



Working Paper No. 1081

THE RISE AND RISE OF FEMINIST MACROECONOMICS: WHO'S RECOGNIZING?

by

Günseli Berik

Economics Department, University of Utah

and

Ebru Kongar

Dickinson College

April 2025

Paper presented at the Thirty-second IAFPE Conference in Rome, July 3, 2024.

This preprint is the accepted typescript of a chapter that is forthcoming in revised form, after minor editorial changes, in Lynne Chester and Alexandra Bernasek eds. *Edward Elgar Handbook on Women and Heterodox Economics: Past, Present, and Future*.

The Levy Economics Institute Working Paper Collection presents research in progress by Levy Institute scholars and conference participants. The purpose of the series is to disseminate ideas to and elicit comments from academics and professionals.

Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, founded in 1986, is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, independently funded research organization devoted to public service. Through scholarship and economic research, it generates viable, effective public policy responses to important economic problems that profoundly affect the quality of life in the United States and abroad.

Levy Economics Institute
P.O. Box 5000
Annandale-on-Hudson, NY 12504-5000
<http://www.levyinstitute.org>
Copyright © Levy Economics Institute 2025 All rights reserved
ISSN 1547-366X

ABSTRACT

Macroeconomics is arguably the most male-dominated field within the discipline of economics. Since the mid-1990s, feminist economists have thoroughly and meticulously challenged this field through empirical and theoretical analyses and proposed alternative starting points, frameworks, and models. We evaluate the contributions of five scholars—Nilüfer Çağatay, Diane Elson, Caren Grown, Stephanie Seguino, and Elissa Braunstein—who have been influential in the development of feminist macroeconomics as a heterodox project since 1995. Through citation analysis, we examine who is recognizing the macroeconomics-related contributions of these five scholars. We document that the journal articles published by these five are cited primarily by women, in mainstream journals, in disciplines other than economics, and in interdisciplinary journals both in and outside of economics. Our analysis reveals that the impact of the five scholars in heterodox macroeconomics journals is miniscule, and the citations of their works are primarily made by other feminist economists, most of whom are women.

KEYWORDS: Citations; Feminist Economics; Feminist Macroeconomics; Gender

JEL CODES: B54, E11, E12

SUGGESTED CITATION: Berik, Günseli and Ebru Kongar. “Rise and Rise of Feminist Macroeconomics: Who’s Recognizing?” in Lynne Chester and Alexandra Bernasek eds. *Edward Elgar Handbook on Women and Heterodox Economics: Past, Present, and Future* (forthcoming). Preprint.

INTRODUCTION

Feminist macroeconomics emerged in the late 1980s and early 1990s, largely as a response to the gender-differentiated impacts of neoliberal macroeconomic policies adopted around the world. These policies, enforced by the World Bank (WB) and International Monetary Fund (IMF) in heavily indebted, low-income countries, comprised short-term stabilization and long-term structural adjustment components. Feminist economists documented their adverse effects on low-income women and analyzed the underlying gendered causes of these disparate effects. While billed as ‘sound’ and ‘sensible,’ as they pursued traditional macroeconomic goals of full employment, price stability, and foreign sector balance, the programs were built on standard macroeconomic models that did not include gender as a dimension of analysis. A lack of gender awareness meant macroeconomic policies disregarded that they built on existing gender inequalities and implicitly presumed gender-neutral effects. Feminist economists also showed how structural reforms failed to achieve their goals if they were not cognizant of gender norms and inequalities.

Feminist research into gender disparities as cause and consequence of macroeconomic outcomes, processes, and policies was catalyzed by Nilüfer Çağatay, Diane Elson, and Caren Grown, who edited two *World Development* special issues in 1995 and 2000 (Çağatay et al. 1995; Grown et al. 2000). The ensuing body of scholarship challenged standard macroeconomic models, sought to restructure macroeconomics in a gender-aware manner, and pursued empirical analyses of the relationship between gender and the macroeconomy. We consider Çağatay, Elson, and Grown to be the first-generation feminist macroeconomists. Also influential in this first generation was Stephanie Seguino, whose sustained contributions to feminist macroeconomics began in the 1990s, and Elissa Braunstein, whose macroeconomic scholarship flourished in the first two decades of the twenty-first century. While many other feminists have contributed to the development of feminist macroeconomics project, we focus on the impact of the five authors whom we view as pivotal. Their contributions went beyond research publications to include teaching and networking among practitioners and academics. These activities were instrumental in the intergenerational propagation of feminist ideas and the flourishing of feminist macroeconomics, which we characterize as a continued “rise,” acknowledging the term first used by Ruth Pearson (2005) to describe the growth of gender and development research.

In this paper, we examine the extent to which the macroeconomics-related journal articles of these five authors have received recognition in terms of citations. Our bibliometric analysis aims to examine the impact of feminist macroeconomics, represented by the five scholars of focus, on heterodox and mainstream economics and across disciplines. To our knowledge, there has not been a citation analysis examining the impact of feminist scholarship on heterodox economics. We also examine the gender identity of the authors who are recognizing feminist macroeconomics scholarship in view of feminist research which shows that marginalization of feminist scholarship in economics and other disciplines, overlaps with an underrepresentation of females (Ferber and Brün 2011; Ferber and Nelson 1993; Pearse et al. 2019). Because macroeconomics is one of the most male-dominated fields within a male-dominated discipline (Lundberg and Stearns 2019), we do not expect much receptiveness to feminist critiques within the field. We expect greater receptiveness among heterodox economists since feminist macroeconomics is a heterodox research project that has Post-Keynesian/Kaleckian and structuralist features. However, the homogeneity of heterodox scholarly communities in gender, racial, and national terms, which undermines pluralism (Strassmann, Grown, and Starr 2010), may similarly work against openness of heterodox macroeconomics to feminist macroeconomic ideas. . Heterodox-feminist economists from institutional, radical political economy, and Post Keynesian traditions have sought to reform the respective heterodox school of thought to make them more gender aware and inclusive (Braunstein 2021; Mutari 2021; Rao and Akram-Lodhi 2021; Seguino 2021). However, there still persists an inherent male bias in heterodox (and mainstream) macroeconomics that Elson (1991) noted over 30 years ago: treating labor as a non-produced factor of production (Braunstein 2021).

