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Board Member Biography

Martha L. Olney
After class early in the term, a student walked up to me. “Don’t take this the wrong way,” he began. I braced. “I like your class. My friend had you last term and said I should totally take your class. She said you’re eccentric but good.”

I’ve spent the weeks since pondering my eccentricity.

I grew up in the 1960s and early 1970s in the San Francisco Bay Area. In the 1960s, girls were offered three career choices: nurse, secretary, or teacher. I was a smart kid, so everyone ruled out secretary. I don’t do blood, which ruled out nurse. That left teacher.

As young as 8, I would say, “I don’t know what I’m going to be when I grow up, but I’m not going to be a teacher.” Typically the response was, “But you’d be so good at it!” And I would counter, “You offer me only three choices—nurse, secretary, and teacher. I’m going to find a fourth.”

continued on page 8

Board Member Biography

Fiona Scott Morton
I signed up for the introductory economics sequence when I arrived at Yale College as a freshman. I found the discipline interesting, intuitive, and useful at explaining the world around me. I was then very lucky to be able to work as an RA for Professor Martin Feldstein at the NBER the summer after my freshman year. Though, in retrospect I have doubts that I did anything very useful for him, I did get to meet the PhD students who worked at NBER and learn about their research, how hard they worked, and what kinds of intellectual debates went on late at night. This experience increased my excitement and interest in the field.

I enrolled in MIT’s PhD program in 1989. The positive atmosphere among the graduate students was a huge benefit to me. I am not sure I would have gotten through the program without the lunchtime camaraderie, parties on the weekends, and my study group. My class had a record number Continued on page 9
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From the Chair

I am pleased to report that six participants in our newly established AEA/NSF Summer Fellows program, jointly run with the AEA’s Committee on the Status of Minority Groups in the Economics Profession, have just completed their research experience at The Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, The Federal Reserve Bank of New York, The Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Bank. The purpose of this program is to increase the participation and advancement of women and underrepresented minorities in economics and the fellowship allows the fellow to spend a summer in residence at a sponsoring research institution such as a Federal Reserve Bank or other public agency. Information on next year’s program will be posted at www.cswep.org/summerfellows. We are interested in expanding the number of public agencies that participate in this program so if you have suggestions of contact people who would be interested in sponsoring summer fellows please send us an email at cswep@tufts.edu or contact Dick Startz at startz@u.washington.edu.

All of us on the CSWEP board are looking forward to seeing you in New Orleans this January at the ASSA meetings. We will sponsor three gender related sessions including “Marriage, Divorce, and Fertility,” “Education and Occupational Choice,” and “Saving and Investment Decisions: How Do Women Fare?” along with three sessions in development economics including “Marriage and Motherhood in Developing Countries,” “Political Economy in Developing Countries: Evidence from India,” and “Health and Education in Developing Countries.” Plan to stop by the CSWEP hospitality suite for continental breakfast or a beverage during the day on January 4th and 5th from 7:30am–noon. This is a great place to network with other CSWEP associates or find some peace and quiet. Come early and often! We are looking for volunteers to help staff the hospitality suite so if you are interested please send an email to cswep@tufts.edu. We will also be hosting a business meeting on January 4th from 5:00–6:00pm in the Cambridge Room at the Hilton New Orleans Riverside Hotel. At this meeting we will announce this year’s winner of the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award and I will present the results from our most recent survey of economics grants received, promotions and/or tenure decisions, and new appointments so that we can put them in our brag box. You can email them to cswep@tufts.edu.

Finally, CSWEP wants to hear from you. Please send me announcements of grants received, promotions and/or tenure decisions, and new appointments so that we can put them in our brag box. You can email them to cswep@tufts.edu.

—Lisa M. Lynch
Navigating the Job Market

—Introduction by Anna Paulson,
Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago

In economics departments across the U.S. and overseas, thoughts are turning to the job market. Graduate students are polishing their job market papers and thinking about how to best navigate the interview process and land a job. Placement heads are holding meetings with students going on the job market and trying to answer their questions. Advisors are crafting letters of recommendation. Universities and colleges, government agencies, research and consulting firms together with a long list of other organizations are advertising job openings on JOE and through SSRN. Faculty members are trading information about openings and leads on good candidates. Recruiting chairs are relaxing, knowing that they booked a suite in New Orleans back in August, or busily lining up a last minute hotel room for interviews.

This series of articles provides information on the job market that we hope will be useful both for those seeking jobs and those seeking to hire new economics Phds. There is a wealth of detailed advice for new Phd’s who are seeking jobs in research universities on the web. Rather than replicate that here, we provide an annotated guide to some of those resources.

In addition, the articles included here highlight three aspects of the job market that receive somewhat less attention. Sarah West draws on her experience at Macalester College to give advice about how to approach a flyout to a liberal arts institution. Anne Layne-Farrar of LECG discusses careers in litigation consulting in her article. Finally, Janice Eberly offers some thoughts about what to consider after receiving an offer based on her experience as department chair of the Finance Department at Kellogg in a year when five new faculty members were hired.
**Job Market Resources on the Web**

- Michele Tertilt’s advice (and assembled links) for PhD students
  http://www.stanford.edu/~tertilt/GradResources.htm

- Harvard’s site for job market candidates
  http://post.economics.harvard.edu/graduate/jobmarket/

- Bob Hall’s job market advice, with 2006 Elaine Bennett Research Prize winner Monika Piazzesi’s comments
  http://faculty.chicagogsb.edu/monika.piazzesi/research/advice.pdf

- Valery Ramey’s job market site
  http://econ.ucsd.edu/~vramey/placement.html

- David Laibson: How to navigate the job market
  http://post.economics.harvard.edu/graduate/jobmarket/LaibsonNotes.pdf

- Stanford’s Phd Placement guide
  http://www-econ.stanford.edu/students/Phd_Placement_Guide.pdf

- University of Chicago economics job market Wiki (prepared by U of C graduate students who were on the job market in 2006–2007 and others). It includes information about the European job markets, liberal arts jobs, and litigation consulting as well as the academic market.

