

CSWEP: PEOPLE TO CONTACT

General Policy Matters	Rebecca Blank, Department of Economics, 2003 Sheridan Rd., Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208
Items for Newsletter	Rebecca Blank, Department of Economics, 2003 Sheridan Rd., Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208
Dues, Change of Address, Roster	Joan Haworth, Membership Secretary, 4901 Tower Court, Tallahassee, FL 32303
CSWEP East	Daphne Kenyon, Department of Economics, Simmons College, 300 The Fenway, Boston, MA 02115
CSWEP Mid-west	Susan Pozo, Department of Economics, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008
CSWEP South	Kathryn H. Anderson, Department of Economics, Box 11, Station B, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235
CSWEP West	Joni Hersh, Department of Economics and Finance, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY 82071

American Economic Association
CSWEP
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Nonprofit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 9
Tallahassee, FL 32303



American Economic Association

1996 Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession

NEWSLETTER

Special Reprint Issue No. 2

Rebecca Blank, Editor
(708) 491-4145

Helen Goldblatt, Assistant Editor
(708) 491-8725

In This Special Issue:

Preparing For The Job Market

A Guide To The Academic Job Market For Students2
Mentoring And Being Mentored7
The Joint Job-Hunting Problem9
Translating A C.V. To A Resume	...10
Finding Senior Academic Jobs	...11

Presenting

How To Survive A Seminar Presentation	...17
Guidelines For Being A Discussant	...19

Publishing

Publish Or Perish: The Perils of Pauline	...20
How Not To Perish: Tips For Submitting Articles	...22
Responding To Referees and Editors	...24

Planning For Promotion And Tenure

The Year Of The Tenure Decision	...27
The Process of Earning Tenure	...32
At A Small Liberal Arts Institution	...32
Collegiality	...37
What Do You Do If You Think You Have Been Mistreated?	...38

Grant Proposals

Grantwriting Guidelines	...40
-------------------------	-------

Membership Information

...43

REBECCA M. BLANK (Chair)
Department of Economics
Northwestern University
2003 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60208
708/491-4145; FAX 708/491-7001

KATHRYN H. ANDERSON
Department of Economics
Box 11, Station B, Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37235
615/322-3425

MAUREEN CROPPER
The World Bank, N10-031
1818 H Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20433
202/473-1277

HALI EDISON
Division of International Finance
Federal Reserve Board
Washington, DC 20551
202/452-3540

RONALD G. EHRENBURG
New York State School of Industrial
and Labor Relations
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853
607/255-3026

JONI HERSCH
Department of Economics and Finance
University of Wyoming
Laramie, WY 82071
307/766-2358

JOYCE JACOBSEN
Department of Economics
Wesleyan University
Middletown, CT 06459
203/685-2357

DAPHNE KENYON
Department of Economics
Simmons College
300 The Fenway
Boston, MA 02115
617/521-2587

NANCY MARION
Department of Economics
Dartmouth College
Hanover, NH 03755
603/646-2511

OLIVIA MITCHELL
Department of Insurance and
Risk Management
307 CPC-3641 Locust Walk
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104
215/898-0424

SUSAN POZO
Department of Economics
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008
616/387-5553

KENNETH SMALL
School of Social Sciences
University of California-Irvine
Irvine, CA 92717
714/824-5658

Ex Officio, AEA President
ANNE O. KRUEGER
Department of Economics
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305
415/326-7639

Membership Secretary:
JOAN G. HAWORTH
Economic Research Services, Inc.
4901 Tower Court
Tallahassee, FL 32303
904/562-1211

A GUIDE TO THE ACADEMIC JOB MARKET FOR STUDENTS¹

Valerie Y. Suslow

Graduate School of Business, University of Michigan

You are at least halfway through your thesis and Fall is approaching. It is time to make a decision, along with your thesis advisor, whether this is the year for you to go on the job market. Consider your advisor's opinion carefully. If she does not think you are ready, heed the advice. If she does think you will be ready, then get yourself set for the adventure of a lifetime!

The academic job market consists of seven distinct stages:

- Preparation of a paper and a seminar for the job market seminar;
- Initial contact with schools to request interviews;
- Calls from schools to set up interviews;
- The AEA Meeting, where the interviews take place;
- Flybacks to the schools for more interviews and a seminar;
- Job offers; and
- Total collapse.

This article will give you a brief tour of each of the stops on this job market trip and offer some helpful hints.

Preparation

In order to go on the job market, you will need a paper (preferably a chapter from your thesis). Have your advisor and other committee members or faculty members at your department read it and give you feedback. At most, one person at each of the universities to which you send this paper will read it. Many more will skim it. Because of this last point, you need to pay particular attention to the introduction and conclusion. Make sure the introduction is well-written and summarizes the major points of the paper. You may want to include an abstract that emphasizes its major contributions. The paper should be ready for mailing by late October.

¹ Although this article concerns academia, much of the advice in it applies to searching for jobs with research institutions or government agencies.

When you are invited to visit a school, you will be asked to give a seminar based on your paper. It is critical that this seminar be smooth and polished. Start giving seminars in your own department as soon as you have a paper in progress that you expect to be included in your thesis. Your seminar will improve with age. Not only that, but you will improve in your ability to anticipate and field questions, which is an important skill to develop.

Contacting Schools

There are several ways that the initial contact can be made. Usually the first contact is made by the department when it sends out the curriculum vitae (and perhaps abstracts of papers) of all the graduate students who are looking for jobs.

Consult your advisor about which "fields of interest" to indicate. It is a mistake to define yourself too narrowly at this stage. Potential employers will survey this information and call or write asking for your paper. Some departments have a standardized form for their students' vitae. Sadly, many of these forms still ask you to list your marital status. You do not have to give out this information. If your department is still including it, approach the placement officer and ask that the form be changed for the benefit of future graduate students.

The second avenue for contacts to schools comes from your advisor or any other faculty member who knows you and your work. Personal recommendations are helpful at this stage. In the early Fall, you should compose a list of schools that you would like to contact. The American Economic Association's publication *Job Openings for Economists* is the major source for academic job listings. Certain advisors will be willing to write or call some of the schools on your list, while others will not, so be sure to ask. If more than one faculty member is willing to help, show them your list and ask if they would feel comfortable calling any of the schools listed. Make sure that those who are doing the calling know your work.

Finally, you will prepare "packets" containing a cover letter, vita, and paper to send to all of the schools contacted by faculty on your behalf, as well as any other schools that you have chosen. Arrange to have three letters of recommendation sent to each of these schools. If a school's search committee is highly organized, they will let you know if they are missing material to complete your file. Don't count on it. It is a very busy time of the year for all faculty and administrative personnel. Packets have gotten lost in the mail, or buried under a stack of *Wall Street Journals* in someone's office. It is **your responsibility** to make sure that the schools have all the information they need to make an informed decision.

Setting Up Interviews

In early December, you should start getting calls from schools that would like to interview you at the AEA's annual meeting. Don't turn anything down yet, unless you are absolutely positive that you are not interested. You should already have registered for the meeting and have received information about the hotels being used for the conference as well as a small street map showing the various hotel locations. When setting up the interview, ask how long the interview

will be and in what hotel. Try hard not to schedule back-to-back interviews at different hotels if at all possible. The elevators are notoriously slow at these meetings, it takes more time than you think to get from one hotel to another, and some interviews start (and end) later than scheduled. You should also feel free to ask who will be present at the interview.

If you are fortunate enough to get more interviews than you know what to do with, you may face the difficult dilemma of canceling an interview with a less preferred school in order to make room for another. While you should not abuse the ability to do this, you should make the difficult phone call to cancel the interview. It is not fair to the school or to other candidates to take up the time slot unnecessarily. However, if you have the time, keep all of the interviews. This job market process serves as your introduction to the profession, so take advantage of it. Faculty members actually remember these interviews for several years. If your first position does not work out to your satisfaction, you will be grateful that you had a chance to introduce yourself to a large number of schools.

The AEA Meeting

The most important logistical fact to know is that hotels will not give out room numbers of individuals. You have to call and ask to be connected to the room in order to find out the room number. Don't expect anyone to be in the evening before the meetings start. You can call first thing in the morning (say, around 8:30 AM) to obtain the room numbers for your first few interviews. Allow some extra time for this if possible, since the phones will be jammed. Alternatively, some schools post their room or suite number on the message board located in the conference registration areas. Sometimes the school will tell you when the interview is set up that the room number will be posted under a certain person's name or even under a code name. You should also check with your own university's suite, if there is one. Other students may find some room numbers and pass the information along.

At the interview, you will be asked to give a short description of your thesis. Have about a ten minute talk prepared, but do not be surprised if you are interrupted with questions. Practice this talk with friends before the meeting, so that you are comfortable with it. Make sure that the description you give of your work is designed for a general audience. There may or may not be a faculty member in your research area at the interview. Also, be prepared to talk about what your research plans are beyond your thesis. Do not give a laundry list of topics. One or two well-thought-out ideas are more impressive. If your research is applied and you have empirical results to discuss, be sure you can attach some meaning to your numbers. Know the literature that you cite in your paper. It is likely to come up in the discussion and at least one of the interviewers may be familiar with it. Also be ready to discuss teaching. Finally, have a list of questions ready (in your mind, not necessarily written down). Salary is not discussed here, but teaching load and research support are common topics. More creative questions are always appreciated. Avoid questions that are stated in a challenging tone: although it is true that these interviews are a two-way street, you do not want to make the faculty interviewing you feel as though their credentials are being questioned. Realize that how you will fit in as a colleague is also being judged. At the end of the interview, the faculty will usually spend some

time telling you about the department, university, and geographic location.

Last but definitely not least: be sure to shake hands with everyone upon entering and leaving the room, and be sure that while you are talking you make eye contact with all of the faculty who are interviewing you.

Flybacks or Visits to Schools

In January and February, schools will invite you to visit for more interviews and a seminar. If you do not hear from them, you can call or ask your advisor to call to find out what is happening. The goal is to ascertain if you are on their "short list" of interviewees that they plan to invite. If you receive an invitation to visit a school, you can call another school in the same area of the country and inform them that you will be "passing through." It never hurts to ask and they may decide to have you out if they are at all interested.

