

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

The Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP) was established by the American Economic Association (AEA) in 1971 to monitor the status of women in the profession and formulate activities to improve their status. This report begins by summarizing trends in the representation of women in the economics profession over the approximately 30 years since CSWEP was established. It then takes a more detailed look at newly collected data for the current year and summarizes the Committee's activities over the past year.

Data on Women Economists

Since its inception, CSWEP has been concerned with collecting and analyzing data on the representation of women in the economics profession. The first CSWEP-administered survey of economics departments was conducted in the fall of 1972. Since that time, each CSWEP Annual Report has presented data on the status of women in the economics profession based either on CSWEP's own survey of economics departments or the AEA's Universal Academic Questionnaire.

The 2003 CSWEP Survey

For the CSWEP 2003 survey, the number of economics departments surveyed was expanded slightly to 139, from 136 in 2002, based on information on institutions granting Ph.D.'s in economics from the Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. Responses were received from 106 departments; 11 indicated that they do not currently have a Ph.D. program in economics and were excluded from the sample. This yielded a sample for analysis of 95 departments, representing a very high response rate of 74.2 percent of the 128 (139 - 11) Ph.D.-granting departments surveyed. The CSWEP liberal-arts survey was greatly expanded to 149 schools (from 93 in 2002) based on the listing of "Baccalaureate Colleges-Liberal Arts" from the *Carnegie Classifications of Institutions of Higher Educa-*

tion (2000 Edition).¹ The number of schools responding was 62, yielding a response rate of 41.6 percent, comparable to the 43.0-percent response rate obtained for a smaller number of surveyed schools last year.

Change over Three Decades

Table 1 presents data from the 2003 CSWEP survey and selected earlier surveys to provide a picture of how women's representation among faculty in Ph.D.-granting institutions has changed over the past 30 years. The 1972 results for Ph.D.-granting departments are based on only 43 economics departments; however, these universities, at the time referred to as "the chairman's group," granted about two-thirds of all Ph.D.'s in economics (1972 Annual Report [Carolyn Shaw Bell, 1973 p. 509]). For the remaining years, figures are based on substantially more departments.² Data on bachelor and Ph.D. degrees awarded in economics from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) have also been included in the table; this data source was selected as providing the most complete information on degrees awarded over this period. (The most recent available year for these data is the 2000-2001 academic year.) Overall, the increased representation of women among students and faculty has indeed been substantial.

Looking first at women's representation among students, one sees that the female share of bachelor's degrees awarded in economics more than tripled between 1972 and 2001, from 11.7 percent to 34.1 percent, as did women's share of new economics Ph.D.'s, which increased from 7.6 percent in 1972 to 29.0 percent in 2001. Similarly, women dramatically increased their representation among faculty. In

¹ A small number of schools (5) that were surveyed in 2002 were deleted from the sample because they were not included in the Carnegie listing.

² While the number of departments providing 1982 data on faculty is not available, the data are from the AEA's Universal Academic Questionnaire (1983 Annual Report [Barbara R. Bergmann, 1984]) and thus represent a sample comparable in size to subsequent years.

TABLE 1—REPRESENTATION OF WOMEN IN MAJOR PH.D.-GRANTING DEPARTMENTS, 1972–2003, SELECTED YEARS

	Percentage female			
	1972	1982	1993	2003 ^a
Students				
Bachelor's degrees	11.7	32.5	29.8	34.1
Ph.D.'s granted	7.6	14.2	23.3	29.0
Faculty, by rank				
Assistant professor	8.8	13.3	25.0	26.5
Associate professor	3.7	6.4	14.1	20.1
Full professor	2.4	2.7	6.8	9.5
All tenured/tenure-track ^b	4.6	6.5	12.6	15.5
Number of departments:	43	na	81	95

Notes: Tabulations of faculty by rank combine tenured and untenured faculty members in the indicated rank. Data on bachelor's degrees and Ph.D.'s granted are from U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics, *Chartbook of Degrees Conferred, 1969–70 to 1993–94* and the *2002 Digest of Education Statistics*; remaining data are from CSWEP Annual Reports, (1973, 1983; see <http://www.cswep.org/pub.htm>) and CSWEP survey data files. Data for 1982 are from the column headed "Other Ph.D." in Table 1 of the 1983 Annual Report because in the 1984 Annual Report (Barbara R. Bergmann, 1985) it states that this column actually refers to "all Ph.D. departments."

