



NEWS

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

2017 ISSUE III

IN THIS ISSUE

FOCUS

Working with a Research Group and Co-authors

Introduction by Ragan Petrie	3
Mentoring Student Teams by Anya Samek	3
Norms and Communication in Collaboration by Julian Jamison	5
The Keys to Effective Collaboration by A. Abigail Payne	7

From the CSWEP Chair

Chair's Letter by Shelly Lundberg	2
--	---

Milestones, Honors, and Remembrance

Interview with Bennett Research Prize Winner Marina Halac by Glenn Hubbard	1
Brag Box	16
Remembering Sharon Levin	11

Calls & Announcements

2018 WEA Sessions Call	12
2018 ASSA Sessions Announced	12
2018 EEA Sessions Announced	14
Upcoming Regional Meetings	16
Call for CSWEP Liaisons	16

Interview with Bennett Research Prize Winner Marina Halac

Glenn Hubbard

You've credited a former teacher of yours, Nuria Susmel, with encouraging you to enter the field of economics. What advice did she offer you as you were seeking your path?

Nuria was my math teacher at Carlos Pellegrini, the high school I attended back in Buenos Aires. When I was in my last year of high school, I had to choose my major for college, and I wasn't sure what I wanted to do. I had really enjoyed my philosophy classes in high school, so I was considering studying philosophy in college. However, while philosophy was sort of a romantic aspiration I had, it wasn't so practical: finding a job in the field and making a living out of it would be challenging in Argentina.

Nuria advised me to study economics. Her argument was simple: I seemed to like math and economics as much as philosophy, but economics would be a safe choice. At that time, the best schools to study economics in Buenos Aires were private, and I think Nuria was aware that I could not afford them. But she told me about a private school, Universidad del CEMA, that had just started a licentiate program (having specialized in graduate studies up to then) where I could apply for a scholarship, and where I ultimately got my degree in economics.



How was your experience at CEMA?

It was really good. I had excellent professors and the class size was very small, so we received a lot of individual attention. Also, studying at CEMA allowed me to learn about the academic world in the US, since most of my professors had done their PhD studies here. My parents and siblings work in entertainment, so both economics and academia are worlds that I had to discover by myself. It was very useful to learn about my professors' experiences.

Another reason why CEMA was so great is that I met Guillermo, my husband, while studying there. We were in the same class and study group. We have been together for 18 years now!

In 2002 you moved from Argentina to the United States to join the World Bank as a research consultant. What was that move like for you?

Interestingly, that was a move that was triggered by the circumstances in Argentina more than my own choices. Argentina had a major economic crisis

continues on page 9

Contributors

Shelly Lundberg,
Leonard Broom
Professor of
Demography,
Department of
Economics, University
of California, Santa
Barbara



R. Glenn Hubbard,
Dean, Columbia
Business School and
Russell L. Carson
Professor of Finance
and Professor of
Economics, Columbia
University

Julian Jamison, Senior
Behavioral Economist,
Poverty and Equity
Global Practice, The
World Bank



A. Abigail Payne,
Director and Ronald
Henderson Professor,
Melbourne Institute:
Applied Economic
& Social Research,
University of Melbourne



Ragan Petrie, Associate
Professor of Economics,
Texas A & M University

Anya Samek, Associate
Professor (Research)
of Economics, Center
for Economic and
Social Research (CESR)
and Department of
Economics, University
of Southern California



CSWEP News Staff

Shelly Lundberg, Editor
Kate Silz-Carson, Oversight Editor
Ragan Petrie, Co-Editor
Amber Pipa, Assistant Editor
Leda Black, **Graphic Designer**

Shelly Lundberg

From the Chair

I'd like to begin by congratulating **Rachel Croson**, who is the recipient of the 2017 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award for her contributions to the status of women in economics. Rachel is Dean of the College of Social Science and MSU Foundation Professor of Economics at Michigan State University. She is an accomplished scholar who has been a leader in the development of mentoring programs for women in economics (including CSWEP's) throughout her career. This award will be presented at the CSWEP Business Meeting during the 2018 AEA Meeting in Philadelphia, PA. This event is scheduled for **3:00–4:30 PM on Saturday, January 6 2018** at the Philadelphia Marriott, and the celebration will continue at a reception that evening from **6:00–7:30 PM**. On behalf of the CSWEP Board I invite you join us to celebrate the contributions of Rachel and previous Bell Award winners to the progress of women in economics.

The 2018 AEA/ASSA Meeting in Philadelphia is fast approaching, and CSWEP will be there with a full program of events that include paper sessions, mentoring programs, and presentation of the 2017 *Annual Report on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession* at the Business Meeting. We are excited about a new event we are offering this year: Best Practices for Mentoring Underrepresented Minority Women Economists on **Sunday, January 7 at 12:00–2:00 PM**. A panel of experts from inside and outside economics will discuss the unique challenges facing minority women in academe and how departments and colleagues can help address them. Register in advance for this event, organized and moderated by Marie Mora. Full details are available in this issue and at www.cswep.org.

CSWEP is presenting paper sessions at the AEA Meeting in three research areas: Aging and Retirement (organized by Gopi Shah Goda and Olivia Mitchell), Development Economics (organized by

Manuela Angelucci and Petra Todd), and Economics of Gender (organized by Claudia Olivetti and Ragan Petrie). Placement in these sessions continues to be highly competitive, with 137 papers submitted and only 28 selected. Of these, nine will be chosen for inclusion in the 2018 *Papers and Proceedings* issue of the *American Economic Review*.

Helping young economists acquire the skills they need to succeed has always been an important goal of CSWEP activities, and we will be sponsoring several mentoring events at the AEA Meeting. Mentoring Breakfasts for Junior Economists, organized by Amalia Miller, are scheduled for **Friday, January 5 and Sunday, January 7 from 8:00 AM–10:00 AM**. Senior economists will be available to answer questions and provide advice at topic-themed tables. Feedback from previous participants in these breakfasts has been overwhelmingly positive. We encourage economists within six years of their PhD as well as graduate students on the job market to preregister for these events (details in this issue and at cswep.org) and participate. We will also be offering a Mentoring Breakfast for Mid-Career Economists, scheduled for **Saturday, January 6 from 8:00 AM–10:00 AM** and organized by Ragan Petrie. At the end of the AEA Meeting, the 2018 CeMENT Mentoring Workshop for Faculty in Doctoral Programs will begin under the leadership of Director Martha Bailey. This intensive and effective mentoring experience is consistently oversubscribed and relies on the generous donation of time from senior mentors.

The Focus section of this issue of *CSWEP News*, edited and introduced by Ragan Petrie, offers advice for engaging in collaborative research. Working with diverse partners, maintaining good communication, norms of co-authorship, leading student teams—a wealth of wisdom and experience is shared by the authors of these articles. This issue

continues on page 10 ↓

FOCUS on Working with a Research Group and Co-authors

Ragan Petrie

At some point in an economist's career, it may be necessary to collaborate with co-authors and research teams. Working with others can have large upside benefits. It can make sizable data collection efforts possible, increase the number of research projects completed and in the pipeline, and improve the research quality of a project. Also, with collaborators, the research process is less lonely, professional networks can deepen, and long-term partnerships may develop. Nonetheless, managing these collaborations so that they are efficient and productive can be challenging. Collaborations have the potential to increase the success of a project and they can also be difficult experiences due to poor communication, misaligned incentives and staffing issues.

The articles in this Focus section address the question of how to best work with co-authors and in teams from a variety of perspectives. Anya Samek, Research Associate Professor of Economics at the Center for Economic and Social Research (CESR) and Department of Economics, University of Southern California, conducts and manages large-scale

field experiments and discusses working with and mentoring student teams. She offers sage advice for how to structure a research team, motivate and mentor students and acquire funding to pay for them. Julian Jamison, Senior Behavioral Economist in Poverty and Equity Global Practice for the World Bank, has worked with a variety of project partners including academics, research teams in nonprofits, businesses, and government agencies. All these partnerships present different challenges and approaches for success. He offers valuable insights, advice, and guidance on navigating this process. Finally, A. Abigail Payne, the Director and Ronald Henderson Professor at the Melbourne Institute at the University of Melbourne, has worked with a variety of co-authors and has built productive and successful collaborations. She offers important perspectives on junior-senior collaborations, how to manage working with co-authors, the value of communication, and how to move partnerships to successful outcomes.