The flybacks are a wonderful way to meet people (not to mention the airline miles you can accumulate!). Try not to schedule too many in one week, and definitely try to travel light so that you don't have to check luggage. Practice your seminar again at your own school before you go out on the road--it is critical. If your research area is highly theoretical, be careful to know your audience. The entire department will be voting on you and you do not want to present a seminar that only one or two faculty members understand. Keep the equations to a minimum and have a handout prepared. Use easy to understand examples to illustrate the important points.

Throughout the day of your visit, you will be shuttled around to different faculty members' offices for half-hour or forty-five minute interviews. Some faculty will spend the time discussing substantive issues and asking you questions. Others will let you direct the interview and will indicate their willingness to answer your questions. Take advantage of these people! Talk to as many faculty as you can about the level of research support or the standard teaching load, so that you know what to ask for if you receive an offer.

Negotiating a Job Offer

I will only say a few words here. Obviously, the strength of your bargaining power will depend on whether you have any other offers. As mentioned above, it is essential that you talk to other faculty members at the school so that you can be informed before beginning the bargaining process. Ask for everything up front--that is, a higher salary if you have a better offer, a moving allowance, a lower teaching load, summer money, funds for a research assistant, travel money for conferences, even specific course loads for the first year or two. Get as much of the agreement as you can in writing.

Total Collapse

With the end of the job market process comes exhaustion and anticipation of your new position. Take some time off to renew your strength and then batten down the hatches and get that thesis finished before you start teaching. It will be an enormous weight off your shoulders if you can finish. If you have a new course or two to prepare, you will find it difficult to budget time for your thesis once you start teaching. If you know you won't be able to finish (and you should never say this at the interview), then you might want to try to negotiate a course off or a fall semester or quarter off in your first year.

Notes for Women in the Job Market

There are a few things that women should be aware of in preparing for the job market.

At the Interview

- Dress appropriately: Either a suit or a nice dress with a jacket is acceptable. Loud colors (for example, hot pink) are not considered appropriate, but the suit does not have to be navy blue. Don't choose short, tight skirts or dramatic makeup.
- It is especially important for women to appear confident and self-assured at the interviews. The majority of the time, women and men candidates are assessed equally. But there are those who need convincing, so be positive!
- Some of you may have to face being asked what we all know are illegal questions. They can come in many forms: Are you married? Do you have any children? There are a variety of ways to handle them. One option is to avoid any conflict and answer the question. Another option is to challenge the interviewer in no uncertain terms. In between these two alternatives lies a third option: If you are comfortable doing so, you can say "Why do you ask?" This response lets them know that you are aware that they should not have asked that question and yet gives them the opportunity to say, for example, that they are willing to assist your spouse in finding a job.

On the Flyback

- Find out how many women are in the department. Are there any senior women? This could be an important signal for the future.
- Along the same lines, seek out any women assistant professors and ask them for an honest assessment of the environment for women. Many women faculty will

make a special point of informing women candidates on these matters. This advice extends also to learning what you can negotiate over if offered a job.

- While visiting a school you may run into a male faculty member who makes inappropriate remarks (or jokes) in your presence. Realize that he is not representative of his colleagues, who will very likely be embarrassed at his remarks. It is probably best to ignore what was said: Just smile and let it pass. Do what you must to maintain your self-respect, but keep your own self-interest in mind as well.

MENTORING AND BEING MENTORED

Rebecca Blank
Northwestern University

In the academic world, graduate students and junior faculty members are often greatly helped when a concerned senior colleague takes a personal interest in their work. Graduate student training is still largely based on an apprenticeship model, whereby graduate students learn how to do good research by working with and for their faculty advisor. Even after finishing a Ph.D., an advisor often serves as an ongoing source of support in the profession. Given the way promotion and tenure decisions are made, senior faculty are typically expected to serve as mentors and advisors to junior faculty in their field.

I have been fortunate to find a series of persons who have acted as mentors to me throughout my career, starting with my high school debate coach. All of these persons were men in a more senior position than myself. As I moved from being a junior to a senior colleague, I tried to identify what made the mentors in my life so effective and useful, as I have tried to find ways to be a mentor to my graduate students and to junior colleagues. While some persons are simply better at mentoring than others, there are things that institutions and individuals can do to improve the advising/mentoring role of senior colleagues.

What makes a good mentor? Probably the most visible characteristic is that a mentor takes a proactive interest in a student or junior colleague. Mentors do not just respond to requests for advice and help, they actively seek out their junior colleagues and ask after their current projects. They pass along their names to persons organizing seminars or looking for discussants. They essentially work as a "promoter" for the junior colleague in a useful way within the profession. Some of my best experiences as a graduate student or newly-minted Ph.D. came from being at conferences where I could never have invited myself, but where a senior colleague arranged for me to participate.

Sometimes good mentoring involves passing along information to students or junior colleagues that comes from greater experience or access in the profession. For instance, offering to read and comment on a junior colleague's first effort at a grant proposal can provide useful guidance. Telling graduate students about regional economics associations or groups like CSWEP can help tie them into professional networks. In many cases, graduate students or young economists don't really know when they can ask for help and when they should be able to "figure it out for themselves" or they are embarrassed to bother someone who is busy. Making it clear that you are available to be "bothered" -- on both substantive research issues and on career issues -- can lead to useful conversations.

As we all know, however, many young economists find themselves in situations where nobody voluntarily comes forward to act as a mentor. While one cannot force an older colleague to be a mentor, there are active steps that young economists can take to make mentoring more likely. In essence, not only are there good mentors, but there are also good "mentees."

Being mentored is not a passive activity; a good mentee gives something back to her mentor. Sometimes this is just the admiration and pleasure felt towards someone who has the good judgement to take an interest in your work. But most persons who have close relationships with advisors and senior colleagues are also proactive in the way they relate to those colleagues. This typically means that they are curious and intellectually interested in their mentor's research and range of interests. They ask good questions and engage in lively conversations. The students whom I find it easiest to work with are those who talk back to me, rather than listening quietly to my comments. Some of my best learning as a graduate student occurred during "bull sessions" in my advisor's office where we got completely off our scheduled topic of conversation and became engaged in extended arguments about topics in labor economics. Yes, I needed an advisor willing to give me his time and energy for these conversations. But I also needed to be willing to ask the questions and to risk presenting my own opinions in order to initiate these conversations.

Institutionally, departments can also encourage mentoring. For instance, here at Northwestern the department has just initiated a policy in which all junior colleagues are officially "assigned" mentors from among the senior faculty. This both reminds senior colleagues of their responsibilities and makes it a little easier for junior faculty to ask favors of their older colleagues, such as "will you read a draft of this grant proposal?"

In a predominantly male profession, women often experience more difficulty in finding good mentors than do men and this may make it harder for them at the beginnings of their career. While I can personally affirm the possibility of good mentoring relationships between men and women, I know that sometimes it is easier for many women to approach other women with questions. For instance, female students who are not in my field will often seek me out for conversations about career and professional issues. While, of course, this takes time away from other activities, this is usually time well spent. Mentors can provide assistance to younger economists that is often not available in any other way.

THE JOINT JOB-HUNTING PROBLEM

Katharine C. Lyall
University of Wisconsin System

The following is based on conversations with an unscientific sample of department chairs and individuals who have made joint job searches.

Look candidly at the market for your specialty and your spouse's--are you competing with each other in the same field or subfield? If you are, look specifically for schools and communities that have several sources of jobs. Searching among universities that have both a business program and an economics department, communities that have more than one college or university within reasonable commuting distance, and geographic areas that have other employers who may hire economists will increase the probability of finding two jobs simultaneously.

Decide in advance whether you require two job offers in-hand simultaneously or whether you are willing to accept one while continuing a search for the other. It is likely that you will be faced with this tactical decision at some point in your search, and it will be less traumatic if you have thought through the risks and probabilities calmly in advance.

Be straightforward about your situation in the cover letters for applications and in interviews with potential employers. You might say: "My spouse, who has a Ph.D. in physics, will also be seeking employment in the Boston area (in the university)." Alternatively, if you are not prepared for a commuter marriage or other separate working situations, you might say: "My spouse has been offered a position at (campus/firm) and I am seeking a position that would enable us both to continue our careers in Cleveland;" or "My spouse, a professional engineer, is also seeking a position that would enable us both to come to Cleveland."

If you are silent about this issue, employers will assume that you are prepared to make a decision on the basis of your own position alone. They will not look kindly on side conditions and "complications" that emerge after an offer has been made. Conversely, employers who know that you're facing a joint job decision are more likely to be active in exploring opportunities for a spouse inside and outside their own organizations.

In universities, it is essential that the department chair or interviewing committee know if your spouse is also seeking an appointment in the university. Ask directly whether the department or committee would be willing to discuss the possibility of an appointment for a spouse with other departments.

Be resourceful and persistent -- do some research on other possible employers in the area, and at some suitable point ask your interviewers: "Do you know someone in the biology department at (campus/firm) that my spouse might contact for possible opportunities?"; or "Do you have contacts in the community that might help my spouse obtain an interview?"

Universities and other employers are encountering joint job searches with increasing frequency. Joint job hunters need to be persistent, straightforward, and creative in helping employers help them.

TRANSLATING A C.V. TO A RESUME

*Anne R. Edwards, Director of Career Services
School of Urban and Public Affairs, Carnegie-Mellon University*

Although the words are often used interchangeably, a curriculum vita (c.v.) and a resume are not the same. "Curriculum vita" translates to "the course of a life" and, as applied to an academic life, is precisely that--a passive description. There may be differences in form among vitae, but they all contain information about education, publications, research interests, work in progress, community service, and teaching experience. Little changes in the vita's format with time; it simply expands. Since a c.v. is the accepted academic form, most researchers have developed a fairly good one and simply add new material periodically.

A resume, on the other hand, is a representation of skills and abilities, an active representation of a life, rather than a chart of its course. It shows results, not merely activities. Resumes, therefore, do not grow significantly longer with time; they are pruned. Typically a maximum of two pages, they are more commonly used in business and government circles, where the name of the chair of your dissertation committee, for example, may be considered extraneous. Since most business and government employees consider themselves "bottom line" people, they usually feel that all the information in a vita is not necessary.

To meet the needs of those other than academics, researchers may wish to have a resume in addition to their curriculum vita. It will be useful in obtaining employment in another sector, whether that work is complementary or represents a career change. Turning a c.v. into a resume is not difficult, but will require some time and thought.