FEMINIST MACROECONOMICS IN THE MAKING

Initial feminist challenges to macroeconomics emerged in the 1980s with critiques of labor force, output, and welfare concepts underlying the standard labor force categories and the system of national accounts. Waring (1988) critiqued the use of GDP as the indicator of aggregate well-being, drawing attention to its exclusion of non-market activities and the inclusion of activities harmful to the environment and overall wellbeing. Benería's (1981) critique focused on the undercounting of informal and subsistence work and exclusion of unpaid work—all predominantly undertaken by women—in labor force statistics.

Both Benería (1981) and Waring (1988) argued for broadening the labor force and output categories to include nonmarket work (production). These broader conceptions are consistent with feminist arguments for conceptualizing the economy as the totality of interdependent paid and unpaid provisioning activities to meet human needs, rather than scarcity and unlimited wants in the mainstream definitions of the rational-economic man model, incorporating complex human behavior in economic analysis (Nelson 1993; Power 2004). The 1980s also saw the introduction of the capability approach, which conceptualized wellbeing in non-monetary terms and promotion of capabilities—individuals’ freedom to lead the lives they choose—as the sole end of policy (Sen 1999).

In the late 1980s, feminist economists also proposed frameworks for examining gendered labor market outcomes, such as employment levels and industrial segregation of employment, in the context of macroeconomic cycles in the Global North (Rubery 1988). Structural adjustment programs (SAPs) of the 1980s also provided the context for demonstrating the relevance of policy attention to gender and critiquing macroeconomic theory’s disregard of labor as a (re)produced factor of production (Elson 1991). Feminist analyses documented the adverse gender-differentiated effects of macroeconomic stabilization and of SAPs on low-income groups, especially women, in low-income countries (Benería and Feldman 1992; Elson 1991). Feminist research also emphasized likely policy failures in sub-Saharan Africa, such as the inability to increase farm output or exports, when structural reforms are implemented without attention to the gender division of work in the household (Koopman 1992). Concurrently, through country case studies, feminist economists examined the gendered labor market effects of the shift from inward-looking to export-oriented production (Çağatay and Berik 1990), responding to the challenge posed by the bold claim that there was a global feminization under way (Standing 1989), and the export success story in South Korea (Seguino 1997). These ideas were germinal in shaping the feminist macroeconomics project.

UNFOLDING OF THE FEMINIST MACROECONOMICS PROJECT

In 1994, Çağatay, Elson, and Grown co-founded ‘The International Working Group on Gender, Macroeconomics and International Economics’ (GEM-IWG) as an international network of economists for the purpose of promoting research and advocacy on gender

equitable approaches to macroeconomics, international economics and globalization (Elson and Grown 2023). Çağatay, Elson, Grown spearheaded research on feminist macroeconomics by editing two *World Development* special issues (Çağatay, Elson, and Grown 1995; Grown, Elson, and Çağatay 2000). These special issues included empirical studies, conceptual frameworks, and gender-aware macroeconomic models.

The research agenda of feminist macroeconomics focuses on documenting the gender-, class-, and ethnicity-differentiated effects of macroeconomic policies and how inequalities can shape country prospects for economic growth and development. Feminist macroeconomists first focused on the conceptually and statistically invisible unpaid provisioning activities as the locus of harm of macroeconomic stabilization and SAPs. The conceptual framework by Elson and Çağatay (2000) identified three biases as causes of hardship for low-income women: the male-breadwinner bias in most societies that reserves jobs for men; the deflationary bias of restrictive fiscal, monetary policies and currency devaluation, and the commodification bias inherent in subsequent structural reforms of privatization and removal of government price regulation and subsidies. Floro (1995) argued that economic restructuring, as entailed by SAPs, can increase the unpaid care burdens of low-income women and cause distress sales of labor, which can lengthen and intensify women's labor time and precipitate serious long-term well-being consequences for women and children. Through a cross-country investigation, Çağatay and Özler (1995) showed that under SAPs, owing to the rise in income inequality and increased openness, the female shares of the labor force increased, and this was independent of a secular U-shaped pattern of this variable.

Feminist macroeconomists challenged the gender-neutrality presumption of standard macroeconomic models and the reforms guided by them. They argued that because gender disparities, such as norms about who is a breadwinner or caregiver, are embedded in social institutions, macroeconomic policies will affect women and men differently (Çağatay 2003; Elson 1999). Likewise, macroeconomic aggregates, such as consumption, investment, and trade, are shaped by the gender-differentiated choices of women and men and the household- and market-level gender inequalities in the division of work, and distribution of income and wealth (Çağatay 2003). Feminist economists also argued that soundness of macroeconomic policies must be judged in terms of their ability to produce improvements in people's capabilities, rather than traditional aggregate indicators that neglect the distribution and

shifting of costs of macroeconomic adjustment to the unpaid reproductive economy (Berik and Rodgers 2008; Berik, Rodgers, and Seguino 2009).

Feminist macroeconomists also examined the effect of gender inequalities on GDP growth. This question has also been of interest to mainstream gender macroeconomists. However, while mainstream research emphasized the synergy between growth and gender equality, focusing on education or labor force participation gaps, research by feminist macroeconomists indicated that the relationship was contingent on the time frame of the analysis, structure of the economy and its institutions, and the gender inequality dimension under focus (Berik, Rodgers, and Seguino 2009). For instance, gender wage inequality leads to a competitive cost advantage in export-oriented sectors and boosts economic growth, while gender inequality in education and labor force participation constrains economic growth. In cross-country analysis, Seguino (2000) found support for the positive effect of gender wage gaps on economic growth in semi-industrialized economies in the 1975-95 period. Feminist macroeconomists argued that mainstream growth models fail to see how persistent gender wage gaps could provide an additional boost to growth in contexts where women's education (productivity) level is rising but women lack bargaining power vis-à-vis employers (Berik, Rodgers, and Seguino 2009).

Modelling efforts in the *World Development* special issues aimed to represent the macroeconomy as a gendered structure (Elson 1995). One approach was to model the economy as two sectors, an unpaid sector, and a monetized sector. Developing such a model for a low-income African economy, Darity (1995) shows that, during structural adjustment, women's labor allocation from subsistence to the export (cash-crop) sector can result in the nutritional deprivation of women. Another approach is to incorporate gender-disaggregated variables. Using a dynamic Keynesian growth-cycle model, Ertürk and Çağatay (1995) examine how secular and cyclical changes in the female share of the labor force and intensity of female household labor affect the behavior of the macroeconomy. Economic recovery of the monetary economy is likely to succeed if the stimulus of increase in the labor force's female share on investment is stronger than the impact of the rising intensity of female household labor on savings. Using a two-sector model, Braunstein (2000) examines the effect of gender relations in the household, via women's reservation wages, on foreign direct investment. These gender-aware models contributed to growing awareness of the relevance of gender to macroeconomic research and policy.