- John Cochrane: How to write a paper
  http://faculty.chicagogsb.edu/john.cochrane/research/Papers/phd_paper_writing.pdf

- John Cawley: More detailed advice on how to navigate the job market

- Jonathan Shewchuk: Giving an academic talk
  http://www.cs.berkeley.edu/~jrs/speaking.html

- Job market rumor forum: Anything and everything
  http://econjobrumors.proboards105.com/

- On-line repository for job market files—for recruiters and candidates
  http://econjobmarket.org/

- AEA advice and links

- LSE: Getting an Academic Job—some European-specific information
  http://econ.lse.ac.uk/faq/mres/phd/jobs.html

- Perri Capell: Wall Street Journal Article on “How to handle age questions asked during a job interview.” This article is not geared for economists, but gives some suggestions on how to handle awkward interview questions.
  http://online.wsj.com/article/SB113503356587626767.html

**A Reminder for Interviewers**

Questions to job applicants should relate to their qualifications and ability to do the job. Federal and state laws prohibit questions about race, sex, religion, national origin, birthplace, age, family/marital status, and disability. Since it would be illegal and discriminatory to make hiring decisions based on these factors, there is no reason to ask about them during a job interview.

**And Some Advice for Interviewees**

While it is illegal for interviewers to ask these kinds of questions, you should think about how you will respond if they are asked. In particular, it is distressingly common for questions to be raised about your family and marital status. How you respond is highly individual, as there is no one right answer for questions like: Are you married? Do you have a spouse/partner that is also looking for a job? Do you have children? Do you plan to have children?

These questions may even be asked with good intent (to see if the institution could help find a job for your partner and therefore convince you to take their offer, for example). Rather than being caught off guard, talk with your advisors and decide on a response in advance. How you choose to answer (or not answering) may depend on many things: how you judge the intent of the question, when the question is asked (during a interview at the ASSA meetings, during a fly-out, or after a job offer has been made)?, how you think answering (or not answering) will affect your chances of receiving a flyout or a job offer at this particular institution? One option is to answer the intent of the question. For example, if you are asked whether you are a United States citizen (not legal to ask), you could reply that you are authorized to work in the U.S., which is a question a prospective employer can ask and which is appropriate to answer.

While not specifically written for economists, Perri Capell’s article on handling age questions may give you some ideas for ways to deal with awkward interview questions.

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB113503356587626767.html
Tips for Interviewing at Liberal Arts Colleges

—Sarah E. West, Associate Professor of Economics, Macalester College

In many ways, interviewing at a liberal arts college is not all that different from visiting a research university—a visit typically lasts one and a half days, which you’ll spend in half hour meetings with faculty, giving a research seminar, going out to dinner, and touring the facilities. Like any prospective employer, a liberal arts college is trying to determine whether you might fit well into their environment. A number of elements in a campus visit to a liberal arts college might be surprising, however, especially to candidates who did not attend such an institution. Here’s some advice I wish I could have given a number of candidates before they visited Macalester:

• Pitch your research seminar carefully. Your audience is likely to include undergraduate students and noneconomists in addition to economics faculty. Impressing this audience can be tricky—you’ve got to show your technical prowess to those who can fully appreciate those skills, but you also have to prove you can communicate your ideas to broader audiences. If you are not asked to teach a class (more on that below), this is also your chance to show you can teach. Ask your main faculty contact exactly how you should conduct your talk.

• Expect to interact with students and for this interaction to matter. Liberal arts colleges distinguish themselves from research universities by offering enhanced opportunities for undergraduates to interact—get one-on-one economics instruction, conduct research, receive career advice—with faculty. To determine whether you are up to the task (and whether you will enjoy the task), the hiring committee will likely have you meet with a group of students. Students are also likely to be among the voting members of the search committee—and their opinions are taken very seriously. Take care to treat students with the same respect you show faculty interviewers.

• Understand what a liberal arts college is about before you step on campus. When interviewing candidates our Dean often asks questions like, “What is the role of an economics department in a liberal arts setting?” Read the college’s mission statement to get a sense of the kind of language the college uses to express its purpose and subtly fold that language into your responses.

• Make sure you can clearly express why you would fit well into the college. Do not say that the reason that you want to come to a liberal arts college is that you want to avoid publication pressure. Saying so shows you are naïve (to assume that you would not feel this pressure at the college) and may signal lack of the work ethic the college seeks. Do talk about how you will infuse your research into your teaching and be ready to discuss not only your future research agenda but also your ideas for how you would structure specific courses (having sample syllabi earns points).

• Learn about what the department expects from junior faculty before and during your visit. Relative emphases on research, teaching, and service vary widely across liberal arts colleges. Before your visit, examine the vitae of faculty to determine the quantity and type of research that is going on, and ask faculty about departmental expectations when in your one-on-one interviews.

• If you are asked to teach a class, invest significant time preparing for it. Your duty is to show that you are or will some day be an excellent teacher. Make sure that you determine exactly what will be expected of you—will you be giving the regularly scheduled lecture or are you free to lecture on a topic of your choice?

• Expect to meet with noneconomists. Liberal arts colleges tend to be more interdisciplinary than research universities—you may be the only member of your subfield in your department but have research and teaching interests in common with someone outside of your department. And, because they are more involved in administration, faculty at liberal arts colleges have to interact more often on a day-to-day basis with colleagues from across campus. The hiring committee wants to know whether you can get along with them.

