



Newsletter of the  
**Committee on the Status of Women  
 in the Economics Profession**

Spring 2011  
 Visit [CSWEP.org](http://CSWEP.org)

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

## How to Get Published in an Economics Journal

**Introduction**  
 by Susan Averett  
 page 3

**Getting Published in  
 Economics Journals**  
 by Robert Moffitt  
 page 4

**Hints for Having a Painless  
 Publishing Experience**  
 by Patricia M. Anderson  
 page 6

**Reflections of a  
 Founding Editor**  
 by Shoshana Grossbard  
 page 7

**ABCs of R&Rs**  
 by Hope Corman  
 and Nancy Reichman  
 page 8

### CSWEP Session honoring Ferber a huge success!

#### Perspectives on Gender and Family: Session in Honor of Marianne A. Ferber

This session at the Midwest Economics Association meeting, organized and chaired by Anne E. Winkler, University of Missouri–St. Louis, honored the distinguished and ongoing career of Marianne Ferber. Marianne Ferber, Professor of Economics and Women's Studies, Emerita, University of Illinois, Urbana–Champaign, was born in Czechoslovakia in 1923, obtained her B.A. at McMaster University in Canada in 1944, and her Ph.D. at the University of Chicago in 1954. As summarized in the 2002 CSWEP Newsletter, Marianne Ferber has made a substantial impact on the profession, including her seminal 1977 paper (with Bonnie Birnbaum) titled "The New Home Economics: Retrospect and Prospects," her edited book (with Julie Nelson), *Beyond Economic*



At the session in honor of Marianne Ferber: Back Row: Robert Pollak, Anne Winkler, Lisa Saunders, Francine Blau, Robin Bartlett. Front Row: Marianne Ferber, Carole Green.

*Man: Feminist Theory and Economics* (1993), and the follow-up *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Economics Today* (2003), *The Economics of Women, Men, and Work* (co-authored with Francine Blau and Anne Winkler), currently in its 6th edition, and countless other scholarly works. She was a founder and President of the International Association for Feminist Economics (IAFFE) and President of the Midwest Economics Association. Among her many honors, she received a Distinguished Alumni Award from McMaster University and was a co-recipient (with Francine Blau) of the 2001 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award.

Session participants combined their formal presentations with reflections

continued on page 10

## CONTENTS

CSWEP Board, Directory	page 2
From the Chair	page 2
Feature Articles:	
How to Get Published	pages 3–8
Books to Note	page 12
Call for Nominations	page 13
CSWEP Sponsored Events at the Western Economic Association Meeting	page 14
Calls for Papers and Abstracts	page 14
Session Summaries	page 14 available online
Brag Box	page 15
Membership Form	available online
Upcoming Regional Meetings	back cover

COMMITTED TO CSWEP  
**JOAN HAWORTH  
 STEPS DOWN**  
*see the Letter from the Chair*

## DIRECTORY OF CSWEP BOARD MEMBERS

**Barbara M. Fraumeni, Chair**  
Professor of Public Policy  
Chair, Ph.D. Program in Public Policy  
Interim Associate Director for Academic and Student Affairs  
University of Southern Maine  
Muskie School of Public Service  
Wishcamper Center  
PO Box 9300  
Portland, ME 04104-9300  
(207) 228-8245  
bfraumeni@usm.maine.edu  
cswep@usm.maine.edu

**Marjorie McElroy, Incoming Chair January 2012**  
Duke University  
Department of Economics  
219A Social Sciences  
Campus Box 90097  
Durham, NC 27708-0097  
(919) 660-1840  
FAX: (919) 684-8974  
mcelroy@econ.duke.edu

**Susan Averett, CSWEP East**  
Professor of Economics  
Lafayette College  
Easton, PA 18042  
(610) 330-5307  
FAX (610) 330-5715  
averetts@lafayette.edu  
CSWEP East: <http://www.iona.edu/eea>

**Debra A. Barbezat, At-large Board member**  
Professor of Economics  
Colby College  
5239 Mayflower Hill  
Waterville, Maine 04901-8852  
207-859-5239  
dabarbez@colby.edu

**Donna Ginther, At-large Board member**  
Professor of Economics  
University of Kansas  
Summerfield Hall  
Lawrence, KS 66045  
(785) 864-3251  
FAX: (785) 864-5270  
dginther@ku.edu  
[www.people.ku.edu/~dginther](http://www.people.ku.edu/~dginther)

**Linda Goldberg**  
Vice President of International Research  
International Research Function  
Federal Reserve Bank of New York  
33 Liberty Street  
New York, NY 10045  
(212) 720-2836  
FAX: (212) 20-6831  
Linda.Goldberg@ny.frb.org

**Kaye G. Husbands Fealing CSWEP Midwest**  
Senior Program Officer  
Committee on National Statistics, The National Academies—Keck Center  
500 5th Avenue—Room 1133  
Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 334-2831  
CSWEP Midwest:  
<http://web.grinnell.edu/mea/>

**Jennifer Imazeki, CSWEP West**  
Associate Professor of Economics  
San Diego State University  
5500 Camponile Drive  
San Diego, CA 92187  
(619) 867-4408  
FAX (619) 594-5062  
jimazeki@mail.sdsu.edu  
CSWEP West: <http://www.weainternational.org/>

**Terra McKinnish, CeMENT**  
Associate Professor of Economics  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, CO 80309  
(303) 492-6770  
FAX (303) 492-8960  
terra.mckinnish@colorado.edu

