



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

Spring/Summer 2004

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



Board Member Biography Lori Kletzer

I stumbled into economics. At the beginning of my first year at Vassar College, I needed one more course and introduction to microeconomics fit my schedule. I went on to the macro course, and decided to major in economics. I was good at it, Vassar's economics faculty was engaging and supportive and I started to see how my slightly activist, public policy interests could work out within economics.

After college, with a bit of interest in health economics, I took an entry-level job with Kaiser Permanente (the HMO) back home in Portland OR. My work didn't have much connection to real issues in health economics, but the time (and drudgery) allowed me to figure out that I really wanted to teach and do economics. So I applied to graduate school and decided to go to Berkeley. Early in my studies, I developed an interest in labor markets and structural change. That interest has really become a professional identity, as a scholar of job displacement.

I met my husband, Ken Kletzer, at Berkeley, and when Ken took a job as an Assistant Professor at Yale, I followed along as a faculty spouse/grad student finishing a dissertation. It was an incredible opportunity, and one that was career-changing, before I even had a career. I met so many economists there who ended up influencing my career.

My first teaching job was at Williams College. Williamstown-New Haven was a doable commute for us. I spent six years there, leaving in 1992, just after getting tenure. It was difficult to leave; I loved the teaching, my colleagues and the College overall offered tremendous respect and support for my research and teaching, and I was very happy there. But we wanted to stop commuting (our son was born in 1990). After a nationwide search, we landed at the University of California Santa

continued on page 12



Interview with Esther Duflo Recipient of the 2002 Elaine Bennett Research Prize

Interviewed by Judith Chevalier



JC: How did you become interested in economics?

ED: I had always been interested in development (I was active in NGOs and community organizations), but I was studying history. My mom is very active in a small NGO (she was a pediatrician). I was going to be an historian (perhaps an economic historian) and do the development work on the side.

Then I spent my last college year in an exchange program in Russia in 92-93. I started working as research assistant for economists (Jeffrey Sachs and my professor in France, Daniel Cohen). It was so exciting to be so close to what was happening in the country (though it was a bit of a disaster then, in Russia) that it occurred to me that it was much more interesting than history!

Also, I met Thomas Piketty, who was then an assistant professor at MIT, and he told me that at MIT, economics was very applied; I could study empirical questions that were very close to policy. Then I put 2 and 2 together and

continued on page 9

CONTENTS

- From the Chair: 2
- Feature Articles, Mentoring: 3-8
- Comment on "Responding to Discrimination in the Academy": 11
- Board Member Biography, Sharon Oster: 12
- Eastern Economic Association Meetings Call for Papers: 13
- Midwest Economic Association Call for Papers: 13
- Southern Economic Association Call for Papers 2004: 13
- Summary of the Eastern Economic Association Meetings February 20-22, 2004: 13-15
- Summary of the Midwest Economic Association Meeting March 19-21, 2004: 15-17
- Western Economic Association Meeting: 17
- Announcements: 18
- Upcoming Regional Meetings and CeMENT Regional Workshop: back cover

Mentoring

Introduction: CeMENT

by Lisa Barrow page 3

Applying for Research Grants from Liberal Arts Colleges

by Lara Shore-Sheppard page 4

An Overview of Networking Strategies

by Joyce P. Jacobsen page 6

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

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

Barbara Fraumeni

Bureau of Economic Analysis BE-2
1441 L Street NW
Washington, DC 20230
(202) 606-9603
FAX (202) 606-5311
barbara.fraumeni@bea.gov

Daniel S. Hamermesh

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

Lori Kletzer

Department of Economics
University of California, Santa Cruz
204 Social Sciences
1156 High Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
(831) 459-3596
lkletzer@ucsc.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

Sharon Oster

Yale University School of
Management
135 Prospect Street
Box 208200
New Haven, CT 06520
(203) 432-5969
Sharon.oster@yale.edu

Ann Owen

Economics Department
Hamilton College
Clinton, NY 13323
(315) 859-4419
aowen@hamilton.edu



From the Chair

CSWEP has continued hard at work on CeMENT, our NSF-funded mentoring initiative for junior economists. In February, we held a mentoring program in conjunction with the Eastern Economic Association meetings. Like our previous workshop at the January ASSA meetings, this one was also

a great success. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those involved in the Eastern Regional Workshop Meeting, especially KimMarie McGoldrick (University of Richmond), the workshop coordinator, as well as those who donated their time to serve as mentors or session leaders including: Rachel Croson (University of Pennsylvania), Mary Beth Deily (Lehigh University), Gail Hoyt (University of Kentucky), Joyce Jacobsen (Wesleyan University), and Rick Lampert (National Science Foundation (NSF), Nancy Marion (Dartmouth College), Karine Moe (Macalester College), Dan Newlon (NSF), Ann Owen (Hamilton College), Bonney Sheehan (NSF), Saranna Thorton (Hampden-Sydney College) and Andrea Ziegert (Denison University). Thank you all! We are also deeply grateful to John Siegfried and the AEA for their continued support and assistance.

Our next CeMENT workshop will be held in New Orleans, November 19-20th preceding the 2004 Southern Economic Association Meeting. For more information, see the announcement in this Newsletter. Following the New Orleans workshop, there will be three remaining workshop opportunities. The third and fourth regional workshops will be held in conjunction with the 2005 Western Economic Association meeting in San Francisco (tentatively June 27-28) and the 2006 Midwest Economic Association meeting in Chicago (March). The final national workshop will be held in conjunction with the 2006 ASSA meeting in Boston. Updated information on the mentoring initiative is available at our website: <http://www.cswep.org/>. Mentoring and advice also constitute the focus of our featured articles in this newsletter.

I'd also like to alert you to our plans for CSWEP-sponsored sessions at the ASSA meetings in Philadelphia, PA in January 2005. We will have three gender-related sessions on "Women's Acquisition of Human Capital," "Health and Gender," and "Marriage and Children." Our three nongender-related sessions are focused on Technology Issues – "Technology and Competition," "Technology, Trade, and Foreign Direct Investment," and "Technology and Labor Markets." We hope to see you in Philadelphia and encourage you to attend these very interesting sessions.

As is customary, CSWEP is organizing three gender-related sessions for the 2006 meetings; the topic for our three nongender-related sessions is industrial organization. Remember to submit your abstracts to CSWEP if you would like to be considered for the 2006 ASSA sessions. All abstracts are due by January 11, 2005. See the announcement in this newsletter, our call for papers in the *JEP* this summer, or <http://www.cswep.org> for further details.

CSWEP also organizes sessions for each of the regional meetings every year. This newsletter contains a call for papers for a number of these meetings; watch future newsletters for others or check out our website. Also, feel free to contact your regional representative if you have program ideas or other suggestions.

Finally, CSWEP wants to hear from you. I encourage you to send me announcements about your activities – grants received, promotions and/or tenure decisions, new appointments, other career activities so that we can relate them to others. You can email them to cswepnews@cornell.edu.

—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 for more information on what we are doing.

CSWEP NEWSLETTER STAFF

Francine Blau, Editor
Lisa Barrow, Co-editor
Annie Buchberg, Assistant Editor
Karine Moe, Oversight Editor
Larry Clarkberg, Graphic Designer

Mentoring

Introduction: CeMENT

by Lisa Barrow, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago



The CSWEP board is excited to announce the kick-off of our second round of CeMENT mentoring workshops for junior faculty. The number of applicants for our first round of workshops at the 2004 ASSA and Eastern Economic Association meetings greatly exceeded the number of spaces available. While we are clearly pleased to have had so much interest in the workshops, we are even happier to hear that workshop participants are saying they found the experience valuable.

The workshops being held in conjunction with the annual ASSA meetings are aimed at junior faculty/economists at institutions where tenure is primarily based on research output; the workshops associated with the regional economic association meetings are aimed at junior faculty in institutions where tenure is based on a balance of teaching, research and service. Our next CeMENT workshop will be held in New Orleans, November 19-20th preceding the 2004 Southern Economic Association Meeting. See the announcement along with application information in this issue of the Newsletter. Following the New Orleans workshop, there are three remaining workshop opportunities. The third and fourth regional workshops will be held in conjunction with the 2005 Western Economic Association meeting in San Francisco (tentatively June 27-28) and the 2006 Midwest Economic Association meeting in Chicago (March). The final national workshop will be held in conjunction with the 2006 ASSA meeting in Boston.

