



American Economic Association

1985 Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

Barbara R. Bergmann (Chair) Department of Economics
University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742

NEWSLETTER

ALETA ASLANI STYERS, EDITOR
(609) 639-4736

Winter, 1985

Is Forbidding Discrimination Inefficient?.....	1
Annual Report.....	2
Financial Aid.....	8
Calls for Papers.....	9
Midwest Economic Association Meetings.....	10
Eastern Economic Association Meetings.....	11
Making a Name for Yourself.....	12
Sexual Harrassment.....	14
Grants.....	15
Second International Interdisciplinary Congress on Women.....	16
Equal Pay for Equal Work in the EEC.....	17
Student Paper Award.....	18

IS FORBIDDING DISCRIMINATION INEFFICIENT?

Do laws forbidding discrimination reduce allocative efficiency? A common thread in economists' discussions of equal opportunity laws has been a presumption that equal pay and/or quota constraints placed on firms act as transfer mechanisms which, as a rule, cause efficiency losses.

Shelly J. Lundberg and Richard Startz present (June 1983) American Economic Review a model of statistical discrimination and examine the effects of prohibiting group-specific treatment of workers on both net social product and the distribution of income. The model assumes competitive firms who pay wages equal to the expected value of a worker's marginal product, conditional upon all information available to them. Each

worker is characterized by a level of innate ability, and by affiliation with one of two groups. Firms are able to assess the marginal product of one group more reliably than the second schedules. The main result is that the allocation achieved by rational agents in this labor market can be improved by prohibiting discrimination based on group membership.

Reprinted from the CWAE Newsletter
editors: Deb Brown and Edna Loehman

CSWEP SESSIONS DECEMBER 1985 AEA MEETING

* * * * *

Do you have a paper you would like to deliver at one of the CSWEP Sessions at the N. Y. AEA Meeting, December 1985? If so, send an abstract to:

Barbara R. Bergmann, Dept. of
Economic, Univ. of Maryland,
College Park, MD 20742



American Economic Association

1984 Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

BARBARA R. BERGMANN (Chair)
 Department of Economics
 University of Maryland
 College Park, MD 20742
 301-454-4181

LOURDES BENERIA
 Department of Economics
 Rutgers University
 Winants Hall
 New Brunswick, NJ 08903
 201-932-7252

BERNADETTE CHACHERE
 Department of Economics
 School of Business
 Hampton Institute
 Hampton, VA 23668
 804/727-5764

MARY FISH
 College of Commerce and
 Business Administration
 University of Alabama
 University, AL 35486
 205-348-7842, 3

SHARON B. MEGDAL
 Department of Economics
 University of Arizona
 Tucson, AZ 85721
 602-621-6224

JOSEPH A. PECHMAN
 Brookings Institution
 1775 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
 Washington, DC 20036
 202-797-6110

CORDELIA W. REIMERS
 Department of Economics
 Hunter College
 New York, NY 10021
 212-772-5444

NANCY D. RUGGLES
 Yale University
 100 Prospect Street
 New Haven, CT 06511
 203-436-8583

ALETA A. STYERS
 AT&T Technologies
 222 Broadway, Ninth Floor
 New York, NY 10038
 212/669-2932

MICHELLE J. WHITE
 Department of Economics
 University of Michigan
 Ann Arbor, MI 48109
 313/764-2355

GAIL R. WILINSKY
 Project Hope
 Millwood, VA 22646
 703/837-2100

ex-officio, AEA President:
CHARLES L. SCHULTZE
 Brookings Institution
 1775 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
 Washington, DC 20036
 202/797-6295

Membership Secretary:
JOAN G. HAWORTH
 4901 Tower Court
 Tallahassee, FL 32303
 904/562-1211

ANNUAL REPORT 1984 COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE ECONOMICS PROFESSION

Women continue to increase their representation in the economics profession, but the rapid entry of young women occurring in other elite professions is not yet evident in economics. In 1983-84, the group of economics departments that grant most of the Ph.D.'s (the so-called Chair's Group) reported that 16 percent of their doctorates went to women. While this is an advance from the levels of the 1970's, it is below the proportion of women among newly trained lawyers (32 percent in 1980-81), physicians (25 percent) and chemical engineers (19 percent). Among undergraduates, the proportion of mathematics majors who are women (43 percent) exceeds the proportion of economics majors who are women (32 percent).

