ADVANCE in Economics

Co-opting a Skeptical Professional Organization
Women in Economics
(CSWEP 2007 Annual Report)

Figure 1: Percentage of Economists in the Pipeline Who Are Women--Ph.D. Granting Departments
## Promotion Gap

(Ginther and Kahn 2004)

**Table 4**
Gender Promotion Gap by Discipline, 10 Years After Ph.D., 1973–2001 Survey of Doctorate Recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Promotion gap</th>
<th>Male coefficients</th>
<th>Female coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage explained by endowments</td>
<td>Percentage unexplained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political science</td>
<td>-4.4%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical science</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life science</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social science</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* Includes control variables discussed earlier.
Promotion Gap
(Ginther and Kahn 2004)

Figure 5
Predicted Survival without Tenure Functions, by Gender and Discipline

CSWEP:
Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

• Standing Committee of the American Economics Association (AEA)

• Established 1971
  “to eliminate discrimination against women and to redress the low representation of women in the economics profession.”

  Collects data, publishes quarterly newsletter, provides services (lounge at AEA meetings, listing service, ...)

• However, not mainstream (step-daughter of AEA)
Mentoring Intervention / Initiative

• 1998 CCOFFE (NSF Program on Women and Girls [now Program on Gender Equity] and Economics)
  Then nothing

• My goal
  Restart workshops
  Institutionalize (get AEA to commit to funding)
Challenges with AEA

• Most economists don’t believe problem
  See and understand the data
  But, model of efficient (labor) markets
  Economist joke: $20 bill on the ground, walk by because must not be there...

• If these labor markets were inefficient (biased), some firm (university) could hire qualified women cheaply, they would outperform, others would imitate and market inefficiency would disappear
  Imperfections in markets are *arbitraged* away
CeMENT: ADVANCE and Econ

• Went back to NSF to re-start workshops

• Strategic co-opting
  Grant made to the AEA, not to a university
  Secretary-Treasurer (lead administrator), Co-PI
  Research design (random assignment), leading labor economists (male and female) collecting data

• Short-term outcome
  ADVANCE panel successful
  Economics panel painful (ultimately successful)
  National workshops 2004, 2006, 2008, + 6 regionals
Institutionalization

- Grant running out 2009
- Proposal to 2007 AEA Executive Committee to continue workshops after grant runs out was successful (although involved much discussion)!
  - Not a matter of money
    - 2007: net unrestricted assets $17.9M, surplus $640,000
    - Workshops cost $30,000 (nationals) $15,000 (regionals)
  - Instead a matter of philosophy
- What worked?
  - Research design pivotal
  - Top researchers (e.g. Ginther testified last week before Science and Technology Subcommittee on Research and Science Education)
  - Timing and the Executive Committee
  - Prospect of “rolling out” to all junior faculty
  - Firm promise until 2014, “default” after that
Lessons Learned

• Even hostile/skeptical professional organizations can be convinced to participate
• Be realistic; pick your battles
• Present the data, but don’t expect it will be effective
• Instead, identify and address their interests
  For us this was research
  For others it may be undergrad education, reputation, access to funding,...