



Newsletter

A publication of the American Economic Association's Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

Published three times annually

Fall 2002

In this issue:

- ***Non-Academic Career Mentoring for Women***
- ***Legal Issues Facing Women in the Workplace***
- ***Marianne Ferber and Francine Blau, co-recipients of the 2001 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award***
- ***CSWEP Activities***

Directory of CSWEP Board Members

Joan G. Haworth, Chair

Economic Research Services, Inc.
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303
(850) 562-1211 (ext. 117)
FAX (850) 562-3838
E-mail: jhaworth@ersnet.com

Andrea H. Beller

Department of Agricultural & Consumer Economics
University of Illinois-Urbana
305 Mumford Hall — 1301 West Gregory Drive
Urbana, IL 61801
(217) 333-7257
FAX (217) 333-5538
E-mail: a-beller@uiuc.edu

Judith A. Chevalier

Yale University
135 Prospect Street
New Haven, CT 06520
(203) 432-3122
judith.chevalier@yale.edu
http://www.som.yale.edu/faculty/jc576

Rachel Croson

OPIM: The Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6366
(215) 898-3025
FAX (215) 898-3664
E-mail: crosonr@wharton.upenn.edu
http://wharton.upenn.edu/faculty/crosonr.html

Janet Currie

Department of Economics
University of California - Los Angeles
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1477
(310) 206-8380
FAX (310) 825-9528
E-mail: currie@simba.sscnet.ucla.edu

Barbara M Fraumeni

Chief Economist
U.S. Department of Commerce
Bureau of Economic Analysis, BE-3
1441 "L" Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20230
(202) 606-9603
Fax: (202) 606-5311
barbara.fraumeni@bea.gov

Claudia Goldin

Department of Economics
Harvard University
217 Littauer
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 613-1200
FAX (617) 868-2742
E-mail: cgoldin@harvard.edu

Caren Grown

International Center for Research on Women (ICRW)
1717 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Suite 302
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 797-0007, ext. 119
FAX (202) 797-0020
E-mail: cgrown@icrw.org

Jean Kimmel

Department of Economics
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5023
(616) 387-5541
E-mail: jean.kimmel@wmich.edu

KimMarie McGoldrick

Department of Economics
E.C. Robins School of Business
University of Richmond
Richmond, VA 23173
(804) 289-8575
FAX (804) 289-8878
E-mail: kmcgoldr@richmond.edu

Robert A. Pollak

Department of Economics
Washington University
205 Eliot Hall — Campus Box 1208
One Brookings Drive
St. Louis, MO 63130
(314) 935-4918
FAX (314) 935-6359
E-mail: Pollak@mail.olin.wustl.edu

Rachel Willis

American Studies and Economics
Campus Box 3520
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3520
(919) 962-8478
FAX (919) 401-9128
E-mail: Rawillis@email.unc.edu

Table of Contents

Features

- **Mentoring**
 - Mentoring and Women in Non-Academic Careers . 3
 - Legal Issues in the Workplace
 - Sexual Harassment 5
 - Gender Pay Equity 7
- **An Interview with the 2001 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award Co-recipients**
 - Marianne A. Ferber 8
 - Francine D. Blau 9
- **CSWEP Activities**
 - CSWEP at the Western Economics Association Annual Conference 11
 - CSWEP Sessions at the Southern Economic Association Meeting 12
 - CSWEP Sessions at the Midwest Economic Association Meeting 12
 - CSWEP Sessions at the 2003 ASSA Meeting ... 13
- **Biography**
 - Janet Currie - University of California, Los Angeles 14
- **News**
 - From the Chair 14
 - Calls for Papers 14-15
 - Announcements 16-18

CSWEP Newsletter

Joan Haworth, *Editor*

Rachel Willis, *Co-editor*

Lee Fordham, *Assistant Editor*

KimMarie McGoldrick, *Oversight Editor*



Co-Editor's Introduction

By Rachel Willis, Ph.D.

This fall CSWEP newsletter focuses on the two themes that were presented at the Southern Economic Association Meetings in Tampa, Florida in November 2001: Non-Academic Career Mentoring and Legal Issues Facing Women in the Workplace. Summaries of the remarks from the excellent panels appeared in the Winter 2002 newsletter. This issue develops the two themes in greater depth in three focused articles written by two long-time CSWEP members: Joan Haworth and Saranna Thornton.

CSWEP has had a long-term focus and commitment to improving mentoring within the academy, but mentoring has as much value in non-academic careers, increasing the likelihood that professional economists will achieve their goals, or salary and promotion equity. This article focuses on why mentoring is needed generally, why it is both especially valuable to and difficult for women, the roles of Mentors, Employers, and Mentees in mentoring relationships, and the potential outcomes. Throughout each section, there is a discussion of how mentoring suggestions can apply to professional positions in non-academic careers. Written by one of CSWEP's own mentors, this longer article draws upon Joan Haworth's success both in academics and as founder and CEO of Economic Research Services.

Saranna Thornton is the co-author of an important new publication by the American Association of University Professors entitled: *Family and Medical Leave Act: Questions and Answers for Faculty*. The guidebook applies the FMLA of 1993 to the academic workplace and is co-authored by Donna Euben, counsel for AAUP. In two shorter pieces for this newsletter, Saranna focuses on two additional critical legal issues facing women in higher education employment: Gender Pay Equity and Sexual Harassment.

Mentoring and Women in Non-Academic Careers

By Joan G. Haworth, Ph.D.

In order for women to be equally represented throughout the labor force we need salary and promotion equity. It is also essential, if we aspire to making leadership roles equally available to women and men in organizations, that we develop the career potential of everyone in the enterprise. Career mentoring has been demonstrated to be a successful way to meet this objective. Mentoring helps to develop perspective, open doors, and focus on career development in efficient and effective ways.

Additionally, the externalities which develop out of successful mentoring programs enhance the career development of women and men, thereby improving the development of the entire organization.

Why is Mentoring Needed?

There are two primary categories of reasons that career mentoring is effective in work environments: (1) successful mentoring relationships can help communicate unwritten guidelines to new employees, improving the chances of successful integration for the Mentee, and (2) mentoring relationships can also be used to directly improve access to career opportunities for Mentees by identifying and enabling good employees to try new challenges. Both are beneficial to firms, institutions, and organizations.

All organizations have many unwritten bits of information that determine employees' success to some extent, and a key role Mentors play is to transmit this information to their Mentees in informal and appropriately confidential ways. The dynamic structure of consulting, as opposed to the *relatively* static institutional structure of the academy, means that employees must be able to respond to the con-

stantly changing client environment, a legal context that is always in flux, as well as the demands of the workplace. The consulting environment, therefore, differs from the academic environment in that employees not only perform different jobs, but perform them in ever-changing situations. The lack of institutionalized employment security in consulting makes it even more important for these employees to assess and reevaluate changes in a timely and accurate manner. In consulting, perhaps even more so than in academics, a Mentee benefits from a Mentor's experience in the field. A good Mentor can be extremely valuable in assessing rapid changes in corporate priorities quickly and responding to those changes appropriately!

The structural difference between a consulting environment and an academic one requires employees to negotiate a more stratified management structure that may diffuse risk-taking behavior or misdirect an employee's energy. It is very helpful to have the input of a Mentor, who is interested in the long term goals of the Mentee, rather than only the advice of a manager, who has a more limited scope of interest. One of the most exciting aspects of a consulting career, as well as the most intimidating, is the great diversity of projects and career paths available. A Mentor's broader vision aids Mentees in identifying the promise of potential new opportunities, either within a company or with another firm or industry. Mentors can also provide direct help to Mentees as their careers develop, by helping them create concrete strategies that will lead to success.

Taking risks is central to success in many fields. As Rosemary Booth (p. 31) states Mentors have positive effects on the careers of their

Mentees when they provide "sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments." Mentoring consists as much in providing growth opportunities through challenging Mentees as it does in easing the way for them. Ways Mentors can provide direct help are discussed below.

Access to Mentoring for Women

Direct assistance to any Mentee must take account of that employee's specific work environment as well as her/his needs. Jean Wallace's study of female lawyers emphasizes the fact that mentoring benefits women by serving to increase their integration into the social fabric of the workplace. Wallace (p. 369) writes that this "is particularly relevant for female professionals working in male-dominated occupations and work settings." Consulting is a field in which the consultant must interact with a number of professions, including corporate and legal cultures. This makes the advice, support and camaraderie of a Mentor even more important. Mentors in non-academic careers have numerous opportunities to assist Mentees in becoming well-integrated into the complex work requirements of their firms or institutions. Examples depend on the type of institution and the position of the Mentor and Mentee in employment, but reducing isolation can be extremely important if the percentage of women in the non-academic enterprise is even lower than would be found within the academy, which is frequently the case in industry.

Studies indicate that women have less access to mentoring than men. Important factors for this difference include stereotyping, socialization, wariness of relationships across

Continued on page 4

genders on the part of Mentors (most of whom are male) as well as blatant discrimination (Ehrich p. 5). Many female Mentees also feel some discomfort with cross-gender mentoring. In a study of Medical School Faculty at Johns Hopkins, 45% of the responding women felt that "relationships [were] more difficult between a faculty member and trainee of different genders than of the same gender," while only 19% of the responding men agreed with this statement (Fried et. al., Table 3, p. 900).

Yet, the role of mentoring in a woman's career path may be far more important than in a man's as it can reduce the isolation and lack of collegiality many women find in the workplace. The Johns Hopkins study found isolation to be a major career obstacle that women face. Isolation ranked second in a list of factors that women considered when making decisions about leaving the profession. According to the researchers, isolation is a "common problem for women faculty" (Fried et. al., p. 900). "Isolation," then, is a term that can apply to a number of relationships described in the study - lack of connections to peers and leaders, as well as little external recognition in the community.

