

Early Draft. Please do not quote or cite.

Women Economists of Promise? Six Hart, Schaffner and Marx Prize Winners in
the Early Twentieth Century

Kirsten K. Madden, Ph.D.
Millersville University, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.
kirsten.madden@millersville.edu

December 2015

Draft prepared for the January 2016 Allied Social Science Association Meetings

Fifty-three monographs with publication dates between 1907 and 1931 received the Hart, Schaffner, and Marx Prize in the U.S.A. In the opinion of a 1929 book reviewer:

“The cult of competitions is widespread today, but few of the winning plays, poems, and plans for peace, prosperity or prohibition have won much approval. In one field, however, a competition has thoroughly justified its existence, for the Hart, Schaffner and Marx Prize Essays have consistently, during the last twenty years, been valuable contributions to economic literature, and many of their authors have subsequently stepped to the very front of the academic field.”¹

The Hart, Schaffner, and Marx prize intention was ‘to encourage a wider interest in the study of economic and commercial subjects.’ First prize included a \$1000 award, second prize a \$500 award. The annual award committee consisted of three to five members, typically filled by the following men: J. Laurence Laughlin of the University of Chicago, J.B. Clark and Wesley C. Mitchell, both of Columbia University, Edwin F. Gay, in association with Harvard University and the *New York Evening Post*, Theodore E. Burton of Washington D.C., Henry C. Adams of the University of Michigan, and Horace White of New York City.

Simon Kuznets, Frank Knight, Edwin Nourse, Harold Moulton, and Edgar Furniss are a few of the men who won either first or second prize or, as in Kuznets’ case, who received honorable mention. Major journals such as the *American Economic Review* announced the prize winners each year. An award winning series with the Hart, Schaffner, and Marx label provided publication exposure for the award recipients. The award winning books often received academic journal reviews.

Eleven percent of the 53 Hart, Marx, and Schaffner award winners were women². The first woman to receive the award was Yetta Scheftel in 1915; the final woman to receive the award was Alma Herbst in 1930. Table 1 lists the six women prize winners by name and university affiliation for each prize winner’s doctoral studies, thesis title, year receiving the award, and prize recognition level.

¹ *Minnesota History*, June 1929, volume 10, number 2, page 178

² Though assessing the first decade of economists’ careers rather than one monograph, compare the John Bates Clark Medal winners: from 1947-1999, 0 women received this award out of 26 award recipients (0%); from 1947-2015, 3 women received this award out of 37 award recipients (8.11%).

Table 1: Women Winning the Hart, Schaffner and Marx Prize³ in the U.S.A.⁴

Name & University Affiliation (Doctorate)	Thesis Title	Award Year	Recognition Level
Yetta Scheftel Univ. of Chicago	The taxation of land value; a study of certain discriminatory taxes on land	1915	1 st prize
Hazel Kyrk Univ. of Chicago	A theory of consumption	1921	1 st prize
Mollie Ray Carroll Univ. of Chicago	Labor and politics; the attitude of the American Federation of Labor toward legislation and politics	1922	honorable mention
Helen Fisher Hohman Univ. of Chicago	The development of social insurance and minimum wage legislation in Great Britain; a study of British social legislation in relation to a minimum standard of living	1928	1 st prize
Caroline Ware Radcliffe College	The early New England cotton manufacture; a study in industrial beginnings	1929	1 st prize
Alma Herbst Univ. of Chicago	The Negro in the slaughtering and meat-packing industry in Chicago	1930	2 nd prize

All but one woman earned her Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, the institutional home of prize committee chairman, J.L. Laughlin. A prize committee member was the thesis director for the other woman, Caroline Ware. Initial investigation into the men prize winners shows more variation in PhD granting affiliation than that for the women, though other personal connections between the men winners and the prize awarding committee members certainly may have existed. Nonetheless, receiving merit-based awards may have implications for productivity and for career path trajectory.

The literature analyzing economics awards hypothesizes numerous potential career effects. Awards may change pre-award issuance behavior of the pool of people who believe they are potential award recipients. For instance, an award may induce potential recipients to undertake actions desired by the award giver or an award may more broadly stimulate productivity in pursuit of the reward. Receipt of awards may change the post-award issuance behaviors of award recipients, particularly productivity. Some recipients may increase productivity perhaps in connection to a rise in self-esteem; other recipients efforts may stagnate (a resting on laurels phenomenon), reflected in lower post-award productivity. There are also social ramifications of publicized awards. Assuming the award is perceived as merit-based, when publicized, the award may serve as a signaling device across a community for desirable researcher characteristics such as intellectual innovation or discipline. The award winner may be the recipient of

³ All six of these women received a Hart, Schaffner and Marx Class A award, which “included any American without restriction.” Class B awards targeted undergraduate research.

⁴ Women received awards for their economic thought in Great Britain as well. At the London School of Economics (LSE), four women received the LSE Hutchinson Silver Medal before 1940: Eileen Power (1923); Dorothy Swaine Thomas (1924); Eveline Mabel Burns (1926); and Margaret James (1926-27).

disciplinary status effects.⁵ It seems reasonable to posit that the Hart, Schaffner, and Marx award winners' productivity and disciplinary status may have been affected.

Though six women did earn the Hart, Schaffner, and Marx award for their economic thought in the early twentieth century, substantial gender discrimination substantially impeded women's career progress in economics specifically and in academia generally. Hammond documents gender bias in economics noting, for example, that as of 1900, there were only 3 women Ph.D. level economists in comparison to 84 men.⁶ Talbot (1910) writes that the academic employment situation for women was sparse:

“In many colleges and universities women hold teaching positions, although as yet mostly of inferior rank, always with slow promotions and frequently with salaries lower than those given to men of the same rank” (pp. 16-7).

Libby (1984) estimates that each year from 1918 to 1920, only 15-18.5% of the Ph.D. dissertations in economics were written by women, and after 1920 the number is nearer to 10% (p. 274). Concerning 1921 job market prospects in economics departments, Leon Carroll Marshall writes of a gender-segmented market to economist Hazel Kyrk: “It is a funny job market this year. There has really been a very heavy demand for men though at rather low salaries and practically nothing for women.”⁷ Analyzing 70 university catalogues in the 1920 to 1922 timeframe, Lonn (1924) identifies 7,499 faculty members, of whom 9% were women. Of the 2,138 university full professorships, 28 were women, and the absolute “number of women increases, naturally, with the descent in rank” (p. 5). In a survey of women academicians, Hutchinson (1930) documents two discriminatory experiences from the perspectives of women economists: “I work just as hard but get 1/2 pay” and “I work just as hard but can't get a tenured position.”

Women who did navigate gender barriers in academic careers during the early twentieth century also faced constraints in their personal lives. In the 1920s, Dorothy Sybil Wolff Douglas, and in the 1950s, Mary Jean Bowman each were barred from academic appointments at the University of Chicago: institutional interpretations of nepotism rules excluded women from such jobs if they were married to men working at the University.⁸ Perceiving the constraints nepotism rules imposed on women's careers, some academic women chose to forego heterosexual marriages.

