



# Newsletter of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

Fall 2003

Published three times annually by the American  
Economic Association's Committee on the Status  
of Women in the Economics Profession



## Board Member Biography: Catherine L. Mann

I am passionate about international economics. After college at Harvard, I spent two years working for an international bank spending about half my time on the road in developing countries. Then, I got my PhD at MIT, went to Washington and ever since have been doing international economics research, working at international policymaking institutions, teaching international economics, and engaging as international advisor to business and governments on how to use information technology effectively. I honestly believe that good research, communicated effectively to policy makers, makes a difference for policy and therefore for economic outcomes.

For my "day-jobs," I worked for about 10 years at the Federal Reserve in the International Finance Division. Two years I spent working with the chief economist at the World Bank. Another year at the White House on the President's Council of Economic Advisors. I have now been nearly six years at the Institute for International Economics. At these institutions, I have analyzed US international economic issues and policy, particularly understanding US trade and the dynamics of the US current account, as well as the exchange value of the dollar. Among other outputs, I wrote "Prices, Profits, and Exchange Rates" (1986) for the Federal Reserve Bulletin, *Is the US Trade Deficit Sustainable?* (1999) for IIE and "Perspectives on the US Current Account and Sustainability" (2002) in the *Journal of Economic Perspectives*.

Around the world, particularly in the last five years, I have focused on issues of international technology and economic policy. My son Bennett has key chains from Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Finland, France, Germany, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, New

continued on page 13



## Margaret de Vries Reflects on Her Pioneering Role

Story reprinted from IMFSTAT News, published by the International Monetary Fund (the Fund). Photos courtesy of the Fund.

*On January 3, Margaret de Vries, retired Fund economist and historian, received the 2002 Carolyn Shaw Bell award from the American Economic Association's Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession. The prestigious award honors an individual who has furthered the status of women in economics through example, achievement, or mentoring. De Vries, who joined the Fund in 1946 and retired in 1987, looks back on the trials and rewards of being a female economist in the Fund's early days.*

*What attracted you to economics as a profession?*  
I grew up in Detroit during the Great Depression. Because of its heavy reliance on automobile production, Detroit suffers unusually badly whenever there's a recession, and during the Great Depression unemployment was higher than in other cities. My father, who was in the construction business, said to me one day, "I'm going to take you for a ride to see some new homes." I was expecting to see

continued on page 10

## CONTENTS

- Board Member Biography, Catherine L. Mann: 1
- Margaret de Vries Reflects on Her Pioneering Role: 1
- From the Chair: 2
- Featured Articles, Responding to Discrimination in the Academy: 3-9
- Autobiography, Karine Moe: 10
- CSWEP Events at the 2004 ASSA Meeting (San Diego, CA): 14
- Eastern Economics Association Meetings: 16
- Southern Economics Association Meetings: 16
- Summary of WEA Meeting: 17
- Announcements: 18
- Brag Box: 18

## Responding to **DISCRIMINATION** in the Academy

**Discrimination and Its  
Resolution in the Economics  
Job Market: A Real Life Story**  
by Srobona Mitra and Richard Startz

page 4

**Gender Discrimination at  
Tenure Time**  
(author anonymous)

page 6

**Workplace Bullying, Women,  
and the Knowledge Economy**  
by David Yamada

page 8

## DIRECTORY OF CSWEP BOARD MEMBERS

### Francine D. Blau, Chair

Cornell University  
265 Ives Hall  
Ithaca, NY 14853  
(607) 255-4381  
FAX (607) 255-4496  
fdb4@cornell.edu

### Joan G. Haworth, Membership-Chair

ERS Group  
4901 Tower Court  
Tallahassee, FL 32303  
(850) 562-1211  
FAX (850) 562-3838  
jhaworth@ersgroup.com

### Lisa Barrow

Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago  
230 S. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, IL 60604  
(312) 322-5073  
FAX (312) 322-2357  
lbarrow@frbchi.org

### Andrea H. Beller

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

### Judith A. Chevalier

Yale University  
135 Prospect Street  
New Haven, CT 06520  
(203) 432-3122  
judith.chevalier@yale.edu

### Rachel Croson

OPIM: The Wharton School  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6366  
(215) 898-3025  
FAX (215) 898-3664  
croson@wharton.upenn.edu

### 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  
currie@simba.sscnet.ucla.edu

### Barbara Fraumeni

Bureau of Economic Analysis BE-3  
1441 L Street NW  
Washington, DC 20230  
(202) 606-9603  
FAX (202) 606-5311  
barbara.Fraumeni@bea.gov

### Claudia Goldin

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

### Daniel S. Hamermesh

University of Texas at Austin  
Department of Economics  
Austin, TX 78712  
(512) 475-8526  
FAX (312) 471-3510  
hamermes@eco.utexas.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  
kmcgoldr@richmond.edu

### Catherine L. Mann

Institute for International Economics  
1750 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 328-9000  
FAX (202) 659-3225  
clmann@iie.com

### Karine S. Moe

Macalester College  
1600 Grand Avenue  
St. Paul, MN 55105  
(651) 696-6793  
FAX (651) 696-6746  
moe@macalester.edu



## From the Chair

A major activity of the Board over the past few months has been implementing the CSWEP mentoring programs for junior economists for which we have obtained funding from the National Science Foundation ADVANCE and Economics

panels. The first set of workshops will be held at the upcoming ASSA meetings in San Diego. They will be followed by a round of mentoring workshops at the four regional economics association meetings and another round of national workshops at the 2006 ASSA meetings. The workshops are designed to provide career development and continuing contact among the participants in the workshops. We also plan on evaluating the effect of participation on indicators of career success. We are very excited about this initiative and will keep you posted about it as it develops. I would like to express my appreciation to the American Economic Association for housing the grant at its headquarters and I would like to thank the AEA staff in Nashville for their excellent administrative support, without which we never could have gotten this initiative off the ground so quickly.

We look forward to seeing you at other CSWEP activities in San Diego where we will have six sessions, three on gender-related issues and three focused on experimental economics. We look forward to seeing you at the CSWEP Hospitality Suite (Manchester Room, San Diego Marriott, January 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> 7:30 to 4:00 and January 5<sup>th</sup> 7:30 to 12:00)—it will be fully stocked with continental breakfast beginning at 7:30 every morning and we'll have beverages available all day. This is a place to network with other economists or to spend a few quiet minutes reading the paper. So do come and bring your friends. We are looking for volunteers to help in staffing the hospitality suite. If you are able to help, please email times that you are available to [cswep@cornell.edu](mailto:cswep@cornell.edu). And plan on coming to the CSWEP Business meeting (January 3, 2004: 4:45pm – 5:45pm in Coronado Room, San Diego Marriott)—where we will be announcing the 2003 winner of the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award. Join us for this exciting occasion. And do not miss the CSWEP reception immediately following in the Warner Center (San Diego Marriott). Further details about CSWEP activities at the San Diego ASSA meetings and about CSWEP events at the November Southern Economic Association meetings are provided in the Newsletter.

—Francine Blau

## What is CSWEP?

CSWEP (the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession) is a standing committee of the AEA (American Economics Association). It was founded in 1971 to monitor the position of women in the economics profession and to undertake activities to improve that position. Our thrice yearly newsletters are one of those activities. See our website at [www.cswep.org](http://www.cswep.org) for more information on what we are doing.

## CSWEP NEWSLETTER STAFF

Francine Blau, Editor  
Janet Currie, Co-editor  
Liane O'Brien, Assistant Editor  
Karine Moe, Oversight Editor  
Larry Clarkberg, Graphic Designer

Responding to

# DISCRIMINATION

in the Academy



*Introduction by Janet Currie, Department of  
Economics, University of California, Los Angeles*

**T**his issue of CSWEP deals with the unpleasant but unfortunately still-topical issue of how individuals at different phases of their careers can respond to discrimination in the academic workplace. Women on the junior job market probably still receive illegal inquiries about their personal lives at a higher rate than men do, and pointing out that such inquiries are illegal is hardly likely to yield a fly-out interview. The article by Srobona Mitra and Richard Startz discusses a case of such discrimination at the hiring phase. Women may also face discrimination at tenure time. CSWEP was unable to find a woman willing to discuss her personal experience with taking legal action “on the record,” but the second article outlines a fairly standard set of steps that a woman undertaking such action would generally follow. The last article, by David Yamada, deals with “workplace bullying,” a problem that women may face at any stage of their careers. Professor Yamada is a leading legal authority on hostile work environments, and his article offers some useful advice and resources for coping with this common problem.

