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Economics, Crime, and Criminal Justice

Anne Morrison Pehl - Harvard University

It appears that John Drulc's 1990 plea in the Journal of Economic Perspectives to attract economists to "help" with the analysis of criminal justice concerns has succeeded! In the past several years, economists have made substantial contributions to the study of trends in and causes of crime, the operation of criminal justice, and public policy. The contributions of economists to these fields have moved far beyond their traditional (narrow) role, which was analyzing crime as an allocation problem and in trying to measure the aggregate effects of deterrence and the criminal sanctions. The study of crime and criminal justice is informed by the work of scholars and practitioners from a large number of fields, including criminology, sociology, psychology, and law. Economists have particular contributions to make due to our orientation toward understanding individual behavior, the aggregation of individual choices and actions, and disentangling causality. In this short essay I have tried to capture the breadth of the contributions by economists, but have had space to include only a few references to specific papers.

1. Criminal Behavior

In the 1960s and 1970s, theoretical work by economists drew attention to the motivations that led to the equilibrium crime rate as resulting from the choices of potential offenders, potential victims, and law enforcers. Over this same period, empirical work tried to tease out the causes of crime using aggregate data. These earlier efforts emphasized explanations that treated crime as an alternative to work in legal and illegal jobs; two very active research areas to expected levels of punishment.

More recently, researchers have turned to a model of the political economy of crime, which suggests that crime rates across location and time. It is not unusual for the crime rate to be 3 to 4 (or more) times higher in one large city than it is in another. Year-to-year increases and decreases in violent crime are often on the order of 20-25 percent. The variation in crime rates is substantially larger than the variation in, for example, demographics or economic conditions. Gilbert Tucker's (1965) and Louisiana's (1996) studies of the determinants of burglary suggest that economic conditions are important determinants of crime. Empirical studies have also shown that economic conditions, particularly changes in the availability of food and housing, are important determinants of crime. In this essay I have tried to capture the breadth of the contributions by economists, but have had space to include only a few references to specific papers.

References for this article are listed at the bottom of page 4.
A Sincere and True Account of the Unexpected Delivery of an Extraordinary Windfall Treasure

Nancy Fuller - University of Massachusetts at Amherst

PART I. NEVER GIVE UP HOPE, YE WHO ENTER HERE

I was faced with some difficult negotiations with the division of the MacArthur Foundation in Chicago. This was no small feat, especially when I was trying to search networks in economics. They had asked me to co-chair a network on the family and the economy with Bob Pollak, and when I was named, I knew that they didn't seem to like any of our ideas. I felt so discouraged and panicked at the thought that this opportunity would slip through my fingers. When I sat down to write the proposal and to actually sound synthesized, I promptly burst into tears and had to retreat to the ladies room for an hour of cold water treatment.

A couple of weeks later, with the network grant still ongoing, I got home from a dinner party to hear a message from Delia Simmons, then President of the Foundation, on my answering machine. "Please call me back any time before 11 PM," she said. It was already about one minute to 11. She had been very involved with starting up the research network, and I knew she was calling to say that, regretfully, they weren't going to go ahead with the funding. I was so surprised by this, I thought, and dialed her number.

When Adele said they were going to give me one of their five-year fellowships, I was speechless. I couldn't even tell my husband about it in time. It was like the final scene from a film I had recently seen. The Game. Michael Douglas becomes a consultant for a公司 that he has lost his job, and he is asked to fly a skyscraper in an agency of the same company, and he is given a giant aiding in the midst of a champagne celebration in which his brother, who is a brilliant man, is able to get the entire gamedesigned to promote personal growth and development.

PART II. HOW TO SPEND MONEY IN A HURRY

I once met ...
demonstrated in Table 1, the proportion of faculty who are women in non-tenure track full-time jobs at Ph.D.-granting departments increased and decreased significantly over the past seven years from a low of 25.2 percent in 1994 to a high of 30.8 percent in 1996 and back down to 31.8 percent in 1999. The percent of assistant professors without tenure who are women is approximately equal to the percent of tenured assistant professors who are women, except for the last year. Unfortunately, the number of female assistant professors is not promoted to associate professor. The percentage of associate professor rank that is held by women hoverVe around 14 percent. Similarly, the percentage of full professors who are women has not improved much over the past seven years, remaining at slightly more than 16 percent. The percentage of faculty who are women holding appointments at 120 Ph.D.-producing departments remains around 13 percent.

Table 2 and 3 exhibit the same information as that exhibited in Table 1, but the trends are once again more pronounced. These trends are particularly visible in the non-tenure track full-time positions. Of course, as noted, the vast majority of women are in these positions. The proportion of women that are full professors that are women are all less than those of otherwise ranked institutions in Table 1. In addition, the top 10 in general have smaller percentages of women.

The availability of women to serve the economics profession has definitely increased. The data that CSWEP has also collected indicates that women have hit a glass ceiling early in their careers—at the time of tenure and promotion. In terms of the pipeline, in 1993 24.0 percent of the new assistant professors were women. Seven years later, only 15.1 percent of the tenured associate professors were women. Furthermore, in 1993, 20.4 percent of the new assistant professors were women, whereas in 1999, only 16.3 percent of the tenured associate professors were women. At the top 10 departments, the situation was in marked contrast, 22.5 percent of the untenured assistant professors and 28.6 percent of the tenured associate professors in 1999 were women. Even though the number of women in the top 20 that report varies over time, they do not depart markedly from the 1994 data where every department reported. For most women in economics, tenure and promotion are the stumbling blocks. It is also important to keep in mind how few women are in those institutions. In 1993, there were 79 female full professors at the reporting Ph.D.-granting departments, whereas in 1999, there were 61 female full professors. There were 61 female full professors at 10 of the top 20 Ph.D.-producing departments and in 1999 that number is 54. In 1993, there were 79 female out of 110 assistant professors at the reporting Ph.D.-granting departments and in 1999 that number is 102. While a greater percentage of young female economists are going to non-Ph.D.-granting institutions and into public and private careers outside of academia, there is no reason to suspect that they are any less successful. However, data in Tables 4 and 5 suggest that women may have a higher probability of getting tenure and promotion at liberal arts institutions. In table 5, 14.3 percent of the new assistant professors were women in 1999, 30.5 percent of tenured associate professors were women, and 33.4 percent of the full professors were women.

The COMMITTEE’S ACTIVITIES

CSWEP On-going Activities. CSWEP is involved in a wide range of activities to help promote women in the profession and to increase the opportunities that will enable them to be both successful and to retain tenure and promotion.