Begin by determining the audience(s) for your resume. Are you looking for consulting jobs in your area of expertise? A management or administrative position? For each target, your resume will be different. Each time you construct a resume, ask yourself what skills, interests, and background are necessary to do the type of job for which you are applying or for the occupation you are considering. Determine which of your many qualifications meet those needs; then only include them. Your research in progress, for example, no matter how fascinating, may not be of interest to every potential employer.

Since each case is different, there are no absolute rules about what to prune from your c.v. Generally, the sections about academic honors (membership in prestigious national honoraries can be recorded under your degrees), research interests, and teaching experience can be eliminated or, at least, condensed substantially. Conversely, your community service section, if it addresses your management experience, may be expanded on your resume.

You may choose to categorize your experience in sections that do not typically appear on a c.v. Grouping your abilities into sections such as "Technical Skills," "Management Experience," and "Communications Skills," for example, might be an extremely important element of landing an interview with a consulting firm. Think carefully about the experiences you want to present and choose sections that do so. A reverse chronological order resume (with work experience listing most recent job first) that includes a brief background summary section to highlight your skills and experience works well for many academics.

Some of the sections of your resume will be identical to those of your c.v., but their placement will be different. A vita usually begins with a list of your degrees; that may not be true on a resume. Leading off with the most important information is the key. If a Ph.D. is required for the job, put it first. But since many nonacademic employers often prefer to know first what kinds of relevant work experience you have had, your educational background may be last on your resume. Again, by looking at the needs of a potential employer, you will know how to place the sections on your resume.

When you have identified and placed relevant sections, make sure you adequately convey the kinds of experiences you have had. Nonacademics often have no idea of the time, effort, and abilities necessary to perform effective research and teaching, so it is important you use terms that they will understand. Avoid insider jargon, unless you are sure your audience will comprehend it. "Directed 22-person team in analysis of local welfare delivery system," for example, may have far more impact than "taught project course."

Amplify the one- or two-line description in your vita's "Other Professional Positions" section, if you are considering a nonacademic job. It may be sufficient for an academic search committee to know that you spent a year "assisting corporation with strategic planning." That description will probably not be enough for a nonacademic employer. She will want to know what kind of strategic planning you did, the tools you used, and, above all, the outcomes of your work. "Developed budgeting model that resulted in a yearly savings of 32 percent," is far more likely to impress her.

When you have done a first draft of a resume, have nonacademic colleagues in your field of interest critique it. Based on their knowledge of the job market, they will probably be able to suggest refinements. Consider taking it to a career counselor at your university; chances are she will also be able to assist you. It may take several iterations, but with practice and assistance, you will develop an excellent resume to take its place alongside your already excellent vita.

Further information about resumes and vitae is available in *The Corporate Ph.D.*, by Carol Groneman and Robert Lear (Facts on File, 1985) and *Finding a Job in Your Field*, by Rebecca Anthony and Gerald Roe (Peterson's, 1984). Good luck!

FINDING SENIOR ACADEMIC JOBS

*Beth Allen
University of Minnesota*

This article describes the academic job market for experienced economists (those who have held Ph.Ds for at least several years) seeking faculty positions in research universities. In this situation, you're not a close substitute for someone just leaving graduate school. More information is available about your scholarly productivity. In addition, the market for senior positions is more nebulous. Buyers and sellers aren't as well defined, the market never really meets, and the job search process is less seasonal. Consequently, different strategies are needed.

The basic trick is to make someone think of mentioning your name as a desirable candidate. It's best if that person is a well respected, established scholar in your field who knows you and your research. These informal recommendations can be prompted if you know of a desirable position, but as in the corporate world, advertising is less likely the better the job. You may be able to gather some information from Job Openings for Economists. It is also useful to try to see job vacancy announcements sent to your department's chair or placement officer.

In other words, some respected person who knows you contacts a buddy at a school that's looking to hire--ideally, an established and powerful person who wants someone like you as a colleague--and presto, you are now on the (informal) list of genuine job candidates. Someone from the department will telephone you for a chat, or write to request your vita and research papers, if you're interested. You may also send a formal letter of interest. If it all sounds terribly uncertain and disorganized, it is!

A more systematic way that departments search to fill a senior vacancy begins by interested (usually senior) faculty formulating a "wish list" by trying to think of names of interesting researchers who might be good acquisitions for the department. Then these people are contacted to see if they might be interested in considering a suitably attractive offer.

The most effective way to get on such a "wish list" is to be professionally active and visible. Publishing certainly helps, but you must also participate in conferences and accept invitations to present papers at other universities. A good seminar may induce members of the audience to consider or recommend you for an opening. Try to meet visitors to your department by attending and participating in their workshops. If possible, regularly send copies of your research papers and reprints to economists with related interests. Consider using sabbatical leaves to expand your horizons (and your research interests and potential collaborators) by visiting other universities which may have a (future) vacancy in your field of specialization.

If you decide to be in the job market even casually, or you're likely to be soon, go to the ASSA meetings and try to be on the program. Circulate. Introduce yourself if necessary, and wear your name tag. Talk to people after sessions, in hotel lobby bars, at cocktail parties--all are great ways to learn about openings--but don't announce outright that you're looking for a job. Most research universities don't interview at the meetings for senior positions, and interviews that do occur are generally quite informal.

If you're seriously job hunting, you should be subtle but still inform people of your interest. This tradeoff between discretion and informativeness is a problem to contemplate before you begin to search. Efficiency requires that someone be aware of your willingness to move. The problem is that your current home department may object to the implication that you are less than perfectly happy.

Consequently, you should first assess your colleagues' likely reactions to your job hunt, especially if you may want to consider staying at your current institution. Many economics departments are market oriented and treat an outside offer as a signal of high-quality research. Others stress collegiality and interpret job market activities as a symptom of disloyalty. Moreover, you should exercise extreme caution regarding early consideration for promotion or

tenure elsewhere. If your home institution refuses to match such an offer, and you don't move, eventual tenure or promotion may be more difficult to obtain than if you had simply waited. A further consideration in deciding how widely to broadcast your availability is whether you really want to obtain offers from a wide range of departmental qualities. Outside offers from lower ranked places are not good "bargaining chips" and can actually harm promotion prospects in your current department if you try to use them that way.

Of course, if you've been turned down for tenure (or told that you are unlikely to obtain it), these considerations don't apply--everyone will understand your search. If you're lucky, your current department will even help. You probably should inform the current placement officers in your doctoral university and your current home institution of the situation. Don't place your name in the "vitae pack," however, unless you're a very recent graduate.

The Interview/Seminar Visit. When you become a serious candidate, you will usually be invited to visit the campus. This stage of the "senior" market may resemble the hunt for your first academic position. You're interviewed (with various degrees of formality) by your potential future colleagues, and then you present a research seminar to the department. Groups of economists entertain you at meals and they may give you a tour of the campus, town, or neighborhoods in which you might live.

Even though you're experienced at this routine, remember to prepare for your visit. The seminar should be clearly organized and well presented. If possible, choose an important unpublished paper that you've "finished" recently and that you've already presented elsewhere to a similar audience. Gather some information about the university, town, and department before you arrive. Decide what questions you want to ask, and what features you want to observe. What aspects of a university and a position matter to you? Employment decisions involve mutual information gathering.

As an experienced economist and experienced job hunter, you'll probably find the interviewing process easier at the senior level. You're not a student being questioned by professors. Your interviewers are peers, and you now know what to expect. You've practiced teaching and presenting your research, so you're more relaxed. You also will be treated as a special guest; there might be a party in your honor. On the other hand, your interviewers have higher expectations now. They demand that your behavior be more confident and more professional. A bad seminar is harder to excuse. You should be a good guest, striving to meet everyone at social events and to do your part to maintain lively conversations with strangers. Act interested and be enthusiastic.

Meetings with deans and other administrators are more common when interviewing for a senior position. A good impression helps to facilitate the formalities of an offer and is likely to affect your negotiations on salary and other items. Be sure to prepare some "emergency backup" questions to ask silent deans. If an administrator begins a general speech on the virtues of moving to that university, try to interrupt politely with specific questions--you'll learn more. Ask, for example, about budgets, future plans for the department and the university, support for research and graduate students, and the quality of the students. Such questions are crucially important if the department claims to be improving. By questioning several administrators carefully, you can learn if the university is committed to upgrading the department and will

provide the resources needed to do so.

If you're scheduled to talk with students or assistant professors, ask them about the academic atmosphere in the department. Do they perceive it as friendly, interactive, hierarchical, dictatorial, intolerant? What do other academic women (or female graduate students) think of the university? Your best information is likely to come from private discussions. Ask several people, and listen carefully to the way their answers are expressed--faint praise can indicate a potential problem area.

Decide beforehand what information about yourself to stress to key faculty members, the chair, and the dean. Some ideas include: your record on obtaining outside research grants, enthusiasm about a current or future research topic of interest to a particular interviewer, willingness to teach a course that is outside your specialty, interdisciplinary background, teaching evaluations, service on university committees, editorial board memberships, and other signals of professional activity and respect. Try to mention such positive information smoothly and discretely during your interviews.

The Decision Process. The chair will telephone you when the department has decided that it wants to offer you a position. Lags of a year or more may occur between your initial contact and this decision. If another candidate had been selected, you will not necessarily be informed, although you are likely to hear about it through the grapevine.

Usually the department formalizes the decision by a vote of all regular faculty members at or above the level of the offer--i.e., tenured associate professors and full professors vote on outside offers at the tenured associate professor level, while only full professors have voting rights regarding positions at the full professor level. Most universities require near unanimity of voters and strong enthusiasm of virtually all key people--those in the candidate's field plus those who are highly respected by the department and the university. Before a formal offer can be made, approval must also be obtained by the department. This process usually requires near unanimity from at least one committee outside of the department and the support or approval of the dean and the chief academic officer (frequently the provost, or vice president of academic affairs) of the university. Budget implications and academic quality are examined; affirmative action compliance may be monitored.

Formal evaluation and documentation of the candidate's standing in the profession occur either before the department decides to make an offer or before the university approves a formal offer. Letters evaluating the candidate's research contributions are collected from established economists elsewhere. The candidate may be asked to suggest some references, but for senior positions, the department chair or personnel committee (in consultation with key faculty in the candidate's field) always requests some letters from persons not having a close academic connection to the candidate. University administrators may be permitted or required to add names to the list. The department or university may ask the candidate to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness (summaries of students' evaluations, teaching awards, lists of dissertations supervised, copies of reading lists and exams, etc.). This may reflect a genuine concern with teaching quality, or it can be pro forma.

