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MOVING FROM GOVERNMENT TO ACADEMIA

Thomas D. Hopkins
Arthur J. Gosnell Professor of Economics
Rochester Institute of Technology

One type of career transition that may become more attractive in the near future is shifting out of government and into higher education. I made such a change a decade ago, and this essay looks back on how the process unfolded for me.

I had held a series of positions as analyst and manager in the Executive Office of the President during three sharply contrasting Administrations, those of Presidents Ford, Carter and Reagan. The key challenge for my intended transition was that, while much of my government work was on issues academics find respectable, I lacked a record of publications in refereed journals. The incentive structure, long hours and managerial duties in my government work had not been conducive to published research.

Once I had decided that college teaching would be the best next step on my career path, my transition had two stages—a four-year search for a suitable tenure-track position, followed by a three-year process of achieving tenure. At the outset, I expected that the setting I should seek was the type with which I had most familiarity—a small, undergraduate, liberal arts college. I had attended and thrived in such a college as a student, and I had fond memories of my first post-doctoral job teaching for several years in this kind of institution. But my initial search for a liberal arts setting was deflected by indications, among other things, that I would encounter a severe salary jolt at those schools willing to take a gamble on an academically-rusty ex-bureaucrat.

I spent the first two years of my transition teaching graduate students in a public policy program at a large university. This visiting appointment proved to be an excellent experience and a natural bridge back into academia. While my government work had moved me some distance from the pedagogy of Principles I, it suited me ideally to working with students entering public service themselves, while I brushed up on library and chalkboard techniques. I also sought out a variety of public policy consulting assignments in addition to my teaching, which increased my visibility and produced marketable evidence of my scholarship.

In the third and fourth years of the transition, I coupled job search with consulting and visiting teaching appointments, including one which gave me a welcome opportunity to renew my undergraduate teaching skills. I gradually acquired a realistic sense of my own strengths and interests, recognizing that applied policy research and small class-size teaching were where I had a comparative advantage.

During this period, I continued to scan Job Openings for Economists, responding to notices that looked promising. It was this process that connected me
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with what proved to be my permanent teaching position in a large, technical institution with an undergraduate, small class-size setting. A routine letter of inquiry started a series of discussions leading to my appointment in a newly endowed chair, set up with specifications that I could not have better tailored to my own experience and aspirations. The emphasis of this institution is on quality teaching and the kind of applied work I most enjoy. An initial three-year trial appointment ensued during which my earlier research initiatives came to fruition, and my classrooms benefited from my government policy work. The academic calendar permits me to participate on an on-going basis in a variety of government projects, and my university incentive structure rewards such involvement. As a result, tenure followed smoothly, as did renewal in the chair.

My transition took considerably longer than I had expected, and I had misgivings at numerous points along the way. Yet this did have one important advantage. Being forced to explore alternatives at a rather slow pace exposed me to a wide array of options and enabled me to sample some of them with care. In my own case, it proved crucial to spend time defining a vision of a career path that I would find satisfying while staying receptive to the quite unexpected opportunities that kept arising. Many of these opportunities resulted from active networking, and my success in identifying and responding to them owed much to a highly supportive family and loyal friends. The net result is an academic job that is a far better fit for me than any I could have anticipated at the outset.

IF YOU CAN, YOU MAY HAVE A FUTURE AS A COMMERCIAL ARTIST... OR AS PRESIDENT.
AND THE TWO SHALL BE AS ONE:
Job Sharing in an Academic Department

Mark Montgomery and Irene Powell
Grinnell College

It is quite common these days for both members of a married couple to have the same level of professional training. Often they will both be trained in the same field. But for academic couples, there is a simple rule of thumb: if you have the same level of training, in the same field of study, then don't expect to have the same zip code. In other words, if you fall in love with another Ph.D., don't expect to whisper sweet nothings to him without the help of Sprint or MCI. A modern alternative to the long-distance marriage, however, is the sharing of one academic position. Or maybe the sharing of one-point-something academic positions. For example, the authors of this article each represent between .7 and 1.0 associate professors at Grinnell College, with an annual mean of .9, and a standard deviation of about .1. (This is not something we try to explain at cocktail parties.) Our joint contract stipulates that we teach no fewer than seven courses between us per year, and up to ten (full-time) if we and the college mutually agree. In this essay we consider the advantages and disadvantages of this kind of arrangement.

Not every college or university is ready to embrace the shared academic contract. In fact, it will only happen for one of two reasons:

1) An angel of the Lord appears to the dean and demands he implement a shared contract policy, or

2) The school has trouble recruiting women.

Often both things have to happen. A place like Grinnell, where we teach, has a strong incentive to resort to shared contracts because it is a small college, in a town of 8000, deep in the heart of Iowa. Rural Iowa. A female professor here may have trouble finding her husband a job better than the one Henry Fonda had in The Grapes of Wrath. If the husband is in the same academic field, a shared contract may be an attractive option.

There are goods things and bad things about shared contracts, of course. Obviously, a couple sharing a job earns less money than if both spouses had full-time jobs at separate institutions. As economists, we can't dismiss this as a trivial disadvantage. But the earnings differential may be smaller than you think. Even if you share a single full-time job, you can usually pick up extra courses to teach. In any given year, there is nearly always someone in your department on leave. When we were recruited, our department was actively seeking a job-sharing couple to create some flexibility in leave replacement. Moreover, don't forget that there is complementary slackness between your budget and time constraints. If you earn less money it's because you
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have less teaching to do. For two assistant professors who want to establish research records, the extra time is a major advantage. For example, the lower time requirements of the shared contract will certainly make it much easier for you to have children. (Actually we couldn't decide whether that's an advantage or a disadvantage of a shared contract, so let's just call it a "feature.") And finally, consider another terrific aspect of splitting a single job: you and your spouse will spend more time together every day than almost any couple you know. A lot more time. (Well, here again, better just call that a feature.)

All right then, let's suppose you and your spouse have abandoned the dream of twin endowed chairs at Stanford and are willing to try a shared position. You have found an institution that is open-minded, progressive, and in tune with cutting-edge innovations in personnel management. Or, at least, one that's out in the sticks. What should you negotiate in your shared contract? First, of course, find out how tenure and promotion requirements will be handled by your institution. Work this out up front. One position-sharing couple we know was told by their chair that he expected twice as much research from each of them because each would be only doing only half as much teaching. WRONG! [Loud Buzzer]. The point of a shared contract is not for the college to get four times as much research for the same salary. Technically, for a single paycheck, the college should expect that you'll each do half as much teaching, half as much research, and spend a lot more time watching Days of Our Lives. In fact, of course, you'll do more than that. The school will get more research and service than they would from a full-time professor, and that redounds to the greater glory of both the college and the couple. All well and good. But don't give them the right to demand it of you.

Along the same lines, how much college service will you do? At Grinnell, we typically each do as much student advising and serve on as many committees as full-time faculty members. We know a couple at Kenyon College, however, who have a similar shared contract, but apparently more brains, because they negotiated the right to limit their committee work.

Speaking of teaching, research and service, how will yours be evaluated: will they treat you as a couple or two individuals? For promotion and tenure Grinnell reviews each partner in the shared contract separately. In this respect the shared contract is not much different than two positions. But for the joint position there is an additional question of timing. One school of thought holds that two half-timers should get twice as many years to produce a tenurable portfolio as full-time faculty. Our friends at Kenyon, for example, were offered seven to ten years, at their own option. Usually, however, the institution is not opposed to your coming up in the regular time frame. The final important issue regarding tenure is what happens if only one of you gets it. Do both partners have to hit the road, or may one of you assume a full-time position? We have heard of at least one case where neither is permitted to stay.