The economics profession continues to appear as inhospitable to women. Surely a major factor in the perpetuation of this image in the minds of today's students is the fact that many academic departments continue to be 100 percent male in their senior ranks. Some departments are 100 percent male in their entirety. In 1983-84, the situation with respect to the senior ranked positions was:

	Number of departments	Number of women above rank of Asst. Prof.	At least this many departments with no women above Asst.Prof.:
Chair's Group	41	22	19
Other Ph.D. granting depts.	34	21	13
Depts. granting MA only	46	27	19
Depts. granting BA only	189	49	140

The 41 departments of the Chair's group who reported on the composition of their their faculties to the annual American Economic Association survey, employed altogether 22 women as Full Professor or Associate Professor. We can deduce from this that at least 19, and surely more than half of them had not a single woman above the rank of Assistant Professor.

Promotions for women within departments are less frequent than for men, given their representation in junior faculty positions (See Table 1). What is perhaps just as damaging is the fact that the ability of women to move from one school to a senior position in another school appears to be virtually nil. Of the 34 economists hired for senior positions by the departments of the Chair's group, only 1 was a woman. In all departments throughout the country, only 2 women made such a move.

In part to promote the visibility of women economists already in academic positions, CSWEP compiles and publishes a list of women faculty members at institutions which grant graduate degrees in economics. The women economists on that list should be prime candidates for recruitment by other academic departments. In the coming year, we will continue to update this list, so that it will be of greater use to economics departments who want to recruit women to their senior positions. Another project currently under examination for feasibility is the publication of a bibliography of women economists' scholarly publications, based on the Journal of Economic Literature.

We also plan to begin compiling lists of departments with no women faculty on senior levels or no women faculty at any level. In future years those lists should grow shorter and shorter, as more and more departments implement plans to end their exclusively male composition.

FEW WOMEN RESEARCHERS AFFILIATED WITH THE NATIONAL BUREAU

One of the most important functions of CSWEP is to campaign for the inclusion of women economists in all of the important activities in which professional economists are engaged. For almost a decade, the leadership of CSWEP has been particularly concerned with the situation at the National Bureau of Economic Research, where women have been largely excluded. This November, the present Chair of CSWEP and the two previous Chairs signed a long letter to NBER President Martin Feldstein. In part, the letter said:

November 20, 1984

Dr. Martin Feldstein, President
National Bureau of Economic Research
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dear Dr. Feldstein:

We at CSWEP are concerned about the low level of representation of women in the activities of the NBER. Currently only 6 of 170 Bureau research associates are women (2.8%), a level which has not shown any tendency to increase over the years since you became President. Yet the Bureau conducts research in a number of fields of applied economics in which women economists are active. We are concerned that the Bureau's low representation of women, combined with its steadily growing size and command over research funds, is increasingly putting younger women economists at a disadvantage relative to male economists in the same fields who have Bureau affiliations. We would like to urge you to take concrete measures to change this situation and we want to provide whatever help and guidance we can.

Obviously, membership in one of the NBER's permanent research programs provides tremendous benefits to younger academics.... Despite the substantial benefit from belonging to one of these programs, there appears to be no formal selection procedure that would ensure that the best researchers in each field are represented. Most research associates/fellows appear to be either former students of directors or senior research associates of that group or junior faculty at a few leading universities. Apparently no attempt is made to publicize these positions or to allow outsiders to apply. Due to the extent that women are not part of the "old-boy network" linking the Bureau research associates, they are effectively eliminated from the pool of potential associates...

What can be done to remedy this situation? We have several suggestions.

First, many male economists were brought into Bureau association because they were either Ph.D. students of Bureau project directors (or other Bureau research associates) or were junior faculty members in the University departments where Bureau project directors teach. Therefore, one way that we advocate for bringing in more women researchers is for all NBER project directors and research associates to review their Ph.D. students of the last five years and the recent women hires in their departments and to consider bringing in any interested and qualified women economists who have been passed over. If, on the other hand, on doing this they find that they have

had no women Ph.D. students over the past five years, then perhaps they should ask themselves why not and consider seriously whether they have been practicing unconscious sex discrimination in selection of thesis students. If they find that their women Ph.D. students are unqualified or uninterested, then they should consider whether they have been consciously or unconsciously discouraging women from entering academics or from working in fields that would be of interest to the Bureau.

Second, some procedure should be set up to allow "outsiders" to apply for positions as NBER research fellows in each group. Since the group of research associates/research fellows is by invitation only, it provides little opportunity for women to gain entry, since the NBER's project directors and other senior researchers have been very unlikely in the past to bring them in. This means that women economists are likely to be excluded by virtue of the selection process even if they are part of the pool of distinguished economists working in areas of interest to the Bureau.

