



Newsletter

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

Published three times annually

Spring / Summer 2001

In this issue:

- The CCOFFE Experience: Reflections from a Mentor and a Mentee
- One Approach to Balancing Work and Family
- Ms. Mentor Orates To Economists
- Tips on Dual, Not Dueling, Careers
- 2000 Elaine Bennett Award Winner Susan Athey, MIT

Directory of CSWEP Board Members

Beth Allen, Chair

Department of Economics
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455
(612) 624-0204
FAX (612) 624-2080
E-mail: cswep@atlas.socsci.umn.edu

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

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

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

Director, Poverty Reduction & Economic Growth Team
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

W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research
300 S. Westnedge Ave.
Kalamazoo, MI 49007
(616) 385-0435
FAX (616) 343-3308
E-mail: kimmel@we.upjohninst.org

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

Joan G. Haworth

Economic Research Services, Inc.
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303
(850) 562-1211 (ext. 176)
FAX (850) 562-3838
E-mail: jhaworth@ersnet.com

Table of Contents

Features

The CCOFFE Experience: Reflections from a Mentor and a Mentee	3
One Approach to Balancing Work and Family	4
Ms. Mentor Orates To Economists	5
Tips on Dual, Not Dueling, Careers	6
2000 Elaine Bennett Award Winner Susan Athey, MIT	9

Departments, Notes

CSWEP “Brag Box”	3
Regional Meetings	9-10
Call for Papers	9-11
How to Become an Associate	11
CSWEP: People to Contact	12



CSWEP Newsletter

Beth Allen, *Editor*
Jean Kimmel, *Co-Editor*
Liz Pukenis, *Assistant Editor*

The CCOFFE Experience: Reflections from a Mentor and a Mentee - Dr. Jean Kimmel, W.E. Upjohn Institute & Professor Karine S. Moe, Macalester College

The authors first met in March of 1998 when we participated in a Creating Career Opportunities for Female Economists (CCOFFE) workshop at the Midwest Economic Association annual meeting. CCOFFE was developed by Professors Robin Bartlett and Andrea Zeigert, both of Denison University, and funded by the National Science Foundation. The initial CCOFFE workshop was held at the 1998 ASSA meeting, and regional CCOFFEs were held later that year and in 1999.

At our workshop, we were in a four-member team with Jean designated as mentor and Karine as one of the three mentees. In our preparations for the workshop, we anticipated assuming these discrete roles. Instead, the workshop was centered around the idea of *team mentoring*. The benefits of team versus one-on-one mentoring are two-fold. First, on a practical basis, the shortage of senior female economists makes it difficult for younger female economists to secure female mentors. (While male economists can and do make good mentors for women, relatively few of them do.) The team mentoring approach, therefore, allows senior women to provide career guidance more efficiently to young female economists. Second, the team approach builds upon the pedagogical research into cooperative learning in the classroom. The idea is that each member of the mentoring team is equally responsible for the mutual support of the team members. The senior member brings her experience; the junior members bring a commitment to provide feedback and support to the other team members. But every member of the team behaves both as mentor and mentee. In this way, the firm division between mentor and mentee that exists in one-on-one mentoring need not exist in team mentoring. As a result, the burden on the mentor is reduced, but also

the benefit to the mentor is enhanced. The mentor may participate with the mentees in thinking clearly about short and long term goals and making explicit plans to meet those goals. This structure increases the motivation for mid-level and more senior female economists to assume the role of team mentor. And, it creates a more collegial atmosphere within the individual teams, thereby enhancing the mentoring experience for all.

At the workshop, over the course of two days we met in a large group with other teams as well as just with our individual teams. The benefit of the large group meetings was to permit conveyance of some information in a more consistent and efficient manner, and to permit contact across teams. In the individual team meetings, we discussed specific research papers authored by team mentees, and engaged in detailed discussions concerning career hurdles, planning and goals. We also garnered valuable advice on publications, balancing work and family, networking, grant writing, and publishing.

We as a team continued monthly email contact with each other for approximately one year after the workshop. The only real leadership role of the mentor was to pass on the first of each monthly update, thereby reminding the other team members to pass on their updates as well. In our team's case, the senior mentor was in fact only about five years older (in terms of years since PhD), but we found that the lack of a senior superstar mentor was not a handicap. In fact, we feel it was helpful to have a team leader who would herself experience real benefits from the team, both from the planning emphasis and professional contacts. Additionally, the non-superstar may be more accessible and represents a more achievable status, and on a practical note, more

numerous in the academic world than the all-too-rare female superstar.

In the three years since our CCOFFE workshop, the main benefits for us from our team mentoring experience appear to have been in the areas of professional contacts and strategic short and long term planning. At the CCOFFE workshop, we as a team worked through our goals and pinpointed specific actions we could each take to achieve those goals. We applied a time frame to these actions and the result was short-term and long-term plans that were feasible but would require regular vigilance. This was the key contribution of the team: by the continued contacts we were kept on track. We also served as professional contacts for each other, and benefited from the exposure to others across the rank spectrum in the CCOFFE large group meetings.

We left the workshop with short term and long term goals. We cheered each other on as we met the goals, one by one. One year after the workshop, one team member left academia, and the other team members stopped corresponding monthly by email. Although the remaining team members continue to see each other at conferences, we cannot claim to have continued mentoring each other. However, we remain professional colleagues who are comfortable discussing professional issues and goals.

At the time of this writing, Karine is newly tenured in the department of economics at Macalester College, and in an interesting turn of events, Jean has accepted a position to start Fall of 2001 as associate professor without tenure at Western Michigan University. So, will the mentor and mentee switch roles? No, in the spirit of team mentoring, we will continue our current collegial relationship of guidance and support.

The CSWEP "Brag Box"

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

Andrea H. Beller received the Senior Faculty Award for Excellence in Research in the College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign at an awards gala held April 16, 2001. The award celebrates outstanding professional achievement and demonstrated excellence in the area of research. This is only the third time it has gone to a woman in the 17-year history of the award.