After the *World Development* special issues, feminist macroeconomists continued to develop structuralist models and deepen analysis of the relationships between job segregation, the gender wage gap, and the structure of production. Blecker and Seguino (2002) and Seguino and Grown (2006) examine the macroeconomic implications of, and policy dilemmas posed by, attempts to reduce the gender wage gap in countries that rely on export growth. Based on a two-sector model, Blecker and Seguino (2002) demonstrate the contractionary effect of improving women's relative wages in a semi-industrialized economy. Similarly, Seguino (2007) shows that wage growth in labor-intensive export industries will be held in check in a context where firms are easily able to relocate to lower-wage countries. Constructing a two-sector model for low-income agricultural economies where women are subsistence farmers, Seguino (2010) shows that, contrary to the case of semi-industrial economies, gender equality can be a stimulus to growth. Providing access to productive inputs to women farmers can raise domestic food production, reduce food imports, and improve the balance of payments.

While to a limited extent compared to the attention on fiscal policy, feminist macroeconomists also examined the gender impacts of monetary policy. Braunstein and Heintz (2008) and Seguino and Heintz (2012) show that contractionary monetary policy widens gender gaps in employment and unemployment, respectively. These employment effects have adverse consequences on consumption and child wellbeing, and therefore feedback effects on economic growth (Seguino 2020).

Feminist macroeconomists, particularly Grown and Elson, focused on fiscal policy as a central instrument for tackling gender inequalities. Barnett and Grown (2004) show the factors in who pays and who benefits from taxes: the gendered division of paid and unpaid labor and in formal and informal employment, occupational segregation by gender, gender earnings inequality, gender differences in consumption expenditure, and gender differences in property rights and asset ownership. They also show that global tax trends, including cuts in tax rates for top-income and wealthy groups, growing reliance on indirect taxes, particularly value-added taxes (VATs), have differential distributional outcomes by gender.

Elson documented the gender biases in budgetary processes (Elson 1998, 2004). Unlike traditional budgetary processes, gender-responsive budgeting calls for a gender-aware approach to revenues and expenditures. It incorporates gender inequalities in economic and decision-making power, gender division of care work, and gender differences in service needs

in the analysis to create gender-equitable outcomes. Through her scholarship and policy-oriented work in and with governmental organizations such as the United Kingdom, Commonwealth Secretariat, and the United Nations entities of UNIFEM and UNDP, along with Çağatay et al. (2000) and many others, Elson has taken the lead in putting gender budgeting on the agendas of national and international governing bodies. She has contributed to country-level analyses that show gender inequality in public spending (Austen et al. 2013) and has been critical of superficial gender-budgeting efforts adopted internationally (Elson 2021).

Gender budgeting efforts have focused on utilizing fiscal resources to reduce gender inequality and contribute to broad-based well-being. One means is through investments in labor-saving infrastructure, such as water and electricity, which make it possible for women to take up remunerated work (with implications for boosting economic growth). Available evidence shows that physical infrastructure investments reduce the unpaid labor hours of women, but there is mixed evidence on whether this translates into an increase in women's employment (Seguino 2020).

Overall, while gender-aware macroeconomic policies are necessary for generating gender equitable well-being, Çağatay (2003) emphasizes that they alone would not be sufficient to overcome entrenched gender biases, which need to be tackled by institutional changes and legal measures.

WIDENING FEMINIST AWARENESS IN MACROECONOMICS: INTERNATIONAL KNOWLEDGE NETWORKING AND WORK IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Çağatay, Elson, and Grown have fueled the growth of feminist macroeconomics research through not only their scholarship but also the networks they generated. In 2003, together with Rania Antonopoulos, Çağatay and Elson expanded the original objectives of GEM-IWG beyond scholarship to include the teaching and exchange of ideas with the launch of the Knowledge Networking Program and Capacity Development. This initiative aimed to increase gender awareness in research and policy formulation by junior PhD economists, who work in academia, governments, international agencies, and civil society organizations.

The highlight of these knowledge networking activities was an annual two-week intensive course, followed by a conference, where a mix of more senior GEM-IWG members and junior researchers presented their work. A large number of junior economists participated in this program, some of whom subsequently formed regional GEM-IWG groups to generate regionally specific scholarship¹ in Latin America and the Caribbean GEM-LAC; in Africa GEM-Africa; in Asia GEM-Asia; in GEM-Europe, which focused on the periphery of Europe; and in a country-level group, GEM-Turkey. The first GEM-IWG workshop in 2003 led to many working papers and 17 members of GEM-IWG, mostly workshop instructors, who contributed to *The Feminist Economics of Trade* edited by Irene van Staveren, Diane Elson, Caren Grown, and Nilüfer Çağatay. GEM-IWG created an international community of economists—called “GEMistas” by Nilüfer Çağatay—who contribute to gender-aware macroeconomic scholarship and policy work (Elson and Grown 2023).

Another catalyst for research and networking was the Gender Equality and the Economy program (GEEP) at the Levy Economics Institute. This program has hosted and co-hosted several conferences/seminars with GEM-IWG since 2009. Rania Antonopoulos, as Director of the Levy Institute's GEEP, brought together feminist economists, many of whom are GEMistas, to work on issues related to gender, macroeconomics, and globalization. These initiatives have generated policy-oriented work on public employment guarantees, and developed new measures of well-being, time, and income poverty. GEEP, Antonopoulos and GEMistas also worked on the financial crisis of 2007-2008. The close collaboration between GEEP and IWG-GEM culminated in two edited books (Antonopoulos and Hirway 2010; Antonopoulos 2013).

Çağatay, Elson, Grown, and Braunstein were also influential through their tenure in, and collaboration with, international organizations, such as the UN and the WB. Çağatay worked as an economic advisor at the UNDP in its Social Development and Poverty Elimination Division in New York between 1997 and 2000. Grown led the UNU-WIDER program on foreign aid effectiveness and gender equality, served as Senior Gender Advisor and Acting Senior Coordinator for Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment at the US Agency for International Development (USAID), Director of the Poverty Reduction and Economic Governance team at the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW), and Senior Program Officer at the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. Between 2014–21, she served as Global Director of the WB’s Gender Group, where she led the institution’s

development and implementation of a Gender Strategy that deliberately and strategically targets gaps in endowments, jobs, and assets and works to increase women's leadership and voices. Elson worked as a special advisor for UNIFEM (now UN Women) and was the chair of the UK's Women's Budget Group (2010–16). Braunstein worked as a Senior Economist for UNCTAD in Geneva, Switzerland. Collectively, these four scholars have facilitated the incorporation of a gender lens in macroeconomic policymaking.

