0.019	0.059

All variables are 0/1. Standard errors in brackets; \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1.



## Appendix A: AEA Professional Climate Survey Instrument

### Section 1: General Climate Questions

'Climate' can be defined as behaviors and attitudes within a workplace or learning environment, ranging from subtle to cumulative to dramatic, that can influence whether an individual feels personally safe, listened to, valued, and treated fairly and with respect.

1. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

*Note: If you are no longer involved in the economics field due to retirement or change in career path, please answer these questions based on your past experience.*

Response options: Strongly agree, Agree, Somewhat agree, Somewhat disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree

- I am satisfied with the overall climate within the field of economics
- I am satisfied with the overall climate at my institution/place of employment
- I feel valued within the field of economics
- I feel valued at my institution/place of employment
- I always feel included socially within the field of economics
- I always feel included socially at my institution/place of employment
- I always feel included intellectually within the field of economics
- I always feel included intellectually at my institution/place of employment
- I feel I have been discriminated against within the field of economics
- I feel I have been discriminated against at my institution/place of employment
- The work that I do is valued within the field of economics
- The work that I do is valued at my institution/place of employment
- I think I have a great deal of power within the field of economics
- I think I have a great deal of power at my institution/place of employment
- My ideas and opinions are often ignored within the field of economics
- My ideas and opinions are often ignored at my institution/place of employment

### Section 2: Demographics

The next few questions cover some of your personal characteristics. This will help us understand how the experiences of current and former AEA members with different characteristics may differ.

2. Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?

- Yes
- No

3. What is your race?

*Select all that apply.*

- White
- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Other

4. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male
- Non-Binary / Agender / Something else

The next few questions are about sexual orientation and gender identity.

5. Do you consider yourself to be...

- Heterosexual / Straight
- Gay / Lesbian
- Bisexual
- Something else / Unsure

6. Have you told others of your sexual orientation?

- I have told most people / I do not actively refrain from disclosing this information
- I have told only those who are closest to me
- No, I have not told anyone

7. Do you consider yourself to be transgender?

- Yes, Transgender, male-to-female
- Yes, Transgender, female-to-male
- Yes, Transgender, gender nonconforming
- No
- Don't know / Not sure

8. What is your religious identity?

*Select all that apply.*

- Agnostic
- Atheist
- Baha'i
- Buddhist
- Christian
- Confucianism

- Daoism
- Hindu
- Humanist
- Jewish
- Muslim
- Native American religion
- Nonreligious/Secular
- Scientology
- Sikh
- Unitarian Universalist
- Something else / Unsure

9. In what year were you born?

- Year between 1900 and 2010

10. Thinking about your family or primary caregivers growing up, what was the highest level of education achieved by any parent or guardian?

- Less than high school
- High school diploma or equivalent
- Associate's degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Professional degree (e.g. MBA, J.D., M.D.)
- Doctoral degree (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.)
- Don't know

11. How would you classify the socioeconomic status / financial security of the household in which you grew up?

- High income / wealthy
- Upper middle class
- Middle class
- Low income / working class
- In poverty

12. How would you characterize your political views with regard to economic issues?

- Very Liberal
- Liberal
- Moderate or middle of the road
- Conservative
- Very conservative
- Undecided / unsure

13. How would you characterize your political views with regard to social issues?

- Very Liberal
- Liberal
- Moderate or middle of the road
- Conservative
- Very conservative
- Undecided / unsure

14. Are you currently living in the United States?

- Yes
- No

15. Do you have a condition, such as any of the following, which affects your work and/or studies?

Acquired/Traumatic Brain Injury  
Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder  
Asperger's/Autism Spectrum  
Blind  
Low vision  
Deaf  
Hard of Hearing  
Learning Disability  
Mental Health/Psychological Condition  
Physical/Mobility condition that affects walking  
Physical/Mobility condition that does not affect walking  
Speech/Communication Condition

- Yes
- No

16. What is your current relationship status?

- Single / Never married
- Married, Partnered, or in civil union/Registered Domestic Partnership and living together
- Married, Partnered, or in civil union/Registered Domestic Partnership and living apart
- Separated
- Widowed
- Other

