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Maternity Leave

Sarauna Thornton, Ph.D. - Hampden-Sydney College

MATERNITY LEAVE MAKES balancing work and family responsibilities a little easier, but many women and their employers are not yet comfortable with the laws governing maternity leave. Consequently, women forego benefits to which they are entitled. This article explains two key federal statutes governing maternity leave benefits and provides suggestions for negotiating leave with your employer.

Pregnancy Discrimination Act (1978)
The Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA) amends Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), and upheld by the Supreme Court in 1987, the PDA prohibits discrimination against women on the basis of pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical complications. The law applies to employers with 15 or more employees and addresses hiring, firing, and maternity leave.

The PDA defines maternity leave as a medical disability leave (granted to women only) covering the period during which a woman is physically unable to work as a result of childbirth or related medical complications (e.g., incompetent cervix, pregnancy-induced hypertension, etc.). Under the law, pregnancy alone, is not considered a disability. The PDA mandates that covered employers must provide paid maternity leave...if and to the extent that they provide paid disability leave for other non-work-related medical conditions requiring a short-term leave (less than 6 months) absence. Employers who don't provide paid disability leave need not provide paid maternity leave. However, employers who provide paid disability leave for medical reasons, must provide paid maternity leave for women who are injured in an automobile accident, have a leg amputation, etc., must provide paid maternity leave. The medically recommended period of recovery for a normal vaginal delivery is 6 weeks while for a cesarian delivery it is 8 weeks.

Paid maternity leave must be granted by employers with either formal or informal paid disability leave policies. Some employers don't have formal short-term disability policies, but they have previously paid employees who were temporarily disabled. The existence of informal paid leave policies obligates the employer to provide paid maternity leave. Note, however, that employers can grant different benefits to different categories of employees. The existence of paid disability leave for clerical staff doesn't guarantee paid maternity leave for professional staff.

According to the EEOC, an employer may not require a pregnant woman to obtain her doctor's permission to continue working. If you choose to work throughout your pregnancy and can still perform your job, your employer can't stop you or assign you other duties against your preferences. On the other hand, if a woman begins maternity leave, her employer must hold her job open for her for as long as it opens the job of other employees (to the same job category) on disability leave. If a woman wants to resume working before her maternity leave expires, and she can perform her duties, her employer must allow it.

Employers may grant maternity leave without providing paid maternity leave. Because maternity leave is a medical disability leave, and men don't suffer from pregnancy-related medical disabilities, employers may grant maternity leave only.

The EEOC has ruled that employers cannot fire or refuse to hire a woman because she is pregnant as long as she is able to perform the major functions of her job during the pregnancy. An employer also cannot fire or refuse to hire a pregnant woman because of prejudices against pregnant women, or the prejudices of co-workers, clients, customers, or students. If a pregnant woman becomes unable to perform her primary job duties (e.g., during childbirth, etc.), her employer may fire her only if it affects other employees who become medically disabled and temporarily unable to perform their primary job functions.

With an increased emphasis on "family values" some employers have illegally sought to restrict maternity benefits to married women. It is also illegal to require women to use accumulated sick leave before taking paid maternity leave. If any employer denies your request, they may be subject to other employers' demands. Similarly, a university can't require women to substitute for maternity leave in sciences. Let's keep the lines open to receive your comments and concerns. If you have any questions or need assistance, please feel free to contact us.
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The Roles of Traditional Mentoring and Team Mentoring

Robbin L. Barlett and Andrea L. Ziegler - Department of Economics, Denison University

N 1972 THE AMERICAN ECO-

nomic Association (AEA) created the Program for Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP) to increase the number of women entering the profession. The earliest available data on the number of women at the top 40 Ph.D. granting departments in the US showed that in 1978, there were only 39 female as-

sistants (13.3%), 9 female as-

sociate professors (4.2%), and 9 female full professors (3.8%) (AEA CSWEP Newsletter, Winter 1983).

Despite CSWEP’s continuous ef-

forts to promote women as presenters and discussants on the AEA’s program at its annual meetings, to suggest women for vacancies on editorial boards of ma-

jor journals, to broaden the applicant pool by keeping a record of female economists and their specialties, and to educate female economists through its newsletter with a series of “how to” ar-

ticles, the gains have been small.

Last year CSWEP sent a question-

naire to its representatives at 120 Ph.D. granting universities in the US. Data obtained from 98 reporting de-

partments showed that 122.75 female assistant professors (23.8%), 75 female associate professors (15.3%), and 116 female full professors (8.4%). The percentage of all economics pro-
n

fessors who are female is now 14.22% (79.8% of total number of 20 schools reporting), there are 29 assistant professors (18.2%), 9 associate professors (8.7%), and 20 full pro-

fessors (4.5%) who are female. The per-

centage of all economics professors who are female at the top 20 schools is 11.1 percent.

While these numbers compare fa-

vorably with those of 1978, they still show a disproportionate decrease in the percentage of economics professors who are female. A number of explanations have been put forth as to why these numbers are not changing at the same rate as the numbers of women entering the profession. These explanations include: lower salaries and benefits, lack of job security, lack of tenure, lack of research opportunities, lack of family support, lack of access to professional development programs, and lack of networking opportunities.

Though the reasons for the slow rate of change are multidimensional, the most important factor is the lack of provision of formal and informal networks for women in economics. This lack of networks has been identified as a major barrier to women’s success in the profession. Women who have access to formal and informal networks are more likely to have successful careers than those who do not.

The lack of formal and informal networks for women in economics has been identified as a major barrier to women’s success in the profession. Women who have access to formal and informal networks are more likely to have successful careers than those who do not.

One step towards addressing this issue is to encourage the formation of formal and informal networks among women economists. This can be done by organizing networking events, such as the Women’s Mentoring Network (WMN), which is dedicated to promoting the advancement of women in the field of economics. The WMN provides opportunities for women to connect with each other and with mentors who can offer guidance and support.

The role of the mentor is crucial in the development of women’s careers in economics. Mentors provide guidance, support, and encouragement, which can help women overcome the challenges they face in the profession. Mentors also help women navigate the academic and professional worlds, and can provide valuable advice on how to maximize their career prospects.

In conclusion, the lack of formal and informal networks for women in economics is a major barrier to women’s success in the profession. The role of the mentor is crucial in addressing this issue. By promoting the formation of networks, we can help women in economics achieve success and contribute to the growth of the field.

Endnotes

1 This paper benefited from comments provided by Sarah Hardy, Lowell Faye and Xue DiJong. Emus are the sole responsibility of the author.

2 Federal statutes specify your minimum rights. Some states have adopted legislation providing more generous benefits.

3 The information in this article should not be used as a substitute for obtaining legal counsel.

4 Californial State Standards and Lou. Grinn.

5 Prospective employers cannot legally ask about your plans to have children—although some will. Responding to these questions may be difficult. Mentoring in this question is illegal and it’s probably not worth it to the interviewees and may negatively affect their chances of getting a job offer. Alternatively, you could change the subject or state that you haven’t considered the issue.