# Discrimination and Its Resolution in the Economics Job Market: A Real Life Story

—Srobona Mitra, Economist, International Monetary Fund

—Richard Startz, Castor Professor of Economics, University of Washington

*Editor's Note: This is a personal story—with most names omitted—told by the graduating, job-seeking student and by the student's advisor.*

## The Student's Story:

The job market for fresh PhDs in economics is a well organized and (apparently) transparent process. However, my experience (as a student at the University of Washington ("UW")) in January 2002 at the AEA meetings in Atlanta leaves much to be desired in the area of gender discrimination. This is a story of discrimination practiced in the academic job market for economists. Although this is a real experience, the name of the university (hereafter "U") has been withheld to preserve the confidentiality of administrative communication between UW and the university.

As PhD candidates participating in the junior job market in economics, my husband and I had consulted with Professors Dick Startz and Shelly Lundberg before the Annual ASSA meetings on how to handle dual career issues. They told us that we should always try to convince the interviewers that we had no constraint on our mobility (given that we had in fact decided we were willing to live apart), should such uncomfortable questions arise. They also said that interviewers were unlikely to bring up the issue. Armed with such helpful advice, we flew to Atlanta confident that we would not encounter inappropriate questions pertaining to such gender issues – especially in an age when such issues are passé and, more importantly, questions regarding them are considered *illegal*.

I was offered a fly-out to U at the Atlanta meetings. The Chair of the Economics department expressed a lot of interest and made plans for a three-day visit to U. In the course of the conversation at the meetings, he said he would ask me an "illegal" question: whether I had a significant other. I mentioned my husband who had also interviewed with them. (Yes, *he* used the word "illegal") He said that this would complicate matters and that he would talk to the Dean and get back to me. Concerned by the tone of his voice, I once again consulted Startz and Lundberg who advised me to write to the Chair

of U reiterating my unconditional interest in a position in the department. The Chair called me the next morning, saying it was "the most painful phone-call" he had made in his life, and *retracted the fly-out invitation*. He said that his decision was based on the fact that there were no visiting positions available for my husband in that university or any other nearby colleges that he might be interested in. The Dean had indicated to him that he would not make me an offer in any case since he was almost certain that I would leave after some time.

Dazed in disbelief, I immediately contacted Professor Startz who brought the matter to the attention of a senior member of the UW provost's office (henceforth "P"), who plays a major role in the faculty personnel system on campus and in policy matters related to faculty and administration. We met with P who described the options I had in responding to the situation. I chose to have the matter dealt with at an informal level where I did not have to interact with U. Since I did not consider U to be a great loss, my interest was to make sure that the Chair did not repeat this behavior with a future candidate. P offered to talk to the General Counsel (henceforth "GC") of U.

The GC of U spoke to their Chair who did not deny the story. He said his action was governed by his desire to prevent a fruitless visit and the waste of time involved. The U university authorities insisted that the department's hiring committee go through a course or a workshop before they leave for the Annual meetings to hire next year. This would hopefully make job-hunting more fair and less uncomfortable for dual career family aspirants to a faculty position at U.

My husband and I ultimately settled for positions five hundred miles apart, and I have no immediate plans to leave my job. I have, however, been reminded that obnoxious questions were asked by people other than faculty interviewers. On my way to another university at a different fly out, the cab driver (engaged by the university) expressed concern that I would not accept an offer made by the university, if it was offered at all, when he learned that I was married!

***"Dazed in disbelief, I immediately contacted [my advisor]..."***



### **The Advisor's Story:**

My initial reaction on hearing Mitra's story was shock, followed shortly by fury at having one of my students mistreated. I consulted first with a female senior colleague, which I have learned over the years is a wise idea when gender issues arise. (And which is particularly convenient when you are married to a former CSWEP Board member.) With Mitra and Lundberg both concurring, I approached P for advice, as P deals with such matters as an officer of UW. P reacted very strongly, saying that UW had an obligation to protect its graduate students, that there were a number of approaches that could be taken, and that the main desideratum was what would best satisfy Mitra. Mitra and I then met with P together, and it was decided that P would contact GC at U – but that the contact would wait until after Mitra had secured a job.

P did contact GC, who was very responsive – and perhaps grateful that the initial contact had been something other than a lawsuit. GC saw to it that it was made clear to the individuals involved at U that this was unacceptable behavior. GC also used this as an opportunity to raise awareness of this issue at U. And since both Mitra and her husband landed excellent jobs, the story had a happy ending.

There is an interesting after note to the story. When I have shared the tale with colleagues who know Mitra and her husband they too have been furious. But the first response from economists (okay, male economists) with no personal involvement has more typically been either that U was just trying to be efficient or that reprimanding the faculty at U will simply teach them to make the behavior less blatant next time. Maybe it is this sort of analysis that has led to the replacement of the "reasonable man" (or "reasonable person") standard.

***"My initial reaction on hearing Mitra's story was shock, followed shortly by fury at having one of my students mistreated."***

***"...the first response from economists (okay, male economists) with no personal involvement has more typically been either that U was just trying to be efficient or that reprimanding the faculty at U will simply teach them to make the behavior less blatant next time."***

# Gender Discrimination at Tenure Time

—Author: Anonymous

**A**lthough CSWEP does not conduct a formal survey of complaints of gender discrimination in the economics profession, almost every female mid-career or senior economist has encountered a colleague in the profession whose tenure decision has been negatively affected by gender bias. This article describes the steps one would take to pursue legal action in such a case. It is perhaps a sad comment that CSWEP was unable to find an author willing to publicly discuss her own case, since even among women who successfully challenge tenure decisions, there is still stigma attached to being involved in such a case.

It is very important for all junior faculty approaching tenure to know the procedures followed at their university, and to know their rights. For example, many departments allow candidates to review their files, including redacted letters, before the files go to the whole faculty. Inaccurate information can be contested and corrected at this point. Also, people who are in the unpleasant position of having a senior colleague (or colleagues) who is very negative about them should consider taking steps to establish a “paper trail”, so that it is possible to document that particular individuals are not impartial evaluators of their work. Women who feel that they will face gender bias at tenure time should also seriously consider changing jobs before coming up for tenure, rather than attempting to deal with the aftermath of being denied.

Women who feel that gender bias led their department to deny them tenure should arrange to meet with the campus representative for the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) or the American Association of University Women (AAUW). These representatives are faculty members who can provide valuable advice based on other cases of employment discrimination on campus, and perhaps provide a guide through an appeals process on campus that may exist for reviewing tenure decisions. These representatives will keep identities and concerns confidential if they are requested to do so, and they can therefore serve as an unbiased sounding board to gauge the severity of grievances. The AAUW also maintains an excellent website with information on navigating the legal system in sex discrimination cases: <http://www.aauw.org/laf/system/index.cfm>.

In many cases a campus AAUP or AAUW representative can provide a referral to a lawyer who has represented other faculty members in employment discrimination cases against the university. It is advisable to *meet with a lawyer as soon as possible, even if uncertain about whether to legally contest the tenure decision*. The statute of limitations set by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for filing a complaint of employment discrimination is 300 days, but state laws can dramatically shorten this time limit. Waiting beyond this time limit to file a complaint may result in the forfeiture of any possible right to sue for gender discrimination in the future.

Most lawyers will provide a free one-hour consultation. During this time you would be able to describe your grievances and hear your lawyer’s opinion on whether these complaints are legitimate in a court of law. If you choose to take formal legal action, your lawyer will want to know what you are seeking to achieve, and she will advise you regarding the potential outcomes of a legal suit. Ask your lawyer about the number of faculty members she has represented in employment discrimination cases and their outcomes. Your lawyer should also be able to refer you to one or two previous clients who can comment on your lawyer’s work and their experience during the entire legal process.

Your lawyer is likely to advise you to take several steps. First, she will advise you to proceed with the established process at your university for appealing tenure denials. The EEOC and the courts require that all avenues for resolving a tenure dispute at the university be exhausted before a discrimination case is taken to court. This process can be highly valuable. University committees which review tenure denials often contain faculty who take their responsibilities seriously. While the committee usually does not have the power to grant tenure, it may come to the conclusion that your tenure review process was incomplete or biased. This committee will often have access to your entire tenure file, and may reveal information in that file which you were not aware of. In some cases, an appeal committee’s written conclusion has been so damning, that a university has chosen to pursue a financial settlement with a professor before she formally filed a legal suit.