One Approach to Balancing Work and Family

Karen Conway, The University of New Hampshire

As I sit down to write about reduced pay arrangements and why they are important, I think back to the other morning. With 10 minutes left before my oldest son had to be at school, I was frantically looking for my daughter's ruby slippers (one simply *can't* go to preschool without them) as my youngest son announced that he had just wet his pants. Miraculously, I got my oldest to school on time and my younger two off to preschool, and then settled into my forty minute drive to work. Or was that *this* morning? Good thing I'm not teaching this semester!

Part of the reason I chose academics is that it seemed like a relatively family-friendly profession. And, in many ways it is—flexible schedules, the ability to work at home, and long winter and summer breaks. My father was a college professor. He was home for lunch most days, could squeeze in an afternoon tennis game, and could take long vacations. However, my father's situation was very different than mine. He had a stay-at-home spouse for many years and lived five minutes from campus. In contrast, I have a spouse who works full-time *and* has a commute of more than an hour each way to work (in the other direction). Neither of us can come home for lunch. In my father's day, many professors had little pressure to publish, although they did have heavier teaching loads. Today, one is judged primarily by one's research record, even at teaching-oriented universities and colleges. I believe that the growing emphasis on research has made the profession less family-friendly. Work interruptions to raise children are more punitive. It is not that difficult to teach a course after five years off; it is very difficult to convince people that you can and will do research after five years off. I admit to making those same kind of judgements when serving on faculty search committees, viewing people less favorably because of holes in their research records even when it was obviously due to family commitments. The truth is, it *is* much harder to restart a stalled research agenda than to prepare or update a course.

All of these contrasts with my father's experience are more likely to cause problems for women. Academic women are more likely to have professional husbands and, because of that, may have long commutes to accommodate dual careers. And then, of course, there is biology. Women have babies, men don't. Pregnancies can be difficult; childbirth, postpartum and beyond are all exhausting. And all of this coincides with the period when women should be making the biggest strides in their career, when "holes" in one's research are the least likely to be forgiven. (Of course, men may be faced with these obstacles as well and, in some ways, they may be more difficult to overcome because society is less supportive.)

I decided therefore, even before I had children, that I would try to reduce my teaching

commitments (and my salary) when the time came. My first baby coincided with my sabbatical—how convenient! My second baby was due in mid-August and so the University gave me the fall semester off. But when I found out I was pregnant with our third child, I knew that I was going to have to reduce my workload for an extended period of time in order to survive. And so I called my department chair immediately. (*I think* we told our parents first, but I'm not sure.)

The arrangement we worked out uses the University of New Hampshire's "pieces of eight" accounting for faculty, whereby each of five courses is counted as 1/8th, and the remaining proportion (3/8ths) is attributed to service and research. We agreed that I would give up 25% of my salary to buy out of two courses a year. This allowed me to spend one semester doing a full load of teaching, and the other catching up on my research. I was expected to carry out the normally expected research and service loads.

This arrangement has worked extremely well for me. I have been able to keep my research program on track and have embraced rather than ducked committee assignments. During my "teaching" semester, my husband takes up the slack, staying home with sick children, doing more day care drop-offs, etc. I take it up during my "research" semester. My "research" semester tends to be in the spring, which also means I can avoid driving to campus on particularly snowy days when my forty-minute commute easily doubles. (This helps with flu season, too!)

The arrangement has had its pitfalls, too. As the first person (to my knowledge) to have such an arrangement, it has been a learning experience for both the University and me. Although my seventy-five percent status is enough to qualify me for full benefits, I had to petition to remain in the bargaining unit (we are unionized) because I was less than 100 percent. Likewise, each year that I'm at less than 100 percent contributes nothing towards sabbatical credit. Our college bylaws were vague in terms of who could vote in faculty meetings and who could serve on key committees. It took time to establish that I could vote, but I had to resign from the School (but not Department—different bylaws!) Promotion and Tenure Committee. Finally, there looms the uncertainty of how this arrangement will be viewed when I come up for promotion to Full Professor. Should the research expectations be higher because I was teaching less? Must I be full-time before I can be promoted and, if so, for how long? More generally, will I be penalized for the "hole" in my teaching much like folks are for "holes" in their publication records?

On a more personal level, I am sensitive to how my arrangement is viewed by my colleagues. Because there is no formal, universal policy, my arrangement is sometimes

viewed as a special deal. Because of this, I think I sometimes overcompensate, wanting to be sure that I do more than enough research and service and yet still feeling apologetic about it. I am embarrassed sometimes to discuss it with those outside my college because I know that others are not so fortunate.

Happily, most of my colleagues are supportive of my arrangement. It is interesting, though, that upon discussion I find they are divided as to why. Some believe that such arrangements should be based on merit and used as a means of rewarding and retaining productive faculty members. This view raises a thorny issue—should faculty members without active research agendas be allowed such an arrangement? Should such arrangements be based on need? Most of my colleagues are sympathetic to my having three small children, a husband who works full-time and commutes to Boston, and a significant commute myself. But what if I lived in town? Or what if I simply wanted to work less for less pay—you know, move to a different point on my supposed budget line? An older colleague of mine has said she finds my arrangement intriguing as a way of rejuvenating herself and developing other aspects of her life. Should the University support that?

The bottom line is that these are issues we should be talking about. Women are increasingly under-represented as one moves up the ranks from graduate student, to assistant professor to full professor. It is not hard to understand why, as revealed by the contrast in my father's career and mine. In a perfect world, male faculty would want these arrangements just as much as females. But the reality is that female faculty more often have the cards stacked against them, and the game could be vastly improved with some flexibility.

Some say that the answer is to buy sufficient child care to permit the year-round 10-12 hour work days necessary for full-time academics with long commutes. Certainly that gives one more time to devote to career. But why must there be only one answer? What about those of us who, at certain points in our lives, don't want to work full-time? Far too many are leaving tenure-track careers altogether, often to become adjuncts, never to return. Others simply scale down what they give to the job but continue to draw full pay, which is unfair to their harder-working colleagues and will come back to haunt them at promotion time.

I am forever grateful to the University of New Hampshire for allowing me to keep the job I love *and* have balance in my life. It would have been much easier for them to just say no. In a profession such as academics that is supposed to be enlightened and progressive, such innovative ways to balance work and family should be observed more broadly. So let's get to work on it.