Salary issues can be a little complicated, especially when raises are based on merit. Until recently, Grinnell insisted that we be paid identical salaries, prorated by the
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number of courses we taught. As it happened, one year Powell ranked 5 on the five-point merit scale, while Montgomery ranked only 3. So they averaged and gave us both a rank-4 raise. As a result, Montgomery became professionally jealous of Powell and Powell began to think of Montgomery as a drag on her career. Recent reforms made it possible for a couple at Grinnell to opt for separate salaries. For us, financially, that should be very worthwhile since those divorce attorneys cost a fortune.

There are lots of other details to work out with a shared contract, some of them things you might not think of. Benefits can be an issue, of course, such as whether you both get full life insurance, and whether you each get full research support, including travel to professional meetings. (At Grinnell, "yes" to all of the above.) Also, you need to determine how sabbatical pay is handled: is it based on one full-time teaching load, or on the amount of teaching you have both actually done. (At Grinnell, it's the latter, averaged over the previous six years.) If you eventually get divorced, may one of you automatically assume full duties? And how about parental leave and early retirement? These are all things to pay attention to.

For many young academic couples a shared contract is an idea worth considering, at least as a starting point for two careers. It may be very attractive when compared with having one partner languish in temporary positions so that the two of you can maintain one household. If one of you already works at an institution that doesn't have this arrangement, you might try suggesting it. If you do, be prepared for your dean to make a really funny face. (It may be worth mentioning it just to see that.) Anyone who would like a copy of Grinnell's contract arrangement can write to the authors at Dept. of Economics, Grinnell College, Grinnell IA, 50112. Our E-mail addresses are Powell@ac.grin.edu and Montgome@ac.grin.edu
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The state of health economics today brings to mind that blessing (or curse) "may you live in interesting times." With all of the changes, turmoil, and uncertainty in the medical system and the entire area of health care, this is certainly an interesting time to be a health economist. Health economics is a lively and growing field, with a multitude of opportunities for timely, important, and sometimes controversial research, teaching, and consulting. There are numerous job opportunities for health economists, not only in academic world, but also in non-academic areas such as government, consulting, and private business. However, because these are such "interesting times," those of us who are health economists can by no mean expect a stable, tranquil, unchanging work environment.

Although there are many job opportunities for health economists in non-academic areas, I will focus here exclusively on academic positions because I have spent my entire career in academics and that is what I know best. I will classify academic positions for health economists rather loosely into four general categories, based upon the type of students taught, even though research in health economics is in no way bounded by the categories. The rationale for the classification is that the type of academic appointment defines the rules by which one is judged for tenure and promotion.

The first category consists of positions in Departments of Economics. The expectation with respect to teaching typically is three or four different economics courses, at either the undergraduate or graduate level, with health economics being a specialty course. One is, of course, expected to teach courses outside of the area of health economics. In an economics department a health economist is simply an economist among other economists, and one's performance is judged by roughly the same standards as a macroeconomist, a labor economist, or a game theorist. The advantage of choosing an economics department is that the rules of the game are fairly straightforward and well-established. The disadvantage is that many economics departments place a reduced (or possibly no) value on publications in non-economics journals, which are primary research outlets for many health economists. A health economist is expected to publish her research in mainstream economics journals just like anyone else. Furthermore, because in most economics departments there is typically only one health economist, it is sometimes difficult to find colleagues with similar interests. Nonetheless, many distinguished health economists have spent their entire career in an economics department.

The other types of positions are all in interdisciplinary departments, which in this context simply means that the academic department includes individuals from variety of disciplines. One interdisciplinary option is to teach students training for careers in the public sector. Appointments in this category would be in Schools of Public Health, Public Policy, Public Administration, or Government, with most courses at the graduate level (most commonly master's degree).

Another option is for a health economist to hold a position in a Department of Business Administration where the focus is on training students to become
managers, typically in the private sector. A variant of this option is a position in a Department of Health Administration that trains students specifically for management positions in the health care field. For most management-focused departments, the master's degree is the terminal degree. Finally, there are job opportunities for health economists in schools that train health professionals, typically Schools of Medicine or Dentistry. In these positions one teaches graduate students who will provide health services. Health economists also may hold a joint appointment, typically in a Department of Economics and in one of the interdisciplinary departments.

A health economist in any type of interdisciplinary department is, of course, expected to teach courses in economics and possibly in finance. Emphasis is on application of economics to the students' career area, for example, how economics is useful to a government rate-setter or a hospital administrator or a medical doctor. (With the current changing medical environment, many physicians are returning to school to take economics and business courses.) Faculty members in these interdisciplinary departments are expected to be extremely knowledgeable about the institutions related to the careers for which the students are training.

The interdisciplinary positions share certain advantages. One advantage is that the number of research outlets typically is larger. That is, most interdisciplinary departments will reward both publications in economics journals and publications in well-established health-related journals. The tenure and promotion requirements differ among departments, but generally will be made clear from the start. Another advantage is the benefit of cross-fertilization among fields. Particularly in an area changing as rapidly as health economics, it can be extremely useful to hear other perspectives on important health care issues or to learn about other approaches or techniques.

There also are disadvantages associated with being a health economist in an interdisciplinary department. Perhaps most difficult is the fact that the boundaries become blurred. Is one's primary identity as a economist who focuses on health issues or as a health economist? A related point is that, in an interdisciplinary department, one is expected to be knowledgeable about issues that cross disciplinary boundaries and to participate in conferences in fields other than economics.

Although the advantages and disadvantages of choosing an academic position in health economics differ according to the specific path chosen, all health economists face the tremendous challenge of keeping up with a field that changes at a sometimes dizzying pace. In addition to economics and health-related journals, one must read a wide variety of industry magazines and newsletters. In the classroom, this means new preparation each time a course is taught in order to remain current. In terms of research, especially empirical research, timing is crucial. Delaying a project for a year or two can be extremely dangerous; in that time the research question may have become moot or changes in the field may require a considerable amount of additional work.

All this, of course, is just another aspect of choosing such an "interesting" career path. Although I may groan as I have to revise my reading lists each semester, on balance I find health economics fun, challenging, and never boring. Perhaps you will find the excitement and challenge of this field to your taste.
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Barbara Ward was a British international economist and journalist who spent her long and distinguished career as a devoted and influential advocate of economic aid to developing countries, in an effort to ensure world peace and alleviate suffering. Barbara Ward was born in England in 1914 and educated at the Sorbonne in Paris and Somerville College, Oxford, where she was awarded a First Class Honors Degree in 1935. She was a prolific writer on economic issues from then on, as an editor of the prestigious *Economist* and as the author of sixteen books including *The International Share-out* (1938), *Faith and Freedom* (1954), *The Interplay of East and West* (1957), *The Rich Nations and Poor Nations* (1962), *Spaceship Earth* (1966), and *The Lopsided World* (1968). She was significantly active during the war years, as a panelist for discussion programs for the BBC (“Brains Trust”) and as a campaigner for Labor Party candidates. She also traveled to Allied military bases on a lecture circuit in Europe for the Ministry of Information. Her work during the postwar years, including *The Interplay of the West and East*, reflected the changes afoot in the relationship between great powers and their developing colonial possessions.