^a Data on bachelor's and Ph.D. degrees are for the 2000–2001 academic year.

^b Includes the above indicated ranks only.

1972 women were only 8.8 percent of assistant professors, 3.7 percent of associate professors, and 2.4 percent of full professors—comprising, overall, less than 5 percent of faculty members in these ranks. By 2003, their representation among assistant professors had tripled to 26.5 percent; gains at the higher ranks were proportionately even larger as women's share of associate professors increased to 20.1 percent and of full professors to 9.5 percent—with women comprising 15.5 percent of all faculty in these ranks. (The tabulations of faculty in Table 1 include both tenured and untenured faculty at each rank.)

While these gains are impressive, the data in Table 1 reveal areas of continuing concern as well. First and most obviously, although women are much better represented in the economics profession than in the past, they remain a minority. Moreover, in each year, the representation of women decreases as we move up the academic hierarchy. To some extent this underrepresentation at the higher levels reflects the more recent

entry of women into the field and the length of time it takes to move up the ranks, the so-called "pipeline effect." Even within a single year, women's representation at the assistant professor rank is roughly comparable to their share of new Ph.D.'s granted. The representation of women at the associate- and full-professor levels tends to track their representation at the lower levels a decade earlier.

However, the pipeline tends to be a "leaky" one in that female representation at the higher ranks tends to fall short of their earlier representation at the lower ranks. This is especially notable since the data are spaced roughly a decade apart, which is more than ample time for promotions to occur. Focusing on the most recent period, for example, one sees that women were 24.0 percent of assistant professors in 1993 compared to 20.1 percent of associate professors in 2003; and 14.5 percent of associate professors in 1993 compared to 9.5 percent of full professors in 2003.³ It must be acknowledged that this type of comparison is imperfect since the number of departments included in the sample varies across years, with unknown effect on the results. Further, the sex composition of the stocks of associate professors and more especially full professors will change more slowly than the respective flows into these categories. Nonetheless, these data are highly suggestive of a leaky pipeline, an issue that has been highlighted in earlier CSWEP Annual Reports. Further evidence in support of this interpretation of the data is provided in recent research on the progress of women faculty in economics (Donna Ginther, 2002; Shulamit Kahn, 2002).

Though the data are suggestive of a leaky pipeline, detailed information on women's representation across faculty ranks for the 1993–2003 period (see Table 2) suggests that significant progress has occurred at the higher ranks within the past couple of years. Prior to the 2002 survey, progress in the representation of women at the higher ranks over the preceding decade looked exceedingly slow to nonexistent. Averaging the percentages for 1993 and 1994 to reduce variability due to the changing samples

³ One exception is that the female share of full professors in 1993 (6.8 percent) is about the same as the female share of associate professors in 1982 (6.4 percent).