⁵ See Frey, et al., 2010 and Chan, et al., 2013

⁶ Claire Hammond, p. 358

⁷ Beller and Kiss, p. 6

⁸ On Douglas, see <http://www.bowdoin.edu/economics/curriculum-requirements/douglas-biography.shtml> (access date 7/21/15); on Bowman, see <https://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/scrc/findingaids/view.php?eadid=ICU.SPCL.BOWMANMJ>, Guide to the Mary Jean Bowman Papers 1916-1998 (access date 7/14/2015)

Women adapted to the discriminatory barriers in constructing and disseminating economics knowledge, seeking “reasonable lives despite the obstacles their own socialization and the larger society placed in their paths.”⁹ Three recognized adaptation strategies include “superperformance,” “subordination,” and “separatism”. Superperforming women were “pathbreaking pioneers, outperforming their male colleagues on most measures of professional success and commitment”, their stellar career outcomes likely the combined result of “individual drive and genius and circumstance.”¹⁰ Women who maintained careers in economics also adapted via subordination, settling into low- or no-status positions as teachers or administrators for high schools, normal schools, teaching colleges, or relegated to lower-status, low-pay, and unstable positions in colleges and universities. Separatists (some of which also warrant recognition as innovators) moved to women’s colleges, focused on niche publications in areas ignored by mainstream economists, settled into economics-related academic departments (such as home economics and social work), took careers in government, or focused on social service.¹¹ An extreme separatist response might include dropping out of economics altogether. For the women who pursued careers associated with academic economics, it was likely that those women economists who were heterosexual opted for career over marriage and childbearing.

Given the discriminatory barriers, it is remarkable that hundreds of women earned Ph.D’s writing theses on economics topics in the early twentieth century. **[post-ASSA 2016, give some info on the 100s of women earning phds from google searches]** The women receiving the Hart, Schaffner and Marx prize had remarkable intellectual ability and/or substantial networking connections with established men economists. How did their careers fare? How did economists specifically, and academia generally, receive their work?

Yetta Scheffel (circa 1893 - ?)

There is minimal biographical record about Dr. Yetta Scheffel. She completed her undergraduate A.B. at Northwestern University in 1906. Her 1907 thesis, “Persistence of Poverty,” earned for Scheffel an M.A. degree in sociology from the University of Chicago. There is a record that she attended the University of Berlin from 1908-09. Scheffel appears on the “Fellows” and the “Graduate Students” list for 1913-14 with the Department of Political Economy at the University of Chicago. Scheffel was a paid staff member of the Illinois Survey from roughly 1913 to 1916, charged with “making an exhaustive study of the settlement of the Military Tract in Illinois” for use in *The Centennial History of Illinois*.¹² She completed her portion of this study by 1915-16 under the direction of Clarence W. Alvord.

⁹ Forget, 1995, p. 26 who cites Glazer & Slater, 1987

¹⁰ *ibid*, p. 34

¹¹ *ibid*, pp. 34-36

¹² The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois History and Lincoln Manuscript Collections houses the completed eight chapter manuscript.

Scheftel's historical products include a published book review in *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* in 1915.

While Scheftel undertook her historical academic ventures, she also completed her Ph.D. with the Department of Political Economy at the University of Chicago. Her thesis, *The Taxation of Land Value: A Study of Certain Discriminatory Taxes on Land*, received first prize in the Hart, Schaffner, and Marx Company of Chicago's Political Economy essay contest for 1915. Edwin Nourse received honorable mention after Scheftel for his "The Marketing Problem in Chicago".

A range of periodicals publicized Scheftel's awards, including newspapers like *The Evening Missourian* of Columbia (p. 3, Wed. Dec. 1, 1915) and *The New York Times*, academic journals such as *The American Economic Review* and *The American Political Science Review*, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics publication, *The Monthly Labor Review*.

The *New York Times* "Notable Book in Brief Review" headline mis-states Scheftel's gender: "Mr. Yetta Scheftel's Prize Essay on the Taxation of Land Value..." The *Times* article may have reported Scheftel's thesis due to its political relevance in the state: "New York is to be the next battle ground of the single tax crusade. It is right to call it a crusade, for its motive is as much social reform as fiscal fitness. The battle will be fought in New York because the strategists of the campaign have selected it to break the force of defeats elsewhere" (25 March 1917).

A number of journals published reviews of *The Taxation of Land Value*. The *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* review judges that:

"Miss Scheftel has prepared a judicious, well-balanced treatment of land-value taxation in those countries where the scheme has been chiefly tried. The history of Australasian land taxes, German taxes on value increment, English land-value duties, and municipal land taxes in Canada is carefully outlined. Study is also given to the fiscal, economic and social effects of such taxes."

The rest of the book review is descriptive except for a comment that the bibliography is "valuable." *The American Political Science Review* describes Scheftel's book as "the newest and in many respects the best study of what is commonly known as the single tax" with "careful discussions of the tax upon land values as a source of revenue and as an instrument of social reform respectively....excellent bibliography" (in "Minor Notices" section, no author attributed) (p. 597)

A June 1917 book review provides a deeper analytical review of Scheftel (1916), identifying weaknesses as well as strengths. In his *American Economic Review* assessment, Arthur N. Young of Princeton University wrote that this thesis "well may be said to be the first attempt 'to present fully the experience with the system of the countries which have introduced'" a land tax. Young highlights Scheftel's "careful and complete account of the complicated land taxes of Australasia, Germany and Great Britain" but Young states that another researcher provides more exhaustive coverage of taxes in

Western Canada than Scheftel. Though “[h]er work shows careful and painstaking research”, Scheftel’s critical analysis perhaps “attempted too much.” Young identifies a few areas of “loose” treatment of economic theory. Though Young agrees with other reviewers concerning the excellence of Scheftel’s bibliography, he describes as “inadequate” the four page index.

Google searches¹³ for a “Yetta Scheftel” turn up limited, disparate factoids. In October 1929, a Dr. Yetta Scheftel is a “new life member” presumably of the Art Institute of Chicago. In 1940, a US Census record lists a Yetta Scheftel as female, white, American in Ward 29 Chicago, estimated birth year 1893, though the Census record identifies Yetta Scheftel as a physician in private practice. If the Census record estimated birth year is correct, it seems unlikely that Scheftel the social scientist is the same person as Scheftel the private physician, as her bachelor’s degree would have been earned at the age of 13 and her master’s degree by age 14. It is unclear but unlikely that Scheftel, the social scientist, became a medical practitioner in her later years.

Scheftel (1916) is the last academic reference in the social sciences that Yetta appears to have published. It seems she had a promising academic career and for unknown reasons, disappears from primary sources that are available via electronic search. The promise Scheftel showed in academic capability is apparent in the fact that her dissertation is cited and briefly discussed in four journals published 40 to 60 years *after* her work, in 1957, 1959, 1961, and 1977. In the journal article, “How College Textbooks Treat Land Value Taxation”, footnote 11 documents that: “Recognition of the stimulating effect of a land value tax policy can be found in the literature of nearly half a century ago. See, for example, Yetta Scheftel....Her investigation showed that ‘the land tax’ had been found to increase the amount of building, decrease the amount of vacant land and stimulate business.”

Hazel Kyrk (1886-1957)¹⁴

Self-supporting by age 17, Hazel Kyrk worked for the household of economist Leon Carroll Marshall while working toward an undergraduate degree at Ohio Wesleyan University. The personal connection with Marshall may have influenced Kyrk’s choice to study economics. Though Kyrk’s intellectual capacity and tenacity were likely the driving forces shaping her biography, Marshall’s patronage probably helped her obtain an academic position in the 1920s at the University of Chicago with such appointments sparse for academic women.

Kyrk earned her bachelor’s degree in 1910. Intermingling academic employment, wartime work in Britain with James Alfred Field, and pursuing higher education, Kyrk completed her Ph.D. from the

¹³ Unless otherwise noted, biographical details for all six women in this paper are from documents turned up through Google searches. Full sets of references for biographical details are available upon request.

¹⁴ The biographical account of Kyrk draws from three secondary sources. Beller and Kiss (2008) presents detailed biographical information; Lobdell (2000) provides a few additional biographical details; and van Velsen (2003) primarily provides analysis of Kyrk’s intellectual contributions.

