



American Economic Association

1992 Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

ELIZABETH HOFFMAN (Chair)

Department of Economics
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
602-621-6227

REBECCA M. BLANK
Department of Economics
Northwestern University
2003 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60208
708/491-3764

IVY BRODER
Department of Economics
The American University
Washington, D.C. 20016
202-885-3762

LINDA EDWARDS
Department of Economics
Queens College of CUNY
Flushing, NY 11367
718-997-5464

JO ANNA GRAY
Department of Economics
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403
503-686-4561

MARJORIE H. HONIG
Department of Economics
Hunter College
695 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10021
212-772-5400

ETHEL JONES
Department of Economics
110 Thach Hall
Auburn University, AL 36849-5242
205-844-2916

FRANK S. LEVY
School of Public Affairs
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
301-405-6341

ROGER NOEL
Department of Economics
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305
415/725-2297

JENNIFER REINGANUM
College of Business
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242
319-335-0541

LEIGH TEFATSION
Department of Economics
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011-1070
515/294-0138

BARBARA L. WOLFE
Department of Economics
University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI 53706
608/262-4030

MYRNA H. WOODERS
Department of Economics
University of Toronto
M5S 1A1, Canada
416/978-4605

ex officio AEA President
WILLIAM WICKREY
Department of Economics
Columbia University
New York, NY 10027
212-854-3677

Membership Secretary
JOAN G. HAWORTH
Economic Research Services, Inc.
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303
904/562-1211

NEWSLETTER

FALL ISSUE - October 1992

Elizabeth Hoffman, Co-editor
(602-621-6227)

Frank Levy, Co-editor
(617-253-2089)

Christina O'Bannon, Asst. Editor
(602-621-6227)

IN THIS ISSUE:

Women's Contributions to Labor Economics: Part II	...2
The Glass Ceiling	...7
Careers in Public Policy Schools	...11
Reflections on a Multi-faceted Career	...13
Should Economists Marry Economists?	...16
Biographical Sketches of CSWEP Board Members	...18
Letter to the Editor	...19
Getting on the Program at the January, 1994 AEA Meetings	...20
Summaries of CSWEP Sessions at the WEA Meetings	...21
CSWEP's 20th Anniversary at the January, 1993 AEA Meetings	...23
CSWEP at the SEA Meetings	...28
Calls for Papers	...29
News and Notes	...31
Fellowships	...33
Obituaries	...35
Jobs	...36
Membership Information	...43

**** WELCOME TO THE NEW CSWEP BOARD MEMBERS ****

Robin Bartlett (Denison)
Ann Witte (Wellesley)

WOMEN'S CONTRIBUTION TO LABOR ECONOMICS: PART II

By
Francine D. Blau
and
Marianne A. Ferber

In the first part of this article, we presented information about the representation of women in labor economics, then reviewed their contributions to the analysis of wages and wage differentials, as well as occupational segregation. In this part we first consider their work on time allocation and household decision-making, labor force attachment and unemployment. Then we examine their research on female headed families, the impact of training and the role of labor unions.

Time Allocation and Household Decision-Making

As important as are the occupations and earnings of those who are in the labor force, an even more fundamental question is the labor force participation decision itself. Women's labor force participation has risen throughout the 20th century, culminating in the dramatic increases of the post-World War II period. Gertrude Bancroft (McNally) was one of the first to concern herself with the influx of women as part of her comprehensive examination of labor force trends in the first half of the century (The American Labor Force: Its Growth and Changing Composition 1958). Spurred in part by their desire to understand the causes of the post-War trends, economists like Jacob Mincer (in Aspects of Labor Economics 1962) and Gary Becker (EJ 75 1965; JPE 82 1974) were prompted to extend the traditional theory of labor supply to incorporate household production and decision-making in a family context.

As economists turned their attention to the family, the issue arose as to how to model decision-making in this multi-person unit. The notion of family utility maximization was advanced in the early influential approaches of Paul Samuelson (QJE 70 1956) and Gary Becker (JPE 82 1974; Treatise on the Family 1981). Samuelson assumed decisions were made on the basis of consensus, something those of us who have lived in families know is not always present. Becker relied on an altruistic patriarch who maximizes family utility because he [sic] values the welfare of other family members as much as his own. Drawing on the notion of comparative advantage, Becker also emphasized the efficiency of the traditional division of labor in which the husband is the breadwinner and the wife specializes in household production.

Aspects of this approach were challenged early on by a number of female economists, including Marianne Ferber and Bonnie Birnbaum (J of Consumer Econ 4 1977) and Isabel Sawhill (Daedalus 106 1977). They claimed that it was unrealistic to assume a single family utility function in light of differences in tastes between husbands and wives. They also argued that while the traditional division of labor may have been an efficient response to conditions that prevailed in earlier times, it does not necessarily represent rational maximizing behavior today. Finally they pointed out the risks of specialization, especially for the "dependent" wife; this argument has also been emphasized more recently by Barbara Bergmann (The Economic Emergence of Women 1986).

Women have also played an important role in developing alternative analyses of the family. The bargaining models of Marilyn Manser and Murray Brown (IER 21 1980) and Marjorie McElroy and Mary Horney (IER 22 1981) recognize possible conflicts of interest between husband and wife, as well as the importance of bargaining power. In addition, in a departure from traditional Marxist views of the family, Heidi Hartmann (Signs 1 1976, pt. 2) and Nancy Folbre (Canadian J. of Econ 6 1982) offered radical analyses of the family as the instrument of patriarchy and capitalism.

Empirical examinations of labor supply have tended to accommodate family decision-making in a fairly simple way by adopting what Mark Killingsworth calls the "male chauvinist" model: "...the wife views her husband's earnings as a king of property income...when she makes labor supply decisions, whereas the husband decides on his labor supply without reference to his wife's labor supply decisions" (Labor Supply 1983, p. 30). This traditional model is less cumbersome than one in which both spouses' labor supply is jointly determined, and may yield results which fairly closely approximate reality when women tend to be secondary earners. Within this context, the growth in married women's labor force participation has been tied to a dominance of the positive substitution effect associated with increases in their own real wages over the negative income effect associated with increases in their husband's real earnings (Mincer 1962).

In her recent thorough analysis of historical changes in women's labor force participation rates from 1890 to 1980, Claudia Goldin (Understanding the Gender Gap 1990) applies this approach to extremely good effect. One of her more intriguing findings is that the conventional model overpredicts married women's labor force participation for 1930, 1940, and 1950. Goldin presents evidence that changes in participation of this group were retarded by institutional barriers such as marriage bars (rules against employing married women), as well as lack of availability of part-time work. Institutional factors of a different sort are emphasized in Clair Brown's analysis of the later rapid increase in married women's participation in which shifting social norms for consumption first allowed and then required the participation of wives to rise (in Clair Brown and Joseph Pechman, eds., Gender in the Workplace, 1987).

Recent work by Shelly Lundberg (RESTAT 70 1988) explicitly examines the nature of the interdependence between the labor supply decisions of husbands and wives. She finds that the presence of children is a crucial variable, with both spouses acting as separate individuals except when young children are present. Women have also contributed to modifying the traditional approach to take into account, for example, the effect of hours constraints on labor supply decisions (Shelly Lundberg, RESTAT 67 1985; and Shulamit Kahn and Kevin Lang, RESTAT 73 1991), and the impact of child care costs on women's labor force participation (Rachael Connelly, RESTAT 74 1992). They have also investigated the effect of cultural differences associated with race, ethnicity or nativity. For example, Cordelia Reimers (AER 75 1985) contrasts participation rates of immigrants and natives while Phyllis Wallace, Linda Datcher-(Loury), and Julianne Malveaux (Black Women in the Labor Force 1980) consider black-white differences.

While the most dramatic shift in labor force participation in the post-World War II period has been the large rise in female participation, there has also been a notable, though smaller, decline

in the participation of men. Women economists have helped to elucidate the source of this shift as well. Much of the decline in overall participation rates has been due to the large decrease in the participation rates of older males. Women who have studied the impact of social security and pensions on the labor supply decisions of these older workers include Marjorie Honig, Cordelia Reimers, and Olivia Mitchell (Giora Hanoch and Marjorie Honig, JOLE 2 1984). There has also been a smaller decrease in the participation of prime aged males. Research by Robert Haveman and Barbara Wolfe (JPE 92 1984) found that the expansion of the Social Security Disability Insurance program can account for only a small portion of this reduction. Recent work by Chinhui Juhn (QJE 107 1992) suggests that, while supply-side factors may have been important in explaining the initial decline from the late 1960s to the early 1980s, the main explanation since then is declining market opportunities (i.e., declining real wages), particularly for less-educated men.

Labor Force and Job Attachment

Given the importance of job tenure and labor market experience in explaining gender differences in labor market outcomes, it is not surprising that considerable attention has focused on issues related to labor force and job attachment. Alice Nakamura and Masao Nakamura (The Second Pay Check, 1985) find that the behavior of career women differs from those who enter the labor force chiefly in order to smooth family income, while Rebecca Blank (AER 79 1989) found that women do little switching among full-time, part-time and nonwork status. A study by Jacob Klerman and Arleen Leibowitz (AER 80 1990) highlights the positive effect of the expected level of child care tax credits on the likelihood of a mother returning to work within 3 months of her first child's birth. Recent research indicates that the labor force attachment of women has been increasing, particularly among the highly educated (M. Anne Hill AER 80 1990; and Audrey Light and Manuelita Ureta AER 80 1990).

Research on gender differences in quitting suggests that, although women have higher average quit rates than men, at the same level of personal and job characteristics women are no more likely to quit their jobs than men (Francine Blau and Lawrence Kahn ILRR 34 1981). Moreover, average female quit rates have declined over successive cohorts; and for workers born after the early 1950s (but not their predecessors), nonquitters can be identified by employers equally well among men and women (Audrey Light and Manuelita Ureta, JOLE 10 1992).

Women have also shed light on other issues related to turnover. For example, Ann Bartel's (AER 69 1979) work elucidated the relationship between job mobility and geographic mobility, while Olivia Mitchell (ILRR 37 1983) showed that male employees covered by pension plans are significantly less likely to change jobs.

Unemployment

A particularly interesting role for women economists in the policy arena occurred in the 1970s. As the unemployment rate edged upward from 3.5 in 1969 to 5.9 percent in 1972, Nixon administration economists issued a two-pronged defense of the performance of the economy. First, they argued that changes in the composition of the labor force, notably the increasing

share of women and youth who traditionally had higher unemployment rates, necessitated an upward revision in the full employment target. Second, they downgraded the seriousness of the unemployment problem for women, suggesting that, from a welfare perspective, attention be focused on the more favorable rates for married males (men with families to support, according to their reasoning).

Women like Carolyn Shaw Bell (The Public Interest 30 1973), Nancy Barrett (in Ralph Smith, The Subtle Revolution, 1979), and Clair Vickery (Brown), Barbara Bergmann, and Katherine Swartz (AER 68 1978) were among those challenging both these arguments. With respect to the seriousness of the unemployment problem for women, they pointed out that many women in the labor force were family heads themselves and that not all married women were comfortably supported by their husband's income. Moreover, as increasing proportions of married men had working wives, it might be argued that *their* unemployment was less of a social concern than previously. It is our recollection that the outcry over the Administration's efforts to focus on married males resulted in the dissemination of a "household head" unemployment series which included single female heads as well as married males.

