



Newsletter

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

Published three times annually

Spring 2002

In this issue:

- ***An Economists Career in a Think Tank***
- ***Funding Opportunities for Economists***
- ***Eva Mueller, 2001 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award Recipient***
- ***CSWEP Activities***

Directory of CSWEP Board Members

Joan G. Haworth, Chair

Economic Research Services, Inc.
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303
(850) 562-1211 (ext. 117)
FAX (850) 562-3838
E-mail: jhaworth@ersnet.com

Andrea H. Beller

Department of Agricultural & Consumer Economics
University of Illinois-Urbana
305 Mumford Hall — 1301 West Gregory Drive
Urbana, IL 61801
(217) 333-7257
FAX (217) 333-5538
E-mail: a-beller@uiuc.edu

Judith A. Chevalier

Yale University
135 Prospect Street
New Haven, CT 06520
(203) 432-3122
judith.chevalier@yale.edu
http://www.som.yale.edu/faculty/jc576

Rachel Croson

OPIM: The Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6366
(215) 898-3025
FAX (215) 898-3664
E-mail: crosonr@wharton.upenn.edu
http://wharton.upenn.edu/faculty/crosonr.html

Janet Currie

Department of Economics
University of California - Los Angeles
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1477
(310) 206-8380
FAX (310) 825-9528
E-mail: currie@simba.sscnet.ucla.edu

Barbara M Fraumeni

Chief Economist
U.S. Department of Commerce
Bureau of Economic Analysis, BE-3
1441 "L" Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20230
(202) 606-9603
Fax: (202) 606-5311
barbara.fraumeni@bea.gov

Claudia Goldin

Department of Economics
Harvard University
217 Littauer
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 613-1200
FAX (617) 868-2742
E-mail: cgoldin@harvard.edu

Caren Grown

International Center for Research on Women (ICRW)
1717 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Suite 302
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 797-0007, ext. 119
FAX (202) 797-0020
E-mail: cgrown@icrw.org

Jean Kimmel

Department of Economics
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5023
(616) 387-5541
E-mail: jean.kimmel@wmich.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
E-mail: kmcgoldr@richmond.edu

Robert A. Pollak

Department of Economics
Washington University
205 Eliot Hall — Campus Box 1208
One Brookings Drive
St. Louis, MO 63130
(314) 935-4918
FAX (314) 935-6359
E-mail: Pollak@mail.olin.wustl.edu

Rachel Willis

American Studies and Economics
Campus Box 3520
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3520
(919) 962-8478
FAX (919) 401-9128
E-mail: Rawillis@email.unc.edu

Table of Contents

Features

- **Think Tanks**
The Center for Global Development: Its Origins and Future Work 3
How the Institute for Women's Policy Research Contributes to Public Policy Development 4
- **Funding Sources**
Funding Opportunities for Women Graduate Students in Economics: Program in Applied Economics. 5
Research Funding Opportunities for Women Economists at the Russell Sage Foundation 7
Notes from Working at a Private Foundation 8
- **An Interview with the 2001 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award Recipient, Eva Mueller** 9
- **CSWEP Activities**
CSWEP at the Eastern Economic Association Meeting 11
CSWEP at the Western Economic Association Meetings 10
CSWEP at the Midwest Economics Association Meetings 12
- **Biography**
Claudia Goldin: "The Economist as Detective" .. 13
- **News**
From the Chair 14
Call for Grants and Papers 14-15
Announcements 16-18

CSWEP Newsletter

Joan Haworth, *Editor*

Caren Grown, *Co-editor*

Lee Fordham, *Assistant Editor*

KimMarie McGoldrick, *Oversight Editor*



Co-Editor's Introduction:

The five articles in this issue of the CSWEP newsletter address two themes. The first two articles, by Heidi Hartmann and Nancy Birdsall, reflect on the experiences of two women economists who have founded think tanks in Washington, D.C. Heidi Hartmann founded the Institute for Women's Policy Research in 1987 to produce timely, policy relevant research on issues of importance to women. Fifteen years later, IWPR is doing applied research on issues of social security privatization, the problems of low-wage workers, child care, and other issues, with a staff of 30 and a budget of \$2 million. Nancy Birdsall co-founded the Center for Global Development in 2001 to bring the problems of inequality and poverty in developing countries to policy makers in Washington, D.C. With a staff of six, the Center works on issues of debt, trade, and foreign assistance, among other things, with the hope of making real changes in the lives of poor women and men around the world.

The next three articles focus on funding opportunities for women economists by private foundations and the Program in Applied Economics. Ashley Timmer discusses how the Program in Applied Economics is beneficial to developing the research careers of graduate students in economics. David Weiman describes research funding at the Russell Sage Foundation, which specializes in the development and publication of social science research. Finally, Kristin Butcher provides some tips on applying for funding at a private foundation and reflects on her short career as a program officer at the MacArthur Foundation in Chicago.

Caren Grown
ICRW

The Center for Global Development: Its Origins and Future Work

By Nancy Birdsall, President of the Center for Global Development

Becoming President of the Center for Global Development has been great good luck for me. Like many women I'm not much of a career planner. But what sometimes seemed like awkward compromises between work and family responsibilities, and between doing more research myself vs. managing people, operations and policy work in places like the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank, made it possible for me to discover my own comparative advantage. That, oxymoronically, seems to be the combination of research, management, policy, writing, public speaking, and idea-mongering that is what the heads of think tanks do.

After discovering economics and completing a Ph.D. when I was already in my thirties and a mother, I started at the World Bank in the research department. I was rescued from the early temptations of an academic career, which would have made me miserable, by the reality that my small child's father lived in Washington. Research at the World Bank insulated me from family-unfriendly travel demands, and kept me out of mainstream operations, the short-run attractions of which might well have permanently diverted me from the applied research and policy work that I like so much. When I finally succumbed to a management job in operations, I chose to do it in Latin America — to minimize lengthy trips. That family compromise accidentally made me a viable candidate a few years later for the Executive Vice Presidency of the IDB. A senior level position in a multilateral bank gave me valuable experience, great contacts, and a new round of ideas and analytic challenges. After five years, however, I wanted more time to think and write.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace was my first think tank experience, and prepared me for taking on leadership of a think tank on the issue I care about most — development. The Center for Global Development aims to reduce poverty and inequality in the world. The universities and the international financial organizations in Washington D.C. are full of outstanding professionals working on growth and poverty in developing and transitional economies. I hope our value-added will be in independent, scholarly analysis focused on the impact of rich country policies and of globalization on the development prospects of poor nations, and especially on the poor in those nations. We want to lay the basis for trade, security, development assistance, immigration, and financial policies that are more “development-friendly,” particularly in the U.S. and Europe. That also implies constructive criticism of the policies and programs of the international financial institutions, the UN agencies, and civil society and the corporate sector too.

The Center for Global Development was launched in November 2001. The genesis of the Center began only last spring, when Ed Scott, the co-founder of BEA Systems, the 13th largest software company in the world, had a very personal response to a documentary about the social impact of the debt burden in Nicaragua. He was moved to do something big for the billions of individuals who struggle with poverty on a daily basis. Following consultations with colleagues and a widening group of experts, he eventually found Fred Bergsten, Director of the Institute for International Economics, and me. The three of us became the co-founders of the Center. Consistent with Ed

Scott's vision, and a reason for my enthusiasm, is that the Center is a think tank plus. The plus refers to a determination, via research-based policy engagement and public education, to keep developing country people's fate on the radar screen in Washington D.C. and in other capitals, and for the larger public in the United States.

Perhaps it is no accident to have a woman at the helm of such a center. It is great fun to work with smart and creative scholars, and I recognize that their productivity depends on letting them follow their excellent intuition and have the time and freedom to take risks. Managing research is, in part, about not managing researchers. It may be that women are better at this elusive task because we are (still) internalizing the typical female role — to keep those around us happy and creative, and to foster independence.

I have high hopes for the Center. We will shortly have six senior research fellows in residence (one-third women including myself — respectable but not terrific), and four non-resident fellows. We are working on the costs of rich country trade protection for developing countries, debt and aid effectiveness (including the bureaucratic politics of the aid business), the distributional implications of privatization, growth after reform (in Latin America and South Asia), the role of the private foreign sector in Africa, U.S. policy toward “poorly performing states,” intellectual property issues and development, the benefits for poverty reduction and institutional transformation of cash-based education subsidies to households, the global war for talent, immi-

Continued on page 4

gration and income convergence, and within-country inequality and growth. Possibly included on a future agenda are the effects on developing countries of collective action, or lack thereof, in global health and environment.

Several of our research staff have joint appointments with the Institute for International Economics, and one with the Brookings Institution. From IIE, our sister institute, we have had the benefits of back-office support and shared space during our start-up period and most important, the advice, contacts and access provided by IIE's Director. We are already engaged in some joint projects with IIE, and potentially with the International Center for Research on Women, Brookings and the Corporate Council on Africa.