Her postwar books indicate a concern for the economic and political future of Europe (The West at Bay (1948) and Policy for the West (1951). She lived and traveled abroad during the 1950's and 1960's, in Africa (Ghana), Canada, and the United States, where she spent the winters 1957-1968 as visiting scholar and Carnegie Fellow at Harvard University. The significant time she spent accompanying her husband, a UN official, in Africa and Asia stimulated her interest in the relationship between the industrialized First World and the underdeveloped Third World as discussed in *Faith and Freedom* (1954). She was noted for her proposal that rich nations earmark percentages of GNP specifically for helping the poor. An influential Roman Catholic activist and a member of the Catholic Curia, she continually voiced her concern for a more equitable distribution of wealth and an end to world poverty. She was the first woman to address the Vatican Council in Rome in 1971. She was also interested in the problems related to urban expansion, rural depopulation, and the creation of slum areas in the Third World, a subject addressed in various journals and lectures. She also worked closely with the United Nations, organizing United Nations-sponsored conferences on housing the poor.

Through her professional life, Barbara Ward influenced notable policy makers including Lyndon Johnson, to whom she became an unofficial adviser in his quest for a Great Society, although she did not support the Vietnam War. Johnson once said the Ward’s books were the only ones he ever read. James Wolfensohn, appointed President of the World Bank in March 1995, describes himself as a “devotee” of Barbara Ward’s work relating to development.

She served as Albert Schweitzer Professor of Economic Development at Columbia University 1967-1973, and organized the Columbia conference on International Economic Development in 1970, a forum for discussion of economic policy differences between the industrialized and developing countries.

In the early 1970's Barbara Ward was also involved with the economics of environmental policy and became president of the International Institute for Environment and Development.
(1973-1980). She supported a stop to the proliferation of nuclear technology, in favor of solar energy sources, an equitable and rational use of natural resources, calling attention to the need to preserve fresh water supplies, especially in developing countries. She authored three major works with Rene Dubos Only One Earth (1970), The Home of Man (1976), Progress for a Small Planet (1979) on these themes. Barbara Ward was an eternal optimist who believed that modern democracy could be combined with existing natural resources to bestow prosperity to all nations. At her death she was working on a book concerning global environmentalism and social justice. She was made a Life Peer of the Empire in 1976 at the request of Prime Minister Harold Wilson earning her the honorific title “Dame”. Barbara Ward died in 1981.

References:


More than most fields of economics, economic demography is fuzzy around the edges. This is, in large part, because the field of demography itself has grown in recent years from a very narrow study of the mathematics of population growth to a broad-based look at the cultural, social, economic, and biological determinants of population growth through the processes of fertility, mortality, and migration and the social constructs of marriage, family structure, and gender. Economic demographers embracing this wider definition of demography, focus their research on the interrelationship of demography and economics, and on promoting and understanding of demographic processes using tools from our economic toolbasket. In considering women’s contribution to the field of economic demography, I continually had to make choices about what was and was not economic demography. I have chosen to focus on the central core of the discipline, avoiding those fuzzy edges, in part because of space constraints, but also because of the extremely thorough two-part article in this newsletter in 1992 on “Women’s Contribution to Labor Economics” by Francine Blau and Marianne Ferber.

At the most basic level, populations grow from births or from in-migration. Populations are reduced in size because of deaths or out-migration. Thus fertility, mortality, and migration are considered the fundamental determinants of population size. Yet marriage and divorce, family structure, and the distribution of tasks within the household are themselves important determinants of fertility, mortality, and migration. Women economists have been active in all these areas of economic demography.

Economic Determinants of Population Processes

Fertility

Two economists, Gary Becker and Richard Easterlin, have changed the way fertility is studied by all demographers. Becker (Demographic and Economic Change in Developed Countries, 1960) applied a standard utility maximization model to a joint household decision where one of the goods in the household utility function is defined as children (or child services). Children are mainly “home-produced” through fertility because of a preference for “own children”. Important determinants of fertility that emerge from this model are family income and the wage of the mother (the value of her non-market time). Easterlin’s model (Family Economic Behavior, 1973) differs from Becker’s in its emphasis on preference formation and the role of relative economic status. Women economists have been active in testing these two models, expanding upon them, and criticizing many of the assumptions that underlie the theory. Papers by Eva Mueller (Rural Development and Human Fertility 1984), Eva Mueller and Richard Cohn (EDCC 1977), Deborah Freedman (JDevStud 1975), Kathryn Anderson (JER 1983), and Nancy Birdsall and Dean Jamison (PopDevRev 1983) each looked at the relationship between income and fertility in the context of a developing country, a relationship key to the Becker model. Deborah Friedman and Arland Thornton (Demography 1982) look more generally at “Income and Fertility: The Elusive Relationship.”

The value of a mother’s non-market time is another key variable in the Becker model. Some examples from a large literature measuring the value of time are Carmel Chiswick (JHR...
1982) “Value of a Housewife’s Time” and Eva Mueller (JDevEc 1984) “The Value and Allocation of Time in Rural Botswana.” More recently, Diane Macunovich has been revisiting the Easterlin hypothesis, adding women back into the decision making and reminding us that women’s wages represent a positive income effect as well as a negative substitution effect in household decision-making.

There have been many criticism of the Becker framework. Susan Cochrane (Pop Studies 1975) offered a critique of economic models of fertility. In 1984, Barbara Wolfe and Jere Behrman (Econometrica) presented “A More General Approach,” which relaxes some of the most vexing assumptions of the Becker model such as supply constraints and endogenous preferences. Wolfe and Behrman are still thinking about broader models in their newer paper “The Synthesis Economic Fertility Model” (JPopEcon 1992).


One of the many ways children differ from other economic goods is that fertility may be the unintended outcome of another economic good, sexual enjoyment. Aileen Layabouts, Marvin Eisen and Winston Chow (Demography 1986) and Shelly Lundberg and Robert Plotnick (JoLE 1995) offer economic models of teenage pregnancy. In a developing country context, economic models of contraceptive use have been tested by Deborah DeGraff (Demography 1991) using data from Bangladesh and by Cochrane and Guilkey (EDCC 1995) using multi-level data from Tunisia.

Fertility rates may be influenced by public policy parameters (though often they are less responsive than policy makers would like.) Cynthia Lloyd (Public Policy, 1974) offered “An Economic Analysis of the Impact of Government on Fertility.” Evelyn Lehrer and Seiichi Kawasaki (Demography 1985) looked at the effect of child care arrangements on fertility, Aileen Layabouts (JHR 1990) examined the effect of health care costs on fertility and Leslie Whittington, Elizabeth Peters and James Alm (AER 1990) studied the impact of personal tax exemptions on fertility.