Growing social acceptance of changing gender roles combined with a disappearance of the gender gap in unemployment rates (the male and female rates are now roughly equal) appears to have muted this argument. However, until fairly recently a number of economists continued to hold that female unemployment was less cause for concern because frictional factors play a larger role in female than male unemployment (Ronald Ehrenberg and Robert Smith, Modern Labor Economics, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd eds, 1982-88; and Janet Johnson, JPE 91 1983).

The argument that the demographic shifts of the 1960s and 1970s increased the so called "full employment unemployment rate" has, on the other hand, been fairly widely accepted by labor economists. However, because the impact of the changing shares of women and youth are generally aggregated together, it is frequently overlooked that, even accepting the basic premises of the argument, the increased share of women taken separately explains very little of the unemployment increase. Simple calculations indicate that about one half of the 1.5 point rise in the unemployment rate between 1957 and 1979 (two years of "full" employment) was attributable to demographic factors. Of this increase, only one-fifth was due to the rise in women's share of the labor force, the remainder was due to the rise in the proportion of youth (Francine Blau and Marianne Ferber The Economics of Women, Men, and Work, 1992, p. 253). This is because, even in the 1960s and 1970s, when the female unemployment rate was higher than the male rate, the differential was relatively modest, whereas young people had considerably higher unemployment rates than adults.

Female-Headed Families

The growth of female-headed families in recent years has been a demographic trend of considerable policy significance. Not surprisingly, women economists have taken a special interest in a variety of issues relating to female heads. Marjorie Hong (JHR 9 1974) was one of the first to examine the impact of AFDC benefit levels on the incidence of female headship; her results suggested a positive relationship. Shortly thereafter, Heather Ross and Isabel Sawhill published one of the first comprehensive examinations of the causes and consequences of the rise

in female-headed families (Time of Transition, 1975), followed in recent years by Irwin Garfinkel and Sara S. McLanahan's Single Mothers and their Children (1986).

Other recent work¹ includes David Ellwood and Mary Jo Bane's (Research in Labor Econ 7 1985) reexamination of the headship issue, which confirms a small positive effect of AFDC benefits on living arrangements; but this effect is not sufficient to account for the increase in female headship in recent years. Rebecca Blank (JOLE 6 1988; JHR 24 1989) and Anne Winkler (JHR 26 1991) have studied the labor supply behavior of female heads. Policy solutions to the economic problems of this group have been examined by Barbara Bergmann (The Economic Emergence of Women, 1986), and Roberta Spalter-Roth, Heidi Hartmann and Linda Andrews (Inst for Women's Policy Res), among others.

Other Topics

In the brief space remaining, we would like to mention two additional areas where women have made important contributions. The recent political campaign has focused considerable public attention on the issue of stagnating real wages and the potential role of training in addressing this problem. The work of women economists in this area includes Laurie Bassi's (RESTAT 66 1984) study of the impact of government training programs on the earnings of program participants, and Lisa Lynch's examination of the effect of private sector training on the earnings of young workers (AER 82 1992).

Finally, while the study of labor unions is often viewed as a "male" area, women economists have done considerable work on this topic. We have space for only a few examples of the diverse work in this field. Susan Vroman's study of wage spill-overs in manufacturing confirms the traditional view that union wage behavior influences nonunion wage changes rather than vice versa. Paula Voos' (ILRR 36 1983) work on the cost and benefits of union organizing drives provides one of the few examples of an attempt to quantify these elements. Linda Edwards and Franklin Edwards' (ILRR 35 1982) finding that unionized municipal sanitation workers receive much higher wages than do those in private firms suggests that unions have more bargaining power in the public than in the private sector. Finally, Janet Currie and Sheena McConnell's (AER 81 1991) examination of the impact of public sector collective bargaining laws on dispute costs and wages suggests that legislators face a trade-off in considering compulsory arbitration: although it tends to reduce dispute costs, it is associated with higher wage outcomes.

Concluding Remarks

This brief survey has inevitably been somewhat superficial and omitted mention of much worthwhile work. Worse than that, there has almost certainly been a bias in terms of our own interests and greater familiarity with some areas than others. Nonetheless, we hope that we have succeeded in showing the importance of women's contributions to analytical and empirical work in labor economics in general, and to women's issues in particular.

¹

See Robert Moffit (JEL 30 1992) for a review of research on the incentive effects of the welfare system.

THE GLASS CEILING
by
Eleanor Chelimsky
U.S. General Accounting Office

Excerpted From
Remarks on the Occasion of Women's History Month
Federal Women's Program
Seattle Regional Office
April 9, 1992

All of us know that women have made quite staggering progress in the past 15 years; we've not only acceded to important positions -- in business, in academia, in the professions -- that we never held before, but we're getting there in numbers. Also, figures for 1988 show women making up 40 percent of law school students, 34 percent of medical students and receiving 31 percent of MBA degrees, which tells us something about future possibilities.... It's also true that women themselves have made enormous personal efforts to break out of yesterday's mindsets and yesterday's jobs. Still, something seems to be wrong. Women are not making it to the top very fast, or in what would seem to be appropriate numbers, all other things being equal.

According to a study (Korn-Ferry/UCLA) cited recently by the Economist, only about 3 percent of top American managers today are female. As for academia, Science tells us that women hold only about 4.5 percent of tenured math faculty positions; in medicine, although there are now some 14,000 women teaching, only about 10 percent are full professors and none are deans. With regard to the federal government, I don't have to remind you that women make up only 2 percent of U.S. Senators. In the executive branch, although women hold 11 percent of SES positions, they also hold two-thirds of lower-graded jobs. At GAO today, women occupy 15 percent of our SES positions, although we are doing less well at the Band III level. But even given some progress at the top in some places, it still seems that, for most fields, at some point in their careers, many women hit something called a glass ceiling.

From my experience, there are two kinds of barriers that keep women from moving up:

- * barriers that are set for us by other people; and
- * barriers that we set for ourselves.

Barriers From Without

The barriers that are not of our own making come in all shapes and sizes and they all work together, willy-nilly, to exclude women. At the beginning of a career, women confront stereotypes -- yes, it's still true after all these years -- about feminine irrationality, incompetence, unpredictability, rigidity, inability to lead, too much control, lack of control, stridency, weakness, humorlessness, you name it.

What is most feeble about these stereotypes -- and many people who have them don't even realize that they have them -- is their utter subjectivity. Exactly the same behavior will get a man praised and a woman condemned. For example, boldness and aggressivity are called "leadership" in a man, but a woman with the same traits is considered "confrontational," "brassy," or "shrill." As Marlo Thomas tells it, "a man has to be Joe McCarthy to be called ruthless; all a woman has to do is put you on hold."

What this means is that, in workplaces where there are not many women in power, and where those few who are do not fight boldly and aggressively (or "stridently and confrontationally," whichever you prefer) for the access of other women to power, the status quo can go on forever. After all, who can even blame people for promoting those they're comfortable with, who resemble them? It's human nature. Yet glass ceilings for women are the result when only those who fit the organization mold get promoted, because they are, of course, not women. (Let me add two points quickly. First, the problem is not insuperable: for example, I've managed to make 70 promotions of women since 1980. Second, it concerns the organization as much as it does women, because what "comfort-level" and "human nature" bring to an organization, basically, are homogeneity instead of diversity; one perspective instead of many; turning inward instead of outward; a static rather than a dynamic orientation; and a host of other organizational illnesses that can eventually destroy, through competitive failure in the outside marketplace, the very "comfort" that was originally being optimized.)

But stereotypes are not just organizational. Most come from the larger society and are only being reflected in the workplace. Often these add up to a set of liabilities for women's access to promotion, even when "comfort-level," "how-will-she-fit-in?" types of questions have been overcome. For example, society expects women who want to work to run both families and careers, and to put their families ahead of their careers if a choice must be made. Men are not expected to put families first: on the contrary, in most cases. So the question of how much dedication women will devote to their work after the birth of their first child, is asked in promotion discussions and always constitutes a comparative disadvantage to women.

So women have a lot of barriers stacked against them from outside: stereotypes, expectations, exclusions, differential treatment. They just don't fit with some basic organizational norms, and even when they do, those who make promotion decisions may have trouble simply envisioning a woman in a position of power, especially when none has been there before. But if looking "peculiar" to promotional decisionmakers is a problem to women in breaking through the glass ceiling, I would say that an even greater problem for them is feeling peculiar. Because one of the end results of the outside barriers I've just discussed is internalization: women often seem to accept unfair and improper evaluations of themselves and their performance as true.

Internal Barriers

I think the greatest single problem women face vis-a-vis the glass ceiling is their own self-doubt. Bernadine Healy notes that women applicants for grants request less money than their male colleagues (on average about \$30,000 less). I've often heard recently-promoted women saying they couldn't do a job just assigned to them: it was too much for them; they didn't have the skills, or methods, or energy; and anyway, everybody was gunning for them. In 25 years at

NATO, MITRE, and GAO, I never heard any man say anything like that.

Carol Gilligan at Yale has studied the lack of confidence that young girls seem to develop between the ages of 11 and 15. Sheila Widnall notes that the self-esteem of women decreases in college while that of men rises. According to student surveys she cites, this is related to women's "differences from the majority, their feelings of powerlessness, of pressure and of isolation." It is startling to see that, in one study, even though the cohort of women had a grade-point average higher than that of men, no woman had a self-estimate in the highest.

In other words, women can perform remarkably and yet be deeply unsure of themselves and their potential. When this is coupled with low expectations from outside and all the other problems I mentioned earlier, the groundwork is laid for women to internalize as their own deficits -- and not even to contest them -- judgments that are fallacious, that are based on only one side of the story, or are reflections of the judge's beliefs, as opposed to reality.

I remember reading a book a couple of years ago by the daughter of Margaret Mead, Mary Catherine Bateson, in which a new president of Amherst had fired her -- absent any discussion with her -- for having been "consistently confrontational," and for having made Amherst "a tense, unhappy place." She wrote, "I should have reacted to his bizarre picture of me and confronted its inaccuracy, but instead I was shattered."

I think we need to look carefully at some of the things we accept in the workplace out of politeness, perhaps, or insecurity, or fear of appearing "peculiar": things like a consistent failure to cite our work (when citation is appropriate), or even remember our names; a tendency to trivialize our achievements or titles or positions; an assumption that, if we have success, it's really due to some man's contribution, etc. etc. I'm not suggesting combat over every little put-down, but rather, inward recognition that these are put-downs and should not be taken seriously, or personalized, or grieved over. To believe them, to allow one's confidence to be shaken by them, to lose one's sense of humor or awareness of the bigger picture, is not a strategy for winning.

Finally, women's lack of self-esteem can make it hard for them to help and support those women who do make it through the ceiling, and hard for the ceiling-busters themselves to promote and support other women when it's possible and appropriate to do so: that is, when their work and leadership qualities warrant it. Self-doubt thus works in a circular way: it's a self-fulfilling prophecy and a powerful promoter of the status quo.

What Then Should Women Do?

I think there are some important pitfalls for women to avoid as they seek to advance their careers. No one should believe that the heroic period is over: to make it through the ceiling in most cases, women need to be, indisputably, the very strongest candidates. It's true that some women may make a personal choice to limit the hours they devote to work and that's fine. But they shouldn't then expect to get the big promotions that go to those who dedicate a significantly greater share of their energies -- all other things being equal -- to workplace products and processes.