17. Do you currently have substantial parenting or caregiving responsibility, such as for any of the following?

Child(ren)  
Sick or disabled partner  
Senior or other family member

- Yes
- No

18. What is the highest level of education you have achieved?

- Less than a Bachelor's degree (auto skip to #20)
- Bachelor's degree (auto skip to #20)
- Master's degree (auto skip to #20)
- Professional degree (e.g. MBA, J.D., M.D.) (auto skip to #20)
- Doctoral degree (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.)
- Other (auto skip to #20)

19. In what year was your Doctoral degree awarded?

Year between: 1950 or earlier and 2018

### Section 3: Job characteristics

20. Which of the following best describes your primary employment or academic enrollment status?

*Note: If both employed and enrolled, please respond with what constitutes the majority of your time.*

- Employed full-time
- Employed part-time
- Enrolled as a student full-time (auto skip to #28 )
- Enrolled as a student part-time (auto skip to # 28)
- Other (auto skip to #28 )

21. Which of the following best describes your employer type?

- College or university
- K-12 institution (public or private) (auto skip to # 25)
- For-profit company or organization (excluding academic institutions) (auto skip to # 25)
- Non-profit organization (excluding academic institutions) (auto skip to #25)
- U.S. military (auto skip to #25)
- U.S. Federal government (non-military) (auto skip to #25 )
- State or local government in the U.S. (excluding academic institutions) (auto skip to # 25)
- Non-U.S. government (auto skip to #25 )
- Other (auto skip to #25)

22. What is your current rank (or, if outside the U.S., which of these is equivalent to your rank)?

- Not a faculty member (auto skip to #25)
- Full professor
- Associate professor
- Assistant professor
- Emeritus/Emerita
- Lecturer or Adjunct
- Special faculty position focused primarily on research (e.g., Research Fellow)
- Special faculty position focused primarily on teaching (e.g., Professor of Practice)
- Visiting Faculty

- Other

23. What is your tenure status?

- Tenured
- On tenure track, but not tenured
- Not on tenure track

24. Which of the following JEL classification codes best describes your research?

*Note: More information can be found here*

- Agricultural and Natural Resource Economics / Environmental and Ecological Economics
- Business Administration and Business Economics / Marketing / Accounting / Personnel Economics
- Economic Development, Innovation, Technical Change, and Growth
- Economic History
- Economic Systems
- Financial Economics
- General Economics and Teaching
- Health, Education, and Welfare
- History of Economic Thought, Methodology, and Heterodox Approaches
- Industrial Organization
- International Economics
- Labor and Demographic Economics
- Law and Economics
- Macroeconomics and Monetary Economics
- Mathematical and Quantitative Methods
- Microeconomics
- Public Economics
- Urban, Rural, Regional, Real Estate, and Transportation Economics
- JEL codes do not fit my research well; (please describe)\_\_\_\_\_

*After responding to this question, auto skip to #26*

25. What is your primary job?

*E.g., market research analyst, consultant, financial analyst, attorney*

---

26. In a typical week, are at least one-half (50%) of your interactions at work with other economists or economics students?

- Yes
- No

27. Indicate how practices and attitudes at your place of employment affect your ability to balance your family and your career goals?

Response options: Very Helpful, Helpful, No Impact, Harmful, Very Harmful

- Work hour flexibility
- Total workload
- Leave policies
- Compensation
- Student attitudes (If not in an academic setting, please skip)
- Economist/faculty/co-worker attitudes
- Administration attitudes

#### Section 4: Experiences

*Note: the following question is critical for determining the next series of questions you receive. While you are free to skip, we kindly request that you provide a response.*

28. For how long have you been in the field of economics? Please include your time as a student and employee.

- Less than 10 years
- 10 or more years (auto skip to #31)

*[If respondent moves forward without answering #28, a soft prompt will ask them to provide a response. They are free to continue without doing so.]*

29. Thinking about the duration of your time in the field of economics, have you ever avoided disclosing any of the following to anyone in the field due to fear of negative consequences, harassment, or discrimination?

