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1. How did you decide you wanted to be an economist?
For as long as I can remember, I knew I wanted to be an academic. My parents are both academics (biologists) and it always seemed to me (and still seems) hard to imagine a better job than getting to go to work every day to think about problems that interest you. Plus, I always loved school and my favorite thing about school was writing papers (I always hated exams, which is why I try to design my classes to have papers or take home exams rather than in class “timed tests”). I still remember my first research paper: in first grade we each had to write a mammal report. I wrote on elephants. I liked writing the paper continued on page 16

Bailey named winner of 2009 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award

Congratulations to Elizabeth Ellery Bailey who has won the 2009 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award. The Award ceremony will be held during the CSWEP Business Meeting Lunch, January 3, 2010, 12:30–2:00 p.m., room M101 and the CSWEP Reception, in part honoring Dr. Bailey, will be held at 6:00 p.m. in room M304, both in the Atlanta Marriott Marquis Hotel.

Deadline for Summer Fellowship applications is February 19, 2010
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There are several “themes” in this newsletter that remind me of the importance of the continuing efforts of CSWEP. The Board of Directors and the Executive Committee are committed to the women in the economics profession and to undertake activities to improve that position. This issue yearly newsletters are one of these activities. See our newsletter at www.cswep.org for more information on what we are doing.
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CSWEP (Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession) is a standing committee of the AEA (American Economic Association). It was founded in 1971 to monitor the position of women in the economics profession and to undertake activities to improve that position. This issue yearly newsletters are one of these activities. See our newsletter at www.cswep.org for more information on what we are doing.
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CSWEP Newsletter:
An opportunity to contribute.
Plan to submit paper proposals! CSWEP will be organizing three sessions on gender-related topics and three sessions on real estate and housing topics for the 2011-2012 AEA annual meetings. We are seeking co-sponsors to host at least one of these sessions. Please send an abstract with all contact information to kcoman@usm.maine.edu. CSWEP will cover travel expenses to the annual meeting. Please submit proposals by December 1.

The following table lists self-reported information from institutions that granted Ph.D.s in economics (92% response rate). The table lists the universities whose economics departments rank in the top ten of departments using either one of the listed criteria. Note that the reported data show that 40% of all participating departments have no female full professors.

University Full Professor Honor Roll
The following table lists self-reported information from institutions that grant Ph.D.s in economics (92% response rate). The table lists the universities whose economics departments rank in the top ten of departments using either one of the listed criteria. Note that the reported data show that 40% of all participating departments have no female full professors.

Board Member Biography
Rohini Pande
Growing up in a large, noisy and fast-growing Indian city was formative in defining my interests in development economics. After a very short-lived stint (two days!) in medical school, I decided I was not made for caring in the hospital setting. However, my pre-medical school focus on math and science courses meant that the only non-science undergraduate degree I could gain admission to was economics. Three years later I had a bachelor degree in philosophy, politics and economics from Oxford. I left Oxford a bit more certain of my academic interests in economics and even more certain of my preference for large and noisy cities. I completed my doctoral work on the political economy of economic growth in the London School of Economics. I was lucky to have a very thoughtful and supportive thesis advisor—TimBesley—and his support has been critical for my academic career.

Entering the U.S. academic system after finishing my doctoral work in Europe was a mixed experience. When I started my first job at Columbia, I had a limited sense of how the U.S. academic profession and the tenure system worked. However, one of the best benefits of knowing edge was that I felt completely unconfined in my research choices. This particular opportunity there were an increasing number of new opportunities to engage in field-based development research.

For the last ten years I have spent roughly two months each year in a field setting for research. With my focus on questions that may be unfamiliar to many of my colleagues, I have had the opportunity to work on a diversity of projects from studying how democratic forms of governance interact with voter preferences to determine which public policies are chosen. Redistribution is central to policy-making in any low-income country. What keeps me motivated is the idea that economics research can help identify which governance structures can provide historically disadvantaged groups policy voice and how institutional design can affect service delivery.

In my work, field work, scientific and changing jobs I have had a pretty peripatetic academic career. I spent three years at Columbia, was on sabbatical at MIT for a year, then three years at Berkeley (2000–3). After a very short-lived stint (two days!) in medical school, I decided I was not made for caring in the hospital setting. However, my pre-medical school focus on math and science courses meant that the only non-science undergraduate degree I could gain admission to was economics. Three years later I had a bachelor degree in philosophy, politics and economics from Oxford. I left Oxford a bit more certain of my academic interests in economics and even more certain of my preference for large and noisy cities. I completed my doctoral work on the political economy of economic growth in the London School of Economics. I was lucky to have a very thoughtful and supportive thesis advisor—TimBesley—and his support has been critical for my academic career.

Entering the U.S. academic system after finishing my doctoral work in Europe was a mixed experience. When I started my first job at Columbia, I had a limited sense of how the U.S. academic profession and the tenure system worked. However, one of the best benefits of knowing edge was that I felt completely unconfined in my research choices. This particular opportunity there were an increasing number of new opportunities to engage in field-based development research.

For the last ten years I have spent roughly two months each year in a field setting for research. With my focus on questions that may be unfamiliar to many of my colleagues, I have had the opportunity to work on a diversity of projects from studying how democratic forms of governance interact with voter preferences to determine which public policies are chosen. Redistribution is central to policy-making in any low-income country. What keeps me motivated is the idea that economics research can help identify which governance structures can provide historically disadvantaged groups policy voice and how institutional design can affect service delivery.

