



Newsletter of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

Fall 2004

Published three times annually by the American Economic Association's Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession



Board Member Biography Ann Owen

When I enrolled as a first year student in Boston University's College of Communication, the last thing on my mind was studying economics. I intended to be a filmmaker, a novelist, or perhaps a journalist, and stumbled into my first two economics classes as part of a set of distribution requirements. Those two courses led to more courses, and by the time I graduated from BU, I realized that I was much better suited to being an economist than a writer. The academic life intrigued me, but I didn't feel yet that I knew enough about what happened outside the classroom in order to make meaningful contributions in it. So I began working at a regional bank, first as a branch manager and later as a product manager for electronic banking.

During this time, I also went back to school to earn an MBA at Babson College and found myself gravitating towards the courses that had the most economic content. This revelation sealed my fate and a few months after completing my MBA, I entered the Ph.D. program at Brown University. I was lucky enough to have a great combination of dissertation advisors (Oded Galor and David Weil), who inspired me to want to use economic theory and empirical analysis to answer important questions. The research agenda I started in graduate school expanded to include growth, income distribution, and human capital accumulation.

My first job after graduate school was as an economist at the Federal Reserve Board. This was a great experience for me. While there, I interacted with over a hundred economists—what a luxury to be able to walk down the hall and talk to a specialist in almost any field of economics in which I happened to be interested. While there, I also developed an appreciation for asking good, policy-oriented

continued on page 9



CSWEP Announces the Joan Haworth Mentoring Fund

"We all know professional development is more likely to occur when a good mentoring relationship provides a junior professional with assistance in evaluation, focus, brainstorming, etc. But mentoring does not occur in a vacuum. It really needs institutional support—and this fund is designed to be used creatively by individuals and institutions to promote professional mentoring for women."

—Joan Haworth

CSWEP announces a new program in which women and/or institutions may apply for incremental funding to support or develop mentoring activities or relationships to support women economists in facilitating their professional advancement. The funds are available upon application from either an institution, a group of women or an individual. It is the intent of this fund to supplement travel funds or incremental expenses to permit senior mentoring women to promote mentoring activities and relationships for the professional development of junior women.

You may apply for funding by downloading the application form from the CSWEP website (www.cswep.org) and submitting it to the Sub-Committee for the Joan Haworth Mentoring Fund. Applications may be submitted from institutions or individuals at institutions who want to bring a particular

continued on page 9

CONTENTS

From the Chair: 2

Feature Articles: Women in Academe,
Government, and Business: 3–8

Interview with Robin Bartlett: 10

CSWEP Events at the 2005 ASSA Meeting: 12

2006 AEA Meeting Call For Papers: 13

Eastern Economics Association Meetings: 13

Papers and Session Organizers Needed
for the 2005 Western Economic
Association Meetings: 13

Southern Economic Association Meeting
CSWEP Sessions: 13

CSWEP Session Summaries: 14

Announcements: 15

Upcoming Regional Meetings and CeMENT
Regional Workshop: back cover

Women in Academe, Government, and Business:

*Weaving Together Strands of the
Economics Profession*

3 Introduction by Catherine L. Mann

4 An Academic Economist in the
Federal Bureaucracy by Katharine G.
Abraham

5 Blending Academic Life with
Government Service by Kathryn L.
Shaw

6 Three Perspectives on an
Economist's World by Marina Von
Neuman Whitman

8 Being an Economist in Washington
and California by Janet L. Yellen

DIRECTORY OF CSWEP BOARD MEMBERS

Francine D. Blau, Chair

Cornell University
265 Ives Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853
(607) 255-4381
FAX (607) 255-4496
fdb4@cornell.edu

Joan G. Haworth, Membership-Chair

ERS Group
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303
(850) 562-1211
FAX (850) 562-3838
jhaworth@ersgroup.com

Lisa Barrow

Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago
230 S. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60604
(312) 322-5073
FAX (312) 322-2357
lbarrow@frbchi.org

Judith A. Chevalier

Yale University
135 Prospect Street
New Haven, CT 06520
(203) 432-3122
judith.chevalier@yale.edu

Rachel Croson

OPIM: The Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6366
(215) 898-3025
FAX (215) 898-3664
croson@wharton.upenn.edu

Barbara Fraumeni

Bureau of Economic Analysis BE-3
1441 L Street NW
Washington, DC 20230
(202) 606-9603
FAX (202) 606-5311
barbara.fraumeni@bea.gov

Daniel S. Hamermesh

University of Texas at Austin
Department of Economics
Austin, TX 78712
(512) 475-8526
FAX (312) 471-3510
hamermesh@eco.utexas.edu

Lori Kletzer

Department of Economics
University of California, Santa Cruz
204 Social Sciences
1156 High Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
(831) 459-3596
lkletzer@ucsc.edu

KimMarie McGoldrick

Department of Economics
E.C. Robins School of Business
University of Richmond
Richmond, VA 23173
(804) 289-8575
FAX (804) 289-8878
kmcgldr@richmond.edu

Catherine L. Mann

Institute for International Economics
1750 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 328-9000
FAX (202) 659-3225
clmann@iie.com

Karine S. Moe

Macalester College
1600 Grand Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105
(651) 696-6793
FAX (651) 696-6746
moe@macalester.edu

Sharon Oster

Yale University School of
Management
135 Prospect Street
Box 208200
New Haven, CT 06520
(203) 432-5969
Sharon.oster@yale.edu

Ann Owen

Economics Department
Hamilton College
Clinton, NY 13323
(315) 859-4419
aowen@hamilton.edu



From the Chair

The CSWEP Board has had a busy few months. We are continuing work on our National Science Foundation funded mentoring initiative. Following up on successful earlier workshops held in January in conjunction with the 2004 ASSA meetings in San Diego and in February 2004 at the Eastern Economic

Association meetings, we will be holding workshops in November 2004 at the upcoming Southern Economic Association meetings in New Orleans. This will be followed by another round of national workshops at the 2006 ASSA meetings and mentoring workshops at each of the two remaining regional economics associations meetings. Watch future issues of the Newsletter or check out our web site <http://www.cswep.org/mentoring/register.htm> for information on future workshops.

Thanks to a generous donation from Joan Haworth, long time membership chair of CSWEP and former interim CSWEP chair, I am pleased to announce a new initiative to improve mentoring of junior women. The Joan Haworth Mentoring Fund is a new program that supports the professional advancement of women economists by providing funds to permit senior mentoring women to engage directly in the professional development of junior women. Applications may be submitted by institutions (or individuals at institutions). Further information is provided in this newsletter and at <http://www.cswep.org/mentoring/MentoringFund.htm>

We look forward to seeing you at CSWEP activities in Philadelphia where we will have six sessions, three on gender-related issues and three focused on technology. We hope you will be able to join us at the CSWEP Hospitality Suite (Grand Ballroom Salon I at the Marriott) January 7th and 8th 7:30 to 4:00 and January 9th 7:30 to noon—we will have a continental breakfast beginning at 7:30 every morning and we will have beverages available throughout the day. This is a place to network with other economists or to spend a few quiet minutes reading the paper. So do come and bring your friends. We are looking for volunteers to help staff the hospitality suite. If you are available to help, please email times that you are available to cswep@cornell.edu. And plan on coming to the CSWEP business meeting (January 7th 4:45 to 5:45 Marriott/Liberty A)—where we will be announcing the 2004 winner of the Carolyn Shaw Bell award along with the 2004 recipient of the Elaine Bennett Research Prize. Please join us for this exciting occasion. And do not miss the CSWEP reception immediately following in Marriott/Liberty B. Further details about CSWEP activities at the Philadelphia ASSA meetings and about CSWEP events at the upcoming Southern Economics Association meetings are provided in this newsletter.

—Francine Blau

What is CSWEP?

CSWEP (the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession) is a standing committee of the AEA (American Economics Association). It was founded in 1971 to monitor the position of women in the economics profession and to undertake activities to improve that position. Our thrice yearly newsletters are one of those activities. See our website at www.cswep.org for more information on what we are doing.