Our authors have also influenced scholarship through their journal editor positions and association leadership. Grown and Elson served as associate editors of *Feminist Economics* (2007–14 and 1994–7, respectively), while Braunstein served as associate editor from 2011 to 2017, before becoming editor of *Feminist Economics*. Seguino has been associate editor for *Feminist Economics*, *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, and *Review of Keynesian Economics*, and has served as the president of the International Association for Feminist Economics in 2010–11.

Through their teaching, editorial work, mentoring, and network building, these five scholars have contributed to the expansion of the feminist macroeconomics knowledge community of scholars.

THE NEXT GENERATION OF FEMINIST MACROECONOMICS

In the second decade of the new millennium, the feminist macroeconomics project was characterized by renewed efforts to incorporate unpaid (and paid) care work in macroeconomic models. There was limited progress on this front until Braunstein, Staveren, and Tavani (2011) constructed a Kaleckian–Post Keynesian model that showed the centrality of care to the functioning of the macroeconomy. Braunstein et al. (2011) used this model to describe different social reproduction regimes and how each might relate to country economic growth prospects. Braunstein, Bouhia, and Seguino (2020) applied this theoretical model to estimate social reproduction regimes in a cross-country analysis.

Another strand of feminist scholarship has emphasized the greater benefits of public spending on social infrastructure as compared to physical infrastructure in facilitating long-run economic growth by increasing the labor productivity of the next generation and providing a

greener and caring path to growth, while simultaneously contributing to gender-equitable job creation through investments in health care and childcare services. This policy-oriented work was spearheaded by Antonopoulos and colleagues at the Levy Institute starting in 2008. Their work focused on countercyclical fiscal policy in the form of immediate and direct job creation (employer of last resort and job or employment guarantee policies) in periods of economic recessions, prolonged structural unemployment or the aftermath of financial crises. The methodology developed at the Levy used I-O tables and constructed and embedded a “care sector” so as to simulate what-if scenarios; hence, it modelled the macro and microeconomic impacts of government spending on social services, such as early childhood development, eldercare, mid-day meal programs for students—activities that had a strong potential to reduce women’s unpaid care work by redistributing it to the public provisioning sector, and compared them to identical size investments in physical infrastructure (construction of stadiums, roads, bridges, etc). Country studies as diverse as South Africa that faced high structural unemployment in the post-apartheid period (Antonopoulos and Kim 2008), the US during the financial crisis of 2007-2008 (Antonopoulos *et al.* 2010), and Greece in the midst of a budgetary and balance of payments crisis (Antonopoulos *et al.* 2014) showed that investing in the care sector of the economy yielded superior results in terms of (a) macroeconomic impacts, (b) the gender impact of job creation, and (c) poverty reduction. Similar outcomes were also recently documented for Ghana and Tanzania (Zacharias *et al.* 2019) and Turkey (İlkkaracan *et al.* 2021).

The goals of GEM-IWG were pursued through the Care Work and the Economy Project (CWE-GAM) in the 2017–21 period. Launched at the American University in Washington, DC, CWE-GAM could be thought as the continuation of GEM-IWG, contributing to the propagation and expansion of feminist macroeconomic research as it seeks to advance methods for integrating care in macroeconomic policymaking. CWE-GAM supported theoretical modelling, notably showcased by the 2022 special issue of *Feminist Economics* on “Rethinking Care and Macroeconomic Modeling,” edited by Blecker and Braunstein. By explicitly building on feminist economics scholarship on paid and unpaid care work, these mathematical models can directly engage with mainstream macroeconomics policy analysis and implementation, challenge the dominant macroeconomic paradigm, and offer an alternative (Blecker and Braunstein 2022, 3). The models featured in this special issue include Post Keynesian or Neo-Kaleckian models (Onaran, Oyvat, and Fotopoulo 2022;

Vasudevan and Raghavendra 2022), which show the positive macroeconomic effects of public spending on the care economy.

Given the recent vintage of these published papers, it is too early to assess the extent to which they are influencing either heterodox or mainstream macroeconomics. That said, the collective policy-oriented work of feminist macroeconomists is shaping policy globally and creating new measures of well-being. Most recently, a team of researchers affiliated with the Levy Economics Institute's GEEP—Ajit Zacharias, Fernando Rios-Avila, Nancy Folbre, and Thomas Masterson—constructed a new measure of consumption that integrates non-market consumption to supplement the consumption statistics generated by the US Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Expenditure Survey (Zacharias et al. 2024). It is perhaps this policy-oriented work and its success in pushing pro-poor, pro-gender equality research onto government agendas that is the true measure of success, according to feminist economists.

IMPACT OF MACROECONOMIC CONTRIBUTIONS OF ÇAGATAY, ELSON, GROWN, SEGUINO, AND BRAUNSTEIN: WHO'S LISTENING?

As evident from the contributions mentioned above, these five scholars have fueled the growth of feminist macroeconomics through their scholarship, networking efforts, and work with international organizations. Their critiques of standard macroeconomic prescriptions arguably contributed to interest in gender disparities in research papers published by the WB and the IMF. In this wave of gender mainstreaming at international financial institutions (IFIs), under the first female Managing Director of the IMF, Christine Lagarde, the IMF was welcoming to a range of gender-aware scholarship.

Braunstein recounts how she benefited from gender mainstreaming when she was invited to present her feminist Post Keynesian macroeconomic model at the IMF (Braunstein, Dafermos, and Niechoi 2023) and was able to engage the audience with the relevance of not only gender but also class lens in macroeconomic analysis. While this engagement is important, the question remains whether the contributions of Braunstein and the other four pioneers of feminist macroeconomics are being recognized by mainstream and heterodox economists in published work.

Assessing the Impact of Feminist Scholarship: Citation Analysis

We analyze patterns in citations to the work of these five scholars to identify who has recognized their contributions. As Pearse et al. (2019: 110) emphasize, “citations are an important act of communication in academic scholarship,” and are one way of assessing the influence of scholarship. Citation (or lack thereof) can occur for a variety of reasons, including size of the sub-field, broad applicability of the research, and the identity of the author. Citation indicates recognition of the scholarship and engagement with the work in agreement or dissent, which goes beyond simply listening to the author. Heterodox economic communities are not large communities. IAFFE has 800 members from over 90 countries (<https://www.iaffe.org/>). At the end of 2023, URPE had 531 members (‘Annual Reports’, n.d.). The Association for Evolutionary Economics listed 165 members in its membership directory as of May 2024.