When the appointment is approved, you are likely to hear by telephone, followed by a formal

letter, signed by the chair and/or dean, that states salary, rank, tenure status, and other important conditions of the offer. A "subject to approval of the trustees or regents" clause is standard. Final approval occurs after you accept the offer and ordinarily is automatic, unless a real budget crisis has occurred. The initial formal offer is usually modified (via another letter) during subsequent negotiations.

Negotiations. Decide on a strategy for discussing the outside offer with the chair of your current department. (A good way to start is to note that, while you like your current position, you were contacted by another place that just sounded too attractive to preclude serious consideration.) Promptly tell your chair about the offer when it becomes firm in your mind (based on either telephone results of the vote or a first letter). If promotion or tenure is involved, you might decide to tell your chair that you expect to obtain a certain offer soon, because early notification permits a timely response. On the other hand, this strategy is a good one only if you are confident that the offer is forthcoming.

Think about the conditions (if any) under which you would stay in your present department. What response can you realistically expect from your university? If forced to suggest a salary, name an amount higher than what you hope to obtain. Would changes in your teaching assignments, committee responsibilities, or research support make you happier? What is your university's standard policy regarding responses to outside offers, and how much flexibility do they have to treat some faculty members differently from others? Should you worry about a possible "goodbye and best wishes" response? Most importantly, avoid ultimatums.

You negotiate simultaneously with the university that has made the offer. It may be hard to distinguish aspects of the offer that can easily be changed from those that are inflexible. My personal philosophy is to discuss anything that matters to me and that doesn't sound outrageously silly. Some items are negotiable and others aren't, but these categories can't be distinguished unless you ask. Fringe benefit plans (such as health and life insurance) and retirement contributions can vary by a factor of ten from one university to another. Don't risk an unpleasant surprise. Moreover, cost-of-living differences can be substantial, so they should also be considered in evaluating real salary differences. A good salary is unambiguously desirable. If you're shy about money, remind yourself that women's salaries are significantly lower, on average, than men's even when one controls for factors such as education, experience, and ability. Your higher salary may help other women if it lessens the stereotype that women are "pushovers."

Market Etiquette. Courtesy demands that you inform your chair of the outside offer before discussing it with your colleagues. Similarly, your own chair should be informed of your decision first. Pre-empt the grapevine.

Don't exaggerate the definiteness of an offer. Be cautious. Emphasize that an offer itself, or the salary, is not yet a written contract. Don't exaggerate the salary or other easily quantified conditions at the outside university.

Avoid making negative comments about a department you're considering. Don't ever suggest to outsiders that you're not likely to accept an offer.

If you're informed of a reasonable deadline, give a timely response, but don't be afraid to tell someone that "if you need an answer today, it's no."

Be nice. Be complimentary (especially when you decline an offer or decide to leave your current institution) even if you must stretch the truth.

Don't ever accept more than one offer simultaneously. Don't renege on a commitment except in truly extenuating circumstances--such as tenure not being approved, which is the equivalent of their making major modifications to their offer.

HOW TO SURVIVE A SEMINAR PRESENTATION

Lisa M. Lynch
Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy, Tufts University

As we approach the annual AEA meetings and the season of job talks it might be helpful to highlight some of the do's and don'ts of seminar presentation. While most of the following is targeted towards those presenting a seminar/job talk for the first time, many of the points are probably worth remembering even for those of us who have become veterans in the profession.

1.) How do you get seminar presentation experience if you do not already have it?

You should always try to find a way of presenting your work on "friendly grounds" before going out on the job market. If you can, present your paper in a seminar at your own department first. It may be useful to set up an informal seminar series where you and other job candidates present mock job talks in front of sympathetic faculty and students. Ask friends who are sitting in on your mock job talk to take notes on things that might help improve the presentation, and also to interrupt your talk as they would if an outside speaker were presenting a seminar. Also, consider having yourself videotaped presenting your paper; watch the tape and note areas for improvement, however painful it may be.

2.) What are some of the useful materials you should distribute for a seminar?

If you have 1 - 1 1/2 hours for your talk you should ensure that your audience has a copy of the paper or at least a handout of the major points and findings you will be covering. If your paper is distributed but you also do a handout make the numbering of tables in the handout and your paper match. If you find yourself reordering the tables in your talk from the way they are presented in your paper maybe you should re-write the paper!

3.) What about overheads?

Many novices (and probably even more veterans) have difficulties in handling overheads. While more and more talks seem to rely on overheads they are neither necessary nor sufficient for a successful presentation. What the overheads do is keep you from making silly mistakes on the blackboard (it is amazing how the mind goes blank when facing that wall), they speed up the presentation, and they keep you on track. However, passing out a handout with the key equations or results can be equally useful. If you do use overheads remember that the typeface that looks great on the printed page may result in bleary eyes and headaches for your audience. Make sure that you use a font that is large enough so that even a person in the back of a large room could see the numbers. One rarely goes through every number in a table in a presentation so consider redoing your tables so that you present only a subset of results. Limit the number of overheads you actually use. You do not need to put everything on an overhead that you are going to say, and you should not merely read your overheads. The overhead is a summary device for each section of your talk that leaves a visual impression on your audience of what your work is all about.

4.) A bad presentation can destroy a good paper but a great presentation cannot resuscitate a bad paper.

Often in the rush to complete the last computer runs or derive one more proof for a paper an author can end up with very little time left to actually prepare a presentation. As a result, even though you may have path breaking findings your audience may be left cold if you have not taken the time to organize your thoughts and materials. One of the classic mistakes first time presenters often make is to spend too much time reviewing the literature and introducing the topic, leaving little time to present their novel contributions and results. While an hour and a half may seem like an eternity, time flies, especially if the audience interrupts with questions. Don't leave yourself too little time to show off your results. At the same time, impressive graphics cannot hide a weak paper. Make sure that you have nailed down the key findings of your paper before you worry about the presentation.

5.) How do you handle a person in the audience who does not want to let you get on with your presentation?

This is not an easy problem to deal with, especially in the context of a job talk when you are trying to show how well you could fit in with everyone in the department. It may be helpful before your talk to discuss with the person organizing the seminar what the etiquette of the seminar is. In general, even if it is the policy that no one interrupts for an hour you may want to tell your audience that if they have a point of clarification to feel free to interrupt. This helps you get a sense of how your talk is going. For the person who is not allowing you to get on with your presentation the following lines may be helpful: "That is an interesting point that I will be addressing in the next part of my talk. But please raise it again if you still have questions." Alternatively, if you feel you have spent as much time as you want on an issue or it is really quite tangential to your presentation try "That is an intriguing issue. Let's talk more about that after the seminar" and then move on. Sometimes you just have to be a little tough and say something like "As I have already stated I addressed this issue in xyz way and now I would like to move on to the rest of my presentation". Then press on. At this point you may actually hear a sigh of relief from the audience because they have probably gotten bored with the discussion if it is just coming from one person. Plus they want to ask their questions on the next section of your paper!

Finally, someone may identify an apparent mistake or issue with your paper that you have never considered before that may dramatically alter your conclusions or approach. You might not always be able to process these comments online and edit your talk accordingly. If this happens, just remember that this is why you do seminars before you send your paper off to a journal! Try to reach a compromise with the person making the observation that you will consider their point more carefully after the seminar but for the moment you would like to move on with the paper assuming your research strategy is correct. Then you may wish to leave some time at the end to consider how the results may change.

6.) How should your seminar change if you are presenting in an AEA session?

Remember that in most AEA sessions you will only have 15-30 minutes to present your paper. Four or five overheads summarizing your model, findings, and conclusions will be the most you

can/should present. Do not spend time summarizing the existing literature or discussing detailed technical issues.

More generally, tailor your talk to take into account the time restrictions and the technical background of your audience. However, never forget to share your enthusiasm for your findings with your audience so that they leave the seminar enthused as well.

GUIDELINES FOR BEING A DISCUSSANT

*Linda N. Edwards
Queens College, CUNY*

A good discussant can be immensely helpful to an author, and can contribute significantly to a conference session by helping the audience to better understand the author's paper and by making the session both more interesting and lively. A poor discussant can destroy the confidence of an author and can set a tone that no one finds either engaging or enjoyable. To be a good discussant takes time and attention. Don't agree to serve as discussant unless you are willing to make the effort. Here are some suggested guidelines for being a good discussant.

1. Show up. If you have made a commitment to serve as a discussant, keep it.
2. Be prompt. It is insulting to everyone if you arrive just in time to present your comments.
3. Read the paper in advance. If you have not received the paper two weeks before the session, take the initiative: telephone the author. The paper may have gotten lost in the mail.
4. Comment on the paper (or papers) that you have been assigned. Do not use the session as a forum for presenting your own research or for delivering your analysis of the President's new tax bill.
5. Restate succinctly the main point or points of the paper. Include a short description of the paper's objective, the techniques used to achieve this objective, the findings, and the paper's contribution. If the author has made all of this quite clear in his or her preceding presentation, you can cut short this part of your discussion.
6. State what you like about the paper. If you do not like anything about the paper, try to find something positive to say (e.g. "this is a very important topic" or "I learned...").
7. Present your analysis of the paper. Provide positive suggestions about how the paper can be improved, rather than simply listing its deficiencies.
8. Prepare your comments to fit the time allotted. Rehearse your presentation, if necessary, to correctly judge its length.
9. Do not read your comments.
10. Treat the author with professional courtesy. Remember, you will be in a similar position at a future conference!

PUBLISH OR PERISH: THE PERILS OF PAULINE

Marianne Ferber

Department of Economics, University of Illinois

No one in academia needs to be told how important publications are for professional survival and success. It is not always easy, however, for beginners to get started on the road to becoming an established scholar. This note offers information on the nature of some of the hurdles that women continue to face, and a few tips that may be helpful in overcoming them.

The first step toward doing research obviously is choosing a suitable topic. It is most helpful to choose a subject that is of current interest and that will be regarded as acceptable by those who evaluate your progress. At the same time, it is probably a mistake to work on something you are not really interested in. It is less likely that you will do really good work--and far more likely that you will hate doing it. Some compromise may have to be made between these two considerations. In addition, you need to take into account the knowledge and skills that are required for carrying the project to successful completion, but it is not essential that you have all of these. You may be able to find someone who has complementary talents.

