

CSWEP: People to Contact

General Policy Matters and Items for Newsletter	Robin Bartlett, Department of Economics Denison University Granville, OH 43023 bartlett@denison.edu
Dues, Change of Address, Roster	Joan Haworth, Membership Secretary 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 ceckel@nsf.gov
CSWEP West	Arleen Leibowitz, Department of Policy Studies UCLA School of Public Policy Box 951656 5268 Public Policy Building Los Angeles, CA 90095-1656, arleen@ucla.edu

American Economic Association
CSWEP
c/o Robin Bartlett
Department of Economics
Denison University
Granville, OH 43023

NONPROFIT ORG.
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT NO. 22
GRANVILLE, OH 43023



Newsletter

A publication of the American Economic Association's Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

Published three times annually

Fall, 1997

In this issue:

CSWEP's New Mission Statement

Original AEA Resolution Creating CSWEP

CSWEP in Retrospect

Women in the Academy

Women in Business

CSWEP: Past, Present, Future

CSWEP Mission Statement *adopted September 26, 1997*

CSWEP recently updated its mission statement, stating our view of its goals and purpose. The new statement is reprinted below.

CSWEP was founded in 1971 to eliminate discrimination against women, and to redress the low representation of women, in the economics profession. CSWEP is based on the principle that economics is a woman's field as much

as it is a man's field. It is comprised of women and men in the diverse areas of the profession – in academia, government, and business. CSWEP works to assure that women's issues are considered in the committee work of the

American Economic Association (AEA), makes an annual report to the AEA on the status of women in the economics profession, and engages in other efforts to promote the advancement of women in the economics profession.

Resolution Adopted by the American Economic Association

Adopted December 29, 1971

I. RESOLVED that the American Economic Association declares that economics is not exclusively a man's field. The Association herewith adopts a positive program to eliminate sex discrimination among economists, whether employed in universities and colleges, industry, finance, publishing, or other endeavors. The President shall make known, by all available means, the Association's adoption of the following principles:

a) To redress the present low representation of women in the economics profession, the Association shall actively encourage the study of economics by women at all levels of education.

b) No academic institution or department shall discriminate against women in admission to studies in economics or in the form or amount of financial aid. Every economics department shall actively encourage qualified women graduate students without regard to age, marital or family status, and shall actively promote their subsequent employment.

c) No employer, academic or otherwise, may discriminate against qualified women economists as candidates for positions, or for promotion or tenure, or for assignment of duties and responsibilities.

d) Salaries, fringe benefits, and facilities and resources for research for

women shall be the same as those for men in the same position and rank.

e) There shall be no distinction between men and women as to what is considered to constitute full-time employment.

f) Employment may not be refused to any qualified economist on the grounds of family relationship to another employee.

II. RESOLVED that the American Economic Association establish a Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession, numbering at least eight persons to be appointed by the President for a term of three years. The Association shall provide or seek funds for this Committee to investigate the extent of conformity to the principles stated above, and shall make recommendations for affirmative action. The Committee shall present an interim report at the next annual meeting. Its general findings, conclusions, and recommendations shall be published by the American Economic Association upon the Committee's request. When the Committee finds evidence of discrimination against women, it shall make this available for publication by the American Economic Association, and for the Association to present, as *amicus curiae*, in any complaint, remedial action or suit.

III. RESOLVED that the American

Economic Association shall encourage flexibility in providing opportunities for education and employment on a part-time basis for both men and women.

IV. RESOLVED that the American Economics Association shall appoint women economists as members of the editorial boards of its economics journals, that it shall actively encourage the appointment of women as program chairmen and participants at all future meetings, and that it shall urge companion associations to follow its example.

V. RESOLVED that, with a view to a radical improvement of the hiring practices in the economics profession, the President and the Executive Committee appoint a committee to recommend to the next annual meeting a code of procedure including among other reforms an open listing of all employment opportunities.

VI. RESOLVED that to facilitate attendance at its meetings, especially by younger members of the profession, the American Economic Association shall provide well publicized child-care arrangements at future sessions.

• • •

The Executive Committee is herewith requested to consider the feasibility of compiling a roster of women members, together with their professional qualifications and fields.

CSWEP, In Retrospect

Carolyn Shaw Bell - Wellesley College Professor Emeritus - CSWEP Chair, 1972-76

I am reminded of a meeting of the Wellesley economics faculty with an applicant for initial appointment: we very much needed his field of economic history and thought him a very strong candidate. At luncheon I asked dutifully "what exactly is your dissertation about?" and was told "the decline of share-cropping in the South and its economic impact on black migration North." "But," was my immediate unthinking retort, "that's not HISTORY. I remember that!" My colleagues roared with laughter, the young man of course knew better, until he joined me in laughing at my total oblivion to my age.

I do remember a lot, but have decided CSWEP is part of history, so I looked up primary data. *The American Economic Review* (May, 1972, pp 470-474) reports the business meeting in 1971, establishing CSWEP to investigate sex discrimination among professional economists in all lines of work and to recommend an affirmative action program. The Committee was charged to report, and the American Economic Association to publish, its "findings, conclusions, and recommendations."

The report was a session on the program at the 1973 annual meeting in New York; the panel discussion became a lively debate preserved on tape. Professor Milton Friedman was invited to join the panel but did not attend the meetings; five long and thoughtful letters between him and me exist with copies in the Wellesley College archives.

As for publication, the Committee opted for one of the quarterly issues of the *AER* to carry its formal findings. The then editor of the journal asked me repeatedly to forget the whole thing, not to write and publish a piece that could only be divisive, that should be tactfully ignored for the sake of professional collegiality, that would cause hard feelings

among the men and not help women at all. I kept replying that I had no power, since I merely chaired the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession, to ignore a Resolution passed by the American Economic Association, nor did I think, honestly, that it was in his power to do so. And so in the December 1973 issue of the *AER*, tucked away at the very end with "Announcements and Notes," appears the article "Combatting Role Prejudice and Sex Discrimination."

I've reread this report, and urge you all to look it up. (*editorial note*: The first part is reprinted in this newsletter.) The first part was drafted by member Ken Boulding, and although the ideas had been kicked around by us, the writing displays his inimitable imprint of style and felicitous language. It points out that insofar as women's abilities remain unused, getting rid of discrimination would increase the labor supply both quantitatively and qualitatively at very little cost. This itself was not an original idea; but Boulding's identification of role prejudice and the ensuing discrimination as a "false social learning process," and of the existence of a "betterment production function," were both enlightening. The article refused any discussion of quotas or goals, for when gross disproportionality between men and women exists in a given occupation or profession precise numbers are unnecessary: "where there is clearly not enough, the simplest and most necessary guideline is 'more.'" (p. 1053.)

Four tools, he said, could help increase the blatantly low proportion of women in the economics profession. These were information, persuasion, rewards, and sanctions. Member Barbara Reagan, in the second part of the article, spelled out the Committee's ideas. We had struggled for almost two years about how to implement the Resolu-

tions and we believed that all economists, not just CSWEP, should take the 1972 Association action extremely seriously. That's why I have been pushing for over ten years to get these resolutions reprinted, to inform everyone of the commitments made by the professional association for itself and for all economists, including specific methods of affirmative action.

During those early years, when the Committee was building up the roster, encouraging regional and local meetings, sponsoring newsletters and functions to inform people about CSWEP and gathering the first hard data about education and employment for women economists, we realized that these activities themselves helped dispel role prejudice. A male chairman commenting on his department's numbers of economics majors, enrollment in first and subsequent economics courses, faculty, promotion, tenure, alumnae experiences, and so on among men and women, commented that he had not at all realized the existing waste of resources. His colleagues agreed to deliberately encourage women students in the field and to use all their professional contacts to locate women candidates for the economics faculty. CSWEP informed women economists about each other, too. They rejoiced in finding a kindred soul in the same subspecialty, a reader of first drafts, members of a panel, and many friendships. A colleague leaving the first meeting of the New England Women's Economic Association exclaimed gleefully, "I've finally got my own club!"

My conclusion from this brief historical summary is that CSWEP accomplished highly useful "consciousness-raising." At the time I was totally unsympathetic to this notion; I refused to accept the premise of "the movement" that women were helpless, trapped by their husbands, their fathers, their male

teachers and physicians and other men, and that women needed women's encouragement to understand their predicament in society. I also opposed most of the leaders in the women's movement for refusing to recognize economic facts – I suppose I have always found ideology unacceptable. But the examples above, echoed by other men with similar reactions, and the experience of women (including myself) who rejoiced at a newfound collegiality, made me accept that what Ken Boulding had called "information" and "persuasion" can also be called "consciousness-raising."

My conclusion today is that both information and persuasion are still badly needed. It may never be possible to raise children to be totally oblivious to stereotypes, particularly that women clearly destined for marriage and motherhood need not trouble their pretty heads about taxes and discount rates and statistical errors in measuring inflation. Despite sophisticated knowledge and liberal goodwill, the old-fashioned image of women remains powerful. A business reporter interviewing me about a woman CEO of a Fortune 500 firm observed that one particular industry, and even the entire region where it was located, were inhospitable to women in executive roles. He asked for my reaction. "Gracious!" I thought, but did not say so to him, "what makes you think there is any industry, or any region, which does accept women?" And he wrote a fine article, appreciative of his subject's abilities and accomplishments. Nonetheless, many of its observations would not have existed in the case of a man.