We await your reply and, again, offer our help and guidance as you consider what concrete measures would be best adopted to rectify this situation.

Sincerely,

Barbara Bergmann
Professor of Economics
University of Maryland
and
Chair, CSWEP

Elizabeth Bailey
Dean, Graduate School of
Industrial Administration
Carnegie-Mellon University
and
Former Chair, CSWEP

Ann Friedlaender
Dean and Professor of Economics
School of Humanities and Social Sciences
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
and
Former Chair, CSWEP

REPRESENTATION AT ANNUAL MEETINGS

Any process of professional selection that is informal, and whose details are only known or understood by a relatively small in-group are disadvantageous to women, who benefit less frequently than men from sponsorship by more established members of the profession. The process by which sessions at the AEA annual meetings are organized and papers invited has been one of these little-understood processes. Formally speaking, the President-elect does the inviting; in practice many volunteers communicate to him or her their desire to participate, and it is out of these submissions that a considerable part of the program is in fact assembled with the help of referees.

We at CSWEP will continue to urge that the selection procedures for the annual meetings be made more formal and more public. While there is an understandable interest in having the profession's (mostly male) celebrities on parade at the meetings, we would urge procedures which give a better representation to innovative research from the less well connected members of the profession, women among them. In the meantime, through the newsletter we are urging women economists to submit proposals for session or individual papers to the President-elect.

RESEARCH ON GENDER-RELATED TOPICS

CSWEP has been concerned to encourage and foster research on gender roles in the economy and related policy issues, and to make sure that women economists and points of view sensitive to the special problems many women face under current economic institutions are well represented in the field. To this end, we continue to sponsor sessions on these topics at the AEA and regional meetings. In November 1984, CSWEP jointly with the Brookings Institution sponsored a conference on Gender Issues in the Workplace, arranged by Clair Brown and Joseph Pechman.

As research proceeds and interest rises, courses on the economics of gender roles are being offered at an increasing number of schools. At least three new textbooks are in the works. A number of economics departments are specifically looking to recruit a specialist in gender-related topics, and individual economists are "coming out" as specialists in the field.

COMMITTEE OPERATION

We wish to thank Gail Wilensky and Nancy Ruggles, whose terms on the Committee expires this year. Gratitude is also due to Aleta Styers, who continues to bear the time-consuming editorial duties on the Newsletter with relative fortitude, and to Joan Haworth, who serves as Membership Secretary. New Committee members for 1985 are Helen Junz of the IMF and Karen Davis of the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health.

Barbara R. Bergmann
Chair, Committee on the Status of
Women in the Economics Profession

TABLE 1 - DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME FACULTY, BY TYPE
OF INSTITUTION - ACADEMIC YEAR 1983-84

	<u>Chair's Group</u>			<u>Other Ph.D.</u>			<u>Only M.A. Departments</u>			<u>Only B.A. Departments</u>		
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Female No.</u>	<u>Per- cent</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Female No.</u>	<u>Per- cent</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Female No.</u>	<u>Per- cent</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Female No.</u>	<u>Per- cent</u>
Existing												
Professor	605	15	2.5	313	11	3.5	227	11	4.8	335	25	7.5
Associate	242	17	7.0	200	10	5.0	183	16	8.7	279	24	8.6
Assistant	315	32	10.2	205	29	14.1	158	27	17.1	346	57	16.5
Instructor	37	4	10.8	40	13	32.5	35	13	37.1	92	22	23.9
Other	39	9	23.1	21	1	4.8	27	13	48.1	40	1	2.5
New Hires												
Professor	24	1	4.2	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Associate	10	0	0	4	0	0	3	0	0	3	1	33.3
Assistant	60	8	13.3	35	5	14.3	34	1	2.9	63	14	22.2
Instructor	19	2	10.5	14	2	14.3	14	3	21.4	42	12	28.6
Other	3	2	66.7	8	0	0	2	1	50.0	8	1	12.5
Promoted to Rank (1982-83)												
Professor	21	1	4.8	15	1	6.7	9	0	0	29	3	10.3
Associate	25	2	8.0	18	3	16.7	15	1	6.7	32	6	18.8
Assistant	1	0	0	4	2	50	1	0	0	14	2	14.3
Tenured at Rank (1982-83)												
Professor	1	0	0	9	0	0	1	0	0	8	2	25.0
Associate	12	2	16.7	28	3	10.7	15	1	6.7	22	5	22.7
Assistant	1	0	0	4	0	0	4	3	75.0	18	1	5.6
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not Rehired												
Professor	29	0	0	20	1	5.0	9	1	11.1	7	0	0
Associate	9	0	0	11	1	9.1	5	1	20.0	6	1	16.7
Assistant	40	7	17.5	20	1	5.0	26	4	15.38	35	6	17.1
Instructor	10	2	20.0	10	2	20.0	10	3	30.0	19	3	15.7
Other	8	0	0	2	1	50.0	0	0	0	6	0	0