The workshops provide resources and information as well as networking opportunities to allow participants to create both junior-senior and peer mentoring relationships. Our hope is that the workshops will improve participants' chances of professional success and enhance their careers more generally. To help

announce our upcoming regional CeMENT workshop, I thought it would be beneficial to share representative essays of the information and advice one might get out of the workshop. The first author is Lara Shore-Sheppard. She is an associate professor at Williams College and a 1998 participant in the first CSWEP mentoring workshop, CCOFFE (Creating Career Opportunities for Female Economists). Shore-Sheppard writes about applying for research grants from institutions with a primary focus on undergraduate education where faculty are less likely to have as much institutional support for grant writing^a The second piece is written by Joyce Jacobsen, the Andrews Professor of Economics at Wesleyan University. Jacobsen offers specific ideas for networking, with junior faculty at teaching-oriented and geographically isolated campuses in mind. While the mentoring workshops and advice are targeted to junior faculty members, as pointed out by one of the mentors at the Eastern Economic Association meetings, it is useful to be reminded of these tips, regardless of your career stage. I would also add that even an economist at a nonacademic institution in an urban, academic center can find good career tips. I hope you enjoy the articles and find useful pieces of advice as well.

^aFor more on grant writing, see the following CSWEP newsletter articles, which are available at www.cswep.org.

Deily, Mary. "Economic Research Funding at the National Science Foundation." Fall 2000.

Timmer, Ashley. "Funding Opportunities for Women Graduate Students in Economics." Spring 2002.

Razzolini, Laura. "How to Get National Science Foundation Funding in Economics." Winter 2003.

Weiman, David. "Research Funding Opportunities for Women Economists at the Russell Sage Foundation." May 2002.

Applying for Research Grants from Liberal Arts Colleges

Lara Shore-Sheppard, Associate Professor of Economics, Williams College



Applying for a grant when you work at a liberal arts college (or any institution with a primary focus on teaching undergraduates) can seem daunting. You most likely lack the institutional grant support structure that major universities offer their faculty, and the amount of time you spend teaching may make the time needed to write a strong proposal seem hard to come by. Nevertheless, the rewards of grant-writing are substantial, and applying for a grant is well worth considering. This article provides tips on grant-writing for economists at undergraduate institutions.

Why apply for a grant?

The main reason to consider applying for a grant is to be able to “buy out” time from teaching, either to reduce teaching time during the semester, or to fund a sabbatical leave. Since time devoted to teaching and to undergraduate contact is likely to be substantial when working at an undergraduate institution, the opportunity to reduce teaching time is an opportunity to get more research done without sacrificing teaching quality (or sleep!). Grant money can also be used to fund student research assistants or summer salary, to purchase computer equipment, or to travel to conferences, all of which are likely to increase research productivity, and obtaining a grant may increase your professional visibility.

Despite these benefits, you may be reluctant to write a grant proposal because the up-front time cost of writing the proposal is so high. However even though grant applications are time-consuming, the proposal-writing process itself has some intangible benefits that accrue whether or not you actually receive the grant. It forces you to think clearly about your project, to plan your work rather than just diving in, and to confront important issues like feasibility in advance. In order to write a good proposal, you have to convince other people that your research project is worthwhile. Since you will also have to convince journal editors and reviewers of the importance of your research, the effort you put in while writing the grant is effort you would have to expend anyway. More concretely, you are likely to be able to use some of what you write for the proposal again when you write your articles, including discussions of previous literature, background, and methodology. Even writing the part of the proposal describing your background and qualifications for doing the research is not wasted effort if you do not receive the grant, since you are forced to analyze what you have done and to put it in the context of other work, an important part of reappointment and tenure statements.

Finding funding

Assuming you have decided to apply for a grant, the first question is where to apply. Most undergraduate institutions do not have a sponsored research office, but if you are fortunate enough to have one, that is a good place to start. Ask colleagues, both at your own institution and at other institutions, and your dissertation advisor about possible sources of grants. The AEA's Resources for Economists has a section on grants (<http://www.aeaweb.org/RFE/JobGrant/index.html>) that has links to various funding sources. Research organizations, institutes, and professional societies in economics sub-fields are also likely to have web pages listing or linking to grant opportunities.

The National Science Foundation (NSF) is a major source of research funding for economists, and the Research in Undergraduate Institutions/Research Opportunity Awards (RUI/ROA) program is targeted specifically to researchers in undergraduate institutions (see <http://www.ehr.nsf.gov/crssprgm/rui/start.shtm> for details). An RUI proposal is essentially the same as any other NSF proposal, except that the investigator has an additional opportunity to make the case for her research in an “RUI Impact Statement.” The ROA portion of the program provides funding for faculty at undergraduate institutions to pursue research as visiting scientists with NSF-supported investigators at other institutions. There isn't a funding advantage in the RUI/ROA program—proposals still have to undergo merit review and are supported out of the same Economics Program budget as any other grant—but for proposals at the margin, submitting as an RUI/ROA may make a difference. More information about NSF grant-writing can be found in the Winter 2003 CSWEP newsletter (http://www.cswep.org/CSWEP_nsltr_winter2003.pdf).

Applying for the grant

First of all, start early! That's true for anyone writing a proposal, since good proposals take a lot of time to write and edit, but it's especially the case when you are responsible for most or all of the budgetary and application details. Read the agency's or foundation's grant application instructions, and review the call for proposals (if relevant), to make sure you target your application as closely as possible to what is being asked for and to ensure you include all the necessary pieces in your proposal. Try to obtain one or more successful proposals that were made to the agency or foundation to which you are applying. Having a successful proposal to consult is useful not only to give you ideas about what needs to be included in the proposal and how it should be organized, but will also help you figure out the

“The main reason to consider applying for a grant is to be able to “buy out” time from teaching...”

details of the forms (if any) and budget. Since it's easy to get bogged down in these details, it's best to start by working on the substantive portion of your proposal, as that is the most important part. Once you have a rough draft of your proposal, you can start working on the administrative and budgetary details while continuing to make progress on the substance.

The first step in figuring out the administrative details is finding out who at your institution reviews your proposal and signs off on it. Although you may not get much, if any, concrete help in putting your grant together, someone at your institution has to review it and sign it. This could be someone in the Provost's office, the President's office, or the Dean of the Faculty's office, for example. Ask colleagues about the procedures. Colleagues in other departments may also be helpful—for example, colleagues in the natural sciences may have applied for grants more frequently and can help you learn the procedure at your school. Keep in mind that the official who reviews your grant may require a final version of your application a week or more before you want to send it out (that's why you started early!) Some grants require reference letters, and your letter-writers will also need to see a draft of your application before they write their letters.

In addition to determining who signs proposals, you also need to find out budgetary procedures and policies. What kind of salary support are you permitted to obtain (e.g. can you buy out of a course? buy out of an entire semester? summer salary only?) and at what rate (e.g. 1/4 of your academic year salary for a course, 1/9 for a summer month)? What are student RA pay rates? What are the fringe benefit rates for your time and for RA time? If you're applying for a multi-year grant, what might a typical salary increase be? What is your institution's indirect cost rate, and what is the rate based on (e.g. the entire grant, or salaries and fringes only)? If you've never applied for a grant, indirect cost can seem quite mysterious. It is an additional percentage added to your grant by your institution to cover overhead costs, if the granting agency permits it. Government agencies typically have negotiated a rate with your school, while many private foundations limit or do not permit indirect cost charges. If your research involves human subjects, you may also need to do certain things to comply with the human subjects review policies of your institution.

Continue to refine your proposal while working on the budget and other details. Some of these activities are complementary. For example, you will need to know policies about buying out your time before you can include an accurate timetable of your research plans in your proposal. If you have

questions about either substantive or budgetary matters, don't hesitate to contact the program officer at the agency or foundation. This is something that may seem difficult, since it feels like cold-calling someone to ask for money, but it really isn't. Program officers are typically very helpful, and talking to them can save a lot of wasted effort as well as help produce a much better proposal.

In writing your proposal, be specific and clear about what you will do and how you will do it. Be sure to motivate your research. Why is it important? How is it ground-breaking? How does it fit the mission of a particular foundation or agency, or the call for proposals? Why are you the right person to conduct this research? Make sure your proposal is well written and carefully edited. Ask colleagues and any letter-writers for both substantive and editorial critiques.

Postscript

Finally, you've finished your proposal and submitted it. It's well-written, well-edited, contains all of the necessary parts—it's beautiful! You wait weeks, or more likely, months, to hear back. If you get the grant, congratulations! But of course, success rates aren't 100 percent, so there's a good chance you don't get the grant. What do you do then (besides reminding yourself of all the benefits you've already gotten from writing the proposal)? Many agencies will let you resubmit, sometimes even multiple times. If this is the case, read the reviews of your proposal and talk to the program officer to determine whether a revised version has a chance of success and what needs to go into that revision. Even if you can't resubmit, it is usually useful to talk to the program officer to find out your proposal's weaknesses before submitting it to another agency or foundation. In fact, there is nothing to stop you from submitting it elsewhere even before you hear back from the first potential funder. Many funders require you to list other places to which you have submitted your grant, and in the event you are funded by both agencies you would have to work out a funding split between them, but there is nothing unethical about submitting a grant to multiple funding agencies at the same time. Good luck!