Lack of citations can also reflect bias against either transformative scholarship or the (often gender or racial) identity of the author or both. As Woolley (2005, 85) notes, “disciplinary transformation generates resistance.” Analyses of citation patterns for authors who publish in transformative journals such as *Feminist Economics* (Small and Braunstein 2024; Woolley 2005) or the *Review of Black Political Economy* (Mason et al. 2005, 2022) find persistent patterns of exclusion of feminist, anti-racist scholarship within the economics discipline. Seguíno (2021) also observes the lack of engagement with feminist macroeconomics by mainstream economists while Onaran and Oyvát (2023) note non-citation of articles published in *Feminist Economics* by mainstream macroeconomists. Putting economics in context, Pearse et al. (2019) document that the impact of feminist economics scholarship is greater outside the discipline, than its impact within.

In economics and other disciplines, the marginalization of feminist scholarship overlaps with the under-representation of women in academic scholarship (Ferber and Brün 2011; Ferber and Nelson 1993; Pearse, Hitchcock, and Keane 2019). In the 1970s and the 1980s economics authors tended to cite a larger proportion of publications by authors of the same gender (Ferber 1986, 1988). As women’s representation and female–male co-authorship increased—especially in the field of labor economics and, to a lesser extent, in general economics journals—women’s disadvantage in having their works cited decreased, but did not disappear by 2008 (Ferber and Brün 2011). Nuanced internal critiques of feminist economics scholarship also show that under-representation of women of color, women from

the Global South and other marginalized intersectional identities in feminist economics may explain why an intersectional feminist lens is often missing, even in feminist economics scholarship (Banks 2021).

Given the relationship between the inclusion/exclusion of feminist ideas and the gender identity of the scholars, in our bibliometric analysis, we pay attention to gender identity (as binary) of the citing authors. While identities (such as race, class, sexual orientation, national origin, and religion) that intersect with gender lead to overlapping and mutually constitutive advantages/disadvantages, we can only identify the gender identity for all citing authors. For authors we do not know personally, we infer the gender identity from the author's first name and confirm it (where possible) using publicly available information, for example, through gender pronouns listed on the affiliated institution's website. In conducting citation analysis, we consult the *Scopus* bibliographic database, which covers a greater number of peer-reviewed publications, more of the journals published outside the US, and more interdisciplinary journals, compared to the Web of Science (Pellack n.d.).

The five scholars of focus in this chapter, like other feminist macroeconomists, publish work at the intersection of development economics, macroeconomics, and international trade, and therefore can (and do) publish in mainstream development economics journals as well as heterodox and interdisciplinary journals. They also publish in fields other than macroeconomics. We focus on their scholarship designated as "primary" by *Scopus* where the author is identical to the researcher in charge of the presented findings, unlike an author of a secondary document, such as a book review (*Scopus Content | Elsevier* n.d.). Among these works, we delineated journal articles that broadly fall in macroeconomics. Accordingly, we included their research on macroeconomics, economic growth, development, and international trade. Given our interest in who is recognizing these authors, we excluded sole- and co-authored self-citations in our count of citations.

RESULTS

Disciplinary Impact

As of May 2024, there were 2,240 citations to the works of our five scholars across 759 academic journals. The first question we examine is whether the pattern of greater external

(interdisciplinary) impact of feminist economics compared to internal (within-discipline) impact also holds for feminist macroeconomics as exemplified by the work of the five scholars, and it does. Fifty-nine percent (1,315) of citations come from disciplines other than economics, while the remaining 41 percent (925) are from the discipline of economics.

We also examine the citations in heterodox economics journals and heterodox macroeconomics journals. According to the *Heterodox News Directory* (n.d.), there are 169 heterodox economics journals. Of these, we designate as a heterodox economics journal only those that are listed as economics journals in *Scopus*. Accordingly, there are 40 heterodox economics journals in our analysis. We designate 9 of these as heterodox macroeconomics journals²: *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, *Investigación Económica*, *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, *Metroeconomica*, *Review of Keynesian Economics*, *Review of Political Economy*, *Review of Radical Political Economics*, *Review of Social Economy*, and *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*.

There are 390 citations to the primary macroeconomics-related works of Çağatay, Elson, Grown, Seguino, and Braunstein in 40 heterodox economics journals, which account for 17 percent of all (2240) citations. Nearly half of the heterodox economics impact (44 percent or 171 citations) comes from one journal, *Feminist Economics*, the only heterodox economics journal categorized also as a gender studies journal by *Scopus*. Sixteen percent of the heterodox economics impact comes from citations in heterodox macroeconomics journals, while a larger proportion (40 percent) of citations are in interdisciplinary heterodox economics journals. Strikingly, the heterodox macroeconomic journal impact amounts to 2 percent—64 of 2240 citations.

Among heterodox macroeconomics journals, most citations to the works of our authors are in the *Review of Political Economy* (ROPE) (20), *Cambridge Journal of Economics* (CJE) (16), and *Review of Radical Political Economics* (RRPE) (12). These three journals are open to all heterodox approaches and publish articles on the global economy. ROPE lists, on its website, “feminist economics” as one of the approaches it publishes. The CJE emphasizes globalization as one of the issues on which it publishes articles. Moreover, ROPE and RRPE are interdisciplinary heterodox macroeconomics journals: the ROPE is listed in *Scopus* as an economics, political science, and international relations journal, and *Scopus* lists the RRPE as an economics and philosophy journal.

There is less engagement with the works of our scholars in the remaining heterodox macroeconomics journals: *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics* (5), *Review of Social Economy* (4), *Metroeconomica* (2), *Review of Keynesian Economics* (2), *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* (3), and there are no citations in *Investigación Económica*.

Not surprisingly, our scholars have a large impact on the field of development, and interdisciplinary heterodox economics journals are primarily in the field of development (*Development and Change*, *New Political Economy*, *Journal of Development Studies*, *Journal of Agrarian Change*, *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, *Critical Sociology*, *Oxford Development Studies*, *Development Dialogue*, and *Review of African Political Economy*).