CSWEP NEWSLETTER STAFF

Francine Blau, Editor
Catherine Mann, Co-editor
Liane O'Brien, Assistant Editor
Karine Moe, Oversight Editor
Larry Clarkberg, Graphic Designer

Women in Academe, Government, and Business: Weaving Together Strands of the Economics Profession

Introduction

by Catherine L. Mann, Senior Fellow, Institute for International Economics



Previously Catherine L. Mann served as Assistant Director at the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, as Senior International Economist on the President's Council of Economic Advisors, and as Advisor to the Chief Economist at the World Bank in addition to teaching as Adjunct Professor at the Owen School of Management at Vanderbilt University and at Johns Hopkins School for Advanced International Studies.

In this edition of the CSWEP Newsletter, four women economists—Katharine G. Abraham, Kathryn Shaw, Marina Von Neuman Whitman, and Janet Yellen—discuss their experiences moving back and forth between the economist's jobs in academe, government, and business.

There are strong synergies and complementarities among these worlds: A strong academic background brings the most up-to-date research to the policy and business environments. At the same time, an ability to focus on the essence of that research extracts the key insights to inform policy and business debate. Diving back into research after a time in the other worlds is ultra-productive as those environments invariably turn up new data and expose the realities of human, firm, and institutional behavior. And, "reality economics" certainly draws students into the classroom and makes teaching more interesting and fun.

There are important differences in how the economist environments work and what is rewarded. Women may be particularly well suited to going back and forth between these worlds, and by doing so advance further, and build better and more rewarding careers, although a disconcerting possibility is that you can spend "too long" outside academe, and find it difficult to return. For example, working in the business and policy worlds, more so than in the individualistic environment of research, requires patience, persuasion, flexibility, juggling, and teamwork. Real life presents women with a lot of experience in these areas, but these assets may find less reward in research halls (although are highly recommended for Dean's offices).

Outside of classroom hours, the timetable for academics is self-determined. In contrast, working in the business and policy worlds can, on the one hand, demand short reaction time—a one-page, tightly reasoned, and analytically sound response in four hours. Or, on the other hand, can require a lengthy prelude of consensus-building to achieve an institutional or wider objective—a new data set, US environmental policy, or where to build the new factory.

The women profiled here have benefited not just from mid-career forays into the business and policy worlds, but also from time spent there early in their careers. So, don't just answer the call when it comes, but seek out opportunities that will jump-start your career while you're still young.

An Academic Economist in the Federal Bureaucracy

by Katharine G. Abraham



Katharine G. Abraham is Professor of Survey Methodology and Affiliate Professor of Economics with the Joint Program for Survey Methodology at the University of Maryland. Formerly, she served as Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

My first job following graduate school was a faculty position at the Sloan School of Management at MIT, where I arrived in 1980. After five years at the Sloan School and two years at the Brookings Institution, I moved to the Department of Economics at the University of Maryland.

In 1993, I was appointed to be Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), a job I held for eight years until returning in 2002 to the University of Maryland as Professor of Survey Methodology and Adjunct Professor of Economics. The BLS is responsible for producing high-profile statistics on employment, unemployment, wages, inflation and productivity. At the time that I became Commissioner, the BLS employed roughly 2,500 people and had an annual budget of about \$350 million.

Like most academics, I had been used to being able to structure my time more or less as I liked. At the BLS, how I occupied my time was to a large extent dictated by events outside my control. I was trained and had worked as a labor economist, and had envisioned that, as BLS Commissioner, I would spend most of my time thinking about labor market data. But for much of the time I was at the BLS, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) dominated public interest in BLS data products and, for a period of several years, most of my time and attention was devoted to technical questions about the CPI.

Individual workdays also often did not progress as planned. I might come in to the office in the morning thinking that I would work on one thing, only to have something else come up—a question from the Hill that needed an immediate response, an urgent inquiry from the Secretary of Labor, an unexpected problem related to the production of one of the economic indicators for which the BLS is responsible—that occupied most of the day.

A big organization can do big things. The data for which the BLS is responsible are a critical part of the statistical infrastructure on which economists rely; producing them well and reliably is a significant accomplishment. And an organization such as the BLS can take on new projects that would be beyond the scope of any academic researcher. During my time at the BLS, for example, work was begun to launch a new time use survey and a new survey on job openings and labor turnover. The resulting data will be of great and lasting benefit, and I am proud of the role I was able to play in planning and securing funding for their collection. Like virtually everything that gets done at the BLS, however, these new surveys were collective endeavors, not something for which I or anyone else can claim individual credit.

Working on projects as large as many the BLS routinely undertakes requires patience. Even when things go smoothly, the time periods involved can be very long, especially in cases that involve cross-agency collaboration. Work by the federal statistical agencies to develop a new industrial classification structure, for example, was launched in 1991. The new structure that eventually resulted from this work was first used by the Census Bureau for the 1997 Economic Census, and the last BLS statistical programs are not scheduled to begin reporting on the new basis until 2005.

In my experience, then, the rewards of government service were rather different than the rewards of life in academia. At the BLS, I was able to contribute to work that I believe was of far greater and more lasting value to the public than anything I personally am likely to produce as an academic researcher. I found that enormously gratifying and also enjoyed the experience of being part of a committed team devoted to achieving a common goal. But I also sometimes chafed at the constraints that go along with working in a large bureaucracy and the diffusion of the sense of personal accomplishment associated with projects that involve many contributors.

My experience in government undoubtedly was somewhat different than the norm for academic economists who serve a stint in Washington. Whereas many economists come to

Blending Academic Life with Government Service

by Kathryn L. Shaw



Kathryn L. Shaw is Ernest C. Arbuckle Professor of Economics, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University. She won many teaching awards at Carnegie-Mellon University. She served as Member of the President's Council of Economic Advisors.

Washington to take policy jobs, the BLS is most decidedly not a policy agency. And I spent a considerably longer period of time at the BLS (eight years) than is typical for a political appointee (less than two years). Both of these aspects of my experience proved to have both advantages and disadvantages. Not holding a policy post meant that I was not a player in the important policy debates that arose during my years in Washington, but it also meant that I was never in the uncomfortable position of having to be “on message” in public appearances even when my own views might have diverged from the Administration’s line. Spending eight years at the BLS meant that I was there long enough to see projects I initiated come to fruition, but having been away from academia for that length of time made returning rather more difficult than it might otherwise have been.

Having served in government has opened some new doors for me. Since leaving the BLS, I have had a variety of interesting opportunities that I do not think otherwise would have come my way. Moving into academic administration might seem to be a natural next step and I have had inquiries about my possible interest in such jobs, but have concluded that path would take me away from the things I like best about academic life. In my first year back in the classroom, I found myself spending an inordinate amount of time preparing course materials and lectures, though I also have found that my government experience enriches my teaching. The hardest part of returning to academic life has been to reestablish a coherent research agenda. During my time at the BLS, I coauthored several research papers, but writing papers was not an activity that was especially relevant to my job as Commissioner. Two years on, I am beginning to feel like a researcher again, and, like my teaching, my research portfolio has been enriched by my BLS experience. The path from academia to government is not a one-way street and I am happy to have made the return journey, even though it has in certain respects been an uphill climb.

Twice I have taken a leave from my academic job to move to the government, and each time has been a terrific experience. My first Washington sojourn was as a Visiting Researcher at the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, and the second was as a Member of the Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) in the last two years of the Clinton Administration. When I moved to the Fed, I had been at Carnegie Mellon University (CMU) for three years after my Harvard PhD, and when I moved to the CEA, I had been at CMU for twenty years.

In each case, I was very impressed to find that solid economic analysis is highly valued in government work. The CEA functions in an advisory capacity for the President. Thus, the CEA seeks to apply solid economic reasoning to a huge range of issues, but also recognizes that the analysis should reflect some constraints of political life. I was the Member in charge of the ‘micro’ side, and for each topic—health care, social security, Internet policy, immigration (H1-B), the minimum wage, etc.—we relied very heavily on the academic literature to guide our analysis. Moreover, in our briefings for the President (whether written or verbal) we also relied on the literature, our own analysis, and calls to academic experts. Political reality and constraints are important in the CEA, but the vast majority of our efforts were spent developing solid economic reasoning to guide us. Of course, not surprisingly, the Fed takes economic analysis very very seriously.