In my work, field work, scientific and changing jobs I have had a pretty peripatetic academic career. I spent three years at Columbia, was on sabbatical at MIT for a year, then Yale for two years, on leave at Berkeley for six month and have since been at Harvard Kennedy School. The limited presence of senior female faculty, unfortunately, was a constant across all my jobs. The benefits that I derived from the few that were there—like Penny Goldberg—has left me more convinced of my research findings (albeit from Indian villages!) on the effectiveness of exposure to women in positions of power in dismantling social stereotypes.

My mobility while a junior faculty is not unusual in the profession—and certainly being a migrant meant that I had to develop much more resiliency than I needed for my less strong ties to any single US cities. That said, changing jobs and moving is exhausting. For me, one of the best rewards of all this moving has been developing a strong network of female colleagues and coauthors. Many of them, like Esther Duflo, Erica Field and Rama Huma, also ran around the world and it is always great to find one of them in India to go search out the last bad of the local wines! Another fun aspect of the job has been the increasing number of graduate students who go as Research Assistants for a summer in the field and come back having caught the bug. Seeing the training up in individual projects and develop strong networks of other researchers, NGO workers and policy practitioners has been fantastic.

University Full Professor Honor Roll
The following table lists self-reported information from institutions that grant Ph.D.s in economics (92% response rate). The table lists the universities whose economics departments rank in the top ten of departments using either one of the listed criteria. Note that the reported data show that 40% of all participating departments have no female full professors.

Columbia University
18% 6
University of California, Berkeley
15% 5
University of California, Los Angeles
25% 2
Colorado State University
20% 3
University of Texas at Dallas
33% 2
Wayne State University
25% 2
Tulane University
50% 1

% of full professors that are female of female full professors

# of female full professors
Navigating the Job Market as Dual Career Economists

Look around. What share of your married female colleagues are married to other Ph.D. economists? In the Research Department at the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, it’s 60 percent. In the Economics Department at Georgia State University, it’s 50 percent. And most of my new, young male colleagues are also married to Ph.D. economists. It’s a phenomenon many of us have either seen or experienced first-hand. In spite of ensuring stimulating dinner conversation, partnering with, what is often the case, a graduate school colleague can make for a particularly challenging and stressful job market experience.

In the articles that follow, three couples offer their advice on how to navigate those difficult decisions and make those difficult choices that come along with being lucky enough to spend the rest of your life with someone who doesn’t cringe when you use the term “opportunity cost” at dinner. Kathleen and Andrew are the youngest in their careers. Kathleen finished first, Andrew is the trailing spouse and they are still in the process of locating those jointly rewarding careers in academia.

Lisa and Ramsey found their best options outside of academia. On the job market for the first time together, they had the added challenge of a newly arrived bundle of joy who one day would cringe when opportunity cost comes up at the dinner table. Ellen and Deb bring yet a third perspective to the joint-economists job search. Although, as lesbians, they perhaps faced a more complex set of issues on the path to careers in academia, all three couples offer comfortably similar advice. “Flexible,” “communication,” “open minded” are themes that all three articles touch on.

In the fourth article, Londa Schiebinger, a historian, summarizes the findings of her research on dual-career academic couples. She presents some striking results comparing attitudes toward career between couples who are both in academia and couples with only one member in academia. She also offers some pointed advice to university and colleges about the value in hiring couples and the best strategies for doing so.

While the job market is full of stressors for all new Ph.D. economists, couples face some unique challenges, and with a significant number of joint-economist job searchers, employers have some unique opportunities in considering hiring couples.
Still Looking...

M. Kathleen Thomas,
Associate Professor of Economics, Mississippi State University

R. Andrew Lucassen,
Instructor, Department of Finance and Economics, Mississippi State University

I never intended to marry another economist, but in June 2004 that’s exactly what I did. I was a new assistant professor at Mississippi State University, and luckily I worked for a department head who was very sympathetic to the plight of academic couples. Andrew was in a tenure-track position at Nichols State University in south Louisiana. For the year prior to our wedding, I made trips down to the bayou or Drew drove up to Starkville. We were young and in love, and that was just fine.

But the 5½ hour car ride got old rather quickly. We knew we did not want to live apart, so after his first year, Drew left his tenure-track position and took an instructor position at MSU. We were very grateful this opportunity became available. It was our understanding that it would be temporary, and Drew would have a shot at a tenure-track position soon.

Five years later, Drew is still in the instructor position. This coupled with changing dynamics in our department resulted in us going out on the job market two years ago. So far, we have been unsuccessful at finding two appropriate positions. We will continue to look until we do. I was recently promoted and awarded tenure at MSU, but I really believe Drew deserves his shot at a tenure-track position soon.

Expect imperfection

Ideally, I would like to be hired as an Associate with tenure. Drew would like to have a tenure-track job, we want to work at a good university or college with bright students, have our research interests supported, be relatively close to our family, have access to affordable housing and good school systems, not face a killer commute, and maybe be within close proximity to a good Thai restaurant and a couple of shopping malls. Something will clearly have to give.

I will most likely have to give up tenure, although most of the schools we have talked to so far would be able to give me a short line to tenure—1 to 2 years. Being close to our family may mean a plane ride—not a 2-hour trip in the car. Good restaurants and shopping will probably mean heavier traffic. We understand the trade-offs. Hope for perfection, but plan to make some compromises. But also know what you won’t be willing to compromise. Drew and I never wanted to live in different cities or states. This is especially true now that we have children. We also want academic jobs, and we have never applied to any jobs in the private sector. To give some perspective, on the junior market, before we were an academic couple, we sent out upwards of 75 applications. In the last two job markets, we have sent out no more than a dozen applications.