PSEW News Release

For Immediate Release
December 1984

Contact: Julie Kuhn Ehrhart
(202)387-1300

Updated Financial Aid Resource Helps Women Students Pay for College

There are literally millions of dollars of financial aid scholarships, grants and loans available to students each year to help pay for their college education. A newly revised version of Financial Aid: A Partial List of Resources for Women is designed to help women learn about and obtain their fair share of these financial aid dollars. Published by the Project on the Status and Education of Women of the Association of American Colleges, the financial aid booklet details programs available to high school students applying to college; older women; minority women; women considering nontraditional careers and others at all levels of postsecondary education.

The booklet contains information on:

- the different kinds of colleges and universities;
- what types of programs are available;
- how to find out about sources of financial aid on campus and in the community;
- what to expect from the financial aid process;
- how to get credit for former courses and "life experience";
- tips on cost-cutting ways to attend school;
- a selected listing of over 80 financial aid programs, most of them geared specifically for women. They include scholarships, grants and loans offered by the federal government, private foundations and corporations, and Individual Institutions; and
- a resource section which lists over 55 books and pamphlets which are helpful in locating money for college.

"There are many financial aid dollars currently available to women students, no matter what their educational goals or financial situation," said Julie Kuhn Ehrhart, author of the booklet. "We hope the programs, resources and general advice contained in this booklet will serve as a useful starting point for women students in their search for these dollars." Financial Aid: A Partial List of Resources for Women is available for \$2.50 (prepaid) from the Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1818 R St., NW, Washington, DC 20009. Checks should be made payable to AAC/PSEW. Bulk rates are available.

Project on the Status and Education of WOMEN
Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, NW, Washington, DC 20009
(202) 387-1300

CALLS FOR PAPERS

Southern Economic Association

CSWEP WILL SPONSOR TWO SESSIONS OF THE SOUTHERN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION MEETINGS TO BE HELD IN DALLAS IN NOVEMBER, 1985. THE SESSIONS ARE:

- * COMPARABLE WORTH: THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL ANALYSES
- * GENDER DIFFERENCES REGARDING PENSIONS AND FRINGE BENEFITS WITH APPLICATIONS TO BOTH EMPLOYEES AND SPOUSES.

INDIVIDUALS INTERESTED IN PRESENTING PAPERS RELEVANT TO EITHER SESSION SHOULD SEND ABSTRACTS TO:

MARIE LOBUE
ECONOMICS & FINANCE DEPARTMENT
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70148
(504) 286-6485

Special Issue of Tourism Recreation Research

Vol. XI, No. : 2, 1986

ECONOMICS OF TOURISM

GUEST EDITOR: DR. MARY FISH
BOX J
COLLEGE OF COMMERCE AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
UNIVERSITY, ALABAMA 35486

Suggested General Topics:

Economics Impact Case Studies
Tourism and Economic Development
Tourism and Balance of Payments
Economic Multipliers and Their Applications
Characteristic of Tourist Demand
Industry Market Structures

MIDWEST ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION

ANNUAL MEETINGS

MARCH 28-30, 1985

CINCINNATI, OHIO

CSWEP SESSION

2:00 P.M. FRIDAY, MARCH 29

Topic: Labor Economics and Gender Issues

Chair: Elizabeth Clayton, University of Missouri,
St. Louis

Papers: "Measuring the Economic Impact of Comparable
Worth", A. Sue Cain, Pittsburgh State University

"Married Graduate Students: The Shared Double
Burden", Marianne A. Ferber & Helen M. Berg,
University of Illinois

"The Return to Work Following Childbirth",
William E. Even, Miami University

Discussants: Elyce Rotella, University of Indiana
Katherine Sheppard, Skidmore College
Michelle White, University of Michigan



Sylvia by Nicole Hollander,
St. Martin's Press

EASTERN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION

The Eastern Economic Association meets in Pittsburgh this spring, on March 21-23, 1985, at the Westin William Penn Hotel. CSWEP will sponsor two sessions on gender-related research, and will also hold an informal business meeting and reception.