Child services is more than just the total number of births. Rahman Mizanu and Julie DaVanzo consider issues of gender preference and birth spacing in Bangladesh (Demography 1993). The “quality” of children is also a concern and an important determinant of the number of children demanded. A large number of papers by women economists consider components of child quality. Aileen Layabouts (AER 1974 and JHR 1977) looked at the relationship between parents’ (mainly mother’s) investments in children and their children’s school achievement. More recently, Francine Blau and Adam Grossberg (ReStat 1992) considered “Maternal Labor Supply and Children’s Cognitive Development.” Barbara Wolfe and Jere Behrman have a series of papers looking at the effect of women’s schooling on child outcomes. (See for example JHealthEc 1987 and JoEconometrics 1987)
Mortality

Mortality studies tend to be divided between infant mortality and adult mortality. Women economists have been important contributors in both areas. Barbara Wolfe and Jere Behrman (JDevEc 1982) examine determinants of child mortality in developing countries. Julie DaVanzo (Demography 1988) looks at infant mortality in Malaysia. Evelyn Lehrer considers the link between infant mortality and fertility in “The Impact of Child Mortality on Spacing by Parity” (Demography 1984). In the area of adult mortality Harriet Duleep (JHR 1986 and Demography 1989) examines the determinants of adult mortality using social security records. Kathryn Anderson (JEcon&Bus 1985) considers “The Effect of Mandatory Retirement on Mortality.”

Migration

As one would expect, economic models of migration emphasize the role of labor market opportunities in determining migration flows. Julie DaVanzo’s article (ReStat 1978), “Does Unemployment Affect Migration?” is an excellent example of the work of economic demographers in this area. Also see DaVanzo (ReStat 1983), “Repeated Migration in the United States.” Another important contributor to this field is Sherrie Kossoudji (Demography 1992 and PopDevRev 1983, written with Susan Ranney). Both papers look at illegal migration from Mexico to the United States.

Marriage (and Divorce)

Gary Becker’s “A Theory of Marriage” (JPE 1973) ushered economists into this field of demography. Once one starts modelling “who marries whom” it is a small step to “who stays married to whom” which is, of course, the flip side of divorce. See Gary Becker, Elisabeth Landes and Robert Michael (JPE 1977) for the extension of Becker’s marriage model to divorce. Shoshana Amyra Grossbard-Schechtman has written a number of papers on the economic theory of marriage and polygamy which is an important test of the Becker model. (Grossbard-Schechtman, On the Economics of Marriage: A Theory of Marriage, Labor and Divorce, 1993). Other authors sympathetic to the Becker model are Elizabeth Peters (AER 1986 and Economic Inquiry 1993) and Carmel Chiswick and Evelyn Lehrer (Demography 1993 and JPopEc 1990). Each of these papers looks at economic determinants of divorce and possible remarriage.

More critical of the Becker model is Julie Nelson, “I, Thou and Them: Capabilities, Altruism and Norms in the Economics of Marriage (AER 1994). She has also written a series of papers that consider economies of scale in household consumption which is often given as one of the many reasons for marriage (Econometrica 1988, for example).

Family Structure

Beyond “who marries whom” is “who lives with whom.” Frances Goldscheider and Julie DaVanzo have coauthored a couple of papers on the timing of teenagers leaving home. (Demography 1985 and PopStud 1990). Also see Marjorie McElroy’s paper “The Joint Determination of Household Membership and Market Work: The Case of Young Men”, JoLE 1985). In a developing country context, see Martha Ainsworth’s dissertation on child fosterage in Cote d’Ivoire, Rebeca Wong and Malathi Ram’s (JMar&Fam 1994) paper on the determinants of living as an extended family, and Cynthia Lloyd and Sonalde Desai.
Economic Consequences of Demographic Change

Fertility

One of the most important topics of demography has been the consequences of population growth on economic growth and development. Susan Cochrane, Nancy Birdsall, Irma Adelman, and Ester Boserup are all important contributors to this large literature, each with a long list of publications of her own. For example, see Birdsall “Analytic Approaches to the Relationship of Population Growth and Development” (PopDevRev 1977) and “Economic Analysis of Rapid Population Growth (World Bank Research Observer, 1989) and Cochrane “Population and Development: A More General Model” (EDCC 1973). Irma Adelman’s development models are more “macro” oriented but see “Some Thoughts on Third Generation of Economic Demographic Models” (U of Cal at Berkeley, CUDARE Working Paper 605, 1991). Finally, Ester Boserup, one of the pioneer women in the field of economic demography has spent her career writing about the relationship between technological change and population growth. Twenty-five of her papers have been republished in Economic and Demographic Relationships in Development, 1990.

Recently, economic demographers have become interested in the “micro” consequence of high fertility rates in developing countries, the effect of high fertility on economic and social outcomes within the family. Cynthia Lloyd and Anastasia Gage-Brandon (PopStud 1994) focus on the impact of high fertility on children’s schooling using data from Ghana while Susan Cochrane and Zeba Sathor write about “Who gets Primary Schooling in Pakistan (Pakistan Development Review 1994), and Deborah DeGraff, Richard Bilsborrow and Alejandro Herrin (PopRes&PolRev forthcoming 1996) consider the effect of high fertility on children’s time use in the Phillipines.

In developed countries, the economic consequences of fertility are felt mainly through the variance in fertility rates rather than their level. Fertility rates have proven to be quite volatile leading to baby booms and baby busts. Rachel Connelly (JHR 1986) and Elizabeth Peters and Evangelos Falaris (JHR 1992) consider the effect of large birth cohorts on schooling choice and wage structures in the U.S. Nancy Birdsall and Jere Behrman (ReStat 1988) consider the Brazilian case.

Mortality

The large body of the papers listed above on the consequences of rapid population growth might be more correctly classified as research concerned with the consequences of the world wide decline in mortality rates rather than research concerned with fertility. In most developing countries experiencing high population growth rates, the cause is mortality declining more rapidly than fertility is declining. While declining mortality may be the cause, further controlling fertility is usually seen as the solution. Recently, Martha Ainsworth has been looking at the consequences of increased mortality in Africa connected with the AIDS epidemic (World Bank Research Observer 1994).

Migration
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There is a large literature on the economic consequences of migration—consequences for the migrant himself/herself, for the origin economy and from the destination economy. Deb Cobb-Clark (AER 1993) looked at the issue of the selectivity of women migrants. Sherrie Kossoudji (JHR 1989) considered immigrant assimilation into the U.S. labor market.

Marriage, Divorce and Family Structure

Women economic demographers have been active in exploring the consequences of divorce for women and children. Sheila Krien and Andrea Beller (Demography 1988) looked at the “Educational Attainment of Children from Single-Parent Families,” while Beller and Seung Sin Chung (JPopEc 1992) considered the effect of remarriage on children’s educational attainment. Similarly, Barbara Wolfe and Robert Haveman (Demography 1991) studied the effect of childhood events on high school completion. Beller and John Graham consider the role of child support income on the economic well-being of divorced women and their children (Horizontal Equity, Uncertainty and Economic Well-Being, 1985). In a developing country context, Rebeca Wong and Ruth Levine look at the role of household structure, “who lives with whom” on women’s economic activity and fertility in Mexico (EDCC 1994), while Rachel Connelly, Deborah DeGraff and Deborah Levison (EDCC forthcoming 1996) examine the role of household structure on women’s employment and child care use in Brazil.

Concluding Remarks

After agreeing to write this survey I realized that this was a losing proposition. Economic demography has no shortage of women contributors, so that in trying to summarize such a large body of work I would inevitably leave out someone crucial. If that someone is you or your friend, colleague, or mentor, I apologize. For me it has been enjoyable to look at the literature of economic demography author by author instead of topic by topic. In doing so, I was able to see the full range of women’s contributions. I found much to be inspired by.
CSWEP ACTIVITIES AT THE 1996 AEA MEETING
January 5-7, 1996
San Francisco Hilton & Towers

BUSINESS MEETING AND RECEPTION
(Business Meeting: Union Square 14)
(Reception: Union Square 15 & 16)

The CSWEP business meeting will be held on January 5 at 4:45 PM. A reception will follow at 5:45 PM.