The lawyer will likely also advise you to meet with as

many faculty members as possible who participated in your tenure decision. Ask what factors led to the decision to deny you tenure. It is important to talk to both those who you think voted in your favor, *and* those who voted against. In many cases of gender discrimination, you will find that faculty members who did not support your receiving tenure will provide contradictory information, which will be valuable to your case, should you decide to pursue legal action. Also request that your department provide you a copy of the letters of recommendation requested from outside faculty regarding your tenure decision, if you have not gained access to them already. In most cases, departments can provide copies of these letters to you with all identifying information removed. Do not mention to them that you are considering legal action, since this will cause many colleagues to shun you.

After you have obtained as much information as possible from faculty and other university officials involved with your tenure decision, your lawyer may advise you to file a formal complaint of gender discrimination with the EEOC. The EEOC will forward this complaint to the university, which usually has two to three months to make a formal response. After reviewing this response, the EEOC will decide whether to represent you in court, dismiss the complaint, assign a mediator, or issue you a right to sue. Even if your lawyer agrees that your grievance is legitimate, do not be surprised if the EEOC does not elect to represent you in court. The EEOC's resources are stretched thin, and they must focus their efforts on cases which have the potential to benefit the largest number of workers.

If the EEOC issues you a right to sue, you will have 90 days to decide whether you wish to proceed with filing a suit against the university. Depending on the information which has been revealed up to that point and the outcome of any university appeals process, the university may elect to attempt to reach a settlement with you at this point. If not, you must decide whether you wish to proceed with a formal suit. Most lawyers representing clients in employment discrimination cases will not accept payment on a contingency basis. Therefore, the process of discovery before a trial and the trial itself can cost upwards of \$100,000. Your lawyer will advise

you on the factors in your case that are likely to work both for and against you in a legal suit.

The AAUW operates the Legal Assistance Fund (LAF), which provides modest financial support to women academics finding gender discrimination cases. Again, their resources are stretched thin, so plan on bearing the bulk of financial costs yourself. You can review past issues of the LAF's newsletter "Update" to read about academic gender discrimination cases which have been successful in the past, or cases that are ongoing. The Chronicle of Higher Education also reports on many cases of academic employment discrimination. However, as your lawyer will tell you, there are no guarantees in any legal suit. The ultimate decision to file suit is up to each individual.

The entire process of fighting a legal case of gender discrimination, beginning with the initial complaint to the EEOC, can often take two years. At some points it is necessary to devote several hours or days to intense legal activity. However, most of the time people can go about their regular daily activities. Unfortunately, the ordeal is an emotional roller coaster, which at times can be worse than the initial exercise of applying for tenure. It is important for those who elect to pursue legal action to focus their professional energies on activities that will benefit their future careers. Being unfairly denied tenure is enormously devastating. However, it is still possible to influence one's future career prospects, and many economists understand the disappointment of being unfairly denied.

***"It is very important for all junior faculty approaching tenure to know the procedures followed at their university, and to know their rights."***

# Workplace Bullying, Women, and the Knowledge Economy

—David Yamada, Professor of Law and Director of the Project on Workplace Bullying and Discrimination, Suffolk University Law School in Boston.



## An “Insidious and Destructive” Problem

Workplace bullying can be defined as the deliberate, hurtful, repeated mistreatment of an employee, driven by a desire to control that individual.<sup>1</sup> *HR Magazine* has labeled bullying “one of the most insidious and destructive problems” in the American workplace.<sup>2</sup> For readers of this Newsletter, this topic

may resonate on both a professional and personal level.

What is workplace bullying? Yelling and screaming are behaviors that typically come to mind when invoking the term, but research is showing that this phenomenon is much more complex than that. For example, Wayne State University social psychologist Loreleigh Keashly has identified a cluster of overt and covert behaviors that may fall within the rubric of workplace bullying:<sup>3</sup> aggressive eye contact, either by glaring or meaningful glances; giving the silent treatment; intimidating physical gestures, including finger pointing and slamming or throwing objects; yelling, screaming, and/or cursing at the target; angry outbursts or temper tantrums; nasty, rude, and hostile behavior toward the target; accusations of wrongdoing; insulting or belittling the target, often in front of other workers; excessive or harsh criticism of the target’s work performance; spreading false rumors about the target; breaching the target’s confidentiality; making unreasonable work demands of the target; withholding needed information; taking credit for the target’s work.

According to Drs. Gary and Ruth Namie, co-founders of the Workplace Bullying & Trauma Institute ([www.bullyinginstitute.org](http://www.bullyinginstitute.org)), bullying can inflict serious harm upon a targeted employee.<sup>4</sup> Common psychological effects include stress, depression, mood swings, loss of sleep (and resulting fatigue), and feelings of shame, embarrassment, guilt, and low self-esteem. Some targets have developed symptoms resembling Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder. Common physical effects include stress headaches, high blood pressure, digestive problems, and reduced immunity to infection.

Employers faced with workplace bullying may experience low worker morale, higher attrition rates, increased absenteeism, and declining productivity. Last year, the *Orlando Business Journal* reported on a study of 9,000 federal workers indicating that 42 percent of female respondents and 15 percent of male respondents had experienced bullying-type behaviors over a two-year period, “resulting in a cost of more than \$180 million in lost time and productivity.”<sup>5</sup> Also, a 1998

study by University of North Carolina management professor Christine Pearson of 775 targets of workplace incivility and aggression found that “28 percent lost work time avoiding the instigator,” “22 percent decreased their effort at work,” and “12 percent actually changed jobs to avoid the instigator.”<sup>6</sup>

Research also is finding that bullying is related to other forms of aggression at work, including workplace violence.<sup>7</sup> According to the director of the National Safe Workplace Institute, “there have been numerous instances where abusive supervisors have baited angry and frustrated employees, pushing these individuals to unacceptable levels of violence and aggression.”<sup>8</sup>

## The “New” Sexual Harassment?

For those who harbor animus or bias against female colleagues but are smart enough not to express it in sexually explicit conduct, bullying may constitute an often “legal” form of sexual harassment. Yale law professor Vicki Schultz analyzed the evolution of sexual harassment law and found that, in deciding hostile work environment claims, many courts refused to consider harassing conduct that was not sexually explicit.<sup>9</sup> These forms of non-sexual harassment sound a lot like bullying: According to Schultz, they include denying women “the training, information, and support they need to succeed on the job” and engaging in “threatening and alienating acts” that undermine women’s confidence and job proficiency.

Indeed, research on workplace bullying is showing that women tend to be the more frequent targets, irrespective of the motivation of the bully.<sup>10</sup> Also, it is instructive that bullying overall is considered to be roughly four times more prevalent than sexual harassment as traditionally defined. (In this context, we may consider some forms of sexual harassment to be behavioral “subsets” of bullying.) In short, bullying is very much a problem for women, and we should acknowledge this while affirming the continuing importance of fighting sexual harassment.

Of course, in terms of sex roles bullying can get more complicated than sexual harassment, where the paradigm case is one of a man sexually harassing a woman. With bullying, all different gender combinations apply, although the literature does suggest that men are more likely to be offenders than women.

## Bullying in the Knowledge Economy

The needs of, and pressures generated by, the Knowledge Economy are making conditions ripe for workplace bullying.



According to business writer Jill Andresky Fraser, “unpleasant working conditions, difficult job demands, and rising career insecurities have combined to make stress the constant companion of many of today’s white-collar men and women.”<sup>11</sup> Although bullying is no stranger to the assembly line, the very nature of service sector work creates conditions in which this behavior is more likely to occur. Frequent, ongoing personal interaction between workers often becomes a basic element of a job, especially in work arrangements between supervisors and subordinates. When people interact more, the likelihood increases that personalities will clash and that individuals who are prone to bullying will have opportunities to do so.

In its ideal form, academic life can offer relief from the kind of stress generated in certain corporate work environments. In reality, however, academe is prime territory for workplace bullying, especially the covert varieties. So many decisions in the academy, including personnel matters, employee evaluation, scheduling, teaching and committee assignments, institutional support for research, and compensation, are based on very subjective judgments, making this environment a perfect setting for the passive-aggressive bully. Those who do not enjoy the protections of tenure (including junior faculty and most administrators) are particularly vulnerable to bullying.