In the 1973 article, Ken Boulding pointed out that genetic differences, like hair color or gender or skin color or height, undoubtedly exist but have no proven impact on job or role performance, with the exception of reproduction. Over the past few years new research suggests other genetic differences in mental and psychological attributes between the sexes, with much to be explored; some genetic differences may in fact affect education and employment. But, *CETERIS PARIBUS!* the social environment remains overwhelming. It follows that social action can change any preconceived notion of social roles, and it is possible to enhance the "social betterment function" by new and striking information, convincing persuasion, and a sensible yet impassioned system of incentives and deterrents.

I would like to add a fifth tool for CSWEP and everyone else, namely boasting. Perhaps social conditioning makes women more modest about their own accomplishments, but that's not contributing to social learning. 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. And if the woman is your mother, or your sister, or your wife, or yourself, go ahead and boast! If we are part of the knowledge industry, then let us help our knowledge to be more complete.

Women in the Academy

Rebecca M. Blank - Northwestern University - CSWEP Chair, 1994-96

The progress of women in the academic world of economics can best be characterized as a good news/bad news story. The good news is that women economists have made substantial gains in numbers and status in academic departments. The bad news is that there is still evidence that women face greater barriers in this world than their male colleagues.

The good news is clear from the data. The National Science Foundation indicates that the share of new Ph.D.s in economics awarded to women has increased from 10 percent in 1974 to 25 percent in 1995. The American Economic Association's (AEA) annual survey of Ph.D.-granting departments indicates that the share of untenured but tenure-track assistant professors who are female has risen from 7 percent to 25 percent over these years. The share of full tenured professors who are women has risen much more slowly, from 2 percent to 5 percent. CSWEP's own (and more complete) survey of Ph.D.-granting departments indicates that over 8 percent of full tenured professors are women. Further, there is evidence that a growing share of published papers are authored or co-authored by women and that women's participation in annual meetings of the AEA has risen.

While these gains should be celebrated, there are still ongoing problems faced by women in academic economics. Most notably, women are still very scarce on most economics faculties. A number of departments continue to have no tenured women. In 1996-97, the CSWEP survey indicates that there were only 108 tenured women in 98 Ph.D.-granting departments. With an average department size of 25, these departments averaged 3 women at all ranks. For many purposes the gender of one's colleagues may be irrelevant. But most women who have been among only one or two in their department will testify that they regularly experience a

sense of isolation, even if this is just the lack of someone who will laugh at some of the same jokes. It has also been suggested that the lack of women on economics faculties is one reason fewer young women are attracted to the field. However, recent research (Canes and Rosen, 1995, or Neumark and Gardecki, 1996) suggests the effects on students of having a role model of the same gender may not be large.

In addition, there is evidence that women disproportionately drop out of tenure track positions. Several years ago I tried to simulate a model of expected progression through the ranks for men and women in economics, starting with the men and women in the profession in 1980. Whichever set of assumptions I adopted about how to simulate "equivalent" progress for women and men, I came up with the same answer: women were advancing more slowly than any simulation would suggest they should be. In short, the sparsity of women at the full tenured level is due both to the fact that women start as a smaller pool of Ph.D. students and to the fact that they leave, or fail to be promoted, at a higher rate than men. Kahn (1993), for instance, finds that the median time to tenure among women is 3 years longer than among men.

Women are now spread more evenly across disciplinary topics than they used to be, although they remain over-represented in the empirical subfields and under-represented in the more theoretical subfields. The academic jobs in which women are located also remain skewed. There are relatively more women in teaching colleges and in jobs at lower-ranked universities. Barbezat (1992) discusses differences in the placement of men and women in the economics job market. Singell and Stone (1993) and McMillen and Singell (1994) investigate the determinants of first job placement and subsequent promotion between men and women in

economics, finding evidence consistent with the theory that women are "underplaced" in academic jobs.

Perhaps the largest change is simply the widespread acceptance of women in economics. Women present at the formation of CSWEP in the early 1970s tell numerous stories of being belittled and not taken seriously by their male colleagues. (For instance, see the conversation with Carolyn Shaw Bell about the founding of CSWEP in the Fall 1993 CSWEP Newsletter.) Current cases of egregious sexual discrimination and exclusion in the profession are few (although not entirely absent.) Instead, the problems that many women currently face are more subtle: Not being as often included in conversations or invited to be part of research projects simply because they aren't "one of the guys;" sitting in faculty meetings as the only woman and realizing their colleagues just don't understand their point of view; or facing institutional issues (the lack of university maternity leave policies, for example) that deeply affect them but don't affect their male colleagues. The good news is that these problems can be dealt with more easily than the outright hostility that women faced 30 years ago in academics; the bad news is that these problems still exist.

A major institutional issue that continues to affect women in academic positions more than their male colleagues is the problem of career timing. Launching a career as an academic economist means extended schooling, followed by a minimum of 6 hard-working years until a tenure decision. The years when a younger faculty member is expected to demonstrate high research productivity and strong service to the university are exactly when many women are also in their prime childbearing years. As recent participants in a CSWEP panel on marriage and children (at the 1996 AEA meetings) indicated,

life just isn't fair for women with children inside the university. Although many husbands do increasing amounts of childcare, most women put significantly more time into childcare responsibilities than their husbands. The typical pattern of older generations of academic women was to have children – if one had children at all – after tenure. One of the changes in the profession is that a growing number of women at well-regarded research schools are having children as junior faculty members. It is still an open question how they will fare in the long run as they try to combine career and family.

Organizations like CSWEP have helped advance women's progress in academics. CSWEP has provided opportunities for (particularly younger)

women to get on the program at AEA annual meetings and to be published in the *AER's Papers and Proceedings*. CSWEP has also been a consistent voice within the AEA for issues of particular concern to women, such as child care at the annual meetings. The networking that occurs through CSWEP receptions and through the Newsletter is also important. As one woman once said to me, "I go to the CSWEP reception at the AEA annual meetings each year just because it's such a lift to walk into a roomful of economists and see that they're all women." Butressing the work of CSWEP, the formation of the International Association of Feminist Economists (IAFFE) in recent years has created additional avenues through which women can make connections. IAFFE has been particularly active in

promoting the application of feminist theory to the field of economics, creating a new subfield of the discipline.

The question of "Why aren't there more women in academic economics?" remains key for the profession. Of particular concern is the continuing low share of undergraduate economics majors who are female. Less than 30 percent of graduating seniors in economics were women in the mid-1990s. While all of us can work to make our departments and universities better places for women faculty to work, until we also improve the pipeline and increase the number of younger women with an interest in the field, the number of women entering academic research and teaching careers in economics will remain low.

References:

- Barbezat, Debra A. 1992. "The Market for New Ph.D. Economists." *Journal of Economic Education*. Vol 23:2, p262-76.
- Canes, Brandice J. and Harvey S. Rosen. 1995. "Following in Her Footsteps? Women's Choices of College Majors and Faculty Gender Composition." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*. Vol 48:3, p486-504.
- Kahn, Shulamit. 1993. "Gender Differences in Academic Career Paths of Economists," *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings*. Vol 83:2, p52-6.
- McMillen, Daniel P. and Larry D. Singell, Jr. 1994. "Gender Differences in First Jobs for Economists." *Southern Economic Journal*. Vol 60:3, p701-14.
- Neumark, David and Rosella Gardecki. 1996. "Women Helping Women? Role-Model and Mentoring Effects on Female Ph.D. Students in Economics." *NBER Working Paper 5733*. Cambridge MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Singell, Jr., Larry D. and Joe A. Stone. 1993. "Gender Differences in the Careers of Ph.D. Economists." *Contemporary Policy Issues*. Vol 11:4, p95-106.

Women in Business

Sharon P. Smith - Dean, College of Business Administration, Fordham University

The anniversary of the founding of CSWEP offers an appropriate occasion to consider how women have fared in business during the past twenty-five years. This question has often been addressed through an analysis of the size and sources of wage differentials between the sexes and how they may have changed over time. I will not address that dimension of the issue here. Instead I will consider whether women have prospered in terms of their access to positions of power and influence in

business. To do so requires looking not only at what progress women have made in business but also at what changes have occurred in business that have affected both men and women. It is helpful to begin by viewing women's position in business from a cultural perspective at the time CSWEP was founded and then reflecting on how and why that position has changed over the intervening years.

Some twenty years ago, Rosabeth

Moss Kanter characterized the corporate world of that time as a culture in which "Women populate organizations, but they practically never run them, especially the large business and public establishments..."¹ The segmentation of office work into male managerial jobs and female clerical jobs both contribute to and was, in part, a consequence of the idealization of what Kanter termed the "masculine ethic" (that is, being tough-minded and analytical, setting aside emotional and personal con-

siderations in making analyses and decisions) as "necessities for effective management." [p. 22] Such occupational segregation reflected both individual choice in career and discriminatory practices in hiring and promotion. It also reflected a pipeline problem: although women's labor participation was increasing dramatically, women were not yet moving in great numbers into the sorts of educational programs that were attractive to corporate employers and thus were not eligible for many of the entry level positions. In 1972, for example, only 9.1 percent of the undergraduate degrees in business and 3.9 percent of the master's degrees in business were awarded to women. Whatever the original source of the segmentation, it was clear, as Kanter observed [pp. 264-287], that correcting it by moving women into positions of influence and authority would not only heighten their commitment to the organization but would also signal the more effective use of a major untapped resource. The quality of worklife would improve throughout the organization, as the hostility that often accompanies blocked opportunities would be eliminated and the talents of all the human resources would be used more effectively.