Economics Department in 1920. She worked for short spurts in a variety of institutions of higher education, including a stint at Oberlin College. Reviewing evidence from the Oberlin College archives, Beller and Kiss suggest that negative reception by male students toward a women professor drove her decision to depart from Oberlin. Quoting an administrative letter of support for Kyrk, part of the evidence cited is:

“Miss Kyrk was an instructor and then associate professor for several years in our department of Economics. Her work showed that she was a very well trained woman, of rather unusual natural ability, and of entirely agreeable personality. She was not wholly successful in her teaching here, primarily, I believe for the reason that any woman would have enormous difficulty trying to teach subjects as banking and transportation to classes composed almost entirely of men [emphasis in the original] in the upper years of the college course. Miss Kyrk’s presentation of the subjects was undoubtedly clear-headed and exact, and her standards were reasonable and altogether satisfactory. I have always felt that a man doing exactly the work that Miss Kyrk did and in the same way would have seemed satisfactory in every way”¹⁵.

Hired in 1925 by the University of Chicago, by 1930 Kyrk obtained a joint appointment in the Economics and Home Economics departments. Kyrk became full professor in 1941 and retired from her joint appointment in 1952. This mature phase of her professional career was stable and conducive to Kyrk making major academic contributions. As a mentor, she nurtured over 30 graduate students, including Margaret Reid who herself became an academic leader. In service, Kyrk worked for a variety of federal agencies such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Office of Price Stabilization, and the Bureau of Home Economics. Her intellectual contributions through government include partial responsibility for a statistical forerunner to base year pricing for the U.S. consumer price index. Kyrk’s major intellectual contributions rest in her interdisciplinary, institutionalist treatment of the consumer as well as being a pioneer in home economics where she retired as a recognized “leader in the field” (Beller and Kiss, p. 16). Summarizing Kyrk’s work life, Beller and Kiss write “by the standards of today, Kyrk had a solid career; in the context of her times, it was a remarkable career” (p. 16).

The literature on Hazel Kyrk documents little with regard to her personal life. There is no evidence of non-work related personal relationships, except that Kyrk raised a foster daughter (Lobdell, p. 253).

Kyrk’s thesis received two distinct assessments in two economics journals. The *Quarterly Journal of Economics* review classifies Kyrk’s thesis as institutional economics—falling within the scope of “social psychology” where factors such as “instincts, folkways, and social classes” drive consumer behavior (p. 344). The reviewer, Z. Clark Dickinson, did not favor the institutionalist school. According

¹⁵ Beller and Kiss, p. 5

to Dickinson, Kyrk undertook a detailed pursuit of only one path of inquiry in consumption economics (want creation) but for Dickinson, there are five paths of useful inquiry. Though Kyrk “touched on all” five topics, she did so “quite inadequately” because of her antagonism toward the approach to consumption based on marginal utility. Dickinson suggests that reliance upon an instinct driven theory generates circular reasoning. Though Dickinson is highly critical of Kyrk’s approach to consumption economics, he describes her work a “clearly and pleasingly written” with plenty of evidence, “a sound groundwork of economic principles and of level-headed, original thinking.”

In 1926, the second review appeared in *The Economic Journal*. This review opens that Kyrk’s work “is both a plea for a complete study of the economics of consumption, and an important contribution to it” (p. 241). MacGregor, the reviewer, clearly sympathizes with Kyrk’s analytical framework, describing it as “[t]rue to the best modern psychology”. With Kyrk charting “some new paths” in her exploration of the consumption “hinterland”, MacGregor excuses the book’s “diffuseness” because “so much is brought under review.” The review closes that the prize winning publication has “well-deserved approval of such examiners as J. B. Clark, J. L. Laughlin, and Wesley Mitchell” the Hart, Marx and Schaffner award committee.

After her thesis, Kyrk published six books as sole author. Two of these books are narrow in their subject appeal, one covering the baking industry from 1849 through 1923 and the second analyzing household expenditures and cost of living for Iowa farms. The single-authored books which received academic attention via journal review are *Economic Problems of the Family* (1929) and its major revision, *The Family in the American Economy* (1953). Kyrk also participated in the creation of three co-authored books in consumption and in family economics.

There are at least sixteen reviews of Kyrk’s books across academic disciplines. Four of Kyrk’s books received journal review, though only two reviews after her thesis appeared in an economics journals (*Industrial and Labor Relations Review* and the Italian journal, *Giornale degli Economisti e Annali di Economia*). Kyrk’s book, *Economic Problems of the Family* received three interdisciplinary reviews. Nine reviewers assessed *The Family in the American Economy* in interdisciplinary journals across economics, sociology, social work, and demography. The final book reviewed was a co-authored publication with Day Monroe and Ursula B. Stone.

Kyrk published twelve single-authored journal articles from 1929 through 1950 and one co-authored article across eight distinct interdisciplinary journals. The journal subject matters range from farm economics to educational sociology to marketing to home economics. The majority of these articles are in two general areas: consumption and family economics. In 1950, Kyrk also published one article in the *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings* about income distribution as a potential

economic welfare measure. Kyrk also participated in the conference of the American Economic Association in 1939.

Hazel Kyrk published over 60 book reviews in academic journals between 1925 and 1957. The *Journal of Political Economy* published at least 15 of these, most of which concerned consumption. Kyrk was also a frequent reviewer for the *Social Service Review* and for the *American Journal of Sociology*. The book reviews tended to address consumption, household economics, the cost of living or the standard of living.

Kyrk's institutionalist economics insights make a splash in economics circles with the publication of her thesis. Kyrk benefited early in her career from recognized intellectual capability and from a personal connection with an established male economist. Throughout her career, Kyrk was a prolific publisher in interdisciplinary venues. Kyrk's intellectual paradigm (institutionalism) was in a field that fell out of fashion in economics, though she was a leader in the trend of consumption economics in the first half of the twentieth century. Her interdisciplinary approach was one which fell out of fashion in economics over the twentieth century. She had noteworthy influence on a fleet of graduate students coming out of the University of Chicago. She made important contributions to U.S. federal government tracking of economic statistics. Given the constraints on women's advances in academia, Kyrk's career trajectory was of the superperforming category; in comparison to men with Ph.D.'s in the twentieth century, Kyrk's career might be described as solid and relatively unremarkable.

Mollie Ray Carroll (1890-?)

Mollie Ray Carroll earned three degrees at the University of Chicago. With 363 other undergraduate degree recipients, Carroll completed her first Chicago degree, a Ph.B, in 1911. Her undergraduate extra-curricular activities included serving as vice president of the Young Women's Christian League (YWCL) of the University of Chicago. In 1913 she was secretary of the Lawrence, Kansas YWCA, after which she must have returned to Chicago, completing her master's degree in 1915.

Carroll held two positions of employment after earning her master's degree. From 1917-18 she was a special agent and assistant inspector under Grace Abbott for the Child Labor Division of the U.S. Children's Bureau. Carroll described her professional responsibilities as a Greenwood, South Carolina child labor inspector in the *University of Chicago Magazine* "Letter Box":

"My job has been very interesting too. Sent down here to aid in the enforcement of the Federal Child Labor Law, now some eight months old, I find the district which I cover every month to be comprised, industrially, chiefly of cotton mills. My task is mainly the ascertaining of the ages of the children, seeing them and their parents, and looking up records of age. I have handled more family Bibles than I knew could exist in one section of the country."

From 1918-20 Carroll was a staff lecturer at the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy. This School was associated with the settlement house movement of the early twentieth century, combining social work education and job experience. Social workers resided in settlement houses and the houses provided food, shelter and education for the income-poor.

Carroll earned her Ph.D. from Chicago in 1920. Her Ph.D. thesis, *Labor and Politics: The Attitude of the American Federation of Labor Toward Legislation and Politics*, received a Hart, Schaffner and Marx “honorable mention” in 1922.