### Advice to Targets and Workers Generally

If you or someone you know is in a bullying situation, it is important to assess the situation carefully and to take any action only after sound deliberation. A short article like this one cannot adequately explore all the factors that should be considered. A number of good books on workplace bullying are available, but my strong recommendation in terms of an intelligent self-help orientation goes to the Namies’ *The Bully at Work* (Sourcebooks, 2000). It is practical, systematic, sympathetic, and insightful. Self-therapy, professional counseling, confronting the bully, lodging a formal complaint with human resources, pursuing a lawsuit, and finding a new job are among the many possibilities explored in the book.

Some targets of bullying may want to consider legal action.<sup>12</sup> However, I have examined extensively the treatment of bullying under modern employment law and concluded that the existing legal remedies, on the whole, are inadequate. Nevertheless, it is worth summarizing the high (er, low) points.

Some workers have attempted to bring personal injury claims for emotional distress against bullying co-employees and employers, but such lawsuits have failed more often than not, for many courts are loathe to permit lawsuits alleging even the most egregious examples of employee abuse to go forward. Filing a workers’ compensation claim may be an option where an employee can show that she has been partially or fully incapacitated because of a bully’s actions. However, this can be particularly difficult to establish where psychological injuries are claimed.

More promising legal grounds do exist. Notwithstanding the limitations of sexual harassment law discussed above, employment discrimination laws may provide relief if the bullying is grounded in the target’s membership in a legally protected class, such as sex, race, age, or disability. If bullying is inflicted as a form of retaliation for reporting or filing claims of alleged illegalities (such as discrimination or financial wrongdoing), then various whistleblower protections may apply. Workers who are bullied for engaging in union activities may avail themselves of federal and state labor laws.

Anyone considering legal action should schedule an initial consultation with a lawyer who specializes in the representation of employees. Bar associations often provide a referral service that can match up people with lawyers in various specialty areas of practice. In addition, many top plaintiff’s employment lawyers are members of the National Employment Lawyers Association ([www.nela.org](http://www.nela.org)); it may be helpful to see if your city or hometown area has a local NELA chapter.

Workers also should encourage their employers to include prohibitions on bullying and general harassment in their employment policies and procedures. IBM, the Oregon Department of Environmental Protection, and MIT are among the small number of employers that already have done so. In addition, union members can and should bargain for anti-bullying provisions in their collective bargaining agreements.

### Time for a Change

We are in the early stages of understanding, and responding to, workplace bullying. But perhaps we can draw some hope from the history of our awareness of sexual harassment. After all, some 30 years ago, the term “sexual harassment” was not commonly used. While the underlying behavior had been present in many workplaces, in its typical form it was seen as one of the costs of being employed -- for women. But the notion that someone had a right to be free of sexual harassment was quite foreign.

As a law professor and legal advocate I hope that the law will become more responsive to the severe harm caused by workplace bullying. One positive sign is that in California, the state legislature is considering the Healthy Workplace bill, a piece of anti-bullying legislation that I drafted and submitted to the Workplace Bullying & Trauma Institute.

Workplace bullying has long been viewed as an unfortunate cost of being employed; simply put, jerks at work tend to be kept on the job. This should change. It is time for us to respond more vigorously to this destructive behavior.

<sup>1</sup> Gary Namie, Ph.D. & Ruth Namie, Ph.D., *The Bully at Work* (Naperville, Ill.: Sourcebooks, 2000) p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Rudy Yandrick, *Lurking in the Shadows: Workplace Bullying*, *HR Magazine*, Oct. 1999, pp. 60-69.

<sup>3</sup> Loreleigh Keashly, *Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: Conceptual and Empirical Issues*, *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, Vol. 1, pp. 85-115 (1998).

<sup>4</sup> Namie & Namie, *supra* note 1, pp. 55-67.

<sup>5</sup> Liz Urbanski Farrell, *Workplace bullying’s high cost: \$180M in lost time, productivity*, *Orlando Business Journal*, March 18, 2002, <http://orlandobizjournals.com/orlando/stories/2002/03/18/focus1.html>.

<sup>6</sup> Christine M. Pearson, *Incivility and Aggression at Work: Executive Summary* (July 1998).

<sup>7</sup> Robert A. Baron & Joel H. Neuman, *Workplace Aggression -- The Iceberg Beneath the Tip of Workplace Violence*, *Public Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 21, 446-464 (1998).

<sup>8</sup> Joseph A. Kinney, *Violence at Work* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1995), p. 132.

<sup>9</sup> Vicki Schultz, *Reconceptualizing Sexual Harassment*, *Yale Law Journal*, Vol. 107, pp. 1683-1805 (1998).

<sup>10</sup> Farrell, *supra* note 5; Dieter Zapf, et al., *Empirical findings on bullying in the workplace*, in *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice*, Stale Einarsen, et al., eds. (London: Taylor & Francis 2003), pp. 110-112.

<sup>11</sup> Jill Andresky Fraser, *White-Collar Sweatshop* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2001) p. 36.

<sup>12</sup> The discussion of potential legal remedies is drawn largely from previously published works, especially David C. Yamada, *The Phenomenon of “Workplace Bullying” and the Need for Status-Blind Hostile Work Environment Protection*, *Georgetown Law Journal*, Vol. 88, pp. 475-536 (2000), and David Yamada, *Brainstorming About Workplace Bullying: Potential Litigation Approaches For Representing Abused Employees*, *The Employee Advocate*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 49-56 (Fall 2000).

a new subdivision, but instead we went to see people, who had lost their homes, living underground. It was a horrible sight. At the time, the prevailing economic theory and attitude was that people were individually responsible. If you were out of work, it was because you weren't ambitious or resourceful enough. It was clear to me that this wasn't true, because I knew many people who were involuntarily out of work but still tried hard to find employment. One could also see the unequal distribution of income in Detroit. You had the houses of working people, then when you crossed over a particular avenue, you'd come to a neighborhood with the most beautiful houses you'd ever seen, usually belonging to automobile executives. These observations got me interested at a young age in the unemployment phenomena, distribution of income, and other problems of economics.

*Did you ever feel that being female was an obstacle to becoming an economist?*

I had no role models. I was ambitious, did well in school, and wanted to have a profession, but the only professional women I saw were teachers. When I was in high school, I wrote to a newspaper advice columnist and said, "I'd like a career and the only one I can think of is teaching." The columnist had no other careers to suggest. Later, in college, it was common to think of women economists as researchers, but not as operators negotiating with countries or as formulators of economic policy in responsible positions. I won a scholarship to the University of Michigan, where I studied economics. Michigan was oriented toward institutional economics and public service. Many of my professors had gone to Washington to work with the New Deal. I graduated in 1943, two years after Pearl Harbor and the United States' entry into World War II. When it came time to graduate, I approached one of my professors and asked, "Look, all the boys are going into the service. What should I do?" He suggested graduate school. Since I had little money for school—I had been working on campus for 33 cents an hour, the minimum wage—he suggested I apply for a fellowship to MIT and told me about a promising young professor who was starting a new department there. The professor turned out to be Paul Samuelson, who later became the first American Nobel Prize winner in economics.

*Were you the first female Ph.D. graduate of MIT in economics?*

I graduated in 1946 with the first class of Ph.D. economics graduates from MIT. There were a couple of other women in our class.

*How did you come to the Fund?*

After MIT, I interviewed for two academic jobs, neither of which I got. The first was at Cleveland Reserve (now Case Western Reserve University). The economics faculty had never had a female applicant but, with a shortage of available

males because of the war, they considered me. I knew at once I wouldn't fit in.

I had dressed very conservatively for the interview, but not only was I a young woman (in my early twenties) among much older men but also my Keynesian economics favoring governmental intervention was too new and liberal for a traditional money and banking department.

The second academic interview was with a women's college, Sarah Lawrence. I dressed the same way, in a skirted suit, but this time I was too conservative. My Keynesian economics did not go far enough for what was then their socialist planning orientation. I decided to go to Washington, which is what I'd wanted to do since my Michigan days.

My interview at the Fund was fascinating. Edward Bernstein, then Director of Research, did all the hiring. Bernstein was notorious for intensively questioning candidates, not unlike oral Ph.D. exams. He would present the candidate with hypothetical country situations and test whether they could apply theory to real-life political situations. I had written my thesis on public debt, and he was interested in the question of public debt in the postwar world. A lot of economists, including Keynes, expected a depression to follow the war, but Bernstein thought there would be inflation (and he proved right, by the way). So he asked how I would handle the public debt problem in that case.