1999 CSWEP Annual Report

Robin L. Barlett, Chair

The American Economics Association (AEA) has charged the Committee on Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP) with monitoring the position of women in the profession and with undertaking activities to improve that position. This report presents information on the position of women in Ph.D.-granting and liberal arts institutions. In addition, this report discusses the committee’s activities during 1999.

WOMEN ECONOMISTS IN AND FROM PH.D.-GRANTING DEPARTMENTS

For the past seven years, CSWEP has worked on making and maintaining contacts with CSWEP representatives at 120 Ph.D.-granting departments. One of the tasks of the Ph.D.-granting representative is to report directly to the AEA representative for her respective department. In order to facilitate that reporting, a one-page questionnaire is sent every September to each CSWEP representative to complete and return by the end of November. Using its representatives, CSWEP has been able to acquire more complete and continuous data than is available currently through the AEA/A: Universal Academic Questionnaire (UAQ) which is also mailed each fall to all departmental chairs [1]. Tabulations of data from CSWEP’s seven annual surveys allow for an examination of recent trends in the status of women graduate students, job-applicants, and faculty members in Ph.D.-granting economics departments in the United States. There has been a recent shift to become aware of the pipeline of women in the profession.

In addition to the Ph.D.-granting survey, CSWEP has also made contacts over the past two years with representatives at 160 liberal arts institutions. In the full surveys are sent to the liberal arts representatives to be completed and returned. While the data in both sets of surveys contains a great deal of “noise,” the information is useful and some trends are discernible.

Information from the CSWEP Ph.D.-granting institutions questionnaire on the status of women graduate students in economics. Table 1 provides information on the percent of female students at various stages of a graduate career: first year, ABD, and Ph.D. In 1993, 35.7 percent of all first-year students were women. In 1999, that figure had increased to 35.9 percent. In 1993, 22.2 percent of all ABDs were women. In 1999, that figure had increased to 33.0 percent. In 1993, the percent of students earning a Ph.D. who were women was 24.2, and in 1999, that figure was up to 37.4 percent. Computing the percent of first-year students in 1993 with the percent of women who earned a Ph.D. in 1999, suggests the dropout rate in graduate school is improving for women. For example, in 1993, 21.9 percent of the students who entered graduate programs were women and in 1997, 24.9 percent of those who earned a degree were women.

Table 2: Percentage of women for the top 20 economics departments in the country [2]. There is one discernable pattern in this table. Most of the percentages of students who are women at various points in their graduate studies are lower than those found in Table 1. Table 2 presents the same percentages for the top 10 economics departments in the US [3]. Again, all of the percentages of women students are lower than those in their graduate schools, but most of these are smaller than those found in Table 2. In terms of a pipeline of qualified women making it over the first hurdle—graduate school—these findings are encouraging. The percentage of women entering graduate school is up. The percent of female graduate students in the top 10 was 35.7 percent in 1993 compared to that of 1999 of 37.4 percent. In the five years later, indicates that female graduate students make it proportionately through the programs.

Information from the CSWEP Ph.D.-granting institution questionnaire on the status of women job applicant in economics. The fate of women in the job market is seen in recent years. For the first time in 1993, 35.7 percent of the job offers came in non-Ph.D.-granting departments, whereas in 1999, 30.5 percent of the offers came in Ph.D.-granting departments. Almost equally, however, the percent of women that received offers from non-Ph.D.-granting departments and fewer in 1999. In terms of public and private sector jobs, female Ph.D.’s in economics received a larger proportion of the new job offers in the public sector and smaller proportion in the private sector in 1993. Newly minted female Ph.D.’s received a smaller proportion of both public and private sector jobs than did their male counterparts in 1999. In terms of non-Ph.D., a disproportionately smaller percentage of female economists took non-US jobs in 1999. However, the percent of women taking non-US jobs increased considerably in 1999. Similarly, a disproportionately smaller percentage of female Ph.D.’s did not finds jobs in 1999. By 1999 that figure had increased.

Women graduating from the top 20 departments, as indicated by the percentages found in Tables 2 and 3, meet with less success than those in lesser institutions. While the overall trends would lead one to believe that the overall trends would lead one to believe that the aggregate, there are some interesting differences. For example, in 1993 recent female graduates from the top 20 departments received 30.8 percent of the new job offers in Ph.D.-granting departments and 32.7 percent in 1999. Over the seven years, however, that percentage decreased. In 1993, the number of percent of women from the top 20 departments who received offers from Ph.D.-granting institutions increased from 25.0 percent in 1993 to 30.0 percent in the top 10 departments exhibited a similar pattern. The overall trend is for women that are receiving Ph.D.’s from one of the top 20 economics departments is to be able to find a job and in doing so, women have a better chance of entering the public and private sector. Conversely, the overall percentage indicates that women have begun receiving a disproportionate share of both public and private jobs. In contrast, a disproportionately smaller percentage of jobs abroad are going to women in each tier and in the aggregate. Finally, women are finding jobs. The percentage of women with jobs is small or zero. Over the past few years women economies have moved away from non-Ph.D. and non-academic arts. Overall as

CSWEP 7 Newsletter

CSWEP 6 Newsletter
CSWEP's Regional Activities. To assist women in the profession who cannot make it to national meetings, CSWEP's regional representatives organize sessions at the Eastern, Southern, Midwest, and Western Economic Association meetings. As at the national meetings, sessions are on gender-related research and on a non-gender-related field to showcase the work of younger women economists. CSWEP is increasing its efforts to broaden the base of its organization by encouraging a closer liaison between the regional governing boards and the formation of regional CSWEP committees to attend to the work of the region associations. The Eastern Economic Association as voted to make its CSWEP representative an ex officio member of its executive committee.

SEVERAL WORDS OF THANKS

The Committee would like to thank several people who have made major contributions to its effort. First, the chair of CSWEP on behalf of the Committee would like to thank all of the senior women who helped with the COCOPE workshops and the junior women who participated in them. Everyone gave of their talents and expertise in a concerted effort to catapult women into the upper ranks of the academy. Among these people, Mary Anderson, the Membership Secretary, and her staff have served CSWEP well by maintaining the roster, sending out annual membership reminders, and creating customized listings for potential employers.