Carroll’s thesis received no reviews from economics journals. The two interdisciplinary reviews that do exist are lackluster. Primarily descriptive in nature, *The Journal of Negro History* review identifies that the thesis mostly omits coverage of race in its discussion of the American Federation of Labor. Addressing topics emphasized by the book, this review questions the adequacy of Carroll’s coverage. Whereas adequacy of coverage is questioned in the first review, “concise” is the descriptive term used in the second review. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* review identifies historical and contemporary political events left out of Carroll’s thesis. This second review describes the “concise” thesis as “well-planned.” An allusion to partiality in coverage is suggested via the descriptive phrase, “sympathetic survey” of American Federation of Labor political policy. Nonetheless, the second review concludes that the book is “a helpful handbook” for the specialist and an easy, illuminating read for the generalist.

In 1920 Carroll became assistant professor at Goucher College in Maryland. By 1924 she was professor and chairman of the Goucher College Department of Economics and Sociology. Carroll was a Guggenheim Memorial Foundation fellow in 1927-28 and spent a couple years in Germany researching the German unemployment insurance system. The 1931 *American Economic Review* book review of Carroll’s German unemployment insurance monograph identifies the timeliness of the book and that it is a “careful” study presenting “invaluable, disinterested testimony.”

Carroll resigned from her Goucher College position in 1930. A few career-oriented factoids are available on Carroll. While working for Goucher College, she gave professional talks in both South Carolina and Georgia in Spring 1925. Carroll was actively involved with the League of Women Voters for decades. She served as a national vice president of the League, participated in at least one League convention leading a discussion about problems associated with women in industry (1926), and wrote about economics for the League. Carroll returned to the University of Chicago and its Graduate School of Social Service Administration (an administrative outgrowth of the earlier Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy) in 1926 to teach two summer courses titled, “The Field of Social Work” and “Child Welfare Problems.” In Spring 1930, she was one of more than 1,250 economists who signed “The Economists’ Tariff Protest of 1930” opposing the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill.

By 1935-36, Carroll was the Executive Head Resident of the University of Chicago Settlement and an associate professor of social economy with her alma mater. During this year, she also was secretary for the board of directors of the Chicago Douglas Smith Fund and was director of research for the New York City Workers' Education Bureau. Carroll published twice with the Workers' Education Bureau Press on the topics of trade unions and worker education.

By 1941, Carroll was with the Labor Standards Division in the United States Department of Labor. In 1950, she served as a labor economist with the Social Security Administration. In 1965 a "Dr. Mollie Ray Carroll of Fairfax, Va" provided critical testimony for a U.S. Senate Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee to the Judiciary Committee. Carroll testified with the opinion that:

"while America has been built by the vision and energy of immigrants, including your ancestors and mine, the so-called melting pot has often not melted. Masses of poorly screened immigrants have too often become undigested lumps of frustrated, undiluted foreign ideology and habits, pawns of some of the world's worst elements."

It is unclear when or why this xenophobia developed.

From 1923 to 1939, Carroll published four books (including her thesis), one of which came in two editions. All four books received published academic review across interdisciplinary journals. Her thesis and the book on German unemployment insurance that she published as a result of her Guggenheim fellowship are the more substantial academic contributions. The 1930 text of *Our Wants and How They Are Satisfied* is under 70 pages long, providing a common sense explanation of economic principles for the National League of Women Voters. Hazel Kyrk's two paragraph review describes the contents and purpose. The *Southern Economic Journal* review of *What is Collective Bargaining?* identifies Carroll's unique position on collective bargaining. The reviewer concludes that though "[m]any readers will accuse Miss Carroll of being too idealistic and too far from the day-to-day struggle for existence," her book does rise to its purpose to encourage reasoned communication. Beyond the four books that received journal review, Carroll published a few more tracts printed by the National League of Women Voters in the mid-1920s.

Carroll published 21 times in inter-disciplinary periodicals through the 1920s and the 1930s. Her major publication outlet links to her Ph.D. thesis topic: Carroll published 9 articles between 1925 and 1938 in the *American Federationist*, the "official magazine of the American Federation of Labor." Carroll published three times each in *American Labor Legislation Review*, in *Social Forces*, and in the *Journal of Adult Education*. She published twice in *Social Service Review* and one article about German social statistics appears in the *Journal of the American Statistical Association*.

Carroll was one of five in an American Economic Association round table panel covering unemployment and public works. Her contribution on German public works appears after J.B. Clark's comments in the 1930 papers and proceedings issue of the *American Economic Review*.

Carroll published over 35 book reviews in academic journals between 1919 and 1936, with roughly half published in *Social Service Review*. A few of the remaining reviews appear in established economics journals such as the *Journal of Political Economy* and the *American Economic Review*. The rest are interdisciplinary publications with broad range, extending across sociology, religion, ethics, history, and statistics. Eight of the books reviewed from 1929 forward have German titles, suggesting Carroll continued using the German language skills acquired during her time in that country to facilitate international exchange of knowledge. Only five book reviews appear before 1930. Most of her 1930s book review titles revolve around employment and unemployment relief.

Carroll's professional life iterated between U.S. federal government and academic spheres. She clearly maintained networking ties to the University of Chicago at least 15 years after earning her terminal degree. Though her 1920 Ph.D. thesis was worthy of honorable mention, it took a full decade for Carroll to receive passing attention for her research on a second subject, German insurance, from the American Economic Association, and even then this was only in the form of conference participation and book reviews.

The electronic records about Mollie Ray Carroll suggest that she was an active academic contributor until the mid-1930s. Her academic contributions were numerous and diverse in scope, though perhaps not the quality or type of work to receive disciplinary recognition. After the mid-1930s, her academic contributions cease. She worked briefly for the federal government before earning her Ph.D.—her initial federal employment possibly the result of social networking through Edith Abbott of the University of Chicago and her sister Grace Abbott. Carroll returned to federal employment in later life. It is unclear whether Carroll's return to federal bureaucracy was due to personal desire or whether she was pushed away from academia. Throughout her career, Carroll made contributions in the field of labor. Beyond dedication of her thesis to her parents, no records turn up about her personal life.

Helen Fisher Hohman (1894-1972)

Helen Fisher Hohman completed an undergraduate degree at the University of Illinois in 1916. Her spouse, economist Elmo P. Hohman, was also an Illinois alum. By 1919, Helen graduated from a two year program at the New York School of Social Work and worked as an Economics Department assistant at Vassar College, an appointment which lasted until 1920. While Elmo worked on a second degree at Harvard University, Helen and Elmo had teaching appointments at Simmons College for the 1921-22 school year.

Hohman's split attention across the fields of social work and economics led her to write a piece about the importance of both professions. In a 1922 alumni magazine publication, Hohman describes her diaspora: "economists dub me a sentimental reformer, and the social workers pity me as a useless juggler of the metaphysics of supply and demand. Therefore I welcome this opportunity to recommend myself to

both parties....” Perceiving herself with two professional homelands and foretelling her migration to economics, Hohman concludes to her social work audience:

As social workers we can never save the world by case work alone, as economists we cannot fully comprehend our problem; but as cooperators and coordinators, to use familiar terms, we can enrich our contribution to the great tasks to which we are committed. So I believe that they also serve, who only teach and study economics.

In the mid-1920s, Hohman pursued graduate study in economics. During her graduate work, she published an article with the *Journal of Political Economy* on cost of living adjustments to wages. By 1928, she earned a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago with the completion of her thesis, “The Trade Board Acts and the Social Insurance Acts in Relation to a Minimum Standard of Living in Great Britain: A Study in Attitudes toward Poverty and Methods of Dealing with It, 1880-1926.”

The *American Economic Review* announced that Hohman’s dissertation received first prize in the 1928 Hart, Schaffner and Marx competition and acknowledged that an honorable mention went to Simon S. Kuznets for his “Secular Movements in Production and Prices.” The 1928 version of Hohman’s dissertation research received no reviews in journals. Hohman’s 1933 publication of this doctoral study, titled *The Development of Social Insurance and Minimum Wage Legislation in Great Britain: A Study of British Social Legislation in Relation to a Minimum Standard of Living*, did receive attention from five interdisciplinary journals (including sociology, history and political science), though it was only reviewed by one major economics journal, the *Journal of Political Economy*. In contrast, Kuznets “honorable mention” received eight journal reviews in 1930 and in 1931, including the *American Economic Review*, *The Economic Journal*, and *Journal of Political Economy*.