Those are all inputs of course. What about measuring success by outputs and influence? Tracing the influence of research has on policy is an inexact science at best. Already we are sensing demand for and responsiveness to our work. We are benefiting from the renewed interest in the U.S. in understanding the rest of the world after September 11, and from the international revitalization of the global war on poverty with the UN meetings in Monterrey and Johannesburg this year, the focus on Africa of the upcoming G-8 summit, and the Bush

Administration's initiative to increase and reform foreign aid. We are seen as independent (and the only research group in Washington focusing explicitly on development), non-partisan, credible, and creative. We are sufficiently mainstream to be potentially influential on the all too polarized debates about globalization, though with much more focus on the downsides and the risks, particularly for the poor, than the traditional proponents. We are developing proposals for collaborative work with research and policy institutes in developing countries. In addition to our research staff, we have senior policy and program staff who are making a strong effort to interact with and have our research agenda influenced by the activist community. Their task is to help create and sustain networks – in universities, in the faith-based community, in Congress – of people committed to development, and to join with the advocacy community in translating research evidence into good policies.

I hope and expect that this will help us hit several home runs in our first few years. By home runs I mean being able to attribute to our work an improvement in U.S. policy toward developing countries; changes in World Bank, UN or other approaches; changing the way that policy makers and the general public think

about poor nations; and producing counter-intuitive yet convincing conclusions about how the world works. Most importantly, we want to put the challenge of reducing global poverty and inequality more permanently and firmly on the map of U.S. policy.

Visit our website www.cgdev.org to learn more about the Center.

Nancy Birdsall is President of the Center for Global Development. Prior to launching the center, Ms. Birdsall served for three years as Senior Associate and Director of the Economic Reform Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. From 1993 to 1998, Ms. Birdsall was Executive Vice-President of the Inter-American Development Bank, before which she spent 14 years in research, policy, and management positions at the World Bank, most recently as Director of the Policy Research Department. Ms. Birdsall is the author, co-author, or editor of more than a dozen books and monographs, including, most recently, *Population Matters: Demographic Change, Economic Growth and Poverty in the Developing World*. She holds a Ph.D. in economics from Yale University and an M.A. in international relations from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies.

How the Institute for Women's Policy Research Contributes to Public Policy Development

By Heidi Hartmann, Ph.D., President & CEO, IWPR

As early as my graduate school years at Yale in the heady political times of the late 60s and early 70s, I thought about starting some kind of center on women's issues. I'm sure I didn't know it would be a public policy think tank. But I always had a strong streak of practicality and, perhaps because of growing up poor, wanted to make my education useful. A willingness to be different and take the initiative, such as studying women in economics when that wasn't done, must have contributed, too. So, in 1976, after two years teaching the political economy of gender at the New School, I moved to the public policy world in Washington, DC, first at the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and then at the National Academy of Sciences. I soon came to think that an independent think tank conducting credible social science research and producing numbers on costs and benefits, numbers of affected women, and so on, was just what was needed to help advance public policy in women's interests.

About ten years later, I began the process that led to the Institute of Women's Policy Research (IWPR). IWPR began with helpful

friends, a feminist philanthropist who gave \$10,000, and a letter to our collective 'Christmas' list that brought in another \$10,000 or so. IWPR's first "office" was in the trunk of my 1969 Buick Electra 225, as I commuted between Suitland, where I had a fellowship at the Census Bureau and downtown Washington, where I would meet with the steering committee. From that beginning in 1987, when we did our first study on the value of unpaid family leave, we've been off and running.

Now 15 years old, with a staff of 30 and an annual budget of more than \$2 million, IWPR has successfully established its unique niche in providing timely, policy-relevant research on issues of importance to women. The Institute is able to provide research on a continuous basis in several program areas:

- family and work issues such as family leave, child care, and universal pre-K;
- employment and earnings issues such as pay equity, unemployment insurance, and contingent and part-time work;
- poverty and income security issues such as welfare and social security reform;

- safety and health, including the economic costs of domestic violence, women's access to health insurance, the costs and benefits of converting birth control pills to over-the-counter status; and
- civic and political participation, including IWPR's flagship series of reports on the *Status of Women in the States* (reports for 33 states have already been published; the remainder will be published in 2002 and 2004), and new work on the factors contributing to women's participation and the importance of gender in understanding terrorism.

IWPR operates much like other think tanks in D.C., with a few crucial differences. First, like most policy-oriented think tanks, we strive to conceptualize and carry out research that will be useful in the policy process: identifying and illuminating issues policymakers should address (but perhaps have been largely ignoring), evaluating existing or proposed policies, or analyzing the underlying causes of the problems that policies seek to remediate. Sec-

Continued on page 5

ond, we work to ensure that our research is visible and accessible to those working to influence or make policy. Finally, like most think tanks, IWPR's chief asset is its human capital. Our interdisciplinary research staff has backgrounds in economics, sociology, psychology, political science, and public policy. As social scientists, we generally produce research that is quantitative, often using government data sets such as the Current Population Survey and the Survey of Income and Program Participation. Some studies involve the collection of data through interviews and other means. Others are small, in-depth qualitative or case studies. Yet others are primarily literature reviews.

IWPR's focus on women and improving women's lives means that we necessarily operate in some ways that are different from other think tanks. First, we work fairly closely with advocates in women's and other organizations as well as with staff in policymaking bodies, often taking the lead from them on which issues are of most concern to women and may see policy action soon. Advocates and staff often request data that document the need for new policies and estimate their costs and or benefits. Hard numbers can often frame the debate and help tip the scales in favor of policy change. Among the questions we've been asked to research are:

- How much do workers lose from not having job-guaranteed family leave, even unpaid leave, and what is the cost of that to society?
- Since many low-wage workers receive means-tested benefits, such as welfare and food stamps, how many welfare recipients are also working and how does it affect their family income?
- How much would it cost to provide universal pre-kindergarten to all three- and four-

year olds in a particular state?

- Would privatizing Social Security be likely to help or harm women? Would the effects be different for different women?

Second, in addition to the research results we produce, we provide technical assistance to advocates and policymakers on how to use our research findings to strengthen arguments for policy change. For example, we have involved about 600 women in the production, review and dissemination of our 33 published *Status of Women in State X* reports; these women have led efforts to improve women's status in their states and communities. Often, we provide help with testimony, media training, and other skills advocates need to be effective.

Third, we also see ourselves as contributing to "the intellectual capital of the women's movement," which means it is our responsibility to lead as well as respond. Most recently, within weeks after September 11, we produced a "quick and dirty" literature review on women and terrorism that has been widely cited and has helped women leaders to pursue meaningful public policies in this changed era.

One of the most difficult challenges, since research often takes considerable time, is anticipating what policy topics may emerge on the political calendar two and three years from now. What research should we have ready when? Answering this question requires "reading" many factors and, as in predicting the business cycle, we don't always get it right. Also, as researchers, we don't, of course, always know what answers we will get. Sometimes our research may point to a different direction than the one where advocates were headed. In that case, we work with them and with policymakers to come up with new strategic approaches that better reflect what the data are telling us. We

also try call attention to issues that we think are being ignored, to policy solutions that are being overlooked, or to policy outcomes that weren't anticipated.

Fourth, it is very important to us at IWPR to build a network of feminist researchers and research users to further advance policy-relevant work on women and we have spent considerable time and resources on this outreach effort. When I founded IWPR 15 years ago with the help of anthropologist Terry Odendahl, there was no professional association of women scholars working on important public policy issues that affect women's lives. Most associations of researchers were and are primarily academic, and academic concerns (teaching, the need to publish to achieve tenure, and so on) often dominate their discussions and meetings. While the Association for Public Policy and Management (APPAM) now has members who are developing a women's caucus, there is still no such established professional association. One way we have been able to bring together our three main constituencies — researchers, policymakers and advocates — is through our biennial Women's Policy Research Conferences. We held the first conference in 1989 with about 100-150 participants. The 2001 conference attracted 600 participants; the next is scheduled for June 22-24, 2003.

Like most jobs, on some days mine can be tedious and difficult. But on many days it is exhilarating to see IWPR's work being used by many to bring about change for women—in legislative debate, in the media, in advocacy work. Currently that happens more at the state level than the federal, but wherever it happens, it provides the rush of adrenalin that keeps us all going.

Visit www.iwpr.org or call us at (202)785-5100 for an information packet.

Funding Opportunities for Women Graduate Students in Economics: Program in Applied Economics.