Two CSWEP members will leave the Committee at the end of 1999. Catherine Echel and Henry Purcell. Catherine Echel (Virginia Tech University) was instrumental in shepherding the COCOPE proposal through the National Science Foundation and instituting the Elaine Benoist Award. As CSWEP's Southern representative, she organized several sessions, held business meetings and receptions at the Southern meetings. Henry Purcell (Princeton University) lent his expertise and advice on several occasions during the grant writing process for COCOPE and participated in the 2000 roundtable. He was an active member of the board with flawless attendance. Both of these Committee members also organized sessions for the national meetings and edited an issue of the newsletter. They deserve our deepest thanks for a job well done.

Finally, the chair of CSWEP would like to thank Sally Schleiter for keeping the chair, the Committee, and all of its paper and cyber work on track. Additional thanks go to both Denison University and its Department of Economics for substantially supporting the work of CSWEP with office space, paper, telephones, and postage. Mary Winer and her staff at the AEA offices also deserve a word of thanks for all of their help with budgets and general information. Marlene Light was also a tremendous help for arranging meetings room at the national meetings. All of these people have been wonderful to work with and the Committee could not have been as successful and productive as it was without their dedication.

Respectfully submitted,
Robin L. Barlett
Chair

Notes

1. CSWEP's sample contains all US economics departments plus the University of Toronto, while that of the AEA UAA includes a few non-US US economics departments. The most recent versions of the AEA UAA are much shorter and have received a much greater response rate.

2. The top 20 departments are Brown University, University of California – Berkeley, University of California – Los Angeles, University of California – San Diego, University of Chicago, Columbia University, Cornell University, Harvard University, University of Maryland, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Michigan University, University of Minnesota, New York University, Northwestern University, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, University of Rochester, Stanford University, University of Wisconsin – Madison, and Yale University.

3. The top 10 economics departments are University of California – Los Angeles, University of California, Columbia University, Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Minnesota, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, Stanford University, and Yale University.

Table 1. The Percent of Economists Who are Female in the Pipeline - All Ph.D.-Granting Departments: 1993-99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduating Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Ph.D.</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Non Ph.D.</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*U = non tenure track and T = Tenure track

Table 2. The Percent of Economists Who are Female in the Pipeline - Top 20 Ph.D.-Granting Departments: 1993-99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduating Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Ph.D.</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Non Ph.D.</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*U = non tenure track and T = Tenure track
Table 3. The Percent of Economists Who are Female in the Pipeline: Top 10 Ph.D. Granting Departments: 1993-99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job Market:

| Academic Ph.D. | 27.8 | 20.5 | 17.2 | 19.6 | 9.3 | 17.0 | 34.9 |
| Academic Non-Ph.D. | 30.5 | 16.7 | 17.1 | 10.0 | 6.2 | 7.5 | 50.0 |
| Private Sector | 32.0 | 17.4 | 24.0 | 25.1 | 6.5 | 24.2 | 39.4 |
| Non U.S. Academic | 21.4 | 36.0 | 23.5 | 3.5 | 6.1 | 11.8 | 20.8 |
| Non U.S. Non-Academic | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Overall | 22.9 | 20.0 | 18.1 | 22.6 | 23.0 | 34.0 | 30.4 |

Dr. Sandra Ohrn Moose, Second Recipient of the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award

It was announced at the Committee on the Status of Women in Economics profession, on the occasion at the Allied Social Science Association Convention in Boston that Sandra Ohrn Moose, a Senior Vice-President and Director of the Boston Consulting Group (BCG), is the second recipient of the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award.

The Carolyn Shaw Bell Award was created in January 1998 as part of the 25th Anniversary celebration of the founding of CSWEP. Carolyn Shaw Bell, the Katherine Cox Chair Professor Emerita of Wellesley College, was the first Chair of CSWEP. The Bell award is given annually to an individual who has furthered the status of women in the economics profession, through example, achievements, increasing our understanding or helping how women can advance in the economics profession, or mentoring of others.

Dr. Moose has had a distinguished business career with BCG. In 1965, she received the BA summa cum laude in economics from Wheaton College, where she was a member of Phi Beta Kappa and Woodrow Wilson Fellow. In 1969, she received her Ph.D. in economics from Harvard University and joined BCG, serving as a director since 1973. She was in charge of BCG's New York Office from 1988-1998 and was appointed chair of the East Coast. In 1980, she was named a C-Level partner and chair of the East Coast consumer goods and retailing practice area. In the course of her career, she has served in a broad spectrum of industries dealing with a wide range of issues. Over the past ten years, she has been actively engaged in the financial services, telephony and consumer goods industries. She is director or trustee of several business and charitable organizations, including GTE Corpora- tion, Rohm and Han Company, the Daughters Medical Center, the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, and the Boston Public Library. She is also a member of The Economic Club, the Women's Forum, the Committee of 200, a national organization of women business leaders, and the Council of the Harvard Graduate Society. In the letter nominating her for the award, Dr. Moose is described as a true trailblazer, someone who has served as an outstanding role model and done much to encourage the recruitment and advancement of women. Her notable accomplishments make her a worthy recipient of the second Carolyn Shaw Bell Award.

The Award was announced at the annual ASSA/EA meeting CSWEP reception. A "master" plaque that lists all award winners, in addition to the furthering the status of women citation, will be sold in Boston. We need every day to herald some woman's achievement, to tout a woman's book or paper or scholarly article, to brag about a promotion or prize and to show admiration for the efforts and influence of women, in their professional and personal and social and human endeavors of all kinds. (CSWEP Newsletter, Fall 1997, p.4)

The award requires that the "master" plaque be displayed prominently in a public place in the winner's local area so that others can see the achievements of the winner.

The Carolyn Shaw Bell Award

Description: This award is given annually to any individual who has furthered the status of women in the economics profession, through example, achievements, increasing our understanding of how women can advance in the economics profession, mentor of others.

Eligibility: Any individual who has been trained in economics is eligible for the award, whether they are a practicing economist or not. For example, an individual is eligible to receive the award if they were an undergraduate economics major.

Petition: The award will be announced at the annual ASSA/EA meeting CSWEP reception. A "master" plaque that lists all award winners, in addition to the furthering the status of women citation, will be sold in Boston. We need every day to herald some woman's achievement, to tout a woman's book or paper or scholarly article, to brag about a promotion or prize and to show admiration for the efforts and influence of women, in their professional and personal and social and human endeavors of all kinds. (CSWEP Newsletter, Fall 1997, p.4)

The award requires that the "master" plaque be displayed prominently in a public place in the winner's local area so that others can see the achievements of the winner.