Our scholars' impact on mainstream economics is larger (24 percent or 535 of all citations) compared to heterodox economics (17 percent or 390). While there is one mainstream economics journal categorized as both a gender studies and an economics journal, *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, this journal garners only 2 (or 0 percent of) all citations. About a third of all citations in mainstream economics journals are in development journals, where *World Development* alone accounts for 112 of the 535 mainstream economics citations. Development also accounts for 25 percent of all "other disciplines" citations, the second largest category after "interdisciplinary social science" journals (36 percent).

These results are consistent with the early evaluation of Woolley (2005) who assessed the impact of *Feminist Economics*, and the recent analysis of feminist scholarship in economics by Pearse, Hitchcock, and Keane (2019). Feminist macroeconomic scholarship, generated by the five trailblazing scholars, is recognized primarily outside the discipline of economics.

A Closer Look at Heterodox Macroeconomics

Our analysis shows limited recognition of the contributions of our five scholars in heterodox macroeconomics. We examine the citing article titles and the citing authors' gender identity to see whether this limited impact is related to the gender identity or the gender lens in the research of the citing authors. There are 64 citations in 40 unique articles published in heterodox macroeconomics journals to the works of our five scholars. Twenty-three (58

percent) of the citing articles signal a gender lens or topic in the title, which we identified as the following terms: caring, women, motherhood, male-bias, feminist or feminism. Two-thirds of the 64 citations have at least one female author. The remaining third are either sole- or co-authored by male-only authors.

Most of the citing authors in heterodox macroeconomics journals are long-time contributors to feminist macroeconomics literature³: Özlem Onaran (as sole- and co-author), Xiao-Yuan Dong (co-author), Irene van Staveren, Stephanie Seguino, Elissa Braunstein, Zdravka Todorava, Jennifer Olmsted, Nancy Folbre, Deborah Figart, and Marcella Corsi (co-author). Also noteworthy is the reproduction of the next generation of feminist macroeconomists. Specifically, among citing authors, we recognize graduates of the economics PhD program at the University of Utah: Adem Yavuz Elveren, Chiara Piovani, Nursel Aydiner-Avsar, Daniel Ossa, and Özge Özyay.

The predominance of women among citing authors is not limited to heterodox economics journals. For each of our scholars, we compiled a list of the top 10 authors who frequently cite her work. Except for 10 citing authors (about 25 percent), all are women, and 84 percent of all (2,240) citations are made by female authors. Also notable is that the scholars we examined frequently cite each other's work as they collectively build the feminist macroeconomics literature. Also, seven scholars, who are contributors to feminist economics scholarship and are women, are the authors who most frequently cite the work of our five scholars: Günseli Berik, Shahra Razavi, Irene van Staveren, Yana van der Meulen Rodgers, Adrienne Roberts, Juanita Elias, and Özlem Onaran.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We evaluated the contributions of five scholars to the development of feminist macroeconomics, which was catalyzed by two *World Development* special issues produced by Çağatay, Elson, and Grown. These efforts resulted in the growth of the number of scholars who work on feminist macroeconomic topics and the application of innovative methods to examine macroeconomic problems from a feminist perspective.

Our citation analysis—based on *Scopus* data—shows that the trailblazers of feminist macroeconomics are mostly recognized by scholars outside the economics discipline and in interdisciplinary scholarship. Heterodox macroeconomics journals account for the smallest share (2 percent) of all citations, which gives us pause, given that our authors share with heterodox macroeconomists critiques of mainstream macroeconomics and seek to build alternative macroeconomic models.

Most of the economics journal citations to the work of the five scholars come from two sources: *Feminist Economics* and *World Development*. There are fewer citations in heterodox macroeconomics journals (and other heterodox journals such as the *Review of International Political Economy* (29) and the *Journal of Economic Issues* (25) not focused on macroeconomic topics). Their disciplinary impact is stronger in mainstream economics, probably because of the openness of development journals to heterodox ideas, as noted by Woolley (2005). As other studies have found for feminist economics, feminist macroeconomics scholarship has a feminist audience in other disciplines at the intersection of economics, gender studies, and development. Within heterodox macroeconomics thus far, integration of gender inequalities in macroeconomic analysis is primarily an internal conversation among feminist macroeconomists.

We anticipate more engagement of heterodox macroeconomists with feminist macroeconomic ideas. The ongoing work of Seguíno and Braunstein is more strictly Post Keynesian/Post-Kaleckian, and they directly speak the language of theoretical modelling, which is the primary (if not only) methodology featured in heterodox macroeconomics journals, and feminist macroeconomic modelling efforts have recently taken off. Recently Onaran and Oyvát (2023) have delineated the benefits of a unified research agenda for both feminist economics and Post Keynesian macroeconomics and have underscored how this agenda will have policy relevance in addressing multiple contemporary crises. Whether this call will be reflected in citations remains to be seen.

In our study, due to the large sample size, we were unable to conduct a content analysis of the citations to the articles of the five scholars to deepen the analysis of their influence. Therefore, we cannot determine whether a citation reflects engagement with feminist ideas, critique of them or their co-optation. Future work could examine the nature of the citations in

each of these strands of scholarship. Another extension of this chapter could explore the barriers to incorporation of a gender lens in heterodox macroeconomics.

Macroeconomic policies directly contribute to wellbeing (or ill-being) by affecting both the extent to which different social groups have access to income and the scope of social protection and care policies that support them. Feminist macroeconomics emphasizes the need for countercyclical macroeconomic policies, public investment in physical and social infrastructure, changes to tax and monetary policy, gender budgeting in a gender-aware macroeconomic toolkit, and supplementing the class analysis of heterodox macroeconomics with a gender lens. It is time, in our view, these two heterodox projects engage in greater dialogue to create a more just and equitable society.

