



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

Spring/Summer 2006

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



Board Member Biography Nancy L. Rose

The path that led me to become a professor of economics at MIT is paved by luck, labor, and love. High school debate awakened a life-long interest in public policy. Through much of my undergraduate experience at Harvard, I assumed that being interested in policy issues meant a government major, law school, and ultimately Washington, D.C. Sampling an industrial organization course with Richard Caves, who was a fabulous professor, led to a "minor" diversion. By the time I added courses on regulatory economics and econometrics, I was hooked! In economics I found the rigorous analytic frameworks needed to evaluate policy alternatives—crucial in the fast-changing world

continued on page 12



Board Member Biography Donna Ginther

Life as a Peripatetic Economist

I have benefited from an unconventional education and career path as an economist. I started college at Marquette University as a communications major with a vague interest in a political career. I took macroeconomics my second semester, and it was the most difficult class I had ever encountered. I was fascinated by the complexity and challenge of economics and how the course material related to the real world. During my sophomore year of college, I left Marquette to live in Washington, D.C. and work on Capitol Hill while taking evening courses. Seeing the political process first-hand, I realized that politicians spend most of their time squabbling over the allocation of scarce resources. To understand how the world works, I determined that I must understand economics. I

continued on page 13

In Memoriam Carolyn Shaw Bell (1920-2006)

CSWEP is saddened to report the death of Carolyn Shaw Bell, CSWEP's first chair, on May 13, 2006. This newsletter is dedicated to Carolyn's memory. Her impact on the advancement of women in the economics profession is far-reaching and ongoing. For insight into her many contributions see the Winter 2005 and Fall 1993 CSWEP newsletters at www.cswep.org/newsletters.htm

TOP TEN TIPS FOR JR. FACULTY ON JUMPSTARTING YOUR CAREER

—by Daniel S. Hamermesh, University of Texas at Austin

1. Send your thesis and post-thesis articles off to journals quickly. It takes on average more than 18 months from submission to fi-

continued on page 15



Q&A with Claudia Goldin

—by Sharon Oster

Claudia Goldin is the Henry Lee Professor of Economics at Harvard University, and is the 2005 recipient of the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award.

Can you tell us about your early experiences in Economics as a beginning undergraduate and what led you to decide to go to graduate school in Economics?

Until my college years the only career I considered was as a scientist. I had the good fortune to go to the Bronx High School of Science and to attend a high school sum-

continued on page 14

CONTENTS

Nancy L. Rose Biography: 1, 12

Donna Ginther Biography: 1, 13

Top Ten Tips: 1, 15

Q&A with Claudia Goldin: 1, 14–15

Feature Articles: Research Careers
Outside of Academics: 3–11

CSWEP Sessions at the Eastern Economic
Association Meetings: 16

CSWEP Sessions at the Midwest Economic
Association Meetings: 16

Southern Economic Association Annual
Meeting CSWEP Sessions: 17

Western Economic Association Annual
Meeting CSWEP Sessions: 17

Call for Papers: 18

Announcements: 18–19

Upcoming Regional Meetings: back cover

Introduction to Symposium on Research Careers Outside of Academia

3 Introduction by Katharine G. Abraham

4 Working as a Research Economist at the RAND Corporation by Julie DaVanzo

6 Working as a Research Economist at the UpJohn Institute by Susan N. Houseman

8 Working as a Research Economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia by Loretta J. Mester

8 Working as a Research Economist at the Bureau of Labor Statistics by Anne E. Polivka

DIRECTORY OF CSWEP BOARD MEMBERS

Lisa Lynch, Chair

Fletcher School of Law and
Diplomacy
Tufts University
160 Packard Avenue
Medford, MA 02155
cswep@tufts.edu

Joan G. Haworth, Membership- Chair

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

Katharine G. Abraham

University of Maryland
1218 LeFrak Hall
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 405-1004
FAX (301) 314-7912
kabraham@survey.umd.edu

Rachel Croson

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

Donna Ginther

Department of Economics
University of Kansas
Summerfield Hall
Lawrence, KS 66045-7585
dginther@ku.edu

Gail Hoyt

University of Kentucky
335D Gatton Business &
Economics Bldg.
Lexington, KY 40506-0034
(606) 257-2517
FAX (606) 323-1920
ghoyt@pop.uky.edu

Lori Kletzer

Department of Economics
University of California, Santa Cruz

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

Anna Paulson

Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago
230 South LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60604-1412
Anna.Paulson@chi.frb.org

Karine S. Moe

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

Sharon Oster

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

Ann Owen

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

Nancy Rose

Massachusetts Institute of
Technology
Department of Economics
MIT Room E52-371B
Cambridge MA 02139
(617) 253-8956
FAX (617) 253-1330
nrose@mit.edu

Richard Startz

Department of Economics
University of Washington
Box 353330
Seattle, WA 98195-3330
startz@u.washington.edu



From the Chair

The fourth regional mentoring workshop of CEMENT, our National Science Foundation funded project, was held in conjunction with the Midwest Economic Association meetings on March 26th and 27th, 2006. We had nineteen participants who were matched by teaching and research interests to groups and mentors. I would like to thank all those involved in this workshop especially the workshop coordinator KimMarie McGoldrick (University of Richmond), Rachel Connolly (Bowdoin College), Kelly Noonan (Rider University), Catherine Kling (Iowa State University), Jill McCluskey (Washington State University), Jenny Minier (University of Kentucky), Martha Starr (American University), Lynne Pepall (Tufts University) and William E. Becker (Editor of *Journal of Economic Education*). Many thanks as well to John Siegfried and the American Economics Association for their continued support and assistance on this project. We expect to be able to sponsor at least one more workshop. For updates please check our website www.cswep.org.

I would like to alert you to our plans for the CSWEP sponsored sessions in Chicago, IL in January 2007. This will be a special year since we will be celebrating 35 years of CSWEP activities. At Chicago we will have four gender-related sessions including "Getting Ahead: The Determinants of Professional Success," "Issues in Family/Household Decision Making," "Understanding the Gender Gap in Wages" and "Gender Implications of Social Welfare Policy Choices." In addition, we will have one session on "Long Run Growth" and we will sponsor a panel discussion entitled "Looking Down the Pipeline: Female Economists in the Making." We hope to see you in Chicago and join in the 35th anniversary celebrations!

Planning ahead, remember to submit your abstracts to CSWEP if you would like to be considered for the 2008 ASSA meetings in New Orleans. We are sponsoring three gender-related sessions and three non-gender related sessions on development economics. Please e-mail a cover letter (specifying to which set of sessions the paper is being submitted) and a copy of a one- to two-page abstract (250–1000 words), clearly labeled with the paper title, authors' names and contact information for all the authors by January 12, 2007 to cswep@tufts.edu.

I also want to remind you about the Joan Haworth Mentoring Fund, a program that supports the professional advancement of women economists by providing funds for senior women to engage directly in the professional development of junior women. Further information is provided at <http://www.cswep.org/mentoring/MentoringFund.htm>.

Finally, CSWEP wants to hear from you. I encourage you to send me announcements of grants received, promotions and/or tenure decisions, and new appointments so that we can put them in our brag box. You can email them to me at cswep@tufts.edu.

—Lisa M. Lynch

What is CSWEP?

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

CSWEP NEWSLETTER STAFF

Lisa Lynch, Editor
Katharine Abraham, Co-editor
Anne Hurst, Assistant Editor
Karine Moe, Oversight Editor
Larry Clarkberg, Graphic Designer

Introduction to Symposium on Research Careers Outside of Academia



—Introduction by Katharine G. Abraham

As demonstrated by the experiences of this issue's symposium contributors, it is entirely possible to pursue a successful research career outside of academia! Each of the four authors has spent most of her work life in a nonacademic job—Julie DaVanzo at the RAND Corporation, Susan Houseman at the Upjohn Institute, Loretta Mester at the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia and Anne Polivka at the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In these positions, each has made important research contributions and earned respect as a research economist.

The right nonacademic position can offer significant advantages, especially for an economist who is interested in empirical topics and policy questions. These advantages, as described by the symposium contributors, may include excellent computing facilities, exceptional research assistant support, unusual access to interesting data, a critical mass of colleagues with similar interests and, early in one's career, more time for research than many assistant professors enjoy. Other aspects of their jobs also have been a source of satisfaction to the symposium contributors—the public service dimension of working at the Fed and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the opportunity for involvement with interdisciplinary teams at the RAND Corporation, and the connections to policymaking that come from working at a policy-oriented “think tank” such as the Upjohn Institute.

In certain respects, a nonacademic job may be more flexible than a position as a university faculty member. Several of the contributors mention the option for part time work available to research staff employed by their organization. This option was particularly important to one of the contributors in helping her to balance work and family during the years when her children were young, while preserving the opportunity to return to more full-time research work at a later point in time. The contributors also comment on the advantage of not being subject to the time path for research productivity dictated by the academic tenure clock.

