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CSWEP Mission Statement

CSWEP was founded in 1971 to eliminate discrimination against women, and to redress the low representation of women in economics, finance, and related fields. CSWEP is based on the principle that economics is a woman's field as much as it is a man's field. It is comprised of women and men in the diverse areas of the profession - in academia, government, business, CSWEP works to assure that women's issues are considered in the committee work of the American Economic Association (AEA), makes an annual report to the AEA on the status of women in the economics profession, and, in other efforts to promote the advancement of women in the economics profession.

Resolution Adopted by the American Economic Association

Adopted December 29, 1971

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

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

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

c) Every employer, academic or otherwise, may discriminate against qualified women economists as candidates for positions, or for promotion or tenure, or for assignment of duties and responsibilities.

d) Salaries, fringe benefits, and facilities and resources for research for women shall be the same as those for men in the same position and rank.

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

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

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

IV. RESOLVED that the annual Economic Review carry, in each issue a report on meetings, whether academic or professional.

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

VI. RESOLVED that the Executive Committee request that the College of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and the University of California, Berkeley, provide publicized child-care arrangements at future sessions.

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

CSWEP, In Retrospect

Carolyne Shaw Bell - Wellesley College Professor Emeritus - CSWEP Chair, 1972-74

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

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

The report was a session on the program at the 1973 annual meeting in New York; the panel discussion became a lively debate centered on tape. Professor Milton Friedman was invited to join the panel did not realize the identification of role prejudice and the ensuing discrimination as a "false social learning process," and of the existence of a "better production function," move both enthusiastically. The article refused any discussion of quotas or goals, for when gross disproportionality between men and women exists in a given occupation or profession precise members of the committee were the most significant: "where there is clearly not enough, the simplest and most necessary guideline is more." (p. 1053.)

Four tools, he said, could help increase the blantly low proportion of women in the economics profession. These were information, permission, rewards, and sanctions. Member Barbara Reagan, in the second part of the article, spelled out the Committee's ideas. We had struggled for almost two years about how to implement the resolutions and we believed that all economists, not just CSWEP, should take the 1972 Association action extremely seriously. We have been pushing for over ten years to get these resolutions reprinted, to inform everyone of the commitments made by the professional association for itself and for all economists, including specific methods of affirmative action.

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

My conclusion from this brief historical summary is that CSWEP accomplished highly useful "consciousness raising." At the time I was totally unsympathetic to this notion; I refused to accept the premise of "the movement" that women were helpless, trapped by their husbands, their fathers, their male
Women in the Academy
Rebecca M. Blank - Northwestern University - CSWEP Chair, 1994-96

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

The good news is clear from the data. The National Science Foundation indicates that the share of new Ph.D.s in economics awarded to women has increased from 10 percent in 1974 to 25 percent in 1993. The American Economic Association's (AEA) annual survey of Ph.D. granting departments indicates that the share of untenured but tenure-track assistant professors who are female has risen from 7 percent to 25 percent over these years. The share of full tenure professors who are women has risen much more slowly, from 2 percent to 5 percent. CSWEP's own (and more complete) survey of Ph.D. granting departments indicates that over 8 percent of full tenure professors are women. Further, there is evidence that a growing share of published papers are authored or co-authored by women and that women's participation in annual meetings of the AEA has risen.

While these gains should be celebrated, there are still ongoing problems faced by women in academic economics. Most notably, women are still very scarce on most economics faculties. A number of departments continue to have no tenured women. In 1996-97, the CSWEP survey indicates that there were only 108 tenured women in 98 Ph.D.-granting departments. With an average department size of 25, these departments averaged 3 women at all ranks. For many purposes the gender of one's colleagues may be irrelevant. But most women who have been among only one or two in their department will testify that they regularly experience a sense of isolation, even if this is just the lack of someone who will laugh at some of the same jokes. It has also been suggested that the lack of women on economics faculties is one reason fewer young women are attracted to the field. However, recent research (Carr and Rusen, 1995, or Neumark and Cardelci, 1996) suggests the effects on students of having a role model of the same gender may not be large.

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

Women are now spread more evenly across disciplinary topics than they used to be, although they remain over-represented in the empirical subfields and under-represented in the more theoretical subfields. The academic jobs in which women are located also remain skewed. There are relatively more women in teaching colleges and in jobs at lower-ranked universities. Barber (1992) discusses differences in the placement rates of Ph.D.s by sex and field. Women in economics job market. Singell and Stone (1993) and McMillen and Singell (1994) investigate the determinants of first job placement and subsequent promotion between men and women in economics, finding evidence consistent with the theory that women are "underplaced" in academic jobs.