References

- Razzolini, Laura. "How to Get National Science Foundation (NSF) Funding in Economics." CSWEP Newsletter, Winter 2003.
- Smeeding, Timothy. "Grantwriting Guidelines in the Social and Behavioral Sciences." CSWEP Newsletter Special Reprint Issue No. 2.

An Overview of Networking Strategies

Joyce P. Jacobsen, Andrews Professor of Economics, Wesleyan University



Herein I offer a set of specific networking ideas. These are particularly geared for folks who are junior professors at teaching-oriented colleges and state university campuses, particularly those of you who find yourselves in geographically-isolated sites with colleagues who, while nice folks, solid citizens, and good teachers, are mostly not heavy-duty researchers.

My first academic position was at Rhodes College in Memphis, Tennessee, a liberal arts college of about 1400 students with a combined economics and business department housing a total of six economists, so I know about what it is like to be in the academic outback. But I wanted to be at a liberal arts college—and Wesleyan wasn't hiring that year. My dissertation advisor thought I was dropping off the face of the earth and kissing my research agenda goodbye. All the things I'm advocating today are things I did while I was at Rhodes, and they all helped keep my career on track.

Keep in mind that with networking, as with having multiple papers in the publishing pipeline, you never know which lead will pay off, which may make you think it isn't worth bothering because any one contact may not lead anywhere in career terms. But because each contact has a low probability of tangible result, you need to make a lot of them in order to get some payoff. Also networking tends to be subject to snowballing reputation effects, so earlier contacts are less likely to pay off, while later contacts have higher payoffs (particularly once people know who you are already when they meet you).

I. Try to go to at least two conferences a year.

This is really a no-lose proposition. Institutions like people to go to conferences. Even administrators—and colleagues in the humanities—understand conferences. They know it gives you see-and-be-seen time, or "face time". In addition, you'll probably enjoy going and it will likely give you renewed energy for doing research and being engaged in the profession. Cajole funds from the dean or the department chair. If necessary, pay for some of it yourself.

1) Get on the program at the ASSA meetings. Organize (or co-organize) and submit a session for the AEA or for an affli-

ated group. For the AEA, in order to stand out from the crowd, you need a hook for the session topic and one or two big names to serve as chair and a discussant. Don't be afraid to ask name-brand professors to be on your session; all they can do is say no, and they may be quite likely to say yes. Submit a paper to the CSWEP sessions. If you are accepted, also recall that CSWEP has an automatic publication "in" for *Papers and Proceedings* for six papers out of their six sessions, which gives you good publication odds. If you are an empiricist, submit your paper to the Econometric Society sessions. In the case of both the CSWEP sessions and the Econometric Society sessions, discussants are often chosen from among the rejected paper submitters, so you may still end up on the program. As a junior person, it is good to be a discussant. If you do a good job, it will only raise your networking capital.

When you're at the meetings, network. Attend the CSWEP business meeting and cocktail party; your graduate school's cocktail party; the opening night cocktail party; the CSWEP hospitality suite for free breakfast; fraternize with the people in your session. Read the other people's papers in your session even if you aren't their formal discussant and offer them comments at the conclusion of the session. You have to give to get in the networking business, even though the person you give to may not be the person you get from (at least not directly). Have business cards made up that have your email address on them and your work webpage if you have one. Give them to people.

2) If you don't get on the ASSA program, volunteer for your department's search committee. Then network as above.

3) Get on the program at your regional or subregional meeting. Organize (or co-organize) and submit a session—the regional meetings are anxious for people to hand them fully-set-up sessions. Submit a paper to the CSWEP sessions. Also let the regional CSWEP coordinator know that you're willing to serve as a discussant or chair for a session.

When you're at the meetings, network. Attend the CSWEP cocktail party; other cocktail parties; fraternize with the people in your session. Read the other people's papers in your session even if you aren't their formal discussant and offer them comments at the conclusion of the session.

“...with networking, as with having multiple papers in the publishing pipeline, you never know which lead will pay off...”

4) Get on the program at a more specialized meeting. Possibilities are expanding all the time. Attend a specialized meeting in your subfield—there’s an economics association for everyone these days; check out listings of economic societies (<http://rfe.wustl.edu/OrgsAssoc/Soc/index.html>). Consider going international: workshops aimed at training younger economists are increasingly being held abroad, particularly in Europe where the graduate programs are smaller and pan-European training more common. Figure out which regional conference has the most people in your field and go to it even if it is not the region where you live. For example natural resource economists tend to attend the Western; heterodox economists are at the Eastern in good numbers. Interdisciplinary conferences can also be useful to attend, depending on your research field (e.g. the public policy association meetings, the population association meetings, the southwestern social science association meetings) both for meeting people in other fields, and also as bonding experiences with the other economists in attendance (who will generally be outnumbered and therefore will band together). If you go to meetings year after year, particularly the same meetings, you will accrete acquaintances and even turn some of them into work friends.

II. Accept all requests for book reviews, referee reports, and proposal reviews, and turn them in on time.

If for some reason you absolutely can’t do it, give the requestor a suggestion or two for someone else to ask. It cannot hurt to develop a reputation for being conscientious and cooperative. You want to be on the good side of editors.

III. Make new contacts and maintain existing ones.

1) Make contacts with faculty, particularly young ones or older but active researchers, at neighboring institutions. Offer to read their papers and give them feedback. Invite them to give a seminar at your school. If there is a seminar series at a neighboring institution, contact the seminar coordinator and offer to give a paper.

2) Look for working papers in your area—go to webpages

of people whose work interests you, as well as looking in the online databases (<http://rfe.wustl.edu/ScholComm/WorkPap/index.html>). Don’t wait to read papers in published form. If you absolutely can’t make it to the ASSA, borrow the program from a colleague who did go and send email requests to people who gave papers that sound interesting and relevant to you, asking for a copy of their working paper. If their work is related to yours, send them a copy of your paper subsequently. Send people comments on their working papers, or give them a comment in person, which can be as simple a comment as: “I read your paper and found it interesting/enjoyed it.”

3) In general, when you meet or contact people, if you’ve read their work, tell them so. If you liked one of their papers, tell them so. We don’t give people enough positive feedback in this profession. When you publish a paper you will in general be amazed at the deafening silence following this momentous event. You can’t tell who has read it or what they thought of it. No matter how famous the person, it doesn’t hurt to give them a compliment. The biggest names in the profession love to be stroked; they have the biggest egos, after all.

4) Keep in touch with people from your graduate school who were in your immediate cohort. If there are people teaching at nearby institutions who graduated either soon before or soon after your cohort, contact them with a friendly emailed hello. Do the same with people from your undergraduate institution who went on to get a Ph.D. in economics. Invite them to give a seminar at your school. Hopefully they will reciprocate.

5) If your college doesn’t have a seminar series, consider using student-programming funds to invite people to give student-oriented talks. This can include asking economists that you don’t know personally, but would like to get to know, particularly if you know they are visiting another institution in the area. If you don’t have an ODE chapter (*Omicron Delta Epsilon* is the national honor society for economics), start a chapter, be the faculty advisor, and have the chapter sponsor a speaker, perhaps for their initiation ceremony.

6) Identify similar institutions and form an informal association between your economics departments by contacting other young people or people in your field at those institutions.

“Network outside of economics, both with academics and policy folks. Identify as a social scientist as well as an economist.”

Consider organizing a small-scale teaching-related conference. Consider doing some economic education-related research as a coordinated effort. Research on economic education, or college education, is a nice sideline for people in teaching institutions. There are good journals like *Journal of Economic Education*, and you can give the paper at the Robert Morris University annual economics conference that concentrates on teaching-related issues.

7) Network outside of economics, both with academics and policy folks. Identify as a social scientist as well as an economist. Talk to other colleagues at your institution (particularly sociologists), folks with data, folks at local nonprofits, folks in local and state government, and even talk to lawyers. Respond to local media requests. Give talks on and off campus. Look for state and local government and private sources for state and local-oriented research and consulting opportunities that can lead to research projects. Once you're famous, if it gets to be too much, you can start saying no to requests. These sorts of outreach activities will help inform your teaching too. Students like to hear how you are engaged in the wider world, and they will help you develop concrete examples for use in your course lectures.

IV. Try to give at least two seminars a year at other institutions, and at least one informal talk at your own institution, and invite at least one person to visit your institution.

It should be easy to give and receive such invitations if you followed my advice in (III) above.

V. Here's one optional but strongly recommended suggestion: Try to spend some time visiting at another institution higher up the academic pecking order or at a policy think tank.

It looks good on your *curriculum vitae*, it is good to get perspective regarding how things can be done differently than at your institution, and you really will meet some new people doing this. Try to avoid just going back to where you did your graduate work. This time away can be during your mini-sabbatical (if you are lucky enough to have one), or taken as unpaid leave (negotiate with the Chair and the Dean—argue that it is critical for your research program). Consider applying for research grants to cover the time so you don't have to teach, but generally if you can get a visiting professorship, the money won't be a problem, often your home institution will let you keep your benefits, and even though you are teaching you'll still have less work because you don't have to do administrative stuff at the other institution and you will probably have a lighter course load.