Ms. Mentor Orates To Economists

Note: Ms. Mentor is an adviser extraordinaire whose perfect wisdom appears in her tome, *Ms. Mentor's Impeccable Advice for Women in Academia* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997). Her Q & A advice column is now published monthly on the *Chronicle of Higher Education's* jobs site (www.chronicle.com/jobs, click on "Ms. Mentor"). Ms. Mentor, who never leaves her ivory tower, channels her mail via Professor Emily Toth in the English Department at Louisiana State University. Her e-mail address is ms.mentor@chronicle.com, but eager questioners should be aware that she rarely answers individual queries outside the column.

Anonymity is guaranteed, and rants and gossip are always welcome.

Q: Is Ms. Mentor needed?

A: Indeed she is, for few women are born with the precise expertise and knowledge to note, interpret, and intuit the peculiar folkways of the patriarchs who dominate academia, politics, finance, and rock music (to name but a few of their fiefdoms). Indeed, many beasts and barriers lurk for professional women—from double standards to poor evaluations to snide comments to sexual harassment to unequal pay to glass ceilings. But Ms. Mentor, who knows all, provides the rhetorical tools and imaginative strategies to transcend and triumph over oafs and bozos.

Q: What can Ms. Mentor do for me?

A: First of all, Ms. Mentor congratulates you on your selfishness. Few women possess enough ego, and far too many retreat behind excuses and stereotypes ("I'm only doing this for my family" or "I'm not a feminist, but...") Be pro-women, be pro-you, and harken to Ms. Mentor, who will tell you about some things to watch for:

- Beware the Early Administration Trap, for it will eat you up.
- Beware the job that requires developing a program instead of publishing your research. Too many women are good girls who do all that they're asked to do—instead of what's going to be rewarded.

- Beware the "Mommy Trap"—the shunting of women to jobs requiring nurturing, nudging, teasing, cajoling, flirting, pleading, and comforting the weak and aiding the troubled.

Women, presumed to be nicer people and less concerned with such crass details as good salaries, are too often pushed toward such fields as "human resources management," while men get groomed for the posts with good pay, prestige, and promotion—and POWER. Men jostle for ranks and favors, and they are the ones who get to play "Whose Is Bigger?"

Women may want to transform that game—but first, they have to be inside the gates. Now, Ms. Mentor does not disdain nurturing. Indeed, she has been known to hold a hand, and once even dried a tear. But she thinks everyone should do some nurturing, while women have the right to be ambitious tough cookies who go for the gold, not just for the gratitude. Ms. Mentor also urges women to laugh at the posturings of the other gender. Suppose, for instance, that you are the keynote speaker on "Women's Economic Equity," and you give a carefully-reasoned, superbly -documented presentation on the importance of paying women what they are worth. You exhort the audience not only to follow guidelines for equal pay, but also to consider justice and equality. Capitalists ought to play fair with their employees, you state.

Your presentation is enthusiastically applauded, and then the first questioner launches into an oration on "Our national parks" or "Our national debt" or "Our national pastime—or why you should invest in the Super Bowl." This oration-question, which often lasts three minutes or more, is rarely germane to the woman's original presentation. The real purpose is to seize the spotlight from the woman speaker (you). This technique is known as "peacocking," and women speakers must be ever vigilant against it. Ms. Mentor suggests packing a peacock feather and waving it—but failing that, women audience members should always giggle when it happens and whisper "peacocking" to one another. Yet Ms. Mentor is also a realist about power. If your chancellor

or your CEO is the peacock, do stifle your laughter—lest you be punished for your impertinence. Snicker quietly to yourself. Keep a kleenex handy.

Q: What else should professional women know?

A: If you are newish to any job, do not be deluded into thinking that powerful people want honest, frank appraisals from their underlings. They do not. Be silent, and let them reveal what they're really up to—which is often at odds with the written rules. In academia, for instance, tenure candidates are officially judged on their teaching, research, and service. But what really matters most is "collegiality," or whether They like you. If They enjoy lunching and socializing with you, they'll want you around for the next thirty years. If not, not.

Q: Has Ms. Mentor said all she has to say?

A: Certainly not, but Jean Kimmel, the learned worthy who invited Ms. Mentor to contribute a snippet to this publication, could use but a sampling of Ms. Mentor's vast store of lore. Ms. Mentor will conclude with a few random but infinitely useful observations on the work life of women:

- If you wear black all the time, no one will remember your name.
- If you chat with and support secretaries and administrative assistants, they will help you with valuable inside information.
- Do keep copious notes and save all professional documents, with copies at home.
- Do not write indiscreet e-mails, for some imp is sure to press the "Reply" key and send your lurid confession ("so hot to trot with the intern") to at least 4000 people all over the world.
- And when you do become a program director, a department chair, a dean, or a queen—keep finding, mentoring, and abetting women. You cannot truly be Ms. Mentor—but you can model yourself after her many perfections.

Upcoming Event

On Thursday October 11, 2001, CSWEP and the National Economics Club (NEC) are co-sponsoring a speaker in their continuing series of quarterly luncheon events in Washington, DC. **Kathleen Cooper**, currently Chief Economist of Exxon-Mobil, who has been nominated to be Under Secretary for Economic Affairs in the Department of Commerce, will speak on a topic to-be-announced. Topic and any changes in the date of the program will be announced on the NEC web page: The luncheon begins at noon, ends at 1:30 p.m., at the Chinatown Garden Restaurant - 618 H Street NW (just east of the H Street exit from the Chinatown/Gallery Place Metro Station). The speech begins at 12:40 p.m. For those who want lunch, reservations are required by 11:00 a.m., October 9th, through the NEC reservations line (703-739-9404). The cost of the luncheon is \$15 for CSWEP and NEC dues paying associates/members, \$20 for others.

Tips on Dual, Not Dueling, Careers

Deborah A. Freund & Thomas J. Kniesner

Deborah A. Freund is Senior Research Associate at the Center for Policy Research, Professor of Public Administration, and Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs of Syracuse University. Thomas J. Kniesner is Senior Research Associate at the Center for Policy Research and the Krisher Professor of Economics in the Maxwell School at Syracuse University. They have been married for 20 years and have a 6-year-old son, William. Both have held tenured faculty positions at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Indiana University, Bloomington, and Syracuse University, and also have worked in government and in the private sector.