Response options: Yes / No

- Racial/ethnic identity
- Sex
- Gender identity
- Sexual orientation
- Disability status
- Marital status / caregiving responsibilities
- Religion
- Political views
- Age
- Citizenship status
- Place of employment
- Research topics

30. During your time in the field of economics, have you personally been discriminated against or been treated unfairly or witnessed discrimination / unfair treatment by anyone in the field of economics based on any of these factors?

*Select all that apply for each item.*

Response options: Yes, personally experienced; Yes, witnessed, No;

- Racial/ethnic identity
- Sex
- Gender identity
- Sexual orientation
- Disability status
- Marital status / caregiving responsibilities
- Religion
- Political views
- Age
- Citizenship status
- Place of employment
- Research topics
- Based on a factor other than the ones listed above

*After answer this question, auto skip to #33*

31. [Asked only of those who replied 10 or more years] Thinking about your last 10 years in the field of economics, have you ever avoided disclosing any of the following to anyone in the field due to fear of negative consequences, harassment, or discrimination?

Response options: Yes / No for each

- Racial/ethnic identity
- Sex
- Gender identity
- Sexual orientation
- Disability status
- Marital status / caregiving responsibilities
- Religion
- Political views
- Age
- Citizenship status
- Place of employment
- Research topics



32. [Asked only of those who replied 10 or more years] Thinking about your last 10 years in the field of economics, have you personally been discriminated against or been treated unfairly or witnessed discrimination / unfair treatment by anyone in the field of economics based on any of these factors? *Select all that apply for each item.*

Response options: Yes, personally experienced; Yes, witnessed, No

- Racial/ethnic identity
- Sex
- Gender identity
- Sexual orientation
- Disability status
- Family status
- Religion
- Political views
- Age
- Citizenship status
- Place of employment
- Research topics
- Yes, but not related to one of these factors

33. During your time as a student studying economics, do you feel you personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment or witnessed discrimination / unfair treatment by anyone in the field in any of the following ways? *Select all that apply for each item.*

Response options: Yes, personally experienced; Yes, witnessed, No

- Access to research assistantships
- Access to advisors
- Access to quality advising
- In the job market (If currently a student without job experience in the field, please leave blank)

34. [Asked only of those who responded a faculty position in #22 & less than 10 years in #28] During your tenure within the field of economics, do you do you feel that you have personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment or witnessed discrimination / unfair treatment by anyone in the field in any of the following ways? *Select all that apply for each item.*

Response options: Yes, personally experienced; Yes, witnessed, No;

- Promotion decisions
- Compensation
- Teaching assignments

- Service obligations
- Access to time and funding to attend conferences and seminars
- Access to graduate student researchers
- Course evaluations
- Publishing decisions
- Funding decisions
- Sabbatical time
- Access to potential coauthors
- Invitations to participate in research conferences, associations and networks.

35. [Asked only of those who responded a faculty position in #22 & 10 or more years in #28] Within your last 10 years in the field of economics, do you do you feel that you have personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment or witnessed discrimination / unfair treatment by anyone in the field in any of the following ways?

*Select all that apply for each item.*

Response options: Yes, personally experienced; Yes, witnessed, No;

- Promotion decisions
- Compensation
- Teaching assignments
- Service obligations
- Access to time and funding to attend conferences and seminars
- Access to graduate student researchers
- Course evaluations
- Publishing decisions
- Funding decisions
- Sabbatical time
- Access to potential coauthors
- Invitations to participate in research conferences, associations and networks.

36. [Asked only of those who responded not a faculty member in #22 or #25 is displayed & who responded less than 10 years in #28] During your tenure within the field of economics, do you do you feel that you have personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment or witnessed discrimination / unfair treatment by anyone in the field in any of the following ways?

*Select all that apply for each item.*

Response options: Yes, personally experienced; Yes, witnessed, No

- Promotion decisions
- Compensation
- Professional development opportunities (including opportunities and funding to attend conferences and seminars)

- Publishing decisions

37. [Asked only of those who responded not a faculty member in #22 or #25 is displayed & who responded 10 or more years in #28] Within your last 10 years in the field of economics, do you feel that you have personally experienced discrimination or unfair treatment or witnessed discrimination / unfair treatment by anyone in the field in any of the following ways?  
*Select all that apply for each item.*

Response options: Yes, personally experienced; Yes, witnessed, No

- Promotion decisions
- Compensation
- Professional development opportunities (including opportunities and funding to attend conferences and seminars)
- Publishing decisions

38. [Asked only of those who responded less than 10 years in #28] During your tenure within the field of economics, have you ever done any of the following to avoid possible harassment, discrimination, or unfair or disrespectful treatment by one or more economists?