These studies all suggest that a network of colleagues is essential both to feeling a part of a profession, and for functioning successfully in that profession (Fried et. al., p. 901). Mentoring is *not* networking, however. According to Lisa Catherine Ehrich (p. 7), networking provides peer support and community visibility, but it lacks the power dynamics and power potentials found in mentoring relationships. Therefore, mentoring generally involves relationships that focus on the power to develop an individual into a leader, hopefully resulting in a subsequent repetition of the process. A recent study noted that female Mentors are much more likely to choose a Mentee based on her/his ability and potential than male Mentors are (Allen et. al. p. 279). Researchers have proposed that one reason for this difference by gender is that women recognize the need for support within organizations to overcome barriers to advancement and, therefore, are more willing to put time into mentoring (Allen et. al. p. 279). As more women enter into traditionally male fields, more mentoring is needed to build up the resources necessary for women to become part of the fabric of these fields.

What Mentors Can Do for Mentees

The Johns Hopkins Medical School study listed some concrete ways that Mentors can promote the career of the Mentee within research academic institutions. These include (Fried et. al. Table 3, p. 900) critiquing scientific work, facilitating participation in a conference, and inviting manuscripts for projects. Similar strategies can be applied to non-aca-

demically mentoring relationships. For example, in the consulting business Mentors can ask to have their Mentee assigned to their own projects. As experience is gained, they can discuss the Mentee's progress and positive qualities with other managers. Mentors can then request that a woman with potential be made part of someone else's valuable project. Mentors can identify and recognize the women who are contributing valuable insights to their projects to colleagues and supervisors through providing Mentees with an opportunity to be a coauthor on a report or to present a portion of a study to a client. The Mentor can set up opportunities for the Mentees to meet directly with clients - at first with supervision and then, after successful performance, as the firm's representative.

Just as important as helping the Mentee gain access to valuable career opportunities, the Mentor can provide the encouragement and support that help a Mentee over the "rough spots" and mistakes one inevitably makes as experience is gained in the field. A mentor can model behavior, including how to deal with mistakes, in a way that a manager cannot. As Sheila Dillon, a senior vice-president and divisional head of corporate security and compliance at First Union explained, "[s]he lets others know she makes mistakes so they will feel comfortable in discussing themselves" (Booth, p. 33). Booth ultimately concludes that the main distinction between a manager and a Mentor happens at this psycho-social level. Both a manager and a Mentor can provide career pathways, but only a Mentor can add the additional emotional support (Booth, p. 35).

What Employers Can Do to Improve Mentoring

Successful mentoring programs are proactive. A central piece of The Johns Hopkins University mentoring program was a monthly colloquium for women in which participants addressed task/goal identification, conflicts management, and, in one month, mentoring itself. Even a well-meaning Mentor may not have all the skills necessary to successfully mentor colleagues independently. Women faculty at Hopkins wrote a mentoring handbook for Mentors and Mentees which continues to be used to educate the faculty. In this program, mentoring became the responsibility of the institution as well as of the individual employees in the institution.

Providing training, resources, and support to help the Mentors effectively train for this role is critical inside the academy or out. This type of active intervention is especially important when the organization has not previously met its responsibilities in the career development of professional staff or if the Mentors themselves were not on the receiving end of a good mentoring relationship for their career

development. Of course, it is also important to recognize that not every employer nor every employee needs a formal mentoring program. Some institutions are generally open and encouraging to productive people. The professionals readily communicate the important priorities and assist each other in developing their professional careers in this type of organization. Some individuals don't require or necessarily benefit from a program.

Mentee Responsibilities

The active interventions that the Johns Hopkins study advocates as a way of "reducing isolation and structural career impediments" require a commitment to work on the part of both the Mentor and Mentee (p. 898). The mentoring process is a two way street: Mentees need to take responsibility for building and sustaining these relationships along with the Mentor. In "Taking a Hard Look at Formal Mentoring Programs," Stacy D. Blake-Beard suggests that the Mentor and Mentee each openly discuss their expectations of the relationship in order to avoid "raised expectations and the resulting disappointment and anger that follow when those expectations are not met" (p. 335).¹

First, Mentees should understand that they themselves have at least some control over their access to mentoring. A recent study found that the most important factor considered by Mentors when choosing a Mentee is the perceived potential of the candidates. The more promise and ability a person appears to have, the more likely she/he will be chosen (Allen et. al. p. 277). This means that it is very important to know what qualities are perceived as measures of potential and then focus on those qualities in presenting yourself as a worthwhile mentoring candidate.

Second, the mentee must also have a clear sense of what she expects from her place of work. Whether or not a woman Mentor is more valuable (or less) to a Mentee than a man may depend upon how accurately one or the other perceives the way to success in a particular organizational structure. For example, women may perceive organizational structures and the strategies necessary for success in these structures differently than men. Or, women may see ability, potential, and hard work as something that a group would do to achieve team success rather than as tactics used by an individual to succeed over others within the organization. Any difference in perception may make it more difficult for men to mentor women and vice versa, especially if they do not share similar ideas about how to succeed. Further, if women do tend to be more likely to think that teamwork means career success, and the organization does not value teamwork skills in developing leaders, then female Mentees will need to recognize the differences. Finally, women must be

Mentoring and Women . . . continued from page 4
careful not to replicate gender stereotypes themselves. They must expect to be challenged and criticized and to be held accountable for their work product by their Mentor. Again, mentoring means encouragement, but expectations of the Mentees must be realistic.

Outcomes of Mentoring:

Formal mentoring programs are particularly important when the work environment leaves women isolated and out of the mainstream of success. Mentoring can change a woman's career path but it can also change an institution, organization, or firm in positive ways. In the Johns Hopkins mentoring program their primary goal - to retain and promote more women (Fried, p. 898) - was fully met. While they hoped to increase the number of senior women (Associate Professors) by 50% in 8 years they actually saw a 550% increase in a bit more than 5 years (Fried, p. 903).

Other programs have shown similar success. However, these programs have long term goals - changing the entire work environment - and cannot expect to have long-term impact in a few short years. Current research links mentoring programs with higher salaries, increased promotions and greater commitment to an organization (Blake-Beard p. 332; Friday p. 156; Wallace p. 381). They benefit both the Mentee and the organization - improving the career trajectory of women and of men and the full development of the firm's human resources.

Conclusion

Mentors are not confidants and may not be best friends. Good mentors are those who recognize the potential of an associate and work to assist that woman in "making the right moves" in their career. Women in non-academic careers with Ph.D. level education generally have little guidance during their academic training that is focused on developing a non-academic career. Working in the consulting world typically requires skills in addition to those usually obtained in the classroom or academy. Identifying those skills and learning which relationships should be developed, enables us to move ahead - but knowing how to do that is not obvious. This is why mentoring relationships, formal and informal, in non-academic careers are important.

Women are less likely than men to be a part of the power structure that develops careers and leaders. Mentoring provides a vehicle by which this inequity can be remedied for those who are part of organizations without an organizational structure that facilitates equal participation in successful career development. It is a very useful tool for non-academic work environments where valued individual criteria are often insufficiently understood and women are likely to be left out of the normal networks for success.

Bibliography

Allen, Tammy D., Mark L. Poteet and Joyce E. A. Russell (2000). *Protégé Selection by Mentors:*

What Makes the Difference? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 271-282.

Blake-Beard, Stacy D. (2001). Taking a Hard Look at Formal Mentoring Programs: A Consideration of Potential Challenges Facing Women. *Journal of Management Development*, 20(4), 331-345.

Booth, Rosemary (1996). Mentor or Manager: What is the Difference? A Case Study in Supervisory Mentoring. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 17(3), 31-36.

Ehrich, Lisa Catherine (1994). Mentoring and Networking for Women Educators. *Women in Management Review*, 9(3), 4-10.

Friday, Earnest and Shawnta S. Friday (2002). Formal Mentoring: Is There a Strategic Fit? *Management Decision*, 40(2), 152-7.

Fried, Linda P., MPH et. al. (1996). Career Development for Women in Academic Medicine: Multiple Interventions in a Department of Medicine. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 276(11), 898-905.

Wallace, Jean E. (2001). The Benefits of Mentoring for Female Lawyers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 366-391.

¹ See also Table I "Challenges and Strategies for Women in Formal Mentoring Programs" which addresses managing a mentoring relationship within a larger corporate structure and provides concrete strategies for common situations (Blake-Beard p. 336).

Legal Issues in the Workplace: Sexual Harassment

By Saranna Thornton

At the conclusion of a meeting, Emily Bryson, a full professor and special assistant to the Dean stands up and walks to the door. The Dean steps in behind her, reaches his hand up her dress, and fondles her behind.¹

An economist's supervisor repeatedly tells her, "Don't come to me with your questions. I don't waste my time training women for this job because they aren't qualified."

The first incident is obviously sexual harassment, but what about the second? A colleague's conduct can be harassing even if there is no explicitly sexual act or communication. To determine if sexual harassment occurred one must ask: "Would the employee have been treated similarly if he/she were of the opposite sex?" In the second example, if the woman had been a man, her supervisor wouldn't have refused to train her. Thus, she too has been sexually harassed.

Sexual harassment at work is outlawed by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964,

which bans discrimination based on sex.² The Supreme Court has ruled that Title VII protects both women and men from sexual harassment by members of the opposite sex and by members of the same sex.³

Although Title VII only covers businesses with 15 or more workers, some states (e.g., Idaho) have adopted laws that make Title VII applicable to smaller firms. Even so, if your firm is very small, you may not be legally protected from workplace sexual harassment.