Given that the Hart, Schaffner & Marx prize committee rated Hohman’s research monograph as the worthier research product, it is unclear why Kuznets received multiple reviews in major economics journals and Hohman’s work was not received until 1933 and then only by one major economics journal. Like Kuznets’ book, Hohman’s 1926 journal publication is technical. In contrast, the *Journal of Political Economy* review of Hohman (1933) identifies that her award winning thesis “method of treatment is historical rather than analytical” and criticizes the work for undertaking no international comparison of social insurance. Perhaps thesis methodology had some effect on disciplinary reception of the two scholars’ works. Some of the journal attention Kuznets receives is critical. An open question is whether receiving critical disciplinary attention has more positive career impact than receiving no professional attention.

After earning her doctorate, Hohman compiled and edited “Essays on Population and other papers by James Alfred Field” at the University of Chicago, which was published in 1931. This publication received four reviews in interdisciplinary journals. Both Elmo and Helen served as economics professors with Northwestern University from the early 1930s through the 1950s, though her academic rank with

Northwestern is unclear. Hohman is another woman economist who was a prolific book reviewer. Hohman reviewed over forty books during her time with Northwestern.

Social insurance was the central topic of Hohman's post-graduate publications. Her research in social insurance spanned countries of North America and Europe. She served as a consultant for the U.S. federal government's Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Board, when she studied the Swedish social insurance program. *Old Age in Sweden* identifies that Helen Hohman travelled in Europe during the summer of 1937. Her summer activities included direct observation of the Swedish social insurance program and review of Swedish documents. She also consulted with Social Insurance Section staff in the International Labor Office at Geneva. Hohman thanks both Gunnar Myrdal and Bertil Ohlin in the acknowledgements, two male economists with noteworthy contributions that continue to receive attention in the early twenty-first century.

Three reviewers assessed *Old Age in Sweden*. The *Journal of Political Economy* review provides both a descriptive account and a positive assessment, concluding that Hohman's work is "a comprehensive and accurate source of information on the Swedish experience." In 1940, the *American Economic Review* published a Hohman article about American public assistance.

Hohman's publishing career after 1940 appears to rest on the intellectual capital she developed in her formative research years. These later social insurance publications emphasize Great Britain, Sweden, and cost of living adjustments. Only one publication branches out from her earlier emphases, though as a handbook for professional social service provisioners, it is not an academic heavyweight. Hohman published over 40 book reviews, of which 26 appears in major economics journals.

A daughter and two grandchildren survived Helen Hohman. It is unclear how she juggled an academic position with family responsibilities.

Hohman had a solid career as a research economist with lifetime academic service at Northwestern University. Her research caught passing attention from two major economics journals. That Hohman coupled an academic career with marriage to an economist and raising a child is particularly noteworthy given the time period.

Caroline Ware (1899-1990)

Caroline Ware's¹⁶ intellectual accomplishments span academic disciplines, institutions, and countries. Her contributions in history overshadow her work in economics, and she had substantial

¹⁶ Lee and Samuel's entry to Dimand et. al, *A Biographical Dictionary of Women Economists*, pp. 460-464, is the source for Ware's biographical profile. Anne Firor Scott (2006) also provides biographical information in *Pauli Murray and Caroline Ware: Forty Years of Letters in Black and White*, some of which is summarized in "Caroline Farrar Ware. Brief life of a multifaceted public citizen: 1899-1990" *Harvard Magazine* online, 2009, <http://harvardmagazine.com/2009/05/caroline-farrar-ware> (10/19/2015 access).

research programs in community development, women's issues, race relations, and worker's education. Running parallel with this active research agenda, Ware held appointments at four institutions of higher learning between 1925 and 1961, where teaching was also an important responsibility. Her academic appointments were at Vassar College, Sarah Lawrence College, the American University Graduate School, and the School of Social Work at Howard University.

Lee and Warren (2000) identify many public agencies for whom Ware labored. These include the National Recovery Administration's Consumer Advisory Board and consumer groups associated with the National Emergency Council, the National Defense Advisory Board, President Truman's Council of Economic Advisors and President Kennedy's Consumer Advisory Council.

According to the American Association of University Women, Ware "led AAUW in the fight to establish a consumer agency in the federal government and testified on behalf of AAUW on consumer interests and fair-housing issues."¹⁷ Ware also published in 1962 for the United States President's Commission on the Status of Women and the YWCA republished this work in 1963.

Experience in Puerto Rico in the late 1940s spurred Ware's contributions in community development. According to Lee and Samuels, from 1962-1976, Ware "was a technical advisor in community development and cultural affairs for the United Nations" and travelled in Latin America. She published a number of tracts on this subject matter, including *Iniciativa de un pueblo: ayuda mutua en Puerto Rico (Initiative of a people: mutual assistance in Puerto Rico)* and *El servicio social y la vivienda (Social services and housing)*, both in 1953; *Trabajos prácticos en organización y desarrollo de la comunidad (Practical work in organization and community development)* in 1960 and a piece assessing Venezuelan community development appeared in 1963.

The work Ware undertook to complete her Radcliffe Ph.D. in 1925 kickstarted her energized career. She received the \$1,000 Hart, Schaffner, and Marx first prize in 1929 for *The Early New England Cotton Manufacture: A Study in Industrial Beginnings*. Interestingly, Professor Edwin F. Gay of Harvard University both directed her thesis and was one of four members on the award committee. Ware credits both Gay and the "critical coöperation" of her husband, Gardiner C. Means in the preface to her thesis.

As book reviews note, Ware's efforts to unearth historical documents for her thesis are noteworthy. Visiting a multitude of historical societies in New England, at one she "found boxes and boxes filled with a jumble of half-rotted letters, accounts, letter-books and production-sheets." After "[t]hree days of sorting and arranging" Ware constructed an "amazingly full" record of the first cotton-spinning firm in the Northeastern United States. In her quest for randomly preserved records in "family attics or deserted barns" she consulted a town clerk, a banker, and then a judge who led her to a cotton-

¹⁷ American Association of University Women website, <http://www.aauw.org/2012/08/14/from-the-archives-caroline-ware/> 10/19/2015 access.

spinning entrepreneur's descendent. This descendent "remembered having some old books in the attic belonging to some ancestor" which included a variety of business records such as sales accounts and expense receipts (Ware, 1926, p. 5). Ware also compiled records from personal mill visits, accompanied by "letters of introduction to persons in authority" (p. 6). Ware's quest for original source material turned up piecemeal documents, each of which Ware fitted "into the fragmentary picture to change the shading or to strengthen a line" (p. 6). The meticulous thesis research uncovering historical documents and piecing them together are one basis for Ware influence with the history discipline.

Ware's award winning thesis received three journal reviews, including one by Delmar Leighton in the *American Economic Review*. Leighton identifies that Ware worked a large amount of historical material to construct a 70 year history of cotton manufacturing in New England. Ware provides "value...for historical students" in her source data and in a 16 page bibliography (p. 316). Ware's thesis illuminates understanding of finance, marketing and labor force management in a capital intense industry start-up and makes an "able attempt" to assess community development effects of the industry. Using one-half of the review, Leighton takes Ware to task for emphasizing "exploitation" in her thesis.