The business world has changed dramatically in the ensuing twenty-five years. Faced with the challenge of global competition, American business has restructured and re-engineered itself totally. These changes have transformed what constitutes a career path and have shifted the responsibility for movement along that path. Career paths are no longer clearly defined: they

may be vertical, horizontal, diagonal. They may move across functional boundaries as well as across companies and industries, according to larger needs and opportunities. They may move among corporations, entrepreneurial operations, and non-profit organizations. Thus the career path is now the responsibility of the employee to manage rather than in the control of the employer. Indeed most individuals can anticipate having multiple careers over a lifetime. Networks and alliance are of paramount importance, not only for individuals as they manage their careers but also for firms as they retain the loyalty of their customers.

Women's labor force participation rates continue to rise. Women have dramatically altered their chosen areas of study. In 1995 (the latest figure available), 47.6 percent of baccalaureate business degrees and 39.4 percent of master's degrees in business were awarded to women. Women are now moving into very different occupations and industries than they did twenty-five years ago, though they continue to shoulder a disproportionate share of household responsibilities. In the corporate world, their increased movement into accounting has been particularly remarkable. However, these changes do not mean the segmentation and powerlessness that Kanter observed have been eliminated. A glass ceiling persists. Catalyst, a nonprofit research group, reports that women hold only 2.4 percent of the highest-ranking corporate office positions in the 500 largest corporations. Not surprisingly, predictions in the business press of individuals who

will form the next generation of CEO's identify a scant handful of women at most. The ceiling has been raised but not eliminated.

Judy B. Rosener's study of leadership style has confirmed that there are innate differences between men and women and that these differences have special implications for the changing business climate. In particular, men generally display a "command-and-control" style whereas women tend toward an interactive manner that is "particularly effective in flexible, nonhierarchical organizations of the kind that perform best in a climate of rapid change."² At present, these abilities "remain undervalued and underutilized" [p. 199]. This undervaluation, coupled with an anticipated increase in flexibility for managing other household responsibilities, are most likely principal reasons for women's choosing a career path in which they leave the corporate world to start their own entrepreneurial operations. Will the corporate world recognize and value women's abilities at all levels? Despite the growing numbers of women in the pipeline, I do not believe the glass ceiling will disappear quickly. Talented women will gravitate to those corporations that recognize women as a resource innately qualified to add value to a business world challenged by rapid change. The strategic advantage those corporations gain may provide the incentive for other corporations to act similarly. Then, perhaps, the ceiling will eventually be eliminated and men and women will have equal opportunity for their talents to be recognized and rewarded accordingly.

References:

- ¹ Rosabeth Moss Kanter, *Men and Women of the Corporation* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1977), p. 16.
- ² Judy B. Rosener, *American's Competitive Secret Utilizing Women as a Management Strategy* (New York: Oxford University, 1995), p. 11.

CSWEP: Past, Present, Future

Robin L. Bartlett - Denison University - CSWEP Chair

The stage was set at the Annual Business Meeting of the American Economic Association (AEA) December 29, 1970 in Cobo Hall, Detroit, Michigan. A resolution was offered to have a session at the 1971 meetings on the role of women in economic life. And the rest is history. According to an interoffice memo (Chamberlain 1972) of the Ford Foundation from Mariam K. Chamberlain to Marshall A. Robinson, dated January 11, 1972, there were lively gatherings at the AEA annual meetings held December 27-29, 1971 in New Orleans. First, Barbara Bergmann chaired the session titled "What Economic Equality for Women Requires." The overflow audience spilled into the corridors and was very sympathetic. Later that same day another gathering took place to form the Caucus of Women Economists and to draft a resolution to present at the AEA's business meeting for action.

Two Yale graduate students jointly chaired the meeting. Over 100 men and women — established and novice members of the profession alike — were present. The seven items spelled out in the original draft of the resolution began with: "Resolved that the AEA endorses the principle that sex discrimination and inequality have no place in the Economics profession." The Caucus wanted discrimination against women in the profession to stop and for the AEA to facilitate that effort. Carolyn Shaw Bell, Katherine Coman Professor of Economics at Wellesley College, was elected chair of the Caucus and was designated to present a modified resolution to the Association's business meeting. Interestingly, this version of the resolution began with: "Resolved that the American Economic Association declares that economics is not a man's field." John Kenneth Galbraith chaired the business meeting. One of the first amendments to the resolution was to add "exclusively" to the first sentence (AER 1971). Six of the original items were passed almost intact. The

creation of a roster of women economists was tabled for later action. Token opposition arose. The timely remarks of Robert Eisner and Andrew Brimmer, however, expedited the process.

Item II of that resolution gave birth to the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession. President Galbraith (AER 1972) appointed Carolyn Shaw Bell and eight other members: Walter Adams, Francine Blau, Martha Blaxall, Kenneth Boulding, Collette Moser, Barbara Reagan, Myra Strober, and Phyllis Wallace. Mariam Chamberlain then wrote a grant to the Ford Foundation which helped finance CSWEP through its formative years.

CSWEP has accomplished much over the past 25 years. There have been 10 chairs of CSWEP and 77 board members. Their names are listed at the end of this piece to give them the recognition they deserve. During its early years, CSWEP set out to document the problems of women in economics. Questionnaires were sent to all the Ph.D.-granting institutions in the US to systematically collect the first information on how many women were economists and where they were employed. This questionnaire eventually led to the annual survey distributed by the AEA known as the Universal Academic Questionnaire (UAQ). The UAQ provides information on the number of male and female assistant, associate and full professors at Ph.D.-granting institutions used in CSWEP's annual report as well as widely used salary information (also see Albelda, forthcoming).

To ensure that potential employers could identify available women economists, CSWEP established a roster. A roster provides employers with the list of over 7000 women economists and their areas of expertise. To ensure that everyone in the job market has all the available information about potential

jobs, the AEA subsequently began the publication of Job Opportunities for Economists or JOE. Anti-nepotism rules, formal and informal, were dropped in many departments in order to enable both members of a couple to belong to a faculty (see AEA Resolution I, part f). Over the years CSWEP has published a newsletter three times a year which contains a variety of "how to" articles to help women pursue their professional goals.

CSWEP sponsors six sessions at the annual AEA meetings each year. Half of the sessions pertain to gender-related material and are intended to explore the economic position of women in and outside of the market. The other three sessions focus on specific topics or areas to showcase the young women who are entering these fields. Six to eight of these papers are selected to be published in the proceedings. Recently, to facilitate custodial parents attending its annual meetings, the AEA contracted with Kiddiecorp to provide child care at the meetings. The AEA sessions, JOE, Kiddiecorp, and the employment of couples in the same department all grew from seeds planted in the founding resolution.

In 1993, CSWEP began collecting its own data not only to obtain an accurate count of women in academic jobs, but also to determine the number of women in the pipeline. While significant progress has been made with regard to the percentage of women in academia, a serious gender imbalance still exists at the upper ranks. Information gathered by CSWEP's 1996 annual departmental questionnaire shows that 29 percent of all undergraduates who earn a baccalaureate in economics in the Ph.D.-granting institutions are women. Thirty percent of those entering Ph.D. programs are women. Twenty-eight percent of the ABDs are women and 24 percent of the Ph.D.s earned in economics go to women. Only 20 percent of the jobs at Ph.D.-granting insti-

tutions, however, go to women. At non Ph.D.-granting institutions, 26 percent of the new hires are women. As Rebecca Blank points out, the number of women hired in tenure track positions at the country's Ph.D.-granting institutions has improved noticeably, but the number who receive tenure is still not on par with that of men.

While previous efforts of CSWEP have been helpful, it will take many more years before the serious imbalance between the status of men and women in economics is rectified. The 25th anniversary of CSWEP provides the opportunity to evaluate its success with respect to the original items in the founding resolution. In its new mission statement, CSWEP members have reaffirmed their belief that economics is a woman's field as much as it is a man's field; their commitment to represent women's views within the Association; and their determination to help women succeed in the profession. To these ends,

CSWEP is in the process of taking several new initiatives. First, since publishing and grant-writing are keys to the success of young faculty members, CSWEP wrote a grant to the National Science Foundation (NSF) to hold a series of workshops that will bring junior and senior women together in teams to catapult more women into the tenured ranks and above. The CSWEP board and several senior women in the profession are trying a new approach to facilitating the progress of younger women through the ranks. Forty junior women and eight senior women are scheduled to meet for the first time after the AEA meetings to work in teams to cooperatively help each other with publishing, grant-writing, networking, and balancing life choices. Working together on each other's projects will speed up the process of feedback and review. At the regional meetings, CSWEP board members will also facilitate similar workshops. We hope to reach over 160 female economists in the course of the coming year.

Second, CSWEP's regional representatives are making connections with women in their areas and with regional associations. CSWEP is making a concerted effort to reach out to women who are not at the large research institutions. The newsletter has more articles on teaching and research at institutions other than those granting Ph.D.s. The newsletter will also begin a new section where responses from readers will be published. Finally, as Carolyn Shaw Bell suggested, women economists need to boast more about their achievements. CSWEP is currently exploring the establishment of a prize in economics that would celebrate the work of a woman economist.

Women economists have a critical role to play in the development of the profession and the discipline of economics. CSWEP hopes that the next 25 years will see the abolition of the gross gender imbalance that Kenneth Boulding wrote 25 years ago.