6 Useful resources include: (3) Progess and Employment: The Complete Handbook on Discrimination, Maternity Leave, and Health and Safety. The Bureau of Natural Affairs, 1989. (2) Encyclopedia of Working Mother Needs to Know About Pregnancy Rights, Maternity Leave, and Making Her Career Work for Her, Aux\n
7 Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault, First Street, Rockville, MD, 1996. (4) (HEC Sex Discrimination Guidelines, 29 Code of Federal Regulations 1004.10 and 1004.11).

8 Some arguments against granting leave may sound silly. Over the years, however, I have heard each one.

9 Associated with Economics, Public Health, or Social Work.


11 Does Maternity Leave Induce Birth? Susan L. Ackert (Department of Economics and Business, Lakehead College, Eau Claire, PA, 1984) and Leslie A. Whittenburg (Georgetown University) Presented at the 1992 AASSA meetings, New Orleans, LA.
While mentoring is considered as important for success in the academic world as it is in the business world, less empirical research has been done on the impact of faculty-faculty mentoring in the academy. A study of 430 faculty members found a higher level of career development and satisfaction for faculty with mentors than those without. With mentors they published more, received a larger number of competitive grants, and served as leaders of state, national and international organizations more often than did those without mentors (Quarles, 1985). In a study of 64 female and 69 male mentored faculty, women published less than men and were not included in networks that led to publications and promotions (Fagenson, 1993). Women who collaborated with others were as successful as men as measured by number of publications and number of grants received (Cameron, 1979).

All this suggests that mentoring is very important. Finding a mentor, however, is more difficult for female economists than it is for male economists for a variety of complex and related reasons. Junior female economists have less access to senior male colleagues to choose from a whole array of fields as potential mentors. At major research-oriented institutions there are few women in senior positions, and none in most fields to serve as role models or as dissertation advisors. As more universities and national committees seek female representation, the pool of senior women available for mentoring is further limited because of these other demands. At times, successful senior women are lured away by higher paying positions in administration, business, or government.

While men can and do serve as excellent mentors to women, relatively few of them do. Developing a male-female mentoring relationship can be problematic. A female mentee may be hesitant to approach a potential male mentor on gender-related concerns. Requests by a female mentor may be misinterpreted as harassment or taken advantage of by the mentor. Even if a working mentor/mentee relationship is established, language differences may result in less than effective communication (Tannen, 1991).

Given the scarcity of appropriate potential mentors at research-oriented universities, particularly at the top economics departments, and the complex dynamics of one-on-one mentoring relationships, senior male and female economists must find new more effective ways to provide career information and guidance to junior female economists. There is, however, a promising alternative approach. Educational institutions and corporations successfully employ teams to improve classroom performance and productivity, respectively. Teams are a form of cooperative learning where each member of the team is equally responsible for the team’s success and each member of the team shares equally in the rewards. In higher education, cooperative learning groups have been shown to be successful in a variety of ways (Barlett 1995, 1996a, b, and c; Belkensky et al. 1986; Johnson, Johnson, and Smith 1991). Such groups have a common goal and share their resources and expertise to achieve that goal. The performance of individual group members is affected by the performance of the group as a whole. There is a growing literature on the effectiveness of high performance teams in academia, business and government (Senge, 1994).

The concept of cooperative mentoring is straightforward. Ideally, a small group of women faculty, say economists, with common research and teaching interests would be brought together under the guidance of a senior economist in their field. Each member of the team is responsible for the mutual support and advancement of all its members. The senior economist brings her expertise and acts as a resource for the team. Each team member brings her expertise and willingness to work on everyone’s projects, thus providing support for other members of the team. This commitment to shared goals provides junior female economists with the additional guidance, support, and confidence they need to be successful. In effect, the team serves all the career and psychosocial functions provided by a traditional mentor except those that can only be served by someone in a position of power. The role of the senior economist in a team differs from that of a traditional mentor, a ‘sage on the stage’, Davis is primarily responsible for passing on the collective wisdom and knowledge of the profession to the mentee by molding, protecting and promoting the protégé. By way of contrast, the team leader is a ‘guide on the side’, who facilitates and directs team members’ discovery of the secrets of professional success.

Developing teams, as distinct from relying solely on one-on-one mentoring relationships between junior and senior female economists, to improve the chances of junior female economists writing fundable grants for funding and publishing articles in major journals is attractive for several reasons. First, the education literature suggests that students at all levels of learning learn best from their peers. The literature on how female students and people of color best learns confirms this observation (American Association of University Women, 1991; Arnold, 1992; Belkensky et al., 1986; Cohen, 1994; Cooper et al., 1994; Davis, 1993; Lin, 1993; Magid, 1992; Mahler and Tetreault, 1992; Tobin, 1993; Triesman, 1992). Second, teams share the responsibility of mentoring, an opportunity to get to know each other. One of the reasons previous attempts by CSWE to engage women in mentoring relationships were not more successful was that being responsible for a number of young scholars and really getting to know them consumes a great deal of time and energy. The commitment was too open-ended. Teams, on the other hand, allow for mutual responsibility and facilitate the development of friendships, thus minimizing the problems caused by the dearth of female mentors, and alleviating the sense of isolation many junior faculty members feel.

The data suggests that there is one, maybe two women, in each of the H.U. granting institution teams. Team mentoring is an efficient way to use the knowledge and resources of the relatively few senior members of the profession to promote the careers of their younger colleagues. The team provides feedback and support and the mentor provides guidance and wisdom. The mentees take on more responsibility for peers and the mentor devotes less time to any one mentor. Once teams have met as a group, they can stay connected electronically.

While there is no evidence that team mentoring will be superior to traditional mentoring, it can only help. Given the smallness of women economists and their isolation, any mentoring they receive from different sources can only add to their human and social capital. Team mentoring will not displace traditional mentoring, but it can certainly complement it and boost the probability that junior female economists will write successful grant proposals, publish significant research, and earn tenure.
1997 CSWEP Annual Report

Robin L. Bartlett, Chair

The American Economics Association (AEA) has changed the Committee on the Status of 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 graduate students and faculty in academic economics departments and reports on the committee's activities during 1997.

THE HIRING AND PROMOTION OF WOMEN ECONOMISTS IN PH.D. GRANTING DEPARTMENTS

For the past three years, CSWEP has worked on developing its contacts in all of the Ph.D. granting departments in the US. One of the tasks of the CSWEP representatives in these institutions is to report on the status of women in their departments. CSWEP has been able to acquire more complete and accurate data than is available currently through the AEA Universal Academic Questionnaire (UAQ) which is mailed to all department chairs each fall. CSWEP sent out a questionnaire in September of 1996 and was able to obtain information from 98 of its 120 contacts in comparison to the UAQ which received responses from 62 Ph.D. granting economics departments in 1995. [1]

Information from the CSWEP questionnaire on the status of women faculty. Table 1 provides information on the share of women faculty at various ranks in the 98 Ph.D granting departments. Column 1 provides information on all 98 departments, while Column 2 and 3 provide information from the top 10 and 20 schools.