Be upfront from the beginning

The first year we were on the market, we did not reveal in our cover letters that we were on the market with a spouse. I had a good first interview with a university we both loved. But they didn’t realize that Drew had also applied. Even though they were hiring for multiple positions, they were for different fields, and they did not have a system in place to deal with a trailing spouse. Now we mention each other in the opening paragraph of our letter of application. Why even waste time with an interview, if the department cannot accommodate both of you? Also, with my situation, an application would look rather suspect if I...
Building a Life

Ellen Mutari,
Professor of Economics and Women’s Studies Coordinator,
The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey

Deborah M. Figari,
Dean, School of Graduate and Continuing Studies,
and Professor of Economics, The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey

Two career-committed academics in a national job market face many challenges when trying to find satisfying individual employment situations while building a life together. We faced a distinct set of hurdles in our search process, a process that really began in the mid-1980s when Deb entered the job market and continued—off and on—until Ellen landed a tenure-track job in 1999:

Hurdle #1
We are both economists, from the same Ph.D. program, in similar fields. Deb, who completed her degree in 1986, studies discrimination and contemporary labor market policies; Ellen, who finished in 1995, studies the economic history of women’s employment. Even “worse”—from the employer’s perspective—we are frequent collaborators and co-authors. This made it difficult to find employment in small departments which often have room for only “one of each” field or specialization.

Hurdle #2
We are both heterodox economists who chose to get our doctorates from American University in Washington, DC, because of its reputation for balancing mainstream economics with political economy. AU’s political economy track included the history of economic thought and economic history in addition to contemporary theory and methods. Our graduate school advisors suggested that the best options for heterodox economists were small, liberal arts colleges. Many of our graduate students would, sensing a strong bond, ask for graduate students who were more likely to value our broad training.

Hurdle #3
As lesbians, we were even more hesitant than a married heterosexual couple might be to discuss our personal situation in a job interview or before accepting an offer. Back in the 1980s and the early 1990s, lesbians were still pretty invisible in society and culture. Everyone from grocery store clerks to fellow graduate students would, sensing a strong bond, ask if we were sisters, something that happens far less often in a post-Melissa-k.d.-Ellen DeGeneres world. Even assessing the campus climate for lesbian faculty was more difficult at the time. Geography, specifically living in a “blue state,” with a visible LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer) community, also mattered a great deal to us, limiting where we would apply for jobs.

These hurdles made our search process more complex. But we have cleared them and landed on our feet. We are tenured professors at a relatively small (about 7000 students) public sector college in southern New Jersey. After getting tenure for the second time in her career, Deb has served as Dean of the School of Graduate and Continuing Studies at Stockton for six years. Ellen is now on the Economics faculty at Stockton and is serving as Women’s Studies Coordinator. Over 60 of our colleagues and their spouses/partners (along with other friends and neighbors) attended a celebration in honor of our 20th anniversary and domestic partnership in 2004. We now have “upgraded” to a state-recognized civil union. Our institution, founded in 1970, emphasizes interdisciplinary teaching and research, making it welcoming for heterodox approaches to economics. And we continue to collaborate on our research—sharing our ideas as well as our home.

We had several things going for us that transcend the particulars of our situation:

Advantage #1
We were both willing to make compromises and trade-offs, and we have.

Advantage #2
We were flexible about what constitutes career success. Most importantly, we have not defined ourselves by the academic reputation of our employer. Although we have not had the institutional supports for our research provided by the top-tier institutions, we have been productive scholars with solid reputations within the heterodox community. And we both enjoy teaching students from a variety of backgrounds. Teaching at an institution like Stockton is not about passing the disciplinary torch, but about nurturing individual students’ awareness of and intellectual engagement with economic life as they pursue a variety of careers.

Advantage #3
We communicated with each other about our hopes and ambitions, our frustrations and setbacks. And communicated. And communicated.

Advantage #4
We learned from our past decisions, both good and bad. And we talked about what we learned.

Our approach to career decisions reflects our values as feminists. In our research and in our private lives, we have sought a balance between what has been termed “equality feminism” and “difference feminism.” Equality feminism emphasizes breaking down barriers so that women can do those activities and embrace the characteristics that have been deemed “male”—and are often disproportionately rewarded by our society. Difference feminism accentuates the need to value the activities and characteristics that have been labeled “feminine.” Personally, this has meant that we value our work, but view paid employment as only one of the life activities that provides meaning in our lives.

Of course, because we collaborate on research, the boundaries between work and the rest of life are quite porous! Our productivity has been enhanced by living with our primary co-author. This has its advantages.

There is almost always someone with whom to discuss ideas. At one point, we even turned the dining room of a rented home into the study because it had the only modern electrical outlets for our computers. Work became the literal center of our home. We both understand the rhythms of academic life: syllabi, revisions, waves of grading, publishing deadlines, etc.

In twenty-five years of living together, we have never had a commuter relationship. We knew early on that we wanted to avoid separate households if possible. We have come close several times, and never firmly ruled out the possibility. But for us, it would be a last resort.

How We Got Here
We met in 1983, in graduate school at American University in Washington, DC. 1983 was Ellen’s first year at AU, while Deb was studying for her comprehensive exams and about to become “A.B.” The first important compromise came when Deb was finishing her dissertation and entering the job market. Because Ellen was just starting graduate school, Deb delayed going on the national market and stayed at AU to teach in their Washington Semester Program. When Deb had the opportunity to teach abroad in Europe in Alan’s Study abroad program in Brussel, Belgium, Ellen took leave from graduate school and did an independent study project so we could live abroad together.

Still, the need for flexibility and compromise was a lesson learned the hard way. The first year that Deb entered the national academic job market, Ellen had a narrow (and unrealistic) list of major cities where she would move. Though Deb came close to meeting those parameters, she instead received a Fulbright to return to Europe. We spent another year in Western Europe, with Ellen studying for comps. We came back briefly for the ASSA meetings and winter job interviews, this time casting a broader geographic net. Deb accepted an offer from Eastern Michigan University in Ypsilanti, Michigan, starting Fall 1990. We settled into living in progressive Ann Arbor. She received tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, while Ellen adjuncted, completed her dissertation, and dealt with the final stages of her mother’s illness.