Perhaps you are thinking that your current job is not all that great and need a change. Maybe you wish you had a better handle on the organizational ropes to skip versus know in your current employment situation. William Buckley's *God and Man at Yale* is supposedly the source of the characterization of academic fights being so bitter because the stakes are so small. As good economists we claim that the stakes are small in absolute terms but not in relative terms. Try doubling the workload of or professionally neutering anyone in the private sector and see how they react, whether at the minimum wage or the CEO pay grade. We cannot promise that you will be rich and famous as soon as you finish reading, but rather that you will be better off by hearing about many of the issues we have had to confront while managing our dual careers. Although many of our examples are drawn from our experiences as academics in the trenches, we also have experiences in the private and government sectors as well as in senior academic administration to share that may help others avoid many of our personal mistakes.

Thinking About a New Job?

Make it clear in your partner's mind that you both are supposed to be trying to find new jobs. Surprisingly, we have witnessed examples of a couple where one did not tell the other that they were both supposed to be looking for jobs. The result, although not as bad as Cool Hand Luke's when he "failed to communicate," was that person #1 had an unusable job offer because person #2 had not even looked. It is simply not going to happen that an offer will be plopped in #2's lap.

It is also useful to decide what industry, firm, and geographic locations are best suited for you as a couple and how similar do industry, firm, and location need to be between you. Do you both require academic jobs at the same campus? It is fine to be willing to do a long

commute, including across the country, but do not underestimate the havoc it can wreak on your family life as Robert Reich points out in his new book, *The Future of Success*.

Going into a search have a decision rule for how to choose among options. Without comment-ing on the economic dominance of one family utility function over another we offer three commonly used choice-making mechanisms. Some couples use the take turns method. That is, you got to pick where to go last time, now it's my turn to pick. Another is Rawlsian. Pick the pair of jobs that maximizes the job situation for the person with the lower pay. Finally, there is the one that we teach students in labor economics known as the family migration model: go where the sum of the total earnings are greatest.

Be sure that there are any economic gains in the first place on your new jobs, of course. One department chair used to say he disliked hiring labor economists because they asked too many questions about the fringe benefit package. Be careful that the pension contribution and health insurance are not so much worse and net taxes so much higher in your new place that you are actually taking a pay cut overall despite a higher base salary (recent personal experience). If one of you is a high level administrator, have the non-administrator negotiate a minimum raise or you may get none ever again.

Another detail often overlooked when applying the family migration model of decision making is that one person's gains have to be transferable to the other if there are losses to migration for someone. It does no good to have most of your gains be in quality of office and collegial relations if your partner takes a big pay cut.

Do not forget to share the gains from new jobs with your kids too. Give them private or bigger bedrooms or something that makes them better off too for disrupting their lives. If there is nothing you can think of then maybe it is a signal that the move is not a good one for your family. At the same time do not over-estimate the cost of moving so that you stay too long in a bad job situation. We had two dream houses; they can be sold and replicated (or at least substituted for) elsewhere.

An especially thorny issue to many dual job searchers is whether you should tell a potential employer that your mate is also a careerist looking for a job. Our practice has always been one of honesty. If it derails the process for a potential employer to know that you have a partner with a career too then you probably do not want to work there yourself.

Go in knowing that universities are not the least bit savvy at dealing with two career couples. You may have to help them do their job of recruiting you. For example, most universities treat two academic couples as a nuisance rather than a convenience and need explicit convincing. Here is what we tell them. You may as well assume that everyone under 50 whom you would want to hire is part of a two-career situation. What is easier for you: (a) to want to hire person #1 but have to rely on a local medical practice, law firm, or accounting firm to hire person #2, or (b) to have additional control of the hiring decision by controlling the employment situation to person #2 as well? Phrased thusly, two academics are preferred to one academic partnered with a non-university professional. Imagine trying to move a power couple to a university town such as Bloomington or Charlottesville if one is currently a partner in a New York City law firm. Yikes! Make it clear you want separate but equal treatment so to speak. Walk away from any job opportunity when a potential employer refers to one of you as "trailing spouse."

Other tips for successfully changing jobs include not to forget to line up your career calendars such that you have sabbaticals at the same time, for example. (We actually had one dean refuse to let our leaves line up. You know who you are.) If you are giving up a sabbatical on your old job ask that it be replaced on your new one, including the timing of it.

On-the-Job Tips

Now you have moved. Expect to have reduced productivity on a new job for a year while you cycle through the set of activities and all that new personnel and capital to learn how to interact with it best. Adjusting to a new job setting is why most people we know expect a 10 percent salary bump to compensate for the hassle of moving before they start talking raise. Productivity decreases can be minimized if you get in the cue to select research assistants before you move to your new location. Most economists know a good one when they've seen one so you can choose from far away.

Expect to have your partner used as an excuse for a low raise in the future. The same chair who did not like hiring labor economists also used to low ball raises and be up front about it because he did not think the partner would ever leave the university. Where the issue of raises, promotion, and other rewards is based on success, remember that all administrators are bean counters. The only issue is lima, navy,

Continued on page 8

2000 Elaine Bennett Award Winner Susan Athey, MIT

As interviewed by Rachel Croson regarding her work, her mentors and her goals.

The following is the edited interview:

RACHEL: Susan, why did you go into economics? How did you become an economist?

SUSAN: It was accidental. I was a computer science major and I was taking some economics courses in anticipation of, perhaps, going into a computer business someday. One of my sorority sisters, Leslie McFarland Marx, who is now a professor at Rochester, saw that I was taking economics classes and got me a job with her mentor, Bob Marshall. Leslie was two years ahead of me, and she wrote a thesis, took all advanced math classes, applied to graduate school, and got an NSF fellowship. Seeing her go ahead of me really helped me understand what it was all about.

Working as a research assistant for Bob got me excited about research in economics. Bob had had a series of undergraduate mentees, all of whom had gone to graduate school in economics, several women in fact. He hired me to work full-time for him in the summer, advised me on two thesis projects, and helped me with all of my essays. I still keep in touch with him regularly today.

What I liked about economics, early on, was that it was very rigorous and analytical, yet it could be applied to real-world policy problems. When I started working for Bob, I had been working for a government contractor in the computer business. Based on this experience, I wrote a thesis on the regulation of computer procurement, and Bob published a couple of papers on the topic. Later, I was able to watch Bob testify in front of a Senate Subcommittee about a policy change. It was a neat chance to see how theoretical research in economics could influence public policy.