Friday, March 22, at 3:45 p.m.:

Working Women and the Distribution of Income

Chair: Randy Albelda, Hobart and William Smith College

Papers:

Daphne Greenwood and Melanie Hart,

University of Colorado at Colorado Springs

Working Wives and the Nature of Their Contribution to Family Income

David E. Bloom and McKinley Blackburn, Harvard University

Working Women and the Decline of the American Middle Class

Nancy L. Wolff, Iowa State University

Women and the Equity of the Social Security Program

Discussants:

Arnold Katz, University of Pittsburgh

Marie Connolly, Chatham College

Elaine MacCrate, University of Massachusetts

Friday, March 22, at 5:30 p.m.: Reception and informal meeting

Saturday, March 23, at 8:00 a.m.:

Women, the Labor Force, and Household Formation

Chair: Cordelia W. Reimers, Hunter College

Papers:

Josephine E. Olson and Irene Hanson Frieze, University of Pittsburgh
The Impact of Marriage, Children and Husband's Income on the
Employment and Income of a Group of Highly Educated Women

Chuen-mei Fan, Colorado State University

A Labor-Leisure Choice Analysis of Women's Labor Participation and
the Impact of Government Income Tax Policies

Karen Leppel, University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Housemate Selection and Household Income Distribution

Discussants:

Shirley Cassing, University of Pittsburgh

Sam Myers, University of Pittsburgh

Sophia Dimelis, University of Pittsburgh

Registration material for the convention can be obtained from William F. Lott, Executive Director, Eastern Economic Association, Department of Economics, U-63, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06268. His phone is (203) 486-3885.

MAKING A NAME FOR YOURSELF

By Carolyn Shaw Bell

Katharine Coman Professor
of Economics, Wellesley College

At a recent meeting of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession, a question was raised about how women economists can join the group of those who are routinely asked to give papers, comments, be conference participants, or the like. Anyone who is a professional economist can easily accomplish this in a number of ways.

First, at the next professional meeting you attend, be sure to talk with one or more of the speakers. Pick the person whose remarks seem most cogent or pertinent to your own research. Hang around after the meeting and introduce yourself. Ask a question or come up with your own views, ask for a working paper or to be put on the subject's list of those who receive articles. You can also offer to send something of your own. In this way you can quickly establish a network of your own. Be sure, when you are getting acquainted, to use every opportunity to mention mutual acquaintances, if any exist. If you plan a few of these encounters ahead of time, it's helpful to look up the subject of your attention in the AEA directory to have some idea about fields, appointments, etc.

Second, when you have a working paper or published article of your own, write to several people and enclose it. A short note establishing some link between the recipient and the subject of your article, plus a remark along the lines of "in view of your interest in... I thought you might like to see my article. I would be most grateful for any comments." should do the trick. You won't get many replies, but you will get some, and even if you don't your name will crop up in someone's memory on a later occasion.

Third, keep an eye on Congressional hearings and their subject matter. Your documents librarian or Washington representative should be able to put you on the mailing list for announcements of hearings by those committees covering your own fields. When you hear of one to which you could contribute, pick up the phone, don't write. Talk with the staff economist of the committee or the executive officer about the contribution you can make. Offer to testify during the hearings. If there is no room for more testimony, they should ask you to send written testimony anyway. Frequently the staff are delighted to have new participants. They are under pressure to keep their witnesses from being 100 percent white males. At first you will have to pay your own expenses to Washington, but later as an invited witness your travel expenses will be picked up by the Congressional Committee. Be sure to

parlay your Washington trip into local publicity at your own university or college. The business or financial editor of your local newspaper should be interested in an item. Try the suburban papers also. Be sure to notify your own congressional representative and senator of your having testified. Send each a copy of your remarks.

Fourth, watch the press, find out about members of congress and your own state legislature, and draw up your own list of people who ought to know that you are a professional economist and what your expertise consists of. You can write each of them from time to time if you have something non-technical to enclose. Another useful ploy is to write a paragraph or two commenting on some public utterance of your subjects, demonstrating that as an economist, you can be valuable to this person. You can also testify before your state legislature or their committees if they hold hearings along the lines that are suggested above for congress. And don't forget the editorial pages of the Wall Street Journal, the New York Times, and Los Angeles Times, and your own local newspaper. Each of these should be addressed regularly, saving your best remarks for once or twice a year letters to the editors of the national papers. You could certainly send letters to the editor oftener for your local newspaper. Don't write exclusively about "women's concerns"; remember, the object of the game is to establish that you are a professional economist, not that you are a woman and, therefore, interested only in women's concerns. Don't worry, you will be regarded as an expert on women and the economy even if you are not.