Employers covered by Title VII can be held liable for monetary damages for workplace behavior that many women once believed they had to endure as a price they paid to work outside their homes. Despite the penalties for illegal behavior, sexual harassment persists.⁴

The EEOC currently characterizes harassment as; (1) Tangible Employment Action Harassment; or (2) Hostile Environment Harassment. Tangible employment action harassment is perpetrated by a supervisor against

a subordinate and typically inflicts economic harm through the following; not hiring, firing, failure to promote, demotion, undesirable re-assignments, and significant change benefits and/or wages. Tangible employment actions may be part of a quid pro quo type of harassment (e.g., demands of sexual favors in trade for employment benefits). Or they can be detrimental employment actions taken against a subordinate, just because of the subordinate's sex. A department chair who repeatedly gives the most undesirable teaching assignments to a woman assistant professor because he doesn't like working with women is guilty of this type of harassment.

Some in the workplace are confused about what constitutes hostile environment harassment. Title VII does not prohibit simple teasing, offhand comments, or isolated incidents that are not severe in nature.⁵ To create a hostile environment, an act or actions must

Continued on page 6

CSWEP 5 Newsletter

be so severe, or if more minor, so pervasive that they alter the conditions of the victim's employment.

The First, Third, Eighth, and Ninth Circuit Courts of Appeals have ruled that the determination of which incidents are severe and which are minor must be based on a sex specific standard. If a woman is being harassed, the standard is conduct a "reasonable woman" would find offensive. If a man is the victim, male norms are used. In other parts of the U.S. the applicable standard is that of a "reasonable person".⁶

Alleged harassment cases are decided based on the specific circumstances of each case (and thus vary somewhat from court to court). Complimenting a subordinate, just once, on his/her new haircut typically won't qualify as sexual harassment. The same is true if a co-worker invites you out for dinner once or twice. Repeatedly pressing a co-worker (or subordinate) to go on a date when that person finds the invitations unwelcome would probably constitute sexual harassment.

When incidents of harassment are severe, the number of times they must be repeated to be illegal workplace harassment declines. Thus, one act of trapping a colleague in his/her office, pinning the colleague up against a wall and fondling the colleague's genitals would normally meet the threshold of one action severe enough to alter the victim's conditions of employment.

Although most large employers have adopted anti-harassment policies, some employers' policies don't reflect recent legal developments. The EEOC and federal courts have specified that an effective anti-harassment policy must:

- explain prohibited conduct;
- list several people to take complaints (so no one ever has to complain to his/her supervisor or to someone with a conflict of

interest in the case's resolution);

- protect the confidentiality of all parties in a harassment complaint by only making information available as necessary to investigate the complaint;
- provide for an immediate, thorough, and unbiased investigation of a complaint;
- result in timely and appropriate corrective actions that are proportional to the severity of infractions that have occurred (up to and including discharge); and
- protect employees from retaliation when they make complaints or provide information for a harassment investigation.

What should you do if you are the victim of sexual harassment at work? If the incident is minor, and you feel comfortable talking to the person harassing you, tell him/her what behaviors make you uncomfortable and ask him/her to stop. Alternatively, read your institution's harassment policy and file a complaint with an appropriate person. If you are an untenured professor consider asking a senior colleague to remind your academic dean and EEO officer of the institution's obligation to protect you from retaliation. If you are outside of academia, a similar strategy might be useful.

File your complaint in writing (keeping a copy for yourself). Document all incidents of harassment as precisely as possible. Don't worry if you don't have direct evidence of harassment. Many cases are "he said/she said" and the law permits judgments regarding complaints to be made based on the apparent credibility of the victim versus the alleged harasser.

If you are a supervisor, you are legally obligated to report *all* acts of harassment that you learn of. The government's rationale for such a comprehensive reporting requirement is that anti-discrimination laws are supposed to remedy, as well as prevent, discrimination and this can't happen without the knowledge

that discrimination has occurred. (Resist any urges you have to resolve the complaint yourself, unless you have been trained to do so.) Remember both you and the victim are entitled to protection from retaliation during the complaint's investigation and afterwards.

If you believe your employer is mishandling your complaint, you may file a charge with the EEOC, or your agency's EEO Counselor if you are a federal employee. Federal employees must file their complaints within 45 days of the most recent act of harassment. For others: if your state doesn't have an EEO agency, you must file with the EEOC within 300 days, or; within 180 days if your state does have an EEO agency. More information on filing a charge is available at <http://www.eeoc.gov/facts/howtofil.html>.

It can be intimidating to stand up for your rights, or for the rights of others. But if someone doesn't, how will the workplace change?

¹ See *Bryson v. Chicago State University*, 96 F.3d. 912, (1996).

² Under Title VII "sex" applies to being male or female, not to sexual orientation. Other types of illegal workplace harassment are based on race, color, national origin, religion, age and disability.

³ See *Oncale v. Sundowner Offshore Services, Inc.* 523 U.S. 75 (1998).

⁴ Over 15,000 sexual harassment claims a year have been filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) since fiscal year 1995. Slightly over ten percent of the claims are filed by men. Out of court resolutions of claims by the EEOC produced \$53 million in awards for victims of harassment in fiscal year 2001.

⁵ See *Faragher v. City of Boca Raton*, 118 S. Ct. 2275 (1998).

⁶ See *Ellison v. Brady*, 924 F.2d. 872 (1991).

*Remember, the CSWEP
Website **www.cswep.org**
is a great place to keep
up on the most current
CSWEP activities.*

Legal Issues in the Workplace: Gender Pay Equity

By Saranna Thornton

After almost 40 years Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1963 Equal Pay Act (EPA) have not produced pay equity for women. In 1999 many women in academia identified when a special university committee, studying the status of women science faculty at MIT, reported:

“Given the tiny number of women faculty and the fact that they are essentially irreplaceable, one would have assumed that all tenured women would be treated exceptionally, well-pampered, overpaid, indulged. Instead, they proved to be underpaid, to have unequal access to the resources of MIT... How did this surprising state of affairs come about?

*First and foremost it is essential to set aside the issue of whether these women were badly treated because they were simply not good enough. It must be understood that for these particular women the opposite was undeniably true... Once and for all we must recognize that the heart and soul of discrimination, the last refuge of the bigot, is to say that those who are discriminated against deserve it because they are less good.*¹

Turn to the economics literature and you will find many studies confirming the presence of unexplained differences in the salaries of women versus men - inside and outside of academe.²

The EPA overlaps with Title VII's prohibitions on employment discrimination based on sex, and doesn't allow an employer to provide less compensation to a woman than to a man (or vice-versa) for work which is substantially equal and which is performed in the same establishment.

Differential compensation is allowed if it is based on; (1) seniority, (2) a merit pay system, (3) a system that measures quality or quantity of work (e.g., a commission system), or (4) any other factor other than sex. Because education and experience both qualify as “factors other than sex”, an employer may pay a female economist with a Ph.D. from Harvard more than a male economist with a Ph.D. from a lower ranked school. The central office of a government agency may pay a newly hired male budget analyst with 7 years experience more than a newly hired female budget analyst with 3 years experience.

To prove that your employer is illegally discriminating based on sex, you must first show that at least one employee of the opposite sex, working in the same establishment, and performing substantially equal work, is being paid more than you are or receiving fringe benefits you are not receiving (e.g., subsidized health insurance, retirement benefits, etc.).³ That person is called your “comparator”. The comparator need not be a current employee. It could also be a predecessor in your own job. An equally qualified, equally experienced woman economist at a consulting firm who is offered a lower starting

salary than a male predecessor who did the same job probably can make a case for discrimination.

Legally, your job is substantially equal to your comparator's if it requires; (1) equal skill, (2) effort, (3) responsibility, and (4) if the two jobs are performed under similar working conditions. Effort is the physical or mental exertion needed to do your job. Skills are the abilities needed to perform your job duties. Responsibility includes supervisory duties and requirements for independent decision making. Finally, working conditions applies to the physical surroundings of your job.

The equality of two jobs doesn't depend on the job title, but on the job duties performed. Moreover, you don't have to find a comparator who does the exact same work as you. Because your job and your comparator's job only need be substantially equal, a history professor could be a comparator for an economics professor.

Two fund managers working in the same downtown office of an investment bank or two professors working for the same satellite campus of a state university are examples of employees working in the same establishment. However, a female economist in the Washington office of a consulting firm and a male in the New York office are not working in the same establishment.

Market forces and merit pay systems pose challenges for employers trying to comply with Title VII and the EPA. Different courts have produced different rulings on the question of whether market forces qualify as a “factor other than sex” and thus justify male/female pay differentials. In 1998 the Nevada Supreme Court ruled that market forces did justify a salary differential between a white female sociology professor and a comparably qualified black male sociology professor at the University of Nevada.⁴ Yet, a federal district court ruled that Eastern Michigan University could not legally pay a woman professor less than four of her male colleagues (who had less seniority). The University's argument, that the male professors could command higher salaries in private sector jobs, was rejected.

Merit pay can be problematic because some employers regularly make awards on purely subjective grounds, substituting gut feelings about an employee's performance for a neutral system based on articulated performance criteria. In *Kovacevich v. Kent State University* (224 F.3d 806, 2000) the federal Appeals Court ruled that the university's merit pay practices were based on an opaque decision-making process under which a dean's awards were disproportionately to male professors and were radically different from the recommendations made to him by other faculty. Intentionally in some cases, unintentionally in others, ad hoc merit pay systems can result in illegal

pay gaps because the “good old boys” are favored at the expense of women.