This brings us to the second stage, considering collaboration. Young people do need to establish their ability to work independently, or at least as the senior partner of a team. It is a great mistake to specialize in being the junior author, especially when you are a woman and the senior author is a man, possibly a mate. Many people will assume you are riding his coattails. With these caveats in mind, there is much to be said for collaboration, even apart from the knowhow the other person may have. Exchanging ideas is likely to be stimulating. The pressure to live up to an agreed upon schedule and to the partner's expectations provides additional incentives to produce. And, according to all the evidence, more credit is given for two co-authored articles than for one single-authored publication.

Some preliminary findings (Ferber and Teiman, *Eastern Economic Journal*, August-October 1980) suggest that co-authors are significantly more likely to be of the same sex than of the opposite (compared with random pairing), so women in a predominantly male field may have difficulty finding a collaborator. Perhaps making a special effort to show your interest in topics of mutual concern, suggesting how to handle problems, and taking the initiative in proposing collaboration might help to open doors.

The next important question is how far to go in terms of obtaining the best possible results and presenting them in the best possible way. While you would not want to be associated with sloppy, poorly written work, to paraphrase an old saying, perfection is the enemy of excellence. Someone who cannot let go of a project until all possible facets have been explored and all possible objections met is not likely to publish much, if anything. Once you are satisfied that you have done a good and thorough job, and have presented the results in a clear, readable, and preferably interesting way, the paper is ready for review, though not necessarily by a journal. Instead, ask two or three experts in the field to look it over for you. They need not be friends. Many scholars will respond to requests for comments if they are interested in the topic. Frequently they provide useful suggestions for improvements or references to relevant work you

may have missed. Further, such contacts bring your name to the attention of other people in your field.

When the manuscript has been reworked, it is now ready to face the harsh world of journal editors. If you do not already know which journals tend to publish papers in your field (and, perhaps, with your point of view), it is well worth some time to investigate this question. Even so-called general journals tend to be more interested in some topics than in others. In addition to looking at recent issues of journals (keeping in mind that a change in editors may mean a change in policy), it is useful to look at the footnotes in your paper and see where the cited works were published. You may want to seek the advice of colleagues who have read the paper about where to send it.

Another consideration in choosing a journal is how highly regarded it is. Presumably the chances of having your paper accepted are smaller in a more prestigious journal, but the payoff is greater if it is accepted. In general, it is probably a good idea to aim toward the upper end of a realistic range. For one, you are likely to get valuable suggestions from the referees, even if you are turned down. You can then rework the paper and send it to the next journal down the line. This is a useful strategy, unless you are under great time pressure, say for a tenure review, or if you have reason to believe that someone else may be working on the same topic and publish ahead of you.

Last, we come to the happy point where all hurdles have been cleared and your article has been published. It is becoming increasingly common to evaluate work not only in terms of where it is published (or, in the case of a book, how it is reviewed), but also in terms of how often it is cited. To a great extent, citations are determined by the nature of the work and by the readership of the journal where it appears, although evidence from some fields suggest that men are significantly less likely than women to cite work by female authors (Ferber, *Signs*, Winter 1986). Nonetheless, it is possible to increase visibility somewhat by sending reprints to scholars who are likely to be interested in the topic. Few economists would regard this as presumptuous and you may receive papers of interest in return.

Thus, in addition to the usual problems which face all researchers, women face additional obstacles to achieving acceptance and recognition in their profession. It would be a great mistake, though, to use this information as support for a defeatist attitude. Instead, these hurdles should be viewed primarily as challenges rather than barriers, so that overcoming them increases the satisfaction each of us can take in our accomplishments.

HOW NOT TO PERISH: TIPS FOR SUBMITTING ARTICLES FROM AN EX-EDITOR'S POINT OF VIEW

Claudia Goldin
Harvard University

The advice I offer will not make you famous but will, I promise, raise your chances of getting your articles published.

What to Submit?

It comes as a surprise only to those who are not editors and referees that most papers submitted to journals are of poor quality. The leading journals accept one paper for each twenty they receive. The wonder, though, is how editors fill journals with the polished articles we readers have come to expect. The content of accepted papers is often no different from that of the miserable ones that get rejected. The difference is often in the presentation--in the quality of exposition, the intuition provided, the attention to detail, and the sense of the larger issue. Even in the more theoretical and econometrics journals, content is only one part of getting a paper accepted.

Form serves two functions. As in a fine novel, it compels the reader (first and foremost, the referee and editor) to continue turning pages. Form is the conveyance of content. But form is also a signaling device. Much of what we claim to be truth must be taken at face value. To signal sloppiness, even in one's writing, may leave readers less persuaded by the research.

The refereeing process should not be the primary way to get comments from impartial readers, because you will also get a rejection letter and eliminate one journal from your meager list of potential outlets. Plead with friends to give comments on your paper and exchange such favors. You can often be your own best critic. Put the paper away for a month, and you will look at it with new, critical eyes. Most of all, present the paper at seminars. Only when you have to convince others of your logic, do you see the errors in it yourself.

You can greatly increase your chances of having an article accepted (or at least getting a foot in the door with a "revise and resubmit" letter) by working on it. The single most important advice I can offer is to submit polished papers.

Where to Submit?

The most prestigious journal may not be the best outlet for your papers. More to the point, submitting papers to the most prestigious journals can often waste substantial time (but also see the last section below). One consideration in choosing a journal concerns the tenure process at your institution. Consult a senior colleague who knows both department and university tenure procedures. Departments often emphasize quality. But university personnel committees frequently use the yardstick of quantity. Of equal relevance is the future life of your work. Every journal has a particular readership and niche in the profession. For an article to have

maximum impact, and often any bearing at all, it must be placed appropriately; the specialist journal may result in more citations than the generalist journal.

The most appropriate journal may depend on whether you are referencing articles in that journal. Do not cite articles gratuitously though; it is obvious to editors and referees. Turnaround time for a journal is also always relevant, although this process is not a lottery. Rapid turnaround may also mean a high proportion of rejection letters without refereeing. But if you submit polished papers (with good content), the relevant mean time becomes that conditional on being refereed, which could be much longer. I should also add, just for completeness, that contributors to economics journals should submit papers to one journal at a time.

The Editorial Process

Four months have passed since you mailed your paper to a journal and you have received nothing more than an acknowledgment postcard. Should you write the editor and ask what is wrong? Not if you know about "The Editorial Process."

Each journal has its own editorial process, but most use the following procedure. When a paper is received it is logged in at the main office and an acknowledgment card is sent to the author (two weeks have now elapsed since the paper was mailed). If you followed the suggestions to contributors on the inside cover of the journal, you are now beginning the editorial process; if not, you will receive a postcard asking you to comply.

The co-editor in charge of your subfield (say, Labor Economics) will be sent the paper (many journals have several co-editors), and if that co-editor is at a different university, another week will elapse. The co-editor must now look at your paper and assign referees--another one to four weeks, depending on the backlog of his or her work. How many referees are assigned varies, but two is the mode. One is often from the journal's editorial board. Some journals ask referees to respond within four to six weeks and pay small sums as an incentive; some journals ask for a response within twelve weeks. The process places a heavy burden on referees, and editors can do no more than request a timely response. When all referee reports are in, the editor must weigh the evidence and write the final report--another one to four weeks. If the tardiest referee takes twelve weeks to respond, about twenty weeks have elapsed since you mailed the paper.

The editor rejects your paper, citing the criticisms and reservations of the referees. But you believe the referees have not understood your argument. What do you do? The editor, not the referee, is the final arbiter, and the editor uses more than the referee reports in making a decision. Referees submit cover letters that are often more candid than their reports. A good editor, moreover, will read the paper and make an independent evaluation. A paper that is incomprehensible to the referee will probably be rejected even if it could be explained in person.

Then What?

Stigler's Law on missed flights is equally relevant to submitting papers. If you never miss a flight, I recall George Stigler saying in the days before unrefundable tickets, you probably waste

too much time at airports. If you never get a rejection letter, you probably set your sights too low. Getting a rejection letter is not shameful. Many articles were once rejected by some rival journal. You must prepare yourself for the inevitable--what to do after a paper is rejected.

An important part of the refereeing process is revising and restructuring a paper. Even if you follow the first step and write the best paper you can, an informed referee may be able to guide you to write a better paper. Do not submit the paper to the next journal on your list without attempting to address the suggestions of the referee. You will have lost an opportunity to better the product. The paper, moreover, may be sent to the same referee again.

What constitutes a rejection, an invitation to revise and resubmit, or permission to submit *de novo* is often unclear in letters from editors. Each editor has an individual code. When I wanted to reject a paper, I would deliberately use the word reject. But many editors find it more palatable to use euphemisms. If a paper is neither rejected nor accepted, there is often a wide range of possibilities. The question is whether the editor is asking for minor changes or those that would alter the entire structure of the paper. The latter often means jettisoning much of your work and developing another paper, perhaps with the same data or model. If the editor's letter is unclear, it may be best to write and ask for a clarification.

In sum, the best advice I can offer is to read journals and make your papers resemble the ones you most admire, at least in their ability to convey genius.

RESPONDING TO REFEREES AND EDITORS

Roger Noll¹
Stanford University

Receiving referees' reports is unnerving. Even secure scholars fret over how anonymous peers will react to a paper. And, after trembling fingers open the envelope, the usual reaction is perplexity and anger. Referees never like anything, finding flaws in the most carefully crafted article.

My purpose here is to provide guidance about responding to a critical editorial decision. Because few articles are accepted without revision, an essential ingredient to academic success is learning to respond effectively to critical referees, which requires understanding the hermeneutics of editorial review. Simply put, fatter envelopes are better! They imply long referees' reports, signalling that good scholars took your paper seriously. Few reviewers go to great length trashing bad papers. If the referees' reports and rejection letter are brief, you need to rethink the paper. The paper either fails to communicate your ideas or makes no major

¹ The author gratefully acknowledges useful advice from Tim Bresnahan, Shane Greenstein and Frank Wolak, all of whom deserve kinder, gentler refereeing.

contribution.

Suppose you receive a detailed report on an article that avoids the stylistic causes of negative reviews: verbosity, poor organization, unclear syntax, inaccurate placement in the literature, and incomplete explanations of motivation, method and results. Nevertheless, despite dazzlingly polished prose, the referees are lukewarm, and the editor has not said yes.