Also women shouldn't forget, as they move up the ladder, to also "up the organization." The work they do becomes a credit (or a deficit) to the organization, and the latter's goals, rather than individual or subgroup goals, have to become their goals. This is a difficult adjustment known to some as "joining the establishment," and it's not always easy for women to do it and simultaneously keep from taking on the very cultural aspects of organizations that are hostile to women. The effort here should be to never let up on trying to get evolutionary change in the organization, change that is both real and lasting.

Mentors are important for women. They help clarify and operationalize the organizational culture so that women will at least know the rules before they decide to break them. I think the careful study of the particular organization in which they work is critical for a woman's progress. I would also say that women mentors are especially useful because they can predict so many choices that women will have to make and also explain the likely organizational consequences of those choices. Every successful woman I know can point to at least one mentor, male or female, who built up her confidence in her abilities, and made sense for her of a road to follow in the face of confusing reactions from bosses, faculty or peers.

Finally, I believe the surest ways to help women move up through the glass ceiling is simply to increase their numbers at the highest levels. This decreases stereotyping, normalizes expectations, lets the rest of the organization get used to having women around, and facilitates their further success. We've been doing just that at GAO for a few years now and are beginning to see some real progress, at least at the SES-level.

Mary Catherine Bateson writes that "institutions celebrate the transition to the integration (of women) by a series of human sacrifices so that only the second or third woman in a given role has a chance of survival." I admit it sometimes seems exactly like that to me, but I think we can do better. What we need is to give ourselves the permission to succeed, do great work, help each other and learn steadily and intelligently from our experiences. They don't all have to be good experiences, either; indeed, I think nothing fails like success because you don't learn from it. Defeat is a much better teacher. And finally, experience is not merely what happens to you: It's what you do with what happens to you.¹

¹ A Number of references made in this paper are to the following review or studies:

- * "Women in Management," The Economist, March 28, 1992, pp. 17-20.
- * "AAAS Presidential Lecture: Voices from the Pipeline," Sheila E. Widnall, Science, Vol. 241, 30 September 1988, pp. 1740-1745.
- * "Women in Science: From Panes to Ceilings," Editorial, Science, Vol. 255, 13 March 1992. p. 1113.
- * "Women in Science," Science, Vol. 255, Special Section, Editor John Benditt, 13 March 1992, pp. 1265-1388.
- * Mary Catherine Bateson, Composing a Life (Atlantic Monthly Press) 1989.

Careers in Public Policy Schools

by
Frank Levy
and
Rebecca Blank

As economics departments adopt increasingly theoretical orientations, a growing number of Ph.D. candidates with applied interests are considering careers in public policy schools. In the right circumstances, a public policy school can offer real opportunities. But like most other opportunities, a public policy school can contain downside risks as well.

Start with a plus: You don't have to have a public policy degree to teach in a public policy school. Public policy programs typically hire most of their faculty from traditional disciplines. When they have economics courses to teach, they look for economics Ph.D.'s to teach them.¹

Not any applied economist will do, of course. In most public policy programs, the bread and butter teaching is to masters candidates who want to work (or who are already working) in the public sector. A good teacher in such a program must enjoy teaching economics (micro, benefit-cost analysis) at an advanced undergraduate level in which the principles are motivated with policy examples. The students are typically bright and eager to understand how the world works, but they are often not too theoretically or research oriented. While some policy schools have small Ph.D. programs, there is much less interaction with Ph.D. students in these schools than in graduate economic departments.

How many new openings are there in public schools? It depends on how widely you cast your net. There is, first, a list of about a dozen schools which emphasize research and function in a national market. The list would include about one dozen programs including Berkeley, Chicago, Duke, Harvard, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Penn, Princeton, Rochester, Texas, U.S.C., and Washington. Among them, these schools generate no more than 6-8 new openings per year. There are also a much larger number of programs that have less national visibility and focus more on service to state and local government. The job opportunities generated by these programs are far more numerous.

How do you decide if a public policy school is for you? The answer depends, in part, upon your interest in research and your desire to keep up with the economics discipline. Many policy programs encourage their faculty to be involved to some extent in state or national applied work that often does not result in academic publications. In addition if a public policy professor wants to work with students as research assistants or as dissertation students, this often requires looking to other departments.

To stay in touch with economics often requires taking the initiative to make contact with other economists on campus. In practice, the ease of connecting with other departments varies

¹ Much to the disgust, of course, of public policy Ph.D.'s.

dramatically among policy programs. At one extreme is the University of Michigan's program in which all public policy economists have joint appointments in the Economics Department. In this case, finding research assistant candidates, working with dissertation students, etc. is straightforward.² Other policy programs, while not emphasizing joint appointments, have a strong disciplinary focus which similarly allows their economists to have close contact with economics departments.

More typical are policy programs that are far more self-contained. Within some of these programs, traditional academic research gets little credit, while emphasis is placed on providing technical assistance to state and local government and similar service activities. In this situation, it is quite easy to lose contact with both the campus economics department and the economics discipline. If this is a problem for you, it is better to be aware of the situation at the outset.³

But some of these problems - for example, difficulties in keeping up with the discipline - can be true of economics departments as well. And most public policy programs offer several benefits. They attract students who enjoy exploring the outside world to see how it works, a process from which many economics students recoil. The programs also have the virtue of taking institutions seriously. In a good program, for example, a model of government agency as a revenue maximizing firm would be properly attacked because it did not recognize all the competing interests inside the agency. There is, finally a real satisfaction in helping to shape public policy analysts and public administrators who will do good work after graduation.

In sum, public policy programs are not a deus ex machina for an applied economist, but they merit her serious consideration.

If you get depressed the next time you get a rejection letter, consider the following Chinese journal rejection letter sent to us by several readers from difference sources:

"We have read your manuscript with boundless delight. If we were to publish your paper it would be impossible for us to publish any work of a lower standard. As it is unthinkable that, in the next thousand years, we shall see its equal, we are, to our regret, compelled to return your divine composition, and to beg you a thousand times to overlook our short sight and timidity."

² But for an assistant professor, a joint appointment raises the very real risk of trying to satisfy two sets of values at the same time.

³ It is also worth considering a non-academic option: public policy research firms like the Urban Institute, Manpower Development Research Corporation, Mathematic Policy Research, and Public/Private Ventures.

Elizabeth E. Bailey
Reflections on a Multi-Faceted Career

CSWEP likes to expose its members to a variety of career paths in economics. Since I have enjoyed a multi-faceted career, I was asked to write a retrospective on my career experiences.

My career began at Bell Laboratories. Initially, Bell was impressed with my credentials as a mathematical typist--my magna cum laude in economics from Radcliffe didn't matter at all. Soon, Bell invited me to take a computer-aptitude test. After discovering I did indeed possess some computer ability, my next five years were spent programming antimissile systems and creating alternative routing algorithms for the military telecommunications network. My ability to do large-project work and become a valued contributor filled me with joy; I loved watching a project grow from small to large, from conception to application. At the same time, however, I had settled for being a small cog in a very big wheel and had little chance to chart my own course.

During this period my children were born, and life for me became quite a balancing act. I frequently took long lunch hours, which I then made up for by working late at night. Part-time employment would of course have been preferable, but at that time such an accommodation was simply unheard of. For the most part I found life reduced to working and being a parent. But through this I was sustained by the belief that over the course of my lifetime, I'd be able to do everything, and one of the things I wanted to do most of all was to have children. One way to obtain more time at home was to pursue a master's degree in mathematics and computer science which Bell subsidized by continuing to pay half my salary.

My older son, Jim, provided both a singular sorrow and a unique opportunity. He was handicapped from birth and needed special schooling. We were then living in New Jersey, and there was no school in the area equipped to handle children like my son. Feeling compelled to do something for him, I decided the best way was to help create a new school, the Harbor School for Children with Learning Disabilities, in Red Bank, New Jersey. The experience gave me tremendous personal satisfaction as well as firsthand knowledge about organizing and influencing the direction of an institution. By helping James, I had done a great deal to develop my own abilities.

Soon after this, when my second son, Bill, was still very young, I decided to redirect my professional career. With this resolve, I turned down a promotion and prepared to leave my job to pursue a Ph.D. in economics at Princeton University. Bell induced me to stay, however, by offering a fellowship for my doctoral studies, the first ever offered to a woman. I worked hard and, in just over two years, was the first woman to be awarded a Ph.D. in economics in that school's history. My thesis, written under William J. Baumol, was entitled "Economic Theory of Regulatory Constraint".

Changes in public policy were about to make an impact on Bell. The company had been concentrating on engineering issues and was not sufficiently knowledgeable about what economists were thinking. To fill this void Bell tapped me to head an economics research

group, which focused on questions about regulation and deregulation. In a short while our research began to have significant influence, for, in effect, we were augmenting the theoretical economics literature to include regulated firms, and multi-product natural monopolies. I began making presentations to senior executives at AT&T, as well as to academic conferences in Washington and at various universities, including New York University, where I served on the adjunct faculty. I had gone from being an invisible worker to a published scholar. I was getting to chart my own course... and it felt good.

It is impossible not to speak warmly of these years. I loved the satisfaction of motherhood but also the glamour of research; the evolution of elegant ideas and the translation of them into the useful, the practical. My older son's continued difficulties and my own divorce were the only sad notes.

Soon a career opportunity which I found impossible to refuse presented itself. President Jimmy Carter invited me to join the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) as a Republican member, for the express purpose of assisting in the deregulation of the airline industry. My research reputation played a major role in my selection. The economist's case for reduced regulation was based on the demonstration that economic regulation had caused the airlines to operate inefficiently and had prohibited many low-fare options that otherwise might be available to the traveling public.

Led by fellow economist Alfred E. Kahn, the agency pioneered a transition from regulation to deregulation. We believed that change was warranted, and we had the authority for action. Thus we could and did effect this change through a turbulent and challenging period.

During my six years in Washington, I continued to write, focusing on policy aspects of our efforts to deregulate the airline industry. I was asked to join Princeton's board of trustees for a four-year period. This association gave me an invaluable understanding of the management of a remarkable institution, where administrators and trustees bring talent, ideas, and resources together to achieve the highest academic ideals. I was asked to head the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession, and was subsequently elected to the executive committee, and then the vice-presidency of the American Economic Association. Finally during my CAB years, I participated in numerous international negotiating teams and had the opportunity to view cultures as diverse as those in China, Japan, Kenya, Peru, and Western Europe.

With the end of the Civil Aeronautics Board imminent, and also with my younger son's decision to attend Harvard, I made my next career change, becoming a dean of a top-ten business school. Being brought in as a dean from the outside meant that I would be an agent for change at the school, much as I had been at the CAB and Bell Labs. Under the leadership of President Richard M. Cyert, Carnegie Mellon was poised on the threshold of a new age of high technology. At the business school, the greatest challenge facing our students was to succeed in a business environment where the only certainty was rapid change. My job was to prepare these men and women to be the kind of managers who would understand and function in a world that is becoming more and more technical and more and more global.

I was assisted in this endeavor by a talented and innovative faculty and also by direct contact with the concerns and agenda of business. I maintained contact with industry through activity on the boards of Philip Morris, Honeywell, CSX and NatWest Bancorp. I also served on not-for-profit boards, such as The Brookings Institution, TIAA/CREF, and the Presbyterian University Hospital of Pittsburgh.