Wherever you interview, please treat the office staff well, give a firm handshake, make eye contact, smile, and don’t drink too much alcohol when you’re out to dinner!
Litigation consulting is a small, specialized industry, but it can offer a very rewarding career for economists interested in paths outside of the traditional academic realm. In short, we provide economic analysis—both theoretical and quantitative—for clients who are, for the most part but not always, involved in litigation. Broadly speaking, economic consulting covers antitrust, labor and discrimination, intellectual property, and commercial litigation. Sometimes our clients are competition agencies, such as the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission; sometimes the clients are the corporations accused by those and other government agencies; and sometimes the clients are firms involved in private lawsuits.

Because the work typically involves firm behavior, and whether or not that behavior has abused market power in some fashion or was otherwise harmful, our primary field of work is most closely related to industrial organization. That said, our analysis is best described as applied microeconomics, so no special training in IO is required. My fields, in fact, were Labor and Econometrics, and this has provided a solid base for the work I do today.

Unlike other kinds of consulting, we do not offer corporate strategy recommendations, evaluate compensation plans, or provide any of the other more business related advice that firms frequently hire consultants to provide. Instead, our clients hire us because we are economists. In that role, we advise on market definition, assess prices in relation to competitive benchmarks, analyze firms’ and consumers’ incentives, evaluate the efficiency justifications (or lack thereof) of certain behaviors, and determine the likely impact on economic welfare—just to name a few. Most of our work is on complex, unstructured problems with no readily available answers in the economics literature. In fact, it is the difficult nature of the questions that drive clients to hire us.

After conducting the research to answer complicated economic questions, we have to write up our findings in clear language that lawyers, judges, and juries can understand. That means translating complex economic theory into a comprehensible account, free of jargon, relegating any heavy mathematics or econometrics to footnotes or an appendix. Heavy math and econometrics can be critical to our analysis in order to withstand the scrutiny given our work by any economic experts on the other side of a case, but it must be accompanied by intuition so that the arguments hang together for the lawyers who must interpret them.

These tasks, then, define what we look for when hiring new Ph.D.s: research and writing skills. Despite what your thesis advisor may have told you, we do not accept any warm body with a degree from a halfway decent graduate school! We generally hire from top tier schools only. We require a strong microeconomics background, but equally important is an ability to translate that human capital beyond pure theory. Econometrics is not necessary, but applying theory to real-world facts is.

To determine whether or not a job candidate meets these criteria, we typically require a job talk, just like on the academic job market. The difference here is content and emphasis. Instead of dwelling on the novel econometric features you employ in your thesis, we are far more interested in why those methods were worthwhile and what they allow you to say about your findings that you otherwise could not. We also check for sensitivity to real world issues and the potential for practical applications of your analysis. To assess writing and communication skills, we ask for job papers as well, or any other writing sample that you feel best conveys your ability to clearly express economic concepts.

As is probably obvious by now, a career in economic consulting is a great option for anyone who takes pleasure in the research process. Unlike academia, there are no teaching obligations (unless you count educating clients on economics), no student advisory hours to fill, and no tenure review to endure. We frequently get opportunities to publish papers, most often in law and economics or antitrust journals but occasionally in pure economics journals as well. And while we rarely get to select our research topics, I have found this to be a blessing in disguise. I now work on issues that as a graduate student I never knew existed, but that I enjoy immensely.
Once a job offer has been made, a candidate has many choices about how to interact with his/her future professional colleagues—both those at the department you join and those at the departments you don’t. While it may seem obvious, a guiding principle should be that you want your future colleagues to be glad that you accepted their offer; it is unfortunately easy to make people question their decision to extend the job offer in the first place. When interacting with the department representative (usually the chair or the recruiting chair), you’ll want to find the intersection of what areas are open to negotiation and what really matters to you.

In the academic year 2006–07, the Kellogg Finance Department hired 5 new faculty members—4 new assistant professors and a tenured full professor. This was an enormous effort on the part of the whole department, focusing on the junior recruiting committee and on those involved in senior recruiting. Because there was so much recruiting activity happening in a short period of time, it was a good “laboratory” to see many different experiences in comparison to one another. I was the department chair during this process, so I was involved in many of the recruiting conversations and negotiations. Every hire is different, but I have tried to distill a few systematic lessons that may be helpful for candidates on the job market.

1. **What is open to negotiation?**
   What is open to negotiation varies from school to school. For example, in some schools, teaching loads and salaries are non-negotiable—every entering faculty member gets the same deal. On the other hand, the department may have flexibility over summer money, research funds and office or lab space, so these would be more readily negotiable. There’s no point in trying to bargain over retirement or health benefits that are not within the department’s purview. Find out what is open to negotiation and pick battles you can win.

2. **What is valuable to you?**
   There are battles you can win, however, that you probably don’t care about. Be sure to negotiate over things that matter to you—you’ll both preserve your bargaining power and give the department flexibility it may value. For example, some people care very much what they teach—if so, they should let the department know that they’d love to teach a phd course rather than undergraduates, for instance. On the other hand, if this really doesn’t matter to you (or it doesn’t have to happen right away), giving this flexibility back to the department is appreciated (since the teaching schedule is always over-constrained). Remember

   **While it may seem obvious, a guiding principle should be that you want your future colleagues to be glad that you accepted their offer . . .**

   that if you insist on teaching a particular course, it means that one of your future colleagues may have to give it up—if you have a good reason, it may be worth the potential resentment, but don’t incur it on a whim.

   Identifying what matters to you may be harder than it sounds—you need to decide what will matter to you once you are on the faculty at a new school. Other faculty may be able to help you identify these issues. Obviously, faculty with a heavily empirical research agenda may value having research funds and access to research assistants, while a computational economist may want to buy an expensive computer or access to a supercomputer. A faculty member married to another academic or professional may want help finding a job for his/her spouse, or schools for their children. Young faculty with families or the prospect of a family should inquire about family leave policies. One of our new hires was expecting a baby while on the job market, so it was natural to discuss the university’s new parental leave policy. While a candidate might be reluctant (though they shouldn’t!) to bring up these issues, even once the job offer has been made, I viewed this as continued on page 8
What Next? continued from page 7

an opportunity to highlight the benefits that Northwestern offered and how productive a faculty member could be here, even with the challenges of raising a family. I think the prospective faculty member viewed this discussion as further evidence that Northwestern was the right place for him. Identifying what is important to you gives the university a chance to distinguish itself from other competing offers.