Each of these moves was an investment—there were short-run costs, and long run returns—returns that were significantly greater than what I anticipated when I moved. I moved to the Fed because I was a young faculty member who found the solitary research life to be frustrating. I returned to academic life with a renewed interest in economics. Moreover, I taught Macro for many years, and the Fed experience (of doing the Fed forecast, the briefings, etc.) was fantastic for both my understanding, and my credibility in teaching the required MBA class on Macro. Certainly the CEA job contributed to my opportunity to move to Stanford last year (and others who have passed through the CEA have used such ‘administrative’ jobs to move to positions of Dean, etc.).

On the cost side, there can be significant personal costs. In both cases I was gone for 18 months and I did all the commuting back to Pittsburgh every weekend—in the first case, to see my husband who was a Surgery Resident and could never com-

Three Perspectives on an Economist's World

by Marina Von Neuman Whitman

mute, and in the second case, to also return to three young kids (ages 4 through 11). The second time was costly for everyone in my family, and there were tough times. In the long run, the kids got a greater a greater sense of independence and a happier mother. It is hard to ever intentionally 'plan' to leave your family, so it is not so surprising that my moves were spontaneous. But for short intervals, they were very doable.

In each case, I also benefited from the 'consumption good' side of the job—for the pure fun of new work and a wonderful place to be. Washington is a great city at every age, and of course, sitting in the Board Room of the Federal Reserve while we briefed the Chairman, or, attending meetings in the West Wing or Presidential briefings is hard to ever surpass.

I want to pause for a moment and talk about other rewards these jobs might have for women. First, these jobs tend to be 'teamwork' environments, and thus the interactions can often be more fun than solitary research. Moreover, in teams, the 'gender' issue disappears more quickly. When you work together with others, talents become visible more quickly; in academic life, your value can be evaluated only by your publications and teaching record, and less by day-to-day interactions. The second value to women is that such a move does demonstrate a commitment and a willingness to take risks. That can be helpful for all careers. And as a side note, government work (even in the White House) is populated by more women than is academic life. While that did not seem to matter to me much when I was young, after all these years, it matters more.

When should one consider a leave from academics to do government work? There are obvious times, personally and professionally. One time is a few years into academic life, when you want a research break or time off the tenure clock. The second optimal time is right after tenure—when you are looking for new ideas, do not have the tenure clock pressure, and need a break. This is the age group that the CEA looks to when seeking Senior Economists. These jobs provide great inspiration and new ideas—try to go when you are young and seeking new research avenues for research (and for teaching).

It is not as hard to get these jobs as you might think. Academics are not very mobile—after all, it is costly to move a family or commute, and it is costly to switch gears professionally. Therefore, I strongly recommend that if you have an interest in jobs like these, that you seek them out and you may be surprised by your success. Attempt to get jobs through connections (people in your area, even if you do not know them well), or simply by inquiring. For example, to join the CEA, it helps to know people there, but calling the Chief of Staff of the CEA is also a way to start.




Marina Whitman is Professor of Business Administration and Public Policy at the University of Michigan Business School. She has been an officer of the General Motors Corporation, including Chief Economist, and served as a Member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

I am often asked which of my three careers I have enjoyed the most: academic economist, government policy advisor, or corporate executive. My invariable answer is that I would hate to have missed any of them and consider myself incredibly lucky to have experienced all three in one professional lifetime. The three worlds are widely different, though, in what one does, how one does it, and how one is judged, not to mention what is regarded as the appropriate mode of dress.

One significant distinction is between basic and applied research. Academic economists generally devote their efforts to the development and/or empirical testing of new or extended theories and models, while in the corporate or public policy world, at least as I experienced them, the focus is on applying currently-accepted theory and verified empirical evidence to bear on pressing issues and real-world decisions. And they are judged accordingly: the professor by whether her theoretical or empirical work is sufficiently original and important to warrant publication in a major journal; the executive or policymaker by whether their proffered advice is adopted by those who have the power to execute decisions.

Another crucial distinction is that of timing. Academics, however much we may complain about looming deadlines, generally are afforded relatively long periods in which to complete research, a tradeoff for the originality and thoroughness that is expected of such work. The time an economist has to come up with an answer in government or the corporate world is generally much shorter—days or weeks, sometimes just hours, as opposed to months or even years—and the stress is on one's ability to grasp the essence of a problem quickly and on the basis of inevitably inadequate or incomplete information. Nothing is more useless than a brilliant memo that arrives just after the decision it relates to has already been made.

Another critical distinction is between specialist and generalist. In my academic persona, my teaching and research have generally focused on international trade and finance, even if today it is sometimes dressed up as the economics of global-



“The academic world is in many ways the last stronghold of individualism...in both business and government, in contrast, getting anything worthwhile done requires negotiation.”

ization. As a Member of the President’s Council of Economic Advisers, as best I can recall, the areas that fell under my oversight included the international economy, price and wage controls (does anyone remember them?), the development of human resources, environmental issues, regulated industries, and industry studies in general, from agriculture to transportation. As the Chief Economist at General Motors, my perspective was specialized in the sense that it was focused on the automobile industry. But my staff and I were asked for our analyses of issues as varied as national and global vehicle demand forecasts, interest rate trends, anti-dumping cases against Japanese manufacturers, the private and social costs and benefits of tighter fuel efficiency standards or higher gasoline taxes, the future course of exchange rates, comparisons of U.S. and Japanese labor costs, and the public policy aspects of GM’s health care costs.

The academic world is in many ways the last stronghold of individualism, where it is possible to talk unambiguously about *my* course, *my* research, *my* award. In both business and government, in contrast, getting anything worthwhile done requires negotiation and the reconciliation of differing points of view in order to reach a required consensus. It follows that significant achievements are almost always collective rather than individual, and queries such as “what do you regard as your most important achievement at General Motors?” leave me stymied. This puts a high value on the ability to interact effectively with other people and be a “team player”; being right about something is less than half the battle (one survey expert I know put it at about 15%), being persuasive carries a much heavier weight. And the kind of intransigence and one-upsmanship that is frequently admired in the academic world is likely to be a major liability in the other two.

An academic can choose the focus relevant to a particular analysis, from the profitability of a single firm or industry to national income to world economic welfare. But a government or business economist is presented with the constituency or frame of reference within which she must work, although it helps if she can make a good case for consistency between the interests of whatever constituency she represents and the broader public welfare.

Similarly, nothing is more cherished in the academic world than academic freedom: the right to speak one’s mind freely on any or all subjects, without having to be concerned with the institutional impact of such expression. In a corporate or

government position, however, public utterances that are at variance with the views or interests of one’s employer are likely to render the speaker totally ineffective internally, even if it does not cost him his job. One can be an internal advisor or an outside critic—both are honorable positions, and I have been both at different stages in my career—but one cannot be both at the same time, as a number of highly-placed individuals have discovered. Professors can, and should, exercise “voice” in dissent; the only option for someone who cannot in good conscience accept the position of his government or his company is “exit”.

Despite the differences I have been describing, there is a fundamental unity in the economist’s function, in whichever environment it is practiced. I like to think that, in our professional role, we are the guardians of the long run—longer, certainly, than the CEO’s focus on quarterly earnings or the politician’s on the next election—and counselors on the ubiquity of trade-offs and of the law of unintended effects. I may not have convinced the President of the United States that the inflation suppressed by wage-price controls would explode as soon as they were lifted, or the President of General Motors that jawboning the Japanese to build plants in this country if they wanted to sell into the U.S. market would only contribute to global overcapacity in the industry, but at least I tried. And there were some successes as well: my efforts, for example, did a great deal to shift GM from a closed-economy to an open-economy view of the world.

Not only is there a fundamental unity among the economist’s different possible roles, there are major synergies among them as well. Certainly the analytical skills honed in academe enabled me to provide advice reflecting the perspectives I have just described to the politicians and businessmen I served. And my experiences in “the real world” have certainly made me a better classroom teacher, now that I have cycled back at the end of my career to where I began, as a university teacher. This is not only because my lectures intersperse formulas with war stories, thus giving my students a much-needed break, but also because it helps to persuade them of the real-world applicability of the rather abstract concepts they are being exposed to. And there is no question that my research and writing is these days informed by the interplay between the insights derived from modeling and empirical testing and the wisdom gleaned from personal experience. What more could anyone ask?