Table 1 indicates that the share of women with academic appointments in 1996 at the Ph.D granting institutions decreases with rank. The growing group of non-tenured faculty in economics departments consists disproportionately women. Compared to the 24 percent of women receiving Ph.D.s, of those faculty in non-tenure track positions, 50.2 percent are women. Untenured tenure-track assistant professors are 23.8 percent female. Untenured associate professors are 9.1 percent women. Tenured associate professors are 15.4 percent women and tenured full professors are 8.4 percent female. Among the top 20 schools, the numbers are lower at every rank, indicating less representation of women on the faculty in the very top-ranked departments, except in the tenured associate professor ranks of which 61.1 percent are women. The top 10 departments have higher percentages of untenured assistant and tenured associate professor who are women. The percentage of tenured full professors is 5.3 percent.

Information from the CSWEP questionnaire on the status of women graduate students in economics. The availability of women to the economics profession depends on the pipeline of women being trained in economics. Table 2 reports information on women in graduate programs in economics, taken from the CSWEP 1996 questionnaire. For the academic year 1996-97 about 30.5 percent of the first year class are female. Slightly over 28 percent of those who are ABD are female. Yet only 24.1 percent of those receiving a Ph.D. in economics are female at the 98 Ph.D granting departments reporting. [3] The representation of women at the top 20 departments is very similar to that for all graduate departments. Approximately 30 percent of the entering class are women, 26 percent of the ABD's are women, and 22.7 percent of the Ph.D.'s are women. The percentage for the top 10 graduate programs is slightly less favorable for women. While the percentage of new Ph.D.s who are women has improved since the inception of CSWEP in 1972, the percentage of new Ph.D.s in economics is relatively low when compared to the 22 fields reported by the National Science Foundation in 1995.

Information from the CSWEP questionnaire on the job market facing women. Table 3 shows how women fared in the job market in 1996 relative to men. With approximately 24 percent of the Ph.D.'s going to women, only 20 percent of the of the academic jobs at Ph.D. granting departments went to women and 26 percent of the jobs at non-Ph.D. granting departments went to women. At the top 20 schools, women received 22.7 percent of the degrees and 19.2 percent of the jobs at Ph.D. granting departments. These women received a disproportionate share of the jobs at non-Ph.D. granting departments, 42.3 percent. These data suggest that women from the top schools are going to smaller private or state institutions rather than continuing their careers at Ph.D granting departments. Moreover, a disproportionate share of women did not find jobs in 1996.

THE COMMITTEES ACTIVITIES

CSWEP On-going Activities. CSWEP is involved in a wide range of activities to help bring women into the profession and to increase the rate at which women are promoted at various stages of their careers. As part of its ongoing efforts to increase the participation of women on the AEA program, CSWEP organized six sessions for the January 1998 ASSA meetings, three on gender-related topics and three on women, risk, and the financial markets. In addition, we organized a roundtable discussion on Social Security Reform: How will Women Fare? to highlight the important effect that recent changes will have on the economic position of women. CSWEP also holds a business meeting at the annual meetings to report to associates about its activities and to hear from the AEA membership suggestions for future activities. To support junior women meeting senior women, a hospitality suite is staffed by members of the Committee.

New CSWEP Initiatives. This year's meetings are particularly important for CSWEP. We celebrate the 25th anniversary of its founding. To honor the occasion several new initiatives came on line. First, a newly formatted newsletter was designed and produced, and debuted with a special anniversary edition Full 1997. The newsletter contains articles on the progress of women in academia and business. A new mission statement was passed by the Committee during its September meeting and was published, reiterating its commitment to the original goals of CSWEP. The newsletter also contained an article about the past, present, and future goals of CSWEP. CSWEP's website has been redesigned from the pilot effort of last year. Visitors to the new site will find navigating the options more user-friendly and the contents more informative.

At this year's meetings is the first NSF/AAEA-CSWEP workshop to team mentor junior women economists. COCFFE: Creating Career Opportunities For Economists is a two-day workshop that brings together eight senior women economists and 40 junior women economists from the top universities in the country to cooperatively work on each others projects as teams. In addition, there are sessions on publishing, grant writing, networking, and balancing life and careers. Similar workshops will be conducted at the regional meetings this year. By the end of the year NSF/AAEA-CSWEP will have increased the chances of 200 women getting tenure within the next six years.

CSWEP's Regional Activities. To assist women in the profession who cannot make it to national meetings, CSWEP organizes sessions at the Eastern, Southern, Midwest, and Western Economic Association meetings. As at the national meetings, sessions are on gender-related research and non-gender-related field to showcase 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. In addition, CSWEP will conduct regional adaptations of the COCFFE workshops at these meetings this year.

CSWEP's Newsnet. CSWEP has maintained its recently organized network of representatives at 120 Ph.D granting schools in the country. These representatives help the Committee monitor the progress of women at these schools and collect the information upon which elements of this report are based. This year we assisted the Committee on the Status of Minorities in the Economics Profession by expanding CSWEP's survey to include questions about race and ethnicity.

A FEW WORDS OF THANKS

The Committee would like to thank several people who have made major contributions to its effort. JoAnn Haworth, the Membership Secretary, and her staff maintain the Roster, send out annual membership reminders, and create customized listings for potential employer. In addition this year they have helped us redesign the website to bring their operation on line for us.

Two members left the Committee at the end of 1997: Maureen Cropper (The World Bank) and Kenneth Small (University of California - Irvine). Both of these members of the Committee did more than their fair share of the work over the past three years. They organized sessions at the national meetings, hosted the Committee in Washington, and co-edited the newsletter with me. Both members always did more than they needed to do and were always happy to do so.

Finally, CSWEP thanks Sally Scheiderer for keeping the Committee and all of its paper and cyber work on track. Denison University, and in particular the Department of Economics, the Department of Women's Studies, and the Laura C. Harris Chair, has contributed to the work of CSWEP with space, paper, telephones, and postage. Finally, CSWEP thanks Mary Winzer and her staff at the AEA offices for their help and assistance. Marlene Bright also has been a tremendous help with the logistics of setting up the COCFFE workshop. All of these people have been wonderful to work with and the Committee could not have done its work without their commitment too.
NOTES
1. CSWEP’s sample contains only US economics departments, while that of the AEA U.A.Q. includes a few non-US economics departments.
2. A consistent series on the share of women Ph.D.s in economics is obtained from the National Science Foundation’s Annual Survey of Earned Doctorates.
3. The National Science Foundation reports that 24.1 percent of the doctorates granted in economics in 1995 went to women, slightly more than CSWEP identifies. Information on one of the top 20 schools, however, is missing from the CSWEP data.