Covered employers (i.e., those with 15 or more employees) who violate Title VII may be found liable for economic damages, and punitive damages. The EPA applies to all employees of an “enterprise engaged in commerce” (no matter how few employees there are). It also applies to all government agencies, schools, and hospitals. An employer who violates the EPA can be found liable for up to twice the economic damages caused by the discrimination.

In 2000 the EEOC and state EEO agencies received 5357 charges of sex-based wage discrimination.⁵ Because discrimination continues despite the significant financial penalties of Title VII and the EPA, an economist might conclude that the costs of discrimination don't exceed the benefits.

What can you do to change the cost/benefit calculus? Know your rights and work with your colleagues to insure that your employer complies with the law. Pay inequity isn't always willful and sometimes can be resolved through negotiation. If you think a formal pay equity study is needed, the American Association of University Professors, publishes a guide on how to conduct one.⁶ Finally, if all your attempts to change your employer's behavior fail, you might consider filing a complaint with the EEOC.⁷

¹ “A Study on the Status of Women Faculty in Science at MIT” (1999) <http://web.mit.edu/justice/www/download/women.html>

² See for example, M. Bertrand & K Hallock, “The Gender Gap in Top Corporate Jobs,” *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 3, 17-18 (2001).

³ Maternity leave is not a fringe benefit *illegally* available to women only. Maternity leave is a short-term medical disability leave available to women experiencing a physical disability as a result of pregnancy, childbirth, or an abortion. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that employers may provide maternity leave benefits to women without having to provide equivalent medical leave benefits to employees experiencing other types of short-term disabilities. *California Federal Savings and Loan Association v. Guerra*, 479 U.S. 272 (1987).

⁴ See *Farmer v. University of Nevada*, 930 P.2d. 730 (1997).

⁵ Donna R. Euben, “Show Me the Money: Salary Equity in the Academy”, *Academe*, July-August, pp. 30-36, (2001).

⁶ The pay equity guide can be purchased on the AAUP's web site: <http://www.aaup.org>.

⁷ To file a charge with the EEOC go to the following web site: <http://www.eeoc.gov/facts/howtofil.html>.

An Interview with Marianne A. Ferber

Professor of Economics and Women's Studies, Emerita, University of Illinois, U-C

2001 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award Co-recipient

Interviewed by Barbara M. Fraumeni, Chief Economist, Bureau of Economic Analysis

Q: Why did you go into economics?

The reason I chose this field is a rather odd story. I was born in the German speaking part of Czechoslovakia, which was ceded to Hitler in 1938. My parents had been farsighted and were able to get Canadian visa for us and nine other families because that country admitted farmers quota free, and most of my family were farmers. So, 39 of us arrived in Canada that November. My sister, Wilma is two years older than I am, and also brighter and less practical went right on to high school. Although, like the rest of us, she did not know English she graduated the following spring and went to MacMaster University in Hamilton. I was then 15 and three years short of graduating high school. I worked on the farm for a year, then in the city stuffing advertising into envelopes to earn money so that I could also go back to high school. When I went to see the principal in a nearby town, he wasn't sure which year I should enter and suggested that I get advice at MacMaster. The registrar there asked whether I was Wilma's sister or cousin and whether I had as much schooling in Europe as she did. When I told him that I had one year less he thought for a minute and said, "We'll try the experiment, What would you like to major in?" That sounded better than going back to high school, so, I asked for a catalog as a stall and looked for a subject no one had taken before, so that I would start out even. The field I came across was economics. When I came home and my parents asked "Economics? What's that?" I responded that I would tell them as soon as I found out. I thought at the time that I would probably switch, but it turned out I really liked economics from the beginning.

Q: Why did you decide to pursue a graduate degree?

In my junior year, a graduate student from the University of Chicago who had come to McMaster to teach for a year, suggested that I should go on to graduate school and I decided that I might as well give it a try. When I asked where I should go, he said "there are only two places in economics, Harvard and Chicago." So I applied there, and also asked for financial assistance, which I urgently needed. Both offered me tuition scholarships, but I had found

out that Harvard wasn't fully coeducational and decided to go to Chicago. I was always happy I did that because I met Bob Ferber there.

Q: Did you feel isolated in graduate school?

I began graduate school in 1944. This was during World War II, so the department was small and the proportion of women was larger than before, or for a long time afterward. By 1945 GIs started coming back; but I was one of the small minority of advanced graduate students and they looked up to all of us. So there were no problems with the students. Also, during my second year I worked as a research assistant in the Cowles Commission (later Cowles Foundation), which provided a very congenial environment.

That is not, however, the whole story; there were unpleasant incidents, some more serious than others. One day, when I told a new student that I was majoring in international trade and money and banking, he said, "That's a weird assortment for a woman". At the end of the first year I was awarded a fellowship. The next day one of my professors congratulated me, but went on to tell me that he had voted against giving me the fellowship. When I asked why he said, "I don't see why we should spend our scarce funds on a woman who will just go on to get married and have babies." Parenthetically, every time I was tempted to chuck my dissertation, which happened frequently, I said to myself, "I'm not going to prove him right!" Another faculty member said in a letter of recommendation that I was the best woman student he ever had. The department head told me, presumably because he thought I would be pleased, but I was furious. It made me realize that, as two sociologists later wrote, that the problem for women in academia was not so much that they're at the bottom but that they're outside the system. Considerably later, at the first big "women's conference," a fellow alumnus from Chicago said, "Of course we discriminated against women; they only drop out afterwards." In fact, the proportion of women Ph.D.s who dropped out was only marginally different from the proportion of men, but he remained unconvinced.

Most serious was the problem with my

dissertation. A young faculty member I knew agreed to serve on my committee, but the department appointed three people I had not even met and who had no interest in my topic. I never received any advice, the chair didn't answer letters, and the committee took about a year to read each draft of the dissertation. Looking back now, I should have complained, but at that time I was too timid to do that. So I did not finish till 1954, eight years after I had completed all my course work and had left Chicago to marry Bob Ferber in New York. In 1948 we moved to Champaign-Urbana where Bob had accepted a position at the University of Illinois U-C. As luck would have it, in 1954, just when I finished my dissertation and our second child entered nursery school, there was a serious teacher shortage, so the University offered me a job as a visiting lecturer, first a semester at a time, then a year at a time. This went on for 15 years. It was definitely not my choice, although I enjoyed teaching, and I was very pleased when they finally made me an assistant professor with tenure. Even then, however, I was assigned only undergraduate courses.

Q: What about personal life, family, and work?

Throughout the time I struggled with my dissertation as well as later I had the unstinting support of my husband. In my view that is crucial. If you have a partner who does not accept the fact that your career is as important as his you need to either get rid of him or give up on a real career. I would have chosen the former. Happily, I also found that my children never resented that I did not devote all my time to them, perhaps because I was around a good deal since I could do much of my work at home. They loved going to nursery school, had many friends, and enjoyed each other's company. I used to be both amused and pleased when I drove the car pool to nursery school and heard the children brag about their mothers' accomplishments, whether as students or faculty.

Q: You have been described as a mentor and a role model particularly for women. How do you view your role as a mentor?

Marianne Ferber . . . continued from page 8

I was, for a good many years Director of Undergraduate Studies, which afforded me the opportunity to do a lot of advising. While much of it was routine, I enjoyed helping some students with difficult problems. Because I was very rarely given the opportunity to teach graduate courses, my contact with graduate students other than my teaching assistants was with a few who sought me out personally. In time, however, I also met young women at professional meetings and was most pleased that they began to seek my advice with their research. I consider that one of the most rewarding aspects of having become a “senior scholar.” I should add that, oddly enough, not publishing until I was almost 50 years old has made me a useful role model for a substantial number of women. It helped them realize that one can have a respectable career even after getting a late start.

Q: Do you think your accomplishments have made it easier for women coming after you?

There is some evidence that the presence of women faculty is helpful. Some time ago, Helen Berg and I found that graduate students who had come to know some faculty member well were significantly more likely to complete their Ph.D. We also learned that women students were far less likely than men students to get to know male faculty members well. Simi-

larly, having women colleagues, especially if they have similar interests, is a great advantage. It made all the difference to me when Fran Blau joined the faculty here! So, the growing number of women in academia has been an improvement, but we are still far from a level playing field in economics. As I see it, a woman still has to walk on water to be really successful, while a lot of mediocre men do very well.

Q: What advice would you give to young female economists in the profession?

I think you should think carefully what your priorities and goals are. If you are intent on moving all the way up in the hierarchy, you probably have to “play the game” and conform to current standards - whatever they are. If, on the other hand, you want to do what you think is really worthwhile because that gives you most satisfaction, then don’t worry too much about this sort of thing. For instance, people will tell you that you will never get a position at a research university, let alone become a full professor, if you work on women’s issues or if you are too outspoken. Admittedly, that will make it harder, but I got much further than I expected to and that was certainly not because of my contributions to mathematical modeling or because I ever refused to say what was on my mind. Regrettably, that may however be harder now that universities hire increasingly more people for non-tenure track positions.

Q: How did you get involved in the founding of IAFPE?

I became one of the founding members of the International Association for Feminist Economics in part because several friends urged me to get involved, but that was certainly not the only reason. In spite of my continued allegiance to CSWEP - I served on its board for a couple of terms - I found an organization that is further to the left and explicitly international very appealing. In addition, I think that IAFPE has been very useful because it made CSWEP look as moderate as it really is.

As for my involvement in feminist economics, like many other major turns in my life, it came about by happenstance. One day I received a call from Julie Nelson, a young woman I did not know. She asked me if I would chair a session on feminist economic theory. I told her that I did not know anything about it, but she persuaded me that a chair didn’t need to know much, so I agreed. As it turned out, the session was amazingly well attended and afterwards a friend of Julie’s who worked for a major publisher asked us whether we would be interested in editing a book on this subject. Julie agreed to develop a proposal and persuaded me to work with her. As it turned out, it was the University of Chicago Press that eventually published *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics* in 1993 and is about to publish a second volume on the tenth anniversary.