Along other dimensions, a nonacademic position may be less flexible. In these jobs, research projects generally must relate in some way to the organization's mission. At a private research “think tank,” the need to obtain outside funding for research projects also may constrain the type of research that is undertaken. And research staff outside of academia, especially those who work in government, often are less free to set their own schedules than are university faculty members.

While a nonacademic position may not be for everyone, the symposium contributions make clear that there is a world of opportunity outside of academia to do intellectually stimulating and rewarding research work.

Working as a Research Economist at the Rand Corporation

—by Julie DaVanzo



The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit institution whose mission is to “help improve policy and decisionmaking through research and analysis.” I began working at RAND many years ago as a part-time research assistant during my first year of graduate school (at UCLA) and became a full-time staff member upon getting my PhD. Working at a research institution such as RAND provides one an opportunity to concentrate on research. Because research is the company’s business, the resources for research (computing facilities, access to data, research assistance, colleagues with similar or complementary interests and skills) are superb.

Types of Research, Publishing Opportunities

There are many different types of research done at RAND. Some researchers at RAND, such as those in the Labor and Population Unit, of which I have been a part, do types of research that are very similar to applied work done at academic institutions; the funding sources (e.g., grants from NIH) and publication outlets (top academic journals) are the same. One difference is that many of the projects RAND conducts tend to be larger and more interdisciplinary than those at universities. (Also, relatively few RAND projects are solely theoretical.) For example, I have been engaged in projects that have fielded and analyzed large household- and community-level surveys in developing countries. In these I have worked with researchers from many different disciplines, including sociology, health sciences, statistics, and anthropology. I have published in a diverse set of journals, including the *Review of Economics and Statistics* and the *Journal of Development Economics*, the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *The Lancet*, and *The Atlantic Monthly*. Other RAND work is supported by contracts that may provide researchers with less latitude and less opportunity for outside publication, but nonetheless the chance to work on important policy issues. No particular type of work is necessarily rewarded more than another when performance is reviewed. (Performance reviews are conducted annually at the beginning of one’s career at RAND.)

RAND is divided into divisions and units that together span a wide array of topics—ranging from various aspects of

defense and national security (e.g., manpower issues, acquisition policies) to health, education, labor and population, science and technology, criminal and civil justice, among others. It is not uncommon for a researcher to work in several of these areas. While many of the projects are on the U.S., RAND has conducted projects in and on many different parts of the world. I, myself, have worked on projects not only in the U.S., but also in Malaysia, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Cameroon, and Qatar, among others. Not being tied down by teaching responsibilities provides more flexibility to visit these research sites.

RAND researchers can either work on projects that others have developed that need staff, or they can develop their own projects. People typically begin by doing the former and move toward more of the latter as they become more experienced. Projects must fit RAND’s mission as doing “research in the public interest,” and unless the work is classified (as indeed some of the defense and national security work is), the findings must be made available not only to the client but also put into the public domain. RAND traditionally has not done proprietary work (only available to a single client). Otherwise, there are few restrictions on the types of projects that RAND staff are allowed to pursue. But other than on one’s own time (and who has much of that?), one can only do research that some funder is willing to pay for.

In the past, dissemination of RAND research was through hard-copy written reports. As is true nearly everywhere, more and more of it is now available through the web. RAND has a number of dissemination “products,” ranging from working papers to very polished monograph reports and books. All official RAND documents go through a rigorous peer review process very similar to that of a top academic journal. In the review process, particular attention is given to the scientific quality and objectivity of the research. RAND prides itself on being a think tank that is not associated with a particular point of view. Official reports are professionally edited by a skilled group of in-house editors. Another in-house group of professionals, known as “research communicators” (people with advanced degrees in English, communications, journal-



ism, and the like), is available to help prepare pieces, e.g., policy briefs and briefings, for policy audiences. Journal articles are perfectly acceptable products of projects if this is okay with the client.

Opportunities to Teach and Work with Students

RAND has a graduate school—the Pardee RAND Graduate School (PRGS)—that offers PhDs in policy analysis. PRGS has produced more PhDs in policy analysis than any program in the world. RAND staff can teach at PRGS (or other local universities, such as UCLA), and a number do. PRGS students are available to work on RAND projects. We also have several postdoctoral training programs, which give RAND staff additional mentoring experiences and provide projects the opportunity to include talented young researchers (who are available to projects at no cost, because the fellows' salaries are covered by their stipends). For the last several years, I have directed our program in postdoctoral training in Population Studies and the Study of Aging, which is funded by NICHD and NIA.

Working Conditions

What counts at RAND is that you successfully complete your projects. Hours are completely flexible (the building is open 24 hours a day 365 days a year). Working part-time is an option if that is of interest, and the atmosphere is informal. We don't need to "dress up" unless we are hosting a client.

RAND has a number of different sites. Our headquarters and largest office is in Santa Monica, California (overlooking the Pacific Ocean), but we have long had an office in the Washington, D.C., area, and now have one in Pittsburgh as well, providing a lower cost-of-living option for staff. We also have three offices in Europe (in Leiden in the Netherlands; Cambridge, England; and Berlin, Germany) and also one in Doha, Qatar. I have collaborated with staff in all of these offices except Berlin. Some staff have transferred from one office to another, or spent a stint of time working in another site.

All of our time must be charged to projects. Every two weeks, we fill out of time sheet, and, if one is working full time, all 80 hours must be charged to some project

task number or another. There are some institutional funds for supporting professional development, e.g. attendance at conferences, participation in review groups (e.g., NIH study sections), participation in professional committees (e.g., panels or committees of the National Academies of Sciences), or for finding work when just beginning at RAND or in the case of a temporary gap in funding, but the vast majority of time needs to be charged to projects. Just as with real estate, where it's "location, location, location," working at a place like RAND it's "funding, funding, funding." If one can find or develop projects that one likes, it's a terrific place to be. If not, one may end up working on projects that are not as personally or professionally rewarding, or, at the worst, may find oneself out of work. There is no tenure.

Life After RAND

Researchers who have left RAND have gone to all types of different next jobs. A number of economists have gone on to have very successful careers in academia, in economics departments, public policy schools, or schools of public health, for example. Others have gone on to work in the government. Some have gone to international organizations such as the World Bank or to NGOs or the private sector. In all cases, I think their experiences at RAND have poised them very well for their next positions.

I have worked with researchers from many different disciplines, including sociology, health sciences, statistics, and anthropology.

Working as a Research Economist at the Upjohn Institute

—by Susan N. Houseman



I have spent most of my career as an economist in a non-profit research institute, and, like the other authors writing for this symposium, will give a perspective on work outside academia. I also will address a concern common among women contemplating job options: balancing work and family. I have four children. Much of my story is about structuring a job that allows me to stay active in research, spend time with my kids, and position myself for the future when they are grown.

I have spent most of my career as an economist in a non-profit research institute, and, like the other authors writing for this symposium, will give a perspective on work outside academia. I also will address a concern common among women contemplating job options: balancing work and family. I have four children. Much of my story is about structuring a job that allows me to stay active in research, spend time with my kids, and position myself for the future when they are grown.

Some Background: Why I Became an Economist

For much of my time in college I was under the illusion that I would join the Foreign Service. I studied abroad my third year, taking international relations courses and learning French. During that year, however, I came to realize that I liked neither politics nor foreign languages. Rather, what really interested me were the economic aspects of international relations. When I returned to the University of Virginia for my senior year, I started taking lots of economics classes.

I am indebted to two professors, Ron Warren and Art Snow, who pulled me aside and encouraged me to go to graduate school in economics. By that time, however, it was too late to apply to graduate school for the following year, and Ron Warren helped me land a job with a consulting firm in Washington, D.C. I spent two years there, largely working on evaluations of government programs and making up my mind to pursue graduate economics studies.

Academic v. Non-Academic Research Position

I received my Ph.D. in economics from Harvard in 1985 and took my first job at the School of Public Affairs at the University of Maryland. At the same time, I was a visiting scholar at the Brookings Institution. This seemed like an ideal set-up for someone with my interests, and I thoroughly enjoyed the interdisciplinary and policy-oriented environments at Maryland and Brookings. But, I only stayed for four years. In 1989, following a joint job search with my husband, I moved to the Upjohn Institute for Employment Research in Kalamazoo, Michigan, a non-profit research institute focused

on labor market issues. This position has worked well for me, and I have been in it ever since.

The transition to Upjohn was easy for me. I had been hired because of the research I was doing at Maryland and Brookings, and I continued working on those projects. Through the years I have enjoyed great freedom to define my own research agenda. The research I do here is probably little different than what I would have chosen to do had I stayed in a policy school. I believe this position has worked well for me because my own interests are so closely aligned with the mission of the institute where I work.