RACHEL: Do you have that kind of relationship with anybody now that you're a professor? Have you been a mentor?

SUSAN: Yes. I've had such great role models with my mentors, that it would be hard to imagine not trying to help out students that I work with. I have worked closely with students at both the undergraduate and the graduate level. My very first year as a professor, I got a group of about twenty sophomores as undergraduate advisees. I got to know that group really well—I took them out for dinner and met with them regularly. That was a really special group. Six students from that class are now in economics graduate school, including four women. Even among the ones who didn't go into academics, there's a woman from that group I still talk to every few weeks, she's like a younger sister to me now. In terms of graduate students, I've also had already some really great experiences. I find helping students through the job market to be especially intense but

exciting. As a junior faculty member, sometimes I felt it was tough to balance the students with my other obligations, but even if it meant missing some more of the little sleep I was getting, the relationships I've formed are well worth it!

RACHEL: Tell me about your research. What are some of the interesting puzzles or some interesting questions that you think you would advise graduate students to work on or you might be thinking of doing yourself?

SUSAN: I've actually worked in a couple of different areas. I've done pure micro-economic theory, as well as empirical work. One topic that I've worked on both theoretically and empirically is auctions. Auctions have been a hot topic for the past twenty years, but I also think they'll be a hot topic for the next twenty years, but perhaps in different ways. There's been a lot of recent, exciting research on market design and auction design, in more complicated settings, for example, multiple-unit auctions. The internet has made it feasible to run much more complicated auctions than we might have imagined 10 years ago. And, we're getting enormous amounts of data from the Internet, so I think auctions will continue to be an exciting topic.

Another area that I've worked on is the study of repeated games, and I've been particularly interested in repeated games where agents have private information about features of the environment that vary over time. For example, colluding firms may get cost shocks or inventory shocks in every period, or you might have a community or group that's getting together to provide a public good, and people may have privately observed costs and benefits of providing that public good. I've been interested in analyzing the question of whether or not agents are able to sustain cooperation and at the same time provide incentives for truthful revelation of this private information in an environment where they can't use money or side payments in order to induce that revelation. My research (which is joint with Kyle Bagwell) shows that if agents can keep track of individual-specific histories, they may find it optimal to induce truthful revelation of information, enforced by providing future favoritism to agents who admit being a "bad" type today; however, if rewards and punishments must apply equally to all agents in a group, optimal collusion typically involves sacrificing truthful revelation, and thus productive efficiency. So far, I've focused mainly on the topic of collusion, but more recently I've been working on applications in other areas, from government policy games to a study of institutions and developing communities.

RACHEL: So that leads to the next question, do you think that your research is useful for

industry, for policy, for regulators?

SUSAN: Yes, I do. In fact, a lot of the past research on collusion and repeated games didn't provide much of a role for the institutions that we see arising in real-world collusive arrangements. For example, we haven't had much of a role for people to get together in a smoke-filled room and discuss the collusive arrangement. We haven't had much to say about how firms decide when they're going to try to make side-payments, or in an environment where that might be costly, why they even need those side-payments—couldn't they find some other way that wouldn't be illegal? My research on collusion suggests a role for communication as a way to coordinate production to low-cost firms; but communication is only valuable if the firms can find some way to reward or punish individual firms, so that the communication is credible. We also show that if firms are fairly sophisticated and patient, that they may not need side-payments; but if they're less patient, then they may use some combination of keeping track of individual histories and side-payments.

RACHEL: What part of your job really excites you? What part of your job do you wake up in the morning and say, "Gosh, I'm so glad I get to do this today?"

SUSAN: I love being in the middle of the research process, or the beginning. Coming up with a new theory, and developing a model, and proving some results, and then changing the model, and getting to the point where you have just the right model and into discovering how it works—just the moment when the model really "sings" to you—is just a "high" that it's hard to match anywhere else. Sometimes I get a hard time from my friends about how hard I work, and sometimes they may be right, but I have to say that that kind of "rush" from solving models is a lot more interesting than a lot of other things that I could think of doing.

The other part that I've really loved is working with students; in particular, mentoring students and watching their careers develop. That gives me a lot of meaning—it feels like the impact that I have there will outlast a lot of the other things that I do. I feel lucky that I've already had the chance to see the effect that I've had on a few students' lives.

RACHEL: What part of the job do you hate? What part of the job do you dread?

SUSAN: Revising papers. I think that the editorial process has just been in a state of some crisis in the last ten years. My colleague Glenn Ellison has recently done some empirical research to support that contention, which I found very validating, given my own experiences

Continued on page 8

Freund & Kniesner . . . Continued from page 6

or garbanzo. Down deep inside is a little calculator for grant money, articles published, students taught or something. Figure out what your bosses count and take that into consideration in negotiation if rewards are important to you. Similarly, beware of bosses who expect you to produce as though you were employed at a top-5 institution but do not want to behave similarly. Any administrator of consequence who wants you to improve your performance will increase your resource base accordingly.

Never take a job in the same department if you can help it. It makes it impossible to be independently evaluated or for the younger person in the couple to grow without being constantly compared.

Do not work so hard that you miss seeing your kids grow up. There are no reported cases of someone on his or her deathbed wishing they had spent more time in the office when they were younger. Do not treat your precious sabbatical as a paid vacation. Use it to grow professionally. Avoid the in-town sabbatical like the plague. Your colleagues will expect you to continue to do informal service such as vetting job candidates. If you are away you will miss the time sink of

hiring and committee work. If there are family considerations that prohibit moving your family away for any period of time then schedule frequent trips out of town for professional advancement to give seminars, work intensively with co-authors or to attend professional economists' meetings. Besides, it will impress the bosses who rightfully want you to do some advertising as part of paying for your sabbatical.

Cherish opportunities for leave without pay and do not reject them out of hand. For one thing, the opportunities to replace your salary elsewhere diminish as you get older. Moreover, "absence makes the heart grow fonder" in personal and organizational relationships. The best way for your colleagues to appreciate what you do for the organization is to have to do it themselves in your stead while you are off elsewhere.