Mentoring Student Teams

Anya Samek

My area of research involves conducting laboratory and field experiments, which are time intensive and involve a lot of labor input. I learned early that I can't be in many places at once, and so I often need to rely on student help to carry out experiments. Due to the nature of field work, most of my student workers are undergraduates.

Employing a team of undergraduate students also gives me the opportunity to mentor them and expose them to research methods in economics. I think this exercise is of particular importance for undergraduate women, since engaging undergraduate women in research could be one way to increase the pipeline of women into economics graduate

programs and improve the gender imbalance in the profession.

There are also some costs to working with undergraduates. Training the students takes time, as does writing recommendation letters after they have worked with you. In this article, I provide some guidelines for how to make this process as easy as possible. I'll also provide tips on university programs that can provide financial assistance to pay students.

What can I ask undergraduate students to do?

- **For researchers conducting field experiments:** Students can be trained to implement the study, enter and check

the data, and provide feedback on pilots of the experiment in terms of what worked/what did not work.

- **For researchers conducting laboratory experiments:** Students can be trained to assist in the consent/check-in process, passing out instructions, and paying experimental earnings at the end. Although I know that many researchers conduct the entire experiment themselves, I find that having a second person assist makes the process run much more smoothly.
- **For researchers not generating their own data:** Students can be trained to read (sometimes also to find) articles and extract key information

Mentoring Student Teams

(e.g., data source used, effect size found) and to use various computer packages (e.g., EndNote to help organize reference lists, ArcGIS to make maps). Students can also help proof-read papers for grammar, especially if English is their first language and it is not the first language of the researcher. Students can also check in-text calculations against tables or figures, and confirm the accuracy of publication proofs. More advanced students can replicate data analyses that have already been conducted to check the accuracy of the output.

How can I make undergraduate students active participants in the research process?

- **Students as key players in the research process:** I explain the integral parts of all stages of a field experiment—from the recruitment of participants, data collection, data entry, to the analysis and writing, and we discuss the role these play in the research. I help students take ownership of what they have done (e.g., having students type their name at the end of each row of data they have entered). I also hold frequent meetings during the beginning stages of a project so that students can give feedback about what went well or did not go well, which helps refine procedures. To avoid experimenter bias I typically do not tell students about the motivation for each experiment while it is ongoing. We discuss the main hypotheses only after projects are completed.
- **Guided readings:** I also encourage students to read research articles, think about how those projects must have been conducted, and come up with ideas for extensions or improvement. I assign a research article for group discussion every 1–2 weeks. This is usually an article that I am refereeing or that I have just completed myself. In this way, student comments can also be helpful to me.

- **Creating an effective team culture:** Frequent feedback, giving students tasks that they can work on together, and making sure that all students have the opportunity to participate in discussions all act to increase student motivation to do good work.


I am ready to work with some students: Now what?

- **Select motivated students:** The students who contact you after your class are usually the most motivated. I strongly advocate selecting students after you have taught them in a class, since you already know them well. I have also had success with asking undergraduate advisors to e-mail student lists. Once I have some good students, they often recommend friends. I have had limited success with posting job ads on the university job board.
- **Set expectations:** It is easy to assume that students are aware of what is expected of them, but even the brightest students rarely have much of an idea of what research entails. I created a document that provides guidance on what I expect from students, and what they should expect in return. We go over this document at the beginning of each semester. A similar idea that I have seen is a “research contract” that both parties sign. The document includes information about who (and when) to ask for help, expectations about being on time and being accountable for work, communication expectations (i.e., regularly communicating with me and the team), and guidelines on how to perform lab tasks such as entering data, reviewing literature, and working in the field.
- **Encourage asking for help:** Many of my students seem to have trouble asking for help when they are stuck, so I always make clear that they need to come to me with questions and check in on them regularly. A similar problem seems to exist among

graduate students, who may avoid their advisor instead of simply asking for help. I also tell students that they need to be self-motivated. This includes scheduling a meeting with me when they are ready to take on more work. When things are not working, students should be proactive in suggesting improvements. I tell students that the benefits they get from working in our group are proportional to the work that they put in. This gives students autonomy over their experience in the group, which is good for morale and productivity. Finally, I make sure students know they can communicate to me when they’ve made a mistake, so that we can learn from it and correct it (rather than, for example, proceeding with problematic data). Expectations also need to be coupled with clear feedback. I try to provide feedback to students on a regular basis.

- **Help students reflect on their achievements:** I have created a document to give to students after they are done working with my group. In this document, I ask students to list the start and end dates of their position, tasks they have worked on, any times they thought they excelled at a challenge, and what they felt they got out of the time working with me. Did it prepare them for jobs after college? Prepare them for graduate school? This document serves two purposes: First, students reflect on their time working with me. This may help them write future graduate school applications or complete their CV or resume. Second, students send me this document if they need me to write a recommendation letter. This has been a huge time saver, since I can use what students write about themselves as a guide for writing the letter.

How do I pay my students?

- **Your university could pay your students:** Universities are interested in 

providing students with research experience relevant to their major. For example, the University of Southern California offers the Student Undergraduate Research Fellowship and Student Opportunities for Academic Research programs. Under these programs, students receive a stipend to work for a faculty member. To qualify, the student writes a one page proposal and the faculty member provides a short letter. At the University of Wisconsin-Madison, the Undergraduate Research Scholars program selects top entering undergraduate students for a similar scholarship, and students are matched with willing faculty. These programs have a GPA requirement but are not need-based.

- **The government could pay your students:** The Federal Work-Study program in the U.S. sets aside money for students with financial need that can be used to pay students hired in hourly positions. Around 3,400 institutions participate. Work-study covers about 70% of the hourly rate you offer to the student, and you find grant or research funds to cover the rest.
- **Some students will work for free:** Motivated students are aware that they need job experience and faculty recommendation letters for the next stage of their careers. As such, many students will be willing to work for free. This can work out well, but there are a few caveats. (1) If you have a team, either everyone should work for free or no one should work for free, since if students learn that they are unpaid while others are paid, they will be demotivated; (2) It takes a very motivated student to be productive under such an arrangement so closer mentoring/monitoring than usual may be necessary. ■

Norms and Communication in Collaboration

Julian Jamison

I've been a part of many research teams with varying backgrounds and goals. I have had 65-70 coauthors, ranging from good friends with whom I have worked closely on multiple projects over the years, to family members (yes: plural), to people I have never met and whose names I barely recognize. I've worked with public and private sector partners (and funders) of various types, including more than ten governments around the world. I also worked in government for six years. I have published in economics journals as well as journals in medicine, linguistics, philosophy, and information technology. This breadth of experiences has certainly been a lot of fun, and has taught me a lot about the importance of norms and communication for effective collaboration. Here are a few thoughts from the trenches, starting with the more familiar (to economists, at least) and ending with the more exotic.

Within Economics

In economics, my sense of the norm is that authors are listed alphabetically, unless there is a particular reason not to. Research assistants are not generally included as coauthors. One way to determine whether a particular individual's contribution merits co-authorship is to apply this rule: If someone is getting paid specifically to do a task, then their contribution is less likely to warrant co-authorship credit. However, if an individual is paid the same whether or not they do a given task, co-authorship credit is more likely to be warranted. Of course, one can always invite RAs to be coauthors if they are willing and able to contribute to the rest of the research process.

When collaborating with other economists, any and all coauthors are expected to contribute significantly. This doesn't imply that everyone does exactly

equal amounts of work throughout the stages of a project, but it does imply that doing any one element (e.g. research design, data collection, data analysis, or writing) is not enough. Even if her part is done, an alphabetical coauthor should be willing to help two years later when the referee reports come back and a big revision is undertaken.