The award will be announced at the annual ASSA/EA meeting CSWEP reception. A "master" plaque that lists all award winners, in addition to the furthering the status of women citation, will be sold in Boston. We need every day to herald some woman's achievement, to tout a woman's book or paper or scholarly article, to brag about a promotion or prize and to show admiration for the efforts and influence of women, in their professional and personal and social and human endeavors of all kinds. (CSWEP Newsletter, Fall 1997, p.4)

The award requires that the "master" plaque be displayed prominently in a public place in the winner's local area so that others can see the achievements of the winner.

Procedure:

- Candidate is nominated by one person, with two additional supporting letters.
- The nomination should contain the candidate's CV as well as the nominating letter.
- Nominations will be judged by the CSWEP Carolyn Shaw Bell Award Committee.
- The winner will be notified in the Fall preceding the annual ASSA/EA meetings.
- Nominating letters, including the supporting letters and the candidate's CV, are due by July 4th of each year and should be sent to the Chair of the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award Committee.

For 2020, the chair is Dr. Barbara Fraumeni

102 Langdon Street
New Haven, CT 06518
Fraumenib@brown.edu

Contributions to the CSWEP Carolyn Shaw Bell Award Fund will be gratefully accepted and can be sent to Barbara Fraumeni at the above address.

Table 4. Percent Female for Liberal Arts Institutions: 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Composition</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Year 1998-99</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track Full-time (T)</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track Full-time (NT)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor (NT)</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (T)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (NT)</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor (NT)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor (T)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 8

Table 5. Percent Female for Liberal Arts Institutions: 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Composition</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Year 1999-2000</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track Full-time (T)</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track Full-time (NT)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor (NT)</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>131.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (T)</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (NT)</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor (NT)</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor (T)</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 103
GENDER-RELATED TOPICS

"Women, College, and Economics" Chair Carolyn Shaw Bell (Wellesley College)

Two papers analyzed gender differences among college students of economics; both changed their focus over the years with increasing interest in the subject among women. Elizabeth Jensen and Ann L. Owen of Hamilton College revised their title to "Pedagogy, Student Gender, and Interest in Economics." They obtained data from 1767 students with 67 different instructors at 34 liberal arts colleges. They found higher GPAs but lower overall self-confidence, self-rated math ability, and predisposition to major in economics among women; however, there was no difference in the perception of economics as useful to a career. What happens in the classroom can change a student's perceptions of economics: more experienced instructors, discussion of topics focusing on women, evaluating students other than themselves helped students of both sexes; and some evidence exists that more encouragement exists when the instructor is the same sex as the student. One discussion pointed out the major flaw in the study, its omission of women's college, where much higher percentages of students (50% to 85% of the total) study economics, the percentage of majors is high, and faculty typically includes both men and women.

This paper could not be compared with the second, "Generating Interest in Studying Economics, Particularly Amongst Women," because of differences in the educational systems of the United Kingdom and the United States. John Ashworth and Lynne Evans of the University of Durham based their work on data from 33 post-secondary education institutions where 384 second-year students, including 100 women, were taking economics.

Twice the number of women at each institution were added from Arts and Sciences, the alternatives open to post-secondary students. They show that students' choice of economics, relative to arts or business, reflects their higher math ability, prior training in the field, and for women, having a female instructor and a significant number of female classmates. Higher math ability, however, is more likely to lead students into sciences rather than economics, and interest in the field is greater where the sex of the instructor matches that of the student. One discussion questioned the implicit assumption of both papers that studying economics is a Good Thing.

Jill M. Constantine and Laura Perra used economic analysis to answer the question "Why Do So Many More Women Than Black Men Enroll in College?" They note that while the number of women enrolling in colleges now exceeds the number of men, and the disparity is growing, the gap is greatest for African American women; accounting for 62% of black undergraduates.

continued on page 13
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men and women. Data on grades show women earn higher grades than men in all subjects, including math, advanced math, computer, and business. Women, however, are more likely to take more courses in these subjects, and female science majors take fewer science courses than men. In the job market, men apparently have more and better opportunities for the first job; most men reported only one job offer, and the most common occupation was clerical work, no matter in what field. The authors recommend that colleges make greater efforts to provide information and counseling to women.

Lively discussion from the floor on all four papers followed.

"History of Women in Economics" Chair Charlotte A. Price (Sarah Lawrence College)

"Harriet Taylor Mill" by Michele A. Pujol (1951-1997) and Janet A. Seiz (Girard College) discuss Harriet Taylor Mill's (thenwife, HTM; 1807-1858) feminist economics and the long-standing controversy about which of John Stuart Mill's (JSM) works were actually hers or strongly influenced by her. The debate began with his autobiography, published after his death, and has continued. [As is typical in the discussion session.] Most of the work on HTM suffers from the lack of archival evidence that makes this debate nearly impossible to resolve and often blames the gaps or problems with HTM's ideas on her right rather than as reflections of or influences on JSM's. The position presented, based upon analysis of works that can plausibly be attributed to HTM and JSM separately, and other evidence, is that HTM was an independent thinker who often, especially on gender issues, held the more radical and insightful views from her husband. For example, "The Education of Women" (1858) HTM offered a path breaking analysis of gender inequality, with four particularly important elements: the identities women's enforced economic dependence on men as the root of their subordinate status, the second characteristic of rules was (in today's language) socially-constructed rather than "natural," explained how women were induced to accept their situations; and

drew on utilitarian and liberal principles to argue for women's full enrolment. The root of gender inequality is not marriage, and business. Women and the domestic sphere of marriage and motherhood are excluded from participation in the connection between the public and private aspects of Mill's (18-1915) insights. The authors' theoretical perspective is that many of Mill's theoretical insights come from personal experiences, and the conflict between her independence and professional identity and the expectations of women lives at the turn of the previous century. Women and the Economic Factor Between Men and Women as a Factor in Social Evolution (1898) is where she develops the thesis that it is enslavement by the male, not women's role in human reproduction and the sexual division of labor, that leads to women's inequality. In Women and Economics, a critique of women's parasitic existence in the household begins and is continued further in subsequent writings. Mill favors professionalizing the tasks of cooking, cleaning, and child-rearing, and emphasizes equal contributions of both to the household. Mill believes that the development of the argument that the economic is personal, Grapard relies on many sources including Mill's discussion of marriage, which emphasizes that her writing and her public life, Mill appears free and independent; her personal achievements, for example, "The Education of Women" (1858) HTM offered a path breaking analysis of gender inequality, with four particularly important elements: the identities women's enforced economic dependence on men as the root of their subordinate status, the second characteristic of rules was (in today's language) socially-constructed rather than "natural," explained how women were induced to accept their situations; and

continued on page 14
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life and work are virtually unknown to the economics profession. Bulch (1867-1963) is probably best remembered in the wider world as a co-founder of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Her economic and humanitarian arguments for immigration before World War I, for opposition to the war itself, and for American intervention in World War II as well as encouraging more liberal immigration of victims of Nazi persecution before World War II. She taught economics and sociology for over two decades at Wellesley College, charring this tradition and her contract was not renewed (in 1918) because (in her words) she "had overstrained the habitual liberty" of the college. There is a very long list of socially active projects she founded or was involved in and she served on official government commissions at the state and federal levels. Dimmick thinks that Bulch's biography should be of considerable interest to CSWP women and to members of Economists Against the Arms Race (BCAAR).