HOSPITALITY ROOM
(Union Square 21)

The hospitality room will be open January 5 and 6 from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM. A complimentary continental breakfast will be available from 7:30 AM to 10:30 AM each day.

We need your help to welcome people at the hospitality room. Please send your name, phone number, and times you could be there to Rebecca Blank, whose address is on the back cover. Two-hour periods, especially in the morning would be the most helpful.

CSWEP SESSIONS

Roundtable Discussion Session
“Raising Children and Managing a Career in Economics: How Do You Do Both?”
Friday, January 5 - 2:30 PM
Continental Parlor 1 & 2

Panel includes: Elizabeth Bailey, Chair, (University of Pennsylvania), Kathryn Anderson (Vanderbilt University), Marty Eichenbaum (Northwestern University), Mark Montgomery (Grinnell College), Christina Romer (University of California, Berkeley).

International Trade and Finance
“International Linkages: Theory and Evidence”
Friday, January 5 - 8:00 AM
Union Square 14
Chair: Linda Tesar (University of California, Santa Barbara)

Discussants: Enrique Mendoza (Board of Governor of FRS), Mario Crucini (Ohio State University), Urban Jermann (Wharton School), Kei-Mu Yi (Rice University).

Papers: Anne Mikkola (University of Rochester, from June 15 - University of Helsinki) and Athanasios Arvanitis (University of Rochester), "Asset Market Structure and International Trade Dynamics", Sarmila Basu (Southern Methodist University), "The Role Of Homework In A Two Country Business Cycle Model", Linda Tesar (University of California, Santa Barbara) and Henning Bohn (University of California, Santa Barbara), "The U.S. Investment Portfolio and the ICAPM", Jane Eileen Ihrig (University of Minnesota), "Multinational Enterprises' Response to Repatriation Restrictions".
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"Current Debates in Trade Policy"
Friday, January 5 - 10:15 AM
Continental Parlor 7 & 8

Chair: Nancy Marion (Dartmouth College)
Discussants: Jane Ihrig (University of Virginia), Michael Knetter (Dartmouth College), Tom Prusa (Stony Brook), Carsten Kowalczyn (Fletcher School, Tufts).

Papers: Ann Harrison (Columbia Business School) and Gunnar S. Eskeland (The World Bank), "Playing Dirty? Multinationals and the Pollution Haven Hypothesis"; Anne Gron (J.L. Kellogg Graduate School of Management) and Deborah Swenson (University of California at Davis), "Pricing to Market and Imperfect Competition: The Effects of Local Production and Local Competition"; Susan Skeath (Wellesley College) and Corrine Krupp (Michigan State University), "Modelling the Upstream/Downstream Impacts of Antidumping Duties"; Kala Krishna (Penn State) and Jiandong Ju (Penn State), "Market Access Effects of Free Trade Areas".

"Empirical Aspects of Exchange Rates"
Saturday, January 6 - 2:30 PM
Franciscan A

Chair: Maurice Obstfield (University of California, Berkeley)
Discussants: Michael Klein (Fletcher School, Tufts), Richard Clarida (Columbia), Charles Engel (University of Washington), Robert Cumby (Georgetown).

Papers: Susan M. Collins (Georgetown University), "Postponing Economic Reform? The Timing of Exchange Rate Adjustment in Developing Countries"; Anne Mikkola (University of Rochester, from June 15 - University of Helsinki), "Does the Volatility of Exchange Rates Affect The Trade Flows?"; Adrienne A. Kearney (Congressional Budget Office), "Forecasting the Trade-Weighted Dollar Over the Intermediate Run"; Carmen M. Reinhart (IMF) and Carlos A. Vegh (IMF), "Intertemporal Consumption Substitution and Inflation Stabilization: An Empirical Investigation"

Gender-Related Sessions
"Family Behavior"
Saturday, January 6 - 8:00 AM
Franciscan C

Chair: Ronald Ehrenberg (Cornell University)
Discussants: Ronald Ehrenberg (Cornell University), Julie L. Hotchkiss (Georgia State University), Elizabeth Peters (Cornell University), Shelley White-Means (University of Memphis).

Papers: Shirley P. Burggraf (Radciffe College), "Family Values and Economic Rationality"; Amy Farmer (The University of Tennessee) and Jill Tiefenthaler (Colgate University), "Domestic Violence: Credible Threats and the Use of Services as Signals"; Elizabeth T. Powers (Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland), "Fertility and Welfare Participation"; Jean Kimmel (Upjohn Institute), "Reducing the Welfare Dependence of Single-Mother Families: Health Related Employment Barriers and Policy Responses".
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"Women's Work Choices"
Saturday, January 6 - 10:15 AM
Franciscan C

Chair: Kathryn Shaw (Carnegie Mellon University),
Discussants: Kathryn Shaw (Carnegie Mellon University), Joni Hersch (University of Wyoming), Jennifer Gerner (Cornell University), Larry Kahn (Cornell University).

Papers: Lori Kletzer (University of California, Santa Cruz), "International Trade and Job Loss in U.S. Manufacturing: Do Women Have More to Lose Than Men?", KimMarie McGoldrick (University of Richmond) and John Robst (Clarkson University), "Gender Differences in Overeducation: A Test of the Theory of Differential Overqualification", M. Melinda Pitts (North Carolina State University) and Ann A. McDermed (North Carolina State University), "Is There Such a Thing as Women's Work? A 1980s Perspective" M.V. Lee Badgett (University of Maryland at College Park) and Mary C. King (Portland State University), "Occupational Strategies of Lesbians and Gay Men".

"Household and Labor Market Interactions"
Sunday, January 7 - 10:15 AM
Continental Parlor 7 & 8

Chair: Joni Hersch (University of Wyoming)
Discussants: Patricia Reagan (Ohio State University), Ivy Broder (The American University), Walter Oi (University of Rochester), Shelly Lundberg (University of Washington).

Papers: Julie L. Hotchkiss (Georgia State University) and Robert E. Moore (Georgia State University), "The Labor Market Value of Having a Supporting Spouse" Joyce P. Jacobsen (Wesleyan University) and Wendy L. Rayack (Wesleyan University), "Do Men Whose Wives Work Really Earn Less?", Jon D. Haveman (Purdue University) and Janet S. Netz (Purdue University), "Family Matters: Unemployment, Wages, and Mobility", Linda N. Edwards (CUNY Graduate School) and Elizabeth Field-Hendrey (Queens College and the Graduate Center, City University of New York), "Does the Elasticity of Labor Supply Differ by Workplace? Home-Based Women Workers in the 1990 Census of Population".
CHILD CARE BY KIDDIECORP

KiddieCorp will provide professional child care services at the Allied Social Science Associations Meetings. KiddieCorp is in their eighth year of providing high quality services to conventions across the country. KiddieCorp teams are bonded, qualified child care specialists who are carefully selected and trained. KiddieCorp features custom designed programs of educational, social, and creative activities.