An Interview with Francine D. Blau ***Frances Perkins Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations,*** ***Cornell University***

2001 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award Co-recipient

Interviewed by Barbara M. Fraumeni, Chief Economist, Bureau of Economic Analysis

Q: Why did you go into industrial and labor relations and then off to economics?

I grew up in New York City and I wanted to go away to school. There wasn’t a lot of money in the family. Cornell is part public and part private; the state colleges—agriculture, home economics, and industrial and labor relations (ILR)—have considerably lower tuition. I wasn’t exactly sure what ILR was, but it sounded more interesting to me than the other two. I had also learned about Frances Perkins who was FDR’s Secretary of Labor, and was one of the great women in American history. She became a role model for me in entering

this field.

I don’t think I fully realized what overwhelmingly male fields ILR and economics were at that time. When I applied to ILR there was actually a quota on women; they would not accept more than 15 women out of a class of 100. The reason that we were given for it was that there was limited space in the dorms for women.

Q: Did you ever feel isolated in graduate school?

Yes I did. At Harvard, there were over 50 students in my year and only three or four women. One of the things that made it more difficult for me was a lack of consciousness

about the problem. The women’s movement is often dated to 1963 when Betty Friedan published *The Feminine Mystique*, but when I attended college and started grad school in the mid-to-late 1960s, I was almost entirely innocent of those ideas. The goal of many of my female classmates in college was what we used to call a Mrs. Degree—marriage. I wanted to have a career and that sometimes made me feel a bit different from my peers. I was not greatly aware of inequities women faced, or even any special difficulties. When I did hit problems or obstacles I tended to think, “that’s the way it is” or even somehow that it was my fault. In her book, Betty Friedan talks about “the problem that has no name.” She was actually refer-

ring to the emptiness a lot of women felt who had chosen to become housewives. I'm not using it in that sense, but I think it is an apt description of my situation. As I became familiar with the ideas of the women's movement, it was a great relief to have a label to put on the problems I was experiencing. They were a lack of role models and a lack of female peers, as well as occasionally overt discrimination.

Q: How did you get involved in the founding of CSWEP?

I lived in New Haven for a few years while working on my dissertation for Harvard. I got to know the women grad students at Yale. Many of us were active in URPE (the Union for Radical Political Economics). We started talking about the issues confronting women in the field of economics and sharing ideas with women in other cities. We developed the goal of founding a committee on the status of women. Some of us attended the 1971 AEA meetings and put signs out: "Women who want to talk about the status of women in the economics profession meet in such and such a room." We got this great turnout and drafted a resolution for the establishment of CSWEP. Carolyn Shaw Bell, who emerged as our natural leader, presented the resolution at the business meeting. The proposal was hotly debated but we had packed the meeting with our adherents. Some people spontaneously emerged as eloquent supporters, including Bob Eisner of Northwestern. The resolution passed. After it was over I walked over to Bob and said, "Can I shake your hand and thank you?" He said, "Oh, don't tell me, tell my daughter." In 1974 the AEA amended the rules, so there are no more surprises like this at the business meeting.

Q: I want to pull you back to the question of whether you think women's isolation in graduate schools is a thing of the past.

I am not aware of any graduate programs that have a substantial number of women. I believe this minority status can create difficulties for women, and it doesn't necessarily require that people discriminate against you. Women may face some feeling of isolation and not even realize it. I would advise women students to seek out each other and women faculty. I'd also like to say that I don't feel isolated anymore because, in addition to seeking out other women, I have developed very good friendships with my male colleagues. After a while you get used to your minority status and you don't really notice it.

Q: Getting back to CSWEP, you said that Carolyn emerged as the natural leader. How did you end up being co-opted,

selected...?

I am not sure. Perhaps it was because I was in something of a leadership role as one of the people who had come to the meetings to try and organize the committee. I was the only grad student on the CSWEP Board. It was a tremendous experience for me personally. I did have a mentor as an undergraduate, Robert Ferguson at the ILR School who had encouraged me to go to graduate school, and another professor, George Hildebrand, who was also very supportive. But at Harvard I really did not have a mentor. There were no women faculty when I was a student. Richard Freeman joined the faculty after I had begun work on my dissertation and became a member of my committee. He was and continues to be a great inspiration to me, but he wasn't exactly a mentor since I hadn't studied with him and I was not in residence at Harvard when I worked on my dissertation. So being involved in the organization of CSWEP and actually having the honor of being a member of the Board were absolutely stupendous for me, as well as getting to know these wonderful women who had far harder roads to hoe than I did. Front and center are Carolyn Shaw Bell and Barbara Reagan, former chairs, and Phyllis Wallace, an African-American woman who received her Ph.D. from Yale in the 1950s.

It's very important to me, to try to be a mentor to younger people. I thanked Carolyn recently in a letter for being such an inspiration to me. She wrote back that she really didn't remember doing anything special. I think that says it all about Carolyn—mentoring younger people was just "business as usual" for her. That would be my goal.

Q: What about personal life, family, and work? After many years at the University of Illinois you moved to Cornell. How difficult was it to move a two-career family?

What I like to say when people ask me about balancing personal life, family and work—is to paraphrase W.C. Fields—at least I think it was Fields. When he was older someone asked him how it felt and he replied, "Well, it beats the alternative." If you want children, having them is just a wonderful thing. Having my career is extremely important to me too. I feel really lucky that I was able to do both. There were costs, of course, but there were also enormous benefits. I was able to get tenure at a young enough age to have my two kids afterwards. That takes some of the stress off, but it takes off less than you would think because what the tenure process is in part is a socialization process. After getting tenure, you still have very high goals and standards for yourself and you have a lot of commitments to collaborators. I

had kind of an interesting, really lucky, two-career situation. My husband, Larry Kahn, likes to say (humorously) that it was good planning—we met when we were both assistant professors, so we didn't face the problem of locating two jobs in the same place. We were both hired at the University of Illinois at the same time, possibly for the same job. (Illinois was a large department and in those days—the 1970s—they were willing to make multiple offers for the same position.)

One of the things that we like about being married is being in the same place. We were very happy at Illinois and both got tenure there, so we would not have moved unless it was a good opportunity for both of us. When Cornell approached us, we found the offers professionally very attractive. It was also an opportunity for me to go back to my alma mater, back to the ILR school itself. And, I was offered a Chair named for Frances Perkins who inspired my initial entry into the field; that was very exciting. Our children were born and raised in Champaign-Urbana and were not eager to move. When we moved, one was going into eighth grade and the other into sophomore year of high school. (They are now 20 and 22.) But it turned out to be a wonderful experience for them too.

Q: How did you find researching topics related to women and so forth, starting with your dissertation?

The acceptability of researching topics related to women was not high at the time that I started. Some members of the profession just didn't think the topic was that interesting and there was a presumption that a woman could not objectively research this area. There's been an enormous advance in the amount of research on this topic and in the acceptability of research on this topic. A lot of that advance owes itself to the hard work of the women and men who've been doing the research, showing it to be very interesting, and showing that it can be objective. The question that sometimes still gets raised is whether it the best thing for a woman to go into, will it lead to problems? I have very strong feelings about this. The best thing for anyone, male or female, to go into is what interests them. If you do that, in a sense, you can't fail because you've marked out for yourself an interesting and rewarding line of work.

Q: Given that your award is with Marianne Ferber, say something about your experiences with collaborative research with each other and with others.

I've been really lucky in regard to collaborative research in finding co-authors that not only have a lot to contribute professionally, but are also close personal friends. Marianne Ferber is towards the head of that list, but I

Francine D. Blau . . . Continued from page 9

have to also mention my husband, Larry Kahn, and there are others who've been very important to me as well. Now some people think of collaboration as just a kind of pragmatic thing, "With a co-author you can be twice as productive." I think that's totally untrue. What goes up is the quality of the work. The quantity of the work might go up a little, but not as much as you might think. You're in it with somebody else, you're debating it, you're talking about it. Research can be a little lonely and collaborative work obviously is far less lonely. People tend to have different strengths and weaknesses. The whole tends to be better than the sum of the parts for that reason. Collaborative research also keeps me at it, keeps my nose to the grindstone. I might be willing to disappoint myself, but I'm sure as heck not going to disappoint a co-author.

Q: Do you think it is easier for women to be leaders in academia today? What advice would you give to young female economists in the profession?

I do think it is easier than it used to be for women both because there have been women who've gone before and there is now an increasing number of women. My advice can be summarized with a line from Shakespeare, "To thine own self be true." This relates to following your own interests, doing research on what really motivates you. Of course you should be aware of how your work is received, but, in my estimation, the really hard thing about being a female economist or may be just a person, is developing some level of comfort with yourself. Once you're comfortable with yourself it's surprising how much easier other challenges are.

Q: Are there any other experiences or lessons that you would like to relate to the readers of the CSWEP newsletter?

I'd like to add that with family there are conflicting commitments and there are ups and downs with balancing work and family, but they complement each other very well, and people don't always realize that. Your family gives you a dimension of your life outside of your work. You may get an article rejected by a journal, but your two-year-old is still going to run over to you as if you're the greatest person in the world. Or your two-year-old could throw a terrible tantrum, but you might get a letter of acceptance from a journal. So you have alternative sources of gratification that help to keep you balanced and give you a sense of perspective.