The New England Quarterly review also uses most of its space to clarify Ware's exposition in her chapter about "exploitation and reform". This second review explains why Ware's chapter on exploitation is a "one-sided" treatment: she over-emphasized a boarding-house method of labor hiring and under-emphasized a family-hiring method (p. 561-62). This second reviewer is gracious about her error, concluding: "The student of economic history will be grateful to Miss Ware for this study in industrial beginnings; if he regrets that she had slighted certain aspects of the story...his regret is merely that these topics did not fall entirely within the scope of her volume" (p. 562).

The Mississippi Valley Historical Review coverage of Ware's thesis begins quite positively. Ware's thesis "measures up well with the best [Hart, Schaffner and Marx awarded] monographs" and "is a substantial and worth while contribution to the history" of the U.S. industrial revolution. Two criticisms concern the "dry detailed treatment" typical of academic work and a wish that there were more breadth in coverage to related economic issues such as international trade (p. 572).

Over the course of her career, Ware published at least 12 journal articles. Two of these articles appear in economics journals. Her 1926 *Quarterly Journal of Economics* publication related to her thesis topic. In 1949, Ware published an article in *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* about her work on university programs for workers' education.

Ware participated in research resulting in at least 20 monographs. These monographs mostly span her interdisciplinary career from 1931 until 1966, with one co-authored work published much later, in 1981. Roughly two-thirds of these publications were authored by Ware alone, the remainder with co-authors. The subject matter of Ware's monographs exhibit breadth of knowledge. The topics of her

single-authored monographs in economics ranged from the consumer to worker education to women's issues to community development. Her work about community development in Latin America was published in English, Spanish and Portuguese.

Records suggest Ware published nine reviews of others' publications, none of which appeared in economics journals. In contrast, Ware received at least 24 academic reviews of books that she penned alone or with co-authors. The reviews appear across disciplines and journal topics. The work that received the most immediate attention of reviewers was Ware's book published in 1940, *The Cultural Approach to History*. This book received at least 12 interdisciplinary reviews, though none in economics. Economists' reviews of Ware's broad-reaching intellectual contributions were limited to her thesis (reviewed in *American Economic Review*), to *Labor Education in Universities* (reviewed in *Journal of Political Economy* and in *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*), and to *The Modern Economy in Action*, co-authored with her husband (reviewed in the *American Economic Review*).

Ware married economist Gardiner C. Means in 1927, separated by his death in 1988. According to Lee and Samuels, Caroline Ware

“married Means...with the very clearly intention of combining a career with marriage and children (although for physical reasons the marriage remained childless). She long believed that women did not have to choose between children and career. Indicative of her desire to combine marriage and a career, Ware retained her maiden name, a very unusual, but not unheard of, practice then. Apropos of this, she later reported that she then had more status than her husband and did not want to set aside her own name; and that when her husband achieved more status than she, she did not want to ride on his coat-tails. Their relationship was complex, although she reported that they lived in mutually supportive harmony for 60 years” (p. 462).

Preserving the marriage did involve at least one major career-impacting decision by Caroline. She resigned from her Vassar teaching position when Means moved to Washington in 1933 to work for the federal government, and afterwards found “university history departments reluctant to hire women.”¹⁸

Alma Herbst (? – circa 1990)

Records indicate that Alma Herbst earned an A.B. degree from the Ohio State University. Herbst earned a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in 1930. Her dissertation, *The Negro in the Slaughtering and Meat-Packing Industry in Chicago*, won second prize in the 1930 Hart, Schaffner and Marx competition, and like the other women award winners, was in Class A, including any American without restriction. The preface to her award-winning dissertation credits Professor Harry A. Millis of the University of Chicago “for his generous criticisms and helpful suggestions during every stage of the work.”

¹⁸ Anne Firor Scott, “Caroline Farrar Ware. Brief life of a multifaceted public citizen: 1899-1990” *Harvard Magazine* online, 2009 <http://harvardmagazine.com/2009/05/caroline-farrar-ware> (11/5/2015 access).

In December 1930, the *American Economic Review* announced that Herbst “advanced from assistant to instructor of economics at Ohio State University.” According to the University, Herbst “taught at the Ohio State University from 1930 to 1970.” Reliance upon a few spotty indicators, such as the use of the word “taught” in Ohio State University acknowledgements of Herbst’s university contributions, suggest that Herbst’s career may have centered around teaching in labor and industrial relations.

Herbst was a member of a Committee on Teaching in Industrial Relations in 1949. She was partially responsible for “the first Midwestern Conference” held in Columbus, Ohio bringing together 27 people from ten mid-western colleges and universities in the U.S. This conference focus was on teaching and curriculum planning in labor-related and industrial relations subjects.

In Ohio State University online thesis records, Herbst appears as the thesis advisor to one master’s level student and to another doctoral level student. Both thesis dates are 1961 and both have labor-related titles. Curiously, no other thesis advisor records turn up in searches of Herbst’s name, though this may be due to spotty library online recordkeeping in naming thesis advisors.

Parnes (2001) recounts a story of initial favoritism and a later falling out in his work relationship with Herbst at the Ohio State University. According to Parnes, the interpersonal conflict between the two was initiated by Herbst in the 1940s. The story revolves around the establishment of a “school for trade unionists at Ohio State,” something desired by Herbst. Though Parnes and Herbst shared similar broad views on this program, they differed in their preferences over its details. The result was a severing of their personal interaction, a break which, according to Parnes, was triggered by Herbst making a slanderous comment toward Parnes. The account suggests that there were at least three male faculty members in the Commerce program at Ohio State who had negative interactions with or held negative opinions about Herbst (pp. 47-48).

Herbst’s thesis received at least three book reviews shortly after publication. As a University of Chicago Press publication, the *Social Service Review*’s interest in reviewing Herbst’s thesis was perhaps due to institutional, geographic and topical overlap between the thesis and the journal. *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* likely reviewed the thesis due to its subject matter. Both reviews are positive about the thesis. For example, reviewer “M.R.C.” (Mollie Ray Carroll?) of the *Social Service Review* describes the thesis as objective, based on “much valuable factual material, and states that Herbst handles “vexing questions...with courage and scientific caution.” The *Mississippi* reviewer describes Herbst’s approach as “clean-cut” and “interesting” with “[a]bundant statistical tables and charts.” Both reviews relay that Herbst collected her own observations for this study. The *Mississippi* review suggests that “a bit more in the way of case studies and negro folk-opinion might have added somewhat to the interest and value of the treatment.”

Published in *The Survey* in 1932, the third book review by Alain Locke provides a perspective shift about the validity of the book in a broader socio-historic context. A leading figure in the Harlem Renaissance, Locke's review of Herbst provides insight into the book's reception by a contemporary African American intellect. Locke commends the book for its objectivity and its accuracy. Locke empathizes with "the average reader, pardonably weary with graphs and statistics." Most importantly, Locke's review contextualizes Herbst's thesis in the socio-political context of race, labor and industry, and socioeconomic discord in early 1900s Chicago. Locke encourages Herbst's audience to "[r]ead this book not merely as a study of the Negro in the 'Meat-Packing Industry,' but as the story of America's black pawns of labor."

At least thirteen publications reference Herbst's thesis, twelve of which date between 1972 and 2015. These references elicit material from Herbst's thesis to address a variety of labor- and race-related topics including promotion, labor termination, labor productivity, and employee loyalty toward a firm during labor strife.

Though her award winning dissertation continues to receive attention in the early twenty-first century, Herbst has no discernible track record of research productivity beyond her 1930 thesis and one book review in 1942. Though Herbst does appear in a journal note as one of many researchers intending to work on a proposed publication for the Institute of Labor Studies of Northampton, Massachusetts in the late 1940s, her name (along with many of the others) does not appear in the completed published volume. Though her thesis received accolades, her publishing career appears effectively to have both begun and ended with the dissertation.