Being an Economist in Washington and California

by Janet L. Yellen



Janet L. Yellen is President & Chief Executive Officer of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, a position she took after completing this article. She has held the Eugene E. and Catherine M. Trefethen Professorship of Business and Professor of Economics at the University of California at Berkeley, served as the Chair of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, and as Governor of the Federal Reserve Board.

In 1994 I was on sabbatical leave, writing a paper with my husband (George Akerlof) and a colleague (Michael Katz) on the rise in out-of-wedlock births in the United States. It was Spring break for the University and we had gone to Hawaii for a short vacation with our 12-year old son. When the phone rang, I was in the middle of *Liberty and Sexuality*, David Garrow's lengthy account of the legal and political events leading up to *Roe v. Wade*. As far as we knew only my husband's 96-year old aunt knew where we were. But the White House tracked me down. They wanted me to be interviewed immediately to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve. That phone call changed my life. It was the precursor to a five year interlude in government that ultimately included stints both at the Federal Reserve and at the Council of Economic Advisers.

It was a fantastic opportunity for me to apply the tools of economics to questions of importance. I was constantly impressed by the contributions of economists to economic policy and saw the value of even the most recent academic research to policymakers. I learned a huge amount about emerging economic trends, puzzling "anomalies," and nascent policy issues that have now become the focus of my research. I was also inspired by the dedication and professionalism of my colleagues at the Fed and in the Clinton Administration. I became a bit more sophisticated about the political process. The spillovers from these experiences to my research and teaching have been huge.

Before I went to the Federal Reserve Board, the bulk of my academic career had been devoted to research and teaching in macroeconomics. I went into economics because I thought that macroeconomics made a difference—to employment, to welfare, to global financial stability. I taught IS/LM and aggregate demand/aggregate supply analysis to a generation of students,

and explained why the short-term interest rate set by the Fed is the single most important macroeconomic policy lever in the United States. In a sense, I had spent my life preparing for the Fed job, but never with the expectation that it might be mine.

My second day on the job gave me a taste of what it meant to be a Fed Governor. I attended an FOMC meeting where I voted to boost the federal funds rate by 50 basis points to prevent the economy from overheating, thereby preempting an increase in inflation. Participating in those meetings during the next 2 years at the Fed was a true intellectual feast. Every 6 to 8 weeks, the 19 FOMC members would gather in the Fed's boardroom to analyze the macroeconomic mystery that was emerging before our eyes and to debate how to conduct monetary policy in circumstances where there was growing evidence of structural shifts affecting the American economy. On the one hand, the core tools I had brought with me, particularly aggregate supply and demand analysis, proved invaluable as a starting point for forecasting and organizing my thoughts about the economy and policy. Since my return to academia, I have taught the aggregate demand and supply model with a renewed sense of conviction of its relevance. But puzzling through the anomalies and figuring out how policy should be conducted in the face of such uncertainty was the most fascinating part of the experience.

The main mystery was why inflation was falling when unemployment had declined to levels where inflation had previously accelerated—that is, below almost everyone's estimate of the NAIRU. At the same time, corporate profits, the stock market, investment spending, and, later, the dollar were all soaring. We considered and researched any number of possible hypotheses: the containment of health care costs as firms shifted from fee-for-service to managed care plans; the possibility that rising earnings inequality and a long, jobless recovery had left workers traumatized; the implications of globalization and so on. Alan Greenspan, the best detective among us, deserves the credit for recognizing that surging productivity growth could explain all of the anomalies. Productivity growth was increasing, although it was initially unclear in the data.

In addition to questions concerning the economy, there were also difficult issues to analyze concerning policy: How preemptive should monetary policy be in fighting inflation when uncertainty about NAIRU has risen? How low should the Fed set its target for inflation? What role should instrument rules, such



as the Taylor rule, play in the conduct of policy? Would alternative rules perform better? What should the Fed communicate to the public? Should Fed policy be affected by a stock-market bubble? Upon return to academia, my research has focused on such questions.

After two years at the Board I was asked to chair the Council of Economic Advisers. I was sorry to leave the Fed, but this was an opportunity that could not be refused. The Council was established to provide the best professional thinking to the President on every issue of economic significance. It has traditionally promoted the broad national interest, as it most often speaks for those who are impacted by economic policies but are neither well-informed nor well-organized. It is usually a countervailing force against special interests. The CEA routinely champions efficiency, quantification of costs and benefits, and balancing of risks and tradeoffs to promote rational policy choices.

I entered an Administration that was rightly renowned for its attention to economics, with an extraordinary and dedicated group of economists. I devoted much of my time to fiscal policy. Our goal was to turn chronic deficits in the Federal budget into surpluses in order to shore up Social Security and Medicare and to boost national saving and growth. We also prepared plans to reform Social Security, an ambition that, unfortunately, never came to fruition. Somewhat to my surprise, a large fraction of my time was also spent on environmental issues. Here the CEA again played the role of the advocate against the special interests, but in this case, often against the government itself, in pointing to the costs to be borne by the public for further environmental regulation. We strongly favored programs to curb global warming, despite high costs. Again, we were the Cassandra, as we had the role of enforcing realism on the Administration concerning the costs of policies to combat climate change. We suggested rational ways, such as international emissions trading, to reduce the costs of curbing greenhouse gas emissions. We enunciated the costs and the compromises that would make US participation in the Kyoto Accord feasible.

I returned to Berkeley in the summer of 1999 after five years in Washington. My lectures are more pragmatic now, a bit more policy-focused, a bit less theoretical, and full of real-world applications. My research is oriented toward issues that became salient as a consequence of my time in government. As a footnote, I finished the paper on out-of-wedlock births before going to Washington, but the intervening years have been so busy that I only finished reading Garrow after returning to Berkeley, on a subsequent trip to Hawaii.

Ann Owen biography continued from page 1

questions that has been invaluable to both my research and my teaching.

Although I enjoyed my time at the Fed, my ultimate goal was to find a job that would allow me to develop my research agenda but also to reach my potential as a teacher. In 1997, I found that job at Hamilton College. It is a perfect match for me. My research is valued and supported, but so is the thought and time that I devote to teaching.

Throughout my career, I have had unusual support from my husband. We married at 20, while still undergraduates, and he has supported me through several jobs, graduate school, and two relocations that were primarily for the sake of my career. During my first few years at Hamilton, he took a break from his career to be the primary caregiver to our two children.

I suppose that I took a bit of a circuitous route to where I am now, but even if I could revisit these plans, I do not think I would change a thing. What advice would I give to others? Set your goals based on your own preferences, make a plan, but be flexible. The shortest distance between two points might be a straight line, but that trip is not always the best and most interesting journey.

Joan Haworth Mentoring Fund continued from page 1

woman in to provide a mentoring activity—perhaps in conjunction with another professional activity. For example, a junior woman may arrange for a senior woman to participate in a mentoring workshop at her home institution and then apply to JHMF for funds to cover the senior woman's expenses. Applications may also be submitted by senior women who want to travel to an institution for mentoring purposes, stay longer at an institution and initiate mentoring activities or develop mentoring relationships already in existence.

Applicants will be asked to briefly describe the qualifications of the senior mentor and the place where the activities will take place, describe the mentoring activities that will occur and the professional women being mentored. Applicants will describe the relationship between the senior mentor and the professional women being mentored and the institution involved. Applicants will also list the estimated expenses that they desire to have funded. If there is other funding being used for this activity the applicant will be asked to describe that funding. All successful applicants will be required to provide information about the activities and needs of the group mentored after the mentoring experience is completed in order to receive the desired funds..

The fund was provided by Joan Haworth, a long time Board member and membership chair, as well as the Chair of CSWEP for 2001 and 2002. We hope that the current project funded by NSF that supports several mentoring workshops will be able to be supplemented by this generous funding program as well as other self-initiated mentoring programs.