As Ellen entered the academic job market, the limited possibilities in southeast Michigan became apparent. One of the most important pieces of advice came from our friend and eventual co-author, Marilyn Power of Sar-
ah Lawrence College: “Don’t let tenure become a trap!” Marilyn had left a tenured position at the University of New Hampshire to move to Sarah Lawrence. So we started thinking about our next move.

[The dean’s] small acknowledgement of the truth of our personal relationship meant a great deal to us.
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Excellence. Our study suggests that couples more and more vote with their feet, leaving or not considering universities that do not support them. Among couples hires in our study, 88% reported that they would have refused an offer had her or his partner not found an appropriate position. Support for dual careers opens another avenue by which universities can compete for the best and brightest. A professor of medicine in our survey commented that talented academics are often partnered, and “if you want the most talented, you find innovative ways of going after them.”

Diversity. The new generation of academics is more diverse in terms of gender and ethnicity than ever before. With greater diversity comes the need for new hiring practices. Institutions should not expect new participants to assimilate into current practices built around old academic models and demographics. This undermines innovation, opportunity, and equity. New hiring practices are needed to support a diverse professorate—and one of these practices is couple hiring.

Quality of Life. Faculty today are a new breed determined more than ever to strike a sustainable balance between working and private lives. To enhance competitive excellence, universities are increasingly attending to quality-of-life issues that include partner hiring. While often costly up front, addressing the challenges of faculty members’ personal lives may help universities secure their investments in the long run.

Academic Workforce Demographics

New hiring policies require a clear understanding of workforce demographics as well as the cultural practices and values of faculty in the 21st century. This section identifies three ways that couples enter universities (Figure 1). Developing new definitions and terminology is important as universities refine dual-hiring policies and practices.

1. Dual Hires

“Dual hires” are couples where both partners are hired as part of a negotiation. The majority of dual hires are appointed “sequentially.” Typically, one partner, the “first hire,” receives an initial offer and then negotiates for his or her partner. This second partner—who enters the deal through a series of negotiations that generally include a full-blown campus visit and interview—we call the “second hire” in order to overcome the negative terms often applied to this partner, such as “trailing spouse.”

Dual hires also include “joint hires,” or that small but growing number of couples who are a known couple and are recruited together by a university—there is no first or second hire. These couples often market themselves and are approached by universities as a package. Both partners may be stars, in which case everyone wants them and hiring decisions are easy. If each partner is not happily settled at his or her current institution, universities can recruit the couple strategically by offering both attractive positions.

Most dual hires work at the same institution (93%), meaning that universities need clear policies for these types of hires.

2. Independent Hires

Seventeen percent of all respondents to our survey are in an academic partnership but secured employment independently of their couple status, at the same or neighboring institution(s). These respondents comprise our group of “independent hires.” In these cases, either each partner replied to separate advertisements for positions and was hired without mention of a partner, or each already held a faculty position at their current institution before they met and fell in love. Only 20% of respondents fall into this latter group; the vast majority of independent hires formed a partnership before each was hired and faced the problem of finding jobs together. Coordinating jobs in this fashion (without specifically negotiating for a second partner) is not easy, and only 61% find work at the same university.

3. Solo Hires

“Solo hires” are those respondents to our survey who identify their partner as an academic—but one who is not currently employed in an academic position. For lack of better nomenclature, we call this group solo hires, meaning that only one partner has secured academic employment (partners, of course, may have found work outside academia).

Recruiting Women: Partners Matter

Couple hiring is particularly important for recruiting and retaining female faculty. Women faculty are more likely than men to be in an academic partnership (40% versus 34%, respectively—Figure 2). In fact, rates of dual hiring are higher among women respondents than among men respondents (13% versus 7%)

But the differences between men and women go beyond the numbers to encompass the relative value men and women attach to their partners’ careers. In our survey, we asked a question: Whose career comes first in your relationship? Who follows whom? A healthy half of men in academic couples responded “mine,” compared to only 20% of academic women (see Figure 3). Academic women overwhelming (59% vs. 45% academic men) answered “we value each career equally.”

There is a problem in this asymmetry between men and women’s values that leads to one of our most important findings in this study: a good number of women simply will not accept a job unless partners are accommodated. Not only do women more often than men perceive a loss in professional mobility as a result of their academic partnerships (54% for women versus 41% for men), but they actively refuse job offers if their partner cannot find a satisfactory position. In our study, the number-one reason women refused an outside offer was because their academic partners were not offered appropriate employment at the new location. These findings have significant implications: In order to recruit top women institutions need to have a clear process in place to vet partners for hire. Historically, men more than women have used their market power to bargain for positions for their partners. Men comprise the majority (58%) of “first hires” (or the

---

Table: Whose Career is Primary? By Partner Type and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo Hires</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Hires</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Hires</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 1. Academic Couples, by Hire Type

Overall, 10% of faculty enter the academy through dual hires. Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

- 56% Have Employed (Non-Academic) Partner
- 36% Have Academic Partner
- 15% Have Stay-at-Home Partner
- 14% Are Single

- 32% Are Joint
- 27% Are Independent
- 5% Are Sequential
- 34% Recruit by advertising as a couple
- 17% Are Solo Hires
- 5% Are Solo Stay-at-Home Hires

Academic women are more likely than men to have academic partners. Academic men are more likely to have stay-at-home partners, whereas academic women are more likely to be single.

Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

---

Figure 2. Men and Women Have Different Partnering Patterns

- 27% Have Stay-at-Home Partner
- 21% Single
- 14% Employed (Non-Academic) Partner
- 10% Have Academic Partner

Academic women are more likely than men to have academic partners. Men are more likely to have stay-at-home partners, whereas academic women are more likely to be single.

Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

---

Figure 3. Whose Career is Primary? By Partner Type and Gender

Academic couples are more likely than others to value the career of each partner equally. Women more than men say they consider their own and their partners’ careers of equal importance across all couple types.
Agree on Priorities

that an appointment in an economics department was not necessarily an optimal fit with my goals. Ramsey was excited by opportunities to conduct applied industrial organization research in a business setting. All of these considerations gave us a lot of flexibility: We had different specialities within the field of economics; we were not asking for a joint appointment in the same department; and we were a priori very comfortable with high quality nonacademic options. Our priorities and preferences did not always perfectly align with those our advisors but they remained supportive throughout the process.

I only have fond memories of the infamous AEA meetings. We both had a solid set of very promising interviews from top universities, top quality teaching colleges, and the private and public sector. We continued to keep an open mind through the second stage of interviews, pursuing all fly outs. Active conversation ensued between us, almost a test of what we as a newly formed family wanted for ourselves over the next few years. As a dual economist couple invested in policy research we also felt quite strongly that Washington, D.C. would always be an option to us and actually this led us to resist the temptation to settle there right away. We wanted to see if our dual applied-economist careers could work somewhere else first.

Our experience was uncommon in part because we made very conscious and very open joint decisions and were very willing to compromise, under the realities of having a very young child at the time. We also recognized the breadth of opportunities outside of academia despite pressures to pursue academic positions. Today, Ramsey and I feel extremely lucky that we are in the fortunate position of enjoying jobs and careers that we are passionate about and that we have been able to each navigate through all of the rewards and challenges of being active parents.

Reflecting on this process over 10 years later, our advice is the following:

• Take time to think through your career and family vs. career priorities with your partner: Who will be the primary earner? or will you seek equal earning power? Does location matter? How much does location matter and what are the geographic parameters? Is having an academic appointment of highest importance, for one or both of you? At what cost to family life? What other life goals should be considered (having children, being near aging parents, pursuing a favorite hobby or related commitment, etc.)?

• Agree on how much will be disclosed about family demands and priorities. What will your dissertation committee know about your joint vs. individual aspirations? What will each of you reveal during your first and second interviews? Be consistent with what you are communicating and communicate your boundaries clearly.

• Pursue all potential job options that satisfy the "reasonable option" test: On the one hand, aim high because it is hard to predict what an employer will be able or be willing to negotiate on your behalf or your partner's behalf. On the other hand, aim on target and realistically per your agreed-upon priorities.

• Have the hard conversation about a back-up plan. If only one of you gets the right job, will the other be willing to follow? Or, would each be more willing to take a second-best option because it is the better location or better work hours or better pay?

CeMENT, which has been funded by the American Economic Association and the National Science Foundation, will hold workshops aimed at mentoring junior faculty. There are two upcoming CeMENT Workshops, a regional in November 2009 and a national in January 2010. Only those currently registered will be able to attend, but if you missed these opportunities there will be a regional workshop in 2011 and a national workshop in 2012. You can find out more about CeMENT at CSWEP's website: http://csweep.org/mentoring/register.html
so much (and was such a need, even at a young age) that I decided to write a second research paper just for fun, this one on alligators. In retrospect, it was an early warning on the dangers of research based on a small sample size: the paper was peppered with sentences of the form “Alligators, unlike elephants…”

I took me a bit longer than the first grade to figure out what kind of academic I wanted to be. In high school by far my favorite subject was history. So in college I chose political science; it seemed like a great way to try to use history to think about broader questions. But then I discovered a problem: I didn’t actually know much, so it was hard to draw on my (non) wealth of historical knowledge to come up with theories of the world. So I gravitated to quantitative political science. I discovered I loved looking for data, playing with data, and doing empirical work. But at the same time I started to realize that I was less interested in political-sciences type questions of why certain policies got enacted and more interested in questions about what the consequenc-es of different policies were. That led me to economics.

I wasn’t fully sold on economics until the year I spent in Washington, D.C., at the Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) before going to graduate school. I noticed a funny thing about my job: all of the people I worked for knew how to think through a problem better than I did: how to lay out the issues, how and where to look for evidence to bear on those issues, having the available evidence. It was pretty easy to discover their common denominator: they had all been trained as economists! I was sold. I realized that, while it might not have all the answers, economics provided an organizing framework for approaching a huge range of empirical problems that got most of us caught up in their risk aversion—and that risk aversion and risk type might be negatively correlated in some markets—suggested that it was possible to get advantageous selection—in which the lower risk have more insurance and the market problem is one of over-insurance—rather than the classic adverse selection result—in which the higher risk have more insure-ance and the market failure is one of under-insurance.

I also got really lucky in that I ended up doing a lot of my empirical work on health insurance. It was extremely simple because I was interested in information problems in insurance in general and there seemed to be a lot of good data in health insurance. But working on health insurance has opened my eyes to a whole range of exciting questions beyond any of the information problems that got me interested in the topic. In particular, one of the things that fascinates me about health insurance and public policy related to health insurance is that it can have dynamic consequences for insur-ance coverage, a huge (and relatively overlooked) part of the picture is that this public policy is going to affect the un-derlying nature of the risk that is being insured. This has led me into a whole new area of research on how the develop-ment and adoption of new medical technologies is affected by public policies aimed at affecting insurance coverage for today’s technologies. As a result, I’ve become convinced that it’s really important to try to investigate the potential long-term, general equilibrium consequences of different health care policies in terms of shaping the nature of medi-cal care for the next generation, and not just their short run, partial equilibrium impact on insurance for today’s medical technologies.