Twenty-five years of CSWEP Board Members from 1972 through 1997

1997

Robin Bartlett, *Chair*
Maureen Cropper
Hali Edison
Catherine Eckel
Henry Farber
Joyce Jacobsen
Daphne Kenyon
Arleen Leibowitz
Nancy Marion
Olivia Mitchell
Susan Pozo
Kenneth Small
Joan Haworth

1996

Rebecca Blank, *Chair*
Kathryn Anderson
Robin Bartlett
Maureen Cropper
Hali Edison
Ronald Ehrenberg
Joni Hersch
Joyce Jacobsen
Daphne Kenyon
Nancy Marion
Olivia Mitchell
Susan Pozo

Kenneth Small
Joan Haworth

1995

Rebecca Blank, *Chair*
Kathryn Anderson
Robin Bartlett
Marianne Baxter
Maureen Cropper
Ronald Ehrenberg
Joni Hersch
Irene Lurie
Lisa Lynch
Nancy Marion
Kenneth Small
Ann Witte
Joan Haworth

1994

Rebecca Blank, *Chair*
Kathryn Anderson
Robin Bartlett
Ivy Broder
Linda Edwards
Ronald Ehrenberg
Jo Anna Gray
Joni Hersch
Irene Lurie

Nancy Marion
Roger Noll
Ann Witte
Joan Haworth

1993

Elizabeth Hoffman, *Chair*
Robin Bartlett
Rebecca Blank
Ivy Broder
Linda Edwards
Jo Anna Gray
Ethel Jones
Frank Levy
Irene Lurie
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Ann Witte
Joan Haworth

1992

Elizabeth Hoffman, *Chair*
Rebecca Blank
Ivy Broder
Linda Edwards
Jo Anna Gray
Marjorie Honig
Ethel Jones

Frank Levy
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myrna Wooders
Joan Haworth

1991

Elizabeth Hoffman, *Chair*
Rebecca Blank
Marjorie Honig
Ethel Jones
Frank Levy
Shelly Lundberg
Daniel Newlon
June O'Neill
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myrna Wooders
Joan Haworth

1990

Nancy Gordon, *Chair*
Rebecca Blank
Elizabeth Hoffman
Marjorie Honig
Shulamit Kahn

Shelly Lundberg
Kathryn Morrison
Barbara Newell
Dan Newlon
June O'Neill
Barbara Wolfe
Myrna Wooders
Joan Haworth

1989

Nancy Gordon, *Chair*
Cecilia Conrad
Elizabeth Hoffman
Shulamit Kahn
Judith Lave
Shelly Lundberg
Marjorie McElroy
Kathryn Morrison
Barbara Newell
Daniel Newlon
June O'Neill
Joan Haworth

1988

Nancy Gordon, *Chair*
Beth Allen
Cecilia Conrad
Alan Fechter
Elizabeth Hoffman
Shulamit Kahn
Judith Lave
Katharine Lyall
Marjorie McElroy
Kathryn Morrison
Barbara Newell
June O'Neill
Joan Haworth

1987

Isabel Sawhill, *Chair*
Beth Allen
Cecilia Conrad
Karen Davis
Alan Fechter
Nancy Gordon
Shulamit Kahn
Judith Lave
Katharine Lyall
Marjorie McElroy
Helen Junz
Joan Haworth

1986

Isabel Sawhill, *Chair*
Beth Allen
Lourdes Beneria

Bernadette Chacherer
Karen Davis
Alan Fechter
Mary Fish
Nancy Gordon
Helen Junz
Katherine Lyall
Sharon Megdal
Michelle White
Joan Haworth

1985

Isabel Sawhill, *Chair*
Lourdes Beneria
Barbara Bergmann
Bernadette Chachere
Karen Davis
Mary Fish
Helen Junz
Sharon Megdal
Joseph Pechman
Cordelia Reimers
Aleta Styers
Michelle White
Joan Haworth

1984

Barbara Bergmann, *Chair*
Lourdes Beneria
Bernadette Chachere
Mary Fish
Sharon Megdal
Joseph Pechman
Cordelia Reimers
Nancy Ruggles
Aleta Styers
Michelle White
Gail Wilensky

1983

Barbara Bergmann, *Chair*
Irma Adelman
Monique Garrity
Janet Goulet
Joseph Pechman
Cordelia Reimers
Nancy Ruggles
Aleta Styers
Gail Wilensky
Joan Haworth

1982

Elizabeth Bailey, *Chair*
Irma Adelman

M. Louise Curley
Robert Eisner
Monique Garrity
Janet Goulet
Nancy Ruggles
Jean Shackelford
Gail Wilensky
Joan Haworth

1981

Elizabeth Bailey, *Chair*
Irma Adelman
M. Louise Curley
Robert Eisner
Janet Goulet
Barbara Jones
Helen Ladd
Nancy D. Ruggles
Jean Shackelford
Joan Haworth

1980

Elizabeth Bailey, *Chair*
M. Louise Curley
Robert Eisner
Marianne Ferber
Barbara Jones
Helen Ladd
Nancy Ruggles

1979

Ann Friedlaender, *Chair*
Mariam Chamberlain
Marianne Ferber
William Hellmuth
Barbara Jones
Helen Ladd
Ruth Shaeffer

1978

Ann Friedlaender, *Chair*
Mariam Chamberlain
Marianne Ferber
William Hellmuth
Janice Madden
Ruth Schaefer
Margaret Simms

1977

Barbara Reagan, *Chair*
Mariam Chamberlain
Ann Friedlaender
William Hellmuth
Janice Madden

Isabel Sawhill
Ruth Schaeffer
Margaret Simms
Nancy Teeters

1976

Barbara Reagan, *Chair*
Walter Heller
Janice Madden
Isabel Sawhill
Margaret Simms
Nancy Teeters

1975

Barbara Reagan, *Chair*
Walter Heller
Janice Madden
Isabel Sawhill
Nancy Teeters
Florence Weiss

1974

Barbara Reagan, *Chair*
Walter Adams
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Francine Blau
Martha Blaxall
Kenneth Boulding
Collette Moser
Myra Strober
Phyllis Wallace
Florence Weiss

1973

Carolyn Shaw Bell, *Chair*
Walter Adams
Francine Blau
Martha Blaxall
Kenneth Boulding
Collette Moser
Barbara Reagan
Myra Strober
Phyllis Wallace
Florence Weiss

1972

Carolyn Shaw Bell, *Chair*
Walter Adams
Francine Blau
Martha Blaxall
Kenneth Boulding
Collette Moser
Barbara Reagan
Myra Stober
Phyllis Wallace

Combating Role Prejudice and Sex Discrimination

Findings of the American Economic Association Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession *

I. Role Prejudice as an Economic Problem¹

It is well recognized among economists that arbitrary discrimination in the labor market creates a general economic loss. Where certain people are excluded from jobs for reasons which have nothing to do with the performance of the jobs themselves, the loss to consumers plus the loss to those who are excluded is greater than any gain to those who are favored. There is now copious literature on this subject.

It is less well recognized that discrimination among existing members of the labor force is only a special case of a much larger process of role learning and role acceptance, which begins almost from the moment of birth. It is not merely that differences in skills are learned, as in Adam Smith's famous passage about the porter and the philosopher,² but images of possible roles on the part of both the role occupants and the role demanders are likewise learned in the long process of socialization. The existing division of labor at any one time, therefore, may reflect "role prejudice" – that is, a learning process by which certain irrelevant biological or genetic characteristics of individuals are associated with certain roles. Some genetic distinctions are significant for role performance, but many are not and yet are widely believed to be significant. These beliefs are products of a false social learning process, which can be a source of economic loss even larger than false discrimination within an existing labor force. Discrimination in an existing labor force indeed emerges as one consequence of the much larger process of the development of role prejudice.

Role prejudice tends to develop when there are genetic differences in the human population which are visible but are not necessarily significant for role performance. We see this clearly by considering those genetic differences which are undetectable except by refined methods and therefore are socially invisible.

Some of the blood types are perhaps an example. In ordinary life we are quite unaware of a person's blood type. Consequently, it can be safely assumed that there is no role prejudice against blood types of different kinds, unless these happen to be associated with other characteristics which are socially visible. For the major types, this association is fairly minimal. Consequently, we would be very surprised to find a distribution of blood types in any occupational group or income group of any size which is markedly different from the distribution of blood types in the population as a whole.

For any particular distribution of genetic characteristics, it is clear that we can postulate "no-prejudice proportions" in all the different occupations and structures of society. In the case of the socially invisible and irrelevant characteristics mentioned above, the no-prejudice proportions, subject to random variation, in any group of society would be expected to be the same as the proportion of the characteristic in the society as a whole. If there were any case – and I must confess I have not been able to think of one – of a genetic characteristic which is relevant to role performance but which is socially invisible and not in the information system, then the existing structure of proportions of the characteristic in different occupations might not be the same as the proportions in society as a whole, and those occupations which this invisible characteristic favored would have a larger proportion than in the society as a whole, but this would still constitute a no-prejudice distribution. Paradoxically enough, without knowledge there can be no prejudice; without some knowledge, there can be no false knowledge.

Role prejudice may easily arise where there are highly visible and observable genetic characteristics, such as sex, race, height, size, color, and so on. Historically these have frequently been perceived as having some relevance to performance in different roles. But this relevance tends

to be exaggerated, because a rational tendency to economize information can easily turn into an irrational process of stereotyping and false knowledge.