Above all, remember that you are a professional and the equal of anyone in the economics profession in that sense. Just as you would be glad if someone approached you after a lecture or the appearance of one of your articles, so each of the people that you approach will be receptive. All these described methods are in common use by professional economists of both sexes and many nationalities, so if you have not yet used one of them, hurry up and start.



Sylvia © by Nicole Hollande
St. Martin's Press

SEXUAL HARRASSMENT STILL STALKS
THE HALLS OF IVY

Some excerpts on a continuing problem in the nation's colleges and universities, reprinted from "On Campus with Women," Winter 1984, a project on the Status and Education of Women conducted by the Association of American Colleges, 1818 R St., NW, Washington DC 20009

HARVARD SEXUAL
HARRASSMENT REPORT

Substantial numbers of women at Harvard University experience sexual harrassment; 32 percent of tenured female professors, 49 percent of those without tenure, 41 percent of female graduate students, and 34 percent of undergraduate women have encountered harassment in some form from a person in authority at least once while they were at the university. Although one-to-two thirds of the above figures were accounted for by looks, gestures, or verbal harassment, between three and 16 percent of the women reported more serious incidents. For example: twelve percent of tenured women professors, ten percent of non-tenured faculty, six percent of the graduate students, and three percent of the undergraduates reported that they had been subjected to pressure for sexual favors. The various incidents led 15 percent of the graduate students to change their academic programs. An overwhelming majority said they had not reported the incidents to university authorities; half of them related their failure to report incidents to fear of reprisals.

THE GUNTHER CASE:
WHAT DOES IT MEAN FOR HIGHER ED?

In "The Gunther Case, Comparable Worth, and Implications for Academe," James V. Koch, provost and vice president for academic affairs at Ball State University, discusses issues raised by this landmark decision, particularly its implications for personnel policies and the quality of faculty in colleges and universities. The case, County of Washington v. Gunther (June 1981) expanded the set of circumstances that can be used to provide legal standing to sex discrimination suits concerning salary discrepancies. The article appeared in the Educational Record, Vol. 64, No. 2, Spring 1983. Copies of this issue are available for \$7.50 from Publication Sales Dept., American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.

POSTER SHREDDER

In order to drum up the good ol' spirit for its football team, California State, Long Beach issued a poster featuring quarterback Todd Dillon flanked by a couple of leggy blonde women clasping the player's shoulder and thigh. Cries of sexism sent 4000 copies of the poster to the shredder at a cost to the school of \$3,900.

GRANTS, GRANTS, GRANTS

ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION GENDER ROLES RESEARCH

The Rockefeller Foundation announces its second year of the Program to Explore Long-Term Implications of Changing Gender Roles. The purpose of the program is to encourage attention to gender role changes through support of research projects that address the social, psychological, political and/or economic phenomena associated with the rapidly changing status of women. Projects may examine factors underlying such changes or analyze ways in which policy may respond to these changes.

Three sub-themes will be given particular emphasis: (1) changing nature of women's and men's work and family responsibilities; (2) differences in allocation of income and time between men and women within the household, and their implication for social welfare of the family, particularly the children; (3) psychological dimension of gender roles and changing patterns of socialization. Projects may address these concerns through original research or through synthesis and interpretation of research to encourage recognition in appropriate areas of public policy.

Scholars and practitioners from the social sciences, humanities, law, journalism, health and the natural sciences are eligible to apply, regardless of whether they have an academic or institutional affiliation.

Awards will be in the \$15,000-\$30,000 range. Information: Gender Roles Program, Rockefeller Foundation, 1133 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10036. Deadlines; March 15, Sept. 15.

SLOAN FELLOWSHIPS

The Sloan Foundation has a new fellowship program for young economists that finances a year off from teaching to be devoted entirely to research. Any academic economist who is non-tenured and within about 5 years since Ph.D. is eligible.

Applicants cannot apply directly but must be nominated. Any senior economist can nominate a candidate, but a department chair or someone well-known provides strongest chance for the nominee.

No women economists received fellowships in 1984-85. Informal indications are that few or none were nominated. Deadline, Sept. '85 for '86-87.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS

NAB's Grants for Research in Broadcasting are open to all academic personnel including graduate students and senior undergraduates. Awards up to \$5000. Subjects: economics of broadcasting, impact of competing technologies and other communications industry segments, current issues confronting broadcast industry.