Along with Ohio State colleague Ruth Spitz, Herbst is noted as having made "progress" with "an analytical study of the Ohio Federation of Labor and the Ohio CIO Council in an effort to examine the changing role of the Ohio labor federations in the fields of citizenship and community participation."¹⁹ It is feasible that Herbst may have realized some mature research promise by overlapping scholarship with community and university service, though no other electronic records of such activity turn up.

Alma Herbst retired from the Ohio State University in 1962 and was professor emerita by 1968. In 1961 and 1965 and again in Winter 1967-68, the name "Alma Herbst" name appears in the journal, *Educational Horizons*. The Ohio State University Economics Department has an Alma Herbst Memorial Lecture Fund. Established in 1994 by Dr. Virgil C. Crisafulli and Martha Bair Crisafulli, the fund supports an annual labor economics lecture. Crisafulli earned an M.A. in 1940 and a Ph.D. in 1954, both degrees from The Ohio State University. Both theses focused on labor economics. It seems reasonable to conjecture that Crisafulli was a student of Herbst's.

¹⁹ In the "News and Notes" section of the January 1955 issue of *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*

Perhaps Herbst's Ph.D. and thesis award facilitated an appointment from the institution which granted her undergraduate degree. A forty year relationship between a mid-twentieth century woman economist and a major university's economics department is a substantial accomplishment. If Herbst sought a teaching position at her alma mater, then it could be that her personal aspirations were realized. But it is unclear why the research promise embodied in Herbst's thesis, which continues to be recognized 85 years since publication, was not realized in any other attention-grabbing venues. Not much should be made of a documented interpersonal conflict that may have existed with certain colleagues, as another doctorate and his wife valued Herbst's academic career enough to endow a lecture fund in her honor.

An emerging picture of Herbst's professional accomplishments is that of a solidly institutionalized academic who may have emphasized teaching, personal and localized arenas as the receiving grounds for her professional efforts (e.g., students and community-centered projects). No electronic records turn up concerning the personal life of Herbst. Beyond the difficulties women faced in coupling academic career with family, there is no evidence to conjecture about Herbst's marriage or parental status.

Assessing the Career Outcomes of Six Women Economist-Award Winners (Based on Available Information)

Six women received accolades for their Ph.D. theses from the Hart, Schaffner and Marx committee in the first few decades of the twentieth century. There is some limited theoretical and empirical support that awards may increase recipient productivity and disciplinary reception in economics. Nonetheless, an early career award is certainly not a strong predictor of lifetime outcomes, particularly for people experiencing discriminatory barriers. Given the limited opportunities available to women in economics throughout the twentieth century, analyzing how a group of early twentieth century women award winners fared in career and life is instructive.

Available information suggests that Caroline Ware and Hazel Kyrk had the strongest career outcomes across academia generally. Caroline Ware made substantial lasting methodological academic contributions, though this is in the discipline of history, not economics. Kyrk pioneered the initiation of a new academic discipline. Helen Hohman's contributions within the boundaries of economics are noteworthy. The careers of Alma Herbst and Mollie Ray Carroll played out admirably given gender discrimination, but otherwise do not stand out. Yetta Scheftel is a reminder that promising intellectual beginnings do not necessarily bear fruit.

Commonly accepted twentieth century indicators of "superperformance" in academic economics include publications and book reviews in major economics journals²⁰, appointments with major

²⁰ "Major" economics journals in the twentieth century include the *American Economic Review*, *Journal of Political Economy*, and *The Economic Journal*.

universities and prestigious private colleges, and participation in the American Economic Association conference. Considering only these areas, the economics outcomes of the careers of Kyrk, Hohman, and Ware stand out among the women award winners. The award winning theses of all three were each reviewed in at least one major economics journal. Hohman had two publications and Ware had one publication in major economics journals. Kyrk participated in at least two American Economics Association conferences and one of her papers was published in the conference *Proceedings*. The post-graduate research monographs of Hohman and Ware each received a couple of book reviews in major economics journals. Both Kyrk and Hohman had career-long appointments with the economics departments of major U.S. universities. Both Kyrk and Hohman were prolific book reviewers for major economics journals. In contrast, Carroll had only one book review of her research by a major economics journal and one conference participation. Herbst had a lifelong appointment with the economics department of a major public university but is otherwise invisible.

None of the five women economists contributed substantially to the major twentieth century trends in economic thought: neoclassical economics or macroeconomics theory or econometric methodology. The research of all five women do include applications of empirical economics. Kyrk was involved in the construction of a statistical forerunner to the consumer price index, and Hohman made a contribution on cost of living adjustments to wages. Ware and Herbst's theses stand out in their collection of unique primary source data. Carroll provided insights on German social statistics to an American academic audience. Generally speaking though, all five women were socio-political economists who did not fit the narrowing disciplinary norms that developed.

A definition of "superperformer" women economists is "pathbreaking pioneers, outperforming their male colleagues on most measures of professional success and commitment." If their male colleagues' average performance is the comparative yardstick, it does not seem that even Kyrk, Hohman and Ware had stellar economics careers. From this comparative yardstick, it might be more reasonable to classify the three women as "status quo" academic economists who made contributions to the discipline that received passing recognition.

It is reasonable, though, to question the appropriateness of the typical male economist as the comparative standard: in his correspondence with Hazel Kyrk, Marshall identified a gender segregated academic labor market that was more difficult for women economists; it seems reasonable to conjecture that unequal treatment based on gender also existed in publication venues. Furthermore, academic disciplines were not distinct in the first half of the twentieth century. The remainder of this assessment considers the women economists more broadly.

Two women clearly created high quality, innovative interdisciplinary contributions from their careers: Caroline Ware in historical method, workers' education, and community development in Latin

America; and Hazel Kyrk in her institutionalist approach to consumption and by leading in the creation of a new discipline concerning family economics. Helen Hohman made important contributions in social insurance, though it is not clear that her work stands out from a historical perspective. Alma Herbst's thesis on race in the Chicago meatpacking industry and Mollie Ray Carroll's mid-career research on German unemployment insurance were each insightful contributions but neither reflect a career of realized intellectual promise.

All five women pursued interdisciplinary interests, though at different levels. Carroll, Hohman and Herbst show a taste for interdisciplinary understanding: Carroll's breadth of interest in her book review subject matter; Hohman in early attempts to cross social work and economics, and Herbst in taking on the issue of race in labor economics during the early twentieth century. Far more interdisciplinary are the lifelong contributions of Ware (in history, economics and development, and worker's education) and Kyrk (economics, consumption, and family). Ware and Kyrk are appropriately classified as "superperformer separatists": both were "pathbreaking pioneers", individually driven and energized with sparks of genius. Both were also separatist-innovators at least in part responsible for breaking new ground in academic thought. The separatist nature of their groundbreaking contributions did not leave career trails that attracted the attention or the respect of the typical twentieth century male economist.

Networking is apparent in some of the careers of these five women economists. Institutional networking beyond their degree granting and career-long university connections appear more limited for Hohman and Herbst relative to the other three. Ware stands out for her institutional web of interconnections: four relatively long term academic appointments, federal government service including contributions to two US presidential councils, and extended work with the United Nations. Kyrk and Carroll also had career-long institutional connections with federal government agencies. Four of the five women travelled abroad: Kyrk to England during World War I, Carroll and Hohman to Europe during the interwar period, and extensive travel by Ware with the United Nations, particularly in Latin America. The international travel must have expanded the minds and influenced the intellectual creativity of each.