By Ashley Timmer, Program Director for the PAE and other Economics, Projects at the Social Science Research Council

The Program in Applied Economics (PAE) was established in 1997 to support graduate students interested in applying their theoretical training to substantive economic problems. The design of the PAE responded to criticisms of graduate education that had been raised by the AEA Commission on Graduate Education in Economics (COGEE), which conducted a systematic review of graduate education in US universities in the late 1980s. The Commission identified two major concerns with

graduate programs. First, the first-year core curriculum focused too heavily on formal economic theory and econometric methods at the expense of more substantive, applied content. Second, the Commission recognized a problem in the transition from coursework to research, when many students floundered in search of a dissertation topic. The standard curriculum of core (and even applied) courses trained students poorly for this task, not only because of the lack of connection to applied topics in the

early coursework, but also because the courses offered few opportunities for students to develop research ideas or learn how to pursue them.

With funding from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the PAE was established to address some of these challenges for graduate students, in the hope that students who were interested in applied economic problems could find a network of like-

Continued on page 6

mind colleagues and resources to pursue research, training and field work. From the student perspective, the first-year theory courses were frustrating in their lack of applied substance, and some students could no longer remember why they had been drawn to economics. They were often having a hard time translating the theory into something useful to address the problems in which they were interested.

The PAE now brings together a group of students after their first year of graduate school for a week-long summer workshop, with speakers on applied topics and working groups designed to help them build their own research agendas. In past years, topics have included auction markets for complex goods like the FCC spectrum, micro-credit institutions, and education finance reform. Academic faculty speak, but so do practitioner economists who work on these topics in the private sector or in government. The speakers come for a day or two and give seminars, and they also work with students informally and in small groups. Junior faculty are invited for the entire week to help students in working groups think about how to structure a research project. The interaction with faculty seems to give students more confidence in sharing their research ideas. After the workshop, students have commented they felt encouraged to talk more with faculty in their own departments. The younger faculty also give talks about developing job-market papers and other aspects of the research process, to encourage students to think ahead about their dissertation plans.

The workshop helps students to develop skills they need to negotiate graduate school, but it also serves as a reminder that there are real problems that economists tackle, and that the theory training of the first year does have value. Encouraging the students to design new research topics and develop the methodology for answering new economic questions, is one of the ways we facilitate the transition from coursework to research. But there is also great value for the students in meeting their colleagues in other programs and encountering faculty who are also working on interesting applied topics. As one of our alumni noticed, students don't usually meet other economists of their cohort until they go on the job market. We do not wish to overstate our success, but we have rescued at least one student who was planning to quit his graduate program but changed his mind after the workshop, encouraged that there really was life after theory courses.

The PAE also has an annual fellowship program designed to address the concerns of the "lost" third year, by supporting graduate

students as they begin to tackle their dissertation research. The "pre-dissertation" fellowship asks students to develop a year-long plan, which might include cultivating critical research skills or exposing themselves to new areas of research and data. Fellows have undertaken a wide range of activities during the fellowship year: taken a semester at another university to study political science, traveled to Africa to gather data, designed a new research project with a colleague. A few of our fellows have suggested that simply writing their proposals was immensely valuable, because it forced them to sit down in the second year and develop a plan for the first stage of the dissertation. For some, the fellowship has offered the incentive (and means) to get out of their departments and into different environments, allowing them to develop better research projects. As one fellow put it: "When I spoke to policymakers, my theoretically and technically driven assumptions were heavily attacked. . . . I had to reconsider my assumptions based on real-world concerns."

We also try to serve as a commitment mechanism for moving from background research to writing, by bringing the fellows together at the end of the year to present their research at a conference. Like the graduate "brown bag" lunches in departments, the fellowship conference is terrific for substantive feedback from a friendly group. But for students nearing the job market, it has proven useful also for offering a generalist and outsider audience—more like that at a job talk. Fellows have found the perspectives of faculty and students outside their departments to be eye-opening and extremely helpful.

The PAE has proven to be an especially attractive program for women graduate students. Over the past two years, half of our fellows have been women: nine of 16 in the current academic year, and eight of 18 last year. This year, half of our applications were from women, which is unusual in that the proportion of women in top economics departments has been about 25 to 30%. And yet, the PAE has never specifically sought female applicants, nor applied any affirmative action standards to the competition process.

From an outside perspective, I might have found this unusual. But in running the program, I understand that we encourage the sorts of research that women economists—perhaps even more so than male economists—hope to pursue. Without stereotyping too much, the anecdotal evidence suggests that women are drawn to economics in large part to tackle "real-world" problems. In my experience in graduate school and as a professor, it was apparent that women were drawn less to the theoretical fields and more to areas like labor eco-

nomics, public finance and industrial organization. The 1997 AEA member survey indicates that only about 10% of the economists working in either game theory or general equilibrium theory are women, whereas roughly one-quarter of economists researching education and more than a third studying work behavior are women. These are among the fields in economics most closely associated with "applied" research, and those with natural policy dimensions.

I suspect in part this differential attraction for women reflects a continuing anti-math bias that breaks along gender lines, but I think the more important draw is that economic questions in a social context resonate more deeply for women economists. It is my conjecture that female students are more likely than their male counterparts to have held a job in the private or public sector before attending graduate school, and thus perhaps more likely to have applied research in mind at an early stage of their graduate training.

Regardless of the underlying reasons, that the PAE can be supportive of women graduate students is something the Council values deeply. To the extent that we also help to build networks of young economists, provide mentors, and help them to design long-term research agendas, I hope that we also succeed in furthering their careers as economists.

Ashley Timmer is the Program Director for the PAE and other economics projects at the Social Science Research Council. She received her PhD in economics from Harvard University, and was an assistant professor at Duke University prior to joining the Council. Her research focuses on the economic dimensions of political instability and conflict. She is a co-editor of the forthcoming volume *September 11: Context and Consequences* (New Press, 2002).



Research Funding Opportunities for Women Economists at the Russell Sage Foundation

By David F. Weiman, Barnard College, Columbia University

Until returning to the academy last fall, I spent the past four years working at the Social Science Research Foundation and Russell Sage Foundation. My observations focus on the latter experience, but before launching into this discussion, I first share a valuable lesson first learned at SSRC but reinforced at RSF. Unlike the public sector, private foundations support research because it furthers their missions which are expressed in the design of their programs and initiatives. Thus, they tend to fund more applied research. As a related point, foundations conceive their relationships with grantees as partnerships, ongoing collaborations with foundation staff to develop and realize their goals.

Turning to the task at hand, I offer a guide to research funding at RSF. The Foundation is unusual in its specialization in social science research. So, while smaller than many others in the research business, its operating budget of about \$12 million is devoted entirely to the research enterprise. This fiscal year, for example, the Foundation will make about \$5 million in external awards.

Like most foundations, RSF supports more applied research. It is distinctive, however, in its emphasis on basic research rather than policy analysis and program evaluation. An exception to the last statement - an award to assess the HUD's Moving to Opportunity Program - elaborates the rule. While recognizing the profound importance of this innovation in housing policy for low-income households, the Foundation focused on the potential of this randomized experiment to identify and measure neighborhood effects.

The Foundation also has a long tradition of investing in theoretical and methodological innovations and in social science data infrastructure, but only if they clearly lead to a deeper understanding of pressing economic and social problems. Notable examples of the former are the development of behavioral economics and meta-analysis. Methodologically, RSF tends to support quantitative rather than qualitative research but does have a significant track record in the latter area (such as recent ethnographies on welfare mothers by Kathryn Edin and Laura Lein and on fast-food workers in Harlem by Katherine Newman). Moreover, it has used the carrot of research support to broaden methodological boundaries such as the diffusion of case study research into economics.

Russell Sage supports research through

its grant-making and visiting scholar programs and publications division. The largest component of the budget, external awards may be approved by the board of trustees or the President.¹¹ Board-approved awards range in size from \$50 to \$500 thousand, but are typically around \$150 and 200 thousand for data analysis and the write-up of results. Larger awards must involve considerable new data collection such as the Multicity Study of Urban Inequality. Presidential authority awards have a limit of \$50 thousand and are used for smaller projects or to seed larger ones.

The Visiting Scholar Program provides around 20 residential fellowships for post-doctoral researchers each year. Priority is given to scholars whose research is directly aligned with Foundation programs and initiatives and especially those working on Foundation supported research projects. Still, the Foundation will consider scholars working in areas outside of its current (and past) domains, often as a way to prospect for new research areas. While the simple application generally favors more senior researchers, the Board has a commitment to supporting promising young scholars, especially female and minority candidates. This is evidenced by the rather generous terms of the award, including when necessary full-year support.²²

Finally, the Foundation publishes monographs and conference volumes that derive from its supported research including the visiting scholar program. Recent examples in economics include *At Home and Abroad* by Francine Blau and Lawrence Kahn, *The Roaring Nineties* edited by Alan Krueger and Robert Solow, and *Making Work Pay* edited by Bruce Meyer and Douglas Holtz-Eakin.