Discussions were Ann Robson (emerita Victoria College, University of Toronto) on the Pujol and Sitz paper; Mary Hirschfeld (Occidental College) on the Grapard paper; Gillian Hewitson (La Trobe University, Australia) on the Sitz paper, and Peter Webb (Wellesley College) on the Culp/Robson paper. Lydia Cohn Beirne (California State University at Sacramento) commenting primarily on Sitz's contributions and the correspondence as between Harriet Taylor Mill and John Stuart Mill.

"Gender in Economic Thought" Chair: Kirsten K. Madden (Marquette University of Pennsylvania)

"Nineteenth Century American Feminist Economists" by Robert Diment (Brick University) concerns early feminist contributions to economics by four women: Harriet Martineau, Emma Willard, Matilda Dall (1822-1922), Virginia Penny (writing in the second half of the 19th century); and Charlotte Perkins Gilman (writing at the turn of the twentieth century.) Highlighting the fact that there is an extensive but as yet under-recognized history of feminist economics, the discussant, Dure Barker (Hollins University), applauded Diment's efforts to document the early existence of a community of feminist scholars in economics.

"Social Motherhood: Feminism and the Birth of the Welfare State" by Nancy Folbre (University of Massachusetts at Amherst) considers the economic thought of the Fabians in the United Kingdom (including George Bernard Shaw, H.O. Wells, and William Morris) and T.H. Huxley's "Fraternity" during the early decades of the twentieth century. Believing that child rearing on one's own and externalities, the Fabians and Rothbard are presented as early advocates for state financial support of the family. Discussant Maggie Coleman (New York Office of the State Deputy Comptroller) pointed out the importance of this paper and raised a number of issues for further discussion. Discussion Sophia Aguirre (The Catholic University of America) centered on the importance of how we relate motherhood to social issues.

The final paper concerns "Sympa- thy and Self-Interest: Sophie de Grouchy (The Marquise de Condorcet) and Classical Economics" by Evelyn L. Forget (University of Minnesota). In 1798, Sophie de Grouchy commented on Adam Smith’s Theory of Moral Sentiments and presented an alternative theory of human social behavior, highlighting two tendencies (sympathy and self-interest). Sympathy tends to dominate in intimate social groups (the family); self-interest predominates in anonymous social relations (the market.) Questioning the supremacy of self-interest, de Grouchy advocates government policies (e.g., tariffs) to facilitate the development of sympathetic tendencies in anonymous realms.

"NON-GENER-RELATED TOPICS"

"The Economics of Waste" Chair: Molly Macnade (Resources for the Future)

This session explored how older women do under the current Social Security (SS) system and how they continued on page 15

might fare under various reforms. In "Women and Social Security Reforms," Theresa Devine (Congressional Budget Office) noted that SS rules are neutral since men and women with identical work histories would receive identical benefits. Nonetheless, older women depend more on SS than do men due to having lower pay and lower lifetime earnings. A new approach that allows reduced rules changes could render them vulnerable to reforms. "In A Benefit of Our Own: Older Women's Retirement Entitle- ments Under Social Security," Olivia S. Mitchell (University of Pennsylva- nia), Pamela J. Weathers (University of Virginia) and John W. Phillips (Social Security Administration) used HRS data linked with SS records to show that most men become SS insured early in life, whereas only 3/4 of women do; the remainder would have to work five more years or average a greater entitlement. Among those eligible, Primary Insurance Amounts (that determine how much SS benefits are) are 20% below men's for married females and 60% below for wives. Also, wives can receive half their spouse's benefits (at the normal retirement age) unless their own work history would entitle them to more; nevertheless it would take only a small rise in pay to boost wives' benefits above half their husbands'. Looking ahead, changes in economic convergence in female/male SS benefit ratios would have major effects on women's rising market attachment and pay. In "Social Security as a FringeVote", Cress and Specific Rights and Returns," Marianne Baxter (Uni- versity of Wisconsin) examined the link between earnings, tax contributions, and the SS covered earnings base (SSW). She finds that women's labor income more significantly affects future SS income (as measured by the SSW), particularly for the educated middle-aged groups. The functional form between benefits and SSW implies that SS benefit risk is also higher for women. As a result, women might be more exploitively tax their benefits than men with state tax setting equations and allow the errors to be correlated. In "Women and the Endogeneity of tax policy that they argue could produce a spurious correla- tion between prices and smoking productivity. The discussion for the next presentation, "The Role of Profit Status under Imperfect Information: Evidence from the Treatment Patterns of Elderly Medicare Beneficiaries Admitted to Psychiatric Hospitals," was based on joint work of Susan Etter from the Division of

Internal General Medicine and Health Services Research at the UCLA Department of Medicine and Richard Hendricks from the Division of Psychiatric, Harvard Medical School. Using administrative data on all elderly Medicare beneficiaries admitted as inpatient treatment of psychiatric disorder, they examine whether or not patients in for-profit and not-for-profit facilities have differing treatment patterns. They find no evidence that not-for-profit facilities treated a sick population and that lower re-hospitalizations rates than for-profits. They argue that their work suggests that not-for-profit care in hospitals in-patient and for-profits facilities will to declining access and quality of care may be overestimated and that not-for-profit facilities are less inefficient may also be unfounded. This paper was discussed by Dubois Remley from the Division of Health Policy and Manage- ment, Columbia University.

The final paper of the session was John Gould with a presentation of their recent work, "Income Inequality and Health Status: A Cross-National Comparison," which examines which the association between income inequality and aggregate health outcomes. Their work chal- lenges the finding of a causal link from income inequality to individual health in the general population. Using data from the Current Population Survey they find some association between state-level income inequality and health status. In particular, they argue that the strong negative association between income inequality and health status is an artifact of failure to control for individual characteristics that systematically affect health. The discussion of this paper was presented by Ellen Mearns of the Department of Health Care Policy at the Harvard Medical School.