Being at a non-academic research institute can have some advantages over an academic institution when it comes to doing policy research. Researchers at “think tanks” often have a better understanding of government programs and better connections to policymakers. My research has benefited tremendously from the institutional knowledge of my colleagues and from access to specialized data that affiliation with my institute affords.

In addition, non-academic research organizations typically are more focused on reaching the program administrators and policymakers that might use their findings. There is a strong bias in economics departments to publish in refereed journals read almost exclusively by other academic economists. Untenured economics faculty, even in policy schools, would be ill-advised to devote much time to any other type of publication. Although researchers in non-academic institutes do publish in academic journals, they also generally are encouraged to write for a broader audience.

One of my greatest concerns about leaving the University of Maryland was losing academic connections, particularly because my move was not only to a non-academic institution but also to a small city. These problems, which I admit are real, were greatly mitigated by the development of the internet in early 1990s. When I moved to the Institute in 1989, my Maryland collaborator sent me our data set via “bitnet”. In those early years we would Fed-Ex each other draft copies of articles for editing. The internet has greatly facilitated long-distance collaboration, and I have always found myself working with at least one colleague in another state or another country.



Work and Family Balance

It was initially my husband's idea to move away from Washington, D.C. He was changing jobs and, in his line of work, his options in Washington would have required extended time away from home. We were starting a family, and he wanted to be around. As it turned out, the move was good for both of us, as well as for our children.

The job change immediately yielded a couple of important "family-friendly" benefits for me. First and foremost, I didn't have to teach and had minimal administrative duties. I actually like teaching, and a couple of times since moving to Michigan I have taught graduate classes on the side for fun. But to do a good job in the classroom requires tremendous time and energy—time and energy taken away from research and family. I found that my new job afforded me more time both for my work and for my family.

Second, there was no tenure decision looming on the horizon. Although now I have somewhat less job security than I would enjoy were I tenured at a university, at the time I did not face a date in the not-so-distant future at which I would either be granted or denied that job security—a relief for someone like me with a toddler and an infant. In a recent CSWEP newsletter, Dan Hamermesh advised junior faculty to work 60 hours a week. That's good advice for someone wanting tenure. The dilemma facing many women, however, is readily apparent and has been much discussed: The tenure system *de facto* forces the most intensive work effort during prime child-bearing and child-rearing years. Women who want children may choose to postpone having them until after they are granted tenure or full professor rank and thus have more time for family, but in so doing risk fertility problems. In short, the issue is not so much the demands of an academic job *per se*, but rather the timing of those demands.¹

The hours of work in a non-academic job may not be less (and may be more) over the course of a typical career, but they will tend to be more evenly distributed than in academia. I hesitate to suggest non-academic organizations as a panacea for work-family balance. Work environments vary considerably among for-profit, not-for-profit, and government

entities, but in many cases they will be more amenable places for balancing work and family demands over the life cycle.

In my case, I was able to negotiate a reduction in hours after my third child was born. I had been at the Institute for several years by then, and I was a classic "retention" part-time employee. Although, like any professional, my hours varied considerably with deadlines and other work demands, my status gave me some added flexibility during some particularly busy child-rearing years. And, even working part-time, I probably had as much time for research as many full-time academics with regular teaching loads. When my youngest entered school several years ago, I increased my hours.

I have always been concerned about having a job that works for me now and that preserves key options for the future. Kids grow up fast. Last fall my oldest went off to college, and, sadly, our numbers at home will continue to dwindle rapidly over the next four years. I feel fortunate to have had a job that was both intellectually stimulating and compatible with home life. Now, as my parenting responsibilities lessen, I feel especially fortunate to have opportunities to become even more engaged in research I truly enjoy.

Women who want children may choose to postpone having them until after they are granted tenure or full professor rank and thus have more time for family, but in so doing risk fertility problems.

¹For an interesting discussion of research on the link between family composition and tenure among men and women, see Laura W. Perna's article in the Winter 2004 CSWEP newsletter.

Working as a Research Economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia

—by Loretta J. Mester




I have been an economist at the Philadelphia Fed for about 20 years, and am now the director of research, which entails running the research department and serving as the chief economic advisor to the Bank's President. When we went on the market, my husband, George Mailath, also an economist, and I faced a joint location problem. His offer from the University of Pennsylvania and mine from the Philadelphia Fed appeared to be the best outcome, so we accepted these offers and came to Philadelphia. At the time, coming out of Princeton, the Philadelphia Fed was not considered a top placement—there was a bias toward wanting students to opt for positions in academia. However, it turned out to be a very fortuitous choice. I have found the Philadelphia Fed to be a productive place to get research done and I also like the public service aspect of the job.

A new Ph.D. hired by the Philadelphia Fed enjoys the benefits of a high level of resources, excellent colleagues, exposure to new ideas, interaction with academia, and a large amount of time for research. Indeed, research time at the Philadelphia Fed surpasses that which a new Ph.D. would get at most academic departments, where teaching loads can be quite high. A major job of economists in their first year at the Philadelphia Fed is to establish their research agendas, so the responsibilities one has in addition to research are kept to a minimum. Under my tenure at the Philadelphia Fed, we have used the term "research" to mean the same thing as is meant in academia—research on self-chosen topics rather than directed research. That's not to say that an economist won't be asked to provide analyses of important economic issues to senior management, but we would try to arrange assignments so that work on those requests does not come from the economist's research time. In steady state, economists at the Philadelphia Fed can expect half to three-quarters of their time for work on their research agendas. They spend the other part of their time briefing senior management before FOMC meetings or on other policy

issues; writing articles for the Bank's own publication, the *Business Review*; and giving an occasional presentation to business or community groups. Importantly, we try to arrange this work so economists know far in advance when they will be responsible for these tasks, similar to the way academics know their teaching schedules in advance. This is important because uninterrupted time is a necessary (though not sufficient) ingredient to the creative research process.

The Philadelphia Fed finds this structure conducive to its mission. At the hiring decision we select people who are interested in topics of interest to the Fed. This does not mean only monetary and macroeconomics—most of the Reserve Banks, including the Philadelphia Fed, are interested in microeconomics (including local public finance, regional and urban economics, and labor economics), and banking and finance. All of these areas are relevant to the policy work of the Fed, which includes monetary policy, financial system stability and bank regulation, and payments. While the size of the department, at 20 Ph.D.s is somewhat smaller than many university departments, we are more focused on specific fields; therefore economists are more likely to find colleagues with similar interests at the Fed than they are at comparably sized academic departments. I have found the department to be a nurturing environment, with colleagues rooting for one another's success rather than competing with one another. The Fed benefits by having a staff of researchers working at the frontiers of their respective areas who can bring their expertise to bear on policy issues. Also, having staff economists who have proven themselves on the same playing field as others in the economics profession, as evidenced by publishing in the top academic journals, adds to the credibility of the Fed's policymaking. The Federal Reserve System's emphasis on research has increased since I joined the Fed. Back then, while the opportunity for doing good research existed if one wanted to take advantage of it, one could also succeed in the department by focusing more on policy work or taking on other directed research projects. This is not the case today. Engagement in the economics profession including publication is an important part of the job.

The Philadelphia Fed recognizes that it takes real resources to support high-quality research, and these resources are



very competitive with those offered by top academic institutions. There is funding for computing, software, data, library resources, and journal submission fees. Because the Fed computer system must maintain the highest level of security, it is less accessible off-site than typical university computing systems; however, as telecommuting and traveling have become common, remote access has become easier. Economists have access to well-qualified research assistants. Many of these RAs have MAs in economics or are planning to go on to graduate school in economics. Economists are encouraged to present their papers at conferences, since this is a good way to get feedback on their work and to publicize their research to potential referees (which helps garner journal acceptances). At the Philadelphia Fed we also make available funds to bring co-authors to the Fed, and we have a visiting scholar program that allows for interaction between staff economists and leading and/or up-and-coming scholars in the profession. Several co-authorships have developed between Fed economists and our visitors. We are also able to take advantage of our proximity to University of Pennsylvania, and our economists are encouraged to attend seminars there. In addition, funds are available for economists who would like to organize a conference or workshop on a particular topic. An economist would find that the funds available for research support at the Philadelphia Fed are as generous as the research support available in the top 10 to 15 departments.

So what's the downside? Within a research university, every department has the same goal—to produce well-respected research in the field and to convey those ideas to students. Publish or perish and the drive for tenure keep everyone well motivated at the university. Within a Reserve Bank, different departments in the Bank have different objectives and the senior management of the Bank sometimes has to be educated regarding the Research Department's mission and its measures of success. Moreover, because the cap T of the tenure clock is not looming, economists need to be somewhat more self-motivated in getting their research out and becoming engaged in the profession. Indeed, an economist who came to the Fed today and viewed it as a 9 to 5 job would be completely wrong. To be successful here, one must publish. On the other hand, because the tight time constraint of the tenure clock is not binding, researchers who get off to a slightly slower start but then pick up their productivity will find more forgiveness at the Fed than at the university.