He hired me on the spot. It was too quick, and I wasn't sure what my work would entail. I went and sat in Lafayette Park—it was July 5, 1946, and about 105 degrees. I decided to tell Bernstein that I'd have to think about it. He then introduced me to Irving Friedman, the chief of the U.S.-Canada Division, where I would work. Friedman described the debates attending the origins of the Fund, explaining the strong need for the Fund in the postwar world to foster global economic prosperity and the hard problems that would face the staff. He was most persuasive, and explained my particular job. Given my concern about unemployment since childhood, I enthusiastically accepted the job. Friedman was to become my mentor and a lifelong friend.

*You started in the Research Department.*

Everybody did. All the economists worked in the Research Department. It stayed that way until 1950, when area departments began to be created.

The Research Department was all-important in those days, but so was the Legal Department. We had a lot of debates on multiple currency practices. The lawyers argued that multiple rates ran counter to the Articles of Agreement and should be eliminated, convincing the Fund to introduce a strong policy for their reduction and elimination. I started to work on the economics of multiple rates—the reasons why countries used them, the economic justifications for them, and their economic

effects. Friedman and I were gradually instrumental in changing IMF policy on multiple rates from a strict legal approach to one that was more economically oriented and less insistent on their elimination.

*What was your most challenging assignment on this issue?*

It would have to be my mission to Tito's Yugoslavia in 1955. Yugoslavia had the most complex multiple rate system of all—literally hundreds of multiple rates. The Fund's Executive Board did not understand why Yugoslavia had all those rates, and it was my job to understand the system and its rationale. In brief, Tito didn't want an economic system like that of the former U.S.S.R.; he wanted more reliance on price incentives. But he didn't want a capitalistic system, either, so he didn't want to use customs tariffs. So he provided reliance on price incentives for exports and imports through a complex exchange rate system.

On the personal side, too, there was a challenge. The Yugoslavs I dealt with were Croatians, as was Tito. They all drank slivovitz, a very strong plum brandy. They drank it as an aperitif and during their meetings. As a young woman with a small body, I couldn't possibly drink it and function. They teased me about that. But after I gained insights into the many harmful effects their exchange rate system was having on their economy, I earned their respect.

Another tough assignment was working on Pakistan's entry into the Fund in 1950. Pakistan wanted to declare as its initial par value a rate in heated dispute with India. The two countries were in the midst of a prolonged trade war that had halted all trade between India and Pakistan, with devastating effects on both economies. Both sides assigned top-level officials to deal with the Fund. I had to work closely with the Pakistani Minister of Finance, Ghulam Mohammed, and his highest-level economic technician, Anwar Ali, who later became Director of the Fund's Middle Eastern Department. These men had never worked with a woman before, and certainly not one in her twenties, but I worked hard and was accepted as the Fund's representative. This assignment gave me wide recognition and respect among my colleagues.

*In 1957, you became the Fund's first female division chief.*

I was appointed chief of the Far East Division in May 1957 after being assistant chief of the Multiple Currency Practices Division since 1953. Divisions were very important at that time, because there was little hierarchy then.

*Did you encounter any resistance?*

On the contrary, I had developed a reputation in the Fund as bright, experienced, hard working, and having a good understanding of the economies of countries and their political nuances. I was also seen as being cooperative and pleasant

to work with. I had already held a supervisory position over male colleagues as an assistant chief for the previous four years under James Raj. When Raj became director of the Asian Department, he promoted me to division chief. Being a woman did not seem to matter.

*Did you travel a great deal?*

I did. My first mission in 1949 was to Mexico, when I was working in the U.S.-Canada division. The Mexicans were going to devalue, and they were concerned about what effect this would have on their trade with the United States and on commodity prices. As the U.S. desk economist, I was familiar with Mexico's trade with the United States and was assigned to work on this question. Also, I was among the first of the Fund staff to take up the study of economic development, a topic of great interest to the Mexican officials. The two Mexicans who had served as the Fund's first Executive Director, Rodrigo Gómez, and Alternate Executive Director, Raul Martinez-Astos, had gone back to Mexico to take up key posts at the central bank. At the Executive Board, they had been pushing the Fund to study the economics of development. Since I was interested in this topic and had written a paper on it, they were happy to have me come to Mexico.

In early 1952, I also traveled to a number of Far Eastern countries on a variety of assignments, including going alone to Thailand to introduce the authorities there to the Fund's annual consultations, which were to begin in March 1952.

In 1953, I went with Ernest Sturc, then Deputy Director of the European Department, on the first Fund mission to Turkey, which was especially interesting. The Turks were heavily dependent on the export of a few agricultural commodities and wanted to diversify their economy, including determining the appropriate exchange rate for the Turkish lira. They also hoped to use the Fund's financial resources.

The Turkish authorities weren't used to working with women. Kemal Ataturk had only recently begun to modernize the country. In the course of the mission, Ernest said, "You know, these two fellows are very good bridge players. I think if we had a game with them and we beat them, they'd be impressed." Though my bridge skills were a bit rusty, I decided to give it a try. Believe it or not, Ernest and I beat them. After that, I had little trouble convincing them that I was smart and might know economics.

*Why did you switch from operational work to writing the Fund's history?*

My husband, Barend (Bob) de Vries, came to the Fund in 1949 to work in the Research Department. We married in 1952, and several years later, adopted a little girl. The adoption agency required me to quit my job. They just said, "Your office is going to miss you when you have to quit." They never even asked

if I would miss the IMF. The emphasis in the 1950s was on a traditional family, with a mother at home while the husband had a career.

Following the adoption of my daughter (and a son two years later), I taught part-time at The George Washington University, where I had taught earlier while at the Fund. I also wrote several articles from home that were later in *Staff Papers*. By 1958, the Fund was doing very well. Per Jacobsson, then the Managing Director, decided around 1963 that someone ought to write a history describing the Fund's success. He assigned the task to Oscar Altman, a colleague who happened also to be a friend of Irving Friedman. Friedman recruited me to help write this history, doing some of it at the office and some at home. It was, in effect, a flexible part-time consulting arrangement.

*Your flexible arrangement was quite a modern one—one that many women with families try to negotiate these days.*

That's true; the Fund was ahead of other organizations, and it's why I took the history job, cutting back on my operational career. My husband and I realized that it was very hard to raise children and have a happy family with both parents traveling, or even both working. My hardest struggle as a woman professional was with this now-familiar "juggling" act.

*How has the writing of the Fund history changed over the years?*

The history now includes much more of what happens outside the Fund. Keith Horsefield's first history dealt only with the Executive Board; it didn't even go into the staff's work. When I did it, I started including the staff's work and gradually more of the outside groups, like the Summit meetings, the Group of 10, the Group of 24, and some academic debates. While I worked mostly from documents, as did Horsefield, by my successor Jim Boughton's time, most documents were on the Internet. So the history was no longer the vehicle for secret revelations about the Fund. He had to put the Fund into a world economy setting.

*Do you ever regret not going back into operational work?*

Yes. In 1977, after doing the first three volumes of the history with Horsefield and two on my own, I wanted to get back into operational work. But it was difficult to fit into the Fund's new structure.

*What's your impression of how things have changed for women at the Fund?*

I am pleased that women are in very high positions now. One of the people who wrote in support of my award nomination was Margaret Kelly. Another was Burke Dillon, the Fund's former Director of Administration, who then became Executive Vice President of the Inter-American Development Bank. Now there are several women in high positions, including Carol Carson, Director of STA; Teresa Ter Minassian, Director of FAD; and of course Anne Krueger, the First Deputy Managing Director.



De Vries accepts the Carolyn Shaw Bell award plaque at the January 3, 2003 award ceremony.

*What was it like being married to a Fund (and later World Bank) economist?*

Having a common profession has been extremely beneficial to both of us. We have enjoyed a lifetime of close involvement in each other's work, missions, papers, and other activities. We have exchanged views on many economic topics over the years and participated in several speeches and joint conferences, especially in retirement. And after Bob joined the World Bank, we regarded

ourselves as pioneers in Fund-Bank collaboration. We are the "Group of Two."