TABLE 2—THE PERCENTAGE OF ECONOMISTS IN THE PIPELINE WHO ARE FEMALE

Position	Percentage female										
	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
<i>All Ph.D.-Granting Departments:</i>											
First-year students	30.5	29.0	30.5	30.5	31.3	32.2	35.6	38.8	31.9	33.9	34.0
ABD	27.2	25.7	27.8	28.3	26.8	28.2	33.0	32.3	30.2	30.6	32.7
New Ph.D.	24.2	26.8	23.2	24.1	25.0	29.9	34.2	28.0	29.4	27.2	29.8
Assistant professor (U)	24.0	22.9	24.2	23.8	26.0	25.9	27.8	21.4	22.5	23.2	26.1
Associate professor (U)	7.4	6.4	14.1	9.1	11.1	15.9	27.3	17.2	10.0	17.2	24.0
Associate professor (T)	14.5	13.6	12.9	15.4	13.4	14.0	15.1	16.2	15.3	17.0	19.9
Full professor (T)	6.7	6.3	7.5	8.4	6.5	6.1	6.5	7.4	5.8	8.9	9.4
Number of departments:	81	111	95	98	95	92	77	76	69	83	95
<i>Top 10 Ph.D.-Granting Departments:</i>											
First-year students	19.5	23.8	24.5	26.5	20.3	27.2	29.6	29.5	26.9	28.5	21.2
ABD	20.0	20.2	24.1	23.9	25.0	22.0	25.2	25.2	26.6	27.0	26.1
New Ph.D.	22.8	27.9	19.6	18.6	16.5	25.9	24.3	23.0	30.5	25.7	26.3
Assistant professor (U)	22.5	18.8	14.1	21.1	20.0	17.7	14.7	18.2	18.8	15.8	21.9
Associate professor (U)	6.7	6.7	6.7	0.0	12.5	36.4	45.5	30.8	13.3	7.7	11.1
Associate professor (T)	20.0	18.6	12.0	20.0	12.5	7.7	28.6	36.4	23.5	28.6	17.6
Full professor (T)	3.5	2.9	4.7	5.3	5.0	3.7	3.9	7.1	6.3	5.6	7.0
Number of departments:	8	10	9	9	8	7	7	7	10	9	10
<i>Top 20 Ph.D.-Granting Departments:</i>											
First-year students	21.9	27.8	26.1	30.2	21.5	28.8	31.1	32.8	30.5	31.9	26.1
ABD	23.4	22.6	26.8	26.4	28.6	24.1	25.4	26.2	27.2	27.2	28.4
New Ph.D.	25.4	28.4	21.8	22.7	24.9	27.1	28.1	24.6	26.8	24.7	24.8
Assistant professor (U)	20.4	18.9	17.5	18.2	17.8	16.4	21.6	17.7	18.8	21.5	25.1
Associate professor (U)	5.0	5.0	5.9	0.0	7.7	36.4	46.2	26.7	13.3	13.3	23.1
Associate professor (T)	9.0	10.7	12.1	16.7	16.0	8.3	16.3	12.8	19.6	22.9	18.9
Full professor (T)	3.8	4.2	5.4	5.5	5.9	4.7	4.8	7.4	7.0	9.0	6.3
Number of departments:	18	20	19	19	17	16	15	15	18	18	19

Note: U refers to untenured, and T refers to tenured. ABD indicates students who have completed "all but dissertation."

across years, women were 14.1 percent of tenured associate professors. This percentage had increased only slightly to 15.8 percent by 1999–2000 (again averaging the two years of data); and there was virtually no change for tenured full professors where women comprised 6.5 percent of the total in 1993–1994 and 6.6 percent in 1999–2000. In contrast, by 2002–2003 there were clear gains with female representation increasing to 18.5 percent of tenured associate professors and 9.2 percent of tenured full professors.

The data in Table 1 also suggest some concern at the other end of the pipeline. Specifically, the growth of women at the entry level seems to be tapering off. While women's share of assistant-professor positions increased by 11.7 percentage points between 1982 and 1993,

the increase was only 1.5 percentage points between 1993 and 2003. The detailed data for the 1990's shown in Table 2 indicate that the female share of (untenured) assistant professors peaked in 1999 at 27.8 percent and then dropped sharply to 21.4 percent in 2000. It has been increasing steadily since then and is at about its 1998 level, so very recent trends are in an encouraging direction.

Of course the ultimate sources of most entries into the economics profession are bachelor's and Ph.D.'s in economics. Here there are conflicting trends. NCES data show that the female share of new Ph.D.'s in economics has increased fairly steadily over this 30-year period. However, the female share of bachelor's degrees in economics peaked in 1984–1985, decreased through 1993–1994, and has only

TABLE 3—PERCENTAGE FEMALE FOR PH.D.-GRANTING ECONOMICS DEPARTMENTS (2003)