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>All Ph.D.-Granting</th>
<th>Top 10</th>
<th>Top 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenure Track</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor (untenured)</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor (tenured)</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected by CSWEP of 120 Ph.D.-granting schools reporting in column 2, 9 out of 10 reporting in column 3 and 19 out of 20 reporting in column 4.

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Progress</th>
<th>All Ph.D.-Granting</th>
<th>Top 10</th>
<th>Top 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABD</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected by CSWEP of 120 Ph.D.-granting schools reporting in column 2, 9 out of 10 reporting in column 3 and 19 out of 20 reporting in column 4.

### TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>All Ph.D.-Granting</th>
<th>Top 10</th>
<th>Top 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Ph.D.-Granting</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Other Academic</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Public Sector</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Private Sector</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US Academic</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National University</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Found</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected by CSWEP of 120 Ph.D.-granting schools reporting in column 2, 9 out of 10 reporting in column 3 and 19 out of 20 reporting in column 4.

---

Maria Edgeworth and Classical Political Economy

William Kern - Western Michigan University

AMONGST ECONOMISTS THE name Edgeworth is a familiar one owing to the significant contributions of the British neoclassical economist Francis Ysidro Edgeworth. But what is less well known is that F.Y. Edgeworth was not the first in the Edgeworth family to have a considerable interest in economics. His aunt, the Victorian author, Maria Edgeworth (1767-1849), could claim the title of the first political economist in the Edgeworth family.

Maria was born in England, though she lived most of her life in Ireland. The family had owned property in Ireland for nearly two centuries when on Maria’s fifteenth birthday her father, Richard Edgeworth, moved his family to the family manor house where the Edgeworth family lived. Maria was born on her home until her death in 1847.

The family estate was a large one involving a myriad of activities including the assignment of leases, the collection of rents, and the improvement of the land. In addition, as the most significant property owner in the hamlet, her father also had a degree of political influence and obligations. As one of the eldest of the twenty-two children which Richard Edgeworth fathered, considerable responsibility fell to Maria both in conducting the affairs of the estate and in educating her siblings. She was, in the words of one of her biographers, “his right hand.” As a result, she acquired a familiarity with economic and political matters rare for a woman of her age.

Education had long been a particular interest of Richard Edgeworth’s and the huge number of children he fathered turned the estate into a laboratory of educational experimentation. In his attempt to mold his children into useful members of civilized society he enlisted Maria by encouraging her to write children’s stories. These “moral fictions” were stories designed to inculcate the proper virtues. Values such as prudence, honesty, loyalty, and adherence to proper manners were emphasized in Practical Education (1798), The Parents’ Assistant (1800), Early Lessons (1801), and Moral Tales for Young People (1801). The stories were instantly popular, exercising considerable influence on educational practice in the first half of the nineteenth century and earning Maria a significant literary reputation.

In 1800 Maria began a new literary enterprise as a novelist. Her first, and best known novel, Castle Rackrent, quickly established her reputation as a writer of adult fiction. Between 1800 and 1817 she published fifteen books and their success brought her widespread popularity and enabled her to lead the fashionable circles of London and Paris.

Her entry into fashionable society afforded Maria the opportunity to make the acquaintance of the leading figures of the literary, political and scientific world. Though Maria was a writer, she seemed naturally drawn to non-literary figures. The persons for whom she expressed the greatest admiration were persons of accomplishment in politics, engineering, and economic and scientific knowledge. Her friends included industrialists, scientists, politicians, artists, and political economists.

As a result of a visit to England in 1821, Maria made the acquaintance of David Ricardo, who she described as “exceedingly agreeable.” Their mutual admiration and friendship continued until his death in September of 1823. In addition, Maria was also to make the acquaintance of other of the leading figures of classical economics including Thomas Malthus, James Mill, John Stuart Mill, Francis Horner, Henry Brougham, and J.C. Simmonds. Maria made several visits to Ricardo’s estate, Garconble Park, which afforded her the opportunity to interact socially with the Ricardo family as well as discuss political economy. We know from her letters that they had their differences of opinion regarding several matters, though she much enjoyed their debates. Of Ricardo she said she “had never argued or discussed a question with any person who argues more fairly or less for victory than for truth.”

One of the "truths" they debated was Ricardo’s theory of rent. In Ricardo’s system, rents were the result of diminishing returns resulting from the decreasing quality of the soil brought under cultivation due to the pressure of population growth. Population pressure also induced the more intensive cultivation of previously farmed lands again producing diminishing returns. Since wages were determined by the cost of subsistence, and agricultural prices by the cost of producing grain on the least fertile lands, nominal wages and rents would rise, and profits would fall due to diminishing returns. Ricardo therefore deduced that the interests of landlords and labor and capitalists were opposed. Rising rents were indicative of the declining economic fortunes of the rent of society.

But Maria was not convinced that rising rents were explained by diminishing returns or that the interests of landlords and the rest of society were opposed. She accepted the views of one of Ricardo’s critics, the Reverend Richard Jones, who had demonstrated that rents came into being independently of and rose without resort to diminishing returns. Furthermore, he had argued that improvements in agriculture, rather than diminishing returns, explained most of the increase in rents.

Edgeworth’s diagnosis of the problem besetting Irish agriculture pointed in the direction of mismanagement in the agricultural sector rather than di... continued on page 19
Letters to the Editors

Dear Editor:

I have just received the last issue of the CSWEP newsletter with reflections on the last 25 years. I would like to share anecdotal evidence of how CSWEP has touched my life.

I knew of the existence of this organization as a student, when the newsletter arrived just as a consequence of becoming a member of the AEA. It's effects then were of information and persuasion. News of job-openings and calls for papers were especially important. Encouragement in personal discussions about the ASSA meetings had the greatest impact. As a result I was better informed than my male colleagues on deadlines and procedures and less negative about the probabilities of being in the program. It was in the middle '80s when I started passing our newsletter on to graduate students regardless of gender, age, race or national origin. The result was that I was in the AEA program the first year out of graduate school and it was not through the CSWEP sessions but as a regular contributed paper. Since then I have made it a regular activity the submission of my research to be considered for presentation at the AEA meetings. I have been in the program six out of eight years of my academic career.

The second instance when CSWEP came to the rescue was as support at the meetings site. I started my academic career in 1989 as an assistant professor in the department of economics at Iowa State University, and I was a single mother of a two-year-old boy. That December I had a paper accepted for presentation and no babysitting. For three months I agonized about a decision to present or not at the paper. Where would I leave him for the two-hour session? The CSWEP newsletter came along with information about on-site babysitting at the meetings. The problem was solved, I presented my work, and he has been a regular child at a kid and infant program. My son has enjoyed the program picking it as he best among a number of other programs he has sampled! I encourage CSWEP to continue support for this program even when the numbers of users sometimes is not overwhelming. It is also important that the program is located at the convention site.