Notice that these individual requests generally arise after a job offer has been extended. While the generic features of a faculty position can be discussed on an initial visit before a job offer has been made, most schools are reluctant to discuss special idiosyncratic features (say, spouse placement, extra research funding, lab space, etc) in any detail until the offer is concrete.

3. What is your bargaining position?
To be honest, however, these interactions are often infra-marginal. In several cases, I am sure that our potential hires had effectively decided which job they would take immediately upon getting the offers. In other cases, candidates had several broadly equivalent choices and could imagine themselves in any of several faculty positions. In this situation, you should discern not only what matters most to you, but also how your potential colleagues react when you ask. If you have a well-reasoned request that will enhance your productivity and contribution to the department, they should want to help you. A successful hire not only walks through the door, but succeeds once she is there.

To summarize, once you have a job offer you should find out what is open for negotiation, and what is most important for your future effectiveness and productivity at that school. Once you’ve identified those features that are both valuable and negotiable, assess your own bargaining position—do you have competing offers to strengthen your position? Will your request have an impact on your future colleagues? Especially if you have competing offers, the negotiation process can reveal how flexible and responsive the institution is in responding to faculty requests, and how they value requests that potentially enhance faculty productivity. Remember that the school is balancing priorities, too, so try to balance your most important requests with flexibility in other areas. Finally, remember that this negotiation is the first of many interactions with your future colleagues; your professional reputation is also an important outcome of the negotiation process.

Martha L. Olney continued from page 1

I gave my first school speech in 6th grade, the spring that Martin Luther King, Jr. and Bobby Kennedy were both killed. It was a plea for tolerance and acceptance when hate and anger seemed the easier path.

In junior high school, I led the push for dropping the “no pants” dress code for girls. In high school, I joined Women on the Move. We were a ground-breaking group of students, teachers, and community members: women’s libbers, all. Gloria Steinem wrote about our group in her new magazine, Ms.

And that started me down the path I’d spent fifteen or more years avoiding: being a teacher. I did them one better, of course, and became a professor.

I majored in math, my love, at the University of Redlands. The women’s movement seemed to have skipped over Redlands, a liberal arts college in Southern California. My activism waned. I added a second major, economics, which combined math and concern for the real world.

After graduation, I returned to the Bay Area to attend grad school at Berkeley. But I still wasn’t going to be a teacher.

My second year of grad school found me in the classroom, teaching Econ 1 sections. I was good at it. I liked it.

And that started me down the path I’d spent fifteen or more years avoiding: being a teacher. I did them one better, of course, and became a professor. And I spent the next fifteen or twenty years questioning my decision. But now, at 50, I’m content with who I am.

I am an Adjunct Professor of Economics at U.C. Berkeley. It’s an untenured position. I walked away from a tenured job at UMass-Amherst so that I and my partner of nearly a quarter century, Rev. Esther Hargis, could live together in Berkeley. Our almost 10 year old son, Jimmy, was born in Russia. I brought him home when he was 13 months old. I’ve been honored for my teaching several times at both the local and national levels. My research activity in the history of spending and household credit has recently taken a backseat to textbook writing. And I’m honored to be on the board of CSWEP, returning to my feminist roots of activism and advocacy.
of women for the MIT program at that time. Furthermore, I may have belonged to the first all-female study group at MIT: myself, Brigitte Madrian, and Judy Chevalier, all of whom are now full professors.

I took my first Industrial Organization class from Jean Tirole and was hooked. I found the theoretical and empirical analyses of competition and regulation both intellectually stimulating and relevant. I spent much of my third year gathering data in the basement of Baker Library on shipping cartels of the late 19th century. The following year MIT’s Program on the Pharmaceutical Industry offered students data for their research. I began working on generic drugs and generic entry, as well as pricing and government procurement of pharmaceuticals.

My first job was at Stanford GSB, where I had an incredible mentor, Garth Saloner. Garth gave me teaching advice, publication advice, and much more; he protected junior faculty from internal school politics, and held extremely short and effective meetings. My productivity during my time at Stanford was due in large part to him. Then my husband finished his PhD and got a job in Chicago. I became an Assistant Professor at Chicago GSB. My study group was re-united; Brigitte and Judy were also at Chicago at that time, and each of us had a first child within two years. Having female friends going through the same experience at the same institution was, once again, an enormous support.

I started working on new questions about how the Internet affects off-line markets by providing information or lowering switching costs. This series of papers focused on negotiations, the role of information, and the re-distribution of rents in response to the technology. I also branched out by co-authoring with a sociologist on such topics as business owners who care about social status and do not always profit-maximize.

My husband’s Chicago job changed in nature and he decided to leave it. I joined the Yale School of Management in New Haven as an Associate Professor, where Sharon Oster and I designed a maternity policy in time for the arrival of my second child. I came up for tenure when I was pregnant with my last child.

Having a husband who is also an academic, and who wants to share in raising our children, has been invaluable to my sanity and my career, and I am very grateful to him. Though fitting in everything I would like, and need to do, is a daily challenge, most working days I think about how much I love the package of activities that comprises an economics professor’s job, and the continual insights the discipline of economics provides.