Interview with Robin Bartlett

Recipient of the 2003 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award



Interview by Barbara Fraumeni

1. When and how did you get in to economics?

My first choice was to be a professional golfer. In the 50's and 60's women could not play on even public golf courses on the weekend. I would walk along with my father and his friends and hit the ball. By the time I was thirteen I was playing golf competitively against boys since there were no girls playing golf yet. My role model, Patty Berg, was giving a golf clinic one Sunday and my oldest brother was shagging for her. She got up on the tee and sailed a ball over his head. "Back up Jack. You're not playing with the boys!" My dreams of becoming a professional golfer, like Patty Berg, were dashed when the high school golf team coach said I could not play with the team. After all "how would a guy feel if I beat him?"

So, I focused on my studies and was selected as one of thirty students out of 800 in my high school graduating class of 1965 to be funneled through College Prep. Half of the students in this large center city high school was black and the other half was white, but it was segregated: White students took General Education and black students took Special Education classes. My senior year I was elected class Treasurer by assuring the black student leaders that they would have a seat on the prom committee—a first. Fortunately for me, my American history teacher knew a trustee of Western College for Women in Oxford, Ohio. I left Muncie, Indiana on a full ride.

I was always good at Mathematics and liked Physics. When I got to Western I continued to enjoy math, but physics was not quit what I had imagined. I tried French, then theatre. My father suggested that I take a few education courses to get a teaching certificate. My mother suggested typing. I dutifully obliged both, but I flunked typing so I could honestly say I could not type. At the beginning of my junior year I took introductory economics basically because my friends were taking it. I loved it. I did a lot of the work on my own, took graduate courses at Miami across the street and read the General Theory for fun. I had a female professor, Patricia Walker, who said that I was good at economics and asked if I had ever considered going to graduate school. Of course, I had not, but her interest and encouragement was just enough for me to apply.

The fact that I could not be a golfer just because I was a girl had me thinking about gender issues. The unusual race configuration of my high school started me thinking about race issues. The fact that at college I found myself at, the daughter of a mailman and bookkeeper, where some of the students were extremely well to do and others, like myself, were serving them meals in the dining room started me thinking about class issues. Somehow I knew intuitively that economics was at the core of it all.



Robin Bartlett, recipient of the 2003 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award

2. How and why did you decide to pursue a graduate degree in economics?

I liked building models and had the requisite mathematical and conceptual skills. I was extremely interested in social issues and in how the economy worked. I decided to attend Michigan State University. A lot was going on in 1969: the war, campus protest, and women's lib. I really had no idea what I was getting into. I wanted to teach in college. I thought that was what economists did. I received incompletes in most of my classes because of walkouts and shutdowns. The saying then was "never let school get in your way of an education." But as long as you passed the qualifiers, you could continue.

3. Did you feel isolated in graduate school?

I felt different in many ways. First, my mind did not go from A to B to C, unlike the minds of most of the other graduate students. I would play around with a problem trying to determine what it was that I did not know. We all got the same answers, but I had to learn once I got the answer my way to write it their way. Second, everyone else seemed to know what he was doing there. I just moved ahead, meeting one deadline after the other. My father worried that I would become the most educated housewife in the country. I laugh now thinking about the number of ways he was wrong. Third, there were rarely any women in my classes.

When I took a summer internship at the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, D. C., I meet my first female economists. While there were some male economists, they were the division heads and section chiefs. Our section wrote the green book used at Open Market Operation committee meetings. It was an exciting time at the Fed and an exciting time to be studying aggregate economics.

4. Did you make a conscious decision to teach at a liberal arts school, or did it just happen? How do you think the liberal arts environment is different and how does it impact on professors and students?

I had lots of job interviews at big schools and one at Denison. I think I was an Affirmative Action interview at most places. When I interviewed at Denison University, I felt at home; it reminded me of Western College. It was a liberal arts college in the middle of nowhere.

Small liberal arts institutions are different from larger institutions in two significant ways. First, most of the faculty really care about teaching and want to teach. Second, classes are small and you can experiment with a variety of teaching techniques. I do not think I have taught a course the same way more than twice.

My teaching techniques have evolved as my students have changed from the traditional white upper middle class student to a more diverse racial, ethnical, and international student. I have learned as much from my students as they have from me. Some times I think we forget that

students see the world from a very different perspective than we do. What happens today is not framed within the context of previous events the way our experiences frame current events. The more I get into their world the more fascinating teaching becomes.

5. How did you get involved in the creation of the junior faculty-mentoring program, CCOFFE? Do you think that such programs will have a long-run impact on the profession?

Really CCOFFE evolved out of my teaching experience with cooperative learning. Susan Feiner and I wrote a grant to the National Science Foundation to run three workshops on integrating race and gender into the introductory economics course. The workshops were built around the more inclusive pedagogical concept of teams. The difference between a group and a team is the difference between putting five people on a basketball floor and telling them to have at it and having roles for each team member and a game plan. However, it is very difficult to get economists to “play” along. The team leaders during a pre-workshop training session said that they were economists and did not see where these bonding exercises were going to take them: complete waste of time. But to their credit they “played” along as collaborative teaching techniques were demonstrated.

These workshops were just finishing when Becky Blank asked me to extend my term on CSWEP and take over the duties of the chair. I asked her “why me?” She responded, “Because you care.” CSWEP had been working with Dan Newlon to develop a mentoring program to help rectify their shortage of women applying for NSF grants. So we teamed up. One-on-one or traditional mentoring was not an option because of the shortage of female economists. And traditional mentoring was not the best way to go. CSWEP could have prominent economists at a big conference lecture on how to write grants, get published, and survive the journey to tenure. I knew that this approach would not work because it was too much like standing in front of a classroom and lecturing to a group of passive learners. It was not much of a jump from that realization to thinking about cooperative learning and especially teams to solve the mentoring problem. All we needed was a few good women to serve as team leaders—coaches—and a few women—team members—to “play” along. Since Andrea Ziegert had attended one of the NSF race and gender workshops, she helped me write the grant on CSWEP’s behalf to NSF for a mentoring workshop built on cooperative learning teams. We called it CCOFFE, Creating Career Opportunities for Female Economists, to reclaim the notion of the Coffee Klatch, a time, event and place where women have traditionally shared information. The concept of coffee klatch came first and then the title of the grant. While Dan Newlon said that he could not ask prominent women economists to take part in an NSF sponsored workshop called CCOFFE, he came through with the first team leaders.

I think that CCOFFE will have a long run impact on several levels. First, I think it is important for women who are coming up in the profession to know that there are people who are willing to go out of their way to help them. Second, the team approach is an efficient way to produce research. The team members do the editorial and theoretical

work, freeing the team leader to do guidance work. Since most female economists feel isolated, it is important to get good feedback from a dependable few. The senior female economist can make suggestions on where to send the work, putting team members on panels, and seeing to it that they get visibility. Team members can help each other walk through the political mine fields and help work through how to balance family and work.

6. How do you view your role as a mentor?

I think it is important to teach, and mentoring is teaching, by modeling what it is you want your students to do or what you want your protégés to do. You need a strong inner applause to survive in the academic world and particularly in economics where very few economists value or see how critical teaching and teaching well is to their own professional growth. I have tried to teach by providing students and the participants of CCOFFE an environment within which they can learn. Carolyn Shaw Bell told me a long time ago that you really cannot teach anybody anything, you can only help them to learn. And that is the secret of successful teaching or even mentoring, setting up relationship in an environment so that students can learn what they need to learn.



Caren Grown (left), Robin L. Bartlett (center), and Francine D. Blau (right) at the awards ceremony held on January 3, 2004 in San Diego, CA.

7. You’ve done research on teaching and are an innovative teacher in the classroom. Do you think teaching is under-emphasized?

I think that economists have forgotten why it is that they want to teach. The classroom is exciting. Every time you go into a class you learn something new: about your students, about yourself, and most importantly about the material. How often do you hear other economists say that they really did not understand a concept until they taught it? Maybe if an author had to teach the basic idea behind a paper to a class of honors undergraduates before it is sent off for review we could all be saved some time.

8. What advice would you give to young female economists in the profession?

First, the applause must come from within. Every time you do something and accomplish something, reward yourself with a trip to the spa, a nice dinner, time with friends, or whatever you like. It is very unusual to be recognized in this profession and I feel extremely humbled by being nominated and receiving the Carolyn Shaw Bell award. It tells me that I along with the help of many people “did good.” Second, find a small group of colleagues you can depend upon for honest criticism and support.