The next presentation, "The Role of Profit Status under Imperfect Information: Evidence from the Treatment Patterns of Elderly Medicare Beneficiaries Admitted to Psychiatric Hospitals," was based on joint work of Susan Etter from the Division of the General Internal Medicine and Health Services Research at the UCLA Department of Medicine and Richard Hendricks from the Division of Psychiatric, Harvard Medical School. Using administrative data on all elderly Medicare beneficiaries admitted as inpatient treatment of psychiatric disorder, they examine whether or not patients in for-profit and not-for-profit facilities have differing treatment patterns. They find no evidence that not-for-profit facilities treated a sick population and that lower re-hospitalizations rates than for-profits. They argue that their work suggests that not-for-profit care in hospitals in-patient and for-profits facilities will to declining access and quality of care may be overestimated and that not-for-profit facilities are less inefficient may also be unfounded. This paper was discussed by Dubois Remley from the Division of Health Policy and Manage-ment, Columbia University.

The final paper of the session was John Gould with a presentation of their recent work, "Income Inequality and Health Status: A Cross-National Comparison," which examines which the association between income inequality and aggregate health outcomes. Their work chal- lenges the finding of a causal link from income inequality to individual health in the general population. Using data from the Current Population Survey they find some association between state-level income inequality and health status. In particular, they argue that the strong negative association between income inequality and health status is an artifact of failure to control for individual characteristics that systematically affect health. The discussion of this paper was presented by Ellen Mearns of the Department of Health Care Policy at the Harvard Medical School.

The next presentation, "The Role of Profit Status under Imperfect Information: Evidence from the Treatment Patterns of Elderly Medicare Beneficiaries Admitted to Psychiatric Hospitals," was based on joint work of Susan Etter from the Division of the General Internal Medicine and Health Services Research at the UCLA Department of Medicine and Richard Hendricks from the Division of Psychiatric, Harvard Medical School. Using administrative data on all elderly Medicare beneficiaries admitted as inpatient treatment of psychiatric disorder, they examine whether or not patients in for-profit and not-for-profit facilities have differing treatment patterns. They find no evidence that not-for-profit facilities treated a sick population and that lower re-hospitalizations rates than for-profits. They argue that their work suggests that not-for-profit care in hospitals in-patient and for-profits facilities will to declining access and quality of care may be overestimated and that not-for-profit facilities are less inefficient may also be unfounded. This paper was discussed by Dubois Remley from the Division of Health Policy and Management, Columbia University.

The final paper of the session was John Gould with a presentation of their recent work, "Income Inequality and Health Status: A Cross-National Comparison," which examines which the association between income inequality and aggregate health outcomes. Their work challenges the finding of a causal link from income inequality to individual health in the general population. Using data from the Current Population Survey they find some association between state-level income inequality and health status. In particular, they argue that the strong negative association between income inequality and health status is an artifact of failure to control for individual characteristics that systematically affect health. The discussion of this paper was presented by Ellen Mearns of the Department of Health Care Policy at the Harvard Medical School.
The CSWEP 'Brag Box'

"We need every day to herald some woman's achievements ... go ahead and boast!"

Carolyn Shaw Bell

CSWEP 16 Newsletter

Regional Meetings

EASTERN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION MEETINGS

CSWEP will sponsor three sessions at the Eastern Economic Association Meetings on March 24-25th at the Hyatt Regency Crystal City in Crystal City, Virginia, which is just outside of Washington, D.C.

Measurement of Policy Impacts and Changes in the Economy

Date: Friday, March 24, 2000
Chair: Barbara M. Fraumeni, Bureau of Economic Analysis Papers:
- "The Evolution of Toxic Intensity Under Incentive-based Environmental Regulation," Mary Burke (Florida State University)
- "The Measurement of Industry Real Value Added," Brian Moyar (Bureau of Economic Analysis)

Immigrants, Labor Markets and Welfare

Date: Friday, March 24, 2000
Chair: Barbara M. Fraumeni, Bureau of Economic Analysis Papers:
- "The Labor Market Position of Immigrant Women: New Evidence from the German Socio-Economic Panel," Amelie Constant (University of Pennsylvania)
- "Do Immigrants from Less Developed Countries Buread the Welfare State? An Empirical Investigation," Zakou Roy (Center for Development Research (ZEF), Bonn)
- "The Effect of Child Care Costs on Labor Supply and Welfare Participation," Ellen Coccucis (University of Connecticut) and Emily Y. Liu (University of Connecticut)

Welfare Programs and Their Effect

Date: Friday, March 25, 2000
Chair: Barbara M. Fraumeni, Bureau of Economic Analysis Papers:
- "Effects of Welfare Reform on SSI Caseloads," Lucie Schmidt (University of Michigan) and Parvi Sven (University of Michigan)
- "Tribal TANF: Success or Failure," Elizabeth Zahar Greib (Lewis and Clark College) and Candace Maynard (Lewis and Clark College)
- "Welfare Benefits, Employment, and Jobless Spells," Emily Liu (University of Connecticut)

CSWEP Reception

Date: Friday, March 25, from 4 to 5:30 p.m.
Location: Tidewater Room, Hyatt Regency Crystal City
The reception is welcome to all who are friends of CSWEP, current members, and future potential members.

Please bring a friend or arrange to meet a friend at the reception. In addition, it is an opportunity for participants in last year's Creating Career Opportunities for Female Economists (CCOFEE) Workshop to meet again with fellow participants. There will be complimentary hors d'oeuvres and non-alcoholic drinks.

Showing of the National CCOFE (Creating Career Opportunities for Female Economists) Video
Date: Friday, March 25, 2000, from 12:30 to 2 p.m.
Location: TBA
The thirty minute video made during the National CCOFE in January 1998 in Chicago will be shown continuously during lunch-time. Bring your lunch and enjoy seeing what it was like to participate in this CSWEP and NSF sponsored mentoring event for female assistant professors of economics. Hear what was learned and acquire valuable insights into how to succeed in an academic. All are welcome.

MIDWEST ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION MEETINGS

CSWEP will sponsor two sessions at the Midwest Economic Association Meetings from March 31 - April 2 at the Westin on Michigan Avenue in Chicago.