3. What advice do you have for young economists?

My main advice is to find good mentors…and then follow their advice. I’ve been incredibly fortunate in this respect. One of the best pieces of advice I’ve gotten from my men-tors is to focus on trying to write a small number of good papers, rather than a larger number of mediocre papers. I didn’t always want to hear it (which is probably a sign that it was good and badly needed advice) since I always find it more satisfying to be in the middle of working on a project rather than struggling to design a new project. But I can still remember a very humbling experience when I showed a new paper to a mentor only to be told (after a few nice platitudes) “remember Amy, it’s about quality, not quantity.” In the end, even if it was hard to hear, this was really good ad-vise. Every paper—even the very not exciting ones—takes a long time to complete and publish (trust me!), and in the end of the day when you look back on what work you’re re-ally excited about or that you hope may have an impact you realize it’s really about a very very small number of papers. So learning how to not start projects—and how to kill off projects if they aren’t living up to their potential—has been a very hard but extremely valuable lesson.

My other piece of advice would be to find good co-authors. Again, I’ve been tremendously fortunate in this area. I’ve been lucky to work with a series of co-authors who have really added to the understanding of economics as well as my skill set, and helped me move my research in directions that I wouldn’t have been able to go if I were working alone. One of my goals for my own research—and that I try very hard to instill in my students—is to be open to applying whatever larger the technique is best suited to a particu-lar problem. I’ve always been question-driven rather than method-driven, but this has often taken me to problems best tackled by methods outside my current comfort zone. I’ve been lucky to be able to team up with co-authors from whom I’ve been able to learn a great deal. But probably the most important reason to find good co-authors is that it makes the research process so much more fun. I think non-academics have a misplaced stereotype of academia as a rather solitary enterprise. For me, one of my favorite aspects of the profes-sion is the large amount of interaction with interesting and intelligent people—my colleagues, my students, and my co-authors. And, at the end of the day, no one can really share the highs (not to mention the inevitable lows) of a research project with you the way a co-author can.

Amy Finkelstein continued from page 1

While the theory of adverse selection seems both nat-ural and compelling, one thing that was striking to me in graduate school is that we had remarkably little empiri-cal evidence on the existence of adverse selection in actual insurance markets, let alone the magnitude of its welfare consequences. So I started working on these issues and, in one form or another, I’m still working on them. One of the things that I find particularly exciting—and fun—about working in this area is the active back—and—forth between the theory and the empirics. The original classic asymmetric information theory from the 1970s provided both the mo-tivation and the guidance for the original empirical work on detecting asymmetric information. But one of the things about health insurance and public policy related to health care for today’s medical technologies.

Fall 2009 www.cswe.org CSWE Newsletter 16

Child care price freeze!

KiddleCorps child care rates will be frozen at the 2009 lower rate of $10.50 per hour at the Atlanta ASSA! Go to the AEA Annual Meeting web page for more information.

http://www.vanderbilt.edu/AEA/Annual_Meeting/index.html
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2010 ASSA AEA Annual Meeting—CSWEP Sessions

January 3, 2:30 pm, Room A708
Joint CSWEP and CSMGEP Panel Session: Evidence on AEA and NSF Mentoring Programs
Chair: William A. Darity, Jr. (Duke University)
Discussants: Hank Farber (Princeton University), Claudia Goldin (Harvard University), Mark Lopez (Pew Hispanic Center), and Rhonda Sharpe (Bennett College for Women).
Francine Blau (Cornell University), Rachel Croson (University of Texas, Dallas), Janet Currie (Columbia University) and Donna Ginther (University of Kansas) Can Mentoring Help Female Assistant Professors? The Case of CSWEP’s CeMENT Program
Charles Becker (Duke University) and Gregory Price (Moorehouse College) Impact of Pipeline Mentoring Programs

CSWEP Non-Gender Sessions (Personnel Economics):
January 3, 10:15 am, Room A701
Risk and Retention in the Workplace: The Effect of Gender and Incentives
Chair: Linda Bell (Haverford College)
Discussants: Lise Vesterlund (University of Pittsburgh), John Bishop (Cornell University) and Judy Hellerstein (University of Maryland)
Kerry Pannell (Depauw University) and Dorothy Hereinre (Loyola Marymount University) Women’s Labor Choices in Promotion Tournaments: Experimental Evidence
Colleen Flaherty Manchester (Carlson School of Management, University of Minnesota) Learning Through the Lens of Your Job: The Effect of Employer-Financed Education on Retention
Cynthia Bansak (St. Lawrence University), Mary Graham (Clarkson University) and Allan Zebedee (Clarkson University) The Effects of Gender Composition of Top Management on the Economic Fallout

January 5, 10:15 am, Room L508
Empirical Issues in Personnel Economics
Chair: Marianne Bertrand (University of Chicago Booth School of Business)
Discussants: Chad Syverson (University of Chicago), Katherine Shaw (Stanford University) and Casey Ichniowski (Columbia University)
Lan Shi and Christina Tapia (University of Washington) The Disciplining Effect of Concern for Referrals for Better Informed Agents: Evidence from Real Estate Transactions
Maria Guadalupe (Columbia University), Julie Wolf (Harvard Business School) and Amanda Starc (Harvard Business School) Firm Organizational Structure and Productivity
Fali Huang (Singapore Management University) and Peter Cappelli (The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania) Applicant Screening and Performance-Related Outcomes