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

A major institutional issue that continues to affect women in academic positions more than their male colleagues is the problem of career timing. Launching a career as an academic economist means extended schooling, following by a minimum of 6 hard-working years to receive tenure. The position of tenure is one that economists are exactly when many women are also in their prime childbearing years. As recent participants in a CSWEP survey, many of us are also in our prime childbearing years. As recent participants in a CSWEP survey, many of us are also in our prime childbearing years. As recent participants in a CSWEP survey, many of us are also in our prime childbearing years.
Women in Business
Sharon P. Smith - Dean, College of Business Administration, Fordham University

The anniversary of the founding of CSWEP offers an appropriate occasion to consider how women have fared in business during the past twenty-five years. This question has often been addressed through an analysis of the size and sources of wage differentials between the sexes and how they may have changed over time. I will not address that dimension of the issue here. Instead I will consider whether women have prospered in terms of their access to positions of power and influence in business. To do so requires looking not only at what progress women have made in business but also at what changes have occurred in business that has affected both men and women. It is helpful to begin by viewing women's position in business from a cultural perspective at the time CSWEP was founded and then reflecting on how and why that position has changed over the intervening years.

Some twenty years ago, Rosabeth Moss Kanter characterized the corporate world of that time as a culture in which "Women populist organizations, but they practically never ran them, especially the large business and public establishments."1 The segmentation of office work into male managerial jobs and female clerical jobs both contributed to and, in part, a consequence of the idealization of what Kanter termed the "masculine ethic" that is, a philosophy that institutionalized, set aside emotional and personal con

siderations in making analyses and decisions as "necessities for effective management."2 Such occupational segregation reflected both individual choice in career and discriminatory practices in hiring and promotion. It also reflected a pipeline problem: although women's labor participation was increasing dramatically, women were not moving in great numbers into the sorts of educational programs that were attractive to corporate employers and thus were not eligible for many of the entry level positions. In 1972, for example, only 9.1 percent of the undergraduate degrees in business and 3.9 percent of the master's degrees in business were awarded to women. Whatever the original source of the segmentation, it was clear, as Kanter observed [p. 264-287], that correcting it by moving women into positions of influence and authority would not only heighten their commitment to the organization but would also signal the more effective use of a major untapped resource. The quality of worklife would improve throughout the organization, as the hostility that often accompanied blocked opportunities would be eliminated and the talents of all the human resources would be used more effectively.

The business world has changed dramatically in the ensuing twenty-five years. Faced with the challenge of global competition, American business has restructured and re-engineered itself totally. These changes have transformed what constitutes a career path and have shifted the responsibility for movement along that path. Career paths are no longer clearly defined: they may be vertical, horizontal, diagonal. They may move across functional boundaries as well as across companies to positions according to larger needs and opportunities. They may move among corporations, entrepreneurial operations, and non-profit organizations. Thus the career path is now the responsibility of the employee to manage rather than in the control of the employer. Indeed most individuals can anticipate having multiple careers over a lifetime. Networks and alliances are of paramount importance, not only for individuals as they manage their careers but also for firms as they retain the loyalty of their customers.

Women's labor force participation rates continue to rise. Women have dramatically altered their chosen areas of study. In 1995 (the latest figure available), 47.6 percent of baccalaureate business degrees and 39.4 percent of master's degrees in business were awarded to women. Women are now moving into very different occupations and industries than they did twenty-five years ago, though they continue to shoulder a disproportionate share of household responsibilities. In the corporate world, their increased movement into accounting has been particularly remarkable. However, these changes do not mean the segmentation and powerlessness that Kanter observed have been eliminated. A glass ceiling and the incentive for other corporations to act similarly. Then, perhaps, the ceiling will eventually be eliminated and men and women will have equal opportunity for their talents to be recognized and rewarded accordingly.
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CSWEP 6 Newsletter

CSWEP 7 Newsletter
Robin L. Bartlett - Denison University - CSWEP Chair

The stage was set at the Annual Business Meeting of the American Economic Association (AEA) December 29, 1970 in Cobo Hall, Detroit, Michigan. A resolution was offered to have a session at the 1971 meetings on the role of women in economics. And the rest is history. According to an interoffice memo (Chamberlain 1972) of the Ford Foundation from Mariban C. Chamberlain in reply to Bartlett's letter, dated January 11, 1971, there were lively gatherings at the AEA annual meetings held December 29, 1970 and December 28, 1971. First, Barbara Bergmann chaired the session titled "What Economic Equal- ity for Women Requires." The overflow audience spilled into the corridors and was very sympathetic. Later that same day another gathering took place to form the Caucus of Women Economists and to draft a resolution to present at the AEA's business meeting for action.

Two Yale graduate students jointly chaired the meeting. Over 100 men and women — established and novice members of the profession alike — were present. The seven items spilling out in the original draft of the resolution began with: "Resolved that the AEA endorses the principle that sex discrimination and inequality have no place in the Economics profession." The Caucus wanted discrimination against women in the profession to stop and form an AEA to facilitate that effort. Carolyn Shaw Bell, Katherine Coman Professor of Economics at Wellesley College, was elected president of the Caucus and was designated to present a modified resolution to the Association's business meeting. Interestingly, this version of the resolution began: "Resolved that the American Economic Association declares that economics is not a man's field." John-Kenneth Galbraith chaired the resolution committee. One of the first amendments to the resolution was to add "exclusively" to the first sentence (AEA 1971). Six of the original items were passed almost intact. The creation of a roster of women economists was tabled for later action. Token opposition arose. The timely remarks of Robert Eisner and Andrew Beaumont, however, expedited the process.