In the fall of 1991, after a sabbatical leave at Yale, I joined the faculty of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania as the John C. Hower Professor of Public Policy and Management. I am teaching courses that highlight interactions between the public and private sectors, attempting to clarify those that are successful versus those that are dysfunctional. Regulatory policy, both economic and environmental, and corporate governance policy are of particular interest to me. Happily, I am once again finding it possible to link all the diverse aspects of my past and present experience into a coherent approach for my teaching and research future.

I have indeed been fortunate to live in an era when women have had the opportunity to grow. I have taken advantage of these opportunities to invest in my own human capital, and have in turn reinvested this capital in the institutions in which I have participated. I have enjoyed the diversity of career segments in business, government, and academe. I have enjoyed achieving. A lifetime of growth still seems possible to me, and the fire of my enthusiasm is very much alive.

HELP! HELP!

All readers are invited to send notes, articles, and information for possible inclusion in the Newsletter. Please also send news about yourself and others; job moves, promotions, awards, books, and changes in family composition are all of interest to your friends and colleagues. For those who would like to make contributions, we publish three issues each year - Winter, Spring, and Fall. Our schedule is:

	<u>Copy Deadline</u>	<u>Mailing Date</u>
Winter Issue	January 10	February 15
Spring Issue	April 10	May 15
Fall Issue	September 10	October 15

Should Economists Marry Economists?

by

Mark Montgomery and Irene Powell

Grinnell College

It is increasingly common these days for young economists to choose a spouse from among the fellow graduate students. This is not surprising. Romances bloom naturally in graduate school for the same reason that lifelong friendships form in places like Dunkirk and Iwo Jima. Is it a good idea for two economists to marry? We, the authors, have logged twelve years of marriage, nine of them as colleagues in the same Economics department. In this essay we consider whether marrying another economist is a tragic professional mistake or merely a very bad idea.

We begin with the obvious: marry another economist and your spouse's salary is approximately as lousy as your own. If you are both academics that can be very lousy indeed. Your first house will be no bigger than the one Snow White came across while wandering in the forest: as you wait patiently outside the door of its single bathroom you'll think back to those happy days as a grad student and ask yourself, "why didn't I crash parties at the medical school while there was still time?" Of course when we say that your spouse's salary will be as lousy as your own, we are implicitly assuming that you will both have jobs. Fortunately, as economists you and your spouse should have little trouble finding two jobs, unless you get fussy and insist they be on the same continent.

But let's admit that money isn't everything. (We may be relaxing a Chicago School assumption here.) Surely, you say, marrying a fellow economist improves both job satisfaction and homelife by melding the personal and professional aspects of your existence. True. Unless you marry an economist you will have few opportunities to use words like "heteroskedasticity" at the dinner table. Still, having two economists in the home has a warping effect on household discussions. Here is an example,

You: "I've done the dishes every night this week - it's your turn."

Spouse: "What a shame to waste all the human capital you've built up."

And even more than most couples, you will have arguments about money:

"You're crazy; there is no way M_1 could be falling."

And it's not only your relationship that gets strange. Let us suppose that you and your spouse both want children. We are now relaxing another assumption - that all agents are rational. It is just possible that being raised by two economists can make a kid slightly...well,...*weird*. For example, at the age of two the authors' daughter - this is true - would take paper and pencil in hand and announce "I'm working with my data." Of course one might point out that we can all name a prominent economist who had two economists for parents. But this is reassuring only if you regard prominence in economics as a special case of not-being-weird. Most people don't.

Even if marrying another economist does complicate one's personal life, surely, you will ask, must it not offer enormous professional advantages? For example, we all value colleagues who will make the effort to review our research. Isn't it great to have a respected peer to whom one can say, "Edit this paper or sleep on the couch!"? Well, yes and no. Think back to the last time you got comments from a journal on an article you had submitted. Remember the hatred you felt for Referee #2? Well imagine being *married* to him. You see the problem - few marriages need *more* opportunities for criticism. ("You shrunk my blue sweater, left the cap off the toothpaste, and your model is not identified.")

But what about collaboration, you ask. An economist spouse is a built-in co-researcher who loves to do the same things you love to do. You have so much more to share! Your list of romantic activities can include things like walking along the beach, watching a golden sunset, and running two-stage least squares. Right? Don't you get your hopes up. Working with your spouse is more dangerous than normal collaboration because the common professional civilities typically are not applied. To illustrate, suppose you have a coauthor who suggests a minor modification in econometric technique. Compare your probable responses:

To non-spouse collaborator: "Hmm, are you sure that we have an error structure which warrants this approach?"

To spouse: "That model makes about as much sense as inviting your parents here for Thanksgiving."

We realize, of course, that it may be pointless to warn young economists about the dangers of intraprofessional marriage. There is an old saying: love does not enjoy perfect foresight or have complete information. Still, we hope readers will derive some benefit from our twelve years of experience. If you are considering a match with a fellow economist, at least observe a few simple precautions:

- Marry someone whose last name follows yours in alphabetical order - make *him* be the et.al.;
- At department meetings, avoid eye contact with your spouse, especially after you have some something stupid;
- A special safety tip for men: when discussing responsibility for child care, never, never use the term "natural comparative advantage."

And of course one must always bear in mind the key distinction between your job as an economist and your role as a spouse - in the latter position, no matter how good you are, you never get tenure.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF CSWEP BOARD MEMBERS

We continue a series of biographical sketches of CSWEP Board members. This is a sketch of a board member whose term ends in December 1992.

Marjorie Honig

Most economists were not born wanting to be economists. (I believe a good sitcom with an economist as superperson would help a lot with this.) I started professional life as a political scientist, the result not of a sitcom, but of three years as a high school debater and a title as New York State Girls (!) Extemporaneous Speaker. I received a BA in political science from Chatham College and an MA in international affairs from Columbia University.

Early in my MA work I found that the only intellectually satisfying courses - in the sense that one could actually distinguish valid from asserted claims via empirical testing - were in economics. I applied to the Ph.D. program in economics at Columbia. Unknown to me at the time, the Columbia department was ahead of its time in its (possibly unconscious) policy of admitting "non-traditional" students. Perhaps it grew out of the research focus of the department at that time. Gary Becker and Jacob Miner's pioneering work on human capital investment, the economics of the family, and women's labor force participation. Whatever the reason, an inordinately large number of women economists today are products of those times and that department.

Personally, I spent a considerable amount of time learning math and shoring up my morale ("What's a nice political scientist...?") My dissertation was one of the early studies of the effects of an income maintenance program (AFDC) on labor supply, and the empirical analysis of the micro effects of government programs has remained the focus of my research since then.

I began teaching at Douglass College, received my degree, and had my first child some months later. My husband and I then made a joint career move, he to the chemistry faculty of the Hebrew University and I to the research department of the Israeli Social Security Administration, where I became director of basic research a year later. The "portability" of economics was a great advantage since the questions of the effects of public policy, and the methodology to analyze them, were the same regardless of the institutional setting.

In Jerusalem and later in New York, I collaborated with Giora Hanoch, a labor economist at the Hebrew University, on a number of papers on the effects of income maintenance programs on labor supply. Four years and a second child later, my husband and I decided to return to the U.S., and I spent two years at the Center for the Social Sciences at Columbia continuing this joint research, which was funded by the first research grant given by the U.S. Social Security Administration to analyze the effects of Social Security on labor supply. During this time there were two more bouts of joint decision-making, landing us first at the University of Illinois in Champaign/Urbana, and finally in New York, my husband at Columbia and I as chair of the economics department of Hunter College.

Since then, I have attempted to keep department demands at bay (sometimes successfully) and have benefitted from happy collaborations with my colleagues, Cordelia Reimers and Randall Filer. I have continued my research on the labor supply effects of Social Security and have also examined a number of other policy-related issues - the causes of homelessness, the effects of employer pensions on retirement age, and the labor supply of older women.

What are the morals in this story? Professional lives are long and most investments, even those made relatively late, have a long payout period; I have never regretted the move to economics. With respect to joint decision-making: It pays 1) to be married to someone willing to do it; 2) to have a long time horizon -- it may take a few iterations before you both get where you want to be; and 3) to have a sense of humor.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

by

Jennifer Reinganum

Barbara Bergmann's response to my article seems unrealistic as a guide for women who are seeking to combine family life and a successful academic career. It seems obvious that one's spouse should share childcare responsibilities and that domestic help should be obtained when feasible and desirable. But Bergmann's model of the family relies on assumptions that are so heroic they make even me (a theorist) blush:

(A1) **Assume an "ideal" spouse:** this appears to be one who is highly manipulable, who does his share "if approached properly," agrees to live nearer his work than yours so that "he will be the natural person to take the baby to the doctor, to deal with emergencies, etc." In my definition, an ideal spouse does his share as a matter of course. But how do we extend the model to the case in which you discover ex post that your spouse is not ideal, or to the case in which you have no spouse?

(A2) **Assume the budget constraint is non-binding:** hire a live-in housekeeper and be sure to buy a house which is big enough to accommodate him or her. And "don't buy the argument that the family's privacy will be invaded." This is, assume away both the loss of privacy and the problems of your housekeeper (i.e. boyfriends on drugs, or immigration problems, to name but two), which will affect your family as well.

Each pregnancy and childbirth are likely to significantly reduce a woman's productivity for a period of six months to a year, which is a substantial portion of the normal probationary period before a tenure decision. Thus tenure policies at most universities impose additional risk on women who choose to have children during the probationary period. The problems faced by these women cannot be resolved simply by invoking (A1)-(A2).

GETTING ON THE PROGRAM AT THE JANUARY 1994 AEA MEETING

Now is the time to think about submitting an abstract, or a proposal for an entire session, in order to participate in the AEA's annual meeting in January, 1994. CSWEP generally organizes several sessions each year. The sessions are based on submitted paper abstracts.

For 1994, we expect to organize sessions on gender-related topics, as well as on the broad topic of Political Economy, emphasizing topics such as,

- Economic approaches to the politics of open-economy macroeconomic policy;
- The economic causes and consequences of divided government;
- Studies of economic and political sources of regulatory reform;
- Historical studies of the development of interventionist government economic policy;
- Experimental studies of alternative institutional arrangements.

Abstracts will be accepted until February 1, 1993. Please include your address and phone number and send materials to:

Elizabeth Hoffman, CSWEP Chair
Karl Eller Graduate School of Management
McClelland Hall 210
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721

Abstracts in other areas, or proposals for entire sessions, should be sent as soon as possible, but not later than February 1, 1993, to:

Professor Amartya Sen
Department of Economics
Harvard University
Littauer Center
Cambridge, MA 02138

Be sure to include the appropriate JEL classification code; do not send completed papers.