The standard first reaction is to consider giving up economics. Don't--it happens to us all. Ask a distinguished colleague for a personal story about a deflating editorial experience. At least, read this guide before seeking other employment. Most likely, your career still has hope.

The typical second reaction is to question the sanity of the referees. Editors do occasionally pick referees who are not in the field, lack familiarity with your methods, are irresponsible, or just had bad days when they read your paper. Hence, you can ask for a new review. But do not attack the integrity of the referees, regardless of what you think; instead, state objectively and precisely why they are incorrect. And do not expect to win this argument.

The principal cause of incorrect reviews is that the paper is so poorly written that a good scholar in the same field cannot understand it. Referees usually represent the target audience for the paper. If they do not like or understand it, you need to know why so that your revisions will enable your audience to take it seriously.

Responding adequately to referees requires an understanding of editorial processes at journals. Rejection rates are higher in economics than in most disciplines. Consequently, editors cannot eliminate enough papers by rejecting only those with fatal errors. If you have circulated your paper to some colleagues, given it at a few seminars, and responded to the comments you have received, it probably has no outrageous mistakes. But depressingly many rejected articles have no major errors. An author must prove not just that an article is original and correct, but that it is of significant interest to other scholars.

Revising a paper is a process of justifying publication by sharpening its exposition. Usually this is accomplished by eliminating unimportant details, digressions, and extensions, and explaining the methods and insights precisely. Inevitably, establishing that a paper is sufficiently novel and important to be accepted is somewhat subjective. Importance lies in the elegance of the argument as well as in the substance. But regardless of elegance, some will not be convinced until your masterpiece is cited extensively, and you win the John Bates Clark Award.

The first step in the revision process is to decide whether to switch journals or to resubmit. In making this decision an author should give relatively little weight to the editor's cover letter--unless it contains an unequivocal acceptance or rejection. When a paper is first reviewed, the editor probably will not devote much time to it, instead reading just enough to decide whether to reject or to invite resubmission. If the choice is resubmission, the editor's letter is usually discouraging. Editors do not want to mislead authors about the possibility of acceptance, and cannot be certain that a paper will be reviewed favorably even if it responds to all the referees' comments.

The decision whether to try another journal should be based on the referees' reports. The

author, not the editor, is best positioned to ascertain whether satisfying a critical referee is realistic. This assessment has two components: (1) Given the referee's reaction, is any equally good journal likely to accept the paper, or should you lower your target; and (2) If you take another shot at a leading journal, do you stand a better chance with these referees, given their comments, or a fresh set elsewhere?

If you switch journals, still revise the paper in response to the first review. Even resolutely negative reviews usually contain useful suggestions, and upon reflection you may be able to rewrite your paper to avoid so negative a reaction. Also, you might get the same referee again. She will not be pleased if you have not tried to respond to previous criticisms.

You should consider a less prestigious journal if the referees attack the core of your paper's research program: the research is narrow and specialized, or yields a variant of a well-known result. Attacks on the method--an econometric model, a theoretical assumption, etc.--call for more work or better explanations, but not necessarily for the Journal of Economic Rejects.

If you can address the referees' criticisms, resubmission is a good idea. The advantage of resubmission is that the review process is more predictable. New referees will make new criticisms that require another resubmission. The issue is whether you are more likely to satisfy the known criticisms of these referees or the unknown complaints of another group.

To maximize the chance of success in resubmission, you must show that you took all criticisms seriously. Change the text in response to every reasonable comment (and even some that are stupid), and write a cover letter that refers to literally every comment by the referees and the editor. For criticisms that are accepted, cite where the manuscript has been changed. If a criticism is invalid, explain why. Moreover, consider adding, perhaps in a footnote, an indirect response to each incorrect criticism that clarifies your argument.

When the revision is finally resubmitted, resist overconfidence. The probable outcome is rejection or another invitation to revise. Your next response should be based on the same decision process as the first. Editors do not invite multiple revisions if the prospects for acceptance are hopeless, but the most useful data are still the referees' reports. If the referees raise new issues, or claim that you are making the same mistakes, ultimate acceptance is unlikely. If the comments are fewer, narrower, and less negative, acceptance has become more likely and you should resubmit.

Academic life brings two terrible duties: serving on faculty committees and responding to referees' reports. Remember, no one sails through unscathed, and no one enjoys revising papers. Getting published is like a Medieval siege--keep at it until they surrender. Non illegitimus carborundum.

THE YEAR OF THE TENURE DECISION: STRATEGIES FOR SURVIVAL

Janice Fanning Madden
University of Pennsylvania

You are about to become a candidate for tenure at a university which requires its faculty to produce significant research. It is too late either to initiate or to publish any additional research which substantially enhances your credentials. Nonetheless, there are still ways of improving your chances of obtaining tenure and of dealing with this particularly anxiety-provoking stage in your academic career. Moreover, you can avoid making certain mistakes that can delay or deny your promotion. It is important that you start to plan your strategy before your institution initiates its tenure decision procedure.

WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW

Your institution begins the tenure decision process by gathering the materials for your tenure dossier. Typically, the tenure dossier is reviewed by committees at several levels--the department, the school, and the university. Try to learn about the composition of these committees if the identities of their members are not confidential. This dossier is usually more influential at levels of review above your department, but it can also define the case at the departmental level and cause your senior colleagues to reexamine their own opinions.

You can influence the outcome by improving the final "packaging" of your case for tenure, but you need to know several things if you are to assist your chair in doing so. First, you need to know which kinds of information are included in the tenure dossier, how they are compiled and used, and their relative importance. The dossier usually includes the candidate's curriculum vitae, reprints of all published work, copies of current working papers, letters evaluating the candidate's research collected from established scholars in the same specialty at other universities, records of participation in university committees or other administrative duties, and teaching evaluations. As a dossier moves up to levels beyond the originating department, letters from persons within the university who have evaluated the dossier and/or taken part in the consideration at prior levels are typically added. These items include the reports of a reading committee, the chair's letter, and a statement of how you fit into the department's overall objectives. It is important that you know which items are to be included in your dossier and that you understand how they are solicited and their relative weight in the decisions by your department and your university. Then, you may be able to suggest arguments to your supporters or your chair--subtly, of course--if you think there is likely to be some negative evidence. For example, if your teaching ratings are generally mediocre, you might be able to point out that they are improving or that they are much better for graduate courses.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

To answer questions about specific procedures used at your university and in your department, consult your mentor--the senior scholar in your department who has been guiding your professional progress up to this point. However, if you are like the majority of women assistant professors, you arrive at the tenure decision with no one whom you would identify as a mentor. In this case, find someone who would like to see you get tenure, who is trustworthy, and who

understands the tenure process as it currently operates at your university. If there is no accessible tenured faculty member in your own department who is trustworthy and supportive of your promotion, consult supportive economists from outside your department, such as your thesis advisor. In addition, look elsewhere in the university. You should be able to find some knowledgeable senior women faculty members who are committed to furthering women's opportunities in academe. These women can tell you how the process really works (as opposed to formal descriptions of the procedure), can advise you on ways to strengthen the presentation of your case, and may be able to intervene on your behalf if irregularities arise.

How can mentors, senior women faculty, or former thesis advisors help you during the year of your tenure decision? Senior faculty members are likely to have served on some tenure committees and to have engaged in conversations about other tenure cases. They have collected historical "data" on the concerns of past tenure committees in your department, your school, and your university. Such informal "data" may greatly assist you in influencing the "packaging" of your dossier and in deciding any procedural items on which you are consulted, such as the timing of the decision or the addition of particular items to your dossier.

In addition, if you are turned down at any level of review, mentors and advisors can evaluate any explanations provided by indicating whether the grounds cited are frequently used to turn down candidates, whether they are smokescreens for other reasons, or whether your case is making institutional history. They can advise you about alternatives for appeal, their benefits and costs, and their likelihood of success.

STEPS TO IMPROVE THE "PACKAGING" OF YOUR TENURE CASE

Most of your possibilities to influence the outcome occur at a very early stage. The following steps should be taken before your chair or other official initiates the tenure decision process.

The first task you should pursue is the preparation of a brief summary of your scholarly interests and work (no more than a couple of pages). This summary should describe your overall area of interest and how the specific papers you have written and/or projects you have pursued fit into the overall framework. The purpose of this summary is both to explain your interests to nonspecialists and to show how you have seriously and consistently pursued those interests. It is not to enumerate articles. At many research universities, simply having published a lot of papers does not constitute sufficient qualification for tenure. Instead, the reader of this summary should understand what you have done, why it is important, how you have been successful, and why this work forms a significant contribution to your field.

Because this summary may be read by any or all of several persons involved in your tenure decision--your department, persons solicited for outside letters, or noneconomists on committees outside the department--it is worth circulating a draft to your mentors and advisors. Follow their advice about which points to highlight or expand and which to drop. When you and your advisors are satisfied with this summary, give it to your department chair and suggest that it be included in your dossier and provided as part of your vitae to any persons who are asked to write letters on your behalf.

In addition, because many departments send copies of a subset of the candidate's publications

and working papers to outside reviewers, prepare a list of the ones you consider most important. Be sure to choose your very best unpublished papers, as well as some published work.

The second major task is to prepare a list of all scholars outside your university competent to evaluate your research. List all the prominent persons in your field as well as less eminent individuals whom you know to be familiar with your work. If you have not already done so, send every person on the list copies of working papers or of reprints that would most interest them. (You should have already been doing this as papers were written or published. The worst outside letter you can get is one that indicates a lack of familiarity with your work.)

In many universities, the candidate names at least some of the outside scholars from whom evaluation letters are solicited and the department or school names others. Consult with your advisors before submitting a list to your department chair. In most research universities, tenure committees are looking for any reason to turn down candidates. A single lukewarm letter may destroy your chances. The hope is that your advisors can tell you about persons who are known to write erratic letters, consistently negative letters, or consistently positive letters. Be sure that your own nominees are either of the latter variety or are strongly supportive of your work. However, the reviewers known to be uniformly positive won't help to convince your department, so consider choosing reputedly tough people whom you are confident will write positive letters for you. Letters from foreign scholars are sometimes problematic, however, if the authors do not understand the American tenure system and its standards. Finally, if there are some senior people in your field with whom you have had disagreements that you think might undermine their ability to evaluate your work fairly, inform the senior member of your department who is most favorable to your promotion.