Third, my dissertation advisor told me 30 years ago that no matter where you end up kept your mouth shut for the first year. I don’t think I was able to heed that advice, but I think it is good advice.

Finally, I learned at the CCOFFE workshop to send your work out to everyone cited in your references—living or dead. Let people know you are a player. To solve the home versus work dilemmas, contract out—send out your laundry, hire a house cleaner, and get a baby sitter. It is expensive, but save scarce time for home and loved ones. Think of going to meetings and workshops as investing in you. Even if you have to pay for it yourself—do it. Network and see what other economists are doing.

CSWEP Events at the 2005 ASSA Meeting

January 7-9, 2005 Philadelphia, PA

Please note that all events take place in the Philadelphia Marriott

January 7, 2005

CSWEP Hospitality Room, 7:30am-4:00pm

Room: Grand Ballroom/Salon I

Technology, Trade, and Foreign Direct Investment, 8:00am

Presiding: CATHERINE MANN, Institute for International Economics

M. FUAT SENER, Union College—Intellectual Property Rights and Rent Protection in a North-South Product-Cycle Model

MICHELLE CONNOLLY, Duke University, and DIEGO VALDERRAMA, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco—Implications of Intellectual Property Rights for Dynamics Gains from Trade

JANE IHRIG, Federal Reserve Board—The Influence of Technology on Foreign Direct Investment

BEATA SMARZYNSKA JAVORCIK, World Bank, KAMAL SAGGI, Southern Methodist University, and MARIANA SPATAREANU, World Bank—Does It Matter Where You Come From? Investor's Nationality and Vertical Spillovers from FDI

Discussants: POL ANTRAS, Harvard University KEITH MASKUS, University of Colorado JOSE LOPEZ RODRIGUEZ, University of A Coruna STEPHEN YEAPLE, University of Pennsylvania

CSWEP Business Meeting, 4:45-5:45pm

Room: Liberty A

CSWEP Reception, 5:45-7:30pm

Room: Liberty B

January 8, 2005

CSWEP Hospitality Room, 7:30am-4:00pm

Room: Grand Ballroom/Salon I

Health and Gender, 8:00 am

Presiding: KARINE S. MOE, Macalester College

HEATHER BEDNAREK, St. Louis University, CATHY BRADLEY, Michigan State University, and DAVID NEUMARK, Public Policy Institute of California and Michigan State University—Spousal Health Insurance and Labor Supply of Breast and Prostate Cancer Survivors

IRENA DUSHI, International Longevity Center-USA, and MARJORIE HONIG, Hunter College—Household Demand for Employment-Based Health Insurance

KELLY NOONAN, Rider University and NBER, NANCY E. REICHMAN, University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, and HOPE CORMAN, Rider University and NBER—Effects of Child Health on Sources of Public Support

LUCIE SCHMIDT, Williams College—Effects of Infertility Insurance Mandates

Discussants: SARANNA THORTON, Hampton Sydney College DONNA GILLESKIE, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill JANET CURRIE, University of California-Los Angeles JESSICA REYES, University of Texas-Austin

Women's Acquisition of Human Capital, 10:15am

Presiding: MARIA FERREYRA, Carnegie Mellon University

DIANE WHITMORE, University of Chicago—Resource and Peer Impacts on Girls' Academic Achievement: Evidence from a Randomized Experiment

KRISTIN KLOPFENSTEIN, Texas Christian University, and M.

KATHLEEN THOMAS, Mississippi State University—Advanced Placement and Gender Differences in College Persistence

BRIDGET TERRY LONG, Harvard University—Reversals in the College Gender Gap: How Have Women Surpassed Men?

MARIGEE P. BACOLOD, University of California-Irvine—Who Teaches and Where They Choose to Teach: The Role of Female Labor Markets

Discussants: REBECCA BLANK, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor RONALD EHRENBERG, Cornell University

Technology and Competition, 2:30pm

Presiding: JUDITH CHEVALIER, Yale University

REBECCA HELLERSTEIN, Federal Reserve Bank of New York—Information Technology Erodes Cross-Border Market Segmentation: Welfare Implications for the Case of Anti-retrovirals

ANTONIA J. SWANN, York University—Competition, R&D, Innovation and Quality-Generated Growth

ANA AIZCORBE, Bureau of Economic Analysis and Brookings Institution—Product Innovation, Product Introduction, and Intel's Productivity over the 1990's

PAROMA SANYAL, Brandeis University—The Patent Itch: Law Changes and the Urge to Patent

Discussants: JUDITH ANN SHINOGLA, University of South Carolina AMY JOCELYN GLASS, Texas A&M University SHANE GREENSTEIN, Northwestern University

January 9, 2005

CSWEP Hospitality Room, 7:30am-12:00pm

Room: Grand Ballroom/Salon I

Technology and Labor Markets, 8:00am

Presiding: LORI KLETZER, University of California-Santa Cruz

SHARON H. MASTRACCI, University of Illinois-Chicago—Who's Information Age? Employment Prospects for Non-College Women and Men in the New Economy

SABRINA WULFF PABILONIA and CINDY ZOGHI, Bureau of Labor Statistics—Returning to the Returns to Computer Use

JULIE L. HOTCHKISS, Georgia State University and Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, M. MELINDA PITTS, and JOHN C. ROBERTSON, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta—Employment and Earnings on the Technology Roller Coasters: Insight from State Administrative Data

BETSEY STEVENSON, Harvard University—The Internet, Job Search, and Worker Mobility

Discussants: RICHARD MURNANE, Harvard University MADELINE ZAVODNY, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta KATHRYN SHAW, Stanford University DAVID AUTOR, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Marriage and Children, 10:15am

Presiding: DANIEL HAMERMESH, University of Texas-Austin and NBER

ALICIA ADSERA, Population Research Center and University of Illinois-Chicago—Labor Market Performance and the Timing of Births: A Comparative Analysis across European Countries

MICHAEL CONLIN, STACY DICKERT-CONLIN, Syracuse University, and MELISSA KOENIG, Social Security Administration—Love At What Price? Estimating the Value of Marriage

CHARLENE KALENKOSKI, Ohio University, DAVID RIBAR, George Washington University, and LESLIE STRATTON, Virginia Commonwealth University—Parental Child Care in Single Parent and Married Couple Families: Time Dairy Evidence from the United States and the United Kingdom

NIDHIYA MENON, Brandeis University—Does Access to Credit for Women in Developing Countries Exacerbate the Problem of Child Labor? A Research Abstract

Discussants:

GEORGE JOHNSON, University of Michigan LISA BARROW, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago DANIEL HAMERMESH, University of Texas-Austin and NBER ELIZABETH KING, World Bank

2006 AEA Meeting Call For Papers

CSWEP will sponsor sessions at the January 2006 American Economic Association meetings in Boston. We will be organizing three sessions on gender-related topics and three sessions on nongender-related topics. For the gender-related sessions, we are particularly interested in receiving proposals on the under-representation of women in undergraduate economics majors, on the gender implications of increasing global economic integration, and on gender and immigration. However, anyone doing research with gender implications is encouraged to submit an abstract. The three sessions on nongender-related topics will focus on industrial organization. Abstracts are particularly encouraged in the areas of regulation, deregulation, and the performance of sectors with significant governmental involvement. For example, studies on competition in health care, insurance, energy, education, and telecommunications would be most welcome. However, all research topics in the general area of industrial organization are welcome. Accepted papers will be considered for publication in the Papers and Proceedings issue of the American Economic Review.

Send a cover letter (specifying to which set of sessions the paper is being submitted) and three copies of a one- to two-page abstract (250–1000 words), clearly labeled with the paper title, authors' names, and contact information for all the authors by January 11, 2005 to Francine Blau, CSWEP Chair.

We strongly encourage e-mail submissions to cswep@cornell.edu.

Hard copy submissions may be sent to:

Francine Blau

CSWEP Chair

School of Industrial and Labor Relations

265 Ives Hall

Cornell University

Ithaca, NY 14853-3901 (please note on envelope "CSWEP Abstract").

Eastern Economic Association Meetings

CSWEP will be sponsoring two sessions at the Eastern Economics Association meetings. The meetings will be held in New York City at the Sheraton New York Hotel and Towers, March 4–6, 2005. The topics for the sessions will depend on the abstracts received; one of the sessions will be gender-related if possible.