Across Disciplines

Many other scientific disciplines have different norms about author order and author inclusion. Often, there is a "first author" who leads the project and does the majority of the work, with secondary authors in some order in the middle, and perhaps a last senior author (or two) who gives guidance and/or procures funding but doesn't do much work on each particular paper. The advantage of this system is that it allows for more information about each person's role in the research to be conveyed in the author listing; for partial contributors to be acknowledged; and for helpful incentives regarding who keeps the project moving along. The disadvantage is that sometimes it's easier to just work together as a team without thinking about priorities or who's in charge or who's supposed to do what, with everyone willing to shoulder the load if the time is right.

It can be terrific to work with people in other fields, and sometimes (not always) the research is much better that way. In order for the collaborative process to work well, I recommend talking quite early on about how to work together, including what journals to submit to, even if the conversation is a bit awkward. It is important to have these conversations early in the process as they will only get more difficult the longer you wait. You may have to explain the economics norm to your collaborators, and they will find it weird and foreign



Norms and Communication

and probably try to explain to you why it's ridiculous. There is no right answer to the problem of how to delineate credit among collaborators. You can use differing norms matching the field of the journal you send to, or you can make a compromise decision up front. It is important to be aware that someone is likely to be left holding the short straw, in part because no one individual can control or alter what standards their peers will use to judge a final publication. Communicate early, accept that the solution may not be perfect, and don't let that stop you from pursuing interesting and novel opportunities!

NGOs and Think Tanks

When working with non-academics, it is important to be aware of the different incentives faced by academics and non-academics. Regardless of discipline, academics generally have a similar goal with respect to research output: publish in a peer-reviewed journal. Outside academia there are many other incentives. For instance, non-academics may be more concerned with influencing policy or with serving a particular sub-population, rather than with knowledge generation for the greater good. Nonprofits are also typically more tightly beholden to donors. Usually this only means that the product or research question is aimed more narrowly, but sometimes it veers into the territory of advocacy (where the conclusions anticipate the research) or simply of making the donor happy. It is important to acknowledge these incentives at the start of any project.

Ideally, before partnering with a non-profit, you should have a written agreement that says you can publish the results no matter what they are. It's fine to allow them to decide whether they want their name involved at a later date, as long as you are free to describe the context fully. Remarkably, I have found that overconfidence is a wonderful negotiating tool: many NGOs believe their programs are so great that they happily commit in advance to publication of

a rigorous evaluation. You can also assuage their concerns by making it clear that evaluations are of the program itself, not of the organization or its staff.

What about co-authorship? For the most part, how and to whom to award credit will be fairly clear. Some staff are researchers and co-PIs just like any other coauthor. Other staff will not be interested in academic publications. A few may fall in the middle, and one way to approach such decisions is a similar criterion to that for RAs: are they willing to keep working on the paper even when they are not contractually paid to do so? I have occasionally phrased it just this way, not as an ultimatum but more as a spark to get the conversation started and to convey academic norms. Of course, a little generosity never hurts – but be respectful of your future self's time!

For-Profit Firms

There is a fair amount of overlap between partnering with nonprofits and with for-profit firms. Establish an agreement allowing you to publish results without conditions (other than that they may need to check the manuscript to be sure no proprietary or confidential information is included, and they may not want the company name used). It's also appropriate to give any partner the chance to read and comment on a draft before submitting to a journal, and to take their input seriously. The rules for co-authorship are the same as above.

One slightly unique question in this category is how to align incentives. Your research partner is likely to be focused on the bottom line, but you are more likely to be focused on maximizing learning – preferably of a type that improves outcomes widely (and perhaps is shared across the industry). In negotiating these different aims, I find it useful to search for areas of overlap rather than imagining that the goals will ever be fully aligned. For example, maybe the for-profit partner wants to increase uptake of a new savings product for business reasons, and you are interested in how

to encourage consumers to think more about the future.

It's also worth trying to find individuals within a company who are excited about research or about helping clients directly, and thinking about how to give them leverage within the organization. Ask yourself if you have at least some buy-in from managers, from front-line staff, and from the data team. If possible, ask early on for a sample of their existing data so that you can test their internal systems. Finally, be patient and prepared for shifting timeframes: three month delays can abruptly morph into expectations for overnight results.

Governments

Working with governments is similar to working with other partners, although they tend to move more slowly and can be harder to infiltrate. The advantage is the opportunity to work at scale. Having connections within a governmental organization is especially important. However, personnel change over time, so try not to be too dependent on one counterpart. Remember that, as elsewhere, governments are made up of individuals with their own interests and incentives (including advancement), and try to use this to your advantage. For example, one issue that often comes up for field experimentalists is randomization. Many partners are hesitant to do it in practice, but this is especially true for governments. Try different tacks: the equity argument given limited resources; phasing-in over time; encouragement designs. Show them examples of where it has worked before without any problems, or of where their rival has done it. Listen to their concerns, which are sometimes highly specific to the setting. With sufficient creativity, there is almost always a way to achieve the research goal while not crossing any bright lines from the perspective of the rest of the team. This last piece of advice is as good a coda as any for how to approach all research partnerships. ■

The Keys to Effective Collaboration

A. Abigail Payne

I have had a fortunate career when it comes to collaboration. I have enjoyed working with researchers and I believe that the work that was produced was better as a result of the collaboration. Mind you, I do have a few bruises and war stories. There are times when I am frustrated with my collaborators, but the frustration is not one-sided. At times, I have been a contributor to that frustration as well. As in any relationship, communication is key to a good collaboration. The focus of this piece is on collaborating with another researcher. I'll start by discussing with why you might want to collaborate, then discuss my experiences with how to effectively manage collaborations and deal with the inevitable problems when they arise.

Why Collaborate?

I think there are four reasons for collaboration. First is the opportunity to continue to develop your expertise as an economist. A good collaborator will challenge your thinking and will help you to push your boundaries! My strengths include thinking creatively about data, being doggedly determined to get access to data, framing research questions from a policy relevance perspective, and using careful statistical analysis. My work is often based on a theoretical or conceptual framework but I am more interested in testing hypotheses than writing down the theoretical model. Thus, I have quite enjoyed working with those who are stronger as theorists—the combination of theory and empirical work can be quite powerful! As I start to get into areas that involve some use of field experiments, I'm collaborating with those who have strengths in running experiments. I also have collaborated with researchers who have complementary strengths to mine. We all have a set of skills and we use those skills somewhat differently. If we join forces, we'll be pushed to use

our skills in different ways as well as to create something different when we approach a research question with these different skills and perspectives.

The second reason for collaboration is it serves as a concrete way to expand your professional network. I try to shy away from large crowds. I prefer to develop relationships and to build my networks through one-on-one interactions or small group settings. Through collaboration, I have been able to deepen my networks and to have a reach that extends well beyond the colleagues in my department. Especially in academics, we tend not to talk about the importance of networks. But networks matter—for getting a job, being promoted, or as part of the refereeing process.

The third reason relates to time. Although there may not be economies of scale in producing papers, sharing in the work can result in more papers. Over the last few years, I have been working with a team of researchers on a series of projects. These projects relate to the use of a core data set that has been underutilized. We have generated many ideas for possible research papers—but each team member only has so many hours in a day. By working collaboratively and dividing our responsibilities, we are able to work on multiple papers at the same time. This type of strategy can work well when one has a point from which to anchor the team such as the use of the same data set that may share some of the same programs to explore the data and develop the analysis.

The fourth reason is simply the enjoyment of working with a colleague. That colleague can nudge you along. You can nudge that colleague along. Although there is a lot of hard work involved in creating a successful collaboration, there are also a lot of laughs. Collaboration can result in deep and lasting friendships.