Top 5 Ways to Mentor Junior Faculty

(Excerpted from Rachel Croson, CSWEP Newsletter Winter 2003.)

- 1. Referee their papers first.**
- 2. Invite them to present a seminar.**
- 3. Include them in an organized session.**
- 4. Introduce them to others.**
- 5. Provide feedback on their work.**

VI. And finally, consider any consulting you do, any presentation you give, as potentially leading to a publication, even if it isn't refereed.

Sessions can turn into books (book publishers are eager for book proposals). Public talks can turn into short articles. Any presentation you give at a conference or in a seminar setting should be geared towards an eventual publishable article. The coin of the realm in academia is still publications, and while part of the reason we network is to enjoy being connected to the profession, another part is to advance our careers. Your career can only advance if you are promoted, and you are unlikely to be promoted without publishing.

figured that I could be an academic AND try to make a difference in the world ALL AT ONCE... I did not need to have a day job and a night job. So I decided to switch to economics.

JC: Who are the economists that were very influential in your early career?

ED: Definitely, my advisors, Abhijit Banerjee and Josh Angrist. Also, as I said, Thomas Piketty (I would not be an economist without him). Angus Deaton, Duncan Thomas, Marc Rosenzweig, Amartya Sen, Joseph Stiglitz.

JC: So, you have done a lot of work on policy and program analysis in developing countries. Several papers take advantage of randomized public policy experiments, which allows for a control group for evaluation. Are these kinds of experiments common?

ED: A substantial fraction of my work tries to ask seemingly simple program impact evaluation questions: would the situation have been different if this particular policy had not been implemented? For example, would Indian slum children read better if they were offered remedial education if they reached grade 3 without having learned the basic characters? Often you cannot answer this question very reliably, however, because you never see the same children with and without the program. Moreover, program locations are chosen in some specific ways, so that you can not just compare children who went to remedial education programs and children who did not. Yet, knowing such answers is critical if we are to improve the effectiveness of development aid, and public expenditure more generally. We are spending



Esther Duflo, 2002 Elaine Bennett Research Prize recipient, and Margaret Gattitsen de Vries, 2002 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award recipient.

so much on development programs that it seems to be a real shame to fund large programs without knowing whether or not they are effective. When the program is randomly phased in, you can reliably compare beneficiaries and non beneficiaries of the first phase and learn something from this first phase. If the program is useless, it does not need to be expanded. If it is useful, it can be expanded in this and perhaps other locations as well. So randomized evaluation has the potential to dramatically improve the effectiveness of aid.

However, there are very, very few such experiments. Along with several of my colleagues, I try to convince policy makers, international institutions, etc., that there should be more. We have created the Poverty Action Lab at MIT to try to further that work (please check out www.povertyactionlab.org). Some of my projects exploit natural randomness, where the program is being randomly allocated for fairness reason, or to avoid manipulation. Those I just found out a little by chance, because I spend a lot of time in India and I am always eager to learn about new opportunities for research. Many are conducted in collaboration with NGOs, and in this case it is typically the NGO who first contacted us because they wanted to evaluate one of their programs. After doing one program with them, in general we continue working together, and then we either evaluate a program they propose, or we come up together with an idea.

JC: Has your work had any impact on policy-making that you know of?

ED: If only.... One should do a randomized evaluation: tell some policy makers what I found, and not tell to others and then see.... Joke aside: I think my work has had an impact on the

NGOs I worked with. It may also have had some impact on what their funders decided to fund. Over and above that, I am not very sure. Things in policy move slowly. I think some people may slowly take in the lessons that it is important to evaluate program carefully.

JC: You have a few papers that address gender issues in developing economies that the members of CSWEP would be interested in. For people that missed your talk at the AEA meeting when you accepted the Elaine

Bennett prize, can we summarize what we have learned from your research on gender? What should women in more developed economies take away from this research?

ED: I started working on gender issue with a healthy dose of skepticism. There is a lot of evidence around that children are better treated when women earn a larger of the part of the household's money, that fertility and child mortality are more associated with mother's education than with father's education, that laws are different where there are more women in politics, etc.... Yet, all

of these correlations could be misleading. What do they really tell us about the causal impact of empowering women (in the form of money, education, political power)? This is what we need to know in order to figure out whether it is important to have such policies. Perhaps all of these correlations are misleading, because they reflect intrinsic differences between families where women earn money and those where they don't, places that elect women and places who do not, etc... perhaps it is not in the power of a policy maker to influence what is going on in the household just by designing the woman as the recipient of a particular transfer, because that would not affect any of these deeper determinants of decision making within the household. So I decided to try to find out, in three domains: income, education, politics. And this has given rise to four papers. In all of them, my co-authors and I try very hard to answer the causal question. We exploit policy changes, income variations due to rainfall, random determinations of electoral positions reserved to women, etc... In all cases we concluded that indeed, transferring power to women has real consequences: women and men have different preferences, decisions are taken, in politics as well as in the family, with some regards for who has the money and who has the power, and therefore it DOES matter to allocate power to women. For example, girls living with a woman who receives an old age pension in South Africa are heavier and taller than those who do not. Man's pensions have no such effect. A temporary increase in women's income due to a good rainfall leads to increase in food purchase. No such effect is found for temporary increase in men's income. Women's education is a more important determinant of reduced fertility than men's education. Women who are heads of village council invest more on water (but less on schools). While women's preferences in developed countries are of course different (they may not care so much about a new well), the general lesson is that the household is a complicated decision structure, and that who has the power matters. This lesson remains valid here as well. This has implications for who we should decide to vote for, how welfare programs, EITC, child support laws, tax exemption, regulation on pension, etc... should be designed. But much more research is warranted on this subject in developed countries. I think that these are the main lessons for the members of CSWEP.

JC: What do you teach at MIT? Is teaching important to you?

ED: I teach development economics, to graduate and undergraduate students. Teaching is very important to me. When I started studying development, the class was very small. Now it is large, and it is not only composed of people who will turn into development economists. Many students take development and go on to do something else. I think this is great, and I consider it to be a very important part of my job to be giving undergraduate or graduate students who will do something else a glimpse of the problems in the developing world. They can then keep that with them in whatever they will do later, and hopefully this will give them a benchmark and a reference point. Obviously, teaching

and advising students who are going to become development economists is very important too! Development is expanding now; I have a sense that we are in the process of forming generations of people who will shape the field. This is a bit scary, the sense of responsibility this gives me. My own teachers and advisors, Abhijit Banerjee, Michael Kremer, Josh Angrist, and people who have mentored me during my career such as Angus Deaton and Anne Case, have had a tremendous influence on the way I see the world. I still can read the world because they gave me the right instruments. I can only repay this debt by relaying some of this to other people now.

JC: A lot of your research involves field work. How much time do you spend abroad for your research? Do you keep a grueling schedule?

ED: I travel at least 2 times a year to India, and one time to Kenya. This is in addition to all the other trips that we take for this or that reason (conferences etc...), so I end up traveling quite a bit. I am in fact writing this email to you at 2:25 AM from a deserted airport lounge in the domestic terminal in Delhi, waiting for my flight for Udaipur. I arrived from London 2 hours ago. I had stopped in London for two days on my ways to India to give two talks. So at this precise minute I am feeling quite sorry for myself and I would say, yes, this is pretty grueling. Between December 10 and the end of January, I would have visited 4 countries (UK, France, India, Indonesia), and crossed the Indian border 3 times. I end up spending 4 to 6 weeks abroad in the winter, and 8 to 10 in the summer. Because I have several projects going on at the same time, most of this time abroad is made of short stays in different locations. What makes this demanding is that the semester is pretty busy with teaching and students etc, so I feel I never stop running around... I need to squeeze research at pretty odd times.

JC: Which part of the work do you like better—the work in the field or sitting at the computer?

ED: That being said, of course I love it. I much prefer being in the field than in Cambridge. However, I realize that it would not make sense to ALWAYS be in the field. What I really am is an academic, not an administrator: I need want to reflect on what I see in the field, stare at the data I collect, teach development economics and advise PhD students. The field experience feeds all of this, and also feeds off of it. I don't think my career as an academic would make much sense without my field experience, and the opposite is true as well. I feel extremely fortunate to be in a profession where I could achieve such a balance.

JC: Do you have any advice for young people starting out on a career in economics? In development economics in particular?

ED: Start with what interests you. Don't feel limited by the data, the previous literature, or anything. Find a question that excites YOU. Then apply your mind and work hard to see how you can address it. If there is already a literature, read everything, see how you can stand on these giant's shoulders. If there is no lit-

erature, look sideways: perhaps someone has faced the same type of problems in other disciplines (if you want to be a development economist, by the way, you need to know some other discipline well as well: for example IO, Labor, PF, econometrics, theory, macro, finance....) If the data do not exist, go and look for it. If it exists already, don't collect data for the sake of it. Always look for the best way to answer your question.