Session 1: The Economics of Aging and Retirement
Session Chair: Jennifer Ward-Batts (University of Michigan)
Session Papers and Authors: (presenters are identified with an asterisk)
- "The Effects of the Social Security and Pension Plans on Personal Savings: Towards a New Approach," Wei Sun* (University of Notre Dame)
- "The Impact of Poor Health on Household Wealth and Consumption," Helen Levy* (University of California-Berkeley)
- "Long-Term Care, Home Health Care, and Informal Care," David Byrne (University of Virginia), Bridget Heidemann (Seattle University), Michelle Sovinsky (University of Virginia)*, and Steven Stern (University of Virginia)

Discussions:
Robert Willis (University of Michigan)
Kirsten Long (Mayo Clinic School of Medicine, Section of Health Services Evaluation)

continued on page 18
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Session Organizer: Jennifer Ward-Batts (University of Michigan)

Session 2: Studies in Health Economics with a Focus on Women

Session Chair: Renee Irvin (University of Nebraska-Omaha)

Session Papers and Authors: (presenters are identified by an asterisk)

"Medicare Reform and the Effects on Women’s Health," Angela B. Ritzert* and Josephine Robinson (Joint Economic Committee, US Senate)

"Cost-Offset and the Pattern of Care for Depression," Regina L.H. Powers* (Office of Applied Studies at the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration), Thomas W. Croghan and Thomas Knorrer (Syracuse University)

"The Cost-Effectiveness of Cholesterol-Lowering Treatment in the Primary Prevention of Coronary Heart Disease: The Case of a Comprehensive Dietary Intervention vs. Pravastatin," Kristen Long* (Mayo Clinic School of Medicine, Section of Health Services Evaluation)

"Another Look at Infant Health: The Role of Medicaid and Maternal Depression," Lisa C. DeFelice* and Karen Cremon (University of New Hampshire)

Discussants:

* Gloria Buzioli (Institute for Health Services Research and Policy Studies, NWU)

Deborah Dobres (same as above)

Anthony LoSasso (same as above)

Richard Lindrooth (same as above)

Session Organizer: Jean Kimm (W.E. Upjohn Institute)

The CSWEP business meeting will be held on Friday March 31 from 5:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. The CSWEP reception will be held on Saturday, April 1, from 5:30 p.m. to 7 p.m. Please see final program for rooms.

SOUTHERN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION MEETINGS

KimMarie McGillivray organized a teaching poster session. One might ask “What is a poster session?” A poster session is an interactive session in which ideas, exercises, or research results are summarized in ways that would mimic a presentation (overhead style for example) without the formal presentation component. These summaries provide enough information so viewers can get a general idea of what has been done. A good poster also provokes the observer to ask questions and thus provides the opportunity for extended dialog regarding the issues presented. The session was well attended and was held in conjunction with the CSWEP reception. Participants included:

• Susanne D. Thornsby (University of Florida) and Ferdinand F. Wirth (University of Florida) “Teaching Economics to Non-Traditional Students in a Non-Traditional Setting”

• Gill Mitchell Hoyt (University of Kentucky) “LEAP into Economics: Experience with the Lab for Economic and Accounting Proficiency at the University of Kentucky”

• Peter Schuermann (UNC- Wilmington) and KimMarie McGillivray (University of Richmond) “A Conjoint Analysis of Student Registration Decision Making.”

• Maureen J. Lage (Miami University- Ohio) and Glenn Pratt (Miami University- Ohio) “Gender Implications of The Inverted Classroom”

• Susanne Wallace (Central College), Richard Gholson (Central College), and Brian Peterson (Manchester College) “Simulations of Economic Problems with Interdisciplinary Analysis”

• Lisa Ford (University of Richmond) “Is Economic Theory Relevant? Getting Students to Say Yes”

From the Chair ...

CSWEP Chair, Robin L. Bartlett - Denison University

THIS IS MY LAST NEWSLETTER for CSWEP. I have learned a lot from the people I have had the opportunity to meet in this job. When I agreed to become chair, I had no idea the enormity of the task and the possibilities. However, many men and women have given generously of their time and energy to make my tenure as Chair of CSWEP pleasant and productive. Together we achieved much. Yet, there is much to be done. To shepherd CSWEP through the challenges ahead of it, we need a new chair with very different talents than I brought. Beth Allen will be the kind of chair that can go after the resources that CSWEP needs to continue its COCOE work and to embark upon new programs. She has proven her commitment to CSWEP by participating in three of the COCOE workshops – the AEA, Midwest, and Southern meetings. I am confident that she can do the job well.

News and Notes

The Program on Global Security and Sustainability of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation announces a new grants competition for collaborative research on governance in the context of rapid globalization. The purpose of the initiative is to foster systematic interdisciplinary inquiry about cooperative arrangements to deal with problems that affect, and are affected by, global processes, including ecosystem degradation, violent conflict, international financial crises and the spread of deadly diseases.

The Foundation will award grants for projects addressing one or more related aspects of governance: the changing nature of sovereignty – consequences for security and sustainability; providing global public goods; and recontextualizing human rights, citizenship and identity.

Grants are intended to support multidisciplinary collaborations involving more than one policy research group, institute or university. Priority will be given to research teams that include a variety of professional and development perspectives and that involve researchers from different countries.

Total grant requests from all participating groups in a collaborative project may not exceed $600,000 for a maximum grant period of three years. The Foundation will also consider proposals for seed grants that do not exceed $75,000 for one year. The application deadline is July 1, 1999.

For further information about Collaborative Research Grants and a brochure describing how to apply please contact the Program on Global Security and Sustainability at: The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, 140 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, IL 60603 USA (312)726-8000 http://www.macdn.org
Beth Allen - New CSWEP Chair

Beth Allen is the Curtis Carlson Professor of Economics at the University of Minnesota (where she is also a full member of the Graduate Faculty in Finance) and an Adjunct Consultant to the Research Department at the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis. She has recently taught advanced PhD.-level courses in microeconomic theory, general equilibrium theory, game theory, the economics of information, financial economics, and industrial organization.


Both fields involve elegant abstract theory and are advanced mathematics in an interesting way to solve problems and better understand real world phenomena.

Prior to moving to Minnesota in 1992, Dr. Allen was Assistant Professor (1978-83), tenured Associate Professor (1983-86), Professor (1986-92), and Milton C. Dohotar Term Professor (1991-92) at the University of Pennsylvania. She has held visiting positions at Bell Labs, U.C. Berkeley, Churchill College/Cambridge University, University of Bonn, and the Center for Operations Research and Econometrics in Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium. Shorter research visits (one month or more) include CEPR/EMA in Paris, CORE, Bonn, the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the Institute for Social and Economic Research in Osaka, Universiteit Bielefeld, Université de Cergy-Pontoise, Université Aix-

ManiLe, the New University of Lisbon, and the University of Oslo, with funding from a NATO Postdoctoral Fellowship in Science, NFRSS, the Nomaera Foundation, the Bank of Norway, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (through Sonderforschungsbereiche 21 and 303) and the Marshall Plan Fund.