Taken as a whole, the Foundation's vertical integration creates a pipeline nurturing research from its formative stages through publication and dissemination. It seeds new projects through presidential authority awards but also fellowships to visiting scholars. It can then fund these projects through board-reviewed research awards and support scholars while in residence to write-up the findings. And finally, it will publish results and promote their distribution.

The Foundation is currently supporting research through its programs in the Future of Work, Cultural Contact, and Immigration; special projects on the 2000 Census and the Social Dimensions of Inequality; and working groups on the Role of Trust and Behavioral

Economics. With an exception or two, these distinct areas are connected by a common concern about the challenges to American democracy of an emerging post-industrial, global political economic order.

While these issues demand interdisciplinary research, economic analysis is more integral to some programs and initiatives than others. The Future of Work, for example, has spawned a succession of research initiatives analyzing the nature, causes, and consequences of recent shifts in low-skilled labor markets and the corresponding public policy responses. The program is now harvesting a series of firm-level case studies, and fielding two initiatives on the spread of for-profit labor market intermediaries like temp help agencies and the labor market impacts of large-scale incarceration. These initiatives are likely to continue for another funding round or two, but in the meanwhile Foundation staff in consultation with the program's advisory committee is considering new directions. One area under consideration is the education and training market for mid-level jobs.

The point of departure of the Immigration program was also the decline in well-paid manufacturing jobs. With the recent surge in migration, it has turned to the complex questions of identity - how recent immigrant identify themselves and are identified by others and how identities are formed and reinforced through residential and occupational of segregation. It also invites research critically examining traditional notions of ethnicity and racial/ethnic categories with (e.g.) the spread of intermarriage and innovations in the census short form.

Finally, the program on Cultural Contact and initiative on Trust mirror the concerns of the Immigration program, but with a focus on the social and political ramifications of the myriad interactions within an increasingly heterogeneous racial/ethnic U.S. society. Still, they both leave ample room for economists. At the intersection of immigration and cultural contact, for example, are the causes and consequences of firms' strategies of recruiting more diverse workforces. Under the Trust initiative questions of reputation and commitment have been analyzed by the application of game theoretic models and experimental methodology.

I conclude by considering the specific question of funding opportunities for women. The Foundation does not explicitly target

Continued on page 8

women and minorities in its funding decisions. It does, however, have a commitment to developing research capacity in the social sciences, including discovering and nurturing promising younger scholars, especially women and minorities. With increasing numbers of women graduating PhD programs and entering the academy, this strategy makes sense simply on pragmatic terms. But, the Board also sees this policy as a way of strengthening the research enterprise by encouraging those with diverse perspectives and experiences.

The Foundation's most direct route to achieve this end is through the Visiting Scholar program. The selection committee (made up exclusively of Board members) does consider gender diversity as a factor, especially in association with career status and in deciding cases on the margin. Board members have expressed similar sentiments in the discussion of proposals and have frequently admonished staff to beat

the bushes to expand the pool of potential and actual PIs.

A few statistics illustrate the Foundation's commitment to supporting women in the social sciences. First, the percentage of women on the Board has increased significantly over the past two decades from 29 to 42 percent. Reinforcing this change is the significant presence of female scholars on program advisory committees. Second, since 1994 the share of women among visiting scholars has averaged around 37 percent. Finally, based on an analysis of scholars receiving multiple awards since 1987, women account for 29 percent of grantees and an equal share of total awards.

NSF data furnish a rough benchmark. The share of women among recent social science PhDs increased from 30 to 38 percent over the past two decades, and as of 1997 women made up 25 percent of the faculty in research universities. The RSF figures fall within these ranges and suggest that the Foundation is keeping pace

with demographic changes in the profession.

David Weiman is Professor of Economics at Barnard College and Member of the History Graduate Faculty, Columbia University. He is also Senior Research Associate of the Community College Research Center, Teachers College and Faculty Fellow of the Institute for Social and Economic Research and Policy, Columbia University. Weiman was formerly Senior Program Officer at the Russell Sage Foundation and Program Director at the Social Science Research Council.

¹¹ For information on deadlines and submission guidelines, see www.russellsage.org/about/how_to_apply.htm.

²² It also provides subsidized housing in close proximity to the Foundation, a day care allowance, and assistance in negotiating the public and private school systems.

Notes from Working at a Private Foundation

By Kristin F. Butcher, Senior Economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago.

When economists think about grant money, they generally think about the NSF or NIH. There is this whole other strange world of private foundations out there. I had the opportunity to work in this rich, interdisciplinary, sometimes vibrant, sometimes frustrating world for two years. Caren Grown asked me to write a piece about what economists should know about private foundations. After some thought and some consultation, here is what I would want to know as an economist from the outside looking in at a foundation. First, I would certainly want to know how to get money out of one. Second, I might like to know what it is like to work in one as an economist.

Before I proceed, a few words of caution. As of May 1, I will be starting a new job at the Chicago Fed, so I do not have lengthy experience in the foundation world. Also, I have only worked for the MacArthur Foundation and not all foundations are alike. Indeed, they pride themselves on having their own unique flavor, so any information about one may not transfer.

How do you get money out of a private foundation? Even having been on the inside of one this occasionally mystifies me. First, however, perhaps I should say a word about *why* you might try to get money out of a foundation (aside from the obvious fact that they have a lot of it and you don't). Foundations have a great deal of latitude in what they fund and they can take much bigger risks than the government funding agencies. The old complaint about the NSF, that the project basically has to be finished before it can get funded, does not apply. Every

program officer's dream is to find that diamond-in-the-rough project, give it seed money, and watch it blossom. So, in theory, one can get risky, exciting projects off the ground with foundation dollars - and when it works this way, it can be a beautiful thing to behold.

In practice, though, it is often unclear how to approach a foundation. The rules about applying are much different than with a government funding agency. It can even be rather unclear what the foundation is interested in funding. Foundation officers are constantly working to refine program strategies. These strategies are meant to make a little money go as far as possible in solving some big problems. The strategies get translated into guidelines. Guidelines are tricky things to write: define things too narrowly and the foundation might miss out on something really great; write them too broadly and everyone thinks their project "fits perfectly" into the foundation's programs. (Virtually every letter of inquiry contains the words "fits perfectly.") There are two things to remember when you send off your letter of inquiry. First, the guidelines are (hopefully) not written in a vacuum. The strategies are usually the result of lengthy consultations with experts in a field. Some of the money allocated to a particular strategy is probably already earmarked for some of those experts. So, if you weren't one of the experts consulted chances are the budget constraint is quite a bit tighter than you may think before you get your letter in the door. Second, it is important to remember never ever to take rejection from a founda-

tion personally. There are lots of criteria that go into each decision - rejection is almost never because your ideas were found wanting in some head-to-head competition.

One of the things that surprised me a great deal when I joined the MacArthur Foundation was how much communication there was between program officers and potential applicants. You get many phone calls when you are on that side of the big checkbook. If I were thinking about applying to a foundation now, I would call someone there first to get advice. I would NOT call and tell the program officer that my project "fits PERFECTLY" into his or her guidelines. I would call and describe what I wanted to do and ask for advice about funding. If I were going to be in town I would ask if I could stop by for a coffee break and some advice. Program officers really do want to help get good projects off the ground. So, even if the person tells you that despite what you read on the web, there are no good opportunities for you at that particular foundation, he or she may know what other foundations are up to and be able to give you a good lead.

What is it like as an economist working at a private foundation? The MacArthur Foundation is a deeply interdisciplinary place. Not only are there people with research backgrounds from many fields, there are real live practitioners. This can be an exciting environment. I was continually impressed by my colleagues' depth of knowledge in their fields and their wealth of experience.

Continued on page 9

That said, communication can be difficult when people have varied backgrounds. Constantly saying things like “what exactly is the market failure this program is trying to address?” is not likely to win friends. Similarly, curling one’s lip and sneering “yes, but is it *causal*?” as someone earnestly describes the success of his job training program is quite unpopular. The bane of my existence was a comment an economist (who shall remain nameless) once made to a group at MacArthur. When asked why MacArthur should fund economists to study some problem that had been the terrain of sociology for many years, this man said, “because if *we* study it you can actually believe the answers.” Again, this approach is not particularly likely to win points for the projects you, as an economist, might like to fund. If you can find a way to communicate the economic perspective that does not completely alienate your audience, you can feel like you are doing a lot of good. A little economics can

go a long way in many situations, and I often got to feel like my value added was high.

Finally, working at a foundation puts you in a position of incredible privilege. I got to see projects and meet people that I would never have had access to if I had worked strictly as an academic. There is almost no one who won’t take your phone call. If you are interested in something, you can usually get access to it. For example, I was helping to investigate issues around prisoner re-entry to see if that was something MacArthur might like to fund. I was able to get in-depth tours of several prisons, and have long conversations with the people in charge of the re-entry programs. It was fascinating, and made me think of many exciting research projects one could structure around such programs. Ultimately that was part of why I decided to leave: every project I worked on for MacArthur whetted my appetite to do my own research around the question. Working in such a position broadened my horizons and

gave me new insights.