The genetic division of the human race into men and women qualifies in most societies as the major form both of discrimination in the existing labor force and of role prejudice. This is not surprising, as the genetic difference between the sexes is far greater than it is among the races in terms of the structure of information of the genetic code. There is one role indeed – that of bearing children – in which there is 100 percent genetic specialization between the sexes, in the sense that no men will be found in the childbearing population. The very social visibility of the distinction between the sexes, however, makes it a prime candidate for role prejudice, which creates a huge reservoir of false knowledge, false education, and false learning processes. All are costly to society in exactly the same sense that an unknown and unutilized natural resource is costly in the sense of opportunity foregone. We can, oddly enough, think of role prejudice as a large natural resource which can be mined by the development of true knowledge and better learning processes to the benefit of the whole society.

Where the sex distinction is completely irrelevant to role performance, role prejudice can be said to exist wherever there are substantial deviations from the 50 percent rule – that is, 50 percent of each sex in the occupation – this being assumed to be the proportion of the sexes in the total society. The difficult case, of course, is where there is some genetic foundation for partial role differentiation. It is the cases between the 50 percent and 100 percent that are difficult, and in these cases there is often no information system – at the moment at any rate – which can inform us as to the exact proportion of the sexes in different occupations which constitutes zero role prejudice. Fortunately, however, we do

References

- Albelda, Randy, *Economics & Feminism: disturbances in the field*. New York: Twayne Publishers; forthcoming. Chapter 3.
Annual Business Meeting Minutes, Dec. 29, 1970, AER, May 1971, 471-473.
Annual Business Meeting Minutes, Dec. 28, 1971, AER, May 1972, 470-474.
Chamberlain, Mariam K., Inter-Office Memorandum, The Ford Foundation, Jan. 11, 1972.

not have to know where the exact position of the ideal proportion is if the existing proportion clearly represents a gross disproportion. In order to set up a social policy we do not have to know exactly where the ideal lies. We merely have to identify those cases in which the deviation from the ideal is so clear and striking that we can find wide agreement as to the desirable direction of change. At the bottom of the mountain, one knows which way is up, even though one may not know exactly where the top of the mountain lies. Maximizing is an illusion, but betterment is not.

It is the contention of the American Economic Association Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (the Committee) that there is gross disproportionality in the proportion of women to men in the economics profession, and especially in university teaching, as revealed in the data which have been collected. Fortunately, we do not have to argue whether the genetic differences between women and men would result in a no-prejudice proportion of women in economics of 40 percent or 50 percent or 60 percent when the actual proportion is less than 10 percent. This gross disproportionality, of course, arises from sources in the long history of the human race, most of which are outside the economics profession. This, however, does not excuse the economics profession from setting in motion processes which will raise its proportion of women. We are a sector of the knowledge industry and a group of people concerned with eliminating sources of unnecessary economic loss. Only if we are successful beyond our wildest expectations, considering the vastness of the mine of ignorance and false learning, will it be necessary to raise the question as to whether we have gone too far.

The critical question, therefore, is that of the "betterment production function," as it might be called. The social indicator of betterment is in this case clearly an increase in the proportion of women in the profession, especially in those branches where the proportion is least. If the rate of change of this proportion is regarded as the product, the question is: What are the inputs which produce this output, and particularly, what

are those inputs that can be most easily expanded and that have the highest marginal productivity? We might also look at those inputs which have a high negative marginal productivity and which can be contracted. Four broad classes of inputs may be named: Information, Persuasion, Rewards, and Punishments.

1. Information

Information properly organized changes the images of the world of people who receive it and consequently changes their behavior. There are two aspects of the information process – theoretical structures and information about fact. Better theoretical structures are an essential ingredient in the advancement of knowledge, and in this particular case it is important that the theory of role prejudice, as outlined above, should be widely recognized as a legitimate extension of economic and social theory. One of the greatest enemies of the fact of prejudice is the spread of the idea of prejudice. Once it is recognized as a theoretical construct, the facts of perverse social learning which previously have been invisible become glaringly visible. The improvement and elaboration in detail of the theory of role prejudice is still an important task for the future.

Coupled with a wider appreciation of the theory, the development of statistical information, case studies, and a continuing series of social indicators can serve as a constant criticism of what is false in existing theories of the world and a reinforcement of what is true. It is tempting to think of every advance in knowledge as the result of a combination of new theoretical insights with new information collection and processing procedures. In social systems, however, knowledge does not merely reflect the world – it changes it. And in this case particularly, the more we know about role prejudice, the less there is likely to be. Getting lost is one way to improve one's knowledge of the terrain, but studying a map is a better way, and diminishes the amount of getting lost.

2. Persuasion

The mere existence of knowledge and information is not always enough to

insure its spread. One of the major sources of ignorance is inattention, and to insure the spread of new knowledge it is often necessary to call it to the attention of people in ways which are dramatic and persuasive. The fact that persuasion can be abused to propagate false knowledge does not excuse us from its proper use in the propagation of truth. Persuasion plays a particularly important role in the change of values, and without getting into the ancient controversy about the truth of values one has to recognize that change in our image of the world inevitably changes our values about it. As scientists, we have to guard against the information filter which our values create. We cannot pretend, however, that information is value free. Change in knowledge and change in values are joint products of a single process.

A problem of particular difficulty is that of irrelevant and unconscious sources and attitudes, even in the academic and intellectual community, which is supposed to be on its guard against irrationality. The relations between the sexes are often characterized by high levels of emotion, and hence are particularly subject to the distortions which arise from unconscious or irrelevant sources. It is one of the functions of ethical persuasion to raise our awareness and to set up defenses against attitudes and prejudices which arise from this source.

3. Rewards

It is widely recognized in the learning process that positive and negative payoffs are of great importance. Every economist is familiar with the proposition that any human activity which is rewarded above some neutral level will expand and those rewarded below this level will contract. The structure of knowledge and values in the human mind, likewise, grows towards its own more positive payoffs and away from the less positive and negative payoffs. It is by constructing a reward structure that society is most likely to achieve change. These rewards may be either internal or external. Our own applause, as Paul Samuelson suggested, may indeed be the greatest reward of all. No economist, however, can deny the significance of exter-

nal reward, whether the applause of others or those more tangible things, such as subsidies, tax remissions, and price changes. Curiously enough, although psychologists seem to agree that rewards are more successful than punishments in the learning process, it seems harder to legitimate a reward structure. A suggestion, for instance, that dues paid by members of the American Economic Association should be scaled down if the organization or department to which they belong had a high proportion of women might be hard to legitimate, even though it might be effective. Nevertheless, the search for reward structures should go on.

4. Sanctions and Punishments

Punishments always seem to have been easier to legitimate than rewards, perhaps because of a belief that they are cheaper, in spite of much evidence that they do not contribute as much to learning. Nevertheless, there is one extremely good reason for the use of sanctions. In the case of public goods and public bads it is well recognized by economists that legitimated threat of some kind is essential if we are to avoid some "tragedy of the commons." Private reward structures, such as the market and the price-profit mechanism, are particularly well adapted to the provision of private goods, but are poorly adapted to public goods, where without some sanctions in the collection of taxes public goods would simply not be provided in adequate amount. Private reward systems are also poorly adapted to dealing with public bads such as pollution, of which role prejudice is a prime

example, in the sense that everybody is somewhat diminished by it. The "free-loading principle" applies here, for if there are no sanctions it will pay the individual not to participate in a collective sacrifice required for the increase of a public good or the diminution of a public bad. To rely on purely private rewards and exhortations for the diminution of role prejudice is rather like trying to finance a government with purely voluntary contributions.

To say that sanctions are necessary does not mean to deny that there are acute problems both in the quantity and the quality of sanction, and that bad sanctions may be worse than no sanctions. This, however, does not excuse us from the search for good sanctions, which must not be larger than necessary, must be credible, legitimate, precise, equitable, and so on. Sanctions should call on violators and not on the innocent; they should be appropriate – that is, any punishment should fit the crime – and it should be recognized that, like all deterrents, punishments are most successful when they are not carried out. Economists will recognize, however, that no system of sanctions can be perfect and that there has to be some kind of tradeoff between imperfection in the system of sanctions which will inevitably lead to some failures of both justice and of deterrence, and the failure of the provision of public goods or the elimination of public bads which too weak a system of sanctions might involve.

The power of the American Economic Association to invoke sanctions

is small indeed, and it could be argued that, apart from publicity – which under some circumstances is itself a sanction – a professional association should not legitimately engage even in linguistic sanctions like censure. Nevertheless, it is only realistic to be aware of the fact that sanctions of government can be invoked by groups in the society in the furtherance of what they believe to be general betterment. Even a profession is not exempt from participating in the society of which it is a part. It is important that vigilance be maintained against both the abuses of sanctions and their undue neglect, even though the primary emphasis of the intellectual community is properly on information, persuasion, and rewards.

The Committee is aware that it has a special task which is part of a much larger social process. Role prejudice in particular is by no means confined to women. Men also suffer from role prejudice, and it accounts for other kinds of discrimination than one based solely on sex. Nevertheless, as economists we believe in the division of labor and we believe that the pursuit of our particular task is to complement rather than compete with the labors of others in the long process of social betterment. The guidelines that we are proposing, while they are particularly applicable to our special case, are all simply examples of the fundamental general principle – that where there is clearly not enough, the simplest and most necessary guideline is "more." In what follows we spell out in detail this essential principle.