Fiona Scott Morton continued from page 1

Western Economic Association 2007 Annual Meeting CSWEP Session Summaries

June 29–July 3, Seattle, Washington

Trade, FDI, and Government Policy

Session Chair: Katheryn Russ (University of California, Davis and NBER)

Discussants: Carolyn L. Evans (Federal Reserve Board of Governors and Santa Clara University); Andreas Waldkirch (Colby College); Rossitza Wooster (California State University and Portland State University); Katheryn N. Russ (University of California, Davis and NBER)

Andreas Waldkirch (Colby College) presented “Pollution Control and Foreign Direct Investment in Mexico: An Industry-Level Analysis.” Do US multinational firms flock to pollution havens in developing countries as a way to lower costs? The authors build a model where pollution emissions are a choice variable in the firm’s optimization problem as the basis to empirically explore this question. Using detailed location-specific data on pollution emissions within Mexico, they find that a large proportion of US FDI is drawn to areas with the highest pollution intensities.

Rossitza Wooster (California State University and Portland State University) presented “Interdependence of Restructuring by Host Governments and Foreign Firms in Transition Economies.” This paper takes an innovative game-theoretic approach to understanding the factors that influence the investment behavior of multinational firms in countries transitioning to market-based systems. In particular, the author finds that “big bang” reform will be associated with foreign takeovers of domestic firms that actually speed restructuring, while the longer-term uncertainty compels firms to minimize risk by establishing their own plants from the ground up.

Carolyn L. Evans (Federal Reserve Board of Governors and Santa Clara University) presented “Are Antidumping Duties for Sale? Case-Level Evidence on the Grossman-Helpman Protection for Sale Model.” How much to campaign contributions affect the size of antidumping duties? Using a new industry-level dataset linking firms’ campaign contributions with their apparent need for protection as
measured by import penetration ratios, the authors find that politically active firms obtain significantly higher protective antidumping duties. They use a two-stage model of the government’s policymaking process to overcome common endogeneity problems.

Katheryn N. Russ (University of California, Davis and NBER, with Thomas Lubik, Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond) presented “Entry, Multinational Firms, and Exchange Rate Volatility.” The authors use entry by heterogeneous multinational firms to explain the “excess volatility” puzzle—the fact that real and nominal exchange rates appear at least 10 times more volatile than other macroeconomic variables like relative prices and consumption. They show that the impact of country-wide productivity shocks can cause large changes in the repatriated profits of multinational firms, which generates volatility in exchange rates, while entry (exit) by less productive firms will dampen the impact of a positive (negative) productivity shock on consumption and prices.

Topics in Immigration

Session Chair: Mary Lopez (Occidental College)

Discussants: Mary Lopez (Occidental College); Marie T. Mora (University of Texas-Pan American); Cynthia Bansak (San Diego State University); Roberto Pedace (Claremont Graduate University)

Marie T. Mora (University of Texas-Pan American, with Alberto Dávila and André Varella Mollick) presented “The Gender Earnings Gap among Mexican Immigrants along the U.S.-Mexico Border.” Using data from the 2005 American Community Survey, the authors examine to extent to which the U.S.-Mexico border earnings “penalty” varies between men and women. Consistent with the relatively larger share of women in the Mexican immigrant workforce along the U.S.-Mexico border, they find that female Mexican immigrants faced a larger border earnings penalty than their male counterparts in 2005.

Catalina Amuedo-Dorantes (San Diego State University, with Cynthia Bansak) presented “The Effectiveness of Border Enforcement in Deterring and Postponing Repetitive Illegal Crossings Attempts.” The authors examine the extent to which border enforcement helps lower the likelihood of repetitive illegal border crossing attempts by Mexican immigrants or postpones future crossings. Using information collected by the Encuesta sobre Migración en la Frontera Norte de México (EMIF), they find evidence to suggest that increasing border enforcement may deter, and in some instances slightly postpone, repetitive illegal border crossings.

Roberto Pedace (Claremont Graduate University with Stephanie Rohn) presented “A Warm Embrace or the Cold Shoulder: Wage Outcomes in Ethnic Enclaves.” The authors examine the effect of ethnic concentration on immigrant earnings in high-immigration states. Data from the 1-in-6 sample of the 2000 U.S. Census is utilized in order to analyze levels of aggregation which are not possible to explore with more readily available, but significantly smaller, public-use datasets. They find that there is some variability in enclave effects, but that they exhibit an overall negative impact for men and women.

Mary Lopez (Occidental College, with Fernando Lozano, Pomona College) presented “Immigrant Selection and the Gender Wage Gap of Mexican Immigrants in the United States.” The authors analyze the decline in the gender wage gap among Mexicans immigrants in the U.S. Using pooled data from the 1994 to 2005 Current Population Survey Outgoing Rotation Group files, the authors find that the majority of the decrease in the gender wage gap among Mexican immigrants is attributed to a change in the unobservable characteristics of immigrant women. This change has resulted in a rightward shift in the relative position of Mexican women in the earnings distribution in the U.S. and has consequently decreased the gender wage gap of Mexican immigrants.

CSWEP Sponsored Sessions at the 2008 Allied Social Science Associations (ASSA) Meeting

January 4–6, New Orleans, Louisiana

Please note that all events will take place in the Hilton New Orleans Riverside Hotel. Room information for paper sessions will be provided at registration.

Friday, January 4, 2008

CSWEP Hospitality Room
7:30am–4:00pm
Room: Grand Salon 15

Marriage and Motherhood in Developing Countries
8:00am

Presiding: Nancy Qian, Brown University

Discussants: Marcus Rangel, University of Chicago; Michele Tertilt, Stanford University; Adriana Lleras-muney, Princeton University; Eric Edmonds, Dartmouth College
Jorge Aguero and Mindy Marks, University of California-Riverside—Disentangling the Relationship Between Motherhood and Wages: Evidence from Peru

Manisha Shah and Raj Arunachalam, University of Melbourne—Prostitutes and Brides

Adriana Camacho, Universidad de los Andes—Low Birth Weight and Pre-Term Babies: An Indirect Effect of Terrorist Attacks in Columbia