Kristin Butcher received a BA from Wellesley College, an MSc in economics from the London School of Economics, and a PhD in economics from Princeton University. She is a labor economist who has worked on issues surrounding immigration and the impact of family structure on children’s outcomes. Her latest work (joint with Patty Anderson and Phil Levine) is on the impact of maternal employment on childhood obesity (something she thinks about a lot as she stares at her daughter and her maternity leave seems to evaporate!). She has held faculty positions at Virginia Tech and Boston College, and a visiting faculty position at Princeton. She was a program officer at the MacArthur Foundation for two years. She now holds a research position as a senior economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago.

An Interview with the 2001 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award Recipient

Professor Eva Mueller

Professor Emerita of the Department of Economics

Research Scientist of the Population Studies

Center of the University of Michigan

Interviewed by Sherrie Kossoudji, Associate Professor, Social Work, University of Michigan, who completed her dissertation under Professor Mueller.

Edited for the Newsletter.

In the Beginning

My mother had a Ph.D. in Chemistry, which in those days was very unusual. She really wanted to be a doctor. They talked her out of it and said a woman couldn’t be a doctor because it was unfitting for a woman to look at corpses. After she got her Ph.D. World War I had started. She worked for about two or three years, maybe, first in the lab. She finished her lab work and then she was hired by a big chemical trust in Germany as their first woman chemist. She was working for my father, became engaged to him and married. In those days in Germany a woman couldn’t work if she had a working husband. So she had to quit and she never resumed work, but she always talked about it. She had her mind set that even though now she was a housewife and had three children, they must all get Ph.D.s. My sister got a Ph.D. in education, got married and taught at Arizona State. It wasn’t easy to get two people teaching in the same university, and it still isn’t easy.

My mother was the main influence in my decision to get a Ph.D. There was also this

woman teacher who got me interested in economics, but that’s not the whole story. Because of the Depression it impressed me that what the world needed was to rescue its economies. In my class (1942) at Smith I think only one person went on to a Ph.D. out of 500.

After Smith

During the war you couldn’t go to Harvard because they more or less closed down the economics department because all of the faculty was away in Washington working on the war effort. They couldn’t maintain enough of the faculty to take in students. During the war, when I couldn’t study, I got a job at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York through Smith College. The men were all leaving and they were asked if they had any women graduates who could work in their research department. Three Smith graduates went there. One left after a year on the grounds that she didn’t meet enough men because they had all gone to war. She joined the WAVES (you know, that was the women’s part of the Navy). I and the other woman remaining were advanced very quickly because there were no men. The other woman became

the First Assistant Vice President of a bank in New York and the first woman who ate in the Officer’s Dining Room of New York Fed. I stayed until the war was over and then quit to go back to school.

Graduate School

Harvard had made a decision at that time to admit only veterans unless there was a special reason. My boss at the Federal Reserve Bank, George Garvey, introduced me to one of the Fed’s Vice Presidents, Dr. Williams, who worked at the bank maybe one-third of the time. He was a Professor at Harvard. Garvey explained that I had applied and was turned down, so Dr. Williams said, “Oh, we can fix that.” Three days later I had a letter saying I was admitted. That was thanks to my boss and thanks to Dr. Williams.

It’s nice to have somebody who sort of sponsors you and is your patron saint. George Garvey was that and, later, George Katona.

Harvard had admitted about 80 men and about six or eight women in economics. Some of the women had some special connections,

Continued on page 10

Interview . . . Continued from page 9

like they were engaged to somebody whom the department valued. Some were just floating around, like me. Probably more than half didn't finish. The man I wrote my dissertation under was Alvin Hansen, who, at the time, was the number one Keynesian in the U.S. He was kind of fatherly; he had a daughter who was also getting her Ph.D. in economics. She didn't finish as she got married.

While writing my dissertation I needed money. I implied I could teach and I got a job at the University of Buffalo. I had huge classes: 40 to 60 students. I did that for two years and I made no progress on my dissertation. In those days they didn't have teaching fellows to grade papers. So I went back and finished. I was lucky because I could always ask my father for money.

Job Search

The Chair of the Economics department at Harvard said that economics was not a field for women so he couldn't help me get a job. I don't know if he knew that I had worked at the Federal Reserve. To get my first job after Harvard I wrote some letters to people whose stuff I had read and thought they would be interesting to work for. One was George Katona. He happened to know George Garvey, for whom I had worked at the Federal Reserve, so he wrote to him and asked if I would be a plausible candidate. That's how I came to Michigan to the Institute for Social Research. I wanted to go to the Economics department, but they would not accept me. Then I was sort of on the waiting list. John Lansing and, I think, even Jim Morgan, were on the waiting list ahead of me.

They eventually got to me. I always wanted to be in economics.

At Michigan

I had one rule that I would impose on students. The main thing was to go ahead and finish your work because someone, e.g., NIH, monitored how many people didn't finish the fellowships. (Interviewer remarked that one of the emphases with everyone was "take no more than eight months to finish.") I didn't want students unless they were going to finish. (Interviewer remarked that Professor Mueller worked hard to make sure that everybody did finish.) I helped them with my advice and I think almost anybody who was on a fellowship finished, except maybe one person.

In the first place, because there's no difference in my mind between men and women, I encouraged both equally. There was no preference given to women. I told them what they had to do to get ahead, and gave them advice and told them whom to see and who could help them.

I knew that I did well and that I would eventually get promoted. I did really feel confident about that. I can't remember that I ever thought about quitting, at least not in a serious way. Everybody thinks about it once or twice but I was lucky that I got into the Survey Research Center which was a very secure place. I stayed one-third time there and two-thirds time in Economics when I could. I was an Associate Dean for four years. If you stayed more than four years you really lost academic status. So I never wanted to do it longer.

I taught micro-economics and business

cycles, which tied in with my interest in the Depression. I stuck with that for a long time. Then, by chance, I was sent on consulting assignments abroad. So I found places in the world that needed me more. Doing a survey in India was how I started thinking about population and economics. This was a completely new and non-existing field in the sixties. I became involved in economic demography. People in those days were so much more optimistic about population issues. I never became involved in fertility issues, but, instead, worked on developing issues.

After Michigan

In those days you had to retire at age 69, only I waited a year too late. They let people stay. People think now that's not good. Most of my students hadn't finished their dissertation when I retired. You know when I took them on I thought they'd be finished by then. They always took longer than I expected. So I still had a lot of students, but that has petered out. I still am invited to give a paper on this or that, but that is petering out too.

Finally, Professor Mueller was asked if she would have done anything different with her career. After I completed my dissertation I spent my whole career at Michigan. I was well known throughout the university. Being one of the few senior women I was available and served on many committees. I was pretty well settled, there were times when I complained as you would on any job, but nothing big happened that I would have changed.

CSWEP at the Western Economic Association Meetings

There will be two CSWEP-sponsored sessions at the Western Economics Association Meetings this year. The sessions are organized around the themes of "Women's Economic Well-Being" and "Household Bargaining and Household Production". The meetings will be held at the Westin Seattle, June 29-July 3, 2002 with sessions beginning at 8:15 on Sunday, June 30. Further information is available at www.weainterantional.org.

Session 1: Women's Economic Well-Being

Chair: Mary King, University of Portland

Mary King, University of Portland "Defining and Measuring Patriarchal Regimes"

Catalina Amuedo-Dorantes and Cynthia Bansak, San Diego State University "The Role of Contingent Work in the War Against Poverty"

Jennifer Ward-Batts, Claremont and Shelly Lundberg, University of Washington, "Saving for Retirement: Household Bargaining and Household Net Worth"

Discussants:

Catalina Amuedo-Dorantes

Mary King

Session 2: Household Bargaining and Household Production

Chair: Shelly Lundberg, University of Washington

Shelly Lundberg, "Household Specialization"

Gaelle Le Guirriec, University of Paris II - Assas and Reims Management School, "Economics of the family and family policies : intra-household distribution of resources and labor market participation decisions"

Elaina Rose, University of Seattle, "Marriage and Assortative Mating"

Bridget Hiedemann, Seattle University, David Byrne, Michelle Goeree, Steven Stern, University of Virginia "Household Bargaining, Long-Term Care, Home Health Care, and Informal Care"

Discussants:

Jennifer Ward-Batts

Shelly Lundberg

CSWEP at the Eastern Economics Association Meetings

Boston, March 15-17, 2002

In addition to a highly successful cocktail party on Friday evening, CSWEP held two sessions at the Eastern Economics Association Annual Conference.

Session Title: Gender Differences in Education and Labor Choices

The first paper, "Training and Technology in Transitional Economies" by Ying Chu Ng (Hong Kong Baptist University) examined the question of what characteristics determine whether an employee receives training. While this question has previously been studied in the US and other developed countries, this paper is the first to examine it in a transitional economy.