Deadline for applications is March 1. Application forms: Dr. John D. Abel, Senior Vice President, National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N St., NW, Washington, DC 20036-2898.

SECOND INTERNATIONAL INTERDISCIPLINARY CONGRESS ON WOMEN

Groningen, The Netherlands, April 17-21, 1984

Conference program and abstracts of papers presented are available from organizing committee (Chairperson : Christine Clason, Sociologisch Instituut, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, Grote Markt 23, NL-9712 HR Groningen). Selected papers will appear in a special issue of Women's Studies International Forum.

One of the Congress sessions, entitled the INTERFACE OF FAMILY AND WORK, included papers that might be of interest to women in the economics profession. (Chair : Judith Buber Agassi, Sociological Institute, University of Lund, Sweden). A few presentations analyzed sociological or psychological aspects of this interface. Other papers dealt with women's unemployment, with women's contribution to welfare services on a voluntary (i.e. unpaid) basis, and with women's unrecorded economic activities.

The only economic session was a pre-congress workshop on the ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF UNPAID HOUSEHOLD WORK. (Organizer : Luisella Goldschmidt-Clermont, Brussels University, Institute of Sociology, Center for Economic Research). The workshop focused on data collection and evaluation methodology. Participants already involved in -or planning to undertake- economic evaluations of non-market household production, exchanged information, successful experiences and problems. Topics under review included: purposes of evaluations and their impact on methodology, population covered, field covered, economic evaluation methodology, data collection and data sources. - No papers were prepared for the workshop itself. Participants were well informed of each other's work as publications, translations of questionnaires into English, and two-page outlines describing their own research had been exchanged prior to the meeting. The discussion was constructive and fruitful, and a broad consensus emerged on methodological matters.

Participants to the workshop came from Belgium, Finland, France, Germany FR, the Netherlands and the United States. They expressed the wish to meet again in 1½ to 2 years, and to keep in touch in the mean time. A few researchers from Latin America and Asia, although interested were unable to attend; they had expressed the desire to receive publications. - It looks as if the field, namely the economic evaluation of non-market non-monetized production, could benefit from more systematic cross-fertilization. Researchers experience the need for the support and stimulation that interaction with colleagues brings about. The possibility of setting up an informal communication network is under consideration. Those interested in joining should contact Luisella Goldschmidt-Clermont, 74 rue de Versoix, F-01210 Ferney-Voltaire (France). Suggestions on how to fund the network are welcomed.

Luisella-Goldschmidt Clermont

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

Italian Women in the Lead

Twenty-five years after the signing of the Treaty of Rome calling for equal pay for equal work for men and women, women's average earnings are still below men's in almost all activities and professions in all countries of the European Economic Community. In a recent article in *The Economist* (Vol. 132, Issue 2), Dr. Athena Petraki Kottis, Professor of Economics, The Athens School of Economics and Business, Athens, Greece, reports on her study of the salaries of male and female manual workers in 70 industries in each of the six founder countries of the EEC, Germany, France, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg. Dr. Kottis wanted not only to estimate the male-female earnings differentials but to find out whether these differences were caused by differences in certain work characteristics of the two groups (women might be less skilled, have lower seniority, work fewer hours and in general have characteristics associated with lower productivity and earnings) or whether the differences were due to sexual bias against women.

When it came to average earnings of women in industry, the Italian women fared best,

with an average of .81 of the earnings of Italian men. The French women were next with .75 of the average earnings of men, German women followed with .72, Belgians with .74, Netherlands women with .71 and, way down, Luxembourg women with .59.

However, when adjustments were made for differences in work characteristics of men and women, the earnings differential disappeared for the Netherlands and became only one-third its original size for Luxembourg.

On the other hand, 81% of the Belgian male-female earnings differential, 78% in Italy, 68% in France and 46% in Germany could not be explained with differences in work characteristics of women, and were considered attributable to other factors, among them sexual prejudice appearing to be the most likely.

Where earnings differential was not the result of direct discrimination but was caused by differences in work characteristics, Dr. Kottis points out that this does not preclude discrimination, since the formation of these characteristics might have been affected by sexual prejudices. Policies aiming at achieving equality of remuneration should aim at helping women overcome certain serious obstacles affecting unfavorably the formation of their work characteristics and preventing the realization of their potentials.