Response options: Yes / No for each item.

- Not applied for or accepted admission at a particular grad school
- Paused or ceased enrollment at a particular grad school
- Not applied for or taken a particular employment position
- Not applied for or taken a promotion at your place of employment
- Left a particular employment position
- Not presented your question, idea, or view at your school or place of work
- Not participated in a conference
- Not spoken at a conference or during a seminar presentation
- Not made a professional visit to a particular place
- Not attended social events after class, at work, or at conferences
- Changed the topic, content, or method of a class you teach
- Changed the content, method, or conclusions of a research paper
- Not started or continued research in a particular field

39. [Asked only of those who responded 10 or more years in #28] Within your last ten years in the field of economics, have you ever done any of the following to avoid possible harassment, discrimination, or unfair or disrespectful treatment by one or more economists?

Response options: Yes / No for each item.

- Not applied for or accepted admission at a particular grad school
- Paused or ceased enrollment at a particular grad school
- Not applied for or taken a particular employment position
- Not applied for or taken a promotion at your place of employment

- Left a particular employment position
- Not presented your question, idea, or view at your school or place of work
- Not participated in a conference
- Not spoken at a conference or during a seminar presentation
- Not made a professional visit to a particular place
- Not attended social events after class, at work, or at conferences
- Changed the topic, content, or method of a class you teach
- Changed the content, method, or conclusions of a research paper
- Not started or continued research in a particular field

*Note: The following question contains some graphic language and may be difficult for some to answer. This information is important to understanding the climate and areas in need of change within the economics profession, and we hope that you'll provide a thoughtful and honest answer.*

40. [Asked only of those who responded less than 10 years in #28] During your tenure within the field of economics, have you ever experienced any of the following?

Response options: Yes / No for each

- Felt socially excluded at a meeting or event in the field
- Felt disrespected by your economist colleagues
- Felt that your work was not taken as seriously as that of your economist colleagues
- Felt that the subject or methodology of your research was not taken as seriously as that of your economist colleagues
- Another economist or economics student displayed, used, or distributed inappropriate sexual or suggestive materials; made offensive sexual remarks, either directed at you or overheard, including jokes or sexual stories; made remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities that made you uncomfortable; or made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you
- Another economist or economics student made unwanted attempts to establish a dating, romantic, or sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it
- Another economist or economics student made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being romantically or sexually cooperative or implied you'd be treated better if you were sexually cooperative
- Another economist or economics student watched or followed you from a distance; repeatedly waited for you outside of your workplace, classroom, meeting room when you didn't want them to; spied on you; made unwanted phone calls to you or left you unwanted messages, emails or other electronic transmissions including via social media, or sent cards, letters, flowers, or presents when they knew you didn't want them to
- Another economist or economics student attempted to fondle, kiss, or rub up against the private areas of your body; attempted to remove some of your clothes without your consent; attempted to put their penis, fingers, or other objects into your vagina and/or butt without your consent; and/or attempted to have oral sex with you without your consent
- Another economist or economics student fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of your body; removed some of your clothes without your consent; put their penis,

- fingers, or other objects into your vagina and/or butt without your consent; and/or attempted to have oral sex with you without your consent
- Another economist or economics student touched you in a way, other than what was listed above, that made you feel uncomfortable

*Note: The following question contains some graphic language and may be difficult for some to answer. This information is important to understanding the climate and areas in need of change within the economics profession, and we hope that you'll provide a thoughtful and honest answer.*

41. [Asked only of those who responded 10 or more years in #28] Thinking about your last 10 years in the field of economics, have you ever experienced any of the following?