Challenges of Collaborative Work

Maintaining an effective and productive collaboration does present some challenges. For the examples that follow, communication plays a critical role. In general, all projects will go through a phase where there is a misunderstanding or there are frictions in approaches to the research. These frictions include: writing styles, time devoted to the project, the framing of the research, and the structure of the analysis. Throughout the collaboration process we have to think about how we communicate with each other. When there is a concern or disagreement, how do we resolve it? If you have a passive personality and your collaborator is aggressive, how will you handle situations when there are conflicts? Do you remember to praise and be supportive of your collaborators' ideas and work?

Although it can be hard to do, when you are approaching a new collaboration consider whether you and your potential collaborator should have a discussion about such things as the expected contributions of each collaborator, an intended timeline, and other priorities that will affect how quickly the project is undertaken or finished. When one collaborator experiences a major life change (e.g. career, family matter), have a frank discussion about how that change will affect progress on the project.

Seniority of collaborators

You are a junior economist—should you collaborate with a senior economist? What about a well-known economist? I have and I found these collaborations rewarding on a number of fronts. But I also worked with senior collaborators who are respectful of my ideas and my work on the project. A challenge when working with senior or well-known collaborators is

Keys to Collaboration

ensuring that those reading your work will perceive you as a full-fledged collaborator and not merely a research assistant. One problem is that others might think you did not contribute to the paper. Once, I gave a seminar and I was quizzed about a footnote in the paper. Because it took me a while to explain the footnote I could see that some of the audience thought I had not been an equal contributor to the research. To avoid this problem, it is incumbent on you to exert control over how you present yourself and your involvement in a project. Be confident, present well, and make your level of contribution clear to others. Before entering into a collaboration with a senior economist, consider carefully how you will handle that relationship—can you pay respect but also contribute to the project? If you think you will behave like a research assistant or that the senior economist will not respect your ideas, then think carefully about whether the collaboration will benefit you and your career.

If you are a senior economist—how do you treat your junior collaborators? Do you give them space to grow and to make meaningful contributions? Just as junior researchers should think about their role, we as senior researchers should think about how we interact and collaborate with our junior collaborators. As a senior economist, I feel a great deal of responsibility to ensure the junior economist knows her opinion is respected and that I view our work as a true collaboration. I think senior/junior collaborations are a great opportunity to nurture growth and to provide meaningful mentorship.

When to walk away

There have been times when I have made the painful choice to step aside from a project. Sometimes it is because the collaboration had issues that could not be resolved. Sometimes it was because the research was not as promising as we thought it would be at the beginning. When you are a solo author, it is easy to walk away from a project. But when a collaborator is involved,

sometimes you persevere when the better option would be to change course or to abandon a project. Reasons for persevering may be tied to not wanting to let the collaborator down, but sometimes the better approach would be to have a frank conversation to decide the next steps for the project.

Many of my current collaborations are with researchers who are as busy if not busier than I am. Given the time it takes to get a paper published, the risks associated with working with non-standard data sets, and an increasing set of responsibilities as we become more senior, it is very easy to fall into the trap of overcommitting and underdelivering. When you fall into this trap it is easy to turn a blind eye and think a miracle will happen that will dig you out of the hole you find yourself in. Sometimes you have dug that hole, other times a delay or action of a collaborator put you in that hole, and even other times an unexpected event happens. When you find yourself in a hole and it is just simply getting deeper, what do you do? Walking away is one option, but only with open communication. Another option might be to think about changing the project to fit the current circumstances. A third option might be to bring on another collaborator.


Leading a team of collaborators

Although a two-person collaboration can have challenges (and most certainly rewards!), when working with a team of three or more individuals, seemingly minor issues can become major issues. When I think of working with a team, I think of the game we played as children where child #1 tells child #2 something which gets repeated to child #3 and so on. By the time we get to child #n, often there is no similarity between the original statement and the nth iteration of it. When working with a team of collaborators, individuals can misinterpret what was said and end up feeling like they were kept in the dark. Both the leader and the participants of a team should create a plan for regular communication and for the sharing of information

as the project unfolds. Skype, One Note, developing timelines, and the use of other tools and shared drives for holding documents and analysis are important for promoting active and informed participation by all team members. Remember that these tools are only useful if the participants use them.

What if the collaborator is not a coauthor but a data provider, funder or involved in your project in another way?

I've spent my career going after data and working with data from non-traditional sources. This involves developing relationships, working through data sharing agreements, and finding lots of funding to support the work to develop research-ready data sets. Working with individuals that participate in a project as a non-co-author can be tricky. This is where frank and constant communication is important. I have been in situations where when I first meet a data provider, it seems like we get along quite well and it also seems like we are on the same page about my requests to access the data. Then I receive the data extract, or we start to work through a data sharing agreement, and I realize we were not on the same page and there is confusion about what is needed to undertake the project. This is not the point when I want to learn that the data provider's interpretation is not the same as mine. The same can be said about finding funding for a project. We often talk about the big picture importance of a project to obtain funding, but if the funder is expecting something different and this has not been articulated, you can find yourself with money for a project you do not want to undertake.

Today, ensuring that everyone is on the same page is as important as ever, especially when it comes to data given the heightened concerns about issues of privacy, security, and access. My recommendation is to start frank discussions early on and create memoranda and other documents that lay out the intention and understanding of all sides. By working through these documents you can usually save time down the road 

Keys to Collaboration

and ensure your project stays on track. Even when you are in agreement, it is good to maintain and ensure there are regular meetings and opportunities for discussing the project.

Summary

The above discussion highlights some of the key issues I've experienced. Let

me finish with my thoughts about creating opportunities for collaboration. Finding a collaborator is often not strategic—it happens from a casual conversation. Maybe it is over a beer at a conference, or in speaking to a visitor to your organization. My final point about promoting effective and strong

collaborations is to encourage you to be open to the opportunity and find ways to interact with others. Get out of your office and talk to others. Find the time to have that coffee, listen to what others are doing, and engage with a broad set of economists. ■

Halac Interview [continued from page 1](#)

in late 2001, exactly when I was graduating from college. I was working at McKinsey at the time, as an intern, but the situation in Buenos Aires was such that we had no projects there. McKinsey offered me a position in one of their offices in Chile or Brazil, but I wasn't ready to make such a big investment in a career in consulting.

A professor from CEMA then told me about someone he knew at the World Bank, Sergio Schmukler, who was looking to hire a research assistant, and it turned out that a coauthor of Sergio's in another sector of the Bank was looking to hire too. So Guillermo and I ended up taking those RA positions.

Our plan was to go to DC, learn what research in economics was about, get paid in US dollars—very valuable for us after the depreciation of the peso—and then go back to Argentina a year later when the economy would, hopefully, have recovered. We did all that except going back: research proved too interesting to leave! Plus the economic situation in Argentina was still pretty bad, and we enjoyed our time in DC a lot. We got excited about the idea of pursuing PhDs in economics in the US and decided to stay another year at the Bank while we applied to grad school.

How did your time with the organization impact you and your research interests?

Those years in DC were very enriching, on both professional and personal levels. I had never written a paper before and I learned a lot by working with Sergio and others at the Bank. On a personal level, the experience completely opened my mind. I had grown up in Buenos Aires and hadn't travelled

much, and then, all of a sudden, I was working with people from all over the world and being exposed to diverse cultures that I knew little about. It was great.

As for my research interests, I joined the Bank to study sovereign defaults and financial crises—having suffered these in Argentina, I was deeply interested in the subject. And I liked it very much, so when I applied to grad school, I chose UC Berkeley, which is a top school for international finance.

Once at Berkeley, however, my interests shifted. I became fascinated by microeconomic theory after taking the first-year courses. Ben Hermalin taught the contract theory and mechanism design class, and I loved it. I decided to take theory as one of my fields in the second year, and took the contracts class from Steve Tadelis. I got really lucky: Steve is an amazing teacher and had just moved to Berkeley Haas, and that year was the only year that he taught in the economics department.

After my second year, I started doing research on sovereign debt contracts, trying to combine my interests in international finance and contracts and game theory. But, soon after, I realized what I was really passionate about were the theoretical questions. So I decided to do theory, and Ben and Steve, together with Shachar Kariv, became my advisors. I wrote my dissertation in relational contracts, which are self-enforcing contracts—very much like those used for sovereign debt!