	Women	Men	Percentage female
<i>A. Faculty Composition (2003–2004 Academic Year):</i>			
Assistant professor	151	419	26.5
Untenured	146	413	26.1
Tenured	5	6	45.5
Associate professor	87	346	20.1
Untenured	6	19	24.0
Tenured	81	327	19.9
Full professor	131	1,249	9.5
Untenured	1	1	50.0
Tenured	130	1,248	9.4
All tenured/tenure track	369	2,014	15.5
Other (non-tenure track)	96	198	32.7
All faculty	465	2,212	17.4
<i>B. Students and Job Market:</i>			
Students (2003–2004 academic year)			
First-year Ph.D. students	518	1,005	34.0
ABD students	931	1,917	32.7
Ph.D. granted (2002–2003 academic year)	236	555	29.8
Job market (2002–2003 academic year)			
U.S.-based job	170	351	32.6
Academic, Ph.D.-granting department	75	149	33.5
Academic, other	49	74	39.8
Public sector	25	64	28.1
Private sector	21	64	24.7
Foreign job obtained	30	131	18.6
Academic	16	85	15.8
Nonacademic	14	46	23.3
No job found	20	50	28.6

Note: ABD indicates students who have completed “all but dissertation.”

recently attained its mid-1980's level.⁴ According to National Science Foundation data, economics majors have comprised 57–60 percent of new Ph.D.'s in economics since the mid-1980's, and John Siegfried and Wendy Stock (2004) estimate that figure to be as high as 76 percent in recent years (including double majors). The continued increase in the female share of new Ph.D.'s in economics that has occurred since the mid-1980's in the face of the long-term stability in the representation of women in undergraduate economics programs likely reflects an increase in the relative propensity of female economics majors in the United States to go on to graduate school in economics.

Likely working in the opposite direction has been the steady decline in the share of U.S. citizens among new economics Ph.D.'s, from 55.7 percent in 1986–1987 to 36.7 percent in 2001–2002 (see Siegfried and Stock, 2004 [tables 1 and 2]). The female share of Ph.D.'s going to non-U.S. citizens is lower than for U.S. citizens and has increased more slowly in recent years.⁵ Currently, the female share of undergraduate degrees in economics in the United States is approximately the same as the female share of first-year students in economics Ph.D. programs, about 34 percent (see Tables 1 and 3). Thus, in the future, attracting more female under-

⁴ These data are presented in Blau (2004).

⁵ Blau (2004), based on calculations using unpublished tabulations provided by Siegfried and Stock.

graduates into economics may become increasingly important to the continued growth in female representation in economics Ph.D. programs. In this regard, the rising trend since the early 1990's in the proportion of bachelor's degrees in economics going to women is a positive sign.

The CSWEP data suggest that, at least for the near term, further increases in the percentage female of new Ph.D.'s may be expected. The data on the representation of women at various stages of the Ph.D. program over the 1990's in Table 2 provide the opportunity to look at the progress of women through graduate programs in economics. Siegfried and Stock (2004) report a median time to degree of 5.4 years for 2001–2002 Ph.D.'s. Thus, for example, one may compare female representation among Ph.D.'s granted in 2002–2003 (29.8 percent) to their representation among first-year graduate students six years earlier in 1996–1997 (30.5 percent) or to an average of five and six years earlier (30.9 percent). This comparison suggests a somewhat higher attrition rate for female than male graduate students, but the difference is very small, especially given that the comparison is quite crude. Thus, given that women currently comprise 34.0 percent of first-year students, it is likely that 5–6 years hence, the female share of new Ph.D.'s will increase to about one-third.⁶

Detailed Results from the 2003 CSWEP Survey

Tables 3 and 4 present the results from the 2003 CSWEP survey for Ph.D.-granting departments in greater detail, first for all departments and then for the top 10 and top 20 ranked departments separately.⁷ As in past Annual Re-

ports, the tables indicate that for 2003 women are less well represented in the top-tier departments at all levels than in all Ph.D.-granting departments. This includes their representation among students (first-year students, ABD's, and new Ph.D.'s) and faculty at all ranks. For example, female representation among untenured assistant professors was 4.2 percentage points lower at the top ten departments than for all departments, with a smaller disparity of 1.0 percentage point for the top 20. At the tenured associate- and full-professor levels, female representation at the top 10 departments lagged by 2.3–2.4 percentage points. The situation was fairly comparable in the larger group of the top 20 schools, with a disparity of from 1.0 (associate professors) to 3.1 (full professors) percentage points at the senior ranks.