*What are you and your husband doing in your retirement?*

I studied piano for 12 years. Bob has published two books. This past year we have both written memoirs; mine is currently under consideration for publication by Greenwood Press. We've also done a lot of traveling. We started with the places we hadn't seen in the U.S., going to national parks and places like New Mexico, Arizona, Alaska, and Hawaii. Then we started going abroad—last year to Yalta and Odessa on the Black Sea. We still both read a lot of economics, with something like 60 pieces of economics literature delivered every year, including journals, international economic newsletters, as well as several economic books. I also write regularly for the IMF retiree's newsletter, *The Caravan*.

*How do you feel on receiving the Carolyn Shaw Bell award?*

I feel deeply honored to be regarded as a pioneering woman, as one who has helped to open opportunities for women—especially in economics, which I have loved since childhood.

Zealand, Singapore, Sri Lanka, South Africa, Taiwan, Thailand, Tunisia, UK, and Vietnam. Working with both governments and businesses allows me to bring experiences (and contacts) from one country to bear on the issues facing another country. As part of this effort, I am directing a project funded by the Ford Foundation that is developing a research network and coordinating joint papers by researchers from Asian and Latin countries on the topics of technology in entrepreneurship (Chilean and Taiwanese researchers), technology in government (Chinese and Brazilian researchers), technology and skills (Thai and Argentine researchers), technology in financial intermediaries (Brazilian and Korean researchers). In addition, I have co-authored two monographs, *The New Economy and APEC*, (2001) and *Global Electronic Commerce: A Policy Primer* (2000), as well as numerous articles on what it takes to use information technology for economic development, and what challenges emerge when the global marketplace for business butts-up against the national borders of policy-making jurisdiction.

At the same time, I have kept teaching. From 1991-2000 I flew to Nashville every two weeks to teach Executive MBAs at the Owen School of Management at Vanderbilt. To my mid-career, full-time executives from the “real world”, I would say “Macroeconomics says the economy works like this—how does your business work?” Their answers were enlightening to say the least! For the last two years, I have taught international technology economics and policy at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. Half my class is foreign, which is particularly valuable when discussing the issues of privacy, intellectual property, and taxation.

My current research continues to focus on international trade and information technology, considering in particular the effect on both the US and countries abroad of increasing international tradability of services. In keeping with these interests, the sessions that I will coordinate for the 2005 ASSA meeting in Philadelphia will cover the broad nexus of international, technology and productivity, and implications for economies and policies. I look forward to hearing from you on these or any other topics.



#### Autobiography:

### Karine Moe

When I decided to major in economics as a sophomore in college, my father (the stock-broker) expressed in dismay: “Really? You never read the Wall Street Journal.” He was right, I did not have much interest in business. I loved economics, though. I was drawn by the power of the analytical models, and I thought it was an ideal way to combine my math skills with an interest in public policy.

After college, I spent two years earning a Master of Public Policy degree at the John F. Kennedy School of Government. The two years I spent at Harvard were amazing, but by the end of my first year, I knew I was not destined for a career in public service. Instead, I decided on a career of teaching economics and doing economic research at a small private liberal arts college.

My husband and I commuted for the two years I was in Cambridge. Tired of that arrangement, I enrolled in the Ph.D. program in economics at the University of Minnesota and settled quickly on labor economics as a field. My first advisor told me I could not do a thesis on “women’s issues” with him because it would place me in a ghetto and be disastrous for my career. So I switched advisors, and I switched my approach to describing my interests to potential faculty advisors.

My dissertation was a theoretical piece on the connections among economic development, human capital accumulation, and fertility. While the dissertation was not directly on a “women’s issue” (the model included asexual reproduction, after all), I was able to draw on that experience to move into the work that I have done on girls, work and schooling in Latin America. The job market was a relatively easy experience for me. Macalester College had a job opening in my field. The stars aligned, I got the offer, and I moved with my husband, Paul, and then 18 month old daughter, Avery, across the Mississippi River to St. Paul. (My son, Halsey, was not to arrive for another 2 years.)

During the past 8 years, I have enjoyed an ongoing research collaboration with two women I met while at Minnesota. Jane Ihrig and I work on the relationship between government policy and informal sector labor. Deborah Levison and I have focused on deterrents to schooling for girls in Latin America. These collaborations have made doing research far more productive and more fun. I also very much enjoyed editing a book for use in an undergraduate economics of gender course. *Women, Family, and Work: Writings on the Economics of Gender*, which was published by Blackwell this year. I returned to teaching this fall after a one-year sabbatical, which I used to jump start a new research agenda on poverty and education in the U.S.

Macalester has been a good place for me. The combination of research and teaching expectations requires a challenging, and at times daunting, balance. To maintain that balance I relied on several important people. My department colleagues and Provost have been supportive to my needs as a working parent, including a one-semester maternity leave and one-year stop on the tenure clock. I have had excellent support with child care from Lisa Schmidt, nanny extraordinaire. Finally, I know I would not be here without the support of my husband, Paul, who did not let me quit during the boot camp of the first year of graduate school, and who continues to support me every step of the way.

# CSWEP Events at the 2004 ASSA Meeting (San Diego, CA)

Please note: all events take place at the San Diego Marriott

## CSWEP Hospitality Room

Room: Manchester

January 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>: 7:30am – 4:00pm

January 5<sup>th</sup>: 7:30am – 12:00pm

## CSWEP Business Meeting

Room: Coronado

January 3, 2004: 4:45pm – 5:45pm

## CSWEP Reception

Room: Warner Center

January 3, 2004: 5:45pm – 7:30pm

## Psychological Influences on Economic Decisions

Room: Columbia 2 & 3

January 3, 2004: 8:00 am

**Presiding:** Rachel Croson (University of Pennsylvania)

**Papers:** Monica Capra (Washington and Lee University) “Mood Driven Behavior in Strategic and Non-strategic Situations”; Lisa Anderson (College of William and Mary) and Jeffrey Milyo (University of Chicago) “An Experimental Study of the Effects of Inequality and Relative Deprivation on Public Goods Contribution and Social Capital”; Iris Bohnet (Harvard University) and Steffen Huck (University College-London) “Repetition and Reputation: Implications for Trust and Trustworthiness”; Susan Laury and Laura Taylor (Georgia State University) “Altruism Spillovers: Does Laboratory Behavior Predict Altruism in the Field?”

**Discussants:** Paul Zak (Claremont Graduate University), Ananish Chaudhuri (Wellesley College), Rachel Croson (University of Pennsylvania), Wendy Morrison (Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis)

## Join Us For Breakfast at ASSA!

Join us for breakfast at the CSWEP Hospitality Suite during the ASSA Meetings, January 3-5, 2004 starting at 7:30am in the Manchester Room, San Diego Marriott Hotel.

## Child Support Enforcement and Welfare Reform

Room: Atlanta and Chicago

January 3, 2004: 2:30 pm

**Presiding:** Andrea Beller (University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign)

**Papers:** William M. Rodgers III and Yana Van Der Meulen Rodgers (College of William and Mary) “A Rationale for Updating Child Support Schedules”; Elaine Sorensen (Urban Institute) “Understanding How Child Support Arrears Reached \$88 Billion by Examining California’s Experience”; Yunhee Chang (University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign) “Parenting Across State Lines: Effects of the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act”; Lisa Gennetian and Virginia Knox (Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation) “Staying a Single Parent: Evidence from Random Assignment Studies on the Effects of Welfare and Employment Programs”

**Discussants:** John Graham (Rutgers University-Newark), Andrea Beller (University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign), Elizabeth Peters (Cornell University), Lucie Schmidt (Williams College)

## Information and Observability

Room: Torrance

January 4, 2004: 8:00 am

**Presiding:** Sara Solnick (University of Vermont)

**Papers:** Regina Anciales, John Dickhaut, Chandra Kanodia, and Brian Shapiro (University of Minnesota) “Information Transparency and Coordination Failure”; Ragan Petrie (Georgia State University) and James Andreoni (University of Wisconsin-Madison) “Beauty, Gender and Stereotypes: Evidence from the Laboratory”; Gary Charness (University of California-Santa Barbara), Luca Rigotti (Duke University), and Aldo Rustichini (University of Minnesota) “Social Facilitation in the Battle of the Sexes: We Are Watching You”; Roberto Weber (Carnegie Mellon University) “Learning with No Feedback: An Experimental Test Across Games”

**Discussants:** Orly Sade (Hebrew University), Sara Solnick (University of Vermont), Eliane Catilina (American University), David Levine (University of California-Los Angeles)