CSWEP-Sponsored Sessions at the Western Economics Association Annual Conference

CSWEP sponsored two well-attended sessions at the WEA meetings in Seattle this year. The first, chaired by Professor Mary King of the University of Portland, was entitled "Women's Economic Well-Being." The papers presented in this session included "Defining and Measuring Patriarchal Regimes" by King; "The Role of Contingent Work in the War Against Poverty" by Catalina Amuedo-Dorantes and Cynthia Bansak, San Diego State University; and "Health, Wealth, and Gender: Do Health Shocks of Husbands and Wives Have Different Impact on Household Wealth" by Jennifer Ward-Batts of Claremont.

King defines a patriarchal state as one that combines a weak welfare state, a strong family network, low female labor force participation, and the concentration of unemployment among young people. Using the Luxembourg Income Study micro-data, she finds that several Southern European economies may be said to be patriarchal but familial. For example, Italy does not suffer the concentration of poverty among women and children that is found in the U.S., in part because children are much less likely to live in female-headed households. The U.S., on the other hand, has higher female labor force participation, but low wages for women and weak families, leading to a second type of patriarchal regime.

Amuedo-Dorantes and Bansak focus on the practice of pushing welfare recipients into temporary or "contingent" work. Using data from the NLSY79, the authors examine the probability of taking a contingent job, conditional on past welfare dependency and poverty status and the probabilities of either going on welfare

or entering poverty for those in contingent and other jobs. They estimate a simultaneous equations probit model for welfare and contingent work. The results suggest that being on welfare increases the probability of taking a contingent job, although the reverse is not true. Rather, it is the other characteristics of the contingent job (low pay, lack of benefits, etc.) which increase the individual's probability of being poor. The discussant, Jennifer Ward-Batts, suggested that it would be useful to distinguish between high and low skilled jobs, and that some of the exclusion restrictions were questionable (i.e. that the presence of young children affected welfare but not contingent job holding).

Ward-Batts elucidates the mechanisms for health to affect household wealth, and asks whether shocks to husbands and wives have differing effects. She examines married couples in four waves of the Health and Retirement Survey, and examines the effect of the onset of various health conditions on household wealth. Her estimates of whether the effects of health shocks are larger for husbands and wives are mixed. In her comments, King suggested that it would be useful to more fully understand the ways that health affects wealth, as well as finding a way to include those with zero or negative wealth.

The second session, chaired by Shelly Lundberg of the University of Washington, was called: "Household Bargaining and Household Production" and featured a paper by Lundberg entitled "Limits to Specialization: Family Policy and Economic Efficiency," a paper by Gaelle Le Guirriec of the University of Paris II and Reims Management School called "The Allocation of Time Within Single-Person Households and

Single-Parent Households," a presentation by Elaina Rose of the University of Seattle on "Marriage and Assortative Mating," and a paper by Bridget Hiedemann (Seattle University) and David Byrne, Michelle Goeree, and Steven Stern (all of the University of Virginia) on "Long-Term Care, Formal Home Health Care, and Informal Care."

Lundberg presented a model of bargaining in a two-person household which showed that an inability to commit to contracts within marriage could lead to an inefficiently low level of investment in household public goods, such as children. The popular belief that changes in divorce laws making it easier to dissolve marriages have made women better off is thus not necessarily correct. Other changes in the law, such as those guaranteeing women a greater claim in the event of divorce may have counterbalanced this tendency, however. Moreover, making divorce more difficult moves the couple towards an efficient solution only if renegotiation in the second period, when women's bargaining power has been reduced due to specialization in household production, can be prevented. Lundberg suggests several family policies which may provide a partial solution to the inefficiency generated by lack of ability to commit, such as childcare subsidies, family leaves, and income support for lone mothers.

Le Guirriec examines the determinants of demand for products and services that substitute for home production among single-parent households using data from a 1998/99 French household survey. In her model, the demand for these goods and services depends on the

Continued on page 12

value of time, and the availability of substitutes for that time.

Rose presented a model in which the likelihood of “marrying up” (hypergamy) was related to the extent to which matching patterns are driven by specialization in household and market production-i.e. the tendency for women to specialize in the production of household public goods while men specialize in market work. Using the PSID, she finds that the 1970s were characterized by declines in hypergamy, while the 1980s experienced an increase. A change in the extent of hypergamy has implications for people at the tails of the education distribution, who remain unmatched. Her discussant, Ward-Batts suggested that an exploration of these implications, as well as implications for fertility, would be an interesting extension to the paper.

Heidemann et al. use the 1993 wave of the AHEAD survey (of the elderly) to estimate a game theoretic model of family decisions about time spent caring for elderly members. The outcome is a Nash equilibrium which determines each members consumption, transfers for formal care, and time allocations. The estimates allow effects to be decomposed into wage effects, quality of care effects, and “burden effects.” The discussant, Shelly Lundberg, raised questions about the identification of the nonlinear structural model, and in particular about the way that effects of care on parent’s health were modeled. She also noted that it was interesting that parental health, rather than parental utility was included in children’s utility functions.

CSWEP Sessions at the Southern Economic Association Meeting **November 24-26, 2002 - New Orleans, LA**

Economic Issues in Latin America

Chair: Myriam Quispe-Agnoli (Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta)

Papers: “Solidarity Lending and Savings Mobilization: A Case Study of Promujer Peru,” Alicia Robb (Federal Reserve Board of Governors);

“Measuring Financial Liberalization in Latin America: An Index of Banking Activity,” Elizabeth McQuerry and Myriam Quispe-Agnoli (Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta); “Persistence in Corruption,” Luis Sosa (Colorado School of Mines)

Discussants: Lewis S. Davis (Smith College)

Discrimination in the Workplace

Chair: Saranna R. Thornton (Hampden-Sydney College)

Papers: “Gender Earnings Differentials Among Highly Paid College and University Administrators,” KimMarie McGoldrick and James Monks

(University of Richmond); “A Cohort Study of Economists,” Debra A. Barbezat (Colby College); “Alternative Ways to measure the Unexplained Wage Gap,” Emily P. Hoffman (Western Michigan University) and Robert K. Toutkoushian (University of New Hampshire);

“Institutional Factors Affecting a College’s or University’s Likelihood of Having an Illegal Maternity Leave Policy for Faculty,” Saranna R. Thornton (Hampden-Sydney College)

Discussants: TBA

CSWEP Sessions at the Midwest Economic Association Meeting **March 28-30, 2003 - St. Louis, MO**

Globalization and Wages

Chair: Virginia Shingleton (Valparaiso University)

Papers: “Globalization and the Equalization of Wages Worldwide,” Diane Monaco (Manchester College); “Are American Women Down and Out in a Global Economy?” Rebecca A. Havens (Point Loma Nazarene University); “Globalization and High Tech Wages: Is There a Cobweb

Interpretation?” Joanna Bujes (Sun Microsystems) and Diane Monaco (Manchester College)

Discussants: Tara Sinclair (Washington University) and TBA

Women at Risk

Chair: Leslie Papke

Papers: “Why Do Women “Still” Invest Differently Than Men?” Vickie Bajtelsmit and Alexandra Bernasek (Colorado State University); “Will

Women Workers Be More Secure in Retirement Than Their Mothers? Evidence from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP)” Catherine Hill (National Academy of Social Insurance and Institute for Women’s Policy Research); “Married Women and their

Ability to Repay Their Debts After Divorce: The Role that Welfare Plays” Jonathan Fisher (Bureau of Labor Statistics) and Angela Lyons (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign); “Are There Gender Differences in Risk Tolerance or Is It a Question of Measurement?”

Michael Gutter and Tabassum Saleem (University of Wisconsin-Madison)

Discussants: TBA

CSWEP Sessions at the 2003 ASSA Meeting

January 3- 5, 2003

Washington D.C.

Fertility and the Cost of Motherhood

Date: Friday, January 3 • Time: 10:15 AM

Chair: Timothy Smeeding (Syracuse University)

Papers: Rebecca Stein (University of Pennsylvania) "*An Upper Bound of the Cost of Motherhood*"; Lucie Schmidt (Williams College) "*Planning for Parenthood: Effects of Imperfect Fertility Control and Risk Aversion on Women's Choices*"; Reagan Baughman (University of Michigan) and Stacy Dickert-Conlin (Syracuse University) "*Kids for Credit: The Earned Income Tax Credit and Fertility*"; Anne H. Gauthier (University of Calgary), Timothy Smeeding (Syracuse University) and Frank F. Furstenberg, Jr. "*Do We Invest Less Time in Children? Trends in Parental Time Since the 1960s*"

Discussants: Irwin Garfinkle (Columbia University), Barbara L. Wolfe (University of Wisconsin-Madison)

Motherhood and Child Disability and Health

Date: Friday, January 3 • Time: 2:30 PM

Chair: Janet Currie (University of California-Los Angeles)

Papers: Heather Bednarek (St. Louis University) and Jill Hudson (Agency for Healthcare Research & Quality) "*Child Disability and Mother's Labor Supply*"; Anna Aizer (University of California-Los Angeles) "*Impact of Advertising and Outreach on Medicaid Enrollment and Child Health*"; Catalina Amuedo-Dorantes and Kusum Mundra (San Diego State University) "*Medicaid Use by Immigrants' Mothers: Evidence from California*"

Discussants: Elizabeth T. Powers (University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign); Karen Smith Conway (University of New Hampshire); Deborah Garvey (Santa Clara University)

Health and Disability Issues

Date: Saturday, January 4 • Time: 8:00 am

Chair: Genevieve Kenney (The Urban Institute)