The paper used a proprietary data set consisting of 2000 employees (500 companies). Employees reported their formal training (both on-the-job and off-the-job) and their informal training in three different domains—computer training (technical), enterprise management training (operations), and human resource management (management). Surprisingly, unlike Western data sets, there was no effect of employee gender on whether or what kind of training was received. Other results were consistent with those found in more developed countries or our theoretical intuitions: middle and senior employees were more likely to receive training, high-tech firms (categorized by high levels of R&D) were more likely to offer training (primarily off-the job), and foreign-owned or joint-venture firms were more likely to train their employees than state-owned enterprises.

The second paper, "Salary Growth of Recent Male and Female College Graduates" by Lois Joy (Smith College) used a dataset from the National Center for Educational Statistics who surveyed college graduates in 1994 (one year after graduation) and 1997 (four years after graduation). This data is thus more recent than has been previously examined (for example, from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth), and extremely complete. The data indicate that while the salary gap between men and women is still with us, more troubling is that men's salaries *grow* faster than women's salaries. Over the three year period covered in the survey, men's salaries grew 60% while women's salaries grew only 44%.

This paper investigates potential causes of this discrepancy, including the choices of college majors, occupations or industries chosen for the first job and subsequent jobs, and differences in work experiences in the first three years. Three factors were identified as causal of the gender differences in salary growth. First,

the 4 hours more per week that men worked in 1997 as compared to women accounted for a large share of the gender gap in salary growth. Second, the industries chosen by men were different than those chosen by women and were higher paying. Finally, the interaction of the major chosen and the occupation differed by gender. This more recent data suggests that the labor market is less segregated than has been demonstrated using older data sets (progress is being made!), however, men and women apparently still face different forces while pursuing their careers.

Session Title: Environmental Issues

The second session examined environmental issues. The first paper "The Impact of Gender Issues on Sustainable Development in the New York City Watershed Counties" by Joan Hoffman (John Jay College of Criminal Justice) presented an investigation of the ways in which economic stratification, hampered the effort to attain sustainable economic development in New York City's Catskill Mountain Watershed.

In particular, the data examined income patterns and costs of those who live in the counties that contain the NYC watershed. The paper argued that a sustainable standard of living for residents is needed to promote cooperation and enable effective regulation and the ability to maintain the necessary environmental infrastructure in the watershed. The evidence suggested that the watershed area is characterized by a significant group of people with low incomes and growing inequality. Women and minorities appear to be disproportionately represented among those with low income. Their financial burdens negatively affected the environmental infrastructure, either through lower tax revenues or diminished funds available for residential spending on septic maintenance.

The second paper, "Incentive Compatibility and the Hypothetical Double Referenda" by Katherine Carson (Air Force Academy) and co-authors presented an experimental test of a commonly-used (and NOAA-recommended) method of eliciting valuations for environmental goods. The method involves asking respondents two questions about their willingness-to-pay to provide some environmental (public) good. Field research using this method had indicated some anomalies with the responses (the imputed valuation for the good using answers to the first question often differed from that

using answers to the second question). The experiment was designed to provide a simple, clean environment to examine the effectiveness of this elicitation mechanism.

Subjects in the experiment were asked to vote (referenda-style) whether they would be willing to pay a particular amount in order to fund the public good. In the first treatment (consequential), participants' earnings in the experiment were related to these valuations, thus this treatment provides the benchmark for behavior. In the second treatment (inconsequential 1), the participants' earnings were independent of their valuations, thus the experiment mirrored the hypothetical nature of the surveys used in the field and recommended by NOAA. Results indicated that there was no difference between the consequential and inconsequential 1 treatments, thus confirming the NOAA panel's speculation that hypothetical referenda correctly elicited individual's valuations. The third treatment (inconsequential 2) asked subjects to provide a second vote, as is done in the field. The authors replicated the field anomaly—answers to the second question often generated different estimates of individual's values than answers to the first. However, the anomaly seemed *not* to come from individuals' answers to the second question, as is currently assumed. Instead, the errors were found in the answers to the *first* question on the double-referenda. This error causes a slight econometric overstatement of individuals' valuations for environmental goods. Overall, however, authors concluded that the hypothetical double-referenda performed surprisingly well in lab testing and supported the NOAA panel's recommendation that they be used in the field.

I would like to conclude by thanking the paper presenters and discussants for sharing their research and thoughts with us. It was a great pleasure to meet these outstanding female researchers. I hope to see you at next year's



CSWEP at the Midwest Economics Association Meetings Chicago, March 14-16, 2002

Session Title: Evaluating Social Policies that Target Women

Session organizer: Traci Mach -University at Albany-SUNY

Session Chair: Patricia Regan - Ohio State University

Bradley Gray of the University of Illinois at Chicago presented his paper "Do Medicaid Physician Fees for Prenatal Services Affect Birth Outcomes." The study looks at the relationship between Medicaid physician fees and birth outcomes among a national sample of pregnant women. Applying a cohort difference-in-differences methodology, Grey finds a significant negative association between these fees and the risk of low birth weight. For low-income women this association grows significantly. He also find a moderate association between these fees and use of first trimester prenatal services. The paper was discussed by Donna Anderson of the University of Wisconsin at LaCrosse.

Traci Mach from the University at Albany-SUNY and Pinka Chatterji from Montefiore Medical College presented their paper "Welfare Reform, Medicaid Disenrollment, and Access to Prenatal Care in New York City." Mach and Chatterji use individual-level birth certificate data from the late 1990s to measure prenatal care usage and zip code-level measures of Medicaid and welfare participation to capture welfare reform and disenrollment effects. Early results from ordered probit estimates indicate that Medicaid disenrollment has slowed prenatal care uptake. The paper was discussed

by Kosali Ilayperuma Simon of Cornell University.

Kumiko Imai of Cornell University presented "Re-Assessing the Impacts of Head Start on Children's Cognitive and Health Outcomes." Using the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 (NLSY79) and NLSY79 Children data, Imai matched each Head Start child with a set of control children who are similar in terms of demographic and socioeconomic variables, and compare pre- and post-Head Start outcomes with comparable outcomes for control children. Her results suggest that, contrary to previous findings, Head Start has little effect on cognitive outcomes. The results also show that Head Start has no effect on health insurance coverage, but a short-run positive effect on preventive care utilization. This paper was discussed by Bradley Grey of the University of Illinois at Chicago.

Yunhee Chang of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign presented her joint work with Andrea Beller and Elizabeth Powers "Sanctioning and Cooperation with the Child Support Enforcement Provisions of Welfare Reform: Evidence from Illinois." Using administrative data from Illinois Department of Public Aid and Illinois Department of Human Services, their

study investigates the determinants of the likelihood for a single mother on the welfare roll to be sanctioned for non-cooperation. Under the 1996 welfare reform effort, heavier penalties were imposed on both against fathers as well as noncustodial mothers who do not cooperate with the Child Support Enforcement agency in identifying and obtaining child support from their children's fathers. Maximum-likelihood probit models of non-cooperation are estimated as a function of selected characteristics of the grantee, child, and the case. Their fixed effect model suggests that, after the reform, citations for non-cooperation with child support enforcement among mothers on welfare increased more than 20 percent in Central Illinois. This paper was discussed by Meta Brown of the University of Wisconsin at Madison.



Roundtable Discussion: Managing Your Academic Career

This second annual CSWEP-sponsored roundtable at the MEA meetings was organized by Jean Kimmel, Western Michigan University and moderated by Donna Anderson, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. The panel was comprised of three women at various stages in their academic career. Traci Mach is an Assistant Professor of Economics in her second year at SUNY-Albany. She provided comments on the challenges she faces as a new faculty member, including balancing research and teaching responsibilities. She emphasized the importance of getting manuscripts in the journal pipeline early and discussed obtaining external grants. Anne Winkler is an Associate Professor of Economics and Public Policy Administration at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, where she has been employed since 1989. She spoke about the rewards of her job as a teacher, researcher, and co-author of *The Economics of Women,*

Men, and Work. As a parent of two young children, she also discussed how family responsibilities add another dimension to the challenge of managing an academic career. Kathy Hayes, Professor of Economics, has been at Southern Methodist University for 16 years, and is currently Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. Prior to SMU, Kathy held various governmental and academic positions. She described the challenges she has faced in her career, including developing a research agenda, department politics, the transition to administration, and balancing work and family. As an editor of a journal, she also offered insights into getting research published. Comments and questions from the audience provoked discussion of the following issues: the importance of planning a career as opposed to just letting it happen; the benefits and drawbacks of taking advantage of tenure-clock-stopping and leave policies for

childbirth or other family responsibilities; committee work; possible journals for publishing research (*Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities in Economics and Finance* provides a listing of journals along with their manuscript guidelines and acceptance rates); internal and external grants; and mentoring.