Just as female faculty are better represented among all Ph.D.-granting institutions than in the top-ranked departments, as noted in many prior CSWEP Annual Reports, they are also better represented at liberal-arts institutions than at Ph.D.-granting institutions (Table 5). At liberal arts institutions, women were 36.9 percent of untenured assistant professors, 38.5 percent of tenured associate professors, and 16.7 percent of tenured full professors, comprising fully 28.1 percent of faculty at these ranks—considerably exceeding comparable figures for the Ph.D.-granting institutions.

Turning to Ph.D. students, one sees that, as in the case of faculty, the representation of women among new Ph.D.'s in the top-ranked Ph.D.-granting departments also tends to be lower than for all Ph.D.-granting departments, lagging by 3.5–5 percentage points. These disparities are roughly in line with, or larger than, the average for the preceding years since 1993 shown in Table 2. The data in Table 4 show a particularly

⁶ CSWEP data in Table 2 indicate especially high levels of female representation among first-year students in 1999 and 2000: 35.6 and 38.8 percent, respectively. Thus there may be a spike in female representation among new Ph.D.'s coming in the next few years. Alternatively, these estimates, which appear out of line with previous and subsequent years, may be due to sampling variation. The estimate of new Ph.D.'s from the CSWEP data for those years are higher than in the NCES data (26.7 for 1998–1999 and 26.6 for 1999–2000), particularly for 1998–1999.

⁷ These rankings are taken from *US News and World Report*, 2004 Edition. The top ten departments include the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvard University, Princeton University, Stanford University, the University of Chicago, the University of California–Berkeley, Yale University, Northwestern University, the University of Penn-

sylvania, and the University of Wisconsin. The top 20 departments additionally include the University of California–Los Angeles, the University of Michigan, the University of Minnesota, the California Institute of Technology, Columbia University, the University of Rochester, Cornell University, the University of California–San Diego, Carnegie Mellon, and New York University. These are the same rankings used in the 2002 CSWEP Annual Report but represent an updating compared to previous reports. This updating seems advisable since this breakdown is designed to measure women's representation at what are generally regarded as the leading departments, rather than at a fixed set of schools.

TABLE 4—PERCENTAGE FEMALE FOR THE TOP 10 AND TOP 20 PH.D.-GRANTING ECONOMICS DEPARTMENTS (2003)

	Top 10			Top 20		
	Women	Men	Percentage female	Women	Men	Percentage female
<i>A. Faculty Composition (2003–2004 Academic Year):</i>						
Assistant professor	21	75	21.9	44	131	25.1
Untenured	21	75	21.9	44	131	25.1
Tenured	0	0	—	0	0	—
Associate professor	4	22	15.4	10	40	20.0
Untenured	1	8	11.1	3	10	23.1
Tenured	3	14	17.6	7	30	18.9
Full professor	18	239	7.0	27	385	6.6
Untenured	0	0	—	1	0	100.0
Tenured	18	239	7.0	26	385	6.3
All tenured/tenure-track	43	336	11.3	81	556	12.7
Other (non-tenure-track)	10	15	40.0	25	39	39.1
All faculty	53	351	13.1	106	595	15.1
<i>B. Students and Job Market:</i>						
Students (2003–2004 academic year)						
First-year Ph.D. students	55	205	21.2	115	326	26.1
ABD students	194	548	26.1	322	812	28.4
Ph.D. granted (2002–2003)	49	137	26.3	73	221	24.8
Job market (2002–2003 academic year)						
U.S. based job	48	95	33.6	77	158	32.8
Academic, Ph.D.-granting department	33	50	39.8	47	82	36.4
Academic, other	4	6	40.0	13	23	36.1
Public sector	6	17	26.1	11	27	28.9
Private sector	5	22	18.5	6	26	18.8
Foreign job obtained	4	28	12.5	6	49	10.9
Academic	3	23	11.5	3	37	7.5
Nonacademic	1	5	16.7	3	12	20.0
No job found	1	7	12.5	8	11	42.1