SUMMARIES OF THE CSWEP-ORGANIZED SESSIONS
AT THE WESTERN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION
(WEA) MEETING

Roundtable on the Future of Research in Gender and Economics

by
Joni Hersch

Ivy Broder (American University) proposed alternative definitions for a field of Gender and Economics and questioned whether it is or should be considered a separate field of research. Dan Newlon (National Science Foundation) expressed concern about a possible ghettoization of research in this area. He also spoke about the different ways that NSF targets funding to women, such as the Visiting Professorship for Women Program, the Career Advancement Awards and the Planning Grant Program. Julie Nelson (University of California at Davis) described a feminist approach to economic methodology. She provided examples of how standard economic questions under this approach differ from those of the current dominant paradigm. Ron Oaxaca described a new methodology for decomposing wage differentials (which can be applied to the gender gap). Finally, Walter Oi chronicled the economic progress that women have made and discussed potential barriers to future advancement. A lively discussion followed.

Links Between International Markets

by
Leigh A. Riddick

This session included three papers which investigated different aspects of the economic links between international markets. Janice Boucher (Univ. of S. Carolina) presented the results of her continuing research on exchange rates. In her most recent paper, she examines the forward rate unbiasedness hypothesis as a joint outcome of uncovered and covered interest rate parity. Where earlier research examined each parity separately, this joint analysis makes clear the possibility of an omitted variable, which may explain ARCH effects found in other papers. William Maloney (Univ. of Illinois) provided thorough comments, particularly with respect to the specific econometric issues in the paper.

Linda Koe (Federal Reserve Board of Governors) next presented the results of her work with Robert B. Kahn (International Monetary Fund) on the relationship between trade flows and exchange rates. The authors began by examining such changes as financial liberalization, market integration, and changes in credit policies with a strong emphasis on Japan, Germany, and the United Kingdom. They then narrowed their focus to investigate whether central banks may now have more control over long-term interest rates than in the past. It was generally agreed that there was enough information for two separate papers.

Ellen Mead (Federal Reserve Board of Governors) presented the final paper in the session, a study of responsiveness of trade flows to exchange rates. She examined whether trade balances exhibit unit roots. Her results suggest that if we examine a long enough sample we do not have unit roots, a finding consistent with widely held intuition that trade balances are not expected to exhibit that pattern. Karen Johnson (Federal Reserve Board of Governors) discussed the paper.

The session was well-attended, and the audience had interesting questions for each author.

Consumption, Production, and Taxes: Macroeconomic Effects

by
Vincy Fon

Consumption, Production, and Taxes: Macroeconomic Effects was well attended and lively. The first paper, by Marianne Baxter (University of Rochester), "Are Consumer Durables Important for Business Cycles?" investigated three aspects of the link between consumer durables and business cycles. The paper provided an overview of sectoral linkages and business cycle frequencies in postwar U.S. data and documented the higher volatility found in production and purchases of durable goods and the strength of intersectoral comovement. It then developed a two sector equilibrium business cycle model to investigate whether shocks to consumer durables can produce a typical business cycle response. Finally it investigated whether the two sector model could produce the persistence and comovement of macroeconomic time series that was observed in the data. Insightful discussion was provided by George Evans (U.C. Berkeley).

The second paper, by Beth Ingram, M.R. Kocherlakota, and N.E. Savin, was entitled, "Explaining Business Cycles: A Multiple Shock Approach." Several authors have claimed that a large fraction of the variance of United States quarterly detrended real GNP is attributable to an unobservable shock to total factor productivity. This paper argued that the importance of a productivity shock is fundamentally indeterminate. Any model which is in accord with the several time series that make up US macroeconomic data must feature multiple shocks that are mutually correlated. Sorting out the separate effects of these various shocks on a single variable such as real GNP is impossible. The paper was discussed by Rudolfo E. Mancelli (Stanford University).

Ellen McGratten, presented the final paper, "Fiscal Policy and Redistribution." This paper extended an earlier analysis of the economy populated by two types of agents who have different preferences and investment opportunities. Equilibria are computed for alternative fiscal arrangements and compared to the case with lump-sum taxes. The results suggest that there are large differences between the consumption, investment, and labor allocations for the lump-sum case and for distortionary tax cases. The results also illustrate how important are the assumptions about asset markets are to the study of tax incidence. Thomas J. Sauscott, (Hoover Institution) was the discussant.

***THE COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE
ECONOMICS PROFESSION***

C S W E P

CELEBRATES ITS TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY

Roundtable Discussion Session

**Women's Progress in the Economics Profession:
Several Perspectives**

The panel, which includes
Beth E. Allen, Elizabeth E. Bailey, Barbara R. Bergmann, Carol S. Carson,
Susan B. Carter, Elizabeth Hoffman, Nancy L. Rose, and Anna J. Schwartz,
is scheduled for 2:30-4:30, January 5, 1993, Palos Verdes Rm.

Business Meeting and Reception

The business meeting is scheduled for 4:45, followed by the 20th
Anniversary Party and reception at 5:45, on January 5, 1993.

Technical Sessions

Financial Markets and the Real Sector: International Studies

Deposit Insurance and Regulatory Reform in Banking

Money and the Real Sector

Decision-Making Within Families

Gender Differences in Careers

*Cross-Country Comparisons of Women's Labor
Market Experience*

CSWEP ACTIVITIES AT THE 1993 AEA MEETING
January 5-7, 1993

BUSINESS MEETING

The CSWEP business meeting will be held on January 5 at 4:45 PM in Laguna B of the Anaheim Hilton & Towers, Anaheim, CA.

20th ANNIVERSARY PARTY

A reception in honor of women in the job market and to celebrate CSWEP's 20th Anniversary will be held immediately following the business meeting at 5:45 PM in Laguna A (hors d'oeuvres/cash bar) -- please mark your calendar!

HOSPITALITY ROOM

The hospitality room (Palisades) will be open on January 5 and 6, from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM. A complimentary continental breakfast will be available from 7:30 AM to 10:30 AM each day.

We need your help to welcome people at the hospitality room. Please send your name, phone number, and times you could be there to Elizabeth Hoffman, whose address is on the back cover. Two-hour periods, especially in the morning, would be the most helpful.

CSWEP SESSIONS

All sessions in the Anaheim Hilton and Towers.

Tuesday, January 5, 08:00AM
San Clemente

Financial Markets and the Real Sector: International Studies

Chair: Beth Ingram (The University of Iowa)

Discussants: Hali Edison (BGFRS), Alfredo Pereira (UC San Diego), and Eric Leeper (FRBA)

Papers: Jenny Corbett (NIJS), "Financial Structure and Corporate Governance: Japan in International Perspective;" Ann B. Sternlight (U of Richmond) and William A. Darity (UNC - Chapel Hill), "Alternative Financial System Structure and Economic Liberalization;" Rik W. Hafer and Ali M. Kutan (Southern Illinois U), "The Role of German Monetary Policy: Did the EMS Make a Difference?."

Tuesday, January 5, 10:15AM
Malibu

Deposit Insurance and Regulatory Reform in Banking

Chair: Leigh Tesfatsion (Iowa State U)

Discussants: Jacek Prokop (Northwestern U), Diana Hancock (BGFRS), and Stacey Schreft (FRB of Richmond)

Papers: Arnoud W.A. Boot (Northwestern U) and Anjan V. Thakor (Indiana U), "Self-Interested Bank Regulation;" Kristine L. Chase (St. Mary's College of CA), "Game Theory and Banking: Deposit Insurance as a Money-Back Guarantee;" Allan Brunner (BGFRS) and Cara S. Lown (FRB of NY), "Implementing Monetary Policy with Interest-Bearing Deposit Accounts and Low (or Zero) Reserve Requirements."

Tuesday, January 5, 02:30PM

Malibu

Money and the Real Sector

Chair: Jo Anna Gray (University of Oregon)

Discussants: Magda Kandil (Southern Illinois U), Carol Bertaut, (Brookings Inst.) and Martha Schary (Boston U)

Papers: Beth Ingram (The U of Iowa), "Estimating the 'Deep' Parameters of Money Demand Under Alternative Monetary Policy Regimes;" Paula A. McLean (U of Prince Edward Isl), "Budget Deficits, Monetary Policy, and Financial Markets;" Christina D. Romer (UC - Berkeley), "What Ended the Great Depression?."

Tuesday, January 5, 02:30 PM

Palos Verdes

**Women's Progress in the Economics Profession:
Several Perspectives**

Panel: Beth E. Allen (U of Minnesota), Elizabeth E. Bailey (U of Penn), Barbara R. Bergmann (American University), Carol S. Carson (Bur of Econ Analysis), Susan B. Carter (UC-Irvine), Elizabeth Hoffman (U of Arizona), Nancy L. Rose (MIT), and Anna J. Schwartz (Nat Bureau of Econ Res).

Wednesday, January 6, 02:30PM

Carmel

Decision-Making Within Families

Chair: Marjorie McElroy (Duke University)

Discussants: Linda Datcher Lory, Robert Pollak (U of Washington), Maria Hanratty (Cornell U), and Andrea Beller (U of Illinois-Urb)

Papers: Kristin Butcher and Anne Case (Princeton), "Family Composition and the Educational Attainment of Daughters;" Amy Farmer Curry (U of Arkansas) and Jill Tiefenthaler (Colgate U), "Fairness Concepts and the Intrahousehold Allocation of Resources;" Anne E. Winkler (U of MO-St. Louis), "Is AFDC-UP Pro-Marriage?;" Phillip B. Levine (Wellesley C) and David J. Zimmerman (Williams C), "Comparing Occupational Aspirations and Achievement: A Test of Market versus Premarket-Based Explanations of Occupational Segregation."

Thursday, January 7, 08:00AM
Palos Verdes

**Cross Country Comparisons of Women's Labor
Market Experience**
Chair: Lynn Karoly (The RAND Corp)
Discussants: Lynn Karoly and Pamela Loprest (Urban Inst.)

Papers: Mary C. King (Portland State U), "Black Women's Changing Labor Market Status: A Comparison of American and British Experience;" Katharine Abraham (U of Maryland) and Susan Houseman (Upjohn Inst.), "Female Workers as a Buffer in the Japanese Economy;" Iulie Aslaksen (CBS-Norway) and Charlotte Koren (INAS-Norway), "The Connection Between Unpaid Household Work and Money Income: Implications for Income Distribution and Economic Well-Being."

Thursday, January 7, 10:15AM
Laguna B

Gender Differences in Careers
Chair: Joseph Quinn (Boston College)
Discussants: Joseph Quinn, Bill Dickens (UC-Berkeley)
and John Bound (U of Michigan)

Papers: J. Peter Mattila and Peter F. Orazem (Iowa State U), "The Impact of Comparable Worth on State Government Employment;" Shulamit Kahn (Boston U), "Gender Differences in Academic Career Paths of Economics;" Nabanita Datta Gupta (NJ Inst. of Tech), "Probabilities of Job Choice and Employer Selection and Male-Female Occupational Differences;" Susan K. Taylor, "Changes in the Earnings of Male and Female Workers over the 1980s."

CHILD CARE AT THE ASSA MEETINGS

Anaheim

If you need child care in Anaheim, write or call Christina O'Bannon, CSWEP, Karl Eller Graduate School of Management, McClelland Hall, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, 602/621-6227. Each hotel keeps a register of licensed child care agencies. CSWEP has a flyer for distribution.

Boston

We are exploring possibilities for developing on-site child care at the Boston meetings in January 1994. Please let Christina know if you expect to bring children to those meetings, and if you would take advantage of on-site child care.