Another difference between the Fed and universities is that we typically do not teach Ph.D. students at the Fed, whereas teaching and helping to guide the research of such students is one of the benefits of an academic job. I said typically because many of us have served on Ph.D. committees

—sometimes for RAs who are working on their dissertations and sometimes for students we have met at conferences. So this opportunity exists for entrepreneurial economists at the Fed. In addition, given our location, we have opportunities to teach at area universities; e.g., I am an adjunct professor at the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School and others in the department have taught or are currently teaching at Wharton, Villanova, Temple, Penn, Swarthmore, and Bryn Mawr. Teaching must be done on an economist's own time, but schedules are flexible enough to accommodate it. I do have to admit that our schedules are not as flexible as in academia, despite telecommuting and generous vacation allotments.

Finally, some economists may find the non-research parts of the job—policy work and writing non-technical articles for our *Business Review*—to be onerous. To mitigate this possibility, we try to hire economists who have an interest in policy issues; who enjoy applying economic theory, modeling, and empirical work to important policy questions; and who have a taste for public service. In fact, when things are working well, research not only informs policy, but policy informs research. This happened with my own research agenda as I learned more about financial intermediation and was exposed to interesting problems and questions regarding the financial system.

Within the Philadelphia Fed there are now two avenues for advancement for economists. Economists who progress with their research agenda and policy work can eventually take on the managerial responsibilities of running a section of the department or the department itself. This was the path that was available to me. Within the past six years, however, we have established another path for advancement: a research track in which outstanding researchers can advance to the same level in terms of salary and benefits as someone with managerial duties, but without having to take on the heavier burdens of administration.

Because of the Philadelphia Fed's emphasis on academic-style research, economists here who advance their research agendas are attractive to the academic market. Economists have moved from the Fed to academia, and others have moved from academia to the Fed. In fact, because the support is so good, economists are likely to find that they can advance their research agendas more quickly at the Philadelphia Fed than at academic departments that do not offer much teaching relief in the initial years. I have received several offers over the years from academic departments. While these offers have been tempting, in the end, I opted to stay at the Philadelphia Fed because of the quality of life and the mix of research, policy, and public service.

Working as a Research Economist at the Bureau of Labor Statistics

—by Anne E. Polivka



I have been a research economist with the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) for nearly 17 years and recently have moved into a supervisory research economist role. The BLS employs a large number of Ph.D. labor economists and econometricians, most of whom belong to research groups attached to program offices that produce economic statistics on employment and unemployment, compensation and working conditions, prices or productivity. Research economists at BLS can expect to spend approximately 50 percent of their time assisting the program office to which they are attached and approximately 50 percent of their time on independent, academic type research on issues relevant to BLS (although there is considerable ebb and flow in how time is divided between these activities). I have found my work at BLS both fascinating and rewarding.

One of the benefits of working at BLS is that it exposes you to issues concerning primary data collection that most economics graduate students do not encounter in their studies. For example, through my experience at BLS, I have learned about the art of questionnaire design and question wording, the various methods for testing survey content and modes of data collection, the different types of sample design along with their strengths and weaknesses, methods for dealing with survey non-response and missing data, the construction and importance of different types of survey weights, and the interaction between the survey sample design and the proper estimation of various measures derived from a complex survey design. Exposure to these issues has shaped my analytical research, broadening my horizons beyond the world of simple random samples with complete data. In turn, I have found it rewarding to assist others in the appropriate analysis of BLS data and share the information I have learned through my experience at BLS.

An important benefit of the program development work in which all BLS research economists participate is that it of-

fers the opportunity to influence the information collected in some of the Federal Government's most important economic surveys. My program development work has focused primarily on the collection of data from households, specifically the Current Population Survey (CPS), but I also have participated in the development of questions for establishment surveys. My program development work with the CPS has included working on the redesign of the monthly survey; testing the effect on labor force estimates of alternative race and ethnicity questions; conceptualizing, developing and analyzing the contingent and alternative work arrangement supplement; conducting the CPS in the wake of Hurricane Katrina; and participating in the ongoing management of the CPS. My work with offices collecting data from establishments has included the development of a supplement for the Current Employment Statistics survey inquiring about employers' use of temporary help supply workers and independent contractors, and the exploration of reasons for differences in wage data collected in BLS's Occupational Employment Statistics survey and its National Compensation Survey.

A major advantage of working at BLS is that it provides direct access to interesting research databases that are not generally available to the public, as well as to people who have in-depth knowledge about these data. For someone who chooses to take advantage of it, this access offers enormous research opportunities.

The scholarly research that one undertakes at the Bureau can cover a wide variety of areas, but it is constrained in certain ways. To protect its ability to collect data and its integrity as a source of data, BLS must be perceived as nonpartisan and neutral on policy issues. Consequently, researchers at BLS are not permitted to publish articles either in BLS publications or in academic journals that advocate a policy position or forecast an economic outcome. To insure BLS's neutrality, research articles must be reviewed prior to submission for publication. Further, although largely immune from politics



and the agendas of various administrations, BLS's program work can be subject to changes in focus and expectations, particularly when there is a change in BLS management.

Another disadvantage of working at BLS as compared to working in an academic environment is that there is less flexibility and control over where, when and how one works. In general, like other government employees, BLS employees are expected to work 40 hours a week throughout the entire year—we don't have the extended breaks that come with an academic job. BLS does have a flexi-time policy that allows individuals to vary their start and stop times and the days of the week they work, and a flexi-place policy that permits individuals to work off-site on a limited basis. These policies mitigate the constraints somewhat. In addition, in a number of cases, researchers who wanted to work fewer hours have been able to arrange part-time work schedules, something that likely would be more difficult to arrange for an academic on the tenure track. Another point to mention is that, although the computer capabilities afforded to BLS researchers are very good, individual researchers do not have complete freedom to choose their own hardware or software. To protect its data and network systems, BLS has extremely strict firewalls and centralized control over the software and computer applications that individuals can have on their PC's. There are times when this can be annoying.

Another aspect of working at BLS which some people might not like is that a great deal of the development work within the Bureau is done within teams. In addition, program development work can take quite a long time to come to fruition. For example, the 1994 CPS redesign entailed 8 years of developmental work and planning. The upside of working as part of a team on a long-term project, of course, is that the end result can be a truly major accomplishment.

Finally, young researchers may have to work harder to remain at the cutting edge of economic research and to avoid

becoming isolated from the academic community. To counter these tendencies, the research offices at BLS maintain an active seminar series with outside researchers, encourage many informal internal seminars and information exchanges, provide financial support to attend conferences, and encourage BLS researchers to collaborate with outside researchers if they choose.

Overall, given the wide access to BLS data and detailed knowledge about them, the ability to influence what data are collected and the products developed from the collected data, the large number of research colleagues with similar interests employed by BLS, and the ability to pursue one's own scholarly research interests, BLS can be an exciting place for an empirically-oriented economist to work. If I were making the decision over again, I would gladly choose to start my career as a research economist with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The upside of working as part of a team on a long-term project, of course, is that the end result can be a truly major accomplishment.

Nancy L. Rose Biography *continued from page 1*

of government institutions in the late 1970s. I crammed seven economics courses into my senior year, wrote an honors thesis on trucking regulation, and graduated with a degree in Economics with Government.

While I loved economics, I hadn't quite decided to shift career goals. Working as staff economist for a law firm specializing in regulatory policy helped me to do that. I found the economic analysis more interesting than the legal briefs it fed into, and decided to apply to economics graduate programs. I knew MIT was the perfect match when Paul Joskow called to describe the breadth of faculty research on regulatory economics. While my unconventional undergraduate background meant a lot of catching up in my first year in the Ph.D. program, knowing why I was in graduate school and where I wanted to focus my research was an enormous boon. This seems an under-appreciated benefit of working for a year or two before graduate studies. With that start, it's not surprising that my research has continued to focus most on economic regulation. I have studied the effect of regulatory policies on topics including labor rent-sharing, executive compensation, productivity, and technological change. I also have studied questions of broader industrial organization interest, particularly those at the intersection of IO and corporate finance or labor economics. Illustrative issues include how bankruptcy affects airline pricing and service, how diversification affects executive pay, and the impact of corporate profitability on airline safety.

Over my career, I've benefited enormously from relationships with many outstanding economists. A few have played especially crucial roles. I owe Paul Joskow an enormous professional and personal debt, for my growth from student into research assistant, co-author, advisee, colleague and friend. In 1987, Severin Borenstein and I discovered a mutual interest in airline pricing, sparking a friendship and collaboration that has been stimulating, rewarding, and incredibly fun. But I owe most to my husband, Jim Poterba. His passion for economics during college first convinced me to consider the field, his sage advice has guided every step of my career, and his unfailing support has kept me going through the rockiest times. His willingness to take on at least half of our household and child care responsibilities is crucial to making it all work.