KiddieCorp's child care program will be located at the San Francisco Hilton & Towers, building 3, sixth floor, Taylor & Van Ness Rooms. Dates are January 5-7, 1996 (Friday through Sunday) from 7:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. The fee for ages 6 months - 12 years is $25.00 per morning shift, and $22.00 per afternoon shift. Additional hours between 7:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. may be purchased at $5.00 per hour.

MEALS - Parents can either order lunch, bring lunch, or take their child(ren) out for lunch. We will pre-arrange for an optional kiddie meal that can be ordered when parents drop off their child(ren)...it will cost approximately $10.00 including beverage, tax and tip on a cash-only basis. Nutritious snacks and beverages will be served regularly. For parents with infants please bring diaper changing supplies, formula/baby food, and a change of clothes. Please label all lunches and personal belongings. KiddieCorp does not administer any medication.

TO REGISTER - Please complete the accompanying form and send it along with payment (check made PAYABLE TO ASSA) to KiddieCorp, Kristin Leach, ATTENTION: ASSA, 5665 Oberlin Drive, Suite #102, San Diego, CA 92121. Forms must be received by December 1, 1995. Late or on-site registration will be accepted on a space available basis only.

CANCELLATIONS - are allowed up until December 15, 1995. After that a 50% penalty will be applied. Cancellations after the program has started cannot be refunded. This program is subject to change if conditions change.

If you have any questions, call Kristin Leach at 1-619-455-1718. Hope to see you soon!
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KIDDIECORP REGISTRATION FORM

Please indicate on this form the reservations you would like to make for each child. Simply list their name(s), age(s), and circle the price of each shift you want.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHIFT</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, January 5</td>
<td>#1 - 7:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, January 6</td>
<td>#3 - 7:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, January 7</td>
<td>#5 - 7:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Price = $_____

Parent Name(s):_____________________________________________________

Address:_________________________________________________________________

Phone #: home( )_____________ work( )_____________

*Send completed form and check (payable to ASSA) to KiddieCorp at the address on the previous page. Keep a copy for your records.
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GETTING ON THE PROGRAM AT THE JANUARY 1997 AEA MEETING

Now is the time to think about submitting an abstract, or a proposal for an entire session, in order to participate in the AEA's annual meetings on January 3-5, 1997 in New Orleans. CSWEP generally organizes several sessions each year. A subset of the papers presented in these sessions are selected for publication in the May 1997 issue of the *American Economic Review*, "Papers and Proceedings."

For 1997, we expect to organize sessions in two areas:

There will be three sessions on **Gender-related topics**. We are particularly interested in receiving abstracts for research investigating women's health-related issues, but all gender-related research topics are welcome.

There will also be three sessions in the areas of **urban economics** and **state/local public finance**. We are particularly interested in abstracts on the following topics: intergovernmental relations in transition economies; effects of proposed federal block grants, a balanced federal budget, and federal tax reform on state and local governments; limits on government growth; urban fiscal crises; effects of natural disasters on cities; political economy of aid to urban areas; managing congestion and air pollution; reforming the provision and financing of education; explaining levels and trends in state and local expenditures; and taxation and economic development.

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

Abstracts should be submitted by February 1, 1996. Abstracts should be sent to:

Rebecca Blank  
CSWEP  
c/o Department of Economics  
2003 Sheridan Road  
Northwestern University  
Evanston, IL 60208  
Inquiries call: 708/491-4145 FAX 708/491-7001

Abstracts in other areas, or proposals for entire sessions, should be sent as soon as possible, but not later than February 1, 1996, to:

Arnold Harberger  
President-elect, American Economic Association  
2014 Broadway  
Nashville, TN 37203  
(Please mark envelope "AEA Meetings - 1997")
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Economics was an easy choice. The alternative was being an accounts payable clerk. I was an undergraduate math major at the University of South Florida, which was the local option available. I attended school mainly on a part-time and evening basis while working at various jobs, most notably as an accounting clerk. I went to graduate school at Northwestern University. Focusing my course work on economic theory, I did a thesis chaired by John Ledyard and graduated in 1981.

After graduating, I discovered that I was more motivated by real economic problems than by concerns that were purely theoretical, and began exploring more applied economic issues. My background in labor and human resource economics, which ultimately became my area of specialty, was acquired essentially by on-the-job training. I learned survey research techniques from Lucia Dunn, which I've put to good use in collecting original data on three occasions.

My first tenure-track job was, in the polite euphemism, a “bad match.” The smartest move I made in that period was to spend a year on leave at Northwestern. This year was extremely productive and restored my confidence, and my professional life began to blossom.

I was very happy to take a job in 1989 as an Associate Professor in Department of Economics and Finance at the University of Wyoming, and am now a full professor there. Wyoming specializes in environmental and resource economics. Although my research interests are not a main focus of the department, it has been a very congenial and supportive environment. I visited Caltech in 1992-93, with the support of the NSF Visiting Professorships for Women award. This was an extremely productive year and gave me a chance to benefit again from John Ledyard’s tutelage. While I enjoyed attending theory seminars once again, it reinforced the wisdom of my decision to be an applied economist who uses theory as a means rather than as the end. I am now spending my sabbatical year at Duke University where, in addition to continuing research in labor economics, I look forward to new research in the areas of individual risk behavior and health economics.

In recent work, I have examined the effect of individual risk preferences (proxied by smoking behavior and seatbelt use) on wage-risk tradeoffs; the effect of worker over- and under-qualification on training time, turnover, and promotions; the relations between job matching, tenure, and wages; the relation between household responsibilities, earnings, and the gender wage gap; and the effect of Equal Employment Opportunity suits on firm profitability.

My nonacademic interests are mainly sports, primarily running. My highlights include a 3:19 marathon and a 5:15 1500 meters. I still compete occasionally in track meets and road races, and look forward to turning 40 and being eligible for Master’s track meets. I like to try new activities, no matter how little talent I display, which in recent years has included skiing, snowboarding, scuba diving, rock climbing, and piano. I am happy to report that my boyfriend shares my enthusiasm for new ventures.
I grew up in the suburbs of Washington, D.C. and by high school had decided I would become either a concert pianist or a diplomat. I went to Oberlin College because I could study in both the liberal arts college and the conservatory of music. I stumbled into a wonderful introductory economics course taught by Robert Piron and decided that an economics major was a good way to combine my interests in international politics with my aptitude in mathematics. Music was still my passion, but I faced reality and abandoned the idea of becoming a concert pianist.

One of my economics professors alerted me to a Sloan Foundation program that placed college seniors and graduate students as special assistants in the Office of the Major of New York City for a year. Since New York City seemed to face every problem a country did, I applied. I earned a full year's college credit my senior year by working in the Mayor's Office. Over that year I learned I did not have the temperament to be a practitioner in the rough and tumble world of New York City politics, but I was suited for the study of economic and political issues. By that time I had been accepted at Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. I went there and loved it. I took a lot of interesting courses, got a chance to work at the GATT in Geneva, built lasting friendships with fellow students from around the world, and met my future husband. Having decided on a career as an academic economist, I then moved to the Economics Department at Princeton and worked on my PhD. I had two great advisers, Bill Branson and Peter Kenen, who continue to have an influence on my professional development. During this time I married and my husband started making the daily commute to New York City.

When I went on the academic job market, I was advised to look most seriously at departments with graduate programs. I ignored the advice. I wanted to work at a liberal arts college. I chose Dartmouth because the college had a fine academic reputation, the department was serious about both teaching and research, the Hanover area was beautiful and Dartmouth helped my husband find a job at its Medical Center. We were done with commuting!