SOME DECISIONS TO MAKE

Other decisions you can make or influence include whether to search for another job, to alter the timing of your tenure decision, and to go on leave.

Entering the Job Market

For most economists, the year of their tenure decision is the time to enter the job market seriously. Job search is one way to advertise your work and your overall credentials, thereby enhancing your professional reputation and potentially improving your outside letters. An outside offer from an approximately equivalent or better institution or department is likely to make you a more attractive tenure candidate in your own department and any outside offer can help you to get a fast decision. A thorough job search which provides you with concrete alternatives also softens the blow of a negative tenure decision.

Timing Your Tenure Decision

You may be able to affect when you come up for tenure through requests either to count or to ignore teaching experience at another institution, time at your current institution before you received your Ph.D., or time spent on leave. You can also force an early decision by threatening to take an outside offer if tenure is not awarded.

Assuming that you are happy at your current institution and wish to maximize your chances of staying there permanently, timing may affect the probability of a positive tenure decision, other things being equal. Relevant factors to consider include temporary university budgetary crises or hiring freezes that are encouraging tenure review committees to be particularly tough; being in a cohort of particularly promising tenure candidates; and having several papers that you expect to be accepted for publication just after the "regular" decision date. Given the stakes involved in your own tenure decision, it is easy to become paranoid and anxious with respect to any request about the procedures involved--so having informed and trusted advice from more disinterested persons can help when these issues arise.

Going on Leave

Should you go on leave while your tenure decision is being made? There are several reasons to consider this possibility. For many people, there is added tension in working at the university each day when one's tenure case is under review. If you anticipate that you will scrutinize any questions about your research for hints of how the process is going and that you will evaluate every greeting from a senior faculty member for its implications for the tenure vote, then a leave might produce a less stressful daily routine. A leave for other employment or for research introduces you to new people, expands your reputation, and opens up new channels for outside offers, including an alternative if the tenure decision is negative.

There are potential dangers in a leave, however. The old adage "out of sight, out of mind" might work to your disadvantage in a department where interpersonal relationships and good citizenship activities are valued and you score particularly high on those items.

Mentors and advisors can assist you in evaluating these options in your own situation. If you stay, be sure to attend seminars, work long hours in your office, attend the department's social functions, and so forth, to maximize positive professional visibility. Try to schedule a research seminar before the department's vote, if you generally perform well in such presentations.

LEARNING FROM THE MISTAKES OF OTHERS

Three recent tenure cases illustrate some of the problems that can be encountered.

In one recent tenure case at a major research university, the curiosity of a senior faculty member was piqued when the tenure review committee on which he was serving received an extremely negative letter concerning a particularly strong candidate for tenure. The evaluation was written by a highly regarded scholar whose work was closely related to that of the candidate. All other letters were strongly positive, but from scholars whose work was less central to that of the candidate. Because the senior faculty member was particularly supportive of the candidate and was also convinced that the confidential outside letter process was open to violations by vindictive individuals, he decided to ask the candidate about her relationship with this scholar. (Incidentally, such consultation with the candidate after outside evaluators are chosen violates academic ethics.) The supporter was told that the negative letter writer had just lost his research grant and that the funder was now supporting--you guessed it--the candidate whom he evaluated so negatively. With this information, the supportive senior scholar was able to discredit the negative letter and the candidate received tenure.

This candidate was fortunate to have a senior colleague who was willing to risk a breach of ethics for her. Most junior faculty are not so lucky. Be sure you inform your most trusted senior colleague of any reasons someone who is likely to be consulted on your promotion might possibly contribute a less than fair review. Tactfully mention your misgivings to your chair before the list of references is completed and before your evaluation committee is appointed.

At another research university, a department's chair who was not supportive of a woman candidate allowed the other candidates to select all their outside reviewers, but did not allow the disfavored candidate the same opportunity. While such manipulation of the outside evaluation process is unethical (and illegal when it is differentially applied to male and female, or to minority and nonminority candidates), it is rumored to happen frequently and it is almost impossible to detect. This chair was caught, however, because he went one step further and actually removed positive outside letters from the dossier of his disfavored candidate, who was initially denied tenure. After an internal grievance procedure, during which the chair's behavior came to light, the decision was reversed and tenure was awarded.

Another form of manipulation occurs when potential outside evaluators are contacted about their opinions before they are selected to write official reviews or when the desired evaluation is indicated along with the request for an assessment. Institutional insiders will have some perspective on whether such manipulation occurs in your university.

The final story of a tenure decision gone awry deals with the use of outside offers. One assistant professor received an unsolicited tenured offer at a university that she viewed as only marginally inferior to her current institution. Although she was not due to be reviewed for tenure until the following year, both her department's and her school's tenure committees supported her promotion in response to her outside offer. After being told by many powerful persons within her current institution that the university's tenure review committee was not a real hurdle and that her promotion was certain, she declined the outside offer in order to permit the other institution to extend a timely offer to someone else. She was subsequently turned down by the university committee and advised that, since this was an early promotion, they would be happy to reconsider her the next year. Indeed, she did receive tenure the next year. Her refusal of the outside offer before she had officially gotten tenure at her current institution cost her another year of uncertainty, however.

If all works well and you receive tenure, you will no doubt be asked to participate in future tenure decisions and to write outside letters for other candidates. If you think that the candidate is deserving of tenure, remember my previous admonition that any negative or lukewarm comments in an outside letter can be used to turn down the candidate. If you support the candidate, write a clearly and completely positive but specific letter.

THE PROCESS OF EARNING TENURE AT A SMALL LIBERAL ARTS INSTITUTION

*Robin L. Bartlett
Denison University*

Assistant professors often find themselves wondering whether they made the right choice about their career path. Those at large research-oriented universities may think that it would be easier and more rewarding to be at a small liberal arts college--where tenure and promotion are awarded on your ability to teach. And assistant professors at small liberal arts institutions probably find themselves wondering whether it would have been easier to be at a large state university where the criteria for tenure and promotion are straightforward--three articles in the top ten journals, for example.

The process of earning tenure at a large or a small academic institution is not as simple as these stereotypes suggest. Moreover, as the academic market stagnates with shrinking pools of student applicants, shifting governmental priorities, and changing economic prospects, the criteria for tenure and promotion at small liberal arts institutions change as well.

WHAT IS EXPECTED?

The formal criteria for tenure and promotion at small liberal arts institutions are excellence in teaching, scholarship, and community service. These criteria are spelled out in contracts and faculty handbooks, but the definition and the importance of each one changes over time as the institution, through its trustees, administration, and faculty, responds to changing economic and political conditions inside and outside the academy.

When I first came to Denison University 13 years ago, the Economics Department, the President's Advisory Board (Denison's equivalent to the tenure and promotions committee), and its President stressed that teaching was the primary criterion for promotion and tenure. In addition, Denison's faculty was expected to be engaged in broadly defined scholarly activities and to be involved in community service. Quantitatively, excellence in teaching was given roughly the combined weight of scholarship and community service in tenure decisions, but if one met the first criterion and did not meet the next two, tenure and promotion was denied.

Today the situation has changed dramatically, because of the tightened academic job market and the impact of technology on productivity. Teaching is still the primary consideration for review. Only when the department has determined that the excellence-in-teaching criterion has been met are the other criteria reviewed. Scholarship is then given equal weight with teaching, while community service is a necessary but lesser-valued criterion. Furthermore, departments have begun taking a more active role in defining appropriate scholarly activity, despite the fact that the formal criteria as printed in the faculty handbook have not changed.

Excellence in Teaching

Excellence in teaching is the hallmark of small private institutions, but teaching loads and course enrollments affect one's ability to instruct students effectively. Teaching loads at small liberal

arts institutions can range from five courses per year with one to three preparations per semester, to nine courses per year with three preparations per quarter. The former course load is relatively manageable, while the latter is overwhelming. Enrollments can range from three students per course to sixty, with large course enrollments both limiting the options for teaching techniques and easily negating a manageable course load.

Teaching loads and course enrollments are important because they affect a junior faculty member's ability to concentrate on other endeavors, and in particular, to engage in scholarship. Teaching obligations may affect the type of research conducted and the timing of research projects. While it is necessary to develop and to teach courses that fit the department's needs, be careful not to spend all of your time and energy developing courses and grading assignments.

Excellence in teaching does not occur overnight--in fact, learning how to teach takes as much time and effort as mastering a particular field within economics. The mistake that beginning teachers frequently make is to think that teaching is walking into a classroom and lecturing. Getting students to regurgitate what was said in class is difficult and getting them to understand and use economic theory to analyze economic situations is even harder.

Beginning faculty need an ally within the department who will go over course syllabi, tests, and evaluations to give them feedback and suggestions for improvements. Experienced teachers will advise novices to pare down the amount of material they are trying to present and to focus on conveying one or two key concepts each class. Covering all the material in the textbook is not a productive goal in itself. Instead, courses need to be carefully planned, with the instructor's goals and the methods for achieving them being well thought out in advance. Find out what help is available and take advantage of it. The Great Lakes College Association, for example, offers a summer course to help senior and junior faculty to develop their teaching techniques and become more effective in the classroom.

Testing students and making that experience educational is as much an art as presenting the material itself. Testing situations often create a great deal of anxiety for students that can be minimized if students know what to expect and have some control over the outcome. Draw upon the experiences of your colleagues. Become familiar with the norms of the department and develop testing procedures that fit your goals and those of the department.

Each institution has its own way of obtaining information about an instructor's classroom performance. Some institutions administer standardized, campus-wide evaluations through a third party, while other institutions let individual faculty members administer course evaluations in their own classrooms. Unfortunately, when departments or institutions lack alternative means of evaluating the performance of instructors in the classroom, students' evaluations may become the only source of information on teaching in the tenure and promotion process.

Senior faculty have other ways of obtaining the necessary information, though. They may visit classes of junior faculty or review video tapes of them. Interviewing selected students, good and bad, may provide additional information. Junior faculty can gain from early feedback from senior faculty--it can save a lot of time and effort in correcting the inevitable mistakes made during the first few years of teaching.

Scholarship

In the first three years at an institution, junior faculty are expected to learn how to teach and at the same time engage in scholarship. Scholarship can be narrowly defined as publication in recognized journals within a faculty member's area of expertise or it may be broadly defined to include a variety of scholarly activities that may or may not result in publication.