* This report is published pursuant to a resolution adopted by the members at the Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association, December 28, 1971. In providing for establishment of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession, the resolution specified that "Its general findings, conclusions, and recommendations shall be published by the American Economic Association upon the Committee's request" (*Amer. Econ. Rev. Proc.*, May 1972, p. 474). This report has not been considered or approved by either the Executive Committee or the membership.

¹ Part I was drafted for the Committee by Kenneth E. Boulding, professor of economics, University of Colorado.

² "The difference between the most dissimilar characters, between a philosopher and a common street porter, for example, seems to arise not so much from nature, as from habit, custom, and education" (p.15) Adam Smith.

Reprinted with permission from American Economic Review, December 1972, pp. 1,049-1,053 (this is Part I of the full report published there on pp. 1,049-1,061).

Letters to the Editors

Response to "Enhancing the Attractiveness of Research to Female Faculty"

by Savanna Thornton, Ph.D. (Hampden-Sydney College)

If more women choose undergraduate institutions primarily because the work environments are more conducive to balancing work and family, then the policies suggested in Ron Ehrenberg's article should substantially increase women's interest in careers at research universities. But, what if a large percentage of women economists get more utility from teaching than research? Then, the recommended policies may attract smaller numbers of women to research universities.

Regarding specific proposals:

(1) Stopping the Tenure Clock during a year in which a child is born or adopted. Stopping the tenure clock is a great way to reduce the pressure to publish in a year when a baby arrives and one's workload at home dramatically increases. However, stopping the clock has to mean STOPPING THE CLOCK. If tenure committees just expect an additional year's work every time the clock is stopped, it defeats the purpose of the policy. My previous employer permitted the tenure clock to be stopped an unlimited number of times. Upon learning this, a male economist commented, "That's terrible. Now junior women faculty will have babies every year to avoid coming up for tenure." (It's a sad thing when economists are unable to do basic cost-benefit analysis.) Hampden-Sydney College, where I currently teach, is considering a policy that would allow male or female faculty parents to stop the tenure clock just once prior to the tenure decision. Since Hampden-Sydney is less research-oriented than the top 25 liberal arts colleges, our Dean believes this option is less beneficial to junior faculty parents.

(2) Paid Parental Leave. Hampden-Sydney College will vote this fall on a maternity leave policy that will grant a

semester of paid course reductions to women faculty with due dates or birth dates during or just prior to the start of a semester. At this time, paid leave will not be granted to male faculty. To address the legal issues, the maternity policy is defined and structured as medical leave for the short term medical disability resulting from childbirth. Faculty fathers are legally excluded because childbirth causes no medical disabilities for men. The costs are proving to be unimportant. College Administrators care about the cost of REPLACING a faculty member. Lower salaries paid to adjunct replacements mean that paid leave is less expensive than one might expect. Let me illustrate with an example. Under the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978 my employer is currently required to at least provide 6 weeks of paid leave following childbirth (with extensions possible when complications warrant). Compare the costs of hiring a replacement to cover a woman's courses for 6 weeks during the semester vs. the costs of hiring a full semester replacement to teach the courses. Given the labor market for adjuncts in our area, the additional replacement costs are projected to be about \$1750/leave. Combine this with the lower fertility rates of women with graduate degrees, and the fact that women are a minority of the faculty, and we are projecting a total 10 year cost between \$10,000 - \$27,000 (in current dollars).

(3) Banking of Courses. Allow women to bank courses over longer periods of time. Although it may not be obvious, a pregnant woman is already working hard being an intensive care unit for a fetus. A larger course load in the semester before birth can impose a substantial physiological strain on a woman. Adding a larger course load shortly after a baby is born, makes it harder to care for the newborn. Banking courses over a several year period eases this problem.

(4) Reimbursable Tax-Free Dependent Care Accounts. A college/univer-

sity also saves with this option because it doesn't have to pay FICA taxes on the amount of the employees' wages that are set aside into the Dependent Care Account. Under current law, that's 7.65% of the funds deposited.

(5) On Campus Childcare. An employer should ask itself: "What does our faculty need to work most productively?" Scientists get expensive labs because they need them to work productively. Economics faculty may get expensive computers or paid research assistants for the same reason. Why offer child care benefits? Because faculty who are parents of young children typically find that this resource allows them to work more productively. In my own case, during a year while I was actually living ON CAMPUS, my two children were at two different daycare facilities, at opposite ends of town. (One child was enrolled in a Montessori program that didn't take babies. The best quality care I could find for the baby was at the other end of town.) Although my home was a 4 minute walk from my office, I spent an hour in the car every morning and afternoon doing the day care shuttle. On-site day care would have saved 10 hours/week that I could have devoted to other activities.

(6) Professional Expenses. Conference daycare fees should be included as a reimbursable expense. Most daycare providers charge parents for time the child is there and time the child is away. So parents who must take their young children to conferences typically pay daycare expenses to their normal provider and to the conference daycare provider. If a school allocates each faculty member \$X for conference travel, it

The Newsletter encourages letters to the editor that comment on material we have published. Please indicate on your letter that it is intended for publication. We reserve editorial judgment whether or not to publish a letter, and if necessary to shorten it to meet space needs.

should allow parents to use their allotment to pay conference-related daycare expenses. This option is less likely to have substantial cost implications for the college/university because the budget allocation for travel is preset. However, it might reduce the amount of unused travel funds. Providing additional travel allocations to parents who must take children to conferences does increase costs, but is justifiable as a resource that facilitates a faculty member's ability to work.

(7) Compensating Workload. Let's address the cause of the problem - not the symptoms. If women are a scarce resource on college/university faculties, then instead of reducing research or

teaching demands, Administrators should focus on ways to allocate the resource most productively. Does every single college committee have to have a woman on it? Probably not. Eliminating these types of constraints would allow women to limit and focus their ser-

vice work just as their male colleagues do. We primarily earn respect in our profession through research. By reducing a woman's scholarship requirements so she can perform more college service, a school might improve her chances at tenure time, but outside of the school, the woman's reputation is diminished by this time allocation.

Whether the goal is to increase the number of women faculty at research universities or improve the quality of life of the women already working in such institutions, Work-Family policies should be adopted by more employers.

Thoughts on Research Preference

by Karen Leppel

The following ideas are some things that I have been pondering. For lack of a better place to send them, I mention them to you as co-editor of the CSWEP

newsletter. Let me know what you think.

I have been thinking about what I like and dislike about the research process, and I have been wondering about what other academics like and dislike. For example, I dislike digging up data, and cleaning it and preparing it for analysis. I frequently enjoy doing the regression analysis and seeing what seems to be important. I also like doing the actual technical writing of an article. I suspect that other people enjoy different aspects of research. I wonder if gender correlates with these preferences in some way. There are implications for the value of coauthorship in research, resulting from complementarity of skills and preferences.

Do you know if anyone has explored these questions? Are there any articles on the subject of which you are aware? Has anyone collected data that could be used to examine these issues? Are these ideas so obvious that further examination is not worth the effort?

CSWEP Activities at the 1998 AEA Meeting

January 3-5, 1998 • Chicago, Illinois

Business Meeting and Reception

Business Meeting: Hyatt - Water Tower

25th Anniversary Celebration and Reception: Hyatt - Goldcoast Room

The CSWEP business meeting will be held on Saturday, January 3 at 4:45 p.m. A reception and 25th anniversary celebration will follow.

Hospitality Room

Location: Hyatt - Columbus Hall A (Sat. and Sun.)

Hyatt - Whigley Room (Mon.)

The hospitality room will be open on Saturday, January 3, and Sunday, January 4, from 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.; and on Monday, January 5, from 7:30 a.m. to 2 p.m. A complimentary continental breakfast will be available from 7:30 to 9 a.m. each day. Beverages will be available in the afternoon, except Monday.

CSWEP Sessions

Roundtable Discussion Session

• Social Security Reform: How Will Women Fare?

Time: January 3, 2:30 p.m.

Location: Hyatt-Regency Ballroom D

Panel Includes: Cordelia Reimers, Chair, (Hunter College-CUNY), Theresa Devine (Congressional Budget Office), Edith Fierst (Fierst & Moss, Washington, DC), Karen Holden (University of Wisconsin-Madison), Marjorie Honig (Hunter College-CUNY), Marilyn Moon (Urban Institute) and Steven Sandell (Social Security Administration)

Gender-Related Sessions

• Development in the Labor Market for Women

Time: January 4, 2:30 p.m.