CSWEP at the Midwest Economics Association Meeting, *continued*

Session Title: School Choice and Education Policy

Session organizer: Annie Georges - National Center for Children in Poverty at Columbia University

Catalina Amuedo-Dorantes (San Diego State University), Traci Mach (University at Albany SUNY), and John Clapp (San Diego State University) presented "Educational Alternatives and School Governance." The paper examines which type of school's governance system - that is, whether parents, school staff, school district staff, or the state department of education has a greater say in establishing curriculum or in deciding how the school budget will be spent for the school - matters in the school's implementation of innovative after-school and in-school educational programs. Using the NLSY97 School Administrator Survey and the National Education Database the authors conclude that the school district staff and principals are the major players in the implementation of innovative after-school and in-school educational programs. In particular, the implementation of innovative educational programs is more likely to occur when the principal exercises the greatest influence over the budget.

Annie Georges (Columbia University) presented "Gaining Access to College: The Impact of School Policy and Practice." The paper estimates a college enrollment that examines the influence of family income, the effectiveness of alternative educational policies, and the school's educational practice on whether recent high school graduates enroll in a two-year or a four-year college. The results indicate that given that one attends college, family income is not a significant predictor where one goes to college. The primary source of differences in college enrollment is the result of educational policy at the school that influences students' academic experience, and their participation in college preparatory programs.

M. Kathleen Thomas (University of Texas at Dallas) presented "Where College-Bound Texas Students Send their SAT and ACT Scores: Does Race Matter?" Using the Texas Schools Microdata Panel, the author examines where

college-bound Texas students sent their SAT and ACT scores in 1998 in order to determine the students revealed preferences for higher education. Controlling for standardized test scores, income and other background characteristics the findings show that black and Hispanic students have a lower probability of sending SAT or ACT scores to selective Texas public colleges and universities relative to white students. However, black and Hispanic students have a higher probability of sending their scores to selective institutions out-of-state. The author concludes that these findings may be due to the Hopwood vs. Texas decision, a court ruling that ended affirmative action initiatives in Texas public colleges and universities.

The discussants were Greg Duncan (Northwestern University), Kathryn Wilson (Kent State University), and Heather O'Neill (Ursinus College). Mark Long (University of Michigan) was the moderator.

Claudia Goldin

"The Economist as Detective"

[Adapted from an article by the same title in M. Szenberg, ed., *Passion and Craft: Economists at Work* (1998).]

I have always wanted to be a detective and have finally succeeded. As a child in New York City I was determined to become an archeologist and unlock the secrets of the mummies at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. But after reading Paul de Kruif, I turned my attention to microbes. I entered Cornell University to study microbiology but soon realized that there were other subjects—the humanities, history, and the social sciences—about which I knew little. Knowledge was grander than I had been led to believe at the Bronx High School of Science.

In my sophomore year at Cornell I encountered Alfred (Fred) Kahn, whose utter delight in using economics did for economics what de Kruif had done for microbiology. After earning my B.A. in economics at Cornell, I entered graduate school at the University of Chicago. It was almost pure luck to have chosen Chicago and I don't know why I thought it would have been a good place to study and live. It was a lousy place to live, but it was the very best place to do graduate work. I studied both industrial organization and labor economics, but wrote my dissertation in economic history with Robert W. Fogel.

I began my career as an economic historian writing about slavery, the Civil War, the post-bellum South, and the family. I soon switched my attention to the evolution of the female labor force. Women's economic role appeared to be rapidly changing. Yet I quickly came to realize that change was not as precipitous or as recent as most thought. No matter how much change there was, vestiges of the past remained.

When I first began *Understanding the Gender Gap: An Economic History of American Women* (1990), I worked within the accepted framework of female labor supply. But the framework had to be bent to fit historical reality. We economists still don't know how to incorporate changing norms and I was researching a subject in which norms played a major role. The book still bears the imprint of a neoclassical economist, but it is also a considerably more nuanced piece of work than I had originally intended.

I am currently working on the history of education in the United States, interactions between educational institutions and the economy, and the outcomes of economic

growth and the distribution of its benefits. Much of this work is coauthored with Larry Katz. My most recent gender research has concerned the impact of "blind" auditions on the hiring of female musicians, the influence of the "Pill" on social and economic change, and women's surnames and marriage. When I wrote *Gender Gap*, the narrowing of the 1980s was very recent. An invitation to give the Marshall Lectures at Cambridge University, *An Evolving Force* (2002), has allowed me to reflect further on gender change in the late twentieth century.

There is a strong element of detective work in all of my research. My most memorable research moments are those spent in dusty archives and libraries uncovering data on women's work in the eighteenth century, employment during World War II, marriage bars in the 1930s, and auditions for the great U.S. orchestras, to mention a few. In the words of the immortal Holmes: "It has long been an axiom of mine that the little things are infinitely the most important."

From the Chair

Greetings to all of you - with the current academic course year ending and our summer plans in place we hope you have a fruitful and enjoyable summer and, if travel is in your plans, a safe and comfortable trip.

This Spring newsletter once again contains a wealth of good material on the activities of women economists as well as opportunities for further research and more networking contacts. I encourage you to send me all announcements about your own activities - grants received, promotions and/or tenure decisions, new appointments, other career activities so that we can relate them to others. Remember:

“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.” Carolyn Shaw Bell, Fall, 1997

Our board will hold its’ regular Spring meeting in May with a full agenda. We will be working on another possible CSWEP mentoring effort as well as examining the issue of the role of FMLA in an academic career. Please send your thoughts and ideas on these topics to me by email (jhaworth@cswep.org) so they might be shared with other Board members as we progress in these areas this year.

The CSWEP organized sessions at the ASSA meetings in Washington DC in January 2003 will include a panel discussion on the *Role of Mentoring in Academic Careers*. Three of our sessions are on gender issues, including “Gender Differences in the Labor Market”, “Motherhood and Child Disability and Health” and “Fertility and the Cost of Motherhood”. The other three sessions are focused on Macroeconomic issues - “Emerging Issues in Social Security Reform”, “Health and Disability Issues” and “Monetary and Inflation-Targeting Policies.” We hope to see you in Washington and

encourage you to attend these very interesting sessions.

On another note - CSWEP organizes sessions for each of the regional meetings and for the annual ASSA meetings every year. Please contact your regional representative if you have a paper you would like to present at one of those meetings and did not submit your paper to the regional association’s program chair. Watch the newsletter for the calls for papers for these sessions as well.

Remember to submit your paper abstracts to CSWEP for the **2004** ASSA sessions when you see the Call for papers in the JFE this summer or send them to me. The sessions for the next annual meeting are generally completely organized within a few weeks of the current meeting. All abstracts are due by November 1, **2002** for the **2004** program. The CSWEP program focus for the 2004 meetings is *Experimental Economics* - along with sessions on *gender-related issues*.

FULBRIGHT SCHOLAR GRANTS, 2003-2004

The Fulbright Scholar Program is offering 128 lecturing, research, and lecturing/research awards in Economics for the 2003-2004 academic year.

Awards for both faculty and professionals range from two months to an academic year.

While many awards specify project and host institution, there are a number of open “Any Field” awards that allow candidates to propose their own project and determine their host institution affiliation. Foreign language skills are needed in some countries, but most Fulbright lecturing assignments are in English.

Application deadlines for 2003-2004 awards are:

- * May 1 for Fulbright Distinguished Chair awards in Europe, Canada and Russia
- * August 1 for Fulbright traditional lecturing and research grants worldwide

For information, visit our Web site at www.cies.org <<http://www.cies.org>>.

Or contact:

The Council for International Exchange of Scholars
3007 Tilden Street, N.W. - Suite 5L
Washington, D.C. 20008
Phone: 202-686-7877
E-mail: apprequest@cies.iie.org

Call for Papers: Southern Economic Association Meetings

The annual meeting of the Southern Economic Association will be held in New Orleans, LA at the Hyatt Regency New Orleans Hotel, November 24-26, 2002 (Sunday to Tuesday). CSWEP will sponsor up to three sessions.

The first session is available for anyone submitting an entire session (3 or 4 papers) or a complete panel on a specific topic on any area in economics. Send the session proposal and/or abstracts for organizing and filling the open topic session by May 15th to:

Professor Rachel A. Willis
Campus Box 3520
American Studies and Economics
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3520
fax 919.401.9128
email to Rachel_Willis@unc.edu

The remaining two session organizers are accepting individual papers on the topics described at the addresses given below.

Please send abstracts of 1-2 pages (including names of authors with affiliation, rank, address, and paper title by April 1, 2002. Earlier submissions are encouraged. Submissions can be made via snail mail, e-mail, or FAX. Please note that this submission is separate from any submission sent to the SEA's general call for papers.

Employment Discrimination.