Response options: Yes / No for each

- a. Felt socially excluded at a meeting or event in the field
- b. Felt disrespected by your economist colleagues
- c. Felt that your work was not taken as seriously as that of your economist colleagues
- d. Felt that the subject or methodology of your research was not taken as seriously as that of your economist colleagues
- e. Another economist or economics student displayed, used, or distributed inappropriate sexual or suggestive materials; made offensive sexual remarks, either directed at you or overheard, including jokes or sexual stories; made remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities that made you uncomfortable; or made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you
- f. Another economist or economics student made unwanted attempts to establish a dating, romantic, or sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it
- g. Another economist or economics student made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being romantically or sexually cooperative or implied you'd be treated better if you were sexually cooperative
- h. Another economist or economics student watched or followed you from a distance; repeatedly waited for you outside of your workplace, classroom, meeting room when you didn't want them to; spied on you; made unwanted phone calls to you or left you unwanted messages, emails or other electronic transmissions including via social media, or sent cards, letters, flowers, or presents when they knew you didn't want them to
- i. Another economist or economics student attempted to fondle, kiss, or rub up against the private areas of your body; attempted to remove some of your clothes without your consent; attempted to put their penis, fingers, or other objects into your vagina and/or butt without your consent; and/or attempted to have oral sex with you without your consent
- j. Another economist or economics student fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of your body; removed some of your clothes without your consent; put their penis, fingers, or other objects into your vagina and/or butt without your consent; and/or attempted to have oral sex with you without your consent
- k. Another economist or economics student touched you in a way, other than what was listed above, that made you feel uncomfortable

42. [Asked only of those that responded Yes to 40i or 41i]. You indicated that another economist or economics student attempted to fondle, kiss, or rub up against the private areas of your body; attempted to remove some of your clothes without consent; attempted to put their penis, fingers, or other objects into your vagina and/or butt without your consent; and/or attempted to have oral sex with you without your consent.

Thinking about the most recent incident, please answer the following questions.

42a. Where did this happen?

- At my university
- At another university
- At my non-academic workplace
- At an AEA conference or meeting, including travel to or from
- At another professional conference or meeting
- During a conference or meeting, but not at the conference or meeting itself
- Online (via email or other electronic media)
- Somewhere else

42b. Who did this to you?

- My professor/boss/someone with authority
- A co-worker at my institution or place of employment
- Another economist or student that I know
- Another economist or student that I do not know
- Someone else
- I do not know the identity or status of this person

42c. Did you tell anyone what happened, including making an official report or unofficially discussing with someone?

- Yes
- No (auto skip to 42e)

42d. Who did you tell first?

- A colleague
- A friend or family member not associated with the field
- University administration, including University HR
- AEA or conference administration
- Someone from the conference center or meeting place where this occurred
- The police
- Someone else

*After answering this question, auto skip to #42f*

42e. If you didn't make a report to some authority, why not?

*Select all that apply.*

- You didn't know who the right person was
- You were concerned your situation would not be kept confidential
- You did not need/want any assistance or any action taken
- You were concerned the process and/or outcome would be too difficult
- You were concerned about retribution from the person who did this to you and/or others over your reporting

42f. Did your experience lead you to:

*Select all that apply.*

- File an official charge of complaint with your employer
- File an official charge with relevant government agency (such as police or nondiscrimination agency)
- Consider leaving a project, committee, program, or other similar work endeavor
- Be less productive or effective in your work
- Consider leaving your position
- Take leave, sick time, miss work unexpectedly, or other similar time away from work
- Consider not attending future AEA meetings or conferences
- Consider leaving the field of economic research
- Consider leaving academia entirely
- Consider taking legal action

43. [Asked only of those that responded Yes to 40j or 41j]. You indicated another economist or economics student fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of your body; removed some of your clothes without your consent; put their penis, fingers, or other objects into your vagina and/or butt without your consent; and/or attempted to have oral sex with you without your consent

Thinking about the most recent incident, please answer the following questions.

43a. Where did this happen?

- At my university
- At another university
- At my non-academic workplace
- At an AEA conference or meeting, including travel to or from
- At another professional conference or meeting
- During a conference or meeting, but not at the conference or meeting itself
- Online (via email or other electronic media)
- Somewhere else

43b. Who did this to you?

- My professor/boss/someone with authority
- A co-worker at my institution or place of employment
- Another economist or student that I know
- Another economist or student that I do not know
- Someone else
- I do not know the identity or status of this person

43c. Did you tell anyone what happened, including making an official report or unofficially discussing with someone?