The best papers to write are those that you would have liked to read but do not exist.

JC: How do you feel about receiving the Elaine Bennett prize?

ED: I gave some thought to this question. Initially I did not know...I was not very sure that we needed a prize just for women. Since childhood I have been pretty opposed to anything that suggested that women were in any need of anything special. I thought that the only real way to defend women's cause was to prove the point that women can do anything as well as men. So if I had been given this prize at 15 (obviously a ridiculous proposition) I would probably not have been too happy. Recently some people in the profession have asked me why I had accepted a prize that suggested that women were somehow inferior and needed their own prize. But since then I have done a lot of work on women (some of which we've already discussed), and in the course of this work I realized that it is probably costly for society that women are often in such inferior positions, relative to men. At a minimum, my research convinced me that it has consequences (it would be fair to say that I have not proven that it diminishes welfare). So when active steps are taken to give a little bit more power to women, in the family (by giving them income), or in politics (by allocating reserved seats), it not only improves the lot of women, it has consequences for the way the family, or the village, is run. So probably it is the same in academia. For some reason women are underrepresented in economics. Some of this is self-perpetuating. For example the field tends to be more macho and aggressive than it needs to be for science's sake, in my view... This does not help new women to enter, unless they are pretty strong! And it almost certainly has consequences on the type of research that is being done, the way students are taught and advised etc... So now I think that it is right to take active steps to encourage and recognize women in the profession. And therefore I am really happy and honored that I received this prize, because I am honored that the committee thought my work could be something worth recognizing and I could set some model. There are many really excellent women of all ages in the profession. I am proud to be a woman and an economist, and I am happy to have been deemed worthy to have my name attached to an effort to recognize their value.

Comment on "Responding to Discrimination in the Academy"

Julie A. Nelson, Global Development and Environment Institute, Tufts University

In "Responding to Discrimination in the Academy," the editors of this newsletter said they were unable to find an economist willing to discuss her own tenure discrimination case. When asked I am willing to discuss my own case. Here are the bare facts:

In 1995, I took an untenured but tenure-track Associate position at Brandeis University, which had only a fledgling Ph.D. program. I had previously been an Associate Professor with tenure in the department of Economics at the University of California, Davis, whose graduate program is usually ranked among the top 30 in the U.S. When it came time for the tenure review at Brandeis the department refused to do one, saying that my fields did not fit its needs. Simultaneously, they advertised for someone to teach the same fields I had taught at UC Davis. I appealed internally and (before the statute of limitations ran out) also filed a complaint with the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination (MCAD), which is also a filing with the EEOC. I alleged discrimination against me on the basis of my sex and the feminist nature of some of my work. Eventually the university did do a review, and denied me tenure on the basis of supposed inadequacies in my research. I had, at that time, published five times in the top 20 journals in the economics profession (as ranked in a 1994 *JEL* article)—including in *Econometrica*, the *AER*, the *JPE*, and the *JEP*—as well as many articles in other respected journals. A male economics faculty member was, meanwhile, granted tenure. His top-ranked publication was in *World Development*, the journal ranked 104th.

"Anonymous" wrote in this newsletter that "the entire process of fighting a legal case of gender discrimination...can often take two years." In my case it took over two years—and many thousands of dollars—just to get from the initial filing of a complaint to a "probable cause" ruling. But this ruling only meant that MCAD found my allegation of sex discrimination credible enough to authorize a public hearing. Continuing formal legal procedures from that point would have involved the hearing and then, if that decision was appealed, a trial in federal court. My lawyer's estimated time to a final legal judgment was *ten* years. MCAD, however, encourages parties to engage in conciliation conferences rather than pursuing a formal judgment. After months of these, my case was "resolved to the satisfaction of all concerned" in 2001. I have moved on to positions at U Mass Boston, Harvard, and Tufts.

Am I glad I engaged in the legal fight? You bet. I hope anyone experiencing such treatment—or who notices someone else getting such treatment—will not let it slide. Silence encourages institutions to continue acting in the same way.

Cruz. It was a busy time—our daughter was born two months after our arrival in Santa Cruz. While my professional situation within the University was rocky for several years (if I had to do it all again, I would be much more careful about accepting an untenured position, from a tenured one), I feel fortunate to have a “dual-economist career with kids” life that does not involve commuting.

The international focus of the economics department at Santa Cruz pushed me to develop my research focus of the past nine years—the labor market consequences of increasing foreign competition (“trade and jobs”). With that focus, I’ve been able to fuse my passion for policy-relevance to my research. I spent a wonderful part-sabbatical year in Washington DC with the Institute for International Economics, blending my trade and jobs expertise with the Institute’s policy influence. Thanks to remarkable timing, my research at the Institute was influential in the Trade Act of 2002, when Trade Adjustment Assistance was expanded to include a program of wage insurance for displaced workers.

From my lofty perch, mid-career (probably) and middle-aged (certainly), I offer just a bit of advice. Make the effort to meet people and talk about your work. Seek out people with common interests (send that email and make that phone call). One or two people can and will make a big difference in your career. Ask lots of questions and take the advice that makes sense to you. Work on questions you care about. Push back when the job encroaches on family (or even just on you).



Board Member Biography

Sharon Oster

As an undergraduate at Hofstra University in the late 1960’s, I was attracted to Economics by my interest in social justice. When I entered the PhD program at Harvard in 1970, I was in for quite a shock. Nevertheless, while I found the interest in social justice more subdued in the Harvard economics department than I had anticipated, the introduction to more formal economic thinking was quite exciting. Learning microeconomics from Zvi Griliches introduced me to a way of thinking that I have continued to find both intellectually interesting and astonishingly useful in working on practical problems. At Harvard, I was also fortunate enough to study Industrial Organization with Dick Caves, who has amazed generations of IO students with his encyclopedic knowledge and ability to lecture in perfect paragraphs.

My first job, from 1974-82, was at Yale University in the Economics department. From there I moved up the street to the Yale School of Management, which was in its infancy. I found that the empirical bent of a business school suited my interests and talents very well and I have been there ever since. Since 1992, I have been the Frederich Wolfe Professor of Economics and Management. It is hard to believe that I have been at Yale for thirty years. At Yale, I met my husband, Ray Fair, who is a macroeconomist in the economics department. Along the way, we had three children, one of whom is now taking her turn studying at the Harvard Economics department in the PhD program.

My research has concentrated in the field of industrial organization and competitive strategy. My early work looked at issues involving technical innovation, but after moving to a business school I increasingly worked on problems of business strategy including work on nonprofit organizations. Along the way, I have also dabbled a little bit in the labor field, particularly around issues involving women and the labor force.

Teaching in a business school has offered a number of opportunities that come perhaps less frequently to economists in arts and sciences departments. Over the years I have consulted on a number of projects, both antitrust cases and on business strategy matters. At the moment I serve on boards of three publicly traded companies. As an academic, it is interesting for me to see how much harder it is to run a business than we anticipate in our theories. At the same time, it has been gratifying to see how many of the core ideas of microeconomics taught me years ago by Zvi Griliches have value in the business world. Some of my most enjoyable moments have involved explaining ideas like the winner’s curse and marginal analysis to my fellow board members; I like to think that they enjoyed these sessions as well!

Being married to another economist—even one in macroeconomics—seems to me to be an ideal arrangement. Having a guaranteed first reader of one’s work is hard to beat, and living with someone who understands opportunity costs is invaluable. Of our three children, the first two have also chosen to major in economics, and we are still working on the third. I look forward to a stable of economists willing to read and comment on my papers. As I look back on my career, I am amazed at how many varied opportunities I have had by virtue of my Economics degree. It has been a very exciting 30 years.

Eastern Economic Association Meetings Call for Papers

CSWEP will be sponsoring two sessions at the Eastern Economics Association meetings. The meetings will be held in New York City at the Sheraton New York Hotel and Towers, March 4 – 6, 2005. 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 or e-mail.

Abstracts should be submitted by *November 1, 2004* to:

Ann Owen
Hamilton College
198 College Hill Road
Clinton, NY 13323
aowen@hamilton.edu
phone:(315)859-4419

Please note that this submission is separate from any submission sent in response to the EEA's general call for papers, but any papers not accepted for CSWEP sessions will be passed on to the EEA. For further information on the EEA meetings please see <http://www.iona.edu/eea/>

Midwest Economic Association Call for Papers

CSWEP will sponsor two paper sessions and a panel discussion at the 2005 Midwest Economics Association Meeting in Milwaukee, WI. The meeting will be held at the Hilton Milwaukee City Center March 11-13, 2005.