Note: ABD indicates students who have completed “all but dissertation.”

large disparity for first-year Ph.D. students; women’s representation in this group was much lower (7.9–12.8 percentage points lower) for the top 10 and top 20 schools than for all Ph.D.-granting institutions. This represents a considerable increase in the difference between the top-ranked departments and all Ph.D.-granting departments compared to previous years, as well as a substantial decline in female representation among first-year students at the top-ranked departments. While it is understandable that the representation of women in the first-year class may fluctuate from year to year based on the quality of applicants and yield rates, this situation is of great concern for the future, and it is to be hoped that it will be reversed over the next few years.

Finally, Tables 3 and 4 provide the opportunity to take a look at how women fare in the job market for new Ph.D.’s. First, it may be noted that the majority of both male and female economics Ph.D.’s for whom data are available take jobs in the United States, and further that women are more likely to take a U.S.-based job than their male counterparts (77.3 percent vs. 66.0 percent), likely reflecting their lower representation among foreign Ph.D. recipients noted above. Thus, while women constituted 29.8 percent of new Ph.D.’s in economics in 2002–2003, they comprised 32.6 percent of those obtaining U.S.-based jobs. In terms of their sector of employment, the data in Table 3 indicate some significant breaks with the past. Traditionally, women have been underrepre-

TABLE 5—PERCENTAGE FEMALE FOR ECONOMICS DEPARTMENTS IN LIBERAL-ARTS INSTITUTIONS (2003)

	Women	Men	Percentage female
<i>A. Faculty Composition (2003–2004 Academic Year):</i>			
Assistant professor	44	76	36.7
Untenured	41	70	36.9
Tenured	3	6	33.3
Associate professor	53	89	37.3
Untenured	3	9	25.0
Tenured	50	80	38.5
Full professor	34	171	16.6
Untenured	0	1	0.0
Tenured	34	170	16.7
All tenured/tenure-track	131	336	28.1
Other (non-tenure-track)	38	60	38.8
All faculty	169	396	29.9
<i>B. Student Information:</i>			
Student majors (2002–2003 academic year)	1,029	1,300	44.2

sented in academic positions in Ph.D.-granting institutions and overrepresented in academic jobs in non-Ph.D.-granting institutions and in public-sector nonacademic jobs. This year, however, women's share of jobs in Ph.D.-granting departments was approximately equal to their representation in the U.S. job market. And, while women job seekers were overrepresented in non-Ph.D.-granting institutions, as they have been in the past, they were not overrepresented in the public sector. In fact, women's share of all academic jobs, 35.7 percent, was above their availability in the domestic labor market. Women graduating from top-10 and top-20 economic departments were even more successful in landing positions in Ph.D.-granting departments. These developments bode well for substantial increases in the representation of women on the faculty of Ph.D.-granting institutions in the future.

The Committee's Recent Activities

CSWEP Mentoring Initiative

This past year, CSWEP launched a major new initiative to help women surmount some of

the barriers impeding their progress in academia that contribute to the type of leaky pipeline issues that have been documented in this and earlier CSWEP Annual Reports. CSWEP received funding from the National Science Foundation's ADVANCE and Economics Panels to implement and evaluate a series of mentoring workshops for junior (nontenured) economists, focusing especially on issues relevant to women economists at the beginning of their careers. The program is modeled after the successful NSF-funded CCOFFE mentoring workshops organized by CSWEP in 1998 under the leadership of former CSWEP Chair, Robin Bartlett. The four-year CSWEP program includes two rounds of mentoring workshops at the national meetings and one workshop program at each of the four regional association meetings. The first national workshops will be held at the 2004 ASSA meetings in San Diego and a second set will follow in January 2006. The first regional workshops will occur in February 2004 at the Eastern Economic Association meetings, with workshops to follow at meetings of each of the three other regional associations.