- Yes
- No (auto skip to 43e)

43d. Who did you tell first?

- A colleague
- A friend or family member not associated with the field
- University administration, including University HR
- AEA or conference administration
- Someone from the conference center or meeting place where this occurred
- The police
- Someone else

*After answering this question, auto skip to #43f*

43e. If you didn't make a report to some authority, why not?

*Select all that apply.*

- You didn't know who the right person was
- You were concerned your situation would not be kept confidential
- You did not need/want any assistance or any action taken
- You were concerned the process and/or outcome would be too difficult



- You were concerned about retribution from the person who did this to you and/or others over your reporting

43f. Did your experience lead you to:

*Select all that apply.*

- File an official charge of complaint with your employer
- File an official charge with relevant government agency (such as police or nondiscrimination agency)
- Consider leaving a project, committee, program, or other similar work endeavor
- Be less productive or effective in your work
- Consider leaving your position
- Take leave, sick time, miss work unexpectedly, or other similar time away from work
- Consider not attending future AEA meetings or conferences
- Consider leaving the field of economic research
- Consider leaving academia entirely
- Consider taking legal action

44. [Asked only of those that responded Yes to 40k or 41k]. You indicated that another economist or economics student touched you in a way, other than what was listed above, that made you feel uncomfortable.

Thinking about the most recent incident, please answer the following questions.

44a. Where did this happen?

- At my university
- At another university
- At my non-academic workplace
- At an AEA conference or meeting, including travel to or from
- At another professional conference or meeting
- During a conference or meeting, but not at the conference or meeting itself
- Online (via email or other electronic media)
- Somewhere else

44b. Who did this to you?

- My professor/boss/someone with authority
- A co-worker at my institution or place of employment
- Another economist or student that I know
- Another economist or student that I do not know
- Someone else
- I do not know the identity or status of this person

44c. Did you tell anyone what happened, including making an official report or unofficially discussing with someone?

- Yes
- No (auto skip to 44e)

44d. Who did you tell first?

- A colleague
- A friend or family member not associated with the field
- University administration, including University HR
- AEA or conference administration
- Someone from the conference center or meeting place where this occurred
- The police
- Someone else

*After answering this question, auto skip to #44f*

44e. If you didn't make a report to some authority, why not?

*Select all that apply.*

- You didn't know who the right person was
- You were concerned your situation would not be kept confidential
- You did not need/want any assistance or any action taken
- You were concerned the process and/or outcome would be too difficult
- You were concerned about retribution from the person who did this to you and/or others over your reporting

44f. Did your experience lead you to:

*Select all that apply.*

- File an official charge of complaint with your employer
- File an official charge with relevant government agency (such as police or nondiscrimination agency)
- Consider leaving a project, committee, program, or other similar work endeavor
- Be less productive or effective in your work
- Consider leaving your position
- Take leave, sick time, miss work unexpectedly, or other similar time away from work
- Consider not attending future AEA meetings or conferences
- Consider leaving the field of economic research
- Consider leaving academia entirely
- Consider taking legal action

## Section 5: Perceptions and Opinions

45. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

Response options: Strongly agree, Agree, Somewhat agree, Somewhat disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree, Don't know / No opinion

- It is **not** important for the field of economics to be inclusive towards people with different backgrounds.
- Discrimination is rare within the field of economics today.
- Economics would be a more vibrant discipline if it were more diverse.
- The AEA should **not** expend much effort to improve diversity within its ranks.
- People of my race/ethnicity are respected within the field
- People who are not White are respected within the field

- Men are respected within the field
- Women are respected within the field
- Transgender and gender non-conforming people are respected within the field
- People of my sexual orientation are respected within the field
- People who are not heterosexual are respected within the field
- People of my disability status are respected within the field (*If you do not have a disability, please leave blank*)
- People with a disability are respected within the field

46. Do you have any comments or ideas to share about the climate of the field of economics as it relates to diversity, inclusion, harassment, and professional conduct?

- Open-ended response

47. If you are willing, please describe any relevant incidents of discrimination, exclusion, harassment, or assault you have experienced within the economics profession, regardless of when they occurred.

- Open-ended response