The session organizers for next year's meeting are: Lisa Barrow, Virginia Shingleton, and Judy Temple. We are particularly interested in papers on "Issues in Economic Education" and "Economic Issues in Urban Education." We will also consider proposals for complete sessions on any other topic. Please e-mail abstracts of 1-2 pages (including names of authors with affiliations, addresses, and paper title) by September 15, 2004 to:

Lisa Barrow, CSWEP Midwest Representative
Economic Research, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago
E-mail: lbarrow@frbchi.org
Phone: 312-322-5073
FAX: 312-322-2357

Southern Economic Association Call for Papers 2004

CSWEP will sponsor up to three sessions at the annual meeting of the Southern Economic Association to be held in New Orleans, LA November 21-23, 2004. Deadline for submitting information is June 15, 2004.

Up to two sessions will be organized from submitted materials. (One session has already been organized.) Abstracts for papers in the topic areas of *gender, health economics, consumption and savings behavior, international economics, monetary policy, or business reorganization* are particularly solicited, but abstracts in other areas will be accepted by e-mail by June 15, 2004. Abstracts should be 1-2 pages and include paper title, names of authors, affiliation and rank, and e-mail contact information as well as mailing address.

All information should be e-mailed by June 15, 2004 to:

Dr. Catherine L. Mann, CSWEP Southern Representative
Senior Fellow, Institute for International Economics
e-mail: CLMann@cox.net
phone: 202-328-9000

Summary of the Eastern Economic Association Meetings February 20-22, 2004

CSWEP-Sponsored sessions at the Eastern Economics Association Annual Conference

In addition to a highly successful cocktail party on Saturday evening, CSWEP held four sessions at the Eastern Economics Association Annual Conference.

Women Economists and the Last 30 Years

Our first session was a symposium titled Women Economists and the Last 30 Years, organized and chaired by Simone Wegge. Two previous presidents of the Eastern Economics Association, Elizabeth Bailey and Barbara Bergmann, as well as a previous editor of the Eastern Economic Journal, Ingrid Rima served as panel members. The panelists discussed the history of the EEA (Rima attended the birth in a bar in a New York Hotel), the high-points of their careers (Bergmann led a successful fight to remove the question "Who is the head of your household?" and was accused of ruining the 1980 Census), and their career paths (Bailey noted that many female econ-

omists come “through” government). The panel also discussed challenges facing female economists, and included recommendations for overcoming them, including the importance of double-blind refereeing, encouraging promising female undergraduates to go on to grad school, and publishing a “shame list” of departments in which women are far underrepresented.

Experimental and Behavioral Economics

The second session examined issues in experimental and behavioral economics. The first paper “An Experimental Analysis of Intertemporal Decision-Making under Uncertainty” by Sarah Stafford (William and Mary) and Lisa Anderson, presented an experimental investigation of attitudes toward risk and ambiguity when the outcome is realized only in the future. Their preliminary results suggest an interaction between risk, ambiguity and time preferences which have important implications for consumption behavior and policy.

The second paper, “The Relationship between Risk Attitudes and Heuristics Used in Search Tasks: A Laboratory Experiment” by Daniel Schunk (University of Mannheim) and Joachim Winter investigated the relationship between risk preferences, loss aversion and behavior in a search experiment. They find that there is no evidence for a relationship between risk preferences and search behavior, however loss aversion significantly predicts search behavior. Based on this finding, a descriptive model for search behavior is developed.

The third paper, “Quality Adjustment, the Assignment f-Core and the Non-Existence of the General Competitive Equilibrium” by Tomomi Tanaka (University of Hawaii), Charles Plott and Matthew Jones experimentally compares competing theories in a general equilibrium setting with vertical differentiation. The results provide support for finite core models over models of general competitive equilibrium.

The fourth paper, “A Theory of Leadership Based on Assignment of Information” by Mana Komai (Washington and Lee University) and Mark Stegeman was behavioral rather than experimental. The authors develop a model of leadership in which leaders have access to information that followers do not. They show conditions under which this asymmetric information setting can increase efficiency over the complete-information institution.

Labor Markets: Gender and Nationality

The third session examined issues in labor and employment. In the first paper, “Do Immigrants Benefit from

an Increase in the Minimum Wage Rate? An Analysis by Immigrant Industry Concentration” Kalena Cortes (Princeton University) examines the impact of the 1997 minimum wage increase on immigrant workers. She compares the effect of the increase on wages in industries with high and low intensity of immigrants. The results indicate that while wages of immigrant workers do indeed change as the minimum wage changes, this change is not statistically different from that experienced by native workers.

The second paper, “Gender Differences in Central Tendency, Variability and Tails of the Earnings Distribution” by Spyros Kostantopoulos (Northwestern University) and Amelie Constant (IZA) uses data from High School and Beyond and other sources to investigate gender and racial differences in pay, controlling for education, occupation and marital status. The authors investigate both average wages and the variability of wages in the different subpopulations. They find no significant differences either in means or in variances with appropriate controls.

The third paper, “Gender Discrimination in Promotion: The Case of the Spanish Labor Market” by Jose Andres Fernandez Cornejo (Universidad Complutense de Madrid), Rocio Albert and Lorenzo Escot uses a unique survey of Spanish professionals. This survey captures not only wages, but responsibilities, span of control, and a number of other variables not typically available. The paper provides the first evidence of a glass ceiling in the Spanish labor market; the gender balance changes substantially as one moves up in the organization.

Finally, “Human Development Evidence and the Status of Women” by Kruti Dholakia (University of Texas at Dallas) proposes a new measure of gender human development that better captures the gender inequity within developing countries. The paper demonstrates weaknesses of the previously-used measure of gender human development (in particular, it is almost perfectly correlated with human development more generally) and argues that the new measure is more robust and better able to distinguish between countries where gender imbalances exist and those where they do not.

Issues in Economic Education

Our final session was organized by KimMarie McGoldrick and covered a number of questions about economic education. Andrea L. Ziegert served as chair of this session.

The first presentation was “Effectively Moderating Electronic Discussions” by Steve DeLoach and Steve

Greenlaw. This paper (building off of previous work of the authors on using electronic discussions to teach critical thinking in economics) develops strategies to effectively structure and moderate electronic discussions. They demonstrate that the primary job of the moderator is to insure that the discussion is continually making progress towards more advanced critical thinking. A moderator's comments should focus only on helping students make the transitions associated with increasing cognitive complexity rather than leading them to pre-determined "answers." To accomplish this, the moderator must have well-defined goals in mind for these discussions, goals that are appropriate given the level of the class within the curriculum.

The second paper, "Student Quantitative Literacy: Importance, Measurement, and Correlation with Economic Literacy" by Robert Burrus and Peter Schuhmann investigated important influences of quantitative skills on economic literacy. The authors find that students majoring in economics leave principles courses with a higher level of economic literacy than students majoring in other subjects. Students who had already taken microeconomics showed greater economic literacy compared to students entering their first microeconomics course, yet students in the first microeconomics course learned more economics than did students who were in macroeconomics and had already taken microeconomics. Generally, the results show that quantitative literacy is a very important determinant of economic literacy and learning.

Finally, Gail Hoyt and KimMarie McGoldrick presented "Gender Differences in Media Exposure, Economic Knowledge, and Attitudes about Economics." This paper investigated the relationship between the degree of media exposure (for a variety of media sources) and both attitudes towards and knowledge of economics. General results suggest evidence of learning over the semester for principles of economics students, but that the magnitude was small. In addition, student attitudes about economics become more pronounced (both negatively and positively) as the semester progresses. Gender differences were noted for level of economic knowledge (women had less economic background and thus lower levels of initial knowledge), attitudes towards the subject (women were more likely to agree with negative statements after an economics course whereas men were more likely to agree with more positive and more negative statements) and the types of media that students are exposed to (males are more inclined to use the internet and women were more inclined to listen to the radio).

KimMarie McGoldrick also organized and ran the

first regional mentoring workshop for untenured faculty directly after the meetings (February 21-22). The workshop was extremely successful and valued by the participants. Keep an eye out for future workshop announcements on www.cswep.org.

I would like to conclude by thanking the paper presenters and discussants for sharing their research and thoughts with us, and Simone Wegge and KimMarie McGoldrick for organizing their sessions and the mentoring workshop. It was a great pleasure to meet these outstanding researchers. I hope to see you at next year's EEA meetings.

Summary of the Midwest Economic Association Meeting March 19-21, 2004

Session Title: Issues in Gender and Migration

Session Organizer: Catalina Amuedo-Dorantes (San Diego State University)

The CSWEP session on issues in gender and migration included four papers, "Are There Gender Differences in Immigrant Labor Market Outcomes across European Countries?" by Alicia Adsera and Barry Chiswick (University of Illinois at Chicago), "Immigrant and Business Women in Germany: Self-employment Participation and Economic Returns" by Amelie Constant (University of Pennsylvania and IZA), "Immigration and Crime" by Rita J. Simon (American University), and "Remittances and Their Impact on the Educational Attainment of Boys and Girls" by Catalina Amuedo-Dorantes (San Diego State University) and Susan Pozo (Western Michigan University). Donald Williams (Kent State University), Steve Woodbury (Michigan State University and W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research), Bob Gitter (Ohio Wesleyan University), and Annie Georges (National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University) served as discussants.