OTHER SESSIONS OF INTEREST AT THE JANUARY 1993 MEETING

Wednesday, January 6, 08:00AM **Theoretical Issues in Interpersonal Comparisons, Equivalence Scales, and the Cost of Children**
Redondo

Chair: Eva Jacobs (U.S. Bur of Labor Statistics)

Discussants: Rueben Gronau (Hebrew U), Marilyn Manser and David Johnson (U.S. Bur of Labor Statistics)

Papers: Charles Blackorby (U of British Columbia), "The Role of Interpersonal Comparisons in the Use of Equivalence Scales;" Martin Browning (McMaster U), "Measuring Expenditures on Planned Children;" Arie Kapteyn (Tilburg U, The Netherlands), "The Measurement of Utility: Revealed Preference versus Subjective Measures."

Wednesday, January 6, 10:00AM **What Happens Inside Families?**
Avila

Chair: Marjorie McElroy (Duke University)

Discussant: Robert Willis (U of Chicago and Natl Opinion Research Ctr)

Papers: Gary Becker (U of Chicago), "The Formation of Preferences in the Family;" Shelly Lundberg and Robert Pollak, (U of Washington), "Family Bargaining: Conflict and Cooperation;" Nancy Folbre (U of Massachusetts), "'Guys Don't Do That': Gender Coalitions and Social Norms;" Lawrence Haddad (Intl Food Policy Res Inst.) and John Hoddinott (Trinity College, Oxford, U.K.) and Ravi Kanbur (World Bank), "Unitary Versus Collective Household Models: Time to Shift the Burden of Proof?."

Thursday, January 7, 02:30AM **Economic Well-Being of Children**
Huntington

Chair: Andrea H. Beller (University of Illinois)

Discussants: Arleen Leibowitz (Rand Corp) and T. Paul Schultz (Yale University)

Papers: Karen Folk (U of Illinois), "An Analysis of the Costs of Child Care by Relatives;" William Sander (DePaul U), "Gender-Endogenous Fertility and Children's Schooling;" H. Elizabeth Peters and Laura Argys (U of Colorado), "Initial Bargaining Over Divorce Settlements and Compliance Over Time;" Pedro Hernandez, Andrea H. Beller (U of Illinois), and John W. Graham (Rutgers U), "Effects of Child Support on Offspring Educational Attainment: Changes During the 1980's."

CSWEP ACTIVITIES AT THE SOUTHERN
ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION MEETING

Washington, D.C.

November 22-24, 1992

CSWEP-South has organized two sessions for the Southern Economic Association (SEA) meeting:

Economics of the Firm

Chair: Amy Farmer Curry

Discussants: Rajshree Agarwal and Greg Shulman

Papers: T. Randolph Beard and George H. Sweeney, "Random Pricing by Monopolists;" Pamela B. Peele, "Price Discrimination in Retail Car Negotiations: Why do White Males Drive Away with the Deals?;" and Torsten Schmitt, "Entry and Economic Welfare in a Bertrand Industry."

and

Work and Family: Where are we Headed?

Chair: Ana Maria Turner Lomperis

Discussants: Barbara R. Bergmann, Jane E. O'Neill,
and Howard V. Hayghe

Panel: Patrice Flynn, "Women Walking the Human Capital Tightrope;" Shirley P. Burggraf, "The Job/Family Tradeoff: How Should the Cost of Child Rearing be Distributed?;" and, Ronald G. Ehrenberg, "The Tenure System and Family Responsibilities."

CSWEP-South will also have its annual business meeting at 5:30 on Monday, November 23. A reception (cash bar), in honor of women in the job market will follow the meeting. Everyone is invited and encouraged to participate in the business meeting and attend the reception. Persons wishing to volunteer to assist at the reception should contact Ethel Jones, Department of Economics, College of Business Administration, Auburn University, 36849-5242, (205)844-2916, FAX (205)844-4016.

More Sylvia by Nicole Hollander



CALLS FOR PAPERS

CSWEP will sponsor two sessions at the *Southern Economic Association (SEA)* Meetings, November 21-23, 1993, in New Orleans, Louisiana. Please send abstracts to be considered for these sessions by February 1, 1993 to: Ethel B. Jones, Department of Economics, College of Business Administration, Auburn University, Alabama 36849-5242

CSWEP will sponsor one or two gender-related sessions at the Spring 1993 meetings of the *Eastern Economic Association (EEA)*, March 19-21, 1993 in Washington, D.C. Please send abstracts by November 15, 1992 to Professor Linda N. Edwards, Department of Economics, Queens College, CUNY, Flushing, NY 11367-1597.

If you would like to organize a **CSWEP** session at the *Western Economic Association's (WEA)* Annual Meetings, please contact Ivy Broder, Department of Economics, American University, Washington, D.C. 20016. Her telephone number is 202-885-3762, if you would like to discuss your idea with her. The meetings will be held in Lake Tahoe June 21-24, 1993. The CSWEP sessions at these meetings do not have to be gender-related.

**

1993 Cliometrics Conference. The Thirty Third Annual Cliometrics Conference will be held May 14-16, 1993 at Northwestern University. The Cliometrics Society will be able to pay most expenses for the majority of the 50 participants, as it has in recent years. Paper proposals and request for invitations due February 1, 1993; notification of acceptance of papers March 15, 1993; complete papers due April 1, 1993. Proposals for papers should be three to five pages in length. Please send three copies of the proposal to: The Cliometric Society, Department of Economics, Miami University, Oxford, OH 45056. (513-529-2850)

**

The Public Choice Society will hold joint meetings with the Economic Science Association, March 19-21, 1993 in New Orleans, LA. For further information contact Melvin J. Hinich, President, Public Choice Society, Applied Research Laboratories, The University of Texas at Austin, P.O. Box 8029, Austin, TX 78713-8029.

**

The International Association for Feminist Economics (IAFFE) plans to organize several sessions at the Eastern Meetings to be held at the Omni Shoreham, Washington, D.C., March 19-21, 1993. Preliminary topics: Feminist Pedagogy (organizer: April Aerni (716)586-2525, x 549); Feminist Policy Issues and Applications (organizer: Marlene Kim (908)932-9504; Feminist Critique of Economic Theory, Methodology, Rhetoric (organizer: Ulla Grapard (315)824-7533. If you want to present a paper in any of these areas, please send two copies of a 150 word abstract by September 30 (if at all possible) to: Marlene Kim, Labor Education Department, IMLR, Rutgers University, Ryders Lane and Clifton Ave., New Brunswick, NJ 08903.

Boston College is organizing an international conference on "Privatization and Socioeconomic Policy in Central and Eastern Europe" to be held from June 7-10, 1993 in Krawkow, Poland. The conference will be hosted by the Jagiellonian University (Krawkow) and the Krakow Academy of Economics. Paper proposals are invited for sessions on approaches to privatization, rights and economic relations, the role of the state and the political process, women's issues, the role of the industrial west and international organizations, the privatization of social programs, coping during the transition, labor markets and unemployment, and ownership transfer. More information and application forms are available from Joseph F. Quinn, Department of Economics, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02167, USA. Phone: (617) 552-3670; fax: (617) 522-8828.

OTHER MEETINGS

The American Statistical Association will hold the 7th annual ASA Winter Conference January 3-5, 1993 at the Bonaventure Resort & Spa, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. The theme of the conference is "Families and Children: Research Findings, Data Needs, and Survey Issues." Sessions will address research and statistical issues concerning families and children at all life stages. There will be sessions on policy research issues, data gaps, and statistical and survey methodology, all dealing with the major topics affecting families and children, including health, education, family structure, and economic well-being. For conference registration and hotel information, contact the Meetings Department, American Statistical Association, 1429 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314-3402; 703-684-1221.

**

Robert Solow, a member of the Committee for Race and Gender Bias in the Economics Curriculum, is inviting his colleagues to an NSF Funded Faculty Development Project, "Improving Introductory Economics by Integrating the Latest Scholarship on Women and Minorities." The workshop will be held May 22-27, 1993 at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, VA. The registration is \$100. For further information, contact Susan Feiner, Department of Economics, Hampton University, Hampton, VA 23668, (804) 727-5862.

**

The International Association of Feminist Economists held their First Annual Meeting at the American University in Washington, D.C. on July 24-26, 1992. The conference was a rousing success, with representatives from all over the world in attendance. Over 40 papers were presented on topics ranging from feminist methodology in economics to alternative family leave policies to historical studies of welfare in the early 20th century Massachusetts.

A second conference is being planned for the Summer of 1993. For more information, contact Barbara Bergmann, Department of Economics, American University, Washington, D.C. 20016.

A two-part series on the topic of "*Women in Science: How Long a Rare Species?*" has been organized through the joint efforts of the National Zoological Park and Dartmouth College. The first part, on the evening of October 13, will provide an overview of women's underrepresentation in the sciences, both in education and employment. It will highlight the personal experiences of women scientists of various generations and Dartmouth's initiative to retain more women in science at the post-secondary level. The second mini-symposium is scheduled for March 24, 1993. Its focus will be a longer view of the future and the kinds of structural, organizational, and systemic change needed to ensure equitable participation of women in science for the long term. Following both sessions, participants and panelists will have an opportunity at the reception to continue the discussion started during the formal presentations. For further information, write to Brenda L. Schuster, Thayer School of Engineering, Dartmouth College, 8000 Cummings Hall, Hanover, NH 03755-8000.

NEWS AND NOTES

Women's Policy Agenda

Barbara Bergmann (Distinguished Professor of Economics, American University) and **Heidi Hartmann** (Director, Institute for Women's Policy Research) are heading an effort to promote a WOMEN'S POLICY AGENDA as a challenge to be addressed by the Presidential candidates. This agenda includes welfare reform (improving earned income tax credits and collection of child support payments), reducing discrimination through improved auditing of compliance with anti-discrimination laws, issuance of pay equity guidelines by the Labor Department, more government help in paying for quality family care, guaranteeing women's reproductive rights, universal access to health care and raising taxes to pay for these programs. If you are interested in receiving the full text of this agenda and signing the document, contact Barbara Bergmann, Department of Economics, American University, Washington, D.C. 20016. e-mail: bberg@auvm.american.edu or FAX: 202-885-3790.

Hsu O'Keefe, a doctoral candidate at the University of Sao Paulo in Brazil, attended the "Earth Summit" in Rio de Janeiro as a Global Forum participant.

Congratulations on Fellowships, Awards and Promotions!

Francine D. Blau, Professor of Economics and Labor and Industrial Relations at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Campaign, has recently been named an Associate Editor of the Journal of Labor Economics. Francine has also been elected to the AER Executive Committee.

Catherine Lynde has been promoted to Associate Professor at the University of Massachusetts Boston.

Harriett Orcutt Duleep will be an American Statistical Association/NSF/Census Bureau fellow this year.

Valerie Y. Suslow was tenured and promoted to Associate Professor of Business and Public Policy at the School of Business Administration, University of Michigan.

New Positions

Alexandra Bernasek has been appointed Assistant Professor in the Department of Economics, Colorado State University.

Julie Bunn has joined the faculty of the Economics Department at Macalester College.

Pamela Chang has joined the faculty of the Economics Department at Wellesley College.

Sarah Glavin, Boston College Ph.D., has joined the Human Resources Division of the General Accounting Office in Washington.

Denise Hare has joined the faculty of the Economics Department at Reed College.

Hilary Hoynes has joined the faculty of the Economics Department at the University of California at Berkeley.

Mary Joyce, has joined the Office of Publications and Special Studies at the Bureau of Labor Statistics in Washington, D.C.