The third occasion in which I found direct CSWEP support was as a user of the hospitality room. There are not many places in a convention where you can look at your notes before a presentation while a child plays at your feet and feel welcomed. This is exactly what the hospitality room means to me. I know that I can come around alone or with my child and there would be no annoyed looks or harsh words at the presence of a child in an adult environment. I have done this often, and I have counted it as a real resource if I am presenting work at the meetings.

Book Review

(continued from page 10)

women's and men's own rational choices and desires." Albeda concludes with a look at the future of feminist analysis in economics. She is cautiously upbeat, arguing that:

- Feminist economists are stretching the boundaries of economic analysis by recognizing and integrating gender differences into economic models, byspanning disciplines, and by employing a variety of analytical tools and paradigmatic approaches.

- Feminist economists have the potential to push the economic profession to new theoretical and analytical insights as they work to make women's economic roles more visible.

Albeda herself has performed an important service for the economics profession. As any economist reading her book will be granted new insights into the nature of the economics profession and his or her role in that profession.
Summaries of CSWEF-Organized Sessions at the 1998 AEA Meetings

**GENDER-RELATED TOPICS**

*Women and Retirement Issues*
Olivia Mitchell
University of Pennsylvania

The four papers in this session explored labor market and demographic determinants of older women’s wellbeing, focusing on behavioral patterns of women in their 50s and 60s. Two of the studies used to good advantage the interesting new Health and Retirement Study (HRS), a longitudinal survey of Americans age 51-61 in 1992 and their spouses. In her research, Marjorie Honig from Hunter College evaluated whether and how earnings, pensions, social security, and health insurance affect older married women’s expectations of working after age 62. This paper, entitled “Married Women’s Retirement Expectations: Do Pensions and Social Security Matter?”, concluded that married women who work full time plan on remaining employed until age 62 and that the health and social security benefits are better. Conversely, factors inducing them to retire earlier include having a pension and higher levels of family income. Taxes also play a role, not surprisingly: wives whose husbands expect to keep working also plan to work longer, while women valuing joint leisure anticipate earlier retirement. The second HRS analysis, by Melinda Pitts and Michelle Treasick from Salisbury State University, asked how wives’ work patterns are influenced by their husbands’ poor health status. Using the HRS, they estimated the impact on married women’s Retirement Decision: Does Husband’s Health Matter?, the authors evaluated which factors might induce women to work less. The evidence is compelling: more hours over time. The richness of the health measures captured in the HRS permitted the authors to assess whether having a spouse seriously ill or disabled matters to retirement. Health problem has a differential effect than would having a spouse with chronic and/or emotional health problems.

In addition they explored responses to health practices including smoking, exercise, and drinking.

Understanding how government pension influences women’s retirement was the focus of Nabinath Gupta and Bent Christensen from the University of Aarhus, in their paper, "The Effects of Pension Systems Reform on Female Retirement: Evidence from Denmark.” Overtly to reduce unemployment, the Danish government permits workers in young as age 62 to take early retirement. This early retirement option is quite attractive to many, inasmuch as government pensions are normally available only at age 67. The authors estimated a hazard model using data on older married couples, and used the estimated parameters to simulate benefit rule changes. The evidence suggested that reducing benefit amounts saves the underfunded pension system more than does raising the age of eligibility, and keeps women in the labor market longer. Government pensions also were the topic of the final paper in this session, an analysis by Shamila Chaudhary and Michael Leonisio from the Social Security Administration. These authors showed that American women’s eventual social security benefits depend not only on their work histories, but also on their spouses’ earnings patterns and how long they were married. Therefore dynamic changes in women’s employment, pay, and marriage/divorce patterns in the past forty years will have long-lasting. and still not fully understood effects on women’s eventual social security retirement payments. Initial results were summarized in a paper entitled "Marital Status and Lifetime Earnings Outlook for American Women." The authors suggested that younger women who are now having spent many more years in the paid labor market than did their precursors, but these additional work years do not necessarily translate into benefits that accrue evenly to exceed what they could have received as spouses.

*Developments in the Labor Market for Women*
Joyce F. Jacobsen
Wellesley University

Donna Cinner (Washington University) and Chuanlin Jiun (University of Houston) presented “Employment of Women and Domestic-Side Forces,” which examines the relationship between female employment growth and changes in labor demand. Using the 1964-95 March Current Population Surveys and the 1940-1990 Censuses, they find that female employment growth accelerated in the 1970s and 1980s and that growth was biased in favor of more skilled women. They are able to account for the pattern of biased growth using labor demand proxies, but are unable to account for the overall accelerating trend with their demand proxies.

Elinor Braim-Brooks (Williams College) paper, “Women in Transition: Changes in Gender Wage Differentials in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union,” uses household survey data from three former Soviet republics and six East European countries to consider whether women have maintained their relative positions in the wage distribution since the reforms of the early 1990s. She reported a substantial increase in female relative wages in the Eastern countries, but a substantial decline in female relative wages in Russia and Ukraine. In all countries except Russia, women have been negatively affected by the tremendous widening of the wage distribution, but in Eastern Europe the widening distribution has been self-reinforcing through a decline in observed skills and an apparent decline in discrimination against women.

Dean Dudley (US Military Academy), Deborah Vida (New York Medical College), and Casey Wadsworth (RAND) gave the third paper, “The Incidence of Military Service on Married Household Earnings.” They reported present military service is negatively related to labor market data and Department of Defense data contrasting earnings of spouses in civilian and military households. The data supported the expected finding of an earnings penalty related to being a spouse — in a military household.

The final paper, by Karen Munford and Peter N. Smith (both University of York), was titled "Men, Women and the Hiring Function.” They use Australian quarterly data from 1980 through 1991 to characterize worker flows between the states of unemployment, employment, and not in the labor force. Using log-linear regression equations to relate the flow rates, they find evidence supporting thec testing of men over women in the hiring process. Among men, employed job seekers are ranked above those unemployed, and in turn, those in the "precarious" force. Among women, the unemployed and employed did not appear to be competing with each other, while those not in the labor force are ranked below the unemployed.

Discussions Theresa Devine (Congressional Budget Office), Katherine Terrell (University of Michigan), Leslie Stratton (Virginia Commonwealth University), and Amy Askalashki (Wichita College) provided thoughtful contributions.