## Economics of Marriage

*Room: Solana*

**January 4, 2004: 10:15 am**

**Presiding:** Shoshana Grossbard-Shechtman (San Diego State University)

**Papers:** Benoit Rapaport (INRA and TEAM, University of Paris 1), Catherine Sofer (TEAM, University of Paris 1) and Anne Solaz (INED) "Household Production in a Collective Model: Some New Results"; Tanel Yilmazer (Purdue University) and Angela Lyons (University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign) "How Does Marriage Affect the Allocation of Assets in Women's Retirement Savings Plans?"; Terra McKinnish (University of Colorado-Boulder) "Occupational, Sex-Integration and Divorce"; Kate Antonovics (University of California-San Diego) and Robert Town (University of Minnesota) "Are All the Good Men Married? Uncovering the Sources of the Marital Wage Premium"

**Discussants:** Linda Edwards (City University of New York Graduate Center), Robert J. Willis (University of Michigan), Donna Ginther (University of Kansas), Julie Hotchkiss (Georgia State University)

## Experiments in Public Policy

*Room: Coronado*

**January 4, 2004: 2:30 pm**

**Presiding:** Christine Jolls (Harvard University)

**Papers:** Laurie Tipton Johnson (University of Denver), Elisabet Rutstrom (University of South Carolina), and J. Gregory George (Macon State College) "Property Rights Violations and Willingness to Pay"; Linda Babcock (Carnegie Mellon University), Claudia Landeo, and Maxim Nikitin (University of Alberta) "Split-Award Tort Reform, Firm's Level of Care and Litigation Outcomes: An Experimental Study"; David Dickinson and Lynn Hunnicutt (Utah State University) "Effects of Non-binding Suggestions on Bargaining Outcomes"; Bernard Fortin and Guy Lacroix, (Laval University), Jean-Louis Rulliere and Marie-Clare Villeval (University Lumiere Lyon) "Tax Evasion and Social Interaction"

**Discussants:** Sarah Stafford (College of William and Mary), Alessandra Cassar (University of California-Santa Cruz), Christine Jolls (Harvard University), Raymonda Burgman (DePauw University)

## Education and Gender

*Room: Point Loma*

**January 5, 2004: 10:15 am**

**Presiding:** Francine D. Blau (Cornell University)

**Papers:** Uri Gneezy (University of Chicago) and Aldo Rustichini (University of Minnesota) "Gender and Competition at a Young Age"; Mark Arends-Kuenning (University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign) and Akhter Ahmed (International Food Policy Research Institute) "Does the Impact of the Food for Education Program in Bangladesh Differ by Gender? An Analysis of Children's School Enrollment and Academic Achievement"; Shirley Johnson-Lans (Vassar College) "Does Post-Graduate Education of Women and Dual (Family and Labor Force Participation) Roles Affect Investment in Health?"; Deborah Anderson and John Cheslock (University of Arizona) "Institutional Strategies to Achieve Gender Equity in Intercollegiate Athletics: Does Title IX Harm Male Athletes?"

**Discussants:** Caroline Hoxby (Harvard University), Karine Moe (Macalester College), Arleen Leibowitz (University of California-Los Angeles), Lawrence Kahn (Cornell University)

## Eastern Economics Association Meetings

CSWEP will be sponsoring two sessions at the Eastern Economics Association meetings. The meetings will be held in Washington, DC at the Hyatt Regency Washington on Capitol Hill, February 20 – 22, 2004. 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, 2003 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/>.

## TWO Sessions for the Southern Economic Association Meetings

November 21-23, 2003 in San Antonio, Texas

Discussants to be announced

Currently operating with the following dates and times:

Session 1: Labor Economics, Saturday, Nov. 22 at 8:00 a.m.

Session 2: International, Technology and Productivity, Saturday, Nov 22 at 2:15

### **Session 1: Topics in Labor Economics**

Session Chair: Professor Saranna Thornton  
Department of Economics, Box 852,  
Hampden-Sydney College,  
Hampden-Sydney, VA 23943  
phone: 434-223-6253  
FAX: 434-223-6045  
email: [sthornton@email.hsc.edu](mailto:sthornton@email.hsc.edu)

### **Paper: "Health, Health Insurance and Labor Supply: Breast Cancer in Working Women"**

Heather L. Bednarek  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Economics  
St. Louis University  
3674 Lindell Blvd.  
St. Louis, MO 63108  
Phone: (314)977-3847  
Fax: (314)977-1478  
Email: [bednarhl@slu.edu](mailto:bednarhl@slu.edu)  
Co-authors: Cathy Bradley (Michigan State University) and David Neumark (Public Policy Institute of California)

### **Paper: "Does Science Discriminate Against Women? Evidence from Academia, 1973-1997"**

Donna K. Ginther  
Department of Economics  
University of Kansas  
226P Summerfield Hall  
1300 Sunnyside Drive  
Lawrence, KS 66045-7585  
phone: 785-864-3251  
fax: 785-864-5270  
email: [dginther@ku.edu](mailto:dginther@ku.edu)

### **Paper: "Gender Inequalities in Higher Education Outcomes"**

Lois Joy, Ph.D.  
Info Technology Services  
Wright Hall  
Smith College  
Northampton, MA 01063  
Phone: (413) 585-3043  
Email: [ljoy@email.smith.edu](mailto:ljoy@email.smith.edu)

### **Paper: "The New Inequality: Effects of College for All on Non-College Women"**

Sharon H. Mastracci, Assistant Professor  
College of Urban Planning & Public Affairs  
139 CUPPAH, University of Illinois at Chicago  
Chicago, IL 60612  
[mastracc@uic.edu](mailto:mastracc@uic.edu)  
312-413-2419 (phone)  
312-996-8804 (fax)



## Session 2: Topics in International, Technology, and Productivity

Session Chair: Catherine L. Mann,  
Senior Fellow  
Institute for International Economics  
1750 Massachusetts Ave  
Washington DC, 20036  
202-328-9000 X 320  
fax: 202-328-5432  
[CLMann@IIE.com](mailto:CLMann@IIE.com)

### Paper: "Trade, Education and International Technology Spillovers: An Industry Level Analysis"

Prof. Yanling Wang  
The Norman Paterson School of  
International Affairs  
Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By  
Drive,  
Ottawa, ON, Canada K1S 5B6  
[Yanling\\_Wang@carleton.ca](mailto:Yanling_Wang@carleton.ca)

### Paper: "Copyright Exemptions and the WTO: Is TRIPs a Thistle or Shamrock?"

Dr. Christine McDaniel  
Senior Economist  
Office of Industry Trade Policy  
International Trade Administration  
U.S. Department of Commerce  
Washington, DC 20230  
Email: [Christine\\_McDaniel@ita.doc.gov](mailto:Christine_McDaniel@ita.doc.gov)  
Co-author Prof. Rodney D.  
Ludema, Georgetown University,  
[ludemar@georgetown.edu](mailto:ludemar@georgetown.edu)

### Paper: "Intellectual Property Rights and Quality Improvement"

Prof. Amy Jocelyn Glass  
Department of Economics  
Texas A&M University  
Allen Building  
College Station, TX 77843-4228 USA  
(979) 845-8507 phone  
(979) 847-8757 fax  
[aglass@econmail.tamu.edu](mailto:aglass@econmail.tamu.edu)  
Co-author: Prof. Xiaodong Wu,  
University of North Carolina,  
[wux@email.unc.edu](mailto:wux@email.unc.edu)

## Summary of WEA Meeting

There was one CSWEP sponsored session at the WEA meetings, which was held in Denver Colorado, in July 2003. The session was organized by Laura Argys of the University of Colorado at Denver around the theme of "Policies, Families, and Children" and was chaired by H. Elizabeth Peters of Cornell University. In addition to Dr. Peters, Terra McKinnish of the University of Colorado, Boulder acted as a discussant.

**Laura Argys and Brian Duncan** (University of Colorado at Denver) presented "Economic Incentives and Foster Care Placement". This study links individual-level data for 1998 from the Federal Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System with information the researchers collected on foster care regulations at the state and county. Since payments to foster parents vary by child age within states, it is possible to use within state variation to identify their effects. While a few previous studies examine the effects of subsidies on the supply of foster parents, this study looks at the quality and stability of foster care placements. They find that higher subsidies increase the probability that a child will be placed with a family rather than in a group home; increase the probability that a child will be placed with a family of his/her own race or ethnicity; and that more generous payments increase the stability of placements by decreasing the child's number of placements while in foster care.