Allison Kelly, has joined the Economics Department of Suffolk University in Boston.

Penny Koujianou has joined the faculty of Economics Department at Princeton University.

Bozena Leven has been appointed Assistant Professor in the Department of Economics, Trenton State College.

Janet S. Netz joined the faculty of the Department of Economics at the University of Delaware as an Assistant Professor.

Kumiko Powell, Boston College Ph.D. has joined the AT&T Market Analysis and Economics Group.

Christina Shannon has joined the faculty of the Economics Department at the University of California at Berkeley.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS OF INTEREST

Francine D. Blau and Marianne A. Ferber, *The Economics of Women, Men, and Work*, 2nd edition (Prentice-Hall, 1992). Prentice-Hall, Route 9W, Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632. (Mail orders: 201/767-5937. Adoptions/Desk copies: 800/526-0485.) \$21.33

**

Hilda Kahne and Janet Z. Giele, *Women's Work and Women's Lives The Continuing Struggle Worldwide*, Westview Press, Customer Service Department, 5500 Central Avenue, Boulder, CO 80301, (303)444-3541; 322 pages; \$36.75 (ISBN 0-8133-0636-1. Hilda Kahne is a professor of economics at Wheaton College. Janet Z. Giele is associate professor of sociology at the Florence Heller School, Brandeis University.

**

Designed to provide quick access to the expanding wealth of resources by, for, and about women, the National Council for Research on Women Director Series has added three new multi-indexed titles to its list this spring. They are *A Directory of National Women's Organizations*; *A Directory of Women's Media*; and *A Directory of Works-in-Progress and Recent Publications*. For order information, call Dawn Henry at 212/570-5001 or write to NCRW, 47-49 East 65th Street, New York, NY 10021.

**

"*Dhaka Portrait*" and "*Woman*" by Anwar Hossain is now available through AB Publishers, Ispahani Building, 14-15 Motijheel C/A, Dhaka-1000, Bangladesh. "*Dhaka Portrait*" is the first and only existing visual compilation of the capital of Bangladesh. Regarding "*Woman*", this book has a distinctive interpretation of its own.

FELLOWSHIPS

University of California at Irvine, R. Duncan Luce, Director of the IMBS, Social Science Tower, Irvine, CA 92717. The Institute for Mathematical Behavioral Sciences (IMBS) invites applications for up to two postdoctoral fellowships during the 1993-94 academic year for research in mathematical applications to the behavior sciences. These are supported by a National Science Foundation Research and Training Grant, and are restricted to USA citizens. They are each for one year, with the possibility of a one year renewal. The faculty associated with the IMBS span the following substantive disciplines: anthropology, economics, geography, political science, psychology, and sociology.

Iowa State University, Dr. Frances Antonovitz, Director of Graduate Studies, Economics Department, 382 Heady Hall, Ames, IA 50011 (515-294-2701). The Economics Department of ISU invites applications for USDA National Needs Fellowships for students wishing to pursue a Ph.D. in Economics or Agricultural Economics with a field and dissertation topic in the area of agricultural marketing. The fellowships carry an annual stipend of \$17,000, plus tuition, for three years and are available beginning August 1993. Applicants must be citizens of the U.S. or its territories. Interested and qualified minorities and women are encouraged to apply.

**

The Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, University of Minnesota USDA National Needs Fellowship Grant for Ph.D. study and work on a food and agribusiness marketing project titled "International Competitiveness in Good Marketing: Quality and Health Issues in Trade." The student will be funded for up to 45 months starting between January 1 and September 15, 1993. The stipend is \$17,000 per year plus tuition and health insurance. Must be U.S. citizen. For more information, write to: Dale Dahl, Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, 1994 Buford Ave., St. Paul, MN 55108 or call 612-625-7028.

**

With funding from the New York Telephone Company and the NYNEX Foundation, SUNY Empire State College offers an outstanding professional opportunity for minority doctoral candidates interested in college teaching, adult learning, and innovative higher education. Fellowships will begin February 1, 1993, and continue, by mutual agreement, for a two-year term. Fellows will be appointed on a 12-month contract and will receive a stipend of \$30,000 plus fringe benefits. For further information contact: Dr. Marjorie Lavin, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, Empire State College, One Union Avenue, Saratoga Springs, NY 12866-4391.



More Sylvia by Nicole Hollander

The Committee on Women in Agricultural Economics (CWAE) is raising funds to support a graduate student mentor research fellowship, named in honor of Professor Emerita Sylvia Lane, a distinguished agricultural economist who has promoted the advancement of women in agricultural economics. CWAE will be accepting applications from students and prospective mentors soon and wishes to extend an invitation to all economists conducting economic analyses of food, agricultural, or natural resource issues to apply.

The MENTOR RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP will allow young scholars working on food, agricultural, or resource issues to relocate for a portion of a year in order to conduct research with an established expert at another university, institution, or firm. The objectives of this project are to help women entering the profession, or in graduate school find mentors while increasing relevant and innovative research output.

For further information, contact AAEA Foundation/Sylvia Lane Fellowship Fund, attn: Lona Christoffers, American Agricultural Economics Association, 80 Heady Hall, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011-1070.

OBITUARIES

ANN F. FRIEDLAENDER - MIT Dean. Ann Fetter Friedlaender, 54, a professor and researcher in the economics department of Massachusetts Institute of Technology who was the first woman to serve that university as a department chairman and academic dean, died of cancer October 19 in Cambridge, Mass. She was a visiting economics professor at MIT in 1972 and 1973, then became a professor of economics and civil engineering in 1974. In 1983, she became the first woman to head an MIT academic department, as economics department chairman. She became MIT's first woman dean, as dean of the School of Humanities and Social Science. She held that post from 1984 to 1990.

ELIZABETH BRANDEIS (1896-1984). Professor Brandeis started teaching at the University of Wisconsin as an instructor in 1927. She was a part-time lecturer for many years and became a full professor in 1962. Her father, Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, greatly influenced her approach to labor legislation.

She practiced what she called "action research", the investigation of the causes of social problems to establish legislative solutions. Her main areas of research and public service included protective legislation for children, women and migratory workers, setting minimum wages and maximum hours for employment, standards for consumer and industrial safety and unemployment compensation. She devoted much of her time to organizations like the Governor's Commission on Human Rights, The Commission on Migratory Labor and the Wisconsin League of Women Voters.

JOB OPENINGS

For academic positions, the information is usually presented in the following order: University and person to contact; level of position (such as associate or visiting professor); specialization; whether the position is tenure-track/tenured or not; whether a Ph.D. is required; and deadline for applications. NA means that the information is not available.

Editor's Note: You may notice some vacancy announcements whose deadlines have recently passed. They are included intentionally because deadlines are often extended and such announcements can provide information about the general state of the job market. There is no charge for advertising in the Newsletter.

ACADEMIC

Amherst College, Professor Beth V. Yarbrough, Chair, Department of Economics, Amherst, MA 01002; one opening, junior or senior level; labor economist; strong training in modern economic theory and empirical methods; yes; November 20, 1992.

Boston College, Joseph F. Quinn, Chair, Department of Economics, Chestnut Hill, MA 02167; assistant and full or associate; macroeconomics; NA; December 15, 1992.

Boston University, Department of Economics, 270 Bay State Road, Boston, MA 02215; number of openings, subject to budgetary approval, at all levels; general economics, econometrics, economic history, international economics, environmental economics; yes; yes; January 15, 1993.

- ▶ assistant appointments send to Jr. Faculty Recruiting Chair
- ▶ senior appointments send to Sr. Faculty Recruiting Chair

Brown University, Professor Rajiv Vohra, Chair, Department of Economics, Providence, RI 02912; one-year visiting position at the assistant, associate or full professor level in theoretical or applied economics; yes.

Claremont Graduate School, Thomas Borcharding, Economics Search Chair, Department of Economics, Harper East 201, Claremont, CA 91711-6165; senior level; applied microeconomics, industrial organization/regulation, public choice, applied econometrics; applicants should have a considerable research record and capacity to teach graduate micro theory and/or applied econometrics; N/A.

Claremont Graduate School, Dean Sidney E. Harris, Drucker Center Finance Search, 925 North Dartmouth Avenue, Claremont, CA 91711-6184; associate or full; financial management; position includes both research and teaching at the MBA and executive management levels; yes.

Eastern Washington University, Faculty Search Committee, Department of Economics MS #36, Cheney, WA 99004; assistant; labor relations, health, international, money and banking, or managerial; December 15, 1992.

Florida International University, Raul Moncarz, Chair Search & Screen Committee, Department of Economics, Miami FL 33199; assistant and/or associate; microeconomic theory, macroeconomic theory, industrial organization, macro aspects of international trade and Finance and international economics; yes; yes; November 15, 1992.

Gettysburg College, Dr. Ann Harper Fender, Economics Department-Box 391, Gettysburg, PA 17325-1486; assistant; introductory economics and/or statistics, intermediate and advanced undergraduate courses in international trade and finance, industrial organization or environmental economics; yes; yes.

Harvard Institute for International Development (HIID), Ellen Seidensticker, Director of Recruitment, One Eliot Street, Cambridge, MA 02138.

- ▶ Project Associate: environmental policy advisors; Ph.D's in economics with at least five years of experience working on policy analysis of natural resource and environmental issues, preferably with an emphasis on industrial and urban problems.
- ▶ Fellow of the Institute; applicant must have Ph.D. in anthropology, economics, education, political economy, political science, public health, public policy, or sociology with a central concern for development in Third World countries.

Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis, Dr. Peter Rangazas, Chair, Search & Screen Committee, Department of Economics, 425 University Blvd., Indianapolis, IN 46202-5140; assistant; macroeconomics and monetary economics, international economics, financial economics, industrial organization; yes; yes; November 20, 1992.

Ithaca, Carla Wiggins, Chair, Health Services Administration, 953 Danby Road, Ithaca, NY 14850-7181; assistant; basic and advanced health care management; yes; yes; December 1, 1992.

Kansas State University, Search Committee, Department of Economics, Waters Hall, Manhattan, KS 66506-4001; assistant; microeconomics, public economics, industrial organization, environmental economics; yes; yes; December 11, 1992.

Loyola College, Charles E. Scott, Chair, Department of Economics, 4501 N. Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21210-2699; December 1, 1992.

- ▶ assistant or junior associate; international economics with fields of interest in production, statistics or applied macro or micro; yes; yes

- ▶ assistant or junior associate; managerial economics or applied microeconomics; one-year position; no

Michigan State University, Paul L. Menchik, Chairperson; Assistant professor/Instructor of Economics; labor economics; or macroeconomics preferred, subject to budgetary approval. The promise of high quality research and teaching is the main consideration; yes; yes; December 11, 1992.

Northwestern University, Junior Recruiting Committee, Department of Economics, Evanston, IL 60208-2600; assistant; outstanding research record, excellent recommendations, and teaching ability; yes; yes; December 1, 1992.

Occidental College, Search Committee Chair, Department of Economics, Los Angeles, CA 90041; assistant (most likely); introductory and intermediate economic theory courses, and participating in interdisciplinary general education program; yes; December 9, 1992.

Rockland Community College, Affirmative Action Office, 145 College Road, Suffern, NY 10901.