Professor Allen is recognized for her research contributions in the areas of rational expectations, a metric space structure for information and the treatment of endogenous information in a differentiated commodity, randomizing pricing strategies for firms, the structure of aggregate demand and equilibria, and the incorporation of information into cooperative game theory. Other work includes technological diffusion (modeled as a stochastic process with interactions on a graph), approximate expected utility, social choice, the timing of transactions (and currently) firm formation.

Allen's research has been funded by the National Science Foundation (Economics Program and Information Impact Program/Information Science and Technology) since 1979.

Recently Allen has begun research in the area of engineering design and manufacturing, especially some theoretical aspects of geometric modeling and CAD/CAM systems. For this work, she serves as sole principal investigator for a research grant from the NSF's Engineering Design Program (Division of Design, Manufacture, and Industrial Innovation, Directorate for Engineering). Part of the motivation for the interest in this area lies in her desire to understand how firms make decisions about product selection and technology choice.

Beth Allen was elected a Fellow of the Econometric Society in 1983. She has served as member and chair of its Fellow Nominating Committee, member and chair of the Program Committee for the North American Summer Meeting, and member of the Program Committee for the North American Winter Meeting and the World Congress. Currently she serves on the American Economic Association's Honors and Awards Committee and she is President of the Midwest Economics Association. She has lectured at three NATO Advanced Study Institutes and has organized NSF-funded research conferences on general equilibria, decentralization, and game theory. Allen served a term on the NSF's Economics Panel as well as two recent ad hoc panels in engineering. From 1986 to 1989, she served on the CSWEP Board as Eastern Representative and organized the non-gender-related CSWEP sessions for the 1989 AEA meeting in Atlanta. In addition, she participated as a senior mentor in the COCOPE program at the AEA, Midwest, and Southern meetings in 1998. She serves on an advisory committee to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Beth Allen's hobbies include European travel, food and wine (but not cooking), reading (especially biographies and works on the sociology of science), and cultural activities such as listening to Baroque and early music. For exercise, she swims laps very slowly.

CSWEP Board Member Biography

Join the INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR FEMINIST ECONOMICS

You don't have to be a woman to join IAFFE: Amarnya Sen, the latest winner of the Nobel Prize in Economics is one of our members. You don't even have to be an economist. But you do have to be interested in gender issues in the economy and the family. Our prize-winning journal, Feminist Economics (which Bob Eisner said was the only journal he enjoyed reading) comes with your membership. We hold annual meetings in cities like Amsterdam, Tours, Taiwan, and Washington, D.C. Our meeting in August 15-17, 2000, will be in Istanbul.

Now you can get a free book if you are joining IAFFE for the first time:

Feminism, Objectivity & Economics by Julie Nelson ($25.50)

Insights of Feminist Theory on Rational Men, the invisibility of women's economic production, scientific methodologies, intellectual standards for maximizing objectivity, and other problematic aspects of contemporary economic theory.

Out of the Margins: Feminist Perspectives Edited by Edith Kuiper, Jolande Sap, Susan Feniger, Neelie Ott and Zafiris Trantakis ($29.99)

Economics has written women out of its history; built its theories around masculine values, failed to take proper account of women and their work, and ignored most of the policy issues that pass most heavily upon women.

Women in the Age of Economic Transformation: Impact of Reforms in Post-Socialist and Developing Countries Edited by Mahid Amsden-Beguy, Stephen Parnas and Gale Summerfield ($29.99)

Regardless of the type of change involved, women suffer more in the transformation process than men do. Addressing these issues is vital if the burden of economic transformation is to be distributed fairly, equitably, and, above all, just.

Who Pays for the Kids? by Nancy Folks ($7.99)

Questions the basic premises on which women both inside and outside the money economy are the de facto standards for traditional explanations for the unequal distribution of the “costs of caring” between men and women.

To join IAFFE, circle the box title you choose, mark off the appropriate dues, and mail or fax this page with payment in U.S. dollars to: IAFFE, Economics Department, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, PA 17837. Attn: Barbara Kordos. (Fax: 570-577-3451)

Name:
Address:
Phone (Office) (Home) (Fax)
E-mail
Method of Payment:
☐ I enclose: Check, bankdraft or money order ((signature)
☐ Please charge my VISA or MASTERCARD
Card number: Expiration date: Signatures:

Membership Rates for 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income (In U.S. Dollars)</th>
<th>Annual Dues</th>
<th></th>
<th>Income (In U.S. Dollars)</th>
<th>Annual Dues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above $100,000</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
<td>Below $20,000</td>
<td>$10,000 - 29,999</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - 99,999</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$20,000 - 29,999</td>
<td>$10,000 - 29,999</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - 74,999</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>South/Eastern Europe &lt; $10,000</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to Become an Associate

CSWEP

THE COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE ECONOMICS PROFESSION

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

If you have not paid your dues for the current member year (July 1, 1999 - June 30, 2000), we urge you to do so. Questionnaires and dues reminders were mailed in September to associates.

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 ASSOCIATE DUES!!!! JUST SEND IN THIS APPLICATION WITH A NOTE FROM A FACULTY MEMBER VERIFYING YOUR STUDENT STATUS

To become a dues-paying associate 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 ______
Check one: Renewal of CSWEP associate ______ New CSWEP associate ______ Student ______
If you checked student, please indicate what institution you attend ______
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 and Items for Newsletter
Beth Allen, Department of Economics
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455
cswep@atlas.socsci.umn.edu

Dues, Change of Address, Roster
Joan Haworth, Membership Secretary
Economic Research Services, Inc.
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303
jhaworth@ersnet.com

CSWEP East
Barbara Fraumeni
Bureau of Economic Analysis
BE-3
1441 "E" Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20230
barbara.fraumeni@bea.doc.gov

CSWEP Mid-West
Jean Kimmel
WE Upjohn Institute for Employment Research
300 South Westedge Avenue
Kalamazoo, MI 49007
kimmel@we.upjohninst.org

CSWEP South
Rachel Willis, American Studies and Economics
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3520
rwillis@email.unc.edu

CSWEP West
Helen Pepper, Department of Economics
Santa Clara University
Santa Clara, CA 95053
hpopper@mail.scu.edu