CSWEP Gender Sessions:
January 4, 10:15 am, Room A701
Pay, Promotion, and Stability: Women in the Labor Market
Chair: Francine Blau (Cornell University)
Discussants: Mary Daly (Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco), Donna Ginther (University of Kansas), Debra Barbezat (Colby College) and John Haltiwanger (University of Maryland)
Elise Echeverri- Carroll and Sofia G. Ayala (University of Texas-Austin) High-Tech Industries and the Gender Wage Gap: A Test of the Skill-Biased Polarization Hypothesis
Colleen Flaherty Manchester, Lisa M. Leslie and Amin Kramer (University of Minnesota) Is the Clock Still Ticking? The Effect of Clock-Stoppage on Faculty Promotion, Retention, and Wages
Christina E. Hilmer and Michael J. Hilmer (San Diego State University) Are There Gender Differences in the Job Mobility Patterns of Academic Economists?
Catalina Amuedo-Dorantes (San Diego State University) and Tansel Yilmazer (University of Missouri) Portfolio Choice and Risk Attitudes: A Household Bargaining Approach
Urvi Neelakantan (University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign) and Yanhee Chang (University of Mississippi) Gender Differences in Wealth at Retirement
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Southern Economic Association Meeting CSWEP Sponsored Sessions
Saturday November 21, 2009, San Antonio, Texas
8:00 a.m. to 9:45 a.m.

Women in the Labor Market:
Choices and Outcomes
Chair: Melinda Pitts (Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta)
Discussants: Jill Janocha (American University), Sarah Hamersma (University of Florida), Phani Wannava (Middlebury College)
Colleen Manchester, Lisa Leslie, and Tue-Yoon Park (University of Minnesota) Screening for Commitment: The Effect of Maternity Leave Use on Wages
Jill Kearns (University of Kentucky) To Switch or Not to Switch
Kusum Mundra (Rutgers University) Earning Gap across Gender in the U.S. 1980-2005; a Dual-earner Couples v. Single Head Analysis
10:00 a.m. to 11:45 a.m.
Issues in Health and Education
Chair: Susan Avrett (Lafayette College)
Discussants: Jeffrey DeSimone (University of Texas-Arlington), Gary Fournier (Florida State University), Joe Sabia (American University), Angela Fertig (University of Georgia)
Arati Dahal and Angela Fertig (University of Georgia) Mental Health and Spending
Benjamin Ho (Cornell University) and Elaine Liu (University of Houston) Does Sorry Work? Apologies in Medical Malpractice: The Impact of “Apology” Laws
Dara Lee (Boston University) Study, Work, or Play? The Impact of Repealing Blue Laws on Educational Attainment
Sharmistha Self (Missouri State University) and Richard Grabowski (Southern Illinois University) Is there Gender Bias in Participation in Early Childhood Education Programs in Developing Countries? Role of Mother’s Education
3:00 p.m. to 4:45 p.m.
A Menagerie of Topics and Why
Chair: Kathryn Anderson (Vanderbilt University)
Discussants: Donna Ginther (University of Kansas), Anita Alves Pena (Colorado State University), Amrâdîa Bagchi (Kennesaw State University), Jenny Minier (University of Kentucky)
Ellen Meade and Martha Starr (American University) Women’s Work in the AER Papers & Proceedings
Catalina Amuedo-Dorantes (San Diego State University) and Kusum Mundra (Rutgers University)
The Role of Immigrants’ Legal Status in Homeownership
Paul Zimmerman and Julie Carlson (U.S. Federal Trade Commission) Competition and Cost Pass-through in Differentiated Monopolies
Solomon Polachek (State University of New York–Binghamton) and Daria Sevastianova (University of Southern Indiana) Modeling Conflict in the Empirical Macroeconomic Framework: A Sensitivity Analysis
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Western Economic Association International
84th Annual Conference
June 29–July 3, 2009

CSWEP Session Summary
Marriage, Divorce, and Mortality
Chair: Martha Olney, University of California, Berkeley

Visit the CSWEP website for descriptions of the papers on Marriage, Divorce, and Mortality.

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.ionea.edu/eea/

AEEStat: Committee on Economic Statistics: Call for Papers

The Committee on Economic Statistics of the American Economic Association (AEA) will sponsor three sessions at the January 2011 AEA meetings to be held in Denver CO and seeks proposals either for individual research papers or for sessions of three to four papers on economic measurement topics. Any proposal for a paper or session on a topic related to the measurement of economic activity is welcome. The Committee is particularly interested in receiving submissions related to the statistical issues arising from the financial crisis and potential changes in financial regulations, markets, and institutions. One of the three sessions organized by the Committee will be published in the AER Papers and Proceedings volume. Abstracts for individual papers or for the papers to be included in a proposed session should be submitted no later than December 15, 2009 to Matthew D. Shapiro, Chair of the AEA Committee on Economic Statistics, at aeastat@umich.edu.

2010 Western Economic Association Meetings Call for papers

CSWEP will be sponsoring sessions at the 2010 Western Economic Association International (WEAI) meetings, to be held at the Hilton Portland & Executive Tower, Oregon, Jun. 29–Jul. 3, 2010. Deadline for submission of session proposals is January 10, 2010.

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 demographics 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, and publication dates) to Matthew Olney, CSWEP Western Representative Adjunct Professor of Economics University of California, Berkeley Email: solney@berkeley.edu Phone: 510-642-0083

Please note that this submission is separate from any submission sent in response to the WEAI’s general call for papers. For more information on the WEAI meetings, please see http://www.weainternational.org/conferences.htm. CSWEP is unable to provide travel assistance to meeting participants. Please make other arrangements for covering your travel and meeting costs.