*Gender and Risk Avoidance*
Kathryn Shaw
Carnegie Mellon University

The general question raised by this session was, are women more risk averse than men? If so, this could imply, for example, that women will have lower levels of wealth and that they allocate their wealth to assets that are more conservative. This is particularly important as Congress debates whether to create retirement accounts in Social Security that would give the people the right to allocate their wealth across alternative and portfolio diversification. The woman’s level of risk aversion is critical to their decisions on how to allocate funds. Catherine Eckel (National Science Foundation), Philip Grossman (University of Texas at Arlington), and Nancy Lutz (Virginia Polytechnic) presented "Playing It Safe: Women, Men, and Risk Aversion" (joint with V. Padmanabham of Stanford University). Using data on 25 stocks and 140 decisions to purchase extended warranties for computers, the authors find that women are more risk averse than men — they are more likely to purchase extended warranties, all else constant (including their perceptions of risk). The remaining three papers look at the allocation of pension wealth. In "Women, Risk Taking, and Pensions Decisions," Nancy Jusakopolos (Colorado State University) uses data from the 1989 Survey of Consumer Finances to examine women’s allocation of wealth between defined contribution plans and other assets (in joint research with Vieceli Bajaj and Alexander Bernske of Colorado State). They find that women allocate a smaller proportion of their wealth to DCP plans, and that the difference comes from a number of factors-older women, single women, and women with kids allocate much more than do other women. Using more recent data from the SCF (for 1992 and 1995), Anikaa Sundar (Federal Reserve Board of Governors) presented results on how women and men allocate their pension wealth, given that they have a defined contribution plan (from "Gender Differences in the Allocation of Risk, Income Security and pension Wealth, and controlling for risk and health status.

Joanne Doyle (James Madison University) and Toni M. Whited (University of Maryland and University of Delaware) present evidence against representative-agent models in explaining industry-level investment in, "Fixed Costs of Adjustment, Coordination, and Industry Investment." They find that deviations of the actual and optimal capital stock are more persistent for low-uncertainty industries (relative to aggregate uncertainty industries). This finding lends support to the proposition that smooth industry-level investment results from learning and habit formation. John Birg (University of Virginia) noted that the results are very

**NON-GENDER-RELATED TOPICS**

*Economic Fluctuations: Savings, Investment, and Wages*
Sveinn D. Jonsson
Western Michigan University

Annamaria Lusardi (Dartmouth College) estimates a precautionary saving model using an improved measure for income risk in "The Importance of Income Risk in Determining precautionary saving Motives." Using data from the Health and Retirement Survey she finds that precautionary saving is not increased when individuals perceive an increase in the variance of earnings. Nancy Jusakopolos (Colorado State University) offered suggestions for extensions of the paper, separating out bequests and precautionary saving motives. Getting at early retirement issues as a whole, "Relational Investment, and Wages"
strongly given the use of more aggregated and lower frequency data than called for in this situation. She suggested looking into the newer and better capital stock data, employ subperiod tests, and reconsider whether idiosyncratic shocks are id

Rather than estimate the average correlation of wages and employment, Marcello Brocato and Bob Aronson (Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System) depart from common practice and attempt to identify both the labor supply and labor demand curves to differentiate among macroeconomic models. In "Nominal Wage Rigidity and Real Wage Cyclical," nominal wage rigidity is tested by identifying movement along the labor supply and labor demand curves using appropriate measures. They conclude that nominal wage rigidity is an important channel for transmission of aggregate demand shocks to the real side of the economy. Jane Blythe (Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland) also suggested reconsidering whether innovations in the real federal funds rate is the appropriate instrument to use in identifying the labor demand elasticity; close the model by specifying price determination; rule out alternative interpretations of the results.

Erica L. Groshen (Federal Reserve Bank of New York and Mark Schweitzer (Federal Reserve Board) presented "Inflation’s Grease and Sand Effects in the Labor Market." Using a 40-year panel of wage changes they sort out inflation-induced deviations and workers’ playmen’s mean change changes (disruptive or sand effects) from inflation-induced, interoccupational wage increases (sand effects). That said, the grease and sand effects together exist, but cancel at low levels of inflation. At high levels of inflation both effects dominate. Shudain Khan (Boston University) was convinced that the authors have indeed identified the two effects with the grease being limited, and the sand effect unlimited. She offered several technical suggestions.

"Banking and Financial Crimes: The Double Drain with Cross-Border Twist: More on the Relationship Between Banking and Currency Crises." The paper discusses the possibility between currency and banking crises and looks at the transmission of financial crises. It gives a cross-border twist by providing examples of how a banking (currency) crisis in one country can give rise to a currency (banking) crisis in another. In an empirical paper on "Financial Crimes in Asia and Latin America: Then and Now" — Grecia Kamstock (Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis) and Carmen Reinhart (University of Maryland) examine the behavior of financial institutions that identify to stabilize institutions prior to a crisis. In general, they find that financial crises are more severe in Latin America than elsewhere, but that these differences, especially compared to the current Asian crisis, are narrowing.

Nancy P. Marion (Dartmouth College) and Robert P. Flood (international Monetary Fund) delivered a paper that provided a more general overview of the literature on currency crises. They found that this paper entitled "Some Perspective on the Present Currency Crisis Literature," provides a review of the new theoretical and empirical literature. It goes on to extend the existing models by deriving a model that incorporates the optimal commitment to a fixed exchange rate. Finally Liliana Rojas-SSucer (Inter-American Development Bank) gave the paper "Early Warning Indicators of Banking Problems: What Works in Latin America?" This paper shows that bank-based early warning systems developed for industrial countries are not effective for detecting banking problems in Latin America. The paper proposes tests and a test of alternative indicators, which is quite robust. The discussion were Linda Goldberg (Federal Reserve Bank), Angela Redish (University of British Columbia), Caroline Beets (University of Southern California), and Sara Calvo (World Bank).

"Human Capital Accumulation and Growth": David H. Nevin National Science Foundation

Four papers were presented at this session, Anne Owen of Hamilton College and Murat F. Ilygin of the Federal Reserve explored the implications for growth of the existence of more than one type of human capital, showing how the choice between entrepreneurship and employment involved an economy develops and examining how individuals’ decisions to accumulate different types of human capital affect the economy’s long-run potential.

Bart Judson of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago explored the relation between human capital and productivity rather than from any currency crisis and then used this new measure in cross-country panel regressions to show that human capital accumulation yields a positive and significant, but relatively small (about 10 percent) elasticity with per-capita GDP and that the stock of human capital, as a share of GDP increases with GDP.

Mary Lovely and Doug Holtz-Eakin (Economics Department of the University of Wisconsin-Madison) found that an aging population could increase government spending on education despite shifts toward voters with a lower preference for educational spending because elderly voters also favor policies that increase growth rates and a higher social-state level of output per person provides a larger tax base for governmental investment in education.

Jane Bird of the University of Virginia and Kimore S. Muro of Macalester College showed that government policies of taxation and enforcement significantly affect the informal sector across regions of the world as well as in individual circumstances and that the source of the informal sector significantly and negatively affects real GDP per worker.