Following our marriage in my third year of graduate school, Jim and I have navigated the waters of dual careers with remarkable good fortune. At critical career junctures for each of us, we've had competitive offers at the same institution. Despite temptations, in the end we've made our careers at MIT. When I received my Ph.D. from the MIT Economics Department in 1985, I moved no further than MIT's Sloan School of Management – two floors up in the same building! I

remained at Sloan through tenure in 1990 and a joint appointment with Economics in 1994. In 1997, I resigned from Sloan, moving back to the MIT Economics Department. Having watched family and friends juggle commuting relationships for extended periods makes me especially appreciative of the choices Jim and I have had.

The MIT economics environment is legendary. But MIT also has been terrific on the personal front. While the inexorable constraint of a 24-hour day precludes “doing it all,” institutional flexibility can help tremendously in gaining some work/family balance. Dean Lester Thurow's response to my 1989 pregnancy—the Sloan School's first among its faculty—enabled me to combine paid release time and unpaid leave to spend time with my son, to return at my own pace to research, and to avoid two new one-time teaching preps—an enormous benefit for an untenured associate professor. By the mid-1990s, I was a full professor in the Sloan School and the Economics Department and directing the National Bureau of Economic Research program in Industrial Organization. Three jobs and (by then) three kids didn't leave much slack, even with an incredibly involved spouse. After the fourth nanny meltdown in as many months, something had to give—and it was me! Economics Department head Paul Joskow met my plea for relief by crafting a proposal for a temporary half-time appointment, and convinced the MIT administration to approve it. Trading off a few years of less money for more time was a worthwhile investment in my career, family, and sanity, and I'm delighted that MIT now extends that option to all tenured faculty. It empowered me to re-focus and shed responsibilities that were not “mission critical” to my priorities of research, teaching, and family, at least for a time.

Even with the flexibility afforded by MIT policy and an academic spouse, the challenge of balancing activities that impose almost impossible demands on time and emotional energy is daunting. It is easy for research to become a vanishing residual after the demands of teaching, advising, departmental and university administration, and professional service. More surprising for me were the realizations that children and research draw on the same well of emotional energy, and that time competition intensifies as children age. Babysitters aren't good parental substitutes for adolescents. I have been helped by some wonderful collaborators, who invigorate the research process, push me to carve out research time from the endless “to do” lists, and are patient and understanding when projects move forward more slowly than either of us hoped. With two children already in high school, I also find it useful to remember that “life is a marathon, not a sprint.” There are many years between my youngest's departure for college and faculty retirement ages, and even more unanswered questions in industrial organization.

Donna Ginther Biography continued from page 1

returned to University of Wisconsin-Madison and majored in economics for my final two years of college.

I found my intellectual home at the University of Wisconsin. I thrived in the demanding environment where the expectations were much higher than the previous colleges I had attended, and students had to compete to get their professor's attention. The Wisconsin economics faculty stressed research above all else, and I was fortunate to receive funding to write my undergraduate thesis on the Reagan Administration's dismantling of affirmative action enforcement.

After graduating, I job-shopped, working first as a research assistant at the Federal Reserve Board and then as a senior financial analyst at a bank holding company in Wisconsin. These early work experiences convinced me that I was best-suited to a career where I could direct my own lines of intellectual inquiry. I set my sights on becoming an academic economist.

I returned to the University of Wisconsin-Madison for graduate school and studied labor and econometrics. I knew from the beginning that I would study labor economics because it encompassed my interests in gender and economic inequality. At Wisconsin, I became a research assistant for Bob Haveman and Bobbi Wolfe as they were writing *Succeeding Generations*. This was my introduction to the economics of children and families--one of my current research areas. Chuck Manski was my thesis adviser, and I learned all that I know about microeconometrics and the selection problem from his incisive lectures and patient guidance of my thesis.

I had met my husband, Rodger Erickson when we were both research assistants at the Fed. He later joined me in Wisconsin while I finished my graduate course work. We have been balancing our two careers ever since. As I was starting my dissertation, Rodger was promoted to manager at his software employer in Seattle. I risked not finishing my Ph.D. and moved with him to Seattle where I spent the final two years of graduate school writing my dissertation. Shortly after arriving, I introduced myself to Bob Pollak at the University of Washington. Bob generously invited me to participate in the interdisciplinary demography workshop that he organized. The demography seminars at Washington were very different from the labor seminars at Wisconsin and broadened my research interests to include economic demography.

My first academic job was at Southern Methodist University (1995-97). Rodger returned to computer programming and followed me to Dallas. He kept his job with his Seattle employer, and to this day, he telecommutes, working as a software engineer for another Seattle firm. Rodger's ability to telecommute allows me to follow my job opportunities and has earned him the title of 'the perfect academic spouse.'

Bob Pollak moved to Washington University in St. Louis, and he was instrumental in recruiting me to join the faculty in 1997. Although I enjoyed my colleagues and students at

Washington University immensely, I found the tenure-track to be very stressful. I felt anxious about my research and even questioned whether I was a good match for academia. In 2000, I left Washington University for a job in the Research Department at the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, thinking that I would never return to academia.

Working at the Atlanta Fed allowed me to reconnect with my research and built my confidence as an economist. I had much more time to devote to research than I had as an academic, and I managed to publish at a much faster rate. Although I found the macro policy debates very stimulating, as a labor economist working on gender in academic science and the effect of family structure on children's educational outcomes, my research was not an ideal match for the Atlanta Fed. In short, I felt that I was a better fit for an academic job, but this time, it had to come with tenure.

I joined the University of Kansas economics department with tenure in 2002. Although many think that Kansas is flatter than a pancake, complete with tornados and extreme political views on evolution, it has proven to be a great career move for me--this in spite of the occasional tornado. I now have two funded lines of research. The first is on gender differences in employment outcomes in academia. The second, co-authored with Anders Björklund and Marianne Sundström from Stockholm University, is on the effect of legal marriage on child and adult socioeconomic outcomes in Sweden. Rodger and I have set a personal record of living in one location for almost four years, and we have no plans to move! In 2004, our son Bryce was born, and I work hard to strike a balance between my very satisfying career and my delightful little boy.

Although I would not recommend that young economists follow my circuitous career path, my many moves have presented both risks and opportunities. I believe the key to my success has been making the most of the opportunities that each move has afforded. Early in my career, I benefited from participating in the first CSWEP mentoring conference, Creating Career Opportunities for Female Economists (CCOFFE). The same advice I received from the CCOFFE mentors is relevant today. First, time is your most important commodity and you must use it wisely. Make time for your work and personal needs before you meet the needs of your students. Second, outsource mundane tasks to others. Hire someone to clean your house or hire a student to grade homework assignments. This will be money well-spent. Third, ask for what you need to be successful. This means negotiating with your department chair for a higher salary or course reduction. This also means asking your spouse or significant other to share household tasks. Finally, don't forget to have fun. If it means leaving the office early to spend time with your family or even spending six weeks of your sabbatical riding a motorcycle across the country (as I did in 1999), it's important to have a life outside of economics as well.

mer program at Cornell University in microbiology. I later went to Cornell as an undergraduate to study microbiology but soon discovered that there were other subjects—in the humanities, history, and the social sciences—about which I knew little. I left the microscope for libraries and dusty archives where I have remained ever since.

I advise my undergraduates to take courses from the best minds at their universities, independent of subject matter. That’s what I did. Among the best departments at Cornell were government and history and I took many courses there. In my sophomore year I came across Alfred (Fred) Kahn (the person who deregulated the airlines) and his utter delight with economics led me to industrial organization and regulation.

After earning my B.A. in economics at Cornell, I entered graduate school at the University of Chicago to study industrial organization. I was ill prepared for study in a top-ranked department having taken as many credits in government and history as in economics. It was almost pure luck that I chose Chicago and I still don’t know what led me to believe that it would be a good place to study and live. It was a lousy place to live. But it was the best place on the planet to do graduate study in economics. The greatest minds were in Chicago—Friedman, Stigler, Becker, Harberger, Fogel, Telser, McCloskey, Griliches, Coase, Gregg Lewis, Harry Johnson, among others. They taught with religious zeal and I became a true believer.

In graduate school, and for some time after, I had no clear vision of my future. I was, and continue to be, gleeful to research and learn about a wide range of subjects. Looking back, I now realize that much of my work concerns the origins of current policy issues (e.g., economic inequality, education, role of women in the labor force, impact of social insurance, immigration restriction). As one of my teachers, Ronald Coase, noted: “I came to realize where I had been going only after I arrived. The emergence of my ideas at each stage was not part of some grand scheme.”¹

How I became an economist says much about how I work as an economist. There has been no agenda or program, no one theory that must be followed, no one econometric technique to be used, and no agency or foundation to pay for a bottom line. The subconscious produces the nagging questions. Mine concern the evolving human condition and the material conditions of life, the long-run issues of economic development. It doesn’t seem to matter what I work on, I return to these issues and seek the “truth” through fact-finding detective work. It is frequently a highly descriptive “truth” (e.g., what percentage of women were in the labor force in 1890? What fraction of their lives did they work full-time?). But it is also an analytical one (e.g., what part of increased female labor force participation between 1940 and 1950 was due to World War II?).