Another way to grow via leave opportunities is to work in another industry setting. Do not work your entire professional life in a college or university. Try the private sector or the government sector for a year. A famous economist once remarked that you will never look at a bordered Hessian the same way after you spend a year in Washington and personal experience says he was right. In his oral history

of the workplace book, *Working*, Studs Terkel finds that persons most satisfied with their jobs see the end product and persons least satisfied have little idea of how what they do fits into the ultimate good or service sold. Working for a consulting firm, drug company, or the Fed will give you the chance to see the end use of economics better and have good stories to tell students when illustrating the importance of an economic concept.

Unfortunately, your boss will probably not see the benefits of what you did while on leave the same way as you do. He or she will wonder why you did not publish more last year even though they encouraged you to go away and enjoy using your lapsed salary. The same holds if you agree to be a temporary administrator such as chair or a program director. The dean will wonder out loud why your research output fell off the last few years, so beware going in when agreeing to be an administrator.

Anyway

In spite of what we have just said, being an economist is a wonderful life although there may be no life after being an administrator.

Athey . . . Continued from page 7

with the process. It can be very hard to sit down and revise a three- or four-year-old paper for the "nth" time. That's so much less exciting than writing new ones.

RACHEL: Do you have any advice for young women researchers—also young researchers in general—but particularly women?

SUSAN: I think it's important to aim high and find role models and mentors. For young women, I think it is also useful to find a few "buddies," and if you don't have other women in your department, or in your field, to find buddies in other schools. Going through graduate school, the tenure process, balancing work and family, are just incredibly stressful, and so it can be very helpful to have sounding boards.

I also think it is important to cultivate your mentors, keep them informed as your career progresses, and make sure they know that you appreciate their help!

RACHEL: So now you can answer my fun question, if you weren't a skilled, white-collar, educated type of worker, what job would you have? What would you be?

SUSAN: Well, I had a lot of blue-collar jobs when I was in high school, in fact. I graduated high school when I was 16, but still needed to earn

money for college, so I had to be creative about finding places to hire me so young. I did all sorts of jobs, including telemarketing for a lawn service, but my favorite job was working in local pizza joints. So I think that running a restaurant would be a fun job to have. That might seem surprising to some of my friends, since I'm not especially domestic in my skills—my refrigerator is often completely empty, and I often eat microwave dinners in my office. But I love organizing people, and there's a lot of "team spirit" among employees of a restaurant. Then there are also business decisions about everything from scheduling to promotions to coupons, competing with your rivals. Thinking about those things as a teenager taught me my first lessons in industrial organization!

RACHEL: Any final thoughts?

SUSAN: Sometimes people ask me about what it's like to be one of the only women in my field. As you know, some fields in economics have a lot more women than others. I can see a huge difference when I go to the empirical industrial organization meetings, where women play prominent roles in all aspects of the field. In microeconomic theory it's just a very different picture. It has certainly created some challenges, and I haven't always been sure where I fit in. But, at the same time, a lot of people in micro

theory have been very supportive. I think that if we can just get more women coming to graduate school with mathematical training and mathematical backgrounds, there is room for them to succeed.

That's one reason that I've agreed to be interviewed by the press a few times, as well as given talks to high school students and written magazine articles for teenagers. Being interviewed by the press has had costs and benefits for me. I've taken some heat (directly and indirectly) from colleagues for doing it, and I find it extremely stressful, since you can't control what the press will say, and they tend to twist things to make the story interesting. But I feel strongly that it is important for mathematically oriented women to get out and be role models if they can. I know that when I was a teenager or in college, it would have made a big difference to me if I had seen a woman in a mathematical field and she had made it sound interesting and exciting and feasible. I only got to this field because I was picked out by mentors to do so—it never would have occurred to me otherwise. So, even though my efforts alone may not make much of a difference, I think it's important to give it every shot so that young women see that it is possible.

Regional Meetings

Midwest Economics Association Meetings

CSWEP-Sponsored Session: Welfare Reform
Session Organizer and Chair: Annie Georges
(National Center for Children in Poverty at
Columbia University)

Traci Mach (SUNY-Albany) and Patricia Reagan (Ohio State University) presented "The Role of Access to Childcare in the Successful Transition from Welfare to Work." This paper examines the relationship between the cost of child care and the availability of regulated and licensed child care spaces on employment for a sample of welfare leavers from the Ohio Closed Cases Study. Mach and Reagan's findings suggest that the employment of welfare leavers is sensitive to both the price and the space availability of child care. The evidence suggests that the cost of infant care is negatively related to employment whereas an increase in the number of available child care spaces increases employment.

Elizabeth Davis (University of Minnesota) and Bobbie Weber (Linn Benton Community College) presented "Holes in the Safety Net? Use of Child Care Subsidies by Working Poor Families in Oregon." Using administrative data for the state of Oregon, this paper focuses on the duration of child care subsidy receipt. The main findings suggest that the median duration of child care subsidy receipts use in Oregon is 3 months. Even though families do return to participate in the child care subsidy program, subsequent duration still remained short at about 3 months. The preliminary findings suggest that employment is a key factor in the participation in child care subsidy program.

Pina Chatterji and Peter Arno (both of Montefiore Medical Center, Albert Einstein College of Medicine) presented "Welfare Reform, Medicaid Disenrollment, and Health Outcomes in New York City." The paper uses data on Medicaid enrollment and ambulatory care sensitive (ACS) hospitalization rates for asthma, pneumonia, and diabetes in New York City from 1994 to 1999. The findings were somewhat mixed. The authors conclude that there is suggestive evidence that the loss of Medicaid coverage may have adverse health effects for children. One of the two Medicaid enrollment measures had a significant impact on asthma hospitalizations for all children; and the authors found a significant impact on pneumonia hospitalizations for infants and young children.

The discussants were Judy Temple (Northern Illinois University), Patricia Reagan (Ohio State University), and Alison Wellington (The College of Wooster).

There were two non-gender related sessions in international economics sponsored by CSWEP at the Midwest Economics Association in Cleveland this year. These sessions, organized by Diane Monaco of Manchester College, focused on the general themes of International Finance, Development and Emerging Economies and International Trade.