One-page abstracts should include your name, affiliation, snail-mail and e-mail address, phone and fax numbers. Abstracts can be sent via snail-mail or e-mail.

Abstracts should be submitted by November 1, 2004 to

Ann Owen

Hamilton College

198 College Hill Road

Clinton, NY 13323

aowen@hamilton.edu

phone: (315) 859-4419

Please note that this submission is separate from any submission sent in response to the EEA's general call for papers, but any papers not accepted for CSWEP sessions will be passed on to the EEA. For further information on the EEA meetings please see <http://www.iona.edu/eea/>

Papers and Session Organizers Needed for the 2005 Western Economic Association Meetings

CSWEP will be sponsoring sessions at the 2005 Western Economic Association meetings, to be held in San Francisco, at the San Francisco Marriott, July 4-8, 2005. The topics for the sessions will depend on the abstracts received; one of the sessions will be gender-related if possible. If you would like to present a paper or organize a session, please send an abstract of the paper or an outline of the session (including session chair and paper abstracts) to: Lori Kletzer, lkletzer@ucsc.edu by December 1, 2004.

Please note that this submission is separate from any submission sent in response to the WEA's general call for papers. Any papers rejected here will be passed on to the WEA. For more information on the WEA meetings, please see <http://www.weainternational.org/conferences.htm>

Southern Economic Association Meeting CSWEP Sessions

November 21-23, New Orleans, LA

Session 1: Co-integration and empirical applications to money demand and expectations hypotheses

Session Chair: Barbara Rossi (Duke University)

Paper 1: Fixed Bandwidth Asymptotics in Single Equation Models of Co-integration with an Application to Money Demand by Helle Bunzel (Iowa State University)

Paper 2: Near-Optimal Unit Root Test with Stationary Covariate with Better Finite Sample Size by Elena Pesavento (Emory University)

Paper 3: Expectations Hypotheses tests at long horizons by Barbara Rossi

Paper 4: Inflation Dynamics in Japan: Estimates of An Optimization-Based Sticky-Price Model by Dolores Anne (DoAnne) Sanchez (University of Hawai'i at Manoa)

Session 2: Topics in Economics Education

Session Chair Andrea L. Ziegert (Denison University)

Paper 1: Drugs in the Classroom by Gwendolyn Alexander (Fordham University)

Discussant Peter W. Schuhmann (University of North Carolina at Wilmington)

Paper 2: A Writing Intensive Approach to Intermediate Macroeconomics: Assignments and Assessment by Jennifer W. Keil (Hamline University)
Discussant: Steven A. Greenlaw (Mary Washington College)

Paper 3: Gender differences among high school students' academic choice behavior. By Prathibha Joshi (Wesley College) Discussant: Andrea Ziegert

Paper 4: Learning About Learning: Students' Course Choice by Ann Owen and Elizabeth Jensen (Hamilton College). Discussant Gail M. Hoyt (University of Kentucky)

Session 3: Economic Analysis Of the Status of Women

Session Chair: Catherine L. Mann (Institute for International Economics)

Paper 1: A Cross-Country Analysis of Status of Women: A Structural Equation Approach by Kruti Dholakia (University of Texas at Dallas)

Paper 2: Gender Inequality in Education: The Impact of Socio-economic Restrictions

By Mustafa Seref Akin (Southern Illinois University)

Paper 3: "Stop the Tenure Clock" Policies in the Economics Departments of U.S. Colleges and Universities: Theory and Practice by Saranna Thornton (Hampden-Sydney College)

Paper 4: Taxes, Transplants, and Women: Impact of Public Policies for Live Kidney Donation on Women by Miguel Gouveia (Universidade Católica Portuguesa) and Pamela B. Peele (University of Pittsburgh)

CSWEP Session Summaries

Western Economic Association Meetings 2004 in Vancouver, British Columbia

Session Title: Family Economics

Organizer: Lucie Schmidt, Williams College

The CSWEP session on Family Economics included four papers: "Love at What Price? Estimating the Value of Marriage" by Stacy Dickert-Conlin (Syracuse University), Michael Conlin (Syracuse University), and Melissa Koenig (Social Security Administration), "Claims and Contributions: How Much Allowance do Young Adolescents Get and Do They Seem to Work For It?" by Jennifer Romich (University of Washington), "Effects of Increased Access to Infertility Treatment on Infant Health Outcomes: Evidence from Twin Births" by Marianne Bitler (Public Policy Institute of California), and "Effects of Infertility Insurance Mandates on Fertility" by Lucie Schmidt (Williams College). Kevin Milligan (University of British Columbia), Siwan Anderson (University of British Columbia), Jennifer Ward-Batts (Claremont-McKenna College), and Dave Loughran (RAND) served as discussants.

Stacy Dickert-Conlin presented joint work with Michael Conlin and Melissa Koenig that estimates the financial value of a month of marriage. Widows who are entitled to Social Security benefits on the earnings records of their deceased spouse may begin receiving benefits at age 60, unless they have remarried before that age. If they remarry before age 60, they become ineligible for widow benefits. Furthermore, they must wait until age 62 to claim spousal benefits on the earnings record of the new husband, and spousal benefits are usually less generous than widow benefits. The authors use this feature of the Social Security system, along with data from five panels of the Survey of Income and Program Participation linked to administrative data from Social Security, to estimate the financial cost of remarrying before the age of 60. Using individual-specific differences in this cost and information on whether and when a widow remarried (before the age of 60), they estimate the benefit of marriage to be \$5000 per month. This appears to be a reasonable estimate in the context of the short length of time widows are willing to wait and the high value of Social Security benefits.

In her paper, Jennifer Romich presents work that is part of a larger conceptual and empirical research project on children's claims and contributions within households.

Using data from National Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health) and the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 (NLSY97), preliminary findings suggest that young adolescents who do household chores more frequently are also more likely to report getting an allowance. Furthermore, adolescents are also more likely to get an allowance when they live in households that are likely to need labor contributions from kids—households in which there are younger siblings and no stay-at-home parent. These findings are consistent with bilateral altruism, as well as with a model of the household in which parents and children bargain over available resources.

In the third paper, Bitler examines the association between the dissemination of advanced reproductive technologies (such as *in vitro* fertilization) and birth outcomes. New reproductive technologies allow many couples who could previously not conceive to bear children. However, there is little existing information on whether these children are more or less healthy than children conceived without assistance. One challenge is that births resulting from infertility treatments make up a very small share of all births, making it difficult to detect the impacts of these technologies. Bitler restricts her sample to twin births, which are much more likely to be associated with these technologies. She finds that access to advanced reproductive technologies, identified by state legislation mandating insurance coverage for infertility treatment, is associated with small but statistically significant negative effects on gestation, birth weight, and the 5-minute Apgar score. These effects are larger for women over the age of 30.

In the final paper, Schmidt analyzes the effect of state laws mandating insurance coverage of infertility treatment on first birth rates. Infertility currently affects over 6 million individuals in the United States, and one in ten couples cannot conceive without medical assistance. The economic costs of this assistance can be sizeable. However, only 25 percent of all health plan sponsors provide coverage for infertility services. In response to the perceived need for coverage, legislation was introduced at the federal level in 2003 that would require health plans to provide infertility benefits. As the fraction of the popu-

lation affected by infertility continues to rise, there are likely to be continued efforts to legislate mandated coverage. Understanding the implications of coverage expansion thus becomes increasingly important. As of 2003, fifteen states have enacted some form of infertility insurance mandate. These states provide useful information on how expanding coverage affects access to treatments and fertility rates, as well as on how the costs of coverage are distributed across individuals and society. Using a difference-in-differences approach where she is able to exploit variation in mandates both across states and over time, as well as identify control groups that should not have been affected by infertility coverage, Schmidt finds that the presence of a mandate increases first birth rates for women over 35 by 18 percent.