Papers: Shawna Grosskopf (Oregon State University) and Sharmistha Self (College of Saint Benedict) "*To What Extent is the Efficiency of Public Health Expenditure Determined by the Status of Health?*"; Irena Dushi (International Longevity Center-USA) and Marjorie Honig (Hunter College) "*Take-Up of Employment-Based Health and Disability Insurance*"; Julie L. Hotchkiss (Georgia State University) "*A Closer Look at the Employment Impact of the Americans with Disabilities Act*"

Discussants: Thomas E. Getzen (Temple University); Sophie Korczyk (Analytical Services); Thomas DeLeire (University of Chicago)

Emerging Issues in Social Security Reform

Date: Saturday, January 4 • Time: 10:15 AM

Chair: Olivia Mitchell (University of Pennsylvania)

Papers: Beth Asch (RAND), Steven Haider (Michigan State University) and Julie Zissimopoulos (RAND) "*The Impact of Social Security and Medicare on Retirement Incentives: Exploiting Variation in Coverage*"; Vickie Bajtelsmit (Colorado

State University), Alexandra Bernasek (Colorado State University) and Nancy Jianakoplos (Colorado State University) "*The Impact of Social Security Privatization on Women*"; Marie-Eve Lachance (University of Pennsylvania) and Olivia Mitchell (University of Pennsylvania) "*Understanding Personal Account Guarantees*"; Elizabeth Powers (University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign) and David Neumark (Michigan State University) "*Multiple Program Use by Older Americans: Social Security Early Retirement and SSDI*"

Discussants: Jeffrey R. Brown (University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign); Barbara A. Smith (U.S. General Accounting Office); Christian Weller (Economic Policy Institute); Courtney Coile (Wellesley College)

Monetary and Inflation-Targeting Policies

Date: Saturday, January 4 • Time: 2:30 PM

Chair: Fabio Ghironi (Boston College)

Papers: Kai Leitemo (Norges Bank) and Ingunn Lonning (Norges Bank) "*Monetary Policy without the Output Gap*"; Anita Tuladhar (International Monetary Fund) "*Policy Responses to International Capital Flows: A Comparative Study*"; Julie Smith (Trinity University) "*Monetary Regimes and Core Inflation*"

Discussants: Diana N. Weymark (Vanderbilt University); Frank Smets (European Central Bank); Athanasios Orphanides (Federal Reserve Board)

Mentoring and Its Role in Professional Development (Panel Discussion)

Date: Sunday, January 5 • Time: 8:30 AM

Chair: Joan G. Haworth (Economic Research Services)

Presenters: Robin L. Bartlett (Denison University); Andrea L. Ziegert (Denison University); Ronald Ehrenberg (Cornell University); Cecilia Conrad (Pomona College); Francine Blau (Cornell University)

Gender Differences in the Labor Market

Date: Sunday, January 5 • Time: 1:30 PM

Chair: Judith McDonald (Lehigh University)

Papers: Barbara Morgan (Johns Hopkins University) "*Part-Time Work during the Boom Years*"; Alicia Sasser (Mathematica Policy Research) "*Gender Differences in Physician Pay*"; James Monks (University of Richmond) and Michael Robinson (Mount Holyoke College) "*A Puzzling Gender Income Differential among Recent College Graduates*"; M. Melinda Pitts (Georgia State University) "*The Impact of Intermittent Labor Force Participation on Lifetime Earnings and Wealth*"

Discussants: Francine Blau (Cornell University); Joyce Jacobsen (Wesleyan University); Shelly Lundberg (University of Washington)

Biography

Janet Currie, Professor, University of California at Los Angeles

My career as an Economist began almost by accident. I arrived at the University of Toronto as a freshman resolved to study law and hence took the usual array of liberal arts courses, including Economics 101. The Professor, Donald Dewees, was wonderful, beginning each day with a relevant real-life example. Other classes were less satisfactory. I recall being particularly nonplussed with the standard freshman Philosophy assignment: "Prove or disprove the existence of God in five pages or less". Moreover, ALL the liberal arts students wanted to be lawyers, which tarnished the luster of that profession in my eyes. As a sophomore, I decided to become a math major, but quickly realized that this was also a mistake—I had little interest in theory devoid of application. By junior year it was apparent that the only thing I was good at was Economics. Still, I was disappointed to realize upon graduation with a Master's degree in 1983 that I still had little notion of what a professional Economist actually did.

There was only one way to find out. I applied for Graduate School and decided to go to Princeton because it was the only school that offered me funding. I was fortunate to have a stellar cast of first year teachers including Hugo Sonnenschein, David Card, Whitney Newey, Angus Deaton, Alan Blinder, and John Taylor. At the end of first year, I was surprised to find that the Industrial Relations Section at Princeton had adopted me (by paying part of my stipend) and was also offering me summer employment. The IR section was (and is) an incredible research environment. Orley Ashenfelter and David Card were amazing advisors, infinitely patient and available in addition to being brilliant. There were many interesting visitors and students. I was able to begin a productive collaboration with fellow student Sheena McConnell which lasted many years. It was however, perhaps a bit sheltered from the rigors of a real world. I remember my shock when Finis Welch asked during my job talk at UCLA in 1988 (on arbitration of collective bargaining disputes among public school teachers) "why anyone should care about unions when unions were dying?" In my short intellectual life, I had never met a labor economist who did not care deeply about collective bargaining. I was offered a job despite the fact that I had no satisfactory answer.

Mulling this question over in the next few years, I decided that I would like to do research on something I cared deeply about at a personal as well as at an intellectual level. I may

have been influenced in this decision by the example of Claudia Goldin who visited the IR section while working on her important book, "The Gender Gap". Claudia was the most successful female academic I had seen. While her methods were neoclassical, her topic was of visceral interest (at least to working women!). I decided that I wanted to work on children and discovered a gap in the literature: While many welfare programs were justified in terms of helping children, there was little evidence about the effects of these programs on children. Rather, virtually all of the existing literature on welfare programs examined the incentives the programs created for parents.

About the same time, Hank Farber invited me to visit MIT, and I was later offered a job. There, I benefited greatly from the mentoring of Jim Poterba. I recall Jim's assessment of my first effort in my new line of research ("Welfare and the Well-Being of Children"). He told me that while the analysis seemed sound, the paper was boring. I read it with new eyes, and was dismayed to find that he was right! The revised version got a much better reception, and the new line of research was properly launched. While at MIT I was also to begin a very fruitful collaboration with Jon Gruber, as well as joining the NBER.

However, for personal reasons, it made sense to return to UCLA when I was offered tenure there in 1993. While I sometimes miss the excitement of Cambridge, UCLA has been a supportive environment for me both profession-

ally and personally. Since 1993, UCLA has hired a number of excellent economists in Econometrics and applied fields. I am particularly grateful for the quarter of paid leave which I was given after the birth of each of my children in 1997 and in 1999, as well as for the excellent child care and elementary schooling that is available on campus. I often wonder how I would cope without these benefits.

For women who are beginning careers as academic economists I would offer the following advice: Take all the mentoring you can get. Think carefully about the advice that you receive, but feel free to reject it if that seems the best course. "Just Say No" to excess committee work and other non-productive assignments. It is generally helpful to tell the person who is asking you to serve on a fifth committee about the other four you are already working on. Decide what is fair, and stick to it. Remember to "pencil yourself in". That is, if you have a standing appointment with the stairmaster, or your daughter's piano recital, give it the same respect as you would give appointments with other people. Be open to collaboration with other scholars. Push yourself to attend meetings and interact with others in your field. Work on things you care about. And, as Rebecca Blank has noted, be sure to marry well if you would like to have a family! I would be remiss if I did not end by thanking my husband, Bentley MacLeod, for his unstinting love and practical support.



From the Chair

Your Board has had a very productive summer and looks forward to preparing for the ASSA meetings, as well as the regional meeting of the Southern Economic Association in November. You will find elsewhere in the newsletter notices about these events. We encourage all of you to attend the annual meetings in Washington D.C. and, in particular, to attend the seven sessions that have been developed by CSWEP associates.

The Board has focused its' attention this summer on developing ways to use mentoring to further women economists' careers. We are seeking funding to institutionalize mentoring workshops for economists under a CSWEP oversight group. These workshops are designed to provide career development and continuing contact among the participants in these workshops and to produce good data for research into effective mentoring for the future. We hope that

such programs will not only promote mentoring among those in this professional organization but may also be able to assist in modifying the cultures in academic institutions to encourage directed efforts by senior people to promote the careers of promising junior faculty. Obviously this is an exciting effort and we will keep you informed - through the newsletter and the website - of future developments.

We have also moved our website from a local network to the AEA's server. As a consequence of this move our website will be linked easily to all AEA activities and be an even more effective form of communication, providing up-to-date information about professional meetings, grant and professional opportunities, and CSWEP activities. Please be sure to put the CSWEP website on your favorites list and check it routinely. It is our most immediate form of communication with

all of you. www.cswep.org.

This is the last newsletter before Fran Blau takes over as Chair of CSWEP in January, 2003. We are delighted that she will be at the helm for the next three years. I wish her and this terrific Board great success as the Committee continues its mission to monitor and improve the position of women in the profession. I have enjoyed working with the Board and with the AEA staff and Executive Committee in the past two years and greatly appreciate their support during that time. I hope all of you find ways to be active CSWEP supporters and participants in the next few years. An association with other successful women economists - both in academia and in non-academic environments - provides an opportunity to grow both professionally and personally. I hope you take advantage of this group to do that for yourselves.