BOOK ANNOUNCEMENT

Rutgers University Press announced a new series of books, the Douglass Series, which will focus on women's lives and the meaning of gender. A recent title is MY TROUBLES ARE GOING TO HAVE TROUBLE WITH ME EVERYDAY, Trials And Triumphs Of Women Workers, Karen Brodtkin Sacks and Dorothy Remy, editors.

This study of working women focuses on nonprofessional women, concentrating on the impact of technology and workplace reorganization on jobs and working conditions for women, and the fund of experience working women have developed to deal with a variety of unpleasant and exploitative working conditions.

Available from Rutgers Press, 30 College Avenue New Brunswick, N.J. 08903

WESTERN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION

JUNE 30 - JULY 4

MARRIOTT HOTEL

ANAHEIM, CALIFORNIA

WATCH FOR DETAILS ON

CSWEP COCKTAIL PARTY

WOULD YOU LIKE TO CHANGE JOBS?

CSWEP receives many notices of job openings for economists. Some of them are from employers who have a genuine interest in attracting women candidates. If you would like xerox copies of notices we have recently received, send a large (9 by 12) self-addressed envelope with 60 cents postage on it to:

Job Notices List
Committee on the Status of Women
in the Economics Profession
c/o Economics Department
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

STUDENT PAPER AWARD

Readers of the Newsletter who have commented favorably on the establishment of the CSWEP (South) student paper award will be pleased to know the award will be sponsored by CSWEP (National) starting this year. Details will appear in the next newsletter. All submissions must be sponsored, and CSWEP members who teach should start to identify students whose work is appropriate for submission.

The 1984 Winner was Carolyn A. Woj of the University of Illinois. Her paper was sponsored by Thomas S. Ulen, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, College of Commerce and Business Administration.

An abstract of the article follows on page 19. Readers with a particular interest can read the full text in the June 1985 Journal of Legal Studies [XIV (2)] .

Property Right Disputes: Current Fallacies and a New Approach

by Carolyn A. Woj

The current economic approach to the problem of conflicting property rights focuses on the level of transaction costs which would be incurred by the parties if they bargained for the right. This article directs attention to the problems incurred in utilizing the present methodology. It is found that knowledge of the level of transaction costs does not imply that one remedy is superior to the other. Furthermore, basing a choice of remedy on the level of transaction costs gives rise to inefficient results in certain cases. The efficiency loss is bounded by the level of transaction costs.

The approach taken in this paper focuses on 2 variables: the difference in the valuation of the right between the 2 parties in the dispute, and the level of transaction costs. The main guide used to analyze the problem is Ronald Coase' seminal article "The Problem of Social Cost". It is found that a value-maximizing exchange is possible if

$$(V_m - V_l) > (T_m + T_l)$$

where V_m = Value of the right to m.

V_l = Value of the right to l.

T_m = Transaction costs of m.

T_l = Transaction costs of l.

m = Person who values the right most.

l = Person who values the right least.

If the court assigns the right to l and imposes injunctive relief, the possibility of a value-maximizing exchange exists. It will only occur however, if the parties can agree on a price, P^* , such that

$$V_l + T_l < P^* < V_m - T_m \\ \text{or } V_m - V_l > T_m + T_l$$

The current economic theory assumes high transaction costs are prohibitive and low transaction costs are non-prohibitive. The above framework indicates that this supposition is incorrect. We can only determine whether transaction costs are prohibitive or non-prohibitive by looking at the level of transaction costs relative to the difference in the valuation of the right.

Choosing a remedy based on the level of transaction costs gives rise to inefficient results in two cases. The first case occurs when the court assigns the right to l and imposes injunctive relief when prohibitive transaction costs exist. The second case occurs under the damages remedy when prohibitive transaction costs exist. If the court assigns the right to l and sets damages $< V_m$, an inefficient result obtains. Similarly, if the court assigns the right to m and sets damages $< V_l$, an inefficient result occurs. If transaction costs are non-prohibitive, then a mutually beneficial exchange is possible. This leads to the conclusion that the existence of strategic bargaining does not imply that damages is the optimal form of relief. If damages are not set correctly by the courts and non-prohibitive transaction costs exist, the parties may still have to bargain to determine the gains from trade.

Utilizing the 2 variable framework presented above, the 2 remedies are evaluated by the mini-max criteria under different informational assumptions. It is found that knowledge of the level of transaction costs does not imply one remedy is superior to another.

The approach taken in this paper directed attention to the prohibitive or non-prohibitive nature of transaction costs and suggested variables on which the courts should concentrate when information on all relevant variables is limited. The focus is on which party values the right the most.