Political Economy in Developing Countries: Evidence from India
10:15 am

Presiding: Padma Desai, Columbia University

Discussants: Amrita Dhillon, University of Warwick; Abigail Payne, McMaster University; Lori Beaman, University of California, Berkeley; Biju Rao, World Bank

Rajashri Chakrabati, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and Joydeep Roy, Georgetown University and Economic Policy Institute—Gains from a Redrawing of Political Boundaries: Evidence from State Reorganization in India

Nandini Krishnan, Boston University—Mandated Political Representation and Public Good Provision in India

Sujata Visaria, Boston University, Erica Field, and Rohini Pande, Harvard University—Residential Segregation and Religious Violence: Consequences for Long-Term Socio-economic Outcomes in Ahmedabad, India

Lakshmi Iyer, Harvard Business School, and Anandi Mani, Boston University—Traveling Agents: Political Change and Bureaucratic Turnover in India

Education and Occupational Choice
2:30 pm

Presiding: Gail Hoyt, University of Kentucky

Discussants: Caroline Minter Hoxby, Harvard University; Raquel Fernandez, New York University; Alan Krueger, Princeton University; Thomas Dee, Swarthmore College

Justine Hastings, Yale University and NBER, and Jeffrey M. Weinstein, Yale University—Does Gender Influence Gains from Increased Academic Opportunities

Suqin Ge, Virginia Tech, and Fang Yang, State University of New York-Albany—Accounting for Gender Schooling Differences in the U.S.: An Overlapping Generations Analysis

Jennifer Thacher, Melissa Binder, Janie Chermak, and Kate Krause, University of New Mexico—Faculty Compensation and Preferences: Can Differences in Job Preferences Help Explain Why Men and Women are Paid Differently?

Alaka Holla, Innovations for Poverty Action—Missing Students: Risk, Gender, and Human Capital Investments in India

CSWEP Business Meeting
5:00–6:00pm

Room: Cambridge Room

CSWEP Reception
6:00–7:30pm

Room: Prince of Wales

Saturday, January 5, 2008

CSWEP Hospitality Room
7:30am–4:00pm

Room: Grand Salon 15

Saving and Investment Decisions: How Do Women Fare?
10:15am

Presiding: Olivia Mitchell, University of Pennsylvania

Discussants: Silvia Ardagna, Harvard University; Pascaline Dupas, Dartmouth College; Olivia Mitchell, University of Pennsylvania; Enrichetta Ravina, New York University

Annamaria Lusardi, Dartmouth College, and Olivia Mitchell, University of Pennsylvania—Planning and Financial Literacy: How Do Women Fare?

Julie Agnew, Lisa Anderson, Jeffrey Gerlach, and Lisa Szykman, College of William and Mary—Who Chooses Annuities? An Experimental Investigation of the Role of Sex, Information Bias and Financial Literacy

Nava Ashraf, Harvard Business School, Dean Karlan, Yale University, and Wesley Yin, University of Chicago—Female Empowerment: Impact of a Commitment Savings Product in the Philippines

Vickie Bajtelsmit and Nancy Jianakoplos, Colorado State University—Are Self-Employed Women More Financially Savvy?
Sunday January 6, 2008
CSWEP Hospitality Room
7:30am–12:00pm
Room: Grand Salon 15

Marriage, Divorce, and Fertility
8:00am
Presiding: Karine S. Moe, Macalester College
Discussants: Joyce P. Jacobsen, Wesleyan University; Lisa Giddings, University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse; Shelly Lundberg, University of Washington; Lucie Schmidt, Williams College
Kasey Buckles, University of Notre Dame—Understanding the Returns to Delayed Childbearing for Working Women
Kristin Mammen, Barnard College—The Effects of Children’s Gender on Divorce and Child Support
Betsey Stevenson, University of Pennsylvania—Divorce-Law Changes, Household Bargaining, and Married Women’s Labor Supply Revisited
Jungmin Lee, University of Arkansas-Fayetteville and IZA, and AMY FARMER, University of Arkansas-Fayetteville—Impaired Fecundity, Fertility, and Married Women’s Labor Supply

Health and Education in Developing Countries
10:15am
Presiding: Alicia Menendez, University of Chicago
Discussants: Harsha Thirumurthy, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill; Pascaline Dupas, Dartmouth College; Rema Hanna, New York University; Elaina Rose, University of Washington
Adrienne Lucas, Wellesley College—The Impact of Disease Eradication on Fertility and Education
Adeline Delavande, Rand Corporation, and Hans-peter Kohler, University of Pennsylvania—Probabilistic Expectations about HIV in Rural Malawi
Seema Jayachandran, Stanford University, and Paul Glewwe, University of Minnesota—Incentives to Teach Badly? After-School Tutoring in Developing Countries
Stacey Chen, State University of New York-Albany, Jin-tan Liu, National Taiwan University, and Yen-Chien Chen, National Taiwan University—We Prefer Sons But Does it Matter? Evidence from Taiwanese Administrative Data

CSWEP Sponsored Sessions at the 2007 Southern Economic Association Meeting

November 18–21, New Orleans, Louisiana
CSWEP will sponsor five sessions and a reception.