Location: Hyatt-Columbus Hall C&D

Chair: Joyce Jacobsen (Wesleyan University)

Discussants: Theresa Devine (Congressional Budget Office), Leslie Stratton (Virginia Commonwealth University), Amy Aukstikalis (Welch Consulting), Katherine Terrell (University of Michigan)

Papers: Donna Ginther (Southern Methodist University), Chinhui Juhn (University of Houston), Karen Lombard (University of Miami), "Employment of Married Women";

Debora Viola (United States Military Academy), Casey Wardynski (United States Military Academy), Dean Dudley (United States Military Academy), "Women in the Labor Market and the Effects on Military Compensation"; Karen Mumford (University of York), "Men, Women and the Hiring Function"; Elizabeth Brainerd (Williams College), "Women in Transition: Changes in Gender Wage Differentials in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union"

- Gender and Risk Aversion
Time: *January 3, 10:15 a.m.*
Location: *Goldcoast Room*

Chair: Kathryn Shaw (Carnegie Mellon University)
Discussants: Kip Viscusi (Harvard Law School), Andrea Kusko (Federal Reserve Board), John Turner (International Labour Organization), Annamaria Lusardi (Dartmouth College)

Papers: Catherine Eckel (National Science Foundation and Virginia Polytechnic), Philip Grossman (University of Texas-Arlington), Nancy Lutz (Federal Trade Commission and Virginia Polytechnic), V. Padmanabhan (Stanford University), "Playing It Safe: Men, Women, and Risk Aversion"; Vickie Bajtelsmit (Colorado State University), Alexandra Bernasek (Colorado State University), Nancy Jianakoplos (Colorado State University), "Women, Risk Taking, and Pension Decisions"; Leslie Papke (Michigan State University and NBER), "How are Participants Investing Their Accounts in Participant-Directed Individual Account Pension Plans?"; Annika Sundén (Federal Reserve Board of Governors), "Gender Differences in the Allocation of Assets in Retirement Savings Plans"

- Women and Retirement Issues
Time: *January 5, 10:15 a.m.*
Location: *Hyatt-Grand Ballroom D North*

Chair: Olivia Mitchell (University of Pennsylvania)
Discussants: Pamela Loprest (Urban Institute), Liliana Pezzin (Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, HHS), Rebecca Luzadis (Miami University), Richard Johnson (Rutgers University)

Papers: Marjorie Honig (Hunter College-CUNY) "Married Women's Retirement Expectations: Do Pensions and Social Security Matter?"; M. Melinda Pitts (Salisbury State University), Michelle Trawick (Salisbury State University), "Married Women's Retirement Decision: Does Husband's Health Matter? Evidence from the Second Wave of the HRS"; Sharmila Choudhury (Social Security Administration and SUNY Cortland), "Marital Status and Lifetime Earnings: Outlook for American Women"; Nabanita Gupta (University of Aarhus), Bent Christensen (University of Aarhus), "The Effects of Pension Systems Reform on Female Retirement: Evidence from Denmark"

Non-Gender-Related

- Banking and Financial Crises
Time: *January 3, 8 a.m.*

Location: *Grand Ballroom C North*

Chair: Hali Edison

Discussants: Linda Goldberg (Federal Reserve Bank of New York), Angela Redish (University of British Columbia), Caroline Betts (University of Southern California), Sara Calvo (World Bank)

Papers: Victoria Miller (University of Montreal), "The Double Drain with a Cross-Border Twist: More on the Relationship Between Banking and Balance-of-Payment Crises"; Graciela L. Kaminsky (Federal Reserve Board) and Carmen Reinhart (University of Maryland) "Currency and Banking Crises: Is Latin America Different?"; Nancy P. Marion (Dartmouth College) and Robert P. Flood (International Monetary Fund) "Speculative Attacks: Fundamentals and Self-Fulfilling Prophecies"; Liliana Rojas-Suarez (Inter-American Development Bank), "Early Warning Indicators of Banking Problems: What Works for Emerging Markets?"

- Human Capital Accumulation and Growth
Time: *January 4, 10:15 a.m.*

Location: *Hyatt-Columbian*

Chair: Dan Newlon (National Science Foundation)
Discussants: Patricia Pollard (Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis), Shohreh Majim (Western Michigan University), Lant Pritchett (World Bank), Gerhard Glomm (Michigan State University)

Papers: Ruth Judson (Federal Reserve Board), "Measuring Human Capital Like Physical Capital: What Does It Tell Us?"; Mary E. Lovely (Syracuse University) Douglas Holtz-Eakin (Syracuse University), "Generational Conflict, Human Capital Investment, and Economic Growth"; Ann L. Owen (Hamilton College) and Murat F. Iyigun (Federal Reserve Board) "Risk, Entrepreneurship, and Human Capital Accumulation"; Karine S. Moe (Macalester College), Jane Ihrig (University of Virginia), "Informal Employment and Growth"

- Economic Fluctuation: Savings, Investment, and Wages
Time: *January 4, 8 a.m.*
Location: *Hyatt-Buckingham*

Chair: Susan Pozo (Western Michigan University)

Discussants: Jane Ihrig (University of Virginia), Nancy Jianakoplos (Colorado State University), Janice Eberly (Wharton School), Shulamit Kahn (Boston University)

Papers: Annamaria Lusardi (Dartmouth College), "On the Importance of the Precautionary Saving Motive"; Toni M. Whited (University of Delaware) Joanne Doyle (James Madison University), "Uncertainty, Investment, and the Implications of Inaction: An Empirical Analysis"; Beth Anne Wilson (Federal Reserve Board) Marcello Esteveao (Federal Reserve Board), "Nominal Wage Rigidity and Real Wage Cyclicalities"; Erica L. Groshen (Federal Reserve Bank of New York), Mark E. Schweitzer (Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland) "Inflation's Grease and Sand Effects in the Labor Market"

Women on the Run - 1998

To celebrate CSWEP's 25th anniversary, we will hold the Inaugural Women on the Run 5K at the 1998 AEA meetings, on Sunday, January 4, at 4:45 p.m. This is a fun run and open to everyone wishing to run or walk. We will meet in the lobby of the Fairmont Hotel before proceeding to our course in Grant Park. All cotton T-shirts with the CSWEP logo are available for \$15 for applied and theoretical runners. To order a T-shirt, please send a check (payable to CSWEP) with this completed form by **November 15, 1997** to:

CSWEP Run
c/o Robin Bartlett
Department of Economics
Denison University
Granville, OH 43023

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____ **Number of T-shirts** _____ **Size (L or XL)**
_____ **I plan to run or walk on January 4.** _____ **I just want to order a CSWEP T-shirt.**

T-shirts can be picked up at the AEA meetings.

For more information, contact Stacy Dickert-Conlin at sdickert@citizen.maxwell.syr.edu; Joni Hersch at jhersch@uwyo.edu; or Sheila Murray at semurr1@pop.uky.edu. To download this form or find current updates about the run go to <http://www.uky.edu/Courses/PA623/CSWEP>.

Creating Career Opportunities for Female Economists: CCOFFE

CSWEP and the National Science Foundation to Sponsor Workshop in Chicago

CSWEP and the National Science Foundation will sponsor a workshop entitled "Creating Career Opportunities for Female Economists: CCOFFE" on January 5-7, 1998, in Chicago, Ill.

The purpose of the workshop is to bring senior women economists together with up and coming female economists from the 114 Ph.D.-granting institutions in the US to form teams to improve their grant and research paper writing skills.

Subsequent workshops may be held at the Eastern, Western, Midwest, and Southern Regional Meetings. If you are interested in participating at one of these meetings, contact the following:

Eastern - Daphne Kenyon, Department of Economics, Simmons College, 300 The Fenway, Boston, MA 02115, 617/521-2587, dkenyon433@aol.com

Western - Joni Hersch, Department of Economics & Finance, Univer-

sity of Wyoming, Laramie, WY 82071, 307/766-2358, jhersch@uwyo.edu

Midwest - Susan Pozo, Department of Economics, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008, 616/387-5553, susan.pozo.wmich.edu

Southern - Catherine Eckel, National Science Foundation, Economics Program, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Suite 995, Arlington, VA 22230, 703/306-1753 (ext 6981), ceckel@nsf.gov

IAFFE Pedagogy Workshop

Teaching With Technology

A workshop for developing technological applications for the economics classroom will be held on January 2, 1998, 10:15 a.m.-5 p.m. at DePaul University, Chicago, Ill. The workshop is sponsored by IAFFE and the School of Business, University of Richmond.

This workshop, scheduled for the day preceding the Allied Social Science Meeting in Chicago, will focus on using the Internet and multimedia to improve the undergraduate classroom experience for diverse groups of students. This hands-on workshop will highlight techniques and resources that explicitly relate to issues of economic justice, feminist economics, and will incorpo-

rate diverse paradigms in economics. Workshop participants will have opportunities to create examples of active learning exercises and to learn strategies for implementing learning technology in their classes.

Workshop faculty include Joan Combs, Maureen Lage, KimMarie McGoldrick, Shyamala Raman, Kim Sosin, Michael Treglia, and Mary Young.

The cost of the workshop is \$25 for graduate students, \$50 for IAFFE members, and \$75 for non-IAFFE members. This fee includes registration materials, refreshments, and lunch. DePaul is conveniently located to the ASSA hotels.

For more information or to apply for the Workshop, submit a letter of application briefly describing your interest in the workshop and specifically listing selected undergraduate courses for which you are most likely to use technological applications. Participants should be comfortable using Netscape Navigator and be familiar with basic spreadsheet use. Applications are due December 1, 1997. Send all requests for information and applications to: Mary Young/IAFFE Workshop, Department of Economics, Southwestern University, PO Box 6334, Georgetown, TX 78626.