REFERENCES

- Antonopoulos, R. and K. Kim. 2008. "The Impact of Public Employment Guarantee Strategies on Gender Equality and pro-poor economic development: [South Africa, Scaling up the Expanded Public Works Programme- A Social Sector Intervention Proposal.](#)" United Nations Development Program (UNDP).
- Antonopoulos R. and I. Hirway (eds.). 2010. *Unpaid work and the economy: poverty, time use and gender in developing countries*. Palgrave-McMillan.
- Antonopoulos, R., A. Zacharias, T. Masterson, K. Kim. 2010. "[Why President Obama Should Care About "Care": An Effective and Equitable Investment Strategy for Job Creation.](#)" Levy Economics Institute Public Policy Brief, No 108.
- Antonopoulos, R. (ed.) 2013. *Gender Perspectives and Gender Impacts of the Global Economic Crisis*. Routledge.
- Antonopoulos, R., D. B. Papadimitriou, T. Masterson, K. Kim, and S. Adam. 2014. [Responding to the Unemployment Challenge: A Job Guarantee Proposal for Greece](#). Research Project Report. Levy Economics Institute.
- Austen, S., M. Costa, R. Sharp, and D. Eson. 2013. "Expenditure incidence analysis: A gender-responsive budgeting tool for educational expenditure in Timor-Leste?" *Feminist Economics* 19(4): 1–24.
- Banks, N. 2021. "Intersectional identities and analysis," in *Routledge Handbook of Feminist Economics*, edited by G. Berik and E. Kongar (eds.). London: Routledge, 118–26.
- Barnett, K. and C. Grown. 2004. *Gender Impacts of Government Revenue Collection: The Case of Taxation*. Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Benería, L. 1981. "Conceptualizing the labor force: The underestimation of women's economic activities." *The Journal of Development Studies* 17(3): 10–28.
- Benería, L. and S. Feldman. 1992. *Unequal Burden, Economic Crises, Persistent Poverty, and Women's Work*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Berik, G., Rodgers, Y. van der M. and Seguino, S. 2009. "Feminist economics of inequality, development, and growth." *Feminist Economics* 15 (3): 1–33.
- Berik, G. and Y. Rodgers. 2008. "Engendering development strategies and macroeconomic policies: what's sound and sensible?" in *Social Justice and Gender Equality: Rethinking Development Strategies and Macroeconomic Policies*, edited by G. Berik, Y. Rodgers, and A. Zammit, 1–43. New York: Routledge.
- Blecker, R. A. and S. Seguino. 2002. "Macroeconomic effects of reducing gender wage inequality in an export-oriented, semi-industrialized economy." *Review of Development Economics* 6(1): 103–19.

- Blecker, R. A. and E. Braunstein. 2022. "Feminist perspectives on care and macroeconomic modeling: Introduction to the special issue." *Feminist Economics* 28 (3): 1–22.
- Braunstein, E. 2000. "Engendering foreign direct investment: Family structure, labor markets and international capital mobility." *World Development* 28 (7), 1157–72.
- Braunstein, E. 2021. "Care and the macroeconomy" in *The Routledge Handbook of Feminist Economics*, edited by G. Berik and E. Kongar, 351–359. London and New York: Routledge.
- Braunstein, E., I. Van Staveren, and D. Tavani. 2011. "Embedding care and unpaid work in macroeconomic modeling: a structuralist approach." *Feminist Economics* 17 (4): 5–31.
- Braunstein, E., R. Bouhia, and S. Seguino. 2020. "Social reproduction, gender inequality, and economic growth." *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 44 (1): 129–156.
- Braunstein, E. and J. Heintz. 2008. "Gender bias and central bank policy: Employment and inflation reduction." *International Review of Applied Economics* 22 (2): 173–86.
- Braunstein, E., Y. Dafermos, and T. Niechoj. 2023. "I think it is important to speak multiple languages theoretically in order to communicate to different types of people." *European Journal of Economics and Economic Policies: Intervention (EJEEP)*, 20 (1): 2–7.
- Çağatay, N., M. Keklik, R. Lal, and J. Lang. 2000. *Budgets As If People Mattered: Democratizing Macroeconomic Policies*. UNDP. Available from: http://www.undp.org/seped/publications/conf_pub.htm [Accessed May 8, 2024]
- Çağatay, N. 2003. "Engendering macroeconomics," in: *Macroeconomics: Making Gender Matter*, edited by M. Gutierrez, 22–41. London: Zed Press.
- Çağatay, N. and G. Berik. 1990. "Transition to export-led growth in Turkey: Is there a feminization of employment?" *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 22 (1): 115–134.
- Çağatay, N., D. Elson, and C. Grown. 1995. "Introduction." *World Development*, 23 (11): 1827–36.
- Çağatay, N. and Ş. Özler. 1995. "Feminization of the labor force: The effects of long-term development and structural adjustment." *World Development* 23 (11): 1883–94.
- Darity Jr., W. 1995. "The formal structure of a gender-segregated low-income economy." *World Development* 23(11): 1963–8.
- Elson, D. 1991. "Male bias in macroeconomics: The case of structural adjustment" in *Male Bias in Development Process*, edited by D. Elson, 164–90. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

- Elson, D. 1995. "Gender awareness in modeling structural adjustment". *World Development*, 23 (11): 1851–68.
- Elson, D. 1998. "Integrating gender issues into national budgetary policies and procedures: some policy options." *Journal of International Development*, 10: 929–941.
- Elson, D. 1999. "Labor markets as gendered institutions: Equality, efficiency and empowerment Issues." *World Development*, 27(3). Elsevier: 611–27.
- Elson, D. 2004. "Engendering government budgets in the context of globalization(s)." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 6(4), 623–642.
- Elson, D. 2021. "Gender budgeting," in: G. Berik and E. Kongar (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Feminist Economics*. Abington: Routledge, 459- 467.
- Elson, D. and N. Çağatay. 2000. "The social content of macroeconomic policies." *World Development* 28 (7): 1354–1361.
- Elson, D. and C. Grown. 2023. "Nilüfer Çağatay 1955–2022 In Memoriam." *Feminist Economics* 29(3): 3–9.
- Ertürk, K. and N. Çağatay. 1995. "Macroeconomic consequences of cyclical and secular changes in feminization: An experiment at gendered macromodelling." *World Development* 23 (11): 1969–77.
- Ferber, M. A. 1986. "Citations: Are they an objective measure of work of women and men?" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 11: 381–89.
- Ferber, M. A. 1988. "Citations and networking." *Gender and Society* 2(1): 82–89.
- Ferber, M. A. and M. Brün. 2011. "The gender gap in citations: Does it persist?" *Feminist Economics*, 17 (1): 151–158.
- Ferber, M. A. and J. A. Nelson. (eds). 1993. *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Figart, D. M. 1997. "Gender as more than a dummy variable: Feminist approaches to discrimination." *Review of Social Economy*, 55 (1): 1–32.
- Floro, M. S. 1995. "Economic restructuring, gender and the allocation of time." *World Development*, 23 (11): 1913–29.
- Grown, C., D. Elson, and N. Çağatay. 2000. "Introduction." *World Development* 28 (7): 1145–1156.
- Heterodox Economics Directory. 2024. 6th edition <https://heterodoxnews.com/directory/>
- İlkkaracan, İ., K. Kim, T. Masterson, E. Memiş, and A. Zacharias. 2021. "The impact of investing in social care on employment generation, time-, income-poverty by gender: A macro-micro policy simulation for Turkey." *World Development* 144 (C): 105476.