You have a remarkably broad research agenda with papers examining employment relationships, innovation, and fiscal

rules. What ties this body of work together for you?

For me the common factor is that incentives and information are at the center of these problems. These are all situations involving a principal and an agent—say a manager and a worker, or society and a policymaker—where the principal wants to incentivize the agent to take some course of action.

Now the principal's problem is not easy, and information plays a big role in making it complicated. There is often asymmetric information between the parties, in addition to some aspects of the environment being uncertain, and some aspects of the interaction not being contractible. All this constrains the incentives that the principal can provide to the agent. Moreover, incentives also determine the information that is available. Incentives may affect how much information the parties disclose or learn about the environment and about each other, or how fast and in what way this information is learned, which then feeds back into incentives.

That's what I find fascinating: there is a rich interaction between incentives and information. Information affects incentives but also depends on incentives, and the interplay between these two is often dynamic and endogenous. My work has tried to emphasize these effects and explore their implications for different applied questions.

What part of research really excites you?

I think my favorite stage of a project is typically right after I've defined a question. For me the question is motivated by empirical observations or design

Halac Interview

problems. The next thing I do is explore what my intuition says the answer should be; there's nothing like a strong intuition to guide you towards a solution! The following step is to come up with a strategy: how should I set up the model and prove the result formally?

Now at that point I can get quite absorbed by the problem. It can become sort of an obsession, in the sense that part of my brain is constantly thinking about a proof. I realize that may not sound great, but it's actually very exciting! And it's particularly enriching when I'm working with coauthors; I really like discussing problems with coauthors and discovering things together.

What advice would you give to young women starting a career in economics?

I would say find a topic that you are passionate about. Don't be afraid of choosing a specialization like theory that is dominated by men or of changing what you had planned to study when you discover something new. Choose to work on something that you would be happy to become obsessed with: you'll spend many hours working on your research and only if you are truly interested in the questions you are studying will you enjoy it and stay motivated.

Also, find good mentors who can guide you in your research and in your career. I was very fortunate to have great

mentors back in grad school at Berkeley and, after graduating, at Columbia. And I have also benefited from the advice of others in my field; people outside your own institutions can be of great help too.

Finally, I would say make sure you invest not only in your research but also in managing your career. You see, we are our own managers, and there is very little structure in what we do. Should I start a new research project or continue developing an old idea? Should I attend that conference? Where should I submit this paper? These decisions are important, and only after you've figured them out can you happily submerge yourself in your research.

From the Chair continued from page 2

of *News* also includes an interview by Glenn Hubbard with Marina Halac, the recipient of the 2016 Elaine Bennett Research Prize. This prize recognizes outstanding research in economics by a woman not more than seven years beyond her PhD. In the interview, Marina talks about her academic journey, the importance of intuition, and career management. Finally, Anne Winkler offers an in memoriam tribute to Sharon G. Levin, whose legacy includes the success of the many women she mentored during her long career.

Something surprising and promising happened this fall—a broad and intense discussion on social media, the press, and elsewhere about gender in economics. This was kicked off in August by CSWEP Board member Justin Wolfers, whose article in the *New York Times*, “Evidence of a Toxic Environment for Women in Economics,” discussed the Berkeley honors thesis of Alice Wu (<https://goo.gl/WtxjZA>). In this study, Wu documents the gendered discourse in the anonymous online forum Economics Job Market Rumors (EJMR), with sexual terms found to be distinctly associated with discussions of women. The misogyny and racism of many threads in EJMR, and a history of persistent harassment of female economists, has been discussed for years, but

Wolfers' article set off a firestorm of reaction, including a petition to the AEA eventually signed by more than 1,000 economists. The CSWEP Board issued a statement and set of recommendations to the AEA Executive Committee in early October (<https://www.aeaweb.org/about-aea/committees/cswep/statement>), and we were pleased when they issued a statement that “strongly condemns misogyny, racism, homophobia, antisemitism and other behaviors that harm our profession” less than two weeks later. The AEA has also charged an *ad hoc* committee on professional conduct and promised to explore the possibility of creating an alternative website to provide information and transparency to the economics job market (<https://www.aeaweb.org/news/statement-of-the-aea-executive-committee-oct-20-2017>). We look forward to being part of this ongoing discussion, believing that EJMR has been not only an agent of sexual harassment and gender discrimination in economics, but also a signal of a problematic cultural climate in our discipline.

In related news, we are asking the CSWEP community to share with us stories of sexual harassment or assault that you have experienced in a professional context. The next issue of *CSWEP News*, in early 2018, will be focused on

how to deal with sexual harassment and improve the climate in economics on issues related to gender. We hope to include a section of first-person accounts (anonymous or not, as you prefer) that illustrates how sexual predation affects women in economics. Send your contribution to cswep@econ.ucsb.edu with the subject line “my story”.

During the AEA meetings, the CSWEP Board terms of Terra McKinnish, Petra Todd, and Anne Winkler will be ending. I am so grateful for all that they have contributed to the activities and the structure of CSWEP and look forward to continuing to work with them on future CSWEP projects. Terra McKinnish, who has created the Associate Chair for Mentoring position, will be succeeded by Sebnem Kalemli-Ozcan. Anne Winkler will be replaced as Midwest Representative by Shahina Amin, and Sandy Black will be taking over Petra Todd's at-large position. Welcome! I'd also like to thank the CSWEP Board members and affiliates who have contributed so much to CSWEP's mission this year as award committee members, mentors, event organizers, authors and CSWEP departmental liaisons.

Happy holidays! I hope to see you all in Philadelphia in January.

—Shelly

What is CSWEP?

CSWEP (the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession) is a standing committee of the American Economic Association charged with serving professional women economists in academia, government agencies and elsewhere by promoting their careers and monitoring their progress.

CSWEP activities endeavor to raise the awareness among men and women of the challenges that are unique to women's careers and can be addressed with a wide variety of actions, from inclusive searches to formal and informal mentoring activities. CSWEP freely disseminates information on how the profession works as well as advice to junior economists. We intend this information to be of value to all economists, male or female, minority or not.

Annually, CSWEP

- Organizes mentoring workshops, paper presentations sessions at the annual AEA Meetings, and professional development sessions at the annual meetings of the four regional economics associations (the Eastern, Mid-Western, Southern and Western);
- Conducts a survey and compiles a report on the gender composition of faculty and students in academic economics departments in the United States;
- Publishes three editions of the *CSWEP News*, containing a feature section written by senior economists that highlights career advice or other topics of interest to the economics profession; and
- Awards the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award, given to a person for their outstanding work to promote the careers of women economists as well as the Elaine Bennett Research Prize, given biennially to a young woman economist for fundamental contributions to academic economics.

Our business meeting is held during the annual AEA Meetings and is open to all economists. It is a time for us to confer awards and celebrate recipients, present the Annual Report on Women in the Economics Profession and to hear your input on CSWEP's activities. The CSWEP Board meets three times yearly and we encourage you to attend our business meeting or contact a Board Member directly to convey your ideas for furthering CSWEP's mission.

Visit cswep.org for more information.

Remembering Sharon G. Levin

Professor Emeritus, University of Missouri–St. Louis

Anne E. Winkler

Sharon Levin passed away on August 21, 2017, after a hard and long-fought battle against breast cancer. She was 70 years old. After receiving her PhD in Economics at the University of Michigan, Sharon spent her career at the University of Missouri–St. Louis (UMSL), rising to the position of full professor. For 15 years, she served as Chair and Director of Graduate Studies, becoming a mentor to her colleagues and an advisor (informal and formal) to countless students. Sharon was exceptionally generous with her time and expertise. Tributes have poured in via email and LinkedIn from those she mentored. As just one example, Kate Krause, Professor of Economics and Dean, University College, at the University of New Mexico wrote: “Sharon was the one who brought me into the fold at UMSL and, as I often say, that is what changed my life.” During Sharon's tenure as Chair, she actively recruited female faculty and provided valuable advice that helped them earn tenure and promotion, as well as balance work and family. Although she retired from teaching in 2002, Sharon remained research active. She was busy working on an NIH-grant

funded project until a month before she passed away. Much of her research focused on the scientific workforce and the role of gender. She co-authored (with Paula Stephan) the Oxford University Press book, *Striking the Mother Lode in Science* and published more than 40 journal articles, including publications in the *American Economic Review*, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, and *Science*. She successfully secured grants from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institutes of Health. In 1993, Sharon received UMSL's Chancellor's Award for Outstanding Research and Creativity, the first woman faculty member to receive this award. She leaves a trail of highly-cited scholarship that has informed our understanding of the scientific workforce and encouraged new generations of researchers to use data in creative and constructive ways. Her legacy also lives on in the countless number of women (and men) she mentored and in the culture of active mentoring that persists in the UMSL Department of Economics.