Session Title: Early Childhood and Public Policy

Organizer: Elizabeth U. Cascio (University of California, Davis)

The CSWEP session on Early Childhood and Public Policy addressed the private cost of caring for young children, the role played the state in providing programs for early education and care, and the relationship of these state-sponsored programs to children's later success in school. The session featured three papers: "Caring for Young Children: Inequality in the Cost Burden of Child Care," by Dan T. Rosenbaum (University of North Carolina, Greensboro) and Chris Ruhm (University of North Carolina, Greensboro); "Does Prekindergarten Improve School Preparation and Performance?" by Katherine Magnuson (University of Wisconsin, Madison), Chris Ruhm, and Jane Waldfogel (Columbia University); and "Schooling Attainment and the Introduction of Kindergartens into Public Schools," by Elizabeth U. Cascio (University of California, Davis).

Dan Rosenbaum's work with Chris Ruhm provided a useful backdrop for the session. Using data from the 1996 Survey of Income and Program Participation, Rosenbaum and Ruhm estimate the distribution of the cost burden of child care, defined as the ratio of child care expenses to after-tax income. They find that the average child under six years of age lives in a family that spends 4.9 percent its after-tax income on day care. However, they also find a large degree of inequality in the cost burden, estimating that 63 percent of children under age six reside in families with no child care expenses, while 10 percent are in families where the cost burden exceeds 16 percent. They also find that the cost burden of care is typically greater in single-parent than married-couple families, but not otherwise related to socioeconomic status. As the authors demonstrate, this arises in part from the use of lower cost modes of care among disadvantaged families. They argue that the cost burden would be more unequal without redistributive government policies, like low cost, subsidized formal child care.

Katherine Magnuson then presented her joint work with Chris Ruhm and Jane Waldfogel on the relationship between pre-kindergarten—one increasingly common form of subsidized care for four-year-olds—and school readiness. Using rich data from Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Magnuson, *et al.* find that pre-kindergarten attendance is associated with higher reading and mathematics skills at school entry, but also more behavioral problems and lower levels of self-control. By the spring of first grade, the authors uncover little effect of pre-kindergarten attendance on reading and math skills, although the behavioral effects of the program persist. Their data and estimation strategy also reveal larger and more lasting effects of the program for disadvantaged children and those attending schools with low levels of academic instruction.

Elizabeth Cascio completed the session by addressing the same question from an historical perspective. Cascio uses the expansion of state-funded kindergartens programs during the 1960s and 1970s to estimate the effect of public preschool attendance on later schooling outcomes. Using data from the Decennial Census and other sources, along with variation across states in the timing of the funding initiatives, she finds that the average child aged five after a funding initiative was passed was both more likely to have attended public kindergarten and less likely to have been retained in grade. Her estimates imply that attending a public school kindergarten reduced the probability of repeating a grade by up to 20 percent for whites, and by between 30 and 40 percent for racial minorities, who have a relatively high probability of receiving informal care in the absence of the program. Similar comparisons provide only weak evidence of an association between kindergarten attendance and high school dropout regardless of race. In light of these findings, Cascio argues that today's state-funded preschool programs would optimally be targeted toward disadvantaged children.

BRAG BOX

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

—Carolyn Shaw Bell

Lise Vesterlund was promoted to Associate Professor and awarded tenure at the Economics Department of the University of Pittsburgh. Lise was a participant in the original CSWEP mentoring workshop (CCOFFE) and does research in experimental economics.

Lori Kletzer and **Catherine L. Mann** were profiled in the May 22, 2004 issue of *National Journal* in its list of "more than 100 people whose ideas will help shape the debates over 10 important issues of the day."

"Managing Exchange Rates: Achievement of Global Re-balancing of Evidence of Global Co-dependency?" by **Catherine L. Mann** won the Adolph G. Abramson Award for the best article in Business Economics for the year ending in July 2004. This award has been presented annually since 1986 to commemorate Adolph Abramson, the founder and first President of National Association for Business Economics.

Judy Chevalier has been named co-editor of the AER, effective November 1, 2004.

Do you have an item for the brag box about yourself or a colleague? Send it to: cswepnews@cornell.edu

HOW TO BECOME A CSWEP ASSOCIATE

2004 Donation Amount is \$25.00

OPTION 1: ONLINE PAYMENT BY CREDIT CARD

Go to www.cswep.org/howto.htm and follow the "Online Donation by Credit Card" link. It's quick, convenient and secure. We accept Mastercard, Visa and American Express.

OPTION 2: MAIL/FAX

If you prefer to mail or fax your donation, or you are a student member and no donation is requested, fill out the form below and send it to the address at the bottom.

NAME: _____

MAILING ADDRESS: _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP: _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS: _____

check here if currently an AEA member

check here if currently a student Institute name: _____

Expected graduation date: _____

Paying by: check (please make check payable to CSWEP)

credit card (MasterCard/Visa/Amex)

Credit card number: _____

Name as it appears on the credit card: _____

Expiration date: _____ Authorizing signature: _____

send to:
CSWEP, c/o Joan Haworth, Ph.D.
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL
32303

FAX: (850) 562-3838

We rely on your contributions to help support CSWEP activities. In addition to publishing this newsletter, CSWEP organizes sessions at the meetings of the AEA and the regional economics associations and publishes an annual report on the status of women in the economics profession. If you have not made your donation for the current year (January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2004) we urge you to do so. Thank you for your support.

DONATIONS WELCOME

CSWEP is currently in accepting donations for our annual Carolyn Shaw Bell Award to help defray the cost associated with the Award. Donations go into a separate account specifically earmarked for this award. If you would like to make a donation, please send your tax-deductible check made out to the "American Economics Association" to:

Liane O'Brien
CSWEP
Cornell University
204 Ives Hall
Ithaca, NY 1485

VOLUNTEERS NEEDED AT ASSA!

We need volunteers to staff the hospitality suite at the 2005 ASSA Meeting (open January 7-8; 7:30 to 4:00; January 9, 7:30 to noon). Here is your chance to meet other women economists. If interested, please email times that you are available to cswep@cornell.edu. See page 12 for more about CSWEP events at ASSA.

CSWEP Directory

General Policy Matters:

Francine D. Blau

School of Industrial & Labor Relations
Cornell University
265 Ives Hall
Ithaca, New York 14853-3901
fdb4@Cornell.edu

Routine Matters and Items for Newsletter:

Liane O'Brien

School of Industrial and Labor Relations
Cornell University
204 Ives Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-3901
cswepe@cornell.edu

Dues, Change of Address, Roster:

Joan Haworth

Membership Secretary
Economic Research Services, Inc.
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303
jhaworth@ersgroup.com

CSWEP East:

Ann Owen

Economics Department
Hamilton College
Clinton, NY 13323
aowen@hamilton.edu

CSWEP Midwest:

Lisa Barrow

Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago
230 S. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60604
lbarrow@frbchi.org

CSWEP South:

Catherine Mann

Institute for International Economics
1750 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
CLmann@iie.com

CSWEP West:

Lori Kletzer

Department of Economics
204 Social Sciences
1 University of California
1156 High Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
lkletzer@ucsc.edu

Upcoming Regional Meetings

Eastern Economic Association

<http://www.iona.edu/eea/>

2005 Annual Meeting: March 4-6, 2005

New York City: Sheraton New York Hotel and Towers

CSWEP submission date: November 1, 2004

EEA submission date: November 12, 2004.

Midwest Economic Association

<http://web.grinnell.edu/mea>

2005 Annual Meeting: March 11-13, 2005

Milwaukee: Hilton Milwaukee City Center

CSWEP submission date: September 15, 2004

MEA submission date: October 3, 2004

Western Economic Association

<http://www.weainternational.org/>

2005 Annual Meeting June 29-July 3, 2005

San Francisco: San Francisco Marriott

CSWEP submission date: TBA

WEA submission date: TBA

Southern Economic Association

<http://www.etnetpubs.com/conferenceprograms/sea/>

2004 Annual Meeting November 21-23, 2004

New Orleans: Fairmont Hotel

CSWEP submission date: June 15, 2004

SEA submission date: April 1, 2004.

CeMENT: Mentoring for Junior Faculty

The Second of Four Regional Workshops

November 19-20, 2004

New Orleans, LA



American Economic Association
CSWEP
c/o Francine Blau
Cornell University
School of Industrial & Labor Relations
265 Ives Hall
Ithaca, New York 14853-3901

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Ithaca, NY
Permit No. 780