In graduate school I did exams in both industrial organization and labor economics. My first project as an economic historian began as a term paper on the role of slavery in the urban and industrial development of the antebellum South. Robert Fogel strongly encouraged me to expand it into my dissertation, although it was only later that I would discover his broader interests in the subject of slavery. I had previously thought of myself as an industrial organization- or labor- or even urban-economist, not an economic historian. Anyone who has argued with Robert Fogel knows that battles are not easily

won. I didn’t try and, for that, I’m grateful. I was persuaded to write in economic history and have called myself an economic historian ever since.

In a number of different ways you have been a pioneer in the area of economics. CSWEP’s data suggest that when you completed graduate school in 1972, only 7% of the economics Ph.D.’s awarded went to women. To my knowledge you were the first woman tenured in both the Harvard economics department and the University of Pennsylvania. How aware have you been over the years of your own position as a pioneer and how, if at all, did your role as a pioneer influence you?

When I attended Bronx High School of Science, 70% of the class was male. When I was an undergraduate at Cornell, very few women took economics. When I went to graduate school there were just three other women in my first-year class of about 50. I don’t remember anything peculiar about any of these experiences. I am the first woman to be offered or to achieve tenure in the economics departments of the University of Pennsylvania, Harvard University, and Princeton University. But I don’t find that odd or distinctive. Why? In part because I know history. I was born too late to be a pioneer. Many women, more brilliant and accomplished than I, came before me. I did nothing to open doors for women other than to provide an example and be a teacher. I also don’t feel that I have been disparately treated by my teachers in graduate school (there are some exceptions) or by my colleagues (there are exceptions there as well). I am occasionally bothered that I wasn’t encouraged to continue my studies in microbiology and that no one (not even my family) questioned my giving up a goal that had once seemed so important. Would anyone have done so had I been male? Perhaps.

I look back on my years as an economist with no sense that there have been watersheds related to appointments, promotions, fellowships, and honors. I do, however, remember the precise moment that I found the slave bills of sale at the Mormon Genealogical Society; documents at the National Archives containing information on whether firms fired women who got married; and surveys covering the labor market histories of women during World War II, oddly enough squirreled away in the building in which I worked. I remember the “eureka” moments when my model or framework took life and began to “talk back” to me.

Your own work in economics has been at the junction of economic history and labor economics and in that work you have used historical data to illuminate a number of contemporary issues. Is there another sub-field of economics in which you think an increased use of historical data might prove very useful?

I would like to see more work on the historical evolution of social norms. Several years ago I wrote a piece called “A Pollution Theory of Discrimination.” The idea was to model prejudice as an endogenous set of beliefs. The paper contains a model in which discrimination emanates from historical differences in employment. I would like to see more research on the evolution of norms, especially on the historical origins of patriarchy.

At Harvard you are well known as one of the most devoted mentors of graduate students. In the letters supporting your candidacy

¹ R. H. Coase, “My Evolution as an Economist” (1994), unpublished version of a lecture in the “Lives of the Laureates” series, given at Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas on April 12, 1994.

“Follow your passions.”

for the Carolyn Shaw Bell award we received numerous letters detailing your mix of caring and high standards. Can you tell us a bit about your approach to mentoring and what you might see as the benefits, if any, to your own career from your efforts?

Economics is a dynamic field. New ideas are vital and connections across fields can lead to grand innovations (as in Kuhnian “scientific revolutions”). Young minds are incubators of these notions. My students prod me as much as I prod them. Students are vital for that reason and I could not imagine being a researcher without them.

Academic research is both exhilarating and difficult; there are great highs but also abysmal lows. Combining social enjoyment (chitchat, movies, snacks, dinner, and a walk with a dog named Prairie) with the academic helps bridge the gap between the lows and the highs. It is too easy to get off track. The students with the idea that didn’t work out, the paper that got rejected, and the exam that didn’t win the A all need confidence boosters.

Very recently, you have used some of your research to weigh in on the sometimes heated public discussion concerning claims that the modern generation of young women are abandoning the labor force rather than trying to combine careers and family. Can you comment on what you have found in this area?

Several articles in recent years have highlighted the fact that it is often difficult to combine career and family. No one doubts that. These articles have generally focused on women with young children whose husbands have substantial earnings. The women are, as well, the graduates of highly selective undergraduate institutions (such as Princeton and Yale), and many obtained advanced degrees before “opting out” of their careers. No one doubts that such individuals exist. The question was whether these stories were “newsworthy” and were reporting a new trend. In looking at the evidence I (and several others) noted that there were no “newsworthy” trends. In addition, the extent of “opting out” was far less than these articles had led the newspaper reading public to believe. The anecdotes on which these articles generally relied did not have a longitudinal component and the length of out-of-work spells could not be assessed.

Even though opting out does not appear to be a rising trend, there are several important issues that the discussion has raised. One is that we need better data to evaluate the transitions from full-time work to other work statuses for college-educated women, particularly those from selective institutions of higher education. The retrospective data set that I used does not have good information on part-time work and on work transitions. Also of interest is whether the increase in the right tail of the income distribution combined with greater positive assortative mating has increased the opt-out phenomenon among certain individuals. That is, assume that the very wealthiest men marry the most able women. If the right tail of the earnings distribution is longer for men than for women, then even some of the best and brightest women will have earnings that are “petty cash” in their households. Unless they are really committed to their careers, they could “opt out.” Finally, many of us question why major newspapers placed these articles on the front page and why columnists gave so much space to discussions about them.

Do you have any advice for young scholars, particularly women, who are just starting out in academic careers?

Follow your passions.

Top Ten Tips continued from page 1

nal acceptance of an article (and at least another year until publication). If a paper is rejected on initial submission, add at least 6 to 9 months to the total. With a tenure decision during your 6th year, submissions after the third year are unlikely to be accepted by tenure time.

2. Work on several papers at once. If you are working on only one paper, you will have too few publications at tenure time; and you will either be “over-writing” that paper and/or spending lots of time avoiding doing research. But avoid the other extreme—spreading yourself over so many papers that you never finish anything.

3. Become an expert on 1-1/2 topics. Scattershot publications suggest you are a dilettante. Becoming known as an expert in one area, and highly knowledgeable in a second, shows you are a serious scholar and embeds you worldwide as somebody to be talked with about a particular issue.

4. Unless you are at a liberal arts college that stresses teaching, don’t over-prepare your classes. The marginal product of additional preparation time diminishes rapidly; and most schools do not take teaching into account unless you fall below some standard. The loss function here is asymmetric.

5. Attend seminars—and try to meet with the speakers. Aside from the direct intellectual benefit to you, your attendance signals your colleagues that you are interested in developing your skills.

6. Submit abstracts/papers to conferences and workshops. This way you get constructive comments and make yourself known. This latter is especially important, since the people you will meet are ideal candidates to write letters commenting on your work at tenure time.

7. Generally don’t hide your light under a bushel. This summarizes how you should behave at seminars, conferences, workshops and other venues. There are many junior economists in this world, and it is important to become known (but not for silly comments).

8. Avoid service on university-wide committees. Such service is not valued by the department members who will decide your tenure, and it takes time away from activities that they do value.

9. Do (some) service on department committees. Such service is valued by department members (if for no other reason than that it saves them time); and it is also a good way to get to know your colleagues and for them to get to know you. Organizing seminars or helping in recruiting are particularly attractive types of service, since they enable you to meet interesting economists.

10. If you have a problem, talk to the department chairperson or a senior colleague in your specialty. Most senior people see themselves as mentors and are happy to discuss issues of research, teaching and service with you. Most Department chairs wish to bend over backwards to give you a fair shot at attaining tenure.

CSWEP Sessions at the Eastern Economic Association Meetings

Session Title: Topics in Monetary Policy and Financial Markets

Session Organizers: participants in prior CeMent workshops

In this session, Roisin O'Sullivan (Smith College) discussed her paper, "House Prices in the Measurement of Inflation in the Euro Area." She argued that the proper way to include housing prices in an aggregate price statistic depends on the underlying conceptual framework for inflation. Her results showed that, using an alternative weighting scheme based on a signal-extraction approach, including house prices does not have a significant impact on measured inflation, despite their relatively high growth rates in many member states. Tinni Sen (Virginia Military Institute), presented her paper "Anticipated Future Changes under State-Dependent Pricing: A Simple Special Case" (with John R. Conlon). This paper presented a model of state dependent pricing rules under the special case where the rate of change of desired prices will drop to zero in the near future. The paper found that this causes the price level to start increasing immediately and that the real GDP continues to change even after the aggregate price level stops increasing. The last paper in the session, "EMU Operating Procedures and the Behavior of Interest Rates," was presented by Kristen Vangaasbeck (California State University) This paper developed a detailed simulation model for the central bank policy rate, with a focus on identifying different possible sources of interest rate persistence in the money market rates within the Euro area and the U.S. Her Monte Carlo results suggested that operating procedures are an important contributor to the autocorrelation in short-term interest rates.