Calls & Announcements

Visit cswep.org for full details on each of the below opportunities, including submission guidelines for paper and application calls as well as participant, panelist and paper titles for currently scheduled sessions.

Call for Papers, CSWEP Sessions @ 93rd Western Economic Association Conference

CSWEP will be sponsoring sessions at the 2018 Western Economic Association International (WEAI) conference. The deadline for submission of session proposals to CSWEP is January 15, 2018.

One to two sessions will be organized by Catalina Amuedo-Dorantes (CSWEP Western representative) on the broad topic of international immigration and immigration policy. Abstracts on those areas are particularly solicited, although submissions in other areas will also be considered for a potential separate session. Proposals for complete sessions (organizer, chair, presenters and discussants) are particularly encouraged. Please email abstracts (1–2 pages, include names of all authors, as well as all their affiliations, addresses, email contacts, paper title) **by January 15, 2018**, to:

Amber Pipa, Admin Assistant
American Economic Association

Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession
Department of Economics
2120 North Hall
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106-9210
(805) 893-4597

Note that this submission is separate from any submission sent in response to the WEAI's general call for papers. For more information on the WEAI meetings, please see <http://www.weai.org/AC2018>. CSWEP is unable to provide travel assistance to meeting participants. Please make other arrangements for covering travel and meeting costs.

CSWEP Sessions @ Upcoming Meetings

Allied Social Science Association (ASSA) Annual Meetings

January 5–7 2018, Philadelphia, PA

Mentoring Breakfast for Junior Economists

*Friday, January 5, 8:00–10:00 am
Liberty Ballroom Salon C*

CSWEP Development Economics Session 1

*Friday, January 5, 8:00–10:00 am
Meeting Room 306*

Issues in Development

Chair: Manuela Angelucci (University of Michigan)

Short-term impacts of a productive asset transfer and training program in rural Nepal
Sarah Janzen (Montana State University), Nicholas Magnan (University of Georgia), Suhindra Sharma (Interdisciplinary Analysts, Nepal), and William Thompson (University of Georgia)

Discussant: Susan Parker (University of Maryland)

Impact of parental health shocks on children's educational outcomes

Shatakshee Dhongde (Georgia Institute of Technology) and Olga Shemyankina (Georgia Institute of Technology)
Discussant: Silvia Prina (Case Western Reserve University)

Power or preferences? Household bargaining and the uptake of family planning services

Charlotte Ringdal (Norwegian School of Economics) and Ben D'Exelle (University of East Anglia)

Discussant: Nava Asraf (London School of Economics)

Climate change and civil unrest: evidence from the El Nino Southern Oscillation

Beatriz Maldonado (College of Charleston) and Daniel Hicks (University of Oklahoma)

Discussant: Manuela Angelucci (University of Michigan)

CSWEP Economics of Aging Session 1

*Friday, January 5, 2:30–4:30 pm
Grand Ballroom Salon L*

Debt Drivers Late in the Life Cycle

Chair: Karen Dynan (Harvard University)

Debt and financial vulnerability on the verge of retirement

Naomi Oggero (George Washington

University), Annamaria Lusardi (George Washington University), and Olivia S. Mitchell (University of Pennsylvania)
Discussant: Karen Pence (Federal Reserve Board)

In debt and approaching retirement: tap into your Social Security or work longer?

Nadia Karamcheva (Congressional Budget Office) and Barbara Butrica (Urban Institute)

Discussant: Courtney Coile (Wellesley College)

Portfolio allocations of older Americans: the role of cognitive ability and preference parameters

Maria Casanova (California State University, Fullerton) and Marco Angrisani (University of Southern California)

Discussant: Brigitte Madrian (Harvard University)

The role of cognitive decline on retirement decisions: a Mendelian randomization approach

Amal Harrati (Stanford University) and Mark Cullen (Stanford University)

Discussant: Daniel Benjamin (University of Southern California)

CSWEP Sessions

Peer Mentoring Breakfast for Mid-Career Economists

Saturday, 6 January 2018

8:00 am–10:00 am

Liberty Ballroom Salon C

CSWEP Economics of Aging Session 2

Saturday, January 6, 8:00–10:00 am

Grand Ballroom Salon C

Family and Social Transfers for an Aging Population

Chair: Shelly Lundberg (University of California, Santa Barbara)

The cyclical nature of informal care

Yulya Truskinovsky (Harvard University) and Corina Mommaerts (Yale University)

Discussant: Courtney Van Houtven (Duke University)

Medicaid crowd-out of long-term care insurance with endogenous Medicaid enrollment

Geena Kim (Congressional Budget Office)

Discussant: Lee Lockwood (University of Virginia)

Time and money: Social Security income and transfers with children

Anita Mukherjee (University of Wisconsin, Madison)

Discussant: Kosali Simon (Indiana University)

Effects of elderly care for an aging population on the labor market

Jessie Want (University of California, San Diego)

Discussant: Claudia Goldin (Harvard University)

CSWEP Economics of Gender Session 1

Saturday, January 6, 10:15 am–12:15 pm, Grand Ballroom Salon J

Gender in the Workplace

Chair: Ragan Petrie (Texas A&M University)

Leave-taking and labor market attachment under California's paid family leave program: new evidence from administrative data

Maya Rossin-Slater (Stanford University), Sarah Bana (University of California, Santa Barbara), and Kelly Bedard (University of California, Santa Barbara)

Discussant: Nicole Fortin (University of British Columbia)

The gendered effects of career concerns on fertility

Nayoung Rim (University of Chicago) and Kyung Park (Wellesley College)

Discussant: Nicole Fortin (University of British Columbia)

Gender wage gap dynamics, reputation, and sorting

Zoe Cullen (Harvard University), John Humphries (University of Chicago), and Bobak Pakzad-Hurson (Stanford University)

Discussant: Kevin Lang (Boston University)

Discussant: Kevin Lang (Boston University)

Using econometrics to reduce gender discrimination: evidence from differences-in-discontinuities design

Giannina Vaccaro (University of California, Irvine)

Discussant: Kevin Lang (Boston University)

CSWEP Economics of Gender Session 2

Saturday, January 6, 2:30–4:30 pm

Grand Ballroom Salon J

Gender Differences in Networks

Chair: Claudia Olivetti (Boston College)

Gender differences in the choice of major: the importance of female role models

Danila Serra (Southern Methodist University) and Catherine Porter (Heriot-Watt University)

Discussant: Claudia Goldin (Harvard University)

Does collaboration improve female representation in academic fields?