- Koopman, J. 1992. "Hidden roots of the African food problem: Looking within the rural household" in *Issues in Contemporary Economics, Vol. 4: Women and Work in the World Economy*, edited by N. Folbre, B. Bergmann, B. Agarwal, and M. Floro, 82–103. Macmillan.
- Lundberg, S. and J. Stearns. 2019. "Women in economics: Stalled progress." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 33 (1): 3–22.
- Mason, P. L., S. L. Myers Jr., and W. A. Darity Jr. 2005. "Is there racism in economic research?" *European Journal of Political Economy* 21(3): 755–761.
- Mason, P. L., S.L. Myers, and M. Simms. 2022. "Racial isolation and marginalisation of economic research on race and crime." *Journal of Economic Literature* 60 (2): 494–526.
- Mutari, E. 2021. "Feminist institutional economics," in *The Routledge Handbook of Feminist Economics* edited by G. Berik and E. Kongar, 43–52. Abington and New York: Routledge
- Nelson, J. A. 1993. "The study of choice or the study of provisioning? Gender and the definition of economics," in *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics* edited by M. Ferber and J.A. Nelson, 23–36. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Onaran Ö., C. Oyvat, and E. Fotopoulou. 2022. "Gendering macroeconomic analysis and development policy: a theoretical model." *Feminist Economics* 28 (3): 23–55.
- Onaran Ö. and C. Oyvat. 2023. "Synthesizing feminist and post-Keynesian/Kaleckian economics for a purple-green-red transition." *European Journal of Economics and Economic Policies* 20 (2): 317–37.
- Pearse, R., J. N. Hitchcock, and H. Keane. 2019. "Gender, inter/disciplinarity and marginality in the social sciences and humanities: A comparison of six disciplines." *Women's Studies International Forum* 72: 109–126.
- Pearson, R. 2005. "The rise and rise of gender and development" in *A Radical History of Development Studies: Individuals, Institutions and Ideologies* edited by U. Kothari, 157–79. London: Zed Books.
- Pellack, L. n.d. *Library Guides: Database Comparisons: Google Scholar, Scopus, Web of Science*. Available from: <https://instr.iastate.libguides.com/c.php?g=901522andp=6492159> [Accessed April 14, 2024].
- Power, M. 2004. "Social provisioning as a starting point for feminist economics." *Feminist Economics* 10 (3): 3–19.
- Rao, S. and H. Akram-Lodhi. 2021. "Feminist political economy" 34–42.
- Rubery, J. 1988. *Women and Recession*. London: Routledge, Kegan and Paul.

- Seguino, S. 1997. "Gender wage inequality and export-led growth in South Korea." *Journal of Development Studies* 34 (2): 102–32.
- Seguino, S. 2000. "Gender Inequality and Economic Growth: A Cross-Country Analysis." *World Development* 28 (7): 1211–30.
- Seguino, S. 2007. "Is more mobility good? Firm mobility and the low wage–low productivity trap." *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 18 (1): 27–51.
- Seguino, S. 2010. "Gender, distribution, and balance of payments constrained growth in developing countries." *Review of Political Economy* 22 (3): 373–404.
- Seguino, S. 2020. "Engendering macroeconomic theory and policy." *Feminist Economics* 26(2): 27–61.
- Seguino, S. 2021. "Gender and economic growth" in: G. Berik and E. Kongar (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Feminist Economics*. Abington: Routledge, 341–50.
- Seguino, S. and R. Blecker. 2002. "Macroeconomic effects of reducing gender inequality in an export-oriented, semi-industrialized economy." *Review of Development Economics* 6(1): 103–19
- Seguino, S. and C. Grown. 2006. "Gender equity and globalization: macroeconomic policy for developing countries." *Journal of International Development*, 18: 1081–104.
- Sen, A. K. 1999. *Development As Freedom*. New York: Knopf.
- Small, S. F. and E. Braunstein. 2024. "Has the feminist economics intellectual project lost its way? an analysis of the journal's evolution." *Feminist Economics*, 30 (1): 1–39.
- Standing, G. 1989. "Global feminization of labor through flexible labor." *World Development*, 17 (7): 1077–95.
- Strassmann, D., C. Grown, and M. Starr. 2010. "Raising dissonant voices: Pluralism and economic heterodoxy" in: R.F Garnett Jr., E.K. Olsen, M. Starr (eds.), *Economic Pluralism*. London: Routledge, 61–73.
- Van Staveren, I., D. Elson, C. Grown, and N. Çağatay (eds.). 2007. *The Feminist Economics of Trade*. London: Routledge.
- Vasudevan, R. and R. Raghavendra. 2022. "Female self-employment as a developmental strategy: The dual constraints of care-work and aggregate demand." *Feminist Economics* 28 (3): 56–83.
- Waring, M. 1988. *If Women Counted: A New Feminist Economics*. Wellington: Allen and Unwin in association with the Port Nicholson Press.
- Woolley, F. 2005. "The citation impact of *Feminist Economics*." *Feminist Economics* 11 (3): 85–106.

Zacharias, A., T. Masterson, F. Rios-Avilla, F., M. Nikiforos, K. Kim, and T. Khitarishvili. 2019. [Macroeconomic and microeconomic impacts of improving physical and social infrastructure: a macro-micro policy model for Ghana and Tanzania](#). Levy Economics Institute of Bard College.

Zacharias, A., F. Rios-Avila, N. Folbre, and T. Masterson. 2024. *Integrating Nonmarket Consumption into the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Expenditure Survey*. Prepared under contract with the Bureau of Labor Statistics by the Levy Economics Institute of Bard College. Available from: <https://www.bls.gov/cex/consumption/integrating-nonmarket-consumption-bls-consumer-expenditure-survey.pdf> [Accessed May 2, 2024]

¹ According to Özge İzdeş, who was assistant coordinator/coordinator of GEM-IWG between 2006 and 2011, the GEM-IWG network included over 400 funded workshop participants—instructors and junior researchers (personal communication, July 20, 2024).

² We thank Rudiger von Arnim and Matías Vernengo in helping delineate the heterodox macroeconomics journals.

³ The order of citing-author names in this sub-section reflects the frequency of citations.