Session Title: Women and Labor Markets

Graciela Chichilnisky (Columbia University) presented "The Gender Gap" in the second CSWEP-sponsored session, "Women and Labor Markets." She argued that the gender gap is a result of the coupling of two institutions: the family and the market. Comparing the existing gender gap to a prisoner's dilemma, she showed that eliminating the gender gap would result in a Pareto superior outcome. Jessica Wolpaw Reyes (Amherst) also presented in this session, discussing her paper, "Discrimination and Equilibrium in the Market for Obstetricians and Gynecologists." Her results suggested that there is excess demand for female OB/GYNs, which results in female OB/GYNs being able to charge more to their patients in terms of both fees and waiting times. The third paper in the session was presented by Betsey Stevenson (University of Pennsylvania) who discussed "Beyond the Classroom: Using Title IX to Measure the Return to High School Sports." In this paper, she showed that participation in high school sports led to higher labor force participation rates, more education, and a greater likelihood of entering a male dominated profession for female athletes. Finally, Amelie Constant (IZA), present-

ed her paper, "The Gender Gap Reloaded: Is School Quality Linked to Labor Market Performance?" (with Spyros Konstantopoulos). Empirical results in this paper indicated that the gender gap favoring men is more pronounced for Whites, and less pronounced for Blacks and Hispanics. Another interesting result of the paper was that, across all demographic groups, the gender gap in hourly wages is more pronounced in higher paid jobs, indicating the presence of a "glass ceiling."

CSWEP Sessions at the Midwest Economic Association Meetings

Session Title: Marriage, Family, and Childhood Obesity

Session Organizer: Lisa Barrow (Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago)

The CSWEP session at this year's Midwest Economics Association Meetings included two papers "The Russian Marriage Drama" by Maja Micevska (University of Klagenfurt) and Oded Stark (Universities of Bonn, Klagenfurt, and Vienna) and "Family Structure, Neighborhood Wealth, and Child Body Weight: Differential Effects by Gender" by Yanjun (Carol) Bao (University of Illinois at Chicago) and Lisa Powell (University of Illinois at Chicago).

Scott D. Drewianka (University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee) and Diane Whitmore Schanzenbach (University of Chicago) served as discussants. Micevska and Stark document the dramatic decline in the incidence of marriage in Russia during the 1990s transition to a market economy and consider several possible explanations.

From 1989 to 1998, Russia experienced much political and economic upheaval which has been the subject of much research. However, the concomitant social and demographic changes have received less attention. From 1989 to 1998, the number of marriages per 1000 population declined by nearly 40 percent, roughly three times the average decline in marriage rates recorded in the OECD countries during the same period. The authors explore four potential explanations: an increase in the cost of forming marriages, a shift toward western norms, a bleak perception of what the future holds, and a potential correlation in economic outcomes across would-be spouses. Using both macroeconomic and micro-level data, the authors' find support for the argument that a positive correlation in male and female incomes combined with a rise in the cost of forming marriages led to the decline in marriage rates over the 1990s.

Bao and Powell examine the effects of family structure on child obesity and the extent to which such effects work through varying levels of neighborhood median household income using a cross-sectional sample of children aged 2 to 17 from the 2002 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979. Analyses by gender show that girls whose mothers are married or who spend more time in intact families are less likely to be overweight. Contemporaneous exposure to *nonintact* families increases girls' BMI by 0.57 units and their probability of being overweight by 4.3 percentage points. When they examine the effects of long-run exposure to intact family structures, they find no statistically significant relationship with child body weight after controlling for family and neighborhood resources. Living in neighborhoods with higher median household incomes significantly reduces the probability of becoming overweight for children, and the effect is larger for girls and for children in non-intact families.

Southern Economic Association Annual Meeting CSWEP Sessions

The Southern Economic Association will meet in Charleston, SC from November 19-22. CSWEP will sponsor two sessions and one panel.

Session I: Issues in Family Decision Making

- “Does a Husband’s Education Benefit his Wife’s Earnings? An Economic Investigation of “Mr. Mom” Households” Shahina Amin, Kenneth Brown, and Lisa K. Jepsen (University of Northern Iowa)
- “What Do DINKs Do With Their Dough?” Nancy Ammon Jianakoplos and Frank Caliendo (Colorado State University), and Lynnette St. Jean (Pacer Economics)
- “The Labor Market Experiences of Women: An Economic Investigation of the “Opt-Out” Hype” Jenny Keil (Hamline University) and Karine Moe (Macalester College)
- “Gender Differences in Homeownership and Home Values: A Cross-Country Comparison” Carolina Diaz-Bonilla (The World Bank) and Eva Sierminska (Luxembourg Income Study)

Discussants include Katherine Anderson (Vanderbilt University), Julie Hotchkiss (The Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta), and William Hoyt (University of Kentucky)

Session II: Fertility, Technology, and Women’s Human Capital

- “Title IX and Human Capital Formation of Teens” Melanie Guldi (UC-Davis)
- “Career Interruptions Around the First Birth: The Effect of Mothers’ Age” Kasey Buckles (University of Notre Dame)
- “Momma’s Got the Pill: Assessing the Labor Market Effects of Griswold” Martha Bailey (University of Michigan)
- “The Effects of Motherhood Timing on Career Path” Amalia Miller (University of Virginia)

Discussants include Lisa Jepsen (University of Northern Iowa), Sonia Oreffice (Clemson University), Frank Scott (University of Kentucky), and Eugenia Toma (University of Kentucky)

Panel: Jump-Starting Your Career: Ph.D. 0 to +4 Years

Participants include:

- Glenn Blomquist (University of Kentucky)
Charles Clotfelter (Duke University)
Daniel Hamermesh (University of Texas)
Jonathan Hamilton (University of Florida)
Susan Vroman (Georgetown University)

Western Economic Association Annual Meeting CSWEP Sessions

The Western Economic Association Meetings will be held in San Diego, June 29- July 3, 2006. CSWEP will sponsor four sessions:

Session I: “Gender and Economic Outcomes”

Chaired by Jennifer Ward-Batts (Claremont McKenna College)

- “Time Allocation of Parents and Investments in Sons and Daughters,” Shelly Lundberg (University of Washington); Sabrina Pabilonia (Bureau of Labor Statistics) and Jennifer Ward-Batts (Claremont McKenna College)
- “Ownership, Gender, and Firm Performance—A Panel Data Study” Frances Ruane (Trinity College Dublin), Julie Sutherland (University of Wollongong, Australia and Institute for International Integration Studies, Trinity College, Dublin)
- “Gender Differences in Major Federal External Grant Programs” Susan Hosek, Amy G. Cox, Bonnie Ghosh-Dastidar, and Sandra Berry (all RAND)

Discussants: TBA

Session II: “Health and Development”

Chaired by Anoshua Chaudhuri, San Francisco State University

- “Mother’s Education and Child Health: Is There Any Threshold?” Meherun Ahmed (University of Washington), Kazi Iqbal (University of Washington)
- “Providing a Healthier Start to Life: The Impact of Conditional Cash Transfers on Infant Mortality” Tania Barham (University of Colorado-Boulder)
- “Exploring the Changes in Out-of-pocket Payments on Health Care in Vietnam and its Impact on Health Care Utilization and Consumption” Anoshua Chaudhuri (San Francisco State University), Kakoli Roy (Center for Disease Control)
- “Exogamy and gender Bias in Healthcare Provision: A Theory and Evidence from Two Northern States in India” Sharmistha Self (College of Saint Benedict/ St. John’s University), Sajal Lahiri (Southern Illinois University)

Discussants: Guanghai Li (University of Washington), TBA

Session III: “Nonlinear Dynamic Modeling in Time Series Econometrics”

Chaired by Ai-ru Cheng (University of California, Santa Cruz)

- “Integration and common volatility across Latin American foreign exchange market” Isabel Ruiz (Western Michigan University)
- “Model selection in unstable environments,” Raffaella Giacomini (UCLA)
- “Home bias puzzle revisited: A general equilibrium solution based on model mis-specification” Mohammad Jahan-Parvar (University of North Carolina)
- “MCMC Analysis of stochastic volatility models: Joining evidence from spot and option prices” Ai-ru Cheng (University of California, Santa Cruz)

Discussants: TBA

Session IV: "Intellectual Property Rights"

Chaired by Amy J. Glass (Texas A&M University)

"MNE Activities: Do Patent Regimes and Host Country Policies Matter?" Usha Nair-Reichert (Georgia Institute of Technology) and Roderick Duncan (Charles Stuart University)

"Contributory Infringement Rule and Patents" Corinne Langinier and Philippe Marcoul (Iowa State University)

"Intellectual Property Protection and International Technology Diffusion," Amy J. Glass (Texas A&M University)

Discussants: Amy J. Glass, Usha Nair-Reichert, Corinne Langinier

Calls for Papers

Eastern Economics Association Meeting Call for Papers

CSWEP will be sponsoring sessions at the Eastern Economics Association meetings. The meetings will be held in New York City at the Crowne Plaza Times Square Manhattan Hotel on February 23—25, 2007. The topics for the sessions will depend on the abstracts received; one of the sessions will be gender-related if possible.