Soohyung Lee (University of Maryland) and Benjamin Malin (Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis)

Discussant: Claudia Goldin (Harvard University)

Gender peer effects in a predominantly male environment: evidence from West Point

Nick Huntington (California State University, Fullerton) and Elaina Rose (University of Washington)

Discussant: Bruce Sacerdote (Dartmouth College)

Cultural Assimilation, Peer Effects and the Evolution of the Gender Gap in Risk Preferences

Sharon Xuejing Zuo (University of Houston)

Discussant: Bruce Sacerdote (Dartmouth College)

Business Meeting & Award Ceremony

Saturday, January 6, 3:00–4:30 pm

Liberty Ballroom Salon C

Reception

Saturday, January 6, 6:00–7:30 pm

Grand Ballroom Salon I

Mentoring Breakfast for Junior Economists

Sunday, January 7, 8:00–10:00 am

Liberty Ballroom Salon C

CSWEP Economics of Gender Session 3

Sunday, January 7, 8:00–10:00 am

Grand Ballroom Salon I

Intrahousehold Decision-Making and Well-Being: Measurement and Evidence

Session Chair: Betsey Stevenson (University of Michigan)

Intimate partner violence and women's employment: evidence from Colombia

Johanna Fajardo-Gonzalez (Universidad EAFIT)

Discussant: Erica Field (Duke University)

Systematic bias in sensitive behavior and its impact on treatment effects: an application to violence against women

Veronica Frisnacho (Inter-American Development Bank)

Discussant: Erica Field (Duke University)

Parental investments and momentary well-being in the U.S.

J. Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal (University of Zaragoza) and Almudena Sevilla (Queen Mary University of London)

Discussant: Betsey Stevenson (University of Michigan)

Measuring women's empowerment in the household: survey vs. experimental methods

Kelly Jones (International Food Policy Research Institute)

Discussant: Betsey Stevenson (University of Michigan)

CSWEP Sessions

CSWEP Development Economics Session 2

*Sunday, January 7, 10:15 am–12:15 pm
Meeting Room 306*

Health and Development

Chair: Petra Todd (University of Pennsylvania)

Reducing the cost of remoteness: the effects of community health workers programs on maternal and children's health in Madagascar

Catalina Herrera Almanza (Northeastern University) and Maria Rosales Rueda (University of California, Irvine)

Discussant: Petra Todd (University of Pennsylvania)

Fuel subsidy, household productivity and health: panel data evidence from Indonesia

Imelda (University of Hawaii at Manoa)

Discussant: Petra Todd (University of Pennsylvania)

The price of labor: evaluating the impact of user fees on maternal and infant health outcomes

Anne Fitzpatrick (University of Massachusetts–Boston)

Discussant: Rebecca Thornton (University of Michigan)

Health certification in the market for sex work: a field experiment in Dakar, Senegal

Shanthi Manian (University of California–San Diego)

Discussant: Rebecca Thornton (University of Michigan)

CSWEP Panel Discussion: Best Practices for Mentoring Underrepresented Minority Women Economists

*Sunday, January 7, 12:00–2:00 pm
Liberty Ballroom Salon C*

Eastern Economic Association Annual Meetings

March 1–4, 2018, Boston, MA

CSWEP Session 1

Gender, Health and Labor

Chair and Organizer: Zarrina Juraqulova (Denison University)

The challenges and opportunities of female aging population in developing countries

Fafanyo Asiseh (North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University)

Does health aid reduce infant and child mortality from diarrhea in sub-Saharan Africa?

Lynda Pickbourn (Hampshire College) and Leonce Ndikumana (University of Massachusetts, Amherst)

The role of supervisor race and gender on promotion likelihood

Sophie Tripp (Hampshire College) and Yariv Fadlon (Muhlenberg College)

Another gender disparity in the C-suite: do beauty premiums differ between male and female CEOs?

Herman Sahni (Baldwin Wallace University), Laert Feizullari (Baldwin Wallace University), and Suresh L. Paul (MRSTC Inc.)

Discussants: Lynda Pickbourn (Hampshire College), Fafanyo Asiseh (North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University), Herman Sahni (Baldwin Wallace University), and Sophie Tripp (Hampshire College)

CSWEP Session 2

Quantitative Methods

Chair and Organizer: Alice Sheehan (University of Alabama)

Revisiting nonseparability: an empirical comparison

Deniz Ozabaci (University of New Hampshire)

Bayesian inference for spatial probit panel models with two-way fixed effects: a fast solution to large data

Guohui Wu (SAS Institute Inc.) and Xiaoyu Zhou (Louisiana State University)

Roy-model bounds on differential treatment effects

John Gardner (University of Mississippi)

Kernel-based testing with skewed and heavy-tailed data: evidence from a nonparametric test for heteroskedasticity

Daniel Henderson (University of Alabama) and Alice Sheehan (University of Alabama)
Discussants: Deniz Ozabaci (University of New Hampshire), Xiaoyu Zhou (Louisiana State University), John Gardner (University of Mississippi), and Alice Sheehan (University of Alabama)

CSWEP Session 3

Policies, Bad Behavior, and the Criminal Justice System

Chair: Hope Corman (Rider University)
Organizer: Karen Conway (University of New Hampshire)

Whose help is on the way? Analyzing the importance of individual police officers in determining law enforcement outcomes
Emily Weisburst (University of Texas–Austin)

Effects of welfare reform on women's crime: heterogeneous effects by age and state policies
Hope Corman (Rider University)

How do summer youth employment programs improve criminal justice outcomes, and for whom?

Alicia Sasser Modestino (Northeastern University)

Gender, body image and health risks of bullying in U.S. high schools: a study of state anti-bullying laws from survey data

Qi Sun (University at Albany, SUNY) and Baris Yörük (University at Albany, SUNY)

Discussants: Alicia Sasser Modestino (Northeastern University), Emily Weisburst, (University of Texas–Austin), Hope Corman (Rider University), and Molly Jacobs (East Carolina University)

CSWEP Session 4

Economics of Marriage and Living Together

Chair: Laura Argys (University of Colorado Denver)

Organizer: Karen Conway (University of New Hampshire)

How broadband and cell phone access have impacted marriage and divorce in the U.S.
Sheena Murray (Curry College)

How does sex ratio in the workplace affect one's marriage decision?

Shiyi Chen (University of Connecticut)

Heterogeneity in consumption gains from living together as a couple

Solvejg Wewel (Boston College)

The persistence of dowry in India: a constant comparative analysis

Abhilasha Srivastava (Bridgewater State University)

CSWEP Sessions

Discussants: Jennifer Trudeau (Sacred Heart University), Solvejg Wewel (Boston College), Laura Argys (University of Colorado Denver), and Monica Carney (College of Holy Cross)

CSWEP Session 5

Drinking, Driving and Unplanned Fertility

Chair: Angela Dills (Western Carolina University)

Organizer: Karen Conway (University of New Hampshire)

The impact of ridesharing apps on personal alcohol consumption

Jennifer Trudeau (Sacred Heart University) and Ben Brewer (University of Hartford)

The effect of ride-sharing on risky behaviors and traffic fatalities: the case of Uber

Linna Xu (University at Albany, SUNY) and Baris Yörük (University at Albany, SUNY)

Availability of the smartphone and teen fertility

Daniel Dench (City University of New York Graduate Center) and Eric Osborne (City University of New York Graduate Center)

How far is too far? New evidence on abortion clinic closures, access, and abortions

Scott Cunningham (Baylor University), Jason M. Lindo (Texas A&M University, NBER, and IZA), Caitlin Myers (Middlebury College and IZA) and Andrea Schlosser (Baylor University)

Discussants: Angela Dills (Western Carolina University), Jessica Lynn Peck (City University of New York), Caitlin Myers (Middlebury College), and Sheena Murray (Curry College)

CSWEP Session 6

Interventions within the School System—Child outcomes and Long-term Human Capital

Chair: Catalina Herrera-Almanza (Northeastern University)

Organizer: Karen Conway (University of New Hampshire)

Effects of conditional cash transfer on child well-being: evidence from Mexico's Oportunidades program

Alberto Riveroll Usabiaga (Bentley University)

Teacher identity and student performance: evidence from an adult education program in India

Sakshi Bhardwaj (Kansas State University)

Inputs, monitoring, and crowd-out in India's school-based health interventions

James Berry (University of Delaware), Saurabh Mehta (Cornell University), Priya Mukherjee (College of William and Mary), Hannah Ruebeck (Harvard University), and Gauri Kartini Shastry (Wellesley College)

Shocks, resilience and long-term human capital outcomes: evidence from natural disasters in Philippines