My PhD was on two-tier exchange markets, and I continued my research in the areas of exchange-rate policy and the international transmission of disturbances. NBER has provided me with many good contacts and useful ideas. I've also been fortunate to visit for brief periods at the Board of Governors, the Institute for International Economic Studies in Stockholm and the IMF. I also love teaching and hope I have had a positive influence on the lives of my students.

I received tenure at Dartmouth in 1983, a year after our first son was born. Two years later we had our second son. Over the next few years I tried to juggle the roles of wife, mother, teacher and researcher. All went well except in the research area. I delayed my review for full professor until my research could get back on track. This decision led to a period of introspection and self-doubt. Gradually I reaffirmed the choices that I had made about the balance between work and family, and began to work with increased joy and productivity. I also switched to more empirically-oriented projects on new aspects of exchange-rate policy. Eventually I was promoted to full professor. Recently I accepted a three-year appointment as department chair. I feel very fortunate. My husband and I just celebrated our 20th wedding anniversary, we have two wonderful boys, and I am happily engaged in teaching and research.
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Maureen Pirog-Good (Indiana University) and Irwin Garfinkel (Columbia University) both presented papers investigating variations in child support enforcement programs across states. Irwin Garfinkel’s paper (co-authored with Cynthia Miller, Office of Population Research, Princeton University), Sara McLanahan (Office of Population Research, Princeton University), and Thomas Hanson (Office of Population Research, Princeton University), “Deadbeat Dads or Inept States? A Comparison of Child Support Enforcement Systems,” develops a measure of overall effectiveness for state child support enforcement programs. This index is used to rank states according to their performance during the 1980’s and to identify changes in state effectiveness over the decade.

In their paper “Legislated Inequalities: 1993 Child Support Guidelines,” Maureen Pirog-Good and Daniel Mullins (Indiana University) examine the cross-state variation in guidelines for setting child support orders. They employ a public finance model to explain variation in the generosity of AFDC programs and the level of child support enforcement across states. Estimation of the model indicated that child support and AFDC benefits are used as substitutes in assuring an adequate standard of living for children. Maureen Pirog-Good also discussed a paper she co-authored with Patricia Brown (Institute for Research on Poverty), “Accuracy and Ambiguity in the Application of State Child Support Guidelines”. She finds that discrepancies in child support awards calculated by courts using state guidelines are quite large and can be attributed to human error, variation in experience, training, and computer utilization.

Wei-Yin Hu (University of California, Los Angeles) discussed “Child Support, Welfare Dependency, and Women’s Labor Supply”. He evaluates the potential effectiveness of alternative child support policies in reducing welfare program participation. The estimation framework accounts for the endogeneity of child support payments with female labor supply and selection bias due to differential rates of remarriage and AFDC participation. Estimation results suggest that large AFDC cost savings are attainable through improved child support enforcement or child support assurance.

Laura Argys (University of Colorado) and Steve Garasky (Iowa State University) provided insightful commentary.

Economic Interactions of Individuals, Families and Markets
Chair: Anita Chaudhuri, University of Pennsylvania

In the paper, “Housework Effort and Wages of Married Workers”, Joni Hersch (University of Wyoming) and Leslie Stanton perform a cross-sectional analysis and find that time spent on housework has a negative effect on the wages commanded by married women and men. The negative effect of housework on wages persists even after they control for individual fixed effects. Possible reasons include effort spent in household activities and discrimination.

Kristen Keith (University of Toledo) and Abagail McWilliams (Arizona State University West) presented their initial results on the link between gender differences in mobility and the
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recent shrinking of the wage gap in their paper “Gender Patterns in Mobility: A Cohort Analysis”. Using two cohorts of young men and young women they find that for both men and women, involuntary mobility has increased over time. The propensity to quit for family reasons has declined over time, although the extent of this decline is different for men and women.

The paper entitled “Marriage Market Imbalances and Women’s Labor Supply” by Shoshana Grossbard-Schectman and Mathew Niedffer (San Diego State University) studies the concept of “spousal labor” i.e. the “extra work” that an individual performs due to marriage. The paper suggests that individuals choose utility maximizing levels of labor supply and spousal labor and argues that the reservation wage of the individual is affected by the “quasi-wage” or return to spousal labor.

In the paper “The Accumulation of Partnership Specific Capital”, Anita Chaudhuri (University of Pennsylvania) presented a dynamic, game-theoretic model of intrafamily resource allocation. The model endogenizes the role of “partnership specific capital” accumulated over time in a marriage and studies the interplay between partnership specific capital and the “threat of divorce” summarized by the individuals’ “outside options”. The paper demonstrates that the individual with a better outside option can use “threat power” to win concessions from one’s partner. The paper questions the validity of concentrating on Pareto optimal outcomes from static models.

Useful discussions were provided by Jill Constantine (Williams College), Geetha Waehrer (Brigham Young University), Bridge Hiedemann (Seattle University) and Nancy Brooks (University of Vermont).

Professional Development as a Faculty Member
Chair: Joni Hersch, University of Wyoming.

Panelists: Ivy Broder, American University, Eleanor Brown, Pomona College, Dan Newlon, National Science Foundation, W. Kip Viscusi, Duke University.

This session at the WEA meetings was a lively and extremely frank discussion of the “real game” of academics. The panel members addressed a wide range of topics, including teaching priorities, strategies for journal submission, department and university citizenship, gaining visibility in the profession, selecting names for outside reviewers for tenure cases, getting grants, and very insider tips on how the system really works. The discussions carried over to the well-attended CSWEP reception which followed the session.

CSWEP AT THE 1996 WESTERN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION MEETING

Call for papers:
CSWEP will sponsor 2 or 3 sessions at the 1996 meeting of the Western Economic Association, June 28-July 2, 1996 in San Francisco. Anyone who would like to organize a session, present a paper, or act as a discussant, please contact (before January 10, 1996): Joni Hersch, Department of Economics, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708-0097; 919/660-1856; fax 919/684-8974; jhersch@econ.duke.edu.
CSWEP AT THE 1996 MIDWEST ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION MEETING

CSWEP is organizing one gender-related session and one session on macroeconomics at the Midwest Economics Association annual meeting to be held March 21-23, 1996 in Chicago, Illinois. If you are interested in participating in either of these sessions (as a chair, discussant or presenter) please contact Susan Pozo, Department of Economics, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008. Since the deadline for submission of abstracts has passed (October 3, 1995), it would be preferable to call, fax or E-mail me about your intentions. There is still some room for adjustments to the program. (616) 387-5553 (phone); (616) 387-3999 (FAX), Pozo@wmich.edu.

CSWEP AT THE 1996 EASTERN ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION

Call for papers:
CSWEP is organizing one or two gender-related sessions at the 1996 meetings of the Eastern Economic Association to be held in Boston, March 15-17, 1996 at the Park Plaza Hotel. Anyone who would like to organize a session, chair a session, present a paper, or act as a discussant, please contact (before December 15, 1995): Daphne Kenyon, Department of Economics, Simmons College, 300 The Fenway, Boston, MA 02115; (617) 521-2587 (phone), (617) 521-3159 (fax). When sending faxes, please attach a cover page noting Kenyon's name and that she is in the economics department.