Item II of that resolution gave birth to the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession. President Galbraith (AER 1972) appointed Carolyn Shaw Bell and eight other members: Walter Adams, Francine Blau, Martha Blau, Kenneth Boulding, Collette More, Barbara Reagen, Myra Streber, and Phyllis Wallace. Mariban Chamberlain then grunted a resolution that would finance CSWEP through its formative years.

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

To ensure that potential employers could identify available women economists, CSWEP established a roster. A roster provides employers with the list of over 7000 women economists and their areas of expertise. To ensure that everyone in the job market has all the available information about potential jobs, the AEA subsequently began the publication of Job Opportunities for Economists with JOE. Anti-pedestrian rules, formal and informal, were dropped in many departments in order to enable both members of a couple to belong to a faculty (see AEA Resolution 1, part I). Over the years CSWEP has published a newsletter three times a year that contains a variety of "how to" articles to help women pursue their professional goals.

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

In 1993, CSWEP began collecting its own data not only to obtain an accurate count of women in academic jobs, but also to determine the number of women in the pipeline. While significant progress has been made with regard to the percentage of women in academia, a serious gender imbalance still exists at the upper ranks. Information gathered by CSWEP's 1996 annual departmental questionnaire shows that 20 percent of all departments graduate students who earn a baccalaureate in economics in the Ph.D-granting institutions are women. Thirty percent of those entering Ph.D. programs are women. Twenty-eight percent of the AB's are women and 24 percent of the Ph.D's earned in economics go to women. Only 20 percent of the jobs at Ph.D-granting institutions, however, go to women. At non Ph.D-granting institutions, 26 percent of the new hires are women. As Rebecca Blank notes, the number of Ph.D. students hired in tenure track positions at the country's Ph.D-granting institutions has improved noticeably, but the number of new hires is still not on par with that of men.

While previous efforts of CSWEP have been helpful, it will take many more years before the serious imbalance between the status of men and women in economics is rectified. The 25th anniversary of CSWEP provides the opportunity to evaluate its success with respect to the original items in the founding resolution. In its new mission statement, CSWEP members have reaffirmed their belief that economics is a woman's field as much as it is a man's field; their commitment to represent women's views within the Association; and their determination to help women succeed in the profession. To these ends, CSWEP is in the process of taking several new initiatives. First, since publishing and grant-writing are keys to the professional success of young faculty members, CSWEP wrote a grant to the National Science Foundation (NSF) to hold a series of workshops that will bring junior and senior women together in teams to catapult more women into the tenured ranks and above. The CSWEP board and several senior women in the profession are trying a new approach to facilitating the progress of younger women through the ranks. Forty junior women and eight senior women are scheduled to meet for the first time after the AEA meetings to work in teams to cooperatively help each other with publishing, grant-writing, networking, and balancing life choices. Working together on each other's projects will speed up the process of feedback and review. At the regional meetings, CSWEP board members will also facilitate similar workshops. We hope to reach over 100 female economists in the course of the coming year.

Second, CSWEP's regional representatives are making connections with women in their areas and with regional associations. CSWEP is making a concerted effort to reach out to women who are not at the large research institutions. The newsletter has more articles on teaching and research at institutions other than those granting Ph.D.s. The newsletter will also begin a new section where researchers will share their experiences. CSWEP is currently exploring the establishment of a prize in economics that would celebrate the work of a woman economist.

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

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

1997
Robin Bartlett, Chair
Maureen Cropper
Hali Edison
Catherine Ekel
Henry Farber
Joyce Jacobson
David Laband
Arleen Leibowitz
Nancy Marion
Olivia Mitchell
Susan Poo
Kenneth Small
Joan Haworth

1995
Rebecca Blank, Chair
Kathryn Anderson
Robin Bartlett
Maureen Cropper
Ronald Ehrenberg
Joni Hersch
Irene Luzie
Lisa Lynch
Nancy Marion
Kenneth Small
Ann Witte
Joan Haworth

1994
Rebecca Blank, Chair
Kathryn Anderson
Robin Bartlett
Ivy Broder
Linda Edwards
Ronald Ehrenberg
Jo Anna Gray
Irene Luzie

1993
Elizabeth Hoffman, Chair
Robin Bartlett
Rebecca Blank
Ivy Broder
Linda Edwards
Jo Anna Gray
Irene Luzie

1992
Elizabeth Hoffman, Chair
Rebecca Blank
Ivy Broder
Linda Edwards
Jo Anna Gray
Marilyn Horng
Ethel Jones
Frank Levy

1991
Elizabeth Hoffman, Chair
Rebecca Blank
Marilyn Horng
Ethel Jones
Frank Levy
Shelly Lundberg
Dorothy O'Neill
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion

1990
Cynthia Gordon, Chair
Rebecca Blank
Elizabeth Hoffman
Marilyn Horng
Shulamit Kahn

1989
Frank Levy
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1988
Elaine Cohen
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1987
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1986
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1985
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1984
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1983
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1982
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1981
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1980
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1979
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1978
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1977
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1976
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1975
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1974
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1973
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Roger Noll
Jennifer Reinganum
Leigh Tesfatsion
Barbara Wolfe
Myra Wooders
Joan Haworth

1972
Carolyn Shaw Bell
Roger Noll
Combating Role Prejudice and Sex Discrimination

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

1. Role Prejudice as an Economic Problem

It is well recognized among econo-
mists that arbitrary discrimination in the labor market creates a general economic loss. Where certain people are excluded from jobs for reasons which have noth-
ing to do with the performance of the jobs themselves, the loss to consumers plus the loss to those who are excluded is greater than any gain to those who are favored. There is now copious literature on this subject.

It is less well recognized that dis-
crimination among existing members of the labor force is only a special case of a much larger process of role learning and role acceptance, which begins almost from the moment of birth. It is not merely that skills are learned, as in Adam Smith's famous passage about the porter and the philosopher, but images of possible roles on the part of both the role occupants and the role demanders are likewise learned in the long process of socialization. The existing division of labor at any one time, therefore, may re-
flect "role prejudice"—that is, a learning process by which certain irrelevant bio-

gical or genetic characteristics of indi-
viduals are associated with the type of roles they are expected to play. Some genetic distinctions are significant for role performance, but many are not and yet are widely believed to be signifi-
cant. These beliefs are products of a false social learning process, which can be a source of economic loss even larger than false discrimination within an existing labor market. Dismissal in an exist-
ing labor force indeed emerges as one consequence of the much larger process of the development of role prejudice.

Role prejudice tends to develop when there are genetic differences in the human population which are observable but are not necessarily significant for role performance. We see this clearly by con-
templating those genetic differences which are associated with various physical characteristics, such as height or color of hair, and are therefore socially invisible. Some of the blood types are perhaps an example. In ordinary life we are quite unaware of a person's blood type. Conse-
quently, it can be safely assumed that there is no role prejudice against blood types of different kinds, unless these hap-

pen to be associated with other charac-
teristics which are socially visible. For the major types, this association is fairly 

simulated. Consequently, we would be very sur-
prised to find a distribution of blood types in any occupational group or income 
group of any size which is markedly differ-
ent from the distribution of blood types in the population as a whole.

For any particular distribution of ge-
netic characteristics, it is clear that we can postulate "no-prejudice proportions" in all the different occupations and struc-
tures of society. In the case of the socially 

invisible and irrelevant characteristics mentioned above, the no-prejudice pro-
portions, subject to random variation, in any group of society would be expected to be the same as the proportion of the characteristic in the society as a whole. If there were any case—and I most confess I have not been able to think of one—of a genetic characteristic which is relevant to role performance but which is socially invisible and not in the information syste-

m, then the existing structure of pro-
portions of the characteristics in different occupations might not be the same as the proportions in society as a whole, and those occupations which this invisible characteristic favored would have a larger proportion than in the society as a whole, but this would still constitute a no-prejudice dis-

tribution. Paradoxically enough, without knowledge there can be no preju-

dice; without some knowledge, there can be no false knowledge.

Role prejudice may easily arise where there are highly visible and relevant genetic characteristics, such as sex, race, height, size, color, and so on. Historically these have frequently been perceived as having a significant influence by more or less arbitrary and different roles. But this relevance tends to be exaggerated, because a rational ten-

dency to economize information can eas-
ily produce the irrational process of stee-
typing and false knowledge.

The genetic division of the human race into men and women qualifies in most societies as the major form both of discrimination in the existing labor force and of role prejudice. This is not surpris-
ning, as the genetic difference between the sexes is far greater than it is among the races in terms of the structure of infor-
mation of the genetic code. There is one role—indeed—that of bearing children—is which there is 100 percent genetic speci-

fication between the sexes, in the sense that no men will be found in the childbearing population. The very social vis-

ibility of the division between the sexes, moreover, makes it a prime candid-

ate for role prejudice, which creates a huge reservoir of false knowledge, false education, and false learning processes. All are costly to society in exactly the same sense that an unknown and unutilized natural resource is costly in the sense of opportunity forgone. We, oddly enough, think of role prejudice as a large natural resource which can be mined by the development of true knowl-

dedge and proper training processes to the benefit of the whole society.