The first session consisted of a presentation on "The Financial Sector, Currency Depreciation, and Emerging Economies" by Diane Monaco that examined banking sector behavior and possible connections to currency depreciation. This paper was discussed by Susan Pozo of Western Michigan University. The second paper entitled "Test for Mean Reversion in Real Exchange Rates under the Current Float" by Yingzi Su of Wayne State University, looked at long run real exchange rate determinants using time series methods. This detailed econometric study was followed by a discussion by Sharon Erenburg of Eastern Michigan University. The session concluded with an analysis of the economic development policies in one of the most disadvantaged provinces in South Africa—the Eastern Cape. This critique on "The Role of the Manufacturing Sector in Economic Development in the Eastern Cape" was presented by Noluntu Dyubhele of Vista University-Port Elizabeth, South Africa and discussed by Brian Peterson of Manchester College.

The second session on International Trade included "International Trade in Manufactured Products: A Ricardo-Heckscher-Ohlin Explanation with Monopolistic Competition" by Dalia Hakura (co-author Ehsan Choudhri) both of the International Monetary Fund. This work, which presented an integrated model capable of examining the effects of Ricardian, Heckscher-Ohlin and New Trade Theory explanations on relative exports, was followed by a discussion by Diane Monaco. Julie DeCourcy of Michigan State University explored "Cooperative R & D and Strategic Trade Policy with Bertrand Competition" and found that a country is better off when it allows its domestic firms to cooperate in R&D but foreign

firms benefit even more from this domestic R&D cooperation. This strategic trade policy analysis was discussed by Michael Ryan of Western Michigan University. Finally, the work of Naoko Shinkai of the Inter-American Development Bank entitled "Does the Stolper-Samuelson Theorem Explain the Movement in Wages?" was discussed by Sucharita Ghosh of The University of Akron. This research sorts out the differing predictions of the Stolper-Samuelson and Specific-Factors theorems on the correlation between prices and wages of nonintensively used factors.

Mentoring Roundtable at the MEA Meetings

At this year's Midwest Economics Association meeting, CSWEP sponsored its first annual Mentoring Roundtable. The roundtable title was Work/Life Balance Reconsidered and the organizer and moderator was Dr. Jean Kimmel of the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. The panelists were Professor Catalina Amuedo-Dorantes of San Diego State University, Professor Kristin Keith of University of Toledo, and Professor Pat Reagan of Ohio State University. The intent of the panel was to discuss how we as individuals assess our progress and goals in our work lives and non-work lives, including the obvious interactions and trade-offs between the two. The discussion focused on the pros and cons of taking stock on a regular basis to create the possibility of remedying any perceived problems. The panelists discussed how they had weighed professional and personal interests and goals in their decision-making, and how much importance they placed on planning. Audience participation was enthusiastic, with much discussion of personal differences in professional and personal choices.

Midwest Economic Association Meetings - Call for Papers

The Midwest meeting will be held **March 14-16, 2002** at the Westin Michigan Avenue in Chicago. CSWEP will sponsor two sessions at this conference: a session on Evaluating Social Policies that Target Women and a session on School Reform and School Choice. Please send abstracts of 1-2 pages (including names of authors with affiliation, rank, address, and paper title) by Friday September 14, 2001 to the address given below. Earlier submissions are encouraged. Submissions can be sent via snail mail, e-mail, or FAX. Please note that this submission is separate from any submission sent in response to the MEA's general call for papers, but any papers rejected here will be passed on to the MEA. CSWEP will also hold its second annual Mentoring Roundtable at the 2002 MEA meeting. Please see the MEA program for further details.

Professor Jean Kimmel
Department of Economics
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo MI 49008-5023
phone: (616) 387-5535
fax: (616) 387-3999
e-mail: Jean.Kimmel@wmich.edu
Through the summer
fax: (616) 343-3308
e-mail: kimmel@we.upjohninst.org

Eastern Economics Association Meetings

CSWEP-Sponsored Sessions at the Eastern Economics Association Annual Conference February 23, 2001, New York, NY

CSWEP held two sessions at the Eastern Economics Association Annual Conference, both chaired by Barbara M. Fraumeni of the Bureau of Economic Analysis.

Gender and Labor Market Outcomes

The first paper, "Does Attending Predominantly Female Schools Make a Difference? Labor Market Outcomes for Women," by Sherrilyn M. Billger (Union College) explored the effects of attending predominantly-female high schools and women's colleges on labor market outcomes. The results suggest that predominantly-female schooling has lasting positive effects on labor market outcomes for alumnae. Girls who are raised Catholic, who are nonwhite, or who live in urban areas are more likely to enroll in predominantly-female schools. Though women who attended these schools when younger are no more or less likely to enter the workforce, they do earn a 10.3% higher wage than women who attended coeducational high schools. Controlling for selection into predominantly-female schools and into the workforce, the estimated wage differential rises to 13.7%. Alumnae data from a college that was chartered as a women's college and later became coeducational is then used. It is found that the alumnae were less likely to pursue many traditionally male-dominated majors and occupations, but were not less likely to attain advanced degrees after the admission of men into the college.

The second paper, "Gender, Ethnicity, and Occupational Choice in Germany: Is It Who You Are or Who Your Parents Are?" by Amelie Constant and Tayyeb Shabbir (both of the University of Pennsylvania) looks at the occupational choice of men and women in Germany, both Germans and immigrants. It investigates the effects of family background on occupational choice in Germany as well as the impact of traditional human capital investments. Occupations are classified as menial, blue collar, craft, white collar, or professional. Using the 13th wave of the German Socio-Economic Panel (1996), the analysis examines choices of German and immigrant men and women 16-60 years old who are not in the military, in training, or self-employed, controlling for standard human capital variables and geographic location. Other variables include marital status, children in the household, and family background. The research finds that both German and immigrant women are being sorted into white collar or professional jobs. In general both male and female German and immigrant individuals with more education choose higher ranking jobs. Germans are more likely to choose occupations similar to their fathers' occupation, when their father is in the white collar category. In stark contrast, guest workers occupational

choice is rather influenced by their parents' education and not by their fathers' occupation.

The third paper, "Better to Marry Than to Earn? Examining the Male Marriage Premium" by Jennie Wenger (The CNA Corporation) examines the 'ideal worker' hypothesis for the male marriage premium. Williams (1999) suggests that marriage enables some men to perform as 'ideal workers'—specifically those men whose wives stay at home or work in flexible, part-time jobs. Other researchers have disagreed with this hypotheses, looking instead at household specialization, productivity differences, and the education of wives. This paper uses a basic labor supply model to consider the implications of the Williams' theory. Wage equations taking into account the ability of some individuals to perform as 'ideal workers' are estimated using CPS data. After correcting for the wife's education and labor force participation, the male marriage premium is negative and generally small. However, results differ substantively by race. In general, a wife's education level is an important determinant of her husband's wage but there is some evidence that men whose wives are employed respond by working fewer hours; this is consistent with Williams' hypothesis.

"Saving, Poverty and Self-sufficiency

The first paper, "Poverty Within Households: Measuring Differences Using Non-Monetary Indicators," by Sara Cantillon (University College Dublin) and Brian Nolan (Economic and Social Research Institute) uses non-monetary indicators for the exploration of differences in living standards within households. Conventional methods of analysis of poverty assume resources are shared so that each individual in a household or family has the same standard of living. This paper employs deprivation indicators of the type used in recent studies of poverty at the household level to measure differences between spouses in a large Irish sample. In the sample survey in 29% of the cases the wife had a higher deprivation gap using all items than the husband and in 25% of the cases the opposite was true. The results based on a more restricted set of five items which appear to be strictly personal in nature (an overcoat, two pairs of shoes, a hobby or leisure activity, new clothes, and a holiday), in 25% of the cases the wife had a higher deprivation gap using all items than the husband and in 17% of the cases the opposite was true. The paper concludes by discussing the limitations of these indicators for the purpose at hand and pointing to the need to develop more sensitive deprivation indicators designed to measure individual living standards and poverty status which can fit within the framework of traditional poverty research using large samples.

The second paper, "Job Training Under Welfare Reform: Evaluating Clients' Interest in

Nontraditional Training," by Cynthia Negrey (Institute for Women's Policy Research) reports results from interviews with 68 welfare case managers, employment service vocational counselors, job training administrators, and job training instructors as well as 163 job training students currently or recently enrolled in programs at community colleges and elsewhere in seven cities nationwide. The main focus of this paper is the portion of the interview data that examines how gender is related to job preferences among students, particularly nontraditional jobs for women. The results indicate that, while a minority of women are interested in any single nontraditional blue-collar job, the percentage of women who expressed interest in such jobs is larger than the percentage who received recommendations to train for such jobs from caseworkers. In fact, a majority of women in the sample expressed interest in at least one nontraditional job, and 35 percent expressed interest in at least three nontraditional jobs. Thus, while women's interest in nontraditional jobs seems limited, it is greater than that suggested by caseworkers' perceptions and the pattern of caseworker recommendations. This implies that more focused counseling and assessment might increase women's interest in nontraditional jobs and their enrollment in nontraditional training programs.

The third paper, "The Effect of Precautionary Motive on Household Saving and Fertility" by Tansel Yilmazer (University of Texas at Austin) uses a life cycle model that incorporates precautionary motives for saving, to investigate the relation between saving and fertility decisions of households. The 1983-89 panel of the Survey of Consumer Finances is used to examine the interaction of income uncertainty and changes in the number of children on the saving behavior of households at different stages of the life cycle. The empirical evidence shows that households with higher income uncertainty are less likely to have a child at a point in time. Income uncertainty actually reduces the savings of the households with either high or low wealth holdings and does not affect the saving behavior of the others. Results also indicate that having a child reduces the savings of the households with heads below age 31 and raises the savings of the households with older heads. The same argument is true for the children living in the household. Younger households with children save less whereas middle age households with children save more relative to the comparable households without children. The difference between the savings of households with and without children increases with the number of children.

Eastern Economic Association Meetings - *Call for Papers*

CSWEP will be sponsoring two sessions at the Eastern Economics Association meetings; one on gender-related research and the other on research in experimental and behavioral economics. The meetings will be held **March 15-17** at the Park Plaza Hotel in Boston, MA. The sessions will be held on Saturday, March 16th at 11am and 2pm.

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, 2001** to:

Rachel Croson
1322 Steinberg Hall-Dietrich Hall
OPIM: The Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6366
e-mail: 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 www.iona.edu/eea.

How to Become an Associate

CSWEP



THE COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE ECONOMICS PROFESSION

CSWEP depends on all of its dues-paying associates to continue its activities. In addition to publishing the Newsletter, we maintain a Roster of women economists that is used by associates, employers, organizations establishing advisory groups, and the like. We also organize sessions at the meetings of the AEA and the regional economics associations and publish an annual report on the status of women in the profession.

If you have not paid your dues for the current member year (July 1, 2000 – June 30, 2001), we urge you to do so.

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

NOTICE: STUDENTS DO NOT HAVE TO PAY ASSOCIATE DUES!!! JUST SEND IN THIS APPLICATION WITH A NOTE FROM A FACULTY MEMBER VERIFYING YOUR STUDENT STATUS

To become a dues-paying associate of CSWEP and receive our Newsletter and Roster, send this application, with a check for \$20 payable to:

CSWEP
c/o Dr. Joan Haworth
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Name _____

Mailing Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Check here if currently an AEA member _____

Check one: Renewal of CSWEP associate _____ New CSWEP associate _____ Student _____

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

CSWEP: People to Contact

General Policy Matters	Beth Allen, Department of Economics University of Minnesota Minneapolis, MN 55455 cswep@atlas.socsci.umn.edu
Routine Matters and Items for Newsletter	Liz Pukenis, Department of Economics University of Minnesota Minneapolis, MN 55455 cswep@atlas.socsci.umn.edu
Dues, Change of Address, Roster	Joan Haworth, Membership Secretary Economic Research Services, Inc. 4901 Tower Court Tallahassee, FL 32303 jhaworth@ersnet.com
CSWEP East	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 W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research 300 South Westnedge Avenue Kalamazoo, MI 49007 kimmel@we.upjohninst.org
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
CSWEP Washington	Caren Grown, Director, Poverty Reduction & Economic Growth Team International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) 1717 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Suite 302 Washington, DC 20036 grown@icrw.org

American Economic Association
CSWEP
c/o Professor Beth Allen
Department of Economics
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Nonprofit Org. U.S. Postage PAID Mpls., MN Permit No. 155