**Ron Oaxaca**  
Professor of Economics  
University of Arizona  
McClelland Hall, Room 401QQ  
PO Box 210108  
Tucson, AZ 85721-0108  
(520) 621-4135  
rlo@email.arizona.edu

**Rohini Pande**  
Professor of Public Policy  
Harvard Kennedy School of Government  
Mailbox 46  
79 JFK Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
(617) 384-5267  
Rohini\_Pande@ksg.harvard.edu

**Shelley White-Means, CSWEP South**  
Professor of Economics  
University of Health Sciences Center  
Suite 205N Johnson Building  
847 Monroe Avenue  
Memphis, TN 38163  
(901) 448-7666  
shwhiteme@uthsc.edu

**Madeline Zavodny, Newsletter Oversight Editor**  
Professor of Economics  
Agnes Scott College  
Economics Department  
141 E. College Ave.  
Decatur, GA 30030  
(404) 471-6377  
mzavodny@agnesscott.edu



## From the Chair

Please make sure that Assistant Professors in your departments know of the following upcoming mentoring opportunities. Research shows that mentoring matters.

### Regional mentoring workshop applications are due!

Applications for the regional mentoring workshop are due by June 10th. The regional mentoring workshop will occur November 17th and 18th in conjunction with the Southern Economic Association meetings in Washington, DC.

### More mentoring opportunities are upcoming!

The national mentoring workshop will be held after the 2012 AEA/ASSA meetings in Chicago. More information and the application link will be available later. Check the CSWEP website regularly. Also, do not forget to consider the Haworth mentoring fund as a source of supplemental support for senior academic mentors coming to your campus.



### Committed to CSWEP— Joan G. Haworth

After 20 years of service to CSWEP, Joan G. Haworth is stepping off the CSWEP Board. Joan has committed her money, her time and the time of her staff at ERS. Joan got to know many CSWEP fans in her 20 years of handling all aspects of membership with the help of her ERS staff, whose time she provided at no cost to CSWEP. In addition, she led CSWEP as Chair from 2001–2. Some years ago, she also established the Joan Haworth mentoring fund for use by institutions and senior women to provide mentoring support in the form of supplemental travel expenses.

Joan has had a distinguished career as a forensic economist, as well as a tenured member of the Department of Economics at Florida State University. Her publications focus on employment discrimination, comparable worth and the economic status of women. She and her husband founded ERS, with which she is still affiliated, in 1981. During her distinguished career as an expert witness on employment matters. Joan has testified in over 160 litigation matters, including precedent setting cases such as EEOC v. Sears, Roebuck & Company, Penk v. Oregon State Board of Education, Huguley v. General Motors Corporation, AFCSME v. County of Nassau, Lott v. Westinghouse, Donaldson v. Microsoft Corporation, Bravo v. Taco Bell Corporation, and Dukes v. Wal-Mart. I can attest to her skill as an expert in such matters after hearing her speak to an undergraduate economics class some years ago.

Joan will be missed after retiring both from the CSWEP Board and ERS, but the legacy of her commitment will continue.

### New CSWEP Chair as of January 2012

Marjorie McElroy of Duke University has agreed to serve as the CSWEP Chair beginning in January 2012. I feel safe and secure in handing over the Chairmanship to such an outstanding and capable leader.

—Barbara M. Fraumeni

### What is CSWEP?

CSWEP (the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession) is a standing committee of the AEA (American Economics Association). It was founded in 1971 to monitor the position of women in the economics profession and to undertake activities to improve that position. Our thrice yearly newsletters are one of those activities. See our website at [www.cswep.org](http://www.cswep.org) for more information on what we are doing.

## How to Get an Article Published in an Economics Journal: Tips from the Experts



Introduction by Susan Averett,  
Lafayette College

This issue of the CSWEP newsletter is devoted to demystifying the publication process. At universities and colleges around the world, young economists and senior faculty members alike find the publication process to be daunting. Online submission has made it easier to submit your work and likely helped to reduce turnaround times at journals. Yet technology cannot answer questions like how to choose which journal is the best outlet for your work and how to respond to the myriad and often conflicting comments of referees. The aim of this issue of the newsletter is to help you to answer these questions.

We hear directly from three journal editors (Robert Moffitt of the *American Economic Review*, Patty Anderson of the *Journal of Human Resources*, and Shoshana Grossbard, who founded the *Review of Economics of the Household* ten years ago) on what they look for when they receive an article to review. All three agree on some basic principles that may seem obvious yet are surprisingly overlooked in many submissions. First, make your contribution to the existing literature crystal clear in the introduction. Why is it important to study the question you are addressing? How do your findings advance our knowledge on this topic? Second, be sure your writing is as clear and concise as possible.

In addition to obtaining the valuable perspective of editors, I asked two veterans of the publication process, Hope Corman of Rider University and Nancy Reichman of the University of Medicine & Dentistry of New Jersey, for their tips on how to successfully respond to referees. How to respond to a “revise and resubmit” is one of the trickiest aspects of the process. In their article, they address both the emotional roller coaster of addressing sometimes conflicting critiques of referees and offer practical advice on responding and “respectfully disagreeing.”

This series of articles provides important tips for navigating the publication process for all economists interested in getting their work in print. All of the advice given here rests on an important presumption: you’ve written an article that is of high quality and ultimately merits publication. I hope that you find this newsletter a helpful accompaniment to all of the considerable hard work that you do on your papers.

## Getting Published in Economics Journals

—Robert Moffitt, Johns Hopkins University



Getting published in economics journals is one of the toughest tasks for all of us and especially tough for young researchers who are just starting off. If you are at an academic institution, you face not only the same hurdles that older economists face, but you also face