Catalina Herrera-Almanza (Northeastern University) and Ava Cas (The Catholic University of America)

Discussants: Esra Kose (Bucknell University), Gauri Kartini Shastry (Wellesley College), Catalina Herrera-Almanza (Northeastern University), and Anca Cotet-Grecu (Seton Hall University)

CSWEP Session 7

Gender, Labor Market Issues & BMI

Chair: Reagan Baughman (University of New Hampshire)

Organizer: Karen Conway (University of New Hampshire)

Networks and the gender wage gap: evidence from college football performance

Monica Carney (College of Holy Cross)

Women in public spaces and men's migration in Nepal

Pratistha Joshi Rejkarnikar (Tufts University)

Domestic violence against rural women in Colombia: the role of labor income

Ana María Iregui-Bohórquez (Banco de la República, Bogotá, Colombia), María Teresa Ramírez-Giraldo (Banco de la República, Bogotá, Colombia), and Ana María Tribín-Urbe (Banco de la República, Bogotá, Colombia)

Adolescent BMI growth: the role of biological and non-biological mothers in weight development

Molly Jacobs (East Carolina University)

Discussants: Pratistha Joshi Rejkarnikar (Tufts University), Ana María Tribín-Urbe (Banco de la República, Bogotá, Colombia), Zarrina Juraqulova (Denison University), and Reagan Baughman (University of New Hampshire)

CSWEP Session 8

The Market Effects of an Infusion of Goods, People and Disaster Relief

Chair: Ama Baafrá Abeberese (Wellesley College)

Organizer: Karen Conway (University of New Hampshire)

More for cheaper? The effect of trade liberalization on consumer prices

Ama Baafrá Abeberese (Wellesley College)

Public policy, environmental impact and the international second-hand clothes market: market distortions or welfare improvement from in-kind donations?

Debra Israel (Indiana State University)

How do refugees affect businesses? The case of Syrian refugees in Turkey

Onur Altındag (Bentley University), Ozan Bakis (Bahcesehir University Center for Economic and Social Research) and Sandra Rozo (University of Southern California)

Multiplier effects of federal disaster relief spending: evidence from U.S. states and households

Xiaoqing Zhou (Bank of Canada)

Discussants: Xiaoqing Zhou (Bank of Canada), Zinnia Mukherjee (Simmons College), Ama Baafrá Abeberese (Wellesley College), and Ben Brewer (University of Hartford)

CSWEP Panel Discussion:

Women Economists—Our Diverse Career Paths

Chair and Organizer: Natalia V. Smirnova (American Institute for Economic Research)

Panelists: Dvaki Chandra (Summer Institute for the Gifted), Daphne A. Kenyon (Lincoln Institute of Land Policy), Mary L. Lo Re (Wagner College), Alicia Sasser Modestino (Northeastern University), and Natalia V. Smirnova (American Institute for Economic Research) ■

Directory of CSWEP Board Members

Shelly Lundberg, Chair

Broom Professor of Demography
Department of Economics
University of California,
Santa Barbara
North Hall 2127
Santa Barbara, CA 93106-
9210
(805) 893-8619
cswep@econ.ucsb.edu

Margaret Levenstein, Associate Chair, Survey

Research Professor
University of Michigan
Institute for Social
Research
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248
(734) 615-9088
maggie@umich.edu

Terra McKinnish, Associate Chair, Director of Mentoring

Professor of Economics
University of Colorado—
Boulder, CO 80309-0256
(303) 492-6770
terra.mckinnish@colorado.edu

Catalina Amuedo- Dorantes, Western Representative

Professor and Chair of
Economics
San Diego State University
5500 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92182-4485
Phone: (619) 594-1663
camuedod@mail.sdsu.edu

Martha Bailey, Ex Officio Board Member

University of Michigan
Department of Economics
611 Tappan Street, 207
Lorch Hall
Ann Arbor, Michigan,
48109-1220
(734) 647-6874

Fax: (734) 764-4338
baileymj@umich.edu

Karen Conway, Eastern Representative

Professor of Economics
University of New
Hampshire
10 Garrison Avenue
Durham, NH 03824
(603) 862-3386
ksconway@unh.edu

Elizabeth Klee, at-large

Assistant Director of
Program Direction
Division of Monetary
Affairs
Board of Governors of the
Federal Reserve
20th Street and
Constitution Avenue N.W.
Washington, DC 20551
(202) 721-4501
elizabeth.c.klee@frb.gov

Amalia Miller, at-large

Associate Professor of
Economics
University of Virginia
P.O. Box 400182
Charlottesville,
VA 22904-4182
(434) 924-6750
armiller@virginia.edu

Ann Owen, Ex Officio Board Member

Professor of Economics
Hamilton College
198 College Hill Road
Clinton, NY 13323
(315) 859-4419
aowen@hamilton.edu

Ragan Petrie, Southern Representative

Associate Professor of
Economics
Texas A & M University
4228 TAMU
College Station, TX

77843
(979) 845-7351
rpetrie@tamu.edu

Kate Silz-Carson, Newsletter Oversight Editor

Professor of Economics
U.S. Air Force Academy
2354 Fairchild Drive, Suite
6K110
USAF Academy, CO
80840-6299
(719) 333-2597
Fax: (719) 333-7137
katherine.silz-carson@usafa.edu

Petra Todd, at-large

Professor of Economics
University of Pennsylvania
3718 Locust Walk,
McNeil 160
Philadelphia, PA 19104
(215) 898-4084
ptodd@econ.upenn.edu

Anne Winkler, Midwestern Representative

Professor of Economics
University of Missouri—
St. Louis
One University Boulevard
St. Louis, MO 63121
(314) 516-5563
awinkler@umsl.edu

Justin Wolfers, at-large

Professor of Economics,
College of Literature,
Science and the Arts, and
Professor of Public Policy,
Gerald R. Ford School of
Public Policy
University of Michigan
Room 319 Lorch Hall, 611
Tappan Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
(734) 764-2447
jwolfers@umich.edu

Brag Box

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

Danila Serra, Assistant Professor of Economics at Southern Methodist University, was selected as the inaugural recipient of the Vernon L. Smith Ascending Scholar Prize by the International Foundation for Research in Experimental Economics (IFREE). The \$50,000 prize is given to an exceptional scholar in the field of experimental economics whose work embodies IFREE's mission to "Promote human betterment through experimental economics to improve

the understanding of exchange systems." Eligibility is limited to Assistant and Associate Professors (or equivalent). Dr. Serra was selected for her pioneering research on corruption, which has provided key insights into both the extent of corruption and potential policy interventions.

Please join us in congratulating Dr. Serra for her outstanding work and accomplishments!

We want to hear from you!

Send announcements to cswep@econ.ucsb.edu.

Upcoming Regional Meetings

CSWEP sponsors paper sessions, professional development panels & networking events at the meetings of the four regional economics associations. Visit CSWEP.org for more info.

Eastern Economic Association

<https://www.ramapo.edu/eea/>

44 Annual Meeting, March 1–4, 2018
Boston Sheraton, Boston MA

Midwest Economics Association

<http://mea.grinnell.edu/conferences/conference-2015>

Annual Meeting, March 23–25, 2018
Hilton Orrington, Evanston, Illinois

Western Economic Association

<http://www.weai.org/AC2018>

93rd Annual Conference, June 26–30, 2018
Sheraton Vancouver Wall Centre, British Columbia, Canada

Join the CSWEP Liaison Network!

Three cheers for the 150+ economists who have agreed to serve as CSWEP Liaisons! We are already seeing the positive effects of your hard work with increased demand for CSWEP paper sessions, fellowships and other opportunities. Thank you! Dissemination of information—including notice of mentoring events, new editions of the CSWEP News and reporting requests for our Annual Survey and Questionnaire—is an important charge of CSWEP. For this key task, we need your help. Visit CSWEP.org to see the list of current liaisons and departments from whom we'd like to identify a liaison. We are also seeking liaisons from outside the academy. To indicate your willingness to serve, send an e-mail with your contact information to cswep@econ.ucsb.edu.