Phone: (512) 863-1994

Fax: (512) 863-1535

e-mail: youngm@southwestern.edu

Regional Meetings

CSWEP at the 1998 Midwest Economic Association Meetings:

CSWEP will co-sponsor two sessions at the Midwest Economic Association Annual Meeting to be held in Chicago, IL, March 19-21, 1998. One of the sessions will focus on gender-related issues. The non-gender related session will deal with the Economics of Information especially asymmetric information. For more information, contact:

Susan Pozo, Department of Economics
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

CSWEP at the Missouri Valley Economics Association: There will be two CSWEP sponsored sessions at the Missouri Valley Economics Association meetings in Kansas City, Missouri February 26-28, 1998. The two sessions will center on issues related to Women and Economics and Economics Education. For more information, contact:

Karen Vorst
University of Missouri-Kansas City
vorstk@cctr.urnkc.edu
Janice Yee
Wartburg College
Yee@wartburg.edu

CSWEP at the Southern Economic Meetings: There will be three CSWEP sponsored sessions at the Southern Economic Association Meeting to be held in Atlanta, GA, November 21-23. The first session will be a panel on Women's Progress in Academics that includes Beth Allen (University of Minnesota), Robin Bartlett (Chair of CSWEP and Denison University) and Catherine Eckel (Program Director, Economics Program NSF). Session II, Women's Labor Market and Health Issues is chaired by Mary Williams (Widener University). The third session on Industrial Organization is chaired by Catherine Eckel (NSF).

Call for Papers

CSWEP at the 1998 Eastern Economic Association Meeting

CSWEP is organizing two sessions at the 1998 meetings of the Eastern Economic Association. One will be gender related, the other on public finance or health economics. The meetings will be held in New York City from February 26 to March 1. Anyone who would like to organize a session, chair a session, present a paper, or act as a discussant, please contact (before December 1, 1997): Daphne Kenyon, Department of Economics, Simmons College, 300 The Fenway, Boston, MA 02115; Phone: (617) 521-2587; Fax: (617) 521-3199; E-mail: dkenyon443@aol.com. If sending a fax, please attach a cover sheet noting my name and that I'm in the Economics Department.

IAFFE Sessions at the Western Meetings

IAFFE will sponsor two gender-related sessions at the upcoming Western Economics Association meetings, June 28-July 2, 1998, in Lake Tahoe. Please send abstracts for papers by January 10,

1998 to Mary King, Department of Economics, Portland State University, P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207. E-mail submissions to kingm@pdx.edu are fine, but please include the abstract in the body of your message. Alternatively you can fax your abstract to (503) 725-3945. Our tentative emphases are labor markets and pedagogy, but please send abstracts for any gender-related paper you would be interested in presenting. We encourage graduate student participation!

IAFFE Sessions at the Eastern Economic Association Meetings

It is already time to start thinking about submitting papers, sessions, roundtables or panels for the Eastern Economic Association meetings to be held in New York City, February 27-March 1, 1998. (Note that the Easterns are a month earlier this year.) As before, IAFFE hopes to organize sessions in Pedagogy, Labor Markets, Policy Issues, Trade and Development, Economic Thought, and other areas. We need four papers or panel participants for each session, a session chair, and some discussants. Graduate students,

junior faculty, and non-academic economists are encouraged to participate. If you would like to give a paper, please send along a title plus a 200-word abstract. Discussants and chairs please indicate your subject preferences. All participants please send your name, address, phone numbers, and e-mail address. Contact Deb Figart, Economics, SOBL, Richard Stockton College, Jim Leeds Road, Pomona, NJ 08240-0195, e-mail: FigartD@pollux.stockton.edu by October 30, 1997.

IAFFE Sessions at the Midwest Meetings

IAFFE is sponsoring one session at the MEA meetings in Chicago. We need three or four papers for the session. Feminist work in all areas of Economics is welcome. It is also possible to organize a roundtable discussion. If interested in presenting a paper and/or creating a panel, contact Rose-Marie Avin, Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, Eau Claire, WI 54702-4004 by November 1. Please send a one-page abstract and include your address, e-mail and phone number.

Getting on the Program at the January 1999 AEA Meeting

Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession Sessions

Now is the time to think about submitting an abstract, or a proposal for an entire session, in order to participate in the AEA's annual meetings on January 3-5, 1999, in New York. CSWEP generally organizes several sessions each year. A subset of the papers presented in these sessions are selected for publication in the May 1999 issue of the *American Economic Review*, Papers and Proceedings.

For 1999, we expect to organize sessions in two areas: There will be three sessions on gender-related topics. We are particularly interested in receiving abstracts for gender issues in economics, including but not restricted to experimental studies, risk assessment, and valuation. However, all gender-related research topics are welcome.

There will also be three sessions in the area of Labor Economics. We are particularly interested in abstracts on human capital, wages, employment, and mobility. However, all research topics on labor economics are welcome.

If you are interested in presenting a paper, please submit an abstract which includes (1) objectives; (2) background; (3) methodology; and (4) results/expected results. Attach a

separate cover sheet listing (1) name; (2) affiliation; (3) mailing address, e-mail address, phone and fax numbers; and (4) the appropriate JEL classification code.

Abstracts should be submitted by February 1, 1998 to:

Robin Bartlett, CSWEP
Department of Economics
Denison University
Granville, OH 43023

Inquiries call: 614-587-6574; fax: 614-587-6348
Bartlett@denison.edu

Abstracts in other areas, or proposals for entire sessions, should be sent as soon as possible, but no later than February 1, 1998, to:

Professor D. Gale Johnson
Department of Economics
University of Chicago
1126 East 59th Street
Chicago, IL 60637

Please mark envelope "AEA Meetings 1999"

News and Notes

Having returned from working for the Antimonopoly Committee of Ukraine, **Linda Hearne Boner** has joined Glassman-Oliver Economic Consultants, Inc. as Vice President. She was also elected to the Women's Council on Energy and the Environment (WCEE) Board of Directors. Linda is also the proud mom of 6-month old Ekaterina (Katya).

The third edition of *The Economics of Women, Men and Work* by **Francine D. Blau**, **Marianne A. Ferber**, and **Anne E. Winkler** is available through Prentice Hall. In addition to providing a thorough updating of the data and references, there is a new chapter

that deals with recent developments in the labor market and their impact on women and men (which replaces the chapter on unemployment), as well as a new chapter on policies to balance paid work and families; the international chapter has also been substantially changed.

Carol A. M. Clark, Professor of Economics at Guilford College received the 1997 Teaching Excellence Award. She was recognized for including ethical and values questions in her courses and for making economics come alive for students. She teaches a Community Development Course in Mexico. She also teaches

Women in the U.S. Economy, Labor Economics, and Microeconomic Principles. She was promoted to Full Professor in Spring 1996.

Introducing Race and Gender Into Economics, edited by **Robin L. Bartlett** has been published by Routledge, London 1997.

Scholars in Health Policy Research Program is recruiting its fifth cohort of Scholars for the 1998 academic year. To be eligible for the two-year postdoctoral program, applicants must have received a doctoral degree in economics, political science, or sociology after January, 1993, but no later than July 15, 1998. The deadline for application is October 31, 1997. Questions about the

program can be directed to **Katherine Raskin** at the National Program Office.
Phone: (617) 353-9220
e-mail: rwjf@bu.edu

• Correction

We wish to correct a statement published in the Spring 1997 CSWEP Newsletter, page 30, regarding appointment of women to teaching fellows and instructors positions in the late 1940s at Harvard University. **Dr. Rita Ricardo-Campbell** received a regular Harvard University Teaching Fellow appointment for 1945-1946 and was appointed as instructor in June 1946. Dr. Ricardo-Campbell has a book coming out this fall entitled, *Resisting Hostile Takeovers: The Case of Gillette*.

Edith Penrose, 1915-1996

The following is a reprint of an obituary written by Paul Stevens, University of Dundee, and published in the Royal Economic Society Newsletter.

Edith Penrose died peacefully at her home in Waterbeach in October 1996 at the age of 81. She obtained degrees from the University of California at Berkeley and from John Hopkins University. After a short spell with the International Labour Organisation, she became a special assistant to the US Ambassador to London and subsequently was part of the US delegation at the United Nations. Her academic career spanned teaching and research at John Hopkins University (1948-55), short periods at the Australian National University, the University of Baghdad, the London School of Economics, the University of Dar es Salaam and the University of Toronto with extended periods at the School of Oriental and African Studies (1964-78) and finally INSEAD (1977-84). This international variety developed in Edith a strong sense of the global relevance of economics together with an acute awareness of the consequences of economic policy.

Edith retired with the titles of Emeritus Professor of Economics at

the University of London, Emeritus Professor of Political Economy at INSEAD and a clutch of honorary doctorates. Although she formally retired in 1984, she remained active and became a consultant working in many areas including a central involvement in the major oil cases before the US-Iranian Claims Tribunal.

Her chief contribution in economics was her book *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm* published in 1959. The book presented a convincing challenge to the neo-classical assumption of firms maximising profits. Instead, it perceived growth to be the goal and profits the instrument. In recent years, interest in her ideas has revived and the book was reprinted in 1995. She was also noted for her work on economic development and the international oil industry. Her main published contribution was her seminal book *The Large International Firm in Developing Countries* published in 1968. This was the first major book on the industry by an academic economist and it presented a brilliant analysis of the underlying

economics behind the operation of international oil companies, particularly in the Middle East. Her later work on the industry in numerous articles added significantly to this analysis providing insight and understanding. In addition, she published extensively on economic development issues, often with the Middle East as the focus of attention. She was always more interested in the impact of economics on people rather than on the methodology of analysis and she increasingly expressed dismay at the direction in which mainstream economics appeared to be moving.

While her intellectual contribution was formidable, another important contribution lay in her teaching. A large number of postgraduate students from all over the world benefitted from her supervision. One of her greatest strengths was her critical faculties and her willingness to ask awkward questions. Her concern for the poor and deprived and her total lack of pomposity made her fun and always challenging.

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.