Last Pritchard of the World Bank, Patricia Ballod of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, Graham Holm of Michigan State University and Shohreh Majum of Western Michigan University provided extensive and very helpful comments on the papers. There were also questions and comments on each paper from the audience in this productive session.

CSWEP Roundtable on "Social Security Reform: How Will Women Fare?" Cordella W. Rainius Hunter College and the Graduate School of CNUY

Teresa Devine of the Congressional Budget Office led off the CSWEP Roundtable on "Social Security Reform: How Will Women Fare?" with an overview of the financing problem facing Social Security and key features of the existing system and major reform proposals, some of which involve partial privatization. She pointed out that Social Security currently is the most important source of income for older women, but still leaves many of the oldest old who live alone on a one-person benefit — most of whom are women — in poverty. In addition, because the current tax-benefit structure favors one-five earner couples, married women may not see a direct return on their payroll taxes. Because women marry and earn less than their husbands, the future economic security of most older women will depend on what rephorms do to their Social Security benefits based on their spouse’s earnings. Decisions about how much to allocate to the "social" defined-benefit income security program versus the "private" individual pension accounts, the site of spouse and survivor benefits in the social program, and the retirement age and Medicare eligibility for social security accounts (e.g., mandatory joint and survivor annuities, spouses’ and ex-spouses’ ownership and inheritance rights) will determine whether women can escape the social security that are rejected.

Steven Sandell of the Social Security Administration reported the results of research by Howard Furman and himself concerning the effects of certain Social Security tax changes on the elderly population. They examined the effect on poverty rates of reducing the spouse benefit to one third of the retiree’s benefit, or the present in survivor’s benefit to 75 percent of the couple’s total benefit.

Marjorie Holmg of Hunter College-CUNY argued that a shift away from the redistributive and insurance aspects of the present Social Security system to individual accounts is not an issue particular to women, because women’s labor force participation, earnings, private pensions, savings, and investment behavior will become more like men’s over the next 30 years. She observed that due to rising divorce and falling remarriage rates, women know that they must take care of their own financial futures, and that therefore their labor force participation and financial expertise will continue to increase. Individual accounts need not be more risky for women than for men, provided the default distributions is a joint and survivor annuity and any alternative requires spousal consent. As women gain experience with confined contribution employer plans, new accounts generally, their investments will become less conservative and therefore earn higher returns, as well.

Martyn Moon of the Urban Institute, who is a public trustee of the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds, emphasized that privatization and rates of return are not the only issues. In making changes to Social Security, it is essential that women’s options be equal for what is likely to happen to Medicare and Medicaid, since retirement income needs depend in part on the tax treatment of private programs, and if those programs must be financed. She observed that women have a greater stake in a more progressive, redistributive system and that the tax windfall to the informal sector significantly and negatively affects real GDP per worker.
From the Chair ...  
CSWEP Chair, Rabia L. Bartlett - Denison University

The annual meetings in Chicago marked the 25th Anniversary of CSWEP. To commemorate its creation the original committee members were invited back for a special reception and reunion. Walter Adams, Carolyn Shaw Bell (the first chair), Francine Blau, Colletta Moore, Barbara Reagan, and Myra Strober were all present to reminisce about the early years. Phyllis Wallace and Kenneth Boddiing who were also members of the original committee are deceased and were remembered. John Kenneth Galbraith was the first ex-officio member of the committee by virtue of his Presidency of the AEA. He was unable to attend because of health reasons. Most of the previous CSWEP chairs were present as were over 40 of the previous committee members. Joan Hershof was recognized for her many years of service as Membership Secretary.

Two prizes were announced: The Carolyn Shaw Bell Prize and the Elaine Bennett Prize. The Carolyn Shaw Bell prize is intended to honor women and men who have successfully mentored young women economists and the Elaine Bennett prize is to recognize outstanding research by young women economists. The AEA executive committee gave CSWEP the go ahead to plan and institute both of these prizes. There was a huge birthday cake, punch, and champagne punch for all.

In addition, Joni Hersch, Stacy Dickert-Conlin, and Shelia Murphy organized the first Women on the Run'' Walk event. The inaugural three mile run had eleven male and female runners and two walkers. The weather was wet and the wind was strong, but everyone returned safely and had a good time.

The three gender-related and three non-gender-related sessions were well-attended and the roundtable on the effects of Social Security changes on women drew a crowd. The hospitality suite served as a meeting place for persons interested in joining CSWEP and for associates to meet and discuss the job market and network over coffee and tea.

The crownning event was the "Creating Career Opportunities for Female Economists: COCOFF'' workshop sponsored by CSWEP and funded by the National Science Foundation. Beth Allen (University of Minnesota), Rebecca Blank (Counsel of Economic Advisors), Elizabeth Hoffman (University of Illinois - Chicago), Beth Ingram (University of Iowa), Kala Krishna (University of Pennsylvania), Valerie Ramey (University of California - San Diego), and Michelle White (University of Michigan) provided guidance and expertise to 40 junior women from across the county. Kathryn Anderson (Vanderbilt University), Hall Edson (Federal Reserve Board), Barbara Fraumeni (Northwestern University), Joni Hersch (University of Wyoming), Joyce Jacobson (Wellesley University), Daphne Kenyon (Simon's College), Aleshow Liebowitz (UCLA), and Susan Puto (Western Michigan University) served as facilitators. Catherine Edgel (University of Virginia and NSF) served as a resource person. Marianne Ferber and Mariane Chabrier were recognized for their pioneering work in bringing women into the field. And Dan Newman gave a talk on how to write the perfect NSF grant proposal. The two day workshop provided the time for senior and junior women to work on their projects and to discuss issues around research, grant-writing, networking, and balancing life choices. We owe a great deal of thanks to all who volunteered their efforts and to Andrea Ziegert and Sally Schedler (Denison University), both of whom helped me with the details of the workshop.

There will be four more COCOFF workshops at the regional meetings over the next year. Contact your regional CSWEP representative for additional information.

Local Meetings

Regional Meetings


* Gender-Related Issues
  Chair: Kristen Keis, Univ. of Toledo
  Monday, March 21, 1998 10 - 11:45 a.m.
  Discussions: Kristen Keis (Univ. of Toledo), Carolina Antoosen-Dorantes (Western Michigan University)

* The Economics of Information
  Chair: Virginia Shingler, Valparaiso Univ.
  Wednesday, March 19, 1998 1:30 - 3:30 PM
  Papers: "The Economics of Scientific Data," Beth E. Allen (Univ. of Minnesota); "Asymmetric Information and the Quality of Care in the U.S. Renal Dialysis Industry," Renee A. Irvin (Univ. of Nebraska at Omaha); "Limited Liability Companies and Technology Transfer," Kathy Combs (Univ. of Minnesota); "The Informational Value of Sequential Fund Raising," Liz Vesterland (Iowa State Univ.)
  Discussions: Virginia Shingler (Valparaiso Univ.), Carolyn Evans (Harvard Univ.)