Monday, November 19, 2007
Impacts of Social Policy on Family Well-Being and Health Session 7A, 8:00–9:45am
Discussants: Kasey Buckles (University of Notre Dame), Aparna Lhila (University of Georgia), and Ken Troske (University of Kentucky).
Do Children Keep Mothers from Developing their Career? Evidence Using State Kindergarten Entrance Age Laws (Rashmi Barua, Boston University)
Does Physician Quality Affect Hospital Length-of-Stay and Discharge Destination? (Lara Gardner and Sharmila Vishwasrao, Florida Atlantic University)
Earned Income Tax Credit and the Educational Progress of Single Mothers (Linda Carter, Vanderbilt University)
Do public goods explain the relationship between income inequality and birth weight? (Aparna Lhila, The University of Georgia)

Marriage and Children Session 7B, 10:00–11:45am
Discussants: Joanna Lahey (Texas A&M); Lisa Dickson (University of Maryland-Baltimore; Martha Bailey (University of Michigan); and Melanie Guldi (Mount Holyoke).
Starter Marriages (Kasey Buckles, University of Notre Dame and Melanie Guldi, Mt. Holyoke)
Did Welfare Reform Improve the Academic Performance of Children in Low-Income Households? (Amalia Miller, University of Virginia)
Abortion and Comstockery: Fertility Control and the 19th Century Demographic Transition (Liz Oltmans Ananat, Duke University and Joanna Lahey, Texas A&M)
Minimum Drinking Age Laws and Infant Health Outcomes (Angela Fertig, University of Georgia and Tara Watson, Williams College)
**Issues in Environmental Economics**

**Session 7C, 1:00–2:45pm**

**Discussants:** John Whitehead (Appalachian State University), Jonathan Hamilton (University of Florida), and Brandon Koford (University of Kentucky).

Balancing Environmental Protection and Energy Production in the Federal Hydropower Licensing Process (Lea Kosnik, University of Missouri)

An Economic Framework for Coordinating Climate Policy with the Montreal Protocol (Stephen J. DeCanio, University of California, Santa Barbara and Catherine S. Norman, Johns Hopkins University)

Dams, Dam Removal and River Restoration: A Hedonic Property Value Analysis (Lynne Lewis, Bates College, Curtis Bohlen, Colby College and Sarah Wilson, Bates College)

The Distributional Impacts of Climate Change (Jennifer Brown, Fred Loxsom, and Mary Curran, Eastern Connecticut State University)

**Mothers and Public Policy**

**Session 7D, 3:00–4:45pm**

**Discussants:** Scott Hankins (University of Kentucky), Amalia Miller (University of Virginia), Ken Troske (University of Kentucky), and Sally Wallace (University of Georgia).

Smoking and Pregnancy Outcomes Among Young Adults (Angela Fertig and Monica Gaughan, University of Georgia)

The Effect of Minimum Wage Increases on Less-Educated Single Mothers (Joe Sabia, University of Georgia)

The Consequences of Welfare Reform for Prenatal WIC Participation and Birth Outcomes (Sarah Hamersma, University of Florida)

The Earned Income Tax Credit and Poverty among Single Mothers and their Children (Molly Dahl, Congressional Budget Office and Thomas DeLeire, Congressional Budget Office and Michigan State University)

**CSWEP Reception**

6:00–8:00pm in Balcony M

---

**Eastern Economic Association Call for Papers**

CSWEP will be sponsoring sessions at the Eastern Economics Association meetings. The meetings will be held in Boston at the Boston Park Plaza Hotel on March 7–9, 2008. In addition to a session on gender differences, CSWEP session topics are open and all abstracts are welcome. One-page abstracts should include your name, affiliation, mail and e-mail address, and phone and fax numbers. Abstracts can be sent via mail or e-mail.

**Abstracts should be submitted by November 7, 2007 to**

Linda Bell
Haverford College
370 Lancaster Avenue
Haverford, PA 19041
lbell@haverford.edu

Please note that your CSWEP abstract submission is distinct from submissions in response to the EEA general call for papers. Any abstract not accepted for a CSWEP sponsored session will be passed on to the EEA. Further information on the EEA meetings is available at http://www.iona.edu/eea/
Western Economic Association
Call for Papers

CSWEP will be sponsoring sessions at the 2008 Western Economic Association (WEA) meetings, to be held at the Sheraton Waikiki in Honolulu, Hawaii, June 29–July 3, 2008. Deadline for submission of session proposals is December 1, 2007.

One or two sessions are available for persons submitting an entire session (3 or 4 papers) or a complete panel on a specific topic in any area of economics. The organizers should prepare a proposal for a session (including chair, abstracts, and discussants) or panel (including chair and participants) and submit by email before December 1, 2007.

One or two additional sessions will be organized by the Western representative. Abstracts for papers in the topic areas of gender or race/ethnicity; economic history; economic development; or economics of education are particularly solicited. Abstracts in other areas are also welcome.

Please email complete session proposals, panel discussion proposals, or abstracts (1–2 pages, include names of authors, affiliations, addresses, email contacts, paper title) by December 1, 2007 to:
Martha Olney, CSWEP Western Representative
Adjunct Professor of Economics
University of California, Berkeley
Email: molney@econ.berkeley.edu
Phone: 510-642-6083
Fax: 510-642-6615 (include cover sheet; fax is for entire department)

Please note that this submission is separate from any submission sent in response to the WEA’s general call for papers. For more information on the WEA meetings, please see http://www.weainternational.org/conferences.htm

January 2009 American Economic Association Meeting Call for Abstracts

CSWEP will sponsor sessions at the January 2009 American Economic Association meetings in San Francisco. We will be organizing three sessions on gender-related topics and three sessions on public economics topics. Accepted papers will be considered for publication in the Papers and Proceedings issue of the American Economic Review. E-mail a cover letter (specifying to which set of sessions the paper is being submitted) and a copy of a one- to two-page abstract (250–1000 words), clearly labeled with the paper title, authors’ names, and contact information for all the authors by January 11, 2008 to csweep@tufts.edu.

Summer Economics Fellows Program

Purpose: To increase the participation and advancement of women and underrepresented minorities in economics, the fellowship allows the fellow to spend a summer in residence at a sponsoring research institution such as a Federal Reserve Bank or other public agency.

Overview: Sponsored by the American Economic Association and the National Science Foundation, summer economics fellowships are available to senior graduate students and junior faculty. During their residency, fellows participate as members of the research community while engaged in a research project of their own choosing. Fellows will be mentored by experienced economists both on scientific issues, and career issues such as negotiating publications, the job market, and advancement strategies. Fellows are encouraged to present a research seminar at the sponsoring agency during their fellowship. Fellows are typically either junior faculty or graduate students at the dissertation stage. Fellows are to be chosen by the program with the agreement of the sponsoring institution in line with the goal of advancing the participation of women and underrepresented minorities in the economics profession, the fit of a candidate with the activities of the research group at the sponsoring institution, and the value of the proposed research to advancing the sponsoring institution’s own goals.