The Chair would like to take this opportunity to thank the Committee for its hard work on this mentoring initiative and particularly Rachel Croson (Chair of the Committee on the National Workshops), Janet Currie (Chair of the Research Committee), and KimMarie McGoldrick (Chair of the Committee on the Regional Workshops), who, along with John Siegfried, Secretary-Treasurer of the AEA and Francine Blau, CSWEP Chair, comprise the PI's on the NSF grant. We are especially indebted to Rachel Croson for spearheading our effort to secure NSF support for this initiative and also appreciate her willingness to remain on the Committee for a second term both to shepherd the national programs through and to contribute generally to this initiative throughout the grant period. The Chair additionally thanks Janet Currie who, although she is leaving the Committee, has generously agreed to continue chairing the research committee. CSWEP is also deeply grateful to John Siegfried and his staff for support and assistance and for allowing us to house the NSF grant at AEA headquarters in Nashville. The Committee would like to express special thanks to AEA staff members Edda Leithner, Patricia Fisher, Diane Fawkes, Gwyn Loftis, Marlene Hight, and Norma Ayres, for

their hard work on grant-related activities and for their continued support and commitment to CSWEP.

Ongoing Activities

One of CSWEP's major activities is the production of our thrice-yearly *Newsletter*. The *Winter Newsletter*, co-edited with Rachel Croson, focused on academic advice for junior faculty as well as a summary of the research presented at the ASSA meetings in CSWEP-sponsored sessions. Claudia Goldin co-edited the *Spring Newsletter* that included articles on professional development and information on the CeMent Grant. The *Fall Newsletter*, co-edited by Janet Currie, provided articles on discrimination in the academy and an interview with Margaret Garritsen de Vries, 2002 recipient of the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award (see below). These *Newsletter* issues also provided information on upcoming regional and national association meetings, calls for papers, and news of interest to women economists. The Chair would like to thank KimMarie McGoldrick for her hard work and dedication in overseeing the *Newsletter* along with Karine Moe, who now takes over this responsibility.

As part of its ongoing efforts to increase the participation of women on the AEA program, CSWEP members organized six sessions for the January 2003 ASSA meetings. Caren Grown and Jean Kimmel organized three sessions on gender-related issues, and Barbara Fraumeni, along with Kim Sosin, organized three sessions on Macroeconomics. CSWEP held its usual business meeting in which reports were made to its associates and other interested AEA members concerning its activities and suggestions were heard from those present for future activities.

During the 2003 business meeting the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award was presented to Margaret Garritsen de Vries, retired International Monetary Fund (IMF) economist. Dr. de Vries received her Ph.D. from MIT in 1946 and spent almost all of her career at the IMF. She was one of the first staff members of the IMF and was in the second entering doctoral class at MIT. She headed country missions to Islamic countries, showing that gender was not an issue for IMF personnel. She became the first women Division Chief in 1957; it is believed that no other

woman achieved that status until the 1970's. Dr. de Vries mentored women and encouraged them throughout her career. Eventually, Dr. de Vries became the Fund's historian, a position she held until her retirement. Dr. de Vries is an excellent representative of this award, which is given annually to a woman who has furthered the status of women in the economics profession, through her example, through her achievements, through increasing our understanding of how women can advance in the economics profession, or through her mentoring of other women. Along with public recognition accorded her accomplishments, Dr. de Vries also received a 2' x 3' plaque with her name and that of previous winners on it to display prominently at her place of work.

Also during the business meeting, Esther Duflo, the Castle Krob Associate Professor in the Department of Economics at MIT, was awarded the 2002 Elaine Bennett Research Prize. The Elaine Bennett Research Prize was established in 1999 to recognize and honor outstanding research in any field of economics by a woman at the beginning of her career. The prize is given every other year in memory of Elaine Bennett, who mentored many women economists at the start of their careers and made significant contributions to economic theory and experimental economics during her short professional career. Esther Duflo, who received her Ph.D. in Economics from MIT in 1999, specializes in development economics, focusing her studies on the broad range of issues that affect economic and social structures in developing countries. Her outstanding research contributions have focused on such issues as household behavior, educational choice and returns to education, and policy evaluation. She continues to explore the many ways that women impact the economics of the countries in which they live, in roles ranging from caretaker to political leader.