Where the sex distinction is com-

pletely irrelevant to role performance, role prejudice can be said to exist where-
ever there are substantial deviations from the 50 percent rule—that is, 50 per-

cent sex in the occupation—this be-

ing assumed to be the proportion of the sexes in the total society. The difficult 

case, of course, is where there is some ge-
netic foundation for partial role differen-
tiation. It is the case between the 50 

percent and 100 percent that are diffi-
cult, and in these cases there is often no 

information system—at the moment at any rate—which can inform us as to the exact proportion of the sexes in different occupations. We are dealing here with pure and unadulterated role prejudice. Fortunately, however, we do
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not have to know where the exact position of the ideal proportion is if the exist- ing proportion clearly represents a gross disparity of interest. The social policy we do not have to know exactly where the ideal lies. We merely have to identify those cases in which the devia- tion from the ideal is so considerable that we can find wide agreement as to the desirable direction of change. At the bot- tom of the argument, one lever, the way which is up, even though one may not know exactly where the top of the mountain lies. Maximizing is an illusion, but bet- terment is not.

It is the contention of the Ameri- can Economic Association Committee on the Status of Women in the Econom- ics Profession (the Committee) that there is gross disproportionality in the propor- tion of women to men in the economics profession, and especially in university teaching, as revealed in the data which have been collected. Fortunately, we do not have to argue whether the differences between women and men would result in a no-proportionality proportion of women in the economics profession. Either 50 percent or 60 percent when the actual proportion is less than 10 percent. This gross disproportionality, of course, arises from sources in the long histories of the human race, most of which are outside the economics profession. However, it does arise from the discipline of economics from setting in motion processes which will raise its proportion of women. We are a sector of the knowledge industry and a group of people concerned with optimi- zing sources of unnecessary economic loss. Only if we are successful beyond our wildest dreams will we live up to the vastness of the waive of ignorance and false learning, will it be necessary to raise the ques- tion as to whether we have gone too far.

The critical question, therefore, is that of the "betterment production func- tion," as it might be called. The social indicator of betterment is in this case clearly an increase in the proportion of women in the profession, especially in those branches where the proportion is least. If the rate of change of this propor- tion is regarded as the product, the ques- tion in: "What are the inputs which pro- duce this output, and particularly, what are those inputs which can be most easily expanded and that have the highest mar- ket productivity? We might also look at the changes in those inputs which have the highest mar- ket productivity and which can be contracted. Four broad classes of inputs may be named: Information, Persua- sion, Rewards, and Punishments.

1. Information

Information properly organized changes the images of the world of people who receive it and consequently changes their behavior. There are two aspects of the information process - theoretical structures and information about fact. Better theoretical structures are an essen- tial ingredient in the advancement of knowledge, and in this particular case it is important that the theory of role preju- dices, as outlined above, should be widely recognized as a legitimate extension of economic and social theory. One of the great economies of the fact of prejudice is the spread of the idea of prejudice. Once it is recognized as a theoretical construct, the facts of prejudice have been invested with a kind of plausibility that makes them extremely visible. The improvement and elaboration in detail of the theory of role prejudice is still an important task for the future. Coupled with a wider appreciation of the theory, the development of statistical information, case studies, and a con- tinuing series of social indicators can serve as a constant criticism of what is false in the existing theories of the world and a reinf- orcement of what is true. It is tempting to think of every advance in knowledge as the result of a combination of new theoretical insights with new information collection and processing procedures. In social systems, however, knowledge does not merely reflect the world - it changes the world. And in this case particularly, the more we know about role prejudice, the less there is likely to be. Getting lost is one way to improve one's knowledge of the terrain, but studying a map is a better way, and diminishes the amount of getting lost.

2. Persuasion

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

A problem of particular difficulty is that of irrelevant and uncorrelated sources and attitudes, even in the academic and intellectual community, which is sup- posed to be on its guard against irration- ality. The relations between the sexes are in this case of particular tightness and are unfortunately all too difficult to distinguish. The improvement and elaboration in detail of the theory of role prejudice is still an important task for the future. Coupled with a wider appreciation of the theory, the development of statistical information, case studies, and a con- tinuing series of social indicators can serve as a constant criticism of what is false in the existing theories of the world and a reinf- orcement of what is true. It is tempting to think of every advance in knowledge as the result of a combination of new theoretical insights with new information collection and processing procedures. In social systems, however, knowledge does not merely reflect the world - it changes the world. And in this case particularly, the more we know about role prejudice, the less there is likely to be. Getting lost is one way to improve one's knowledge of the terrain, but studying a map is a better way, and diminishes the amount of getting lost.

3. Rewards

It is widely recognized in the learn- ing process that positive and negative payoffs are of great importance. Every economist is familiar with the propo- sition that any human activity which is rewarded above some neutral level will expand and those which fall below this will contract. The structure of knowledge and values in the human mind, likewise, grows towards its own more positive payoffs and away from the less positive and negative payoffs. It is by constructing a reward structure that so- ciety is most likely to achieve change. The rewards may be internal or external. Our own applause, as Paul Samuelson suggested, may indeed be the greatest reward of all. No economist, how- ever, can deny the significance of exter- nal reward, whether the appliance of oth- ers or those more tangible things, such as subsidies, tax remissions, and price changes. Certain economists, notably psycho- logists seem to agree that rewards are more successful than punishments in the learning process, it seems harder to legit- imize a reward structure. A suggestion, for instance, that dues paid by members of the American Economic Association should be reduced if the organization or department to which they belong had a high proportion of women might be hard to legitimate, even though it might be effective. Nevertheless, the search for reward structures should go on.