The CSWEP Business meeting will be held Thursday, March 19, from 5 to 6 p.m. in PDR 17 (5th floor). The CSWEP reception will be held Friday, March 20, from 5 to 6:30 p.m. in the Crystal Room (3rd floor). All interested persons are invited to both the business meeting and the reception.

The Carolyn Shaw Bell Award

Description: This award is given annually to an individual who has fostered the status of women in the economics profession, through example, achievements, increasing our understanding of how women can advance in the economics profession, or mentoring 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.

Prizes: The first award will be made in January 1999 at the CSWEP reception at the ASSA/AEA Convention. A "master" plaque that lists all award winners, in addition to the forthcoming status of women economists will also bear Carolyn's word, "We need every day to herald some woman's achievements, to tout a woman's book or painting or scholarly article, to brag about a promotion or prize and to show admiration for the efforts and influence of women, in their professional and technical and social and human endeavors of all kinds." (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 winners.

NOMINATIONS: The nominations should be submitted by October 31, 1998. Include all of the following:

* The living original members of CSWEP gather in Chicago to celebrate the 25th Anniversary of CSWEP.
Left to right, they are: Myra Strober, Barbara Reagan, Carolyn Shaw Bell, Francine Blau, Colletta Moore, Marnita Blauenfield and Walter Adams.

The nominating letter should be signed by at least five individuals familiar with the nominee's work in the economics profession. The nomination letter should include:

1. A statement of the nominee's contributions to economics and economic policy.
2. A description of the nominee's role in promoting opportunities for women in economics.
3. A description of the nominee's role in promoting opportunities for women in non-academic environments.

The nomination letter should be accompanied by a current curriculum vitae and a list of publications and other professional activities.

Nominations will be accepted until October 31, 1998. The award will be presented at the 1999 ASSA/AEA meetings.

The 1999 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award will be presented at the 1999 ASSA/AEA meetings.
Regional Meetings

CSWEP-Sponsored Sessions at the Eastern Economics Association
February 28
Crown Plaza Manchester
New York, New York
• Women and Wages, Poverty and Borrowing
  Chair: Daphne Kenyon, Simmons College (Tentative)
  CSWEP Paper Session
  Time: 9 to 10:40 a.m.

• Current Issues In Health Economics
  Chair: Daphne Kenyon, Simmons College (Tentative)
  CSWEP Paper Session
  Time: 11 a.m.
  Papers: "Changes in Age-Specific Mortality Rates: Gender and International Comparisons," Yaffi Machne (Bar-Ilan University, Israel); "A Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Resources Required for Medically Ventilated Patients," Diane M. Dowes (School of Public Health, SUNY at Albany), "Cigarette Smokers as Job-Risk Takers," Jori Heinich (Univ. of Wisconsin) and W. Kip Viscusi (Harvard Univ.)

• Creating Career Opportunities for Female Economists at the 1999 Eastern Economic Meetings
  CSWEP Business Meeting
  Time: 2 to 3:40 p.m.
  Presenters: Daphne Kenyon (Simmons College), Barbara Fraumeni (Northeastern University)

Call for Papers

Gender Issues is a quarterly journal edited by Rita J. Simon and published by Transaction. It is dedicated to publishing basic and applied research on the relationships between men and women on the similarities and differences in socialization, personality and behavior, and on the changing aspirations, roles, and status of women in industrial and urban societies as well as in developing nations. To submit an article for consideration, send three copies of each manuscript, with title page and abstract, to:
Rita J. Simon, Editor
Gender Issues
American University
School of Public Affairs
4400 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20016-8043

Include a brief biographical note and an address for correspondence. Articles must not have been previously published or currently be under review for publication elsewhere. For more information, phone 202-885-2985 or fax 202-885-2907.

New England Women Economists Association
Spring 1998 Meeting
Friday, April 3
Simmons College (Main Campus Bldg.)
300 The Fenway
Boston, Massachusetts
5:00-7:45 p.m. Hospitality - Staff Lounge, First Floor
6:15-7:15 p.m. Speaker Program - Room C101, First Floor
7:15-9 p.m. Buffet Dinner and Discussion - Special Function Room, First Level
At the Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston, Susan Elliott oversees sales and business development, credit services, and market research. She also directs the Bank's community investment programs. Ms. Elliott has 22 years of experience in the banking industry. Prior to joining the Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston in 1981, she held positions at Bank of New England and at First Mutual Bank of Boston. Ms. Elliott is a member of New England Women in Real Estate and is also active in several non-profit organizations serving the homeless.

For further information, call Dr. Barbara Sawtelle at (617) 521-2582.

Maria Edgeworth ...

(continued from page 9)

... still looking for her main man in the form of a "right man". She found him in the person of Matthew Bridge, a farmer and gentleman who admired her for her intelligence and beauty. They were married in 1806, and she bore him three children: Susanna, George, and Harriet. Maria was devoted to her family, and she wrote many letters to them. She also continued to write novels, and her most famous work, "Athena", was published in 1806. "Athena" was a satire on the aristocratic society of her time, and it was heavily influenced by the writings of the Enlightenment philosophers. Maria was a strong proponent of women's rights and education, and she believed that women should be encouraged to pursue knowledge and to participate in the public sphere. She was also a strong advocate for social reform, and she wrote many articles and pamphlets on topics such as poverty, crime, and prostitution.

News and Notes

Darlene C. Chidolue has been promoted to Associate Professor of Economics at Lehman University. She has also written "Profit-Sharing versus Fixed-Payment Contracts: Evidence from the Motion-Pictures Industry," which appeared in The Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization, April 1997.

Bijan Yang of the Department of Economics and International Business at Drexel University, co-authored with David Letter, "The Economy and Suicide: Economic Perspectives on Suicide," published by Nova Science in 1997. The book surveys sociological theories of suicide and the economy. It also introduces economic theories of suicide which include those developed by Hansriick and Sosu, Yang and Lester, McCain, Huang and others. Empirical studies of suicide and the economy are also examined in the book.
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, 1997 - June 30, 1998), 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 ASSOCIATES 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 Newsletter

CSWEP: People to Contact

General Policy Matters and Items for Newsletter
Robin Barilett, Department of Economics
Denison University
Granville, OH 43023
barilett@denison.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
Daphne Kenyon, Department of Economics
Simmons College
300 The Fenway
Boston, MA 02115
dkenyon433@aol.com

CSWEP Mid-West
Susan Pozo, Department of Economics
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008
susan.pozo@wmich.edu

CSWEP South
Catherine Eckel, National Science Foundation Economics Program
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 995
Arlington, VA 22230
cnock@nsf.gov

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