The CSWEP "Brag Box"

The August 2002 issue of AMSTAT, in the People News section, announced that **Katharine G. Abraham** was awarded the Julius Shiskin Award for her "many methodological improvements in U.S. price and employment statistics - improvements demanded by the increasingly complex roles those statistics play in business and government affairs." Dr. Abraham, a Harvard Ph.D. graduate, has served on the faculties of the Sloan School of Management at MIT as well as the University of Maryland, where she is now Professor of Survey Methodology. She also served as the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for two four-year terms from 1993 through 2001. Her extensive writings and the improvements in price indices and employment statistics have made significant contributions to the usefulness of public statistics in these areas. This is a very prestigious award and CSWEP associates are proud to congratulate Dr. Abraham on this well-deserved honor.

Andrea H. Beller, Professor, Department of Agricultural and Consumer Economics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, has been appointed a Research Fellow of IZA - Institute for the Study of Labor, an international research center in labor economics, Bonn, Germany.

KimMarie McGoldrick, Associate Professor, E.C. Robins School of Business, University of Richmond was elected to serve a three year term as a board member of the International Association for Feminist Economics.

Each newsletter contains some revelations as to the substantial achievements and the career developments of all of our associates. Please keep the Chair or Board members notified of developments or events that you would like to share with your colleagues.

Call for Papers: CSWEP Sessions

CSWEP at the American Economic Association

The Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP) of the American Economic Association will sponsor sessions at the January 2004 American Economic Association meetings in San Diego. We will organize three sessions on gender-related topics. We are particularly interested in receiving abstracts on the economics of marriage, divorce, child support and father involvement. However, anyone doing research with gender implications is encouraged to submit an abstract. The three sessions on non-gender related topics will focus on Experimental Economics. Abstracts are particularly encouraged in the areas of experimental game theory, behavioral economics and psychology. However, all research topics in the general area of Experimental Economics are welcome. Accepted papers will be considered for publication in the Papers and Proceedings issue of the American Economic Review. Send a cover letter (specifying to which set of sessions the paper is being submitted) and three copies of a one to two page abstract (250 - 1000 words), clearly labeled with the paper title, authors' names, affiliations, and complete contact information by January 11, 2003, to Francine Blau (incoming Chair of CSWEP). Her mailing address is School of Industrial and Labor Relations, 265 Ives Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853-3901 and her email address is fdb4@cornell.edu.

CSWEP at the Eastern Economics Association

CSWEP will be sponsoring two sessions at the Eastern Economics Association meetings. The meetings will be held in New York City at the Crowne Plaza Manhattan Hotel from February 21-23, 2003. The topics for the sessions will depend on the abstracts received; one of the sessions will be gender-related if possible.

One-page abstracts should include your name, affiliation, snail-mail and e-mail address, phone and fax numbers. Abstracts can be sent via snail-mail, e-mail or fax.

Abstracts should be submitted by **November 1, 2002** to

Rachel Croson
Suite 500, Huntsman Hall
3730 Walnut Street
The Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6340
crosonr@wharton.upenn.edu
phone: (215) 898-3025
fax: (215) 898-3664

Please note that this submission is separate from any submission sent in response to the EEA's general call for papers, but any papers rejected here will be passed on to the EEA. For further information on the EEA meetings please see <http://www.iona.edu/eea/>

CSWEP at the Western Economics Association

The 2003 meetings of the Western Economic Association meetings will be held in Denver, July 11-15th. If you would like to present in a CSWEP session, please send your paper or abstract to Janet Currie, Dept. of Economics UCLA, 405 Hilgard Ave., Los Angeles, 90095-1477, currie@simba.sscnet.ucla.edu by Dec. 1, 2002. You are also welcome to submit an entire session (including chairs and discussants) for consideration. Please include your name, contact information (including email), full title, and up to three JEL categories for each submission. Further information about the conference is available at www.weainternational.org.



Announcements

Business Women's Network (BWN) sponsors leadership events, hosts an online newsletter and provides web links to resources for women. Visit www.bwni.com for more information on recent and upcoming events.



Job Postings Available Online

See the CSWEP website for a list of employers who are interested in making sure that women know of their openings. Please go to www.cswep.org



The 2003 IAFFE Pedagogy Workshop

The Eighth Annual IAFFE Teaching Workshop "Using Data for Economic Literacy: A Project for Feminist Pedagogy," organized by the Teaching and Pedagogy Committee of the International Association for Feminist Economics is planned for Thursday, January 2, 2003 at American University in Washington, D.C., USA.

The purpose of the workshop is to provide tools and skills that improve the economic literacy and critical thinking goals of feminist pedagogy. College students often enter their economics courses knowing little about the economy. As a result, economics instructors find it necessary to introduce their students to some basic economic facts and figures before delving into the theoretical underpinnings of the economy.

This workshop will examine how to use U.S. Census Data in economics classes by providing a background and processes for using data in the classroom, and by demonstrating ways to create assignments and interpret data. During the workshop facilitators will focus on the development of both very short and lengthier classroom exercises that utilize web based data sources from the U.S. Census Bureau. Experts from the U.S. Census Bureau will demonstrate Ferret and SIPP (the Survey of Income and Program Participation) and will advise participants on short classroom projects using Census data.

Participants will also be guided through exercises in developing relevant questions that can be explored through these data sources. For example, what constitutes "the" economy, and how have changes in its components affected U.S. individuals and families? What items do families purchase, and how do these budgetary expenditures vary across race-ethnicity, age, family type, and presence of children? How are gender and race-ethnicity related to income distribution and poverty?

Workshop participants will receive materials to use in their own classes and will have the opportunity to discuss the workshop's ideas, with the workshop staff and each other. Workshop Registration: \$50 students; \$60 IAFFE Members; \$85 nonmembers.

For a more detailed schedule and registration coupon please go to the IAFFE website: www.facstaff.bucknell.edu/jshackel/iaffe/pedagogy2003.html



Congressional Budget Office 2003 Economic Policy Fellowships

afford expert economists and policy analysts the opportunity to contribute to the agency's mission of providing the Congress with critical analyses relating to the budget and economic policy.

Further information about CBO, the 2003 Economic Fellowship Program and specific research topics can be found at www.cbo.gov or Congressional Budget Office, Washington, DC 20515, Phone: (202) 226-2628.



Family and Medical Leave Resources

The American Association of University Professors is pleased to announce publication of *The Family and Medical Leave Act: Questions and Answers for Faculty*. The guidebook, by AAUP counsel Donna Euben and economics professor Saranna Thornton, is a resource for those who want to understand how the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 applies to the academic workplace.

For information about ordering, please visit www.aauup.org or contact the AAUP, 1012 Fourteenth St., N.W., Suite #500, Washington, DC 20005, Phone: (202)737-5900.



For CSWEP members employed outside of academia the National Partnership for Women and Families has a good guidebook to the FMLA. See www.nationalpartnership.org for more information.



CSWEP Activities at the 2003 ASSA Meeting

January 3-5, 2003

Grand Hyatt Washington Hotel

- **Board Meeting**
Room: McPherson Square
Date: Thursday, January 2
Time: 4:00 PM - 7:30 pm

- **Business Meeting and Reception**
Room: LaTrobe
Date: Friday, January 3
Time: 4:45 PM - 5:45 PM
 - Announcements of the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award and the Elaine Bennett Prize will be made at the Business Meeting.
 - A reception will follow the business meeting from 5:45 PM until 7:30 PM

- **CSWEP Reception**
Room: Burnham
Date: Friday, January 3
Time: 5:45 PM - 7:30 PM

- **HOSPITALITY Room**
Room: Lafayette Park
Friday & Saturday - 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM
Sunday - 7:30 AM - Noon
 - Beverages will be available in the morning and in the afternoon.



How to Become an Associate

CSWEP



The Committee On The Status Of Women In The Economics Profession

CSWEP depends on all of its associates to continue its activities. In addition to publishing the Newsletter, we maintain a Roster of women economists that is used by associates, employers, organizations establishing advisory groups, and the like. We also organize sessions at the meetings of the AEA and the regional economics associations and publish an annual report on the status of women in the profession.

If you have not made your donation for the current member year (January 1, 2002 - December 31, 2002), we urge you to do so.

If you have already made your donation, please pass this on to a student, friend, or colleague and tell them about our work.

Thank you!

STUDENTS DO NOT HAVE TO PAY ASSOCIATE DUES!!

To become an associate of **CSWEP** and receive our Newsletter, send this application, with your donation for \$25 payable to:

CSWEP Membership
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Name _____

Mailing Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

Check here if currently an AEA member _____ New CSWEP _____ Student _____

If you checked student, please indicate what institution you attend _____

CSWEP: People to Contact

General Policy Matters	Joan G. Haworth, Chair Economic Research Services, Inc. 4901 Tower Court Tallahassee, FL 32303 jhaworth@ersnet.com
Routine Matters and Items for Newsletter	Lee Fordham Economic Research Services, Inc. 4901 Tower Court Tallahassee, FL 32303 lfordham@ersnet.com
Dues, Change of Address, Roster	CSWEP Membership Economic Research Services, Inc. 4901 Tower Court Tallahassee, FL 32303 jhaworth@ersnet.com
CSWEP East	Rachel Croson, OPIM: The Wharton School University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, PA 19104-6366 http://wharton.upenn.edu/faculty/crosonr.html crosonr@wharton.upenn.edu
CSWEP Mid-West	Jean Kimmel Western Michigan University Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5023 jean.kimmel@wmich.edu
CSWEP South	Rachel Willis, American Studies and Economics University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill Chapel-Hill, NC 27599-3520 Rachel_Willis@unc.edu
CSWEP West	Janet Currie, Department of Economics University of California - Los Angeles 405 Hilgard Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90095-1477 currie@simba.sscnet.ucla.edu



American Economic Association
CSWEP
c/o Joan G. Haworth, Ph.D.
Economic Research Services
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Nonprofit Org. U.S. Postage PAID Tallahassee, FL Permit No. 9