4. Sanctions and Punishments

Punishments always seem to have been easier to legitimize than rewards, perhaps because of a belief that they are cheaper, in spite of much evidence that they do not contribute as much to learning. Nevertheless, there is one extremely good reason for the use of sanctions. In the case of public goods and public bads it is well recognized by economists that legitimated threat of some kind is essen- tial if we are to avoid some "tragedy of the commons." Private reward structures, such as patents and copyrights, ap- proach the conditions of a private mechanism, are particularly well adapted to the provision of private goods, but are poorly adapted to public goods, where without government assistance the collec- tive production of public goods, the provision of public goods would simply not be provided in adequate amount. Private reward mechanisms are not adapted to dealing with public bads such as pollution, of which role prejudice is a prime example, in the sense that everybody is somewhat diminished by it. The "free- loading principle" applies here, for it there is no project which will pay the individual to not participate in a collective sacrifice required for the increase of a public good or the diminution of a public bad. To think purely private rewards and ex- hortations for the diminution of role prejudice is rather like trying to finance a government with purely voluntary contributions.

To say that sanctions are necessary does not mean to deny that there are acute problems both in the quantity and the quality of sanction, and that bad sanc- tions may be worse than no sanctions. This, however, does not excuse us from the search for good sanctions, which must not be larger than necessary, must be cred- ible, legitimate, precise, equitable, and so on. Sanctions should call on violators and not on the innocents; they should be ap- propriate - that is, any punishment should fit the crime - and it should be recognized that, like all décrets, pun-ishments are most successful when they are not carried out. Economists will rec- ognize, however, that no system of sanc- tions can be perfect and that there has to be some kind of tradeoff between the per- fection in the system of sanctions which will inevitably lead to some failures of both justice and deterrence, and the failures of not to do all the little social bads of the fun- damental general principle - that where there is clearly not enough, the simplest and most necessary guideline is "more." In what follows we spell out in detail this essential principle.

---

* This report is published pursuant to a resolution adopted by the members at the Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association, December 28, 1971. In providing for establishment of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession, the resolution specified that "in general findings, conclusions, and recommendations shall be published by the American Economic Association upon the Committee's request" (Anam. Econ. Res. Pol., May 1972, p. 470). This report has not been considered or approved by either the Executive Committee or the membership.

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

2 "The difference between the most distasteful characters, between a philosopher and a common street pest, for example, seems to arise not so much from nature, as from habit, custom, and education" (p. 137) Adam Smith.

Reprinted with permission from American Economic Review, December 1972, pp. 1389-1393 (this is Part I of the full report published there on pp. 1389-1391).
Letters to the Editors

Response to "Enhancing the Attractiveness of Research to Female Faculty" by Janet Thornton, Ph.D. (Hamph-Duquesne University)

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

Regarding specific proposals:

(1) Stopping the Tenure Clock during a year in which a child is born or adopted. Stopping the tenure clock is a great way to reduce the pressure to publish in a year. By reducing one's workload at home dramatically increases. However, stopping the clock has to mean STOPPING THE CLOCK. If tenure committees just expect an additional year's work every time the clock is stopped, it defeats the purpose of the policy. My previous employer permitted the tenure clock to be stopped an unlimited number of times. Upon learning this, a male economist commented, "That's terrible. Now junior women faculty will have babies every year to avoid coming up for tenure. 'Tis a sad thing when economists use economic reasoning."

(2) Paid Parental Leave. The paper is a full-time student at a research university. This option allows parents to use their allotment to pay conference-related daycare expenses. This option is less likely to have substantial cost implications for the college/university because the budget allocation for travel is fixed. However, it might reduce the amount of unused travel funds. Providing additional travel allocations to parents who must take children to conferences does increase costs, but is justifiable as a resource that facilitates a faculty member's ability to work.

(3) Compensating Workload. Let's address the cause of the problem - not the symptoms. If women are a scarce resource on college/university faculties, then instead of reducing research or teaching demands, Administrators should focus on ways to allocate the resource most productively. Does every single college committee have to have a woman on it? Probably not. Eliminating these types of constraints would allow more women to limit and focus their service work just as their male colleagues do. We primarily earn respect in our profession through research. By reducing a woman's scholarship requirements or she can perform more college service, a school might improve her chances at tenure or promotion. Unfortunately, the woman's reputation is diminished by this time allocation.