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

Abstracts should be submitted by *November 1, 2006* to

Ann Owen

Hamilton College

198 College Hill Road

Clinton, NY 13323

aowen@hamilton.edu

phone: (315) 859-4419

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

BRAG BOX

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

Lisa Jepsen and **Shahina Amin** have been tenured and promoted to the rank of Associate Professor at the Economics Department of the University of Northern Iowa.

Karine Moe has been promoted to the rank of Full Professor at the Economics Department of Macalester College.

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

Midwest Economic Association Meeting Call for Papers

CSWEP will sponsor up to two paper sessions and one panel session at the 2007 Midwest Economics Association meeting to be held in Minneapolis, MN, March 23-27, 2007, at the Hilton Minneapolis.

Deadline for submission of abstracts or session proposals is *September 15, 2006*.

One or two sessions are available for persons submitting an entire session (3 or 4 papers) or a complete panel on a specific topic in any area of economics. The organizer should prepare a proposal for a panel (including chair and participants) or session (including chair, abstracts and discussants) and submit by email by September 15, 2006.

One or two additional sessions will be organized by the Midwest Representative. Abstracts for papers in any area of economics will be accepted by email until September 15, 2006.

Please email complete session proposals, panel discussion proposals, or abstracts of 1—2 pages (including names of authors with affiliations, addresses and paper title) by September 15, 2006 to:

Anna Paulson, CSWEP Midwest Representative

Economic Research, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago

E-mail: anna.paulson@chi.frb.org

Phone: 312-322-2169

Fax: 312-294-6262

TEACHING INNOVATIONS PROGRAM:

Workshops for Economics Faculty on Interactive Teaching in Undergraduate Economics

Hotel Santa Fe, Santa Fe, New Mexico, June 2-4, 2006

Sponsored by the Committee on Economic Education of the American Economic Association and funded by the National Science Foundation
TIP Web Site: www.vanderbilt.edu/AEA/AEACEE/TIP

CREDIT CARDS ACCEPTED!

CSWEP has updated some of its membership services and is now accepting credit card payment information for donations you send to CSWEP. As in past years, you may also choose to pay by check. By keeping your membership current, you not only support CSWEP activities, you ensure that we have your current mailing address allowing us to remain in contact with you. If you have not contributed \$25 or more for the current year (January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2006) please do so.

ADDENDUM

In the Winter 2006 issue of this newsletter we highlighted Claudia Goldin's path breaking accomplishment as the first tenured woman in both the economics departments of the University of Pennsylvania and Harvard. This reminded one of our readers, Robert Dimand of Brock University, of another economist of note, Anne Bezanson, who in 1929 became the first woman ever to receive tenure at the University of Pennsylvania. Her appointment was in the Industrial Research Department at the Wharton School and she later became president of the Economic History Association in 1946. For an interesting and informative summary of Anne Bezanson's contributions see the paper by Cristel de Rouvray (London School of Economics), "Joseph Willits, Anne Bezanson and economic history: 1939-1954" available at:

<http://archive.rockefeller.edu/publications/resrep/derouvray.pdf>

NOMINATIONS SOUGHT FOR THE ELAINE BENNETT RESEARCH PRIZE

The Elaine Bennett Award is intended to recognize and honor outstanding research by a young woman in any area of economics. The next award will be presented in January 2007.

The prize is made possible by contributions from William Zame and others, in memory of Elaine Bennett, who made significant contributions in economic theory and experimental economics and encouraged the work of young women in all areas of economics.

Nominees should be at the beginning of their career but have demonstrated exemplary research contributions in their field.

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

Inquiries, nominations and donations should be sent to:

Lisa Lynch, CSWEP Chair
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy
Tufts University
160 Packard Avenue
Medford, MA 02155
cswep@tufts.edu

Closing date for nominations for the 2007 prize is September 15, 2006.

CAROLYN SHAW BELL AWARD

The Carolyn Shaw Bell Award was created in January 1998 as part of the 25th Anniversary celebration of the founding of CSWEP. Carolyn Shaw Bell, the Katharine Coman Chair Professor Emerita of Wellesley College, was the first Chair of CSWEP. The Carolyn Shaw Bell Award ("Bell Award") is given annually to an individual who has furthered the status of women in the economics profession, through example, achievements, increasing our understanding of how women can advance in the economics profession, or mentoring others. Inquiries, nominations and donations may be sent to:

Lisa Lynch, CSWEP Chair
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy
Tufts University
160 Packard Avenue
Medford, MA 02155
cswep@tufts.edu

Closing date for nominations for the 2007 prize is September 15, 2006.

HOW TO RENEW/BECOME A CSWEP ASSOCIATE

CSWEP is a subcommittee of the AEA, charged with addressing the status of women in the economics profession. It publishes a three-times-a-year newsletter that examines issues such as how to get papers published, how to get on the AEA program, how to network, working with graduate students, and family leave policies. CSWEP also organizes sessions at the annual meetings of the AEA and the regional economics associations, runs mentoring workshops, and publishes an annual report on the status of women in the economics profession.

CSWEP depends on the generosity of its associates to continue its activities. If you are already a CSWEP associate and have not sent in your donation for the current year (January 2006-December 2006) we urge you to renew your status. If CSWEP is new to you, please visit our website, www.cswep.org to learn more about us. Students receive free complimentary CSWEP associate status. Just indicate your student status below.

Thank you!

If you wish to renew/become an associate of CSWEP you have two options:

OPTION 1: ONLINE PAYMENT BY CREDIT CARD

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

OPTION 2: MAIL/FAX

If you prefer to mail or fax your donation, or you are a student, fill out the form below and send it to the address at the bottom or fax this form to (850) 562-3838.

NAME: _____

MAILING ADDRESS: _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP: _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS: _____ Please supply this information if you are willing to receive emails from us. It saves CSWEP money and is another way to support our activities.

check here if currently an AEA member

check here if currently a student Institution: _____

Expected graduation date: _____

I authorize CSWEP to release my contact information to other organizations that wish to share information of interest with CSWEP members. yes no

Donation Amount: \$25.00 (associate level) \$50.00 \$75.00 \$100.00 Other _____

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

credit card (MasterCard/Visa/Amex)

Credit card number: _____

Name as it appears on the credit card: _____

Expiration date: _____ Authorizing signature: _____

If paying by check please send your donation to:

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

For more information please visit our website www.cswep.org.

To no longer receive mail from CSWEP, please email cswepmembers@ersgroup.com or write to the address provided above.

CSWEP Directory

General Policy Matters:

Lisa Lynch

Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy
Tufts University
160 Packard Avenue
Medford, MA 02155
cswep@tufts.edu

Dues, Change of Address, Roster:

Joan Haworth

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

CSWEP East:

Ann Owen

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

CSWEP Midwest:

Anne Paulson

Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago
230 South LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60604-1412
Anna.Paulson@chi.frb.org

CSWEP South:

Gail Hoyt

University of Kentucky
335D Gatton
Business and Economics Building
Lexington, KY 40506-0034
ghoyt@pop.uky.edu

CSWEP West:

Lori Kletzer

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

Upcoming Regional Meetings

Eastern Economic Association

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

2007 Annual Meeting: February 23-25, 2007

New York City: Crowne Plaza Times Square Manhattan Hotel

CSWEP submission date: November 1, 2006

EEA submission date: November 3, 2006

Midwest Economic Association

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

2007 Annual Meeting: March 23-27, 2007

Minneapolis, MN: Hilton Minneapolis

CSWEP submission date: September 15, 2006

MEA submission date: October 3, 2006.

Western Economic Association

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

2006 Annual Meeting: June 29-July 3, 2006

San Diego: Manchester Grand Hyatt

Southern Economic Association

<http://www.okstate.edu/economics/journal/south1.html>

2006 Annual Meeting: November 18-21, 2006

Charleston, South Carolina: Charleston Place Hotel



Tufts University
American Economic Association
CSWEP
c/o Lisa Lynch
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy
160 Packard Avenue
Medford, MA 02155

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Medford, MA
Permit No. 1161