Alicia Adsera presented joint work with Barry Chiswick on gender difference in immigrant labor market outcomes across European countries. In this study, they rely on the 1994-2000 waves of the European Community Household Panel (ECHP) to conduct a systematic analysis of the earnings of immigrants as compared to native workers. In particular, they test whether there is any systematic variation in the labor market performance of immigrants across gender

related to duration in the destination, schooling, age at immigration, country of origin, or country of destination. They find a significant negative effect of immigrant status on individual earnings of around 40% at the time of arrival in the pooled sample, though somewhat smaller for women. Those differences, however, vary greatly across countries with migrants in Germany and Portugal faring the best relative to natives and those in Sweden, Denmark, Luxembourg or Spain the worst –particularly among non-EU born migrants. Gender differences are more important among those born outside the European Union, with women doing relatively better than men. By continent, Asian men followed by Latin-American and Eastern European men receive the lowest earnings. Latin-American and Eastern European women are at the bottom of the women’s distribution. On average, after 18 years of migration, earnings of immigrants revert to mean earnings of natives. Education matters more for women in terms of explaining earnings, whereas language skills are more relevant for men.

Amelie Constant uses data from the German Socioeconomic Panel (GSOEP) to examine the entrepreneurial undertaking of immigrant and native women in Germany. In particular, she first investigates the factors that affect the sorting of women into self-employment and whether these factors are different for immigrants and natives. Second, she examines whether self-employment has a differential effect on the wages of immigrant and German women that can lead them to economic success. She finds evidence of immigrant women being more likely to start up a business than their German counterparts. Furthermore, self-employed women appear to earn more than their German counterparts and more than their salaried counterparts. That is, there appears to be an assimilation effect whereby immigrant women outperform German women.

Rita J. Simon discussed some of the findings from a larger study of the criminal behavior of immigrants and natives in seven countries that historically and currently have had different policies and practices *vis a vis* immigration. The countries involved were Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain, Japan, and the United States. The data were based on the incarceration rates reported in each country. The pattern that emerged across the seven nations was that overall immigrants in the United States, Canada, and Australia –traditional immigrant receiving countries– have lower rates than natives; but immigrants in France, Germany and Japan had higher rates than natives. Great Britain is in-between immigrant nations and non-immigrant nations but closer to immigrant nations in the ratio of immigrant to native rates of incarceration. There is one offense for which immigrants have higher incarceration rates than natives: drug offenses. The universal over representation of foreigners in

incarceration rates for drug offenses may be probably due in some measure to the inclusion of sojourning foreigners (rather than immigrants) in the numerator of the incarceration rates. When immigrant and non-immigrant nations are compared on incarceration rates for violent and property crimes only, the patterns were consistent with those observed for overall incarceration rates. Immigrants in immigrant nations have lower incarceration rates relative to natives than immigrants in non-immigrant nations. She interpreted the pattern revealed in the data as suggestive of the fact that the more restrictive a nation’s immigration policy, the greater the incarceration rates of foreigners and the greater the public’s belief that immigrants increase crime rates in their country.

Finally, Susan Pozo presented joint work with Catalina Amuedo-Dorantes on remittances and children’s education in the Dominican Republic in which they add to the literature on the impact of remittances by considering how these income flows influence investments in education. In particular, they pay special attention to the differential impact of remittance flows on the distribution of educational investments by gender and order of birth. Their results indicate that remittances do have significant impacts on educational investments in children residing in the Dominican Republic. Remittances do increase the educational attainment of school-aged children in the Dominican Republic, lending support to the liquidity hypothesis. However, remittances do not seem to have a statistically significant impact on the likelihood that school-age children are schooled. The finding that educational attainment increases with remittances but does not increase the probability of schooling suggests that the lifting of the liquidity constraint only benefits children who are already in school. Additionally, they find that remittances seem to have an impact on the distribution of the human capital investment among children depending on their gender and birth order. Girls and the later-born get a bigger share of the benefits of remittances receipts insofar as education is concerned. This suggests an evening-out of educational resources with remittances consistent with the notion that “social remittances,” which are transferred along with monetary remittances, may also impact long-standing cultural patterns of investment in human capital.

Session Title: Economics of Migration

Session Organizer: Lisa Barrow (Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago)

The CSWEP session on the economics of migration included three papers “The Occupational Assimilation of Hispanics in the U.S.: Evidence from Panel Data” by Maude Toussaint-Comeau (Federal Reserve Bank of

Chicago), “International Migration, Human Capital, and Entrepreneurship: Evidence from Philippine Households with Members Working Overseas” by Dean Yang (University of Michigan), and “Rural Labor Migration in China and Its Impact on Rural Households” by Liu Yang (University of Chicago). Kusum Mundra (San Diego State University), Gabriella Bucci (DePaul University), and Adeline Delavande (Northwestern University) served as discussants.

Toussaint-Comeau uses the Panel Study of Income Dynamics from 1990 to 1993 to examine labor market assimilation of Hispanic immigrants in terms of occupation. She constructs a Nam-Powers index of socioeconomic status score for occupations in order to summarize the categorical occupation data in a single measure. Toussaint-Comeau finds that over time, the occupational gap between Hispanic immigrants and non-Hispanic whites and U.S.-born Hispanics narrows and that the rate of assimilation is faster for individuals with higher levels of education. However, among Mexican and Puerto Rican immigrants with low educational attainment, she finds very little occupational assimilation, regardless of how long they have been in the country.

D. Yang makes use of the Asian financial crisis to identify how changes in economic opportunities of overseas workers affect Philippine households. Because Filipino overseas workers work in a large number of foreign countries, Philippine households experienced heterogeneity in the size of the exchange rate shocks faced by their migrant workers. D. Yang uses panel data combined with this exogenous shock size to identify the effect of the economic shock on a variety of household outcomes. He finds that households receiving a more favorable shock experienced larger increases in household income, increased numbers of workers overseas, increased educational spending, improved child schooling, and decreased child labor. He also finds that households with more favorable exchange rate shocks increased hours worked in self-employment and had larger absolute changes (increases and decreases) in entrepreneurial income suggesting that a favorable shock enabled households to engage in riskier entrepreneurial activities.

Finally, L. Yang examines rural-urban migration in China estimating the likelihood of migration based on rural household characteristics and how the migration of rural laborers to more urban areas has affected rural households. She finds that household size increases migration probability and that there are large differences in the probability of migration across geographic areas. Importantly, she finds that the migration of rural labor has a relatively small effect on total grain output (a decline of less than 2 percent) while net household income increases by 16 percent due to high urban wage rates and low marginal product of labor in farming.

Western Economic Association Meeting

CSWEP will sponsor two sessions at the Western Economic Association Meetings to be held in Vancouver, BC, June 29- July 3, 2004.

Session 1, “Early Childhood and Public Policy,” will be chaired by Elizabeth Cascio, University of California, Davis

- Paper 1: “Schooling Attainment and the Introduction of Kindergartens in the South” Elizabeth Cascio, University of California, Davis
- Paper 2: “Getting Inside the Black Box of Head Start Quality: What Matters and What Doesn’t?” Janet Currie, UCLA and Matthew Neidell, University of Chicago
- Paper 3: “Inequality in Preschool Education and School Readiness,” Katherine Magnuson, Columbia University, Marcia K. Meyers, University of Washington, Christopher J. Ruhm, UNC Greensboro and NBER, and Jane Waldfogel, Columbia University
- Paper 4: “Caring for Young Children: Inequality in the Cost Burden of Child Care” Dan T. Rosenbaum, UNC Greensboro, and Christopher J. Ruhm, UNC Greensboro and NBER

Discussants: TBA

Session 2, “Family Economics,” will be chaired by Lucie Schmidt, Williams College

- Paper 1: “Love At What Price? Estimating the Value of Marriage,” Stacy Dickert-Conlin, Syracuse University, Michael Conlin, Syracuse University, and Melissa Koenig, Social Security Administration
- Paper 2: “Adolescent Claims and Contributions,” Jennifer Romich, University of Washington
- Paper 3: “Effects of Increased Access to Infertility Treatment on Infant Health Outcomes: Evidence from Twin Births” Marianne Bitler, RAND
- Paper 4: “Effects of Infertility Insurance Mandates on Fertility,” Lucie Schmidt, Williams College

Discussants: Kevin Milligan, University of British Columbia; Siwan Anderson, University of British Columbia; Jennifer Ward-Batts, Claremont McKenna College; David Loughran, RAND

CeMENT: Mentoring for Junior Faculty
The Second of Four Regional Workshops
November 19-20, 2004
New Orleans, LA

CSWEP is pleased to announce the second of four regional mentoring workshops directed at economists in the pre-tenure phase. The workshop will be held from November 19–20, 2004 directly before the Southern Economic Association (SEA) Regional Meeting in New Orleans November 21–23, 2004. While the workshops are timed to coincide with the SEA, applicants do not need to register for the SEA meeting in order to participate, and applications are welcome from individuals in all parts of the country.