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

Thoughts on Research Preference by Kevin Leppel

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

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

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

CSWEP Activities at the 1998 AEA Meeting

January 3-5, 1998 * Chicago, Illinois

Business Meeting and Reception

Business Meeting: Hyatt - Water Tower
25th Anniversary Celebration and Reception: Hyatt - Gold Coast Room

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

Hospilaty Room

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

Hyatt - Water Tower Room (Fri.)

The hospitality room will be open on Saturday, January 3, and Sunday, January 4, from 7:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., and on Monday, January 5, from 2:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. A complimentary continental breakfast will be available from 7:30 to 9:00 a.m. each day. Beverages will be available in the afternoon, except Monday.

CSWEP Sessions

Roundtable Discussion Session
- Social Security Reform: How Will Women Fare?
  Time: January 3, 2:30 p.m.

The Newsletter encourages letters to the editor that are not published. Please indicate on your letter that it is intended for publication.

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

(5) On Campus Childcare. An employer should ask itself: "What does our faculty need to work most productively?" Scientists get expensive lab equipment because they need them to work productively. Economists may get expensive computers or paid research assistants for the same reason. Faculty who are parents of young children typically find that this resource allows them to work more productively. In my own case, during a year while I was actually living on CAMPUS, my two children were at different daycare facilities, at opposite ends of the city. (One child was enrolled in a Montessori program that didn't take babies. The best quality care I could find for a 16-month-old.) Although my home was a 4 minute walk from my office, I spent an hour in the car every morning and afternoon doing the day care shuttle. On-site day care would have saved 10 hours/week that I could have devoted to other activities.

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

Locations: Hyatt - Regency Ballroom D
Panel includes: Coeditor Reимерs, Chair, (Hunter College/CUNY), Theresa Devine (Congressional Budget Office), Edith Hewitt (St. Mary's, Washington, D.C), Karen Holden (University of Wisconsin-Madison), Marjorie Honig (Hunter College/CUNY), Marilyn Monroe (Urban Institute) and Steven Sandell (Social Security Administration)

Gender-Related Sessions

* Development in the Labor Market for Women
  Time: January 4, 2:30 p.m.
  Location: Hyatt - Columbus Hall 249D
  Chair: Joyce Jacobson (Wayne University)

* Documenting Economic Women (Congressional Budget Office), Leslie Stratton (Virginia Commonwealth University), Amy Audickkinson (Welles Consulting), Katherine Terrell (University of Michigan)

* Paper: Donna glitter (Southern Methodist University), Chaiatt Silin (University of Houston), Karen Lombard (University of Miami), "Employment of Married Women;"
Debora Viola (United States Military Academy), Casey Wardynski (United States Military Academy), Dean Dudley (United States Military Academy), "Women in the Labor Market and the Effects on Military Compensation"; Karen Mumford (University of York), "Men, Women, and the Hiring Function"; Elizabeth Brainerd (Williams College), "Women in Transition: Changes in Gender Wage Differentials in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union"

* Gender and Risk Aversion
  
  **Time:** January 3, 10:15 a.m.
  **Location:** Goldkist Room
  **Chair:** Kathryn Shaw (Carnegie Mellon University)
  **Discussants:** Kip Viscusi (Harvard Law School), Andrea Kahle (Federal Reserve Board), John Tauras (National Labor Organization), Anamandia Lussad (Dartmouth College)

  **Papers:** Catherine Eckel (National Science Foundation and Virginia Polytechnic), Philip Grossman (University of Texas-Arlington), Nancy Lutt (Federal Trade Commission and Virginia Polytechnic), V. Pavliachko (Stanford University), "Playing It Safe: Men, Women, and Risk Aversion"; Vicki Rajabifard (Colorado State University), "Women, Risk Taking, and Pension Decisions"; Leslie Papke (Michigan State University and NBER), "How Are Participants Involved in Their Account Plans? Evidence from a Pooled Individual Account Pension Plan"; Amanda Sudan (Federal Reserve Board of Governors), "Gender Differences in the Allocation of Assets in Retirement Savings Plans"

  **Women and Retirement Issues
  
  **Time:** January 5, 10:15 a.m.
  **Location:** Hyatt Grand Ballroom D North
  **Chair:** Olivia Mitchell (University of Pennsylvania)
  **Discussants:** Pamela Lepore (Urban Institute), Lillian Perin (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, HHS), Rebecca Lusardi (University of Wisconsin), Richard Johnson (Rutgers University)

  **Papers:** Marjorie Honig (Hunter College-CUNY), "Married Women's Retirement Expectations: Do Pension and Social Security Matter?"; M. Mellick Price (Virginia State University), "Married Women's Retirement Decision: Does Husband’s Health Matter? Evidence from the Second Wave of the HRS"; Sharmia Choudhary (Social Security Administration and SUNY Cortland), "Marital Status and Lifetime Earnings: Outlook for American Women"; Kathleen Davis (University of Massachusetts), "The Effects of Pension System Reform on Female Retirement: Evidence from Denmark"