REMINDER: For those of you wishing to register for the Eastern Economic Association meetings to be held in Boston on March 15-17, 1996, you will pay the LOWEST REGISTRATION FEE IF YOU REGISTER BY NOVEMBER 1ST. However, final registrations will be accepted until January 15th. For registration forms, call Carla Scott at (401) 232-6470.
Women and Economic Development

Chair: Yana van der Meulen Rodgers, The College of William and Mary

Discussants: Julie Hotchkiss, Georgia State University, Joseph E. Zveglich, Harvard University.

Papers: Yana van der Meulen Rodgers, College of William and Mary and Joseph E. Zveglich, Jr., Harvard University, “Labor Law and Gender Earnings Equity: Some Evidence from Taiwan”,
Marguerite Berger, Inter-American Development Bank, “Institutional Constraints to Promoting Gender Equity in the Developing Countries: A Case Study of the Inter-American Development Bank”.

Health and Aging

Chair: Shelley White-Means, University of Memphis

Discussants: Kathryn Anderson, Vanderbilt University, Donna Jennings, East Tennessee State University.

Papers: Mary Daly, Syracuse University, “Work Disability and Post-Retirement Economic Well-Being”, Alvin Header, North Carolina State University, “Fuzzy Set Indicators as Predictors of the Economic Well-Being of Older Blacks, by Gender, in the Health and Retirement Survey, Minority Oversample Data”, Shelley White-Means, University of Memphis and Gong Soog Hong, Purdue University, “Well-Being and Retirement Status of Children who Care for Disabled Parents”.

There will also be a CSWEP business meeting from 6-6:15 on Sunday, Nov. 19, followed by a reception from 6:15-7:15. Both events will be held in the Gold Room of the Fairmont Hotel.

Those who are interested in the Consultants interest group should plan to meet at the CSWEP reception at the Southern Economic Association meetings in New Orleans. We will discuss possible activities for the coming year. If you are not attending the SEA but want more information on this group, contact Joan G. Haworth, at the address on the front of the newsletter.
NEWS & NOTES

Lisa Lynch has been appointed Chief Economist at the Department of Labor, effective October 1995. She is taking a leave from her job at the Fletcher School of Tufts University.

Alicia Munnell has been named as a member of the Council of Economic Advisors, pending Senate confirmation.

Linda Bell has been promoted to Associate Professor with tenure at Haverford College.

Linda Cohen has been promoted to Full Professor at the University of California at Irvine.

Michell Garfinkel has been promoted to Associate Professor with tenure at the University of California at Irvine.

Olivia Mitchell and Joe Quinn co-chaired the Social Security Advisory Council’s Technical Panel on Trends in Income and Retirement Savings. A report was submitted in fall 1995.

Julie Ann Elston, of the Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin (WZB), has accepted a position as a Visiting Scholar at the Hoover Institution Stanford University September, 1995 - August, 1996.

In Memorial: Elaine Bennett, Associate Professor of Economics at Virginia Tech, died last May. Elaine’s areas of specialization were game theory and the design of mechanisms for making collective decisions. She taught at the University of Buffalo and the University of Kansas before coming to Virginia Tech. For the past year she has been on leave at the University of California at Los Angeles. She was married to William Zame, also a Professor of Economics there.
ANNOUNCEMENTS

Call for Papers: Feminist Economics. Journal of the International Association for Feminist Economics. Feminist Economics is a new and innovative journal dedicated to developing an interdisciplinary discourse on feminist perspectives on economics and the economy. The first issue of the journal appeared in early 1995. The journal welcomes research articles as well as short essays of 1000 to 1500 words. Authors should submit five (5) typewritten double-spaced copies of their manuscripts (in English) and an abstract of no more than 200 words. Articles should be written with the goal of broad accessibility to an audience of economists, scholars in related fields, and feminists concerned with economic issues. All manuscripts should be sent to: Diana Strassmann, Editor, Feminist Economics - MS 9, Rice University, 6100 South Main Street, Houston, Texas 77005-1892; (713) 527-4660; dls@rice.edu

Grant Opportunity: The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation’s Scholars in Health Policy Research Program will be selecting up to 12 Scholars will be selected annually to participate in the Program at one of three national prominent academic institutions -- the University of California at Berkeley (in collaboration with the University of California at San Francisco); The University of Michigan; and Yale University. Scholars will have access to the full range of university resources and will receive annual stipend support of $52,500 for each of the two years of their participation in the program. To be eligible, applicants must have a doctoral degree in economics, political science, or sociology received after July 1, 1993 but not later than July 1, 1996. The deadline for receipt of applications by the national program office is set for November 1, 1995. Inquiries about the program and requests for application forms should be addressed to: Katherine G. Raskin, M.M.H.S., Scholars in Health Policy Research Program, Boston University School of Management, 685 Commonwealth Avenue, Room 334, Boston, MA 02215, Telephone: 617/353-9220, Fax: 617/353-9227.

New England Women Economists Association (NEWEA) is an association of women economists not just from academic institutions but also from government, private non-profit organizations, banking and financial institutions, research and consulting companies, and industry. NEWEA programs address current public policy or business issues. Topics rotate among the members' areas of interest. Graduate and undergraduate students are particularly encouraged to attend the programs and dinners. Anyone wanting more information on this organization should contact Barbara Santelle at 617/521-2582.

Teaching Workshop: The International Association for Feminist Economics and the IAFFE Teaching and Pedagogy Issues Committee is sponsoring a one-day workshop, “Change in the Classroom: Incorporating Gender and Race into Beginning Economics Courses,” on January 4, 1996, prior to the start of the 1996 ASSA meetings in San Francisco. Robin Bartlett, co-director of the three-year long NSF sponsored project, “Improving Introductory Economics Education by Integrating the Latest Scholarship on Women and Minorities,” and professor of economics at Denison University, will direct the workshop with presentations by Lisa Saunders, Marianne Ferber and Susan Feigner. The workshop will be limited to 60 participants. To register or for more information, contact Meg Lewis, Chair IAFFE Teaching and Pedagogy Issues Committee, Department of Economics, College of St. Benedict, Saint Joseph, MN 56374; (wk) (612) 363-5977, (fax) (612) 363-6099, e-mail: mlewis@ttinn.com computing.csbsiu.edu
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CSWEP depends on all of its dues-paying members to continue its activities. In addition to publishing the Newsletter, we maintain a Roster of women economists that is used by members, employers, organizations establishing advisory groups, and the like. We also organize sessions at the meetings of the AEA and the regional economics associations and publish an annual report on the status of women in the profession.

If you have not paid your dues for the current member year (July 1, 1995 - June 30, 1996), we urge you to do so. Questionnaires and dues reminders were mailed in September to members.

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

NOTICE: STUDENTS DO NOT HAVE TO PAY MEMBERSHIP DUES!!! JUST SEND IN THIS APPLICATION

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

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

NAME______________________________________________________________

MAILING ADDRESS____________________________________________________

CITY, STATE, ZIP_____________________________________________________

Check here if currently an AEA member _____ Renewal of CSWEP Membership _____

New CSWEP Member _____ a Student _____

If you checked student, please indicate what Institution ________________________

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

The Special Reprint Issue of the newsletter contains reprints of ten articles designed to help women economists advance in the profession. The cost for non-members is $8.00.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSWEP: PEOPLE TO CONTACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Policy Matters</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items for Newsletter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dues, Change of Address, Roster</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSWEP East</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSWEP South</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSWEP West</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSWEP Mid-West</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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