Please send abstracts to:
Professor Saranna Thornton
Department of Economics, Box 852,
Hampden-Sydney College,
Hampden-Sydney, VA 23943
phone: 434-223-6253
FAX: 434-223-6045
email: sthornton@email.hsc.edu

Economic Issues in Latin America

Please send abstracts to:
Myriam Quispe-Agnoli
Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta
Research Department
Latin America Research Group
1000 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30309-4470
Phone (404) 498 8930
Fax (404) 498 8058
Myriam.Quispe-Agnoli@atl.frb.org

Call for Papers for the March 2003 Midwest Economic Association Meeting

The 2003 Midwest meeting will be held March 28-30 at the Adams Mark in St. Louis. CSWEP will sponsor two sessions at this conference: a gender-related session on the topic of Women and Risk and a session on Globalization and Low Wages. Please send abstracts of 1-2 pages (including names of authors with affiliation, rank, address, and paper title) by Friday September 6, 2002 to the address given below. Earlier submissions are encouraged. Submissions may be sent via snail mail, e-mail, or FAX. Please note that this submission is separate from any submissions sent in response to the MEA's general call for papers. Also at the 2003 meeting, CSWEP will hold its third annual Mentoring Roundtable on a topic yet to be decided. Please see the MEA program for further details.

Professor Jean Kimmel
Department of Economics
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo MI 49008-5023
Phone: 616-387-5541
FAX: 616-387-5637
Email: jean.kimmel@wmich.edu

Call for Papers for 2003 Eastern Economics 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 Crowne Plaza Manhattan Hotel from February 21-23, 2003.

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

Abstracts should be submitted by **November 1, 2002** to

Rachel Croson
1322 Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall
OPIM: The Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6366
crosonr@wharton.upenn.edu
phone: (215) 898-3025
fax: (215) 898-3664

Please note that this submission is separate from any submission sent in response to the EEA's general call for papers, but any papers rejected here will be passed on to the EEA. For further information on the EEA meetings please see <http://www.iona.edu/eea/>

Announcements

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) will conduct its first-ever **economics** assessment of 12th graders in 2006. NAEP, often called “the Nation’s Report Card,” is the only nationally representative and continuing assessment of what America’s students know and can do in various academic subjects. For each subject area, the Board develops an assessment framework to describe what students at the target grade level should know and be able to do. Each framework is developed through a consultative process involving hundreds of teachers, curriculum experts, policymakers, business representatives, and members of the general public.

The first document prepared for the public during this phase is an Issues Paper that outlines specific topics of concern in **economic education** for the framework development committees to consider during the development process. The Issues Paper is now available for review at the project website, www.naepecon2006.org <<http://www.naepecon2006.org/>>, and includes a public discussion forum for site visitors to provide feedback on the document. The draft of the Economics Framework developed from these comments will be posted on the project’s web site in early April, 2002.

Contacts for this project may be representatives of AIR, a research group contracted to do the work by NAEP. They are Stephen Klein (sklein@air.org and jmitchell@air.org)

The National Initiative for Women in Higher Education (NIWHE) seeks women’s leadership resources for its web site (<http://www.campuswomenlead.org>). Please use the interactive categories of the web site to share information about what is happening on your campus. The National Initiative for Women in Higher Education is looking for models, best practices, research, and success stories that can be made available on our web site. Examples of women’s leadership resources may be: Recruiting, Hiring, Retention Policies; Mentoring Programs; and Leadership Development Programs.

Additionally, some of the best women’s leadership resources will be highlighted in the Summer issue of On Campus with Women (<http://www.aacu-edu.org/ocww/index.cfm>), AAC&U Program on the Status and Education of Women’s quarterly publication.

Julie Hotchkiss, Associate Professor, Department of Economics, Andrew Young School of Policy Studies at Georgia State University is now Associate Editor of the Eastern Economic Journal. Julie would like to encourage CSWEP members to consider the Journal as a possible outlet for their research. The acceptance rate has been about twenty-five percent and they are more interested in working with authors to produce high quality publications rather than simply rejecting more papers than published.

You can contact Julie at jhotchkiss@gsu.edu or c/o Georgia State University, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303.



Announcements

The Carolyn Shaw Bell Award

Description:

This award is given annually to an individual who has furthered the status of women in the economics profession, or mentoring of others.

Eligibility:

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

Prize:

A “master” plaque that lists all award winners, in addition to the furthering the status of women citation, also bears Carolyn’s words: “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 social and human endeavors of all kinds.” (CSWEP Newsletter Fall 1997, p.4). The award requires that the “master” plaque be displayed prominently in a public place in the winner’s local area so that the others can see the achievements of the winner.

Procedure

- Candidate is nominated by one person with two additional supporting letters.
- The nominations should contain the candidate’s CV as well as the nominating letter.
- Nominations will be judged by the CSWEP Carolyn Shaw Bell Award Committee.
- The award will be announced at the annual ASSA/AEA meetings.

Nominating letters, including the supporting letters and the candidate’s CV, are due by July 15th 2002 and should be sent to the Chair of the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award Committee.

For 2002, the chair is:

Dr. Barbara M. Fraumeni

Chief Economist, Department of Commerce

Bureau of Economic Analysis, BE-3

1441 “L” Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20230 (FedEx zip code only is 20005)

Barbara.Fraumeni@bea.gov

Other committee members are:

Barbara Casey (Financial and Marketing Consultant) and

Dr. Caren Grown (Director, Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction Program, International Center for Research on Women)

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



Announcements

The Elaine Bennett Research Prize

The Elaine Bennett Research Prize is given in memory of Elaine Bennett who made significant contributions in economic theory and experimental economics, and encouraged the work of young women in all areas of economics.

The Award is intended to recognize and honor outstanding research by a young woman in any area of economics. The Award will be announced at a session of the American Economic Association Annual Meetings. The Award winner will present a featured lecture and receive all expenses paid to the 2003 meeting.

Nominees should normally be within seven years of obtaining the Ph.D. and should normally be U.S. citizens or permanent residents, or work primarily in the U.S.

Nominations should contain the candidate's CV, relevant publications, a letter of nomination and two supporting letters. The letter of nomination and supporting letters should describe the research and its significance. Nominations will be judged by a committee appointed by CSWEP.

Nominations for the 2003 Elaine Bennett Research Award, including letters and supporting documents, should be sent to:

Joan G. Haworth, Ph.D.
Chair, CSWEP
Economic Research Services
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303

E-mail: jhaworth@ersnet.com
Phone: (850) 562-1211, ext. 117
Fax: (850) 562-3838

Closing date for nominations for the 2003 Prize is September 1, 2002

The Elaine Bennett Research Award is made possible by a donation from William Zame. Tax-deductible donations to the endowment for future prizes are welcome, and should be sent directly to the Chair of CSWEP.

Joan G. Haworth, Ph.D.
Chair, CSWEP
Economic Research Services
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303



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 (January 1, 2002 - December 31, 2002), we urge you to do so.

If you have paid, please pass this on to a student, friend, or colleague and tell them about our work.
Thank you!

NOTICE: STUDENTS DO NOT HAVE TO PAY ASSOCIATE DUES!!!

JUST SEND IN THIS APPLICATION WITH A NOTE VERIFYING YOUR STUDENT STATUS

To become a dues-paying associate of CSWEP and receive our Newsletter, send this application, with a check for \$25 payable to:

CSWEP Membership
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Name _____

Mailing Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

Check here if currently an AEA member _____ New CSWEP _____ Student _____

If you checked student, please indicate what institution you attend _____

CSWEP: People to Contact

General Policy Matters	Joan G. Haworth, Chair Economic Research Services, Inc. 4901 Tower Court Tallahassee, FL 32303 jhaworth@ersnet.com
Routine Matters and Items for Newsletter	Lee Fordham Economic Research Services, Inc. 4901 Tower Court Tallahassee, FL 32303 lfordham@ersnet.com
Dues, Change of Address, Roster	CSWEP Membership Economic Research Services, Inc. 4901 Tower Court Tallahassee, FL 32303 jhaworth@ersnet.com
CSWEP East	Rachel Croson, OPIM: The Wharton School University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, PA 19104-6366 http://wharton.upenn.edu/faculty/crosonr.html crosonr@wharton.upenn.edu
CSWEP Mid-West	Jean Kimmel Western Michigann University Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5023 jean.kimmel@wmich.edu
CSWEP South	Rachel Willis, American Studies and Economics University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill Chapel-Hill, NC 27599-3520 Rachel_Willis@unc.edu
CSWEP West	Janet Currie, Department of Economics University of California - Los Angeles 405 Hilgard Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90095-1477 currie@simba.sscnet.ucla.edu

American Economic Association
CSWEP
c/o Joan G. Haworth, Ph.D.
Economic Research Services
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Nonprofit Org. U.S. Postage PAID Tallahassee, FL Permit No. 9