Supportive people-networking links are obvious in the careers of Kyrk, Ware and Hohman, suggestive in Carroll's case, and mostly non-apparent for Herbst. Kyrk received early career support from Leon Carroll Marshall and travelled with James Alfred Field, as well as benefitting from federal agency networking links with women such as Ursula Batchelder Stone and Day Monroe (a graduate student of Kyrk's). Kyrk's deep mentoring of many graduate students was also likely important in her network expansion over time. Hohman had four noteworthy connections with leading male economists: husband Elmo Hohman, James Alfred Field and two Swedish economists. To date there is no evidence of networking between Hohman and other women economists. Ware likely benefitted early on from her

thesis advisor, Edwin Gay’s connection to the Hart, Schaffner and Marx committee, as well as lifelong interactive influence with her economist-spouse, Gardiner Means. Ware also had a host of co-authored publications, indicating strong networking capacity in research. The only obvious network for Carroll is in her early connections to the women of the Chicago program, including Grace Abbott who headed the first federal agency employing Carroll. Kyrk had substantial influence on graduate students, and it seems likely that Herbst, Ware and Hohman must have had at least some mentees who diffused variations of their mentors’ thinking and methods.

A well-lived life balances career and personal realms. Unfortunately, available information on the personal lives of all six women is limited. Two (Hohman and Ware) were married to male economists. Because both couples maintained two professional careers and lifelong marriages, it seems reasonable to posit that the women received more benefit than difficulty from their marriages. Two (Kyrk and Hohman) carried responsibility for a dependent child. Responsibility for a dependent often draws attention away from career, though there may have been unintended positive effects if human capital developed through parenting transferred into interpersonal skills in their careers. There is no information on important social circles, friendships and intimate relationships for Kyrk, Carroll, Herbst or Scheftel.

Table 2: Career Outcomes for Six Women Economics Award Winners

Name	Overall Career Assessment (based on available information)
Yetta Scheftel	extreme “subordinate” (academic drop-out)
Hazel Kyrk	superperformer and separatist
Mollie Ray Carroll	separatist
Helen Hohman	status quo
Caroline Ware	superperformer and separatist
Alma Herbst	status quo-minus

There is variation in the career outcomes of the six women award winners listed in Table 2. Because Scheftel dropped out of economics altogether, her career might tentatively constitute an extreme case of “subordination.”²¹ Carroll’s career ultimately manifested as separatist when she shifted permanently into federal bureaucratic employment. Hohman and Herbst do not fall in superperformer or separatist categories, but both had decades-sustained academic appointments with major universities. Hohman also had a solid research record in economics and so can be considered a “status quo”

²¹ If information on the reason for Scheftel’s departure is forthcoming—due to shift into an alternative career, for example—her classification might change to separatism.

economist; with no discernible research productivity, Herbst is “status quo-minus.” Kyrk and Ware stand out as superperforming-separatists—both made contributions within economics, but are known for their contributions outside the discipline. In all but one case, these six histories suggest that, with early disciplinary recognition, the award winning women economists navigated gender discrimination in academia leaving a paper trail of careers that made lasting impact on knowledge creation.

References

References for specific undocumented biographical details are available upon request.

Beller, Andrea H. and D. Elizabeth Kiss. "On the Contribution of Hazel Kyrk to Family Economics." June 2008 Working Paper Revision of 1999 draft.

Carroll, Mollie Ray. 1923. *Labor and Politics: The Attitude of the American Federation of Labor Toward Legislation and Politics*. Cambridge, MA: The Riverside Press. Hart, Schaffner & Marx Prize Essay, no. 33.

Chan, Ho Fai, Bruno S. Frey, Jana Gallus and Benno Torgler (February 2013), "Does the John Bates Clark Medal Boost Subsequent Productivity and Citation Success?" University of Zurich Department of Economics Working Paper Series ISSN 1664-705X (online), Working Paper No. 111. (<https://ideas.repec.org/p/cra/wpaper/2013-02.html>, August 2015 access date.)

Forget, Evelyn L. (1995) "American Women Economists, 1900-1940: Doctoral Dissertations and Research Specialization" in *Women of Value: Feminist Essays on the History of Women in Economics*, Dimand, Mary Ann, Robert W. Dimand and Evelyn L. Forget, eds., Aldershot, UK and Brookfield, VT: Elgar, pp. 25-38.

Frey, Bruno S. and Susanne Neckermann (October 2010), "Awards as Signals." Institute for Empirical Research in Economics University of Zurich Working Paper Series ISSN 1424-0459, Working Paper No. 513. (<https://ideas.repec.org/p/zur/iewwpx/513.html>, August 2015 access date).

Hammond, Claire. 1993. *Women and the Professionalization of Economics*. *Review of Social Economy* Vol. 51 No. 3 (Fall), pp. 347-370.

Herbst, Alma. 1932. *The Negro in the Slaughtering and Meat-Packing Industry in Chicago*. Hart, Schaffner & Marx prize essays, 52. Boston: Houghton Mifflin/ Herbst, Alma. (1930) 'The Negro in the Slaughtering and Meat Packing Industry in Chicago', Ph.D. Thesis, University of Chicago (economics).

Hohman, Helen Fisher. 1922. *She Also Serves Who Teaches Economics*. *The Alumni Magazine* for the New York School of Social Work (July): 26-27.

———. 1928. *The Trade Board Acts and the Social Insurance Acts in Relation to a Minimum Standard of Living in Great Britain – A Study of Attitudes Toward Poverty and Methods of Dealing with It – 1880–1926*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago (economics).

Hutchinson, Emilie Josephine. 1930. *Women and the Ph.D.: Facts from the Experiences of 1,025 Women Who Have Taken the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy since 1877*. Institute of Women's Professional Relations Bulletin, no. 2. Greensboro, N.C.: North Carolina College for Women.

Kyrk, Hazel. 1923. *A Theory of Consumption*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin; London: Pitman.

Lee, Frederic S. and Warren J Samuels. 2000. *Caroline Farrar Ware (1899-1990)*. In Robert W. Dimand, Mary Ann Dimand and Evelyn Forget, eds., *A Biographical Dictionary of Women Economists*, Cheltenham, United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc., pp. 460-64.

- Libby, Barbara. 1984. Women in Economics before 1940. In *Essays in Economic and Business History*, Vol III, Edwin J. Perkins, ed. Los Angeles: Economic and Business Historical Society, University of Southern California, pp. 273-90.
- Lobdell, Richard A. 2000. Hazel Kyrk (1886-1957). In Robert W. Dimand, Mary Ann Dimand and Evelyn Forget, eds., *A Biographical Dictionary of Women Economists*, Cheltenham, United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc., pp. 251-53.
- Lonn, Ella. 1924. "Academic Status of Women on University Faculties," *Journal of the American Association of University Women* 17 (January), pp. 5-11.
- Scheftel, Yetta. 1907. *Persistence of Poverty*. M.A. thesis, University of Chicago (sociology).
- . Review of "Ross's 'Old World in the New.'" *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* Vol. 1, No. 4 (Mar., 1915), pp. 617-630
- . 1915-16. "The Settlement of the Military Tract in the State of Illinois: A Study of the Westward Movement." Prepared for The Centennial History of Illinois. Manuscript available at The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois History and Lincoln Manuscript Collections (<http://www.library.illinois.edu/ihx/archon/?p=collections/controlcard&id=254> 10/1/2015 access).
- . 1916. *The Taxation of Land Value: A Study of Certain Discriminatory Taxes on Land*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. Hart, Schaffner & Marx prize essays 22.
- Talbot, Marion. 1910. *The Education of Women*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Velsen, Susan. 2003. Hazel Kyrk and the Ethics of Consumption. Chapter 3 of Drucilla K. Barker and Edith Kuiper, eds., *Toward a Feminist Philosophy of Economics*. London: Routledge.
- Ware, Caroline Farrar. *New England's Cotton Mills: How the Records for Their Story Were Discovered*. *Bulletin of the Business Historical Society*, Vol. 1, No. 4 (Dec., 1926), pp. 4-7.
- . 1925. *The Industrial Revolution in the New England Cotton Industry*. Ph.D. thesis, Radcliffe College (history). Published as: 1931. *The Early New England Cotton Manufacture: A Study in Industrial Beginnings*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Reprinted New York: Russell and Russell, 1966.