Junior faculty may prefer the narrower definition of scholarship, feeling that it is less ambiguous and more objective across fields and disciplines, but there are several problems associated with weighing it heavily in the tenure process. One is that the probability of publishing articles in recognized journals within six years varies significantly across disciplines and even among fields in a particular discipline. For example, the probability that a member of the English department publishes in a recognized journal in six years may be much less than that of a faculty member in one of the sciences. Moreover, several studies show that the lack of double-blind reviewing procedures by major journals biases these publications against the work of scholars from smaller schools.

Second, fewer research resources are at the disposal of faculty members at small liberal arts institutions. Libraries are limited, although interlibrary loan programs and new computer technology make most materials available, but with delays.

Third, graduate students are seldom available to assist with research or to lighten the teaching load. Undergraduate research assistants can help. But undergraduates lack sophisticated research and teaching skills and need close supervision.

Fourth, many small liberal arts institutions are geographically isolated, making it difficult if not impossible to attend seminars and collaborate with colleagues at major universities on a regular basis. Because the process of review and publication can take up to two years, the latest theoretical and empirical techniques are often not immediately available.

Finally, good teaching is time consuming. Because there are only a limited number of hours in a day, research and other scholarly activities must be done differently at smaller institutions. Being intellectually active is just as important as being an excellent teacher. In fact, some argue that the two activities are inseparable and there is no doubt, given the operative constraints of small liberal arts institutions, that both activities must blend together. Directed studies with undergraduate senior fellows in the department, for example, may be used to focus on a research interest. Or, senior seminars may involve in-depth studies of new areas--curricular flexibility is the comparative advantage of a smaller institution.

In order to encourage more scholarly activities, institutions have responded several ways. Some have lightened the teaching loads of the faculty. Others have developed "junior leave programs" to allow younger faculty to study with prominent scholars at larger institutions, to apply for grant monies to buy release time, and to work at recognized think tanks. Still other institutions have generous travel allowances for national and regional meetings. Attending such meetings can bring one in touch with other researchers. Developing contacts and a network of critics contributes to your intellectual growth and, more importantly for contract review procedures, recognized experts in the field will be familiar with your work and your development as a

scholar.

Find out what the expectations for scholarship are at your institution and meet them. Do not try to redefine them at this point in your career. If the scholarship ante has been raised over the years, without the appropriate support mechanisms being put in place, make yourself as marketable as possible and consider seeking another position.

Community Service

Finally, as in any organization, people need to know who you are. Community service is not only a way to gain visibility and demonstrate a commitment to the institution, but also a way to get to know other faculty and for them to get to know you. Being on a committee is not always drudge work and can be fun, but make no mistake about it--being known and well respected for community service is not enough for tenure. Community service is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for tenure and promotion. Junior faculty are expected to serve on committees, but one major community commitment is enough. A highly visible committee with relatively light responsibilities is preferable.

THE TENURE PROCESS

How departments go about making tenure decisions varies by institution and by personalities within the department. Many departments are hierarchical, with the chair being a select administrative appointee who exercises complete authority over all departmental decisions. At the other extreme, some departments are more cooperative and egalitarian and the chair is a rotating position shared by senior faculty. In either case, the chair of a department is the vehicle through which all information is presented for contract renewals, tenure reviews, and promotion. Therefore, the department's chair plays a key role in a faculty member's career.

Good information is the key to fair tenure decisions. It is essential that junior faculty understand what is expected of them from the beginning and that senior faculty have accurate information about what junior faculty are doing. Senior faculty play an important role in the decision-making process, since they provide the chair with evaluations of a junior faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and community service. It is important, then, that junior faculty open and use as many channels of interaction as possible between themselves and senior faculty. Several channels for communication are available: discussions about teaching, the sharing of scholarly ideas, joint participation in community work, and mutual social activities. All of these interactions provide senior and junior faculty opportunities to learn about and from each other.

Usually, in the penultimate year of a junior faculty member's contract, the department chair collects information from senior members of the department on the junior faculty member's overall performance and writes a departmental recommendation to a faculty committee on tenure and promotion. Typically, the members of this committee are elected senior faculty from across the university or college. The faculty committee on tenure and promotion either makes the actual decision on who should be reappointed, given tenure, and promoted; or it serves in an advisory capacity to the next level of administration--the president of the institution.

In order to learn about the political structures inside and outside the institution, every junior

faculty member needs a mentor. A mentor is someone in the department, in a similar department, or in a department at another institution who can help a junior faculty member learn about the formal and informal networks of academic life. Picking a mentor is serious business--it is probably a more important decision than picking a dissertation advisor. Who will make a good mentor? Spend the first year observing members of the department. Watch how they interact with students, their colleagues, and the administration. Who seems to know the ropes? Who seems to be helpful? Who seems to be relatively successful? Mentors need both academic and political skills. Female mentors are not necessarily better than male mentors. Since one person may not have all the requisite skills to be a mentor, consider finding another complementary mentor.

Understanding how to get tenure means knowing not only the formal criteria, but also the formal and informal power structures within an academic institution. Being political does not mean spending hours manipulating various agents in the decision-making process or spending hours playing basketball with the boys. Being political means spending the time and energy necessary to inform those in the decision-making process of your efforts in the classroom, your achievements in scholarly circles, and your contributions to the betterment of the community. Others will not know what you have done unless you diplomatically bring it to their attention.

CONCLUSION

The process of achieving tenure is time consuming and difficult for everyone involved, and the procedures may at times be unclear, but the rewards to receiving tenure at a small liberal arts institution are clear. Teaching at such an institution offers a variety of opportunities for personal involvement and professional growth. Students tend to be good or above average in their abilities and preparation, so the classroom is an exciting place. Not only can you convey the elements of your discipline, but the smaller classes allow you to become involved in the learning process with students. A small liberal arts environment affords an opportunity to shape the minds of the next generation of leaders. Moreover, faculty are not trapped by the narrow confines of their graduate education. Opportunities exist to broaden one's understanding of economics as a social science within a liberal arts context through varied and frequent contact with faculty in other disciplines, in part because interdisciplinary study is encouraged. Finally, tenured faculty play an important role in shaping the direction of the institution. Priorities and curricular change are more easily achieved where administrative labels are few and where administrators and faculty on occasion act in unison.

COLLEGIALITY

*Jo Anna Gray
University of Oregon*

This is an opinion piece, and my views regarding the subject of collegiality are strong ones. The word collegial derives from college, which is defined by Webster's to be "an organized body of persons engaged in a common pursuit or having common interests or duties." Thus collegial behavior recognizes and furthers the common objectives and interests of those with whom one works. Collegiality is, I would argue, a largely unacknowledged fourth criterion for promotion and tenure. (The other three are, of course, teaching, research, and service.) Accordingly, it deserves attention early in your career.

Being collegial does not mean advising students for your senior colleagues while they play golf or are hosting all the department bashes. A good colleague need not be a naturally generous or overtly social animal. A good colleague does, however, bestow significant externalities in areas central to the success of the academy. Some of the attributes of a good colleague are easily recognized and widely agreed upon. A good colleague, for example, reads the papers of co-workers and professional acquaintances and offers constructive suggestions. A good colleague attends seminars, pulls a full load on committee assignments, and responds promptly to requests from colleagues, students, and the staff, even if the response is a courteous "sorry, I can't help you."

Other elements of collegial behavior are harder to measure and agree upon. With shrinking budgets and increased emphasis on teaching missions, faculty accessibility has become a contentious issue on campuses across the country. How much time can one reasonably spend working away from the office? While my own observations suggest a positive correlation between time spent in the office and research productivity, some argue that working at home increases their research productivity. If true, this advantage must be weighed against the externalities generated. Your absence from campus means you are not available to consult with students, colleagues, and others who interact professionally with the faculty. You can be sure that your colleagues, who are left to deal with the students who cannot find you and to conduct the impromptu business you are not around to help with, will notice your absence.

The solution I suggest is two-fold. First, establish a well-advertised, consistent presence on campus. If your schedule regularly includes time at another location, post not only your scheduled office hours, but also the hours you can be found in the vicinity of your office with reasonable certainty. In addition, post the phone number, FAX number, or E-mail address at which you can be contacted off-campus. The point is to facilitate making appointments and scheduling business.

Second, while you need not be present on campus every day, all day, you should be available any time university business is normally conducted. If a committee meeting or seminar is scheduled during your off-campus research time, pack up and head in to campus. The same goes for consultations with colleagues and students that cannot be scheduled during your regular on-campus hours. Neither you nor your department can afford any other outcome.

Finally, for more general guidelines on surviving your first six years in academia, I recommend reading "The Young Economist's Guide to Professional Etiquette", by Dan Hamermesh (Journal of Economic Perspectives, Winter 1992).

5. Choosing a Funder

5A. Make sure that your topic is appropriate for support by the chosen agency or that it is specifically responsive to the RFP to which it is directed.

5B. Know to whom you are writing, e.g., who is on their review board (if they have one); what type of projects they do and do not fund, etc. Most granting agencies with review boards will tell you who the members are if you ask.

5C. Spend some time finding the correct agency, e.g., ask a senior colleague or friend at another university, or ask a university research office, or call proposed agencies directly for information before you begin.

5D. Unlike journal articles, once a proposal is written, there is no ethical dilemma in sending the same proposal to several different potential funders simultaneously (with or without small changes). However, you may be required to list alternative agencies to which you have submitted to the same proposal. Be up front about this at all times.

5E. There is every advantage to stopping by to discuss a proposal with potential sponsors if you are in the area. A two page (or less) brief synopsis of your proposal is a useful thing to bring along to such meetings.

6. Internal Review

6A. Last but not least, prepare your proposal at least two weeks before the deadline. Ask a trusted colleague or close friend to critically review it. Encourage frank opinions. If you don't think that you can find anyone to give your proposal a careful read for free, pay someone to do it for you.

Good luck!

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

CSWEP depends on all of its dues-paying members to continue its activities. In addition to publishing the Newsletter, we maintain a Roster of women economists that is used by members, employers, organizations establishing advisory groups, and the like. We also organize sessions at the meetings of the AEA and the regional economics associations and publish an annual report on the status of women in the profession.

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

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

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

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

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

NAME _____

MAILING ADDRESS _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP _____

Check here if currently an AEA member _____ Renewal of CSWEP Membership _____
New CSWEP Member _____ a Student _____

If you checked student, please indicate what Institution _____