**Eirik Evenhouse** (Institute for Health Policy Studies, University of California at San Francisco) and Siobhan Reilly (Mills College) presented a paper called "The Health Effects of Breastfeeding: A Sibling Study" which uses data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, to examine the long-term effects of breast-feeding in a sample of adolescent siblings. While their study cannot speak to the short-term effects of breast-feeding on infant health, they conclude that some of the reported long-term benefits of breastfeeding are primarily the result of sample selection. Besides examining the effect of breastfeeding and its duration in a between-families model, they estimate a within-family model to see whether inter-sibling differences in outcomes are associated with sibling differences in breastfeeding history. This mitigates selection bias. No matter the measure of breastfeeding used, few effects survive differencing.

**Joseph Sabia** (Cornell University) presented "The Family Cap Controversy: Reducing Nonmarital Births by Decreasing Pregnancies or Increasing Abortions?" The paper uses aggregate state-level data from 1984 to 1998, from those states that report births and abortions to the National Center for Health Statistics, to examine the effect of family caps on nonmarital births, pregnancy rates, and abortion rates. The estimates control for a wide range of other policies that were in effect or enacted in the same time period, and are obtained using a fixed effects logit model corrected for auto correlated and heteroskedastic disturbances. Consistent with most other studies, he finds that the family cap reduced nonmarital birth rates primarily through depressing nonmarital pregnancy rates by 3.6-4.7%, and not through any corresponding increase in abortion rates.

**Bisakha Sen and Shailender Swaminathan** (University of Alabama, Birmingham) presented "Maternal Prenatal Substance Use and Behavioral Problems Among Children in The U.S." This paper uses data from the Children of the National Longitudinal Survey to investigate the link between maternal prenatal consumption of alcohol and tobacco and behavior problems in children. Hence, the paper goes beyond most previous studies, which focus on birth weight. They find evidence of a statistically significant association between prenatal substance abuse and behavior problems, and they also find an interactive effect of alcohol and tobacco consumption. However, the results they presented were primarily descriptive, rather than attempting to identify the causal effect of substance abuse. They plan to pursue an instrumental variables strategy in an effort to identify this effect.

# Announcements

## Quarterly Luncheon Events in Washington, DC.

On Tuesday December 16, 2003, CSWEP and the National Economics Club (NEC) are co-sponsoring a speaker in their continuing series of quarterly luncheon events in Washington, DC. Professor Kristin J. Forbes, Council of Economic Advisers



Member-Designate and the Mitsubishi Career Development Chair and Associate Professor of International Management at MIT's Sloan School of Management will speak on a topic to-be-announced. The luncheon begins at noon, ends at 1:30, at the Chinatown Garden Restaurant - 618 H Street NW (just east of the H Street exit from the Chinatown/Gallery Place Metro Station). The speech begins at 12:30. Reservations are required for those who want lunch by 11am on Monday December 15th at [www.national-economists.org](http://www.national-economists.org) or through the NEC reservations line (703-493-8824). The cost of the luncheon is \$15 for CSWEP and NEC dues paying associates/members, \$20 for others.

## Volunteers Needed at ASSA!

We need volunteers to staff the hospitality suite at the 2004 ASSA Meeting (open January 3-4; 7:30 to 4:00; January 5, 7:30 to noon). Here is your chance to meet other women economists. If interested please email times that you are available to [cswep@cornell.edu](mailto:cswep@cornell.edu). See page 14 for more about CSWEP events at ASSA.

## BRAG BOX

*"We need every day to herald some woman's achievements...go ahead and boast!"*  
—Carolyn Shaw Bell

**Rachel Connelly**, Department of Economics at Bowdoin College, has been promoted to full professor

**Kathryn Shaw** has moved to the Graduate School of Business at Stanford University where she is the Ernest C. Arbuckle Professor of Economics.

**Brigitte Madrian** has accepted a tenured position at the Wharton School.

Do you have an item for the brag box about yourself or a colleague? Send it to: [cswepnews@cornell.edu](mailto:cswepnews@cornell.edu)

## Papers and Session Organizers Needed for the 2004 Western Economic Association Meetings

CSWEP will be organizing sessions at the 2004 Western Economic Association meetings, to be held in Vancouver Canada at the Sheraton Wall Center, June 29-July 3. If you would like to present a paper, or organize a session, please send abstracts of the paper or an outline of the session (including session chair, paper abstracts, and discussants) to: Janet Currie, [currie@simba.sscnet.ucla.edu](mailto:currie@simba.sscnet.ucla.edu) by December 1, 2003.

## Donations Welcome

CSWEP is currently in accepting donations for our annual **Carolyn Shaw Bell Award** to help defray the cost associated with the Award. Donations go into a separate account specifically earmarked for this award. If you would like to make a donation, please send your tax-deductible check made out to the "American Economics Association" to:

Liane O'Brien  
CSWEP  
Cornell University  
204 Ives Hall  
Ithaca, NY 14853

## Credit Cards Accepted!

CSWEP has updated some of its membership services and is now accepting credit card payment information for donations you send to CSWEP. As in past years, you may also choose to pay by check. By keeping your membership current, you not only support CSWEP activities, you ensure that we have your current mailing address allowing us to remain in contact with you. If you have not contributed \$25 or more for the current year (January 1, 2003 through December 31, 2003) please do so.

CSWEP is also continually interested in increasing the number of women economists with whom it has contact. Please encourage your economist female colleagues in your department and other units of your organization to become members. The wider our network, the more impact we can have on the status of women in the economics profession.

### HOW TO BECOME A CSWEP ASSOCIATE

CSWEP depends on all of its associates to continue its activities. In addition to publishing the newsletter, CSWEP organizes sessions at the meetings of the AEA and the regional economics associations and publishes an annual report on the status of women in the economics profession.

If you have not made your donation for the current member year (January 1, 2003 to December 31, 2003) 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.

Students do not have to give a donation to become a CSWEP associate.

Thank you!

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

MAILING ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

CITY, STATE, ZIP: \_\_\_\_\_

E-MAIL ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

check here if currently an AEA member

check here if currently a student      Institute name: \_\_\_\_\_

Expected graduation date: \_\_\_\_\_

Paying by:  check

credit card (MasterCard/Visa/Amex)

Credit card number: \_\_\_\_\_

Name as it appears on the credit card: \_\_\_\_\_

Expiration date: \_\_\_\_\_ Authorizing signature: \_\_\_\_\_

If paying by check please send \$25.00 to:  
CSWEP, c/o Joan Haworth, Ph.D.  
4901 Tower Court  
Tallahassee, FL  
32303

(Please make check payable to CSWEP).

If paying by credit card, you may either mail your form to the above address or fax it to (850) 562-3838

## CSWEP Directory

### *General Policy Matters:*

#### **Francine D. Blau**

School of Industrial & Labor Relations  
Cornell University  
265 Ives Hall  
Ithaca, New York 14853-3901  
fdb4@Cornell.edu

### *Routine Matters and Items for Newsletter:*

#### **Liane O'Brien**

School of Industrial and Labor Relations  
Cornell University  
204 Ives Hall  
Ithaca, NY 14853-3901  
lew14@cornell.edu

### *Dues, Change of Address, Roster:*

#### **Joan Haworth**

Membership Secretary  
Economic Research Services, Inc.  
4901 Tower Court  
Tallahassee, FL 32303  
jhaworth@ersgroup.com

### *CSWEP East:*

#### **Rachel Croson**

OPIM: The Wharton School  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6366  
crosonr@wharton.upenn.edu

### *CSWEP Midwest:*

#### **Lisa Barrow**

Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago  
230 S. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, IL 60604  
lbarrow@frbchi.org

### *CSWEP South:*

#### **Catherine Mann**

Institute for International Economics  
1750 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036  
CLmann@iie.com

### *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

## ATTENTION CSWEP MEMBERS!

Pass this newsletter along to a colleague.  
Encourage them to become a CSWEP associate and  
support our professional community!



American Economic Association  
CSWEP  
c/o Francine Blau  
Cornell University  
School of Industrial & Labor Relations  
265 Ives Hall  
Ithaca, New York 14853-3901

Nonprofit Organization  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Ithaca, NY  
Permit No. 780