January 2011 American Economic Association Meeting Call for Abstracts

CSWEP will sponsor sessions at the January 2011 American Economic Association meetings in Denver. We will be organizing three sessions on gender-related topics and three sessions on housing and real estate topics. Real estate and housing abstracts will be jointly reviewed as we are hoping to co-sponsor at least one session with WREN (Women in Real Estate Network) a working committee of AREUEA (American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association). Accepted papers will be considered for publication in the Papers and Proceedings issue of the American Economic Review.

Abstracts of individual papers and complete session proposals will be considered. 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 on a CSWEP preprint file for all the authors by February 26, 2010 to cswep@usm.maine.edu.

Please note that this submission is separate from any submission sent in response to the WEAI’s general call for papers. For more information on the WEAI meetings, please see http://www.weainternational.org/conferences.htm. CSWEP is unable to provide travel assistance to meeting participants. Please make other arrangements for covering your travel and meeting costs.

The CSWEP Business Meeting at the AEA Annual Meeting January 2010 will be a light lunch meeting on January 3, from 12:30–2:00 p.m., in Room M101. The reception will remain scheduled in the evening at 6:00 p.m., Room M304.
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NOMINATIONS SOUGHT for the NSF 2010 Alan T. Waterman Award

The National Science Foundation is pleased to accept nominations for the 2010 Alan T. Waterman Award. Each year, the Foundation bestows the Waterman Award to recognize the talent, creativity and influence of a singular young researcher. Established in 1975 in honor of the Foundation’s first Director, the Waterman Award is the Foundation’s highest honor for researchers under the age of 35. Nominees are accepted from any field of science or engineering that NSF supports. The award recipient will receive a medal and an invitation to the formal awards ceremony in Washington, DC. In addition, the recipient will receive a grant of $500,000 over a three-year period for scientific research or advanced study in any field of science or engineering supported by the National Science Foundation, at any institution of the recipient’s choice.

Eligibility and Selection Criteria

Candidates must be U.S. citizens or permanent residents and must be 35 years of age or younger or not more than 7 years beyond receipt of the Ph.D. degree by December 31 of the year in which they are nominated. Candidates should have demonstrated exceptional individual achievements in scientific or engineering research of sufficient quality to place them at the forefront of their peers. Criteria include originality, innovation, and significant impact on the field.

For detailed nomination information, please visit https://www.fastlane.nsf.gov/honawards.

Complete nomination packages, consisting of nominations and four letters of reference, are due by November 5, 2009. The nominations and letters must be received through the FastLane system. Please contact the Program Manager for the Alan T. Waterman Award at waterman@nsf.gov or 703-292-8040 if you have any questions. You may also visit http://www.nsf.gov/od/waterman/waterman.jsp for more information.

The nomination of deserving colleagues is one of the most important and gratifying aspects of service in the scientific community. Please help celebrate the contributions of a promising young researcher by submitting a nomination for the Alan T. Waterman award.

Past CSWEP Chair, Francine D. Blau, was named one of the five inaugural Academic Fellows of the Labor and Employment Relations Association (LERA).


Our former Elaine Bennet Awarded, Esther Dufo, an MIT economist who analyzes poverty in Africa and South Asia, is one of this year’s recipients of the MacArthur “genius awards.” Read all about it at: http://www.nytimes.com

Professor Mieke Meurs received the 2008-2009 Scholar Teacher award—the highest honor bestowed upon a faculty member at American University. Kudos to Professor Meurs!

Congratulations to American University Professors Martha Starr and Kara Reynolds, who received tenure this year. They join Mary Hansen, Maria Floro, Mieke Meurs, and Ivy Broder. Women now hold 6 of the 18 tenured faculty positions in the Economics Department.

Caren Grown of American University is bragging about AU’s three new graduate programs in gender analysis in economics. See http://www.american.edu/cas/economics/index.cfm and check out the tracks in both the MA and Ph.D. programs as well as a Gender Analysis in Economics graduate certificate program!
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"We need every day to herald some woman's achievements... go ahead and boast!" —Carolyn Shaw Bell
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Upcoming Regional Meetings:

**Southern Economic Association**

- 2009 Annual Meeting: November 21–23, 2009
  - San Antonio: Marriott San Antonio Rivercenter
  - SEA deadline: Past
  - CSWEP deadline: Past

**Eastern Economic Association**
[http://www.iona.edu/eea/](http://www.iona.edu/eea/)

- 2010 Annual Meeting: February 26–28, 2010
  - Philadelphia: Loew's Philadelphia
  - CSWEP deadline: Nov. 14, 2009
  - EEA deadline: Nov. 6, 2009

**Midwest Economic Association**
[http://web.grinnell.edu/mea](http://web.grinnell.edu/mea)

- 2010 Annual Meeting: March 19–21, 2010
  - Evanston: Hotel Orrington (Chicago's North Shore)
  - CSWEP deadline: Past
  - MEA deadline: Past

**Western Economic Association**

- 85th Annual Conference: June 29–July 23, 2010
  - Portland, Oregon
  - CSWEP deadline: Jan. 10, 2010

### CSWEP Activities

As a standing Committee of the American Economic Association since 1971, CSWEP undertakes activities to monitor and improve the position of women in the economics profession through the Annual CSWEP Questionnaire (results of which are reported in the CSWEP Annual Report), internships with the Summer Fellows, mentoring opportunities through CEMENT and the Joan Haworth Mentoring Fund, recognition of women in the field with the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award and Elaine Bennett Research Prize, support of regional and annual meetings, organizing paper sessions and networking opportunities.

---

Deadline for Summer Fellowship applications is February 19, 2010

It’s never too early to think about nominating outstanding women for the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award or the Elaine Bennett Research Prize! See nomination requirements and descriptions of the awards at: [http://cswep.org/awards.htm](http://cswep.org/awards.htm)