The Chair thanks Barbara Fraumeni, Andrea Beller, and Barbara Casey for their service on the Carolyn Shaw Bell Awards Committee; and Judith Chevalier, Rachel Croson and Susan Athey for their work on the Elaine Bennett Awards Committee.

CSWEP's Regional Activities

CSWEP's regional representatives also organized sessions at each of the regional associa-

tion meetings, including the Eastern, Southern, Midwest, and Western Economic Associations. The work of our regional representatives has been substantial this year. Our thanks go to Lisa Barrow (Midwest), Rachel Croson (Eastern), Catherine Mann (Southern), and Janet Currie (Western), for their excellent programs and efforts to help women economists in their region maintain and increase their professional networks. Abstracts of the papers presented at these association meetings are presented in the *Newsletter* each year.

Additional Words of Thanks

In January 2003, Joan Haworth, stepped down as interim Chair. The Committee is deeply indebted to her for the leadership she provided over the previous two years, and also for her long prior service to CSWEP as membership Chair. We are happy to report that she has agreed to continue to serve in that capacity. Joan Haworth and her staff, including Lee Fordham and Donya Samara, are essential to the success of our outreach mission, and we are very grateful to them for their efforts on our behalf. They maintain the CSWEP roster of women economists that includes over 4,000 women with whom we currently have contact. The terms of three of our Committee members ended in December: Andrea Beller, Janet Currie, and Claudia Goldin. They all made outstanding contributions, and we are enormously grateful to them for their willingness to serve. This year we welcomed new Committee members Lisa Barrow, Daniel Hamermesh, Catherine Mann, and Karine Moe. We are pleased to have them aboard and thank them for the very significant contributions they have already made. The Chair also thanks the other members of the Committee for their exceptional efforts in the past year to advance the goals of CSWEP.

Finally the Chair warmly thanks Liane O'Brien who has provided excellent and indispensable administrative support for the Com-

mittee and served as Assistant Editor of the *Newsletter* over the past year. The Chair is also extremely grateful to Cornell University and the staff of the School of Industrial and Labor Relations for their administrative support of CSWEP's activities and for providing CSWEP with office space and other resources.

FRANCINE D. BLAU, *Chair*

REFERENCES

- Bell, Carolyn Shaw.** "Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession." *American Economic Review*, May 1973 (*Papers and Proceedings*), 63(2), pp. 508–11.
- Bergmann, Barbara R.** "The Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession." *American Economic Review*, May 1984 (*Papers and Proceedings*), 74(2), pp. 457–62.
- _____. "The Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession." *American Economic Review*, May 1985 (*Papers and Proceedings*), 75(2), pp. 448–53.
- Blau, Francine D.** "The Market for New Ph.D. Economists in 2002: Comment." *American Economic Review*, May 2004 (*Papers and Proceedings*), 94(2), pp. 187–88.
- Ginther, Donna K.** "Women in Economics: Moving Up or Falling Off the Academic Career Ladder." Unpublished manuscript presented at the American Economic Association Meetings, Atlanta, GA, January 2002.
- Kahn, Shulamit.** "The Status of Women in Economics during the Nineties: One step forward, Two steps back." Unpublished manuscript presented at the American Economic Association Meetings, Atlanta, GA, January 2002.
- Siegfried, John J. and Stock, Wendy A.** "The Market for New Ph.D. Economists in 2002." *American Economic Review*, May 2004 (*Papers and Proceedings*), 94(2), pp. 272–85.

This article has been cited by:

1. Christiana Hilmer, Michael Hilmer. 2007. Women Helping Women, Men Helping Women? Same-Gender Mentoring, Initial Job Placements, and Early Career Publishing Success for Economics PhDs. *American Economic Review* **97**:2, 422-426. [[Citation](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
2. Matthew Drennan. 2006. Economics: Diminishing Marginal Utility. *Challenge* **49**:5, 71-91. [[Crossref](#)]