 Participating Programs for Summer of 2008
The Federal Reserve Bank of Boston
The Federal Reserve Bank of New York
The Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco
The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve

Application: Applicants are asked to apply directly to the program, but are welcome to indicate a preference for a particular sponsor. Applicants should include a c.v. and one page description of their proposed research, as well as the applicant information form. (A cover letter is not necessary.) Graduate students should include a letter of recommendation from a faculty member; junior faculty may include such a letter from a senior faculty member. Fellowships are open to all economists without regard to gender or minority status, although the goal of the program, advancing the careers of women and underrepresented minorities, will drive the selection process. For example, in seeking to advance women in the economics profession an institution may sponsor a couple, or a male partner of a female economist, or otherwise sponsor a male economist whose participation would assist the general goal of advancing women in the profession. Please send applications to CSWEP@tufts.edu. Preference in consideration will be given to applications received by February 1, 2008.

Administration: The program is administered by an ad hoc committee appointed by the Chairs of CSWEP and CSMGEP.

For further information, visit http://www.csweep.org/summerfellows/index.htm or contact Dick Startz, Summer Fellows Program Coordinator at aansfsf@u.washington.edu.
"We need every day to herald some woman’s achievements... go ahead and boast!"  
—Carolyn Shaw Bell

Marjorie Baldwin has been appointed Director of the School of Health Management and Policy in the W. P. Carey School of Business at Arizona State University.

Linda Bell has been named Provost of Haverford College.

Susan Collins has been named the Joan and Sanford Weill Dean of Public Policy at the University of Michigan.

Judy Chevalier has been appointed Deputy Provost for Faculty Development at Yale University.

Fiona Scott Morton has been appointed Associate Dean for Faculty Development at Yale School of Management.

HOW TO RENEW/BECOME A CSWEP ASSOCIATE

CSWEP is a subcommittee of the AEA, charged with addressing the status of women in the economics profession. It publishes a three-times-a-year newsletter that examines issues such as how to get papers published, how to get on the AEA program, how to network, working with graduate students, and family leave policies. CSWEP also organizes sessions at the annual meetings of the AEA and the regional economics associations, runs mentoring workshops, and publishes an annual report on the status of women in the economics profession.

CSWEP depends on the generosity of its associates to continue its activities. If you are already a CSWEP associate and have not sent in your donation for the current year (January 2007-December 2007) we urge you to renew your status. All donations are tax-deductible. If CSWEP is new to you, please visit our website, www.cswep.org to learn more about us. Students receive free complimentary CSWEP associate status. Just indicate your student status below.

Thank you!

If you wish to renew/become an associate of CSWEP you have two options:

OPTION 1: ONLINE PAYMENT BY CREDIT CARD
Go to www.cswep.org/howto.htm and follow the “Online Payment by Credit Card” link. It’s quick, convenient and secure. We accept Mastercard, Visa and American Express.

OPTION 2: MAIL
If paying by check please send your donation by mail to: CSWEP, c/o Joan Haworth, Ph.D. 4901 Tower Court Tallahassee, FL 32303
(Please make check payable to CSWEP.) If you are a student, fill out the form below and send it to the same address.

NAME: ___________________________________________
MAILING ADDRESS: _____________________________________________________________
CITY, STATE, ZIP: ___________________________________________________________________
E-MAIL ADDRESS: ___________________________________________

check here if currently an AEA member
check here if currently a student

Institution: ___________________________________________
Expected graduation date: ___________________________

I authorize CSWEP to release my contact information to other organizations that wish to share information of interest with CSWEP members.  □ yes □ no

Donation Amount: □ $25.00 (associate level) □ $50.00 □ $75.00 □ $100.00 □ Other _________

Please visit our website www.cswep.org.

To no longer receive mail from CSWEP, please email cswepmembers@ersgroup.com or write to the address provided above.
CSWEP Management Directory

General Policy Matters:
Lisa Lynch
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy
Tufts University
160 Packard Avenue
Medford, MA 02155
cswep@tufts.edu

Dues, Change of Address, Roster:
Joan Haworth
Membership Secretary
ERS Group
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303
jhaworth@ersgroup.com

CSWEP East:
Linda A. Bell
Economics Department
Haverford College
370 Lancaster Avenue
Haverford, PA 19041-1392
lbell@haverford.edu

CSWEP Midwest:
Anna Paulson
Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago
230 South LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60604-1412
Anna.Paulson@chic.frb.org

CSWEP South:
Gail Hoyt
University of Kentucky
3350 Gatton
Business and Economics Building
Lexington, KY 40506-0034
ghoyt@pop.uky.edu

CSWEP West:
Martha L. Olney
University of California
Department of Economics
549 Evans Hall, #3880
Berkeley CA 94720-3880
molney@econ.berkeley.edu

Upcoming Regional Meetings:

Eastern Economic Association
http://www.iona.edu/eea/
2008 Annual Meeting March 7–9, 2008
Boston: Boston Park Plaza Hotel
Deadline for submission: November 7, 2007
CSWEP deadline: November 7, 2007

Midwest Economics Association
http://web.grinnell.edu/mea
Chicago: Hyatt Regency Chicago

Western Economic Association
http://www.weainternational.org/
Waikiki: Sheraton Waikiki
Deadline for submission: December 15, 2007
CSWEP deadline: December 1, 2007

Southern Economic Association
http://www.etnetpubs.com/conferenceprograms/sea/
2007 Annual Meeting: November 19–21, 2007
New Orleans: New Orleans Marriott Hotel