CSWEP has received funding from the NSF to run a series of mentoring workshops to help junior economists overcome the tenure hurdle, with a special focus on addressing the unique challenges that women face at the beginning of their careers. Funding comes jointly from the ADVANCE panel and the Economics panel of the NSF. Regional workshops are aimed at helping junior faculty in institutions where tenure is based on teaching, research and service. (National workshops, on the other hand, are designed for faculty whose institutions promote primarily on research and publication. The next national workshop will be held in conjunction with the ASSA meetings in January 2006.) CSWEP held the first regional workshop after the Eastern Economic Association meetings in February. Here's what a few participants had to say about their experiences:

Junior faculty benefit from the CeMENT workshop in many ways. First, the content of the sessions and reference materials provided are very helpful, particularly in the area of research. Second, the workshop provides many opportunities to meet successful people, particularly women. Junior women can learn a lot from senior women in a variety of areas—everything from how to handle a negative referee's report to the suggestion of hiring a cleaning service to free up some time in our lives! Third, the workshop provides junior faculty with an instant support group of people with similar research and teaching interests. Members of my research group send e-mails on a monthly basis, and we are planning sessions for two future meetings.

Lisa Jepson
University of Northern Iowa

What aspect of the workshop was most beneficial to you? 1. Tips! I have lists of things that I should be saving for my tenure file, ways to get my name out there, strategies that will help me get published, get tenure, and stay sane in the process. 2. The biggest realization for me is that although there is uncertainty surrounding tenure requirements, I need to ask questions. Within days of the conference, I was already discussing what I need to do with other members of my department. Everyone should be so lucky as to participate in this conference. It's an eye-opening and extremely positive experience.

Gwendolyn Alexander
Fordham

The most beneficial aspect [of the workshop] was the nature of the answers I received from the senior faculty members. There was no circumventing the questions. For instance, if I asked, how many hours I should spend on doing such and such. The answer was x hours, not "well, that differs from person to person, do what you are most comfortable with..." In other words, there were real solutions to all the problems. This workshop was probably the most important thing that has happened in my career so far (okay, I'm not tenured yet). I consult the notes that I took during the workshop over and over again.

Tinni Sen
VMI

This workshop is aimed at faculty whose institutions value a balance of teaching, research and service. The focus of the sessions will be on developing participants into successful teacher/scholars and we will spend as much time on enhancing teaching and service activities as we will on discussing research.

Participants are arranged into small groups based on their teaching/research interests and interact with each other and with senior (tenured) faculty mentors. The workshop schedule includes small group interaction, where group members and mentors discuss and offer feedback on the participants' teaching and research activities. Topics addressed at the first workshop include:

- How to develop and improve teaching activities
- How to combine teaching and research interests
- How to attend a conference and network
- How to revise a paper (referees and editors)
- How to write a grant
- How to develop a tenure portfolio
- How to balance: work and family; teaching, research and service

The deadline for application is September 7, 2004. For information on how to apply see: www.cswep.org

ELAINE BENNETT RESEARCH PRIZE

The Elaine Bennett Research Prize is awarded every other year to recognize, support, and encourage outstanding contributions by young women in the economics profession. The next award will be presented in January 2005.

The prize is made possible by contributions from William Zame and others, in memory of Elaine Bennett, who made significant contributions in economic theory and experimental economics and encouraged the work of young women in all areas of economics.

Nominees should be at the beginning of their career but have demonstrated exemplary research contributions in their field.

Nominations should contain the candidate's CV, relevant publications, a letter of nomination and two supporting letters. The letters of the nomination and supporting letters should describe the candidate's research and its significance. Nominations will be judged by a committee appointed by CSWEP.

Inquiries, nominations and donations may be sent to:
 Francine D. Blau, CSWEP Chair
 Cornell University
 School of Industrial and Labor Relations
 265 Ives Hall
 Ithaca, NY 14853-3901
 607-255-2438
 CSWEP@cornell.edu

The Nomination Deadline is September 15, 2004.

CAROLYN SHAW BELL AWARD

The Carolyn Shaw Bell Award was created in January 1998 as part of the 25th Anniversary celebration of the founding of CSWEP. Carolyn Shaw Bell, the Katharine Coman Chair Professor Emerita of Wellesley College, was the first Chair of CSWEP. The Carolyn Shaw Bell Award ("Bell Award") is given annually to an individual who has furthered the status of women in the economics profession, through example, achievements, increasing our understanding of how women can advance in the economics profession, or mentoring others. Professor Bell wrote in the 25th Anniversary Newsletter, in the Fall of 1997, the following:

"We need every day to herald some woman's achievements, to tout a woman's book or painting or scholarly article, to brag about a promotion or prize and to show admiration for the efforts and influence of women, in their professional and technical and social and human endeavors of all kinds."

In the spirit of these words, the award requires that the traveling plaque be displayed prominently in a public place in the winner's local area so that others can see the achievements of the winner.

Inquiries, nominations and donations may be sent to:

Francine D. Blau, CSWEP Chair
Cornell University
School of Industrial and Labor Relations
265 Ives Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-3901
607-255-2438
cswep@cornell.edu

The Nomination Deadline is September 15, 2004.

The Establishment of China's Women Economists Network (CHWEN)

CSWEP is pleased to announce the creation of China's Women Economists Network (CHWEN) during the 3rd China Economic Annual Conference held in Shanghai, China, December 20-21, 2003. CHWEN's mission is to improve the status of women economists and contribute to gender research in China.

The idea for CHWEN developed out of the first research training and mentoring program for Chinese young women economists, which was held during May 2002 in Peking University with the sponsorship of Ford Foundation. Fifteen young women economists from universities and research institutes across China

attended the program. Under the guidance of renowned economists from both China and overseas, these women have further strengthened their research capability. As a result, the young economists felt a strong need to establish a network for better communication and information sharing, as well as cooperation and capacity building.

CHWEN would like to develop contact with networks of women economists from other parts of the world, such as CSWEP and the Canadian Women Economists Network (CWEN). If you are interested in connecting with CHWEN, please contact the General Secretary of the Executive Committee, Professor Yaohui Zhao at yzhao@ccer.pku.edu.cn.

HOW TO BECOME A CSWEP ASSOCIATE

2004 Donation Amount is \$25.00

OPTION 1: ONLINE PAYMENT BY CREDIT CARD

Go to www.cswep.org/howto.htm and follow the "Online Donation by Credit Card" link. It's quick, convenient and secure. We accept Mastercard, Visa and American Express.

OPTION 2: MAIL/FAX

If you prefer to mail or fax your donation, or you are a student member and no donation is requested, fill out the form below and send it to the address at the bottom.

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 (please make check payable to CSWEP)

credit card (MasterCard/Visa/Amex)

Credit card number: _____

Name as it appears on the credit card: _____

Expiration date: _____ Authorizing signature: _____

send to:
CSWEP, c/o Joan Haworth, Ph.D.
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL
32303

FAX: (850) 562-3838

We rely on your contributions to help support CSWEP activities. In addition to publishing this 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 year (January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004) we urge you to do so. Thank you for your support.

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
cswep@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:

Ann Owen

Economics Department
Hamilton College
Clinton, NY 13323
aowen@hamilton.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:

Lori Kletzer

Department of Economics
204 Social Sciences
1 University of California
1156 High Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
lkletzer@ucsc.edu

CeMENT: Mentoring for Junior Faculty

The Second of Four Regional Workshops

November 19-20, 2004

New Orleans, LA

See page 18 for details.

Upcoming Regional Meetings

Eastern Economic Association

<http://www.iona.edu/eea/>

2005 Annual Meeting: March 4-6, 2005

New York City: Sheraton New York Hotel and Towers

CSWEP submission date: November 1, 2004

EEA submission date: November 12, 2004.

Midwest Economics Association

<http://web.grinnell.edu/mea>

2005 Annual Meeting: March 11-13, 2005

Milwaukee: Hilton Milwaukee City Center

CSWEP submission date: September 15, 2004

MEA submission date: October 3, 2004

Western Economic Association

<http://www.weainternational.org/>

2004 Annual Meeting June 29-July 3, 2004

Vancouver, British Columbia: Sheraton Wall Centre

2005 Annual Meeting June 29-July 3, 2005

San Francisco: San Francisco Marriott

CSWEP submission date: TBA

WEA submission date: TBA

Southern Economic Association

<http://www.etnetpubs.com/conferenceprograms/sea/>

2004 Annual Meeting November 21-23, 2004

New Orleans: Fairmont Hotel

CSWEP submission date: June 15, 2004

SEA submission date: April 1, 2004.



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