- ▶ Public Assistance Comprehensive Employment (P.A.C.E.) Program Counselor; program provides intensive academic and career counseling to eligible social services recipients; September 11, 1992.
- ▶ Program Coordinator: Multicultural Leadership Program; coordinate recruitment and assessment of participating students; recruit, train, and work with faculty and community mentors; August 31, 1992.
- ▶ Counselor/Coordinator of Minority Student Services: plan and implement programs and support services for minority students.

Seton Hill College, NECWB Interim Director, Greensburg, PA 15601; National Education Center for Women in Business (NECWB) will provide research, information and educational activities focused on women entrepreneurs; October 16, 1992.

- ▶ Center Director; Ph.D. required
- ▶ Assistant/Associate Director for Education
- ▶ Assistant/Associate Director for Research

SUNY-College of Technology at Alfred, Chair, Search Committee, David H. Huntington Building, Alfred, NY 14802; President; chief college administrative officer, is responsible to the Chancellor of SUNY for the total organization, administration, and development of the college; yes.

SUNY-Plattsburgh, Chair, Search Committee, c/o Office of Personnel, Box 1748, Plattsburgh, NY 12901; Director of the Educational Opportunity Program; a minimum requirement of Master's Degree in Counseling, Psychology, Higher Education Administration, or related field; administrative experience required with previous experience at the director's level preferred.

SUNY-Stony Brook, Thomas J. Muench, Chair, Department of Economics, Stony Brook, NY 11794-4384; full/associate/assistant; macroeconomics, international, public finance, labor, industrial organization, or growth and development (with weight on having an interest in interacting with strong theoretical group in game theory); yes; yes; February 15, 1993 or until filled.

Trenton State College, Dr. Daniel Hall, Chairperson, Department of Economics, Hillwood Lakes, PO Box 4700, Trenton, NJ 08650-4700; assistant; money and banking, business statistics, international economics; yes; yes; November 18, 1992.

University of California, Santa Cruz, Chair of Search Committee, Department of Economics, Crown College, Santa Cruz, CA 95064; yes; yes; December 10, 1992.

- ▶ assistant; natural resource and environmental economics; refer to provision #44-923
- ▶ assistant; applied microeconomics, labor economics, or public economics; refer to provision #224-901

University of Cincinnati, Harland W. Whitmore, Chair, Faculty Search Committee, Department of Economics, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0371; assistant professor; open economy macro, yes; yes, December 21, 1992.

University of Hawaii at Manoa, Dr. Calla J. Wiemer, Recruiting Chairperson, Department of Economics, 2424 Maile Way, Porteus 542, Honolulu, HI 96822; assistant; public finance, international trade, labor economics; yes; yes; or ABD; January 7, 1993, pending approval.

University of Colorado at Boulder, Professor James R. Markusen, Chair, Department of Economics, Campus Box 256, Boulder, CO 80309-0256; December 15, 1992.

- ▶ assistant or all levels; public economics
- ▶ assistant or all levels; open-economy macro/international finance
- ▶ associate/full; micro-economic theory; industrial organization; game theory and bargaining theory

The University of Illinois at Chicago, Secretary, Search Committee, Department of Economics, P.O. Box 4348, Chicago, IL 60680; subject to budgetary approval; yes; yes; December 17, 1992.

- ▶ assistant; general economics, macro theory, international economics, applied industrial organization

- ▶ associate or full professor; for experienced, highly productive researcher. Any field will be considered.

The University of Iowa, Recruiting Committee Chair, Department of Economics, Iowa City, IA 52242.

- ▶ ranks open; general economics, economic theory, macroeconomics; visitor applications are also being considered.
- ▶ assistant, associate/full; policy economics, transportation economics, health economics, public finance; yes; yes.

University of Maryland at College Park, Department of Economics, College Park, MD 20742; assistant and associate/full; economics theory: micro and macro, economic development, international economics, industrial organization; yes; yes.

- ▶ Junior faculty recruiting: Professor Martin N. Bailey, Junior Recruitment Chairman, Attn: Mary Louise Snidow
- ▶ Senior faculty recruiting: Chairman

University of Massachusetts-Boston, Chairperson, Personnel Committee, Department of Economics, 100 Morrissey Blvd., Boston, MA 02125-3393; subject to budgetary approval.

- ▶ assistant; international economics; yes; yes
- ▶ one year visiting assistant or associate; industrial organization

University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, Department of Economics, 271 19th Ave South, Minneapolis, MN 55455; associate/full/assistant; general economics; fields of specialization are open; yes; yes; January 15, 1993.

- ▶ Junior faculty search committee: Professor Andrew McLennan
- ▶ Senior faculty search committee: Richard Rogerson

The University of North Carolina - Asheville, Professor S.C. Browning, Chair, Department of Economics, One University Heights, Asheville, NC 28804-3299; assistant; economic development; resource economics; and interest in financial markets and institutions; yes; yes.

The University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill, Professor John Akin, Latané Search Committee, Department of Economics, CB# 3305, Gardner Hall, Chapel Hill, NC 27599; Nominations and applications are invited for the Henry Latané Distinguished Professorship in Economics. The Department is seeking an outstanding scholar from any field within economics.

University of Oregon, Jo Anna Gray, Chair, Department of Economics, Attn: Search, Eugene, OR 97403-1285; assistant (2); teaching and research interests in applied microeconomics, urban/regional, public finance, resource economics, or development; yes; yes; December 1, 1992.

University of Pennsylvania, Department of Economics, 3718 Locust Walk, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6297; one or more tenure track positions available subject to final administrative approval; strong research potential and a capacity for effective teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate level; December 1, 1992.

- ▶ Junior faculty recruiting: Chair, Assistant Professor Recruiting
- ▶ Senior faculty recruiting: Chair, Personnel Committee

University of Redlands, Dr. Christopher J. Niggle, Chair, Department of Economics, P.O. Box 3080, Redlands, CA 92373-0999; assistant or associate; international economics; additional responsibilities include teaching principles of economics, economic development and comparative economic systems; yes; yes; December 1, 1992.

The University of Texas at Dallas, Search #365, P.O. Box 830688, Richardson, TX 75083-0688; open rank; School of Social Sciences seeks a policy-oriented economist; money and banking, international economics, public economics, health, education, and welfare, discrimination, economic development, urban and regional economics; yes; NA; November 1, 1992 or until filled.

University of Toledo, Steven J. Weiss, Chair, Search Committee, Department of Economics, Toledo, OH 43606; assistant; econometrics; yes; yes; December 1, 1992.

The University of Tulsa, Cadwell L. Ray, Chair, Department of Economics, 600 South College, Tulsa, OK 74104; assistant; senior; six positions; industrial organization, economic development and growth, natural resources/environmental economics; N/A; January 1, 1993.

The University of Utah, Dr. Cathleen Zick, Chair of Search Committee, 228 AEB, Family & Consumer Studies, Salt Lake City, UT 84112; assistant; household consumption patterns; consumer demand analysis; consumer/family policy; economics of marriage/fertility; yes; yes; January 1, 1993 or until filled.

The University of Vermont, Ross Thomson, Chair, Department of Economics, 479 Main Street, Burlington, VT 05405; assistant; one or two positions; applied econometrics, public economics, health economics, industrial organization, environmental economics, urban and regional economics; yes; yes; December 1, 1992.

Washington University, Department of Economics, Box 1208, One Brookings Drive, St. Louis, MO 63130-4899.

- ▶ assistant; economic history; November 15, 1992. Contact: Professor Douglass North

- ▶ Endowed Professorship in Economics; Department of Economics and the John M. Olin School of Business invite applications and/or nominations for an endowed full professorship in an area suitable for a joint appointment. Seeking micro theorist with an interest in applications. Contact: Professor Edward Greenberg

Wesleyan University, Professor Richard Miller, Department of Economics, Middletown, CT 06459; assistant; any field; yes; yes.

Williams College, Ralph M. Bradburd, Chair, Department of Economics, Fernald House, Williamstown, MA 01267; December 6, 1992.

- ▶ assistant; two or more positions; general economics, macroeconomics, international economics, or any field
- ▶ senior; economic development; yes

NON-ACADEMIC

Congressional Budget Office, Fiscal Analysis Division, Washington, D.C. 20515. Attn: David Delquadro, Personnel Officer. Phone (202)226-2628, Fax (202)226-2601. Refer to vacancy announcement #92-24. International economist to work on macroeconomic forecasting and modelling. Candidates should have a Ph.D. or equivalent experience, and a solid theoretical background in open-economy macroeconomics.

Federal Trade Commission, Ms. Margaret E. Fitzpatrick, Economist Recruitment Room 3613, 6th & PA Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20580; economists; applied microeconomics theory; economics of uncertainty and information, industrial organization, consumer protection economics, law and economics; December 15, 1992.

The National Science Foundation (NSF), Division of Science Resources Studies, 1800 G. Street, NW, Room L-609, Washington, D.C. 20550 has openings in the fields of economics, statistics, or social science. Contact Karen King at (202)357-7844 to request information about the positions and how to apply.

Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Charles R. Kerley, ORNL, Building 4500N, MS 6205, P.O. Box 2008, Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6205; Full-time Research Associate Position, Energy and Economic Analysis Section; Ph.D. or Ph.D. candidate in Economics, Agricultural Economics, Geography, Economic Policy. Opportunity to conduct government sponsored research in energy and technology development, waste management, environmental economics, impact skills, proposal development, reporting and publication are required.

CSWEP

The Committee on the Status of Women in the
Economics Profession

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

If you have not paid your dues for the current member year (July 1, 1992 - June 30, 1993), we urge you to do so. Questionnaires and dues reminders were mailed in September to members.

If you have paid, please pass this newsletter page on to a student, friend, or colleague and tell them about our work. Thank you!

**NOTICE: STUDENTS DO NOT HAVE TO PAY MEMBERSHIP DUES!!!
JUST SEND IN THIS APPLICATION**

To become a dues-paying member of **CSWEP** and receive our Newsletter and Roster, send this application, with a check for \$20 payable to:

CSWEP, c/o Dr. Joan Haworth
4901 Tower Court, Tallahassee, FL 32303

NAME _____

MAILING ADDRESS _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP _____

Check here if currently _____ an AEA member _____ Renewal of CSWEP Membership _____

New CSWEP Member _____ a Student _____

If you checked student, please indicate what Institution _____

Check here if you wish a copy of the Special Reprint Issue _____

The Special Reprint Issue of the newsletter contains reprints of ten articles designed to help women economists advance in the profession. The cost for non-paying members is \$8.00.

CSWEP: PEOPLE TO CONTACT

General Policy Matters	Elizabeth Hoffman, Department of Economics, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721
Items for Newsletter	Elizabeth Hoffman, Department of Economics, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721
Dues, Change of Address, Roster	Joan Haworth, Membership Secretary, 4901 Tower Court, Tallahassee, FL 32303
CSWEP East	Linda Edwards, Department of Economics, Queens College of CUNY, Flushing, NY 11367
CSWEP South	Ethel B. Jones, Department of Economics, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849
CSWEP West	Ivy Broder, Department of Economics, The American University, Washington, D.C. 20016
CSWEP Mid-West	Robin L. Bartlett, Department of Economics, Denison University, Granville, OH 43023

American Economic Association
CSWEP
c/o Elizabeth Hoffman
Department of Economics
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721

Nonprofit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 1034
Tucson, AZ