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

  **Location:** Omni Balboa C North
  **Chair:** Hali Edison
  **Discussants:** Linda Goldberg (Federal Reserve Bank of New York), Angela Redish (University of British Columbia), Caroline Betsis (University of Southern California), Sara Calvo (World Bank)

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

  **Human Capital Accumulation and Growth
  
  **Time:** January 4, 10:15 a.m.
  **Location:** Hyatt Columbus
  **Chair:** Dan Newton (National Science Foundation)
  **Discussants:** Patricia Pollack (Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis), Shohrtah Majnon (Western Michigan University), Lani Poitier (World Bank), Gerhard Glomm (Michigan State University)

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

  **Economic Fluctuations: Savings, Investment, and Wages
  
  **Time:** January 6, 8 a.m.
  **Location:** Hyatt-Buckingham
  **Chair:** Susan Fu (Western Michigan University)
  **Discussants:** Jane Baot (University of Virginia), Nancy Jankiwieck (Colorado State University), Jane Brehm (Wharton School), Shohrtah Majnon (Kohn Buston University)

  **Papers:** Anamandia Lussad (Dartmouth College), "On the Importance of the Precautionary Saving Motive"; Tami M. Whited (University of Delaware), Joanne Doyle (James Madison University), "Uncertainty, Investment, and the Implications of Inaction: An Empirical Analysis"; Beth Anne Williams (Federal Reserve Board) and Marcella Ewens (Federal Reserve Board), "Nominal Wage Rigidity and Real Wage Cyclicalities"; Erica L. Graham (Federal Reserve Bank of New York), Mark E. Schweitzer (Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland), "Inflation's Omen and Real Effects in the Labor Market"

---

**Creating Career Opportunities for Female Economists: COFFE**

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

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

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

**Eastern - Daphne Kenyon, Department of Economics, Simmons College, 300 The Fenway, Boston, MA 02115, 617/521-2387, dkenyon@asof.com**

**Western - Joni Hersch, Department of Economics & Finance, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY 82071, 307/766-3258, jhersch@uwyo.edu**

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

**Southern - Catherine Eckel, National Science Foundation, Economics Program, 4200 Wilson Blvd., Suite 905, Arlington, VA 22230, 703/306-1753 (ext 6981), ceckel@nsf.gov**
Getting on the Program at the January 1999 AEA Meeting
Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession Sessions

Now is the time to think about submitting an abstract, or a proposal for an entire session, in order to participate in the AEA's annual meetings on January 1-3, 1999, in New York.

CSWEP generally organizes several sessions each year. A subset of the papers presented in these sessions are selected for publication in the May 1999 issue of the American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings.

For 1999, we expect to organize sessions in two areas:

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

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

If you are interested in presenting a paper, please submit an abstract which includes (1) objectives; (2) background; (3) methodology; and (4) results/expected results. Attach a separate cover sheet listing (1) name; (2) affiliation; (3) mailing address, e-mail address, phone and fax numbers; and (4) the appropriate JEL classification code.

Abstracts should be submitted by February 1, 1998 to:
Robbin Bartlett, CSWEP Department of Economics Denison University Granville, OH 43023
Inquiries call 614-367-6704; fax 614-367-6148 Bartlett@denison.edu

Abstracts in other areas, or proposals for entire sessions, should be sent as soon as possible, but no later than February 1, 1998, to:
Professor D. Gale Johnson Department of Economics University of Chicago 1126 East 59th Street Chicago, IL 60637

Please mark envelope "AEA Meetings 1999"
Edith Penrose, 1915-1996

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

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

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

Her chief contribution in economics was her book The Theory of the Growth of the Firm published in 1959. The book presented a convincing challenge to the neo-classical assumption of firms maximising profits. Instead, it perceived growth to be the goal and profits the instrument. In recent years, interest in her ideas has revived and the book was reprinted in 1995. She was also noted for her work on economic development and the international oil industry. Her main published contribution was her seminal book The Large International Firm in Developing Countries published in 1968. This was the first major book on the industry by an academic economist and it presented a brilliant analysis of the underlying economics behind the operation of international oil companies, particularly in the Middle East. Her later work on the industry in numerous articles added significantly to this analysis providing insight and understanding. In addition, she published extensively on economic development issues, often with the Middle East as the focus of attention. She was always more interested in the impact of economics on people rather than on the methodology of analysis and she increasingly expressed dismay at the direction in which mainstream economics appeared to be moving.

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

How to Become an Associate

CSWEP

THE COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE ECONOMICS PROFESSION

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

If you have not paid your dues for the current member year (July 1, 1997 - June 30, 1998), we urge you to do so. Questionnaires and dues reminders were mailed in September to associates.

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

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

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

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

Name ____________________________

Mailing Address ____________________________

City ____________________________ State __________ Zip __________

Check here if currently an AEA member _____

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

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

Check here if you wish a copy of the Special Reprint Issue ______

The Special Reprint Issue of the newsletter contains reprints of ten articles designed to help women economists advance in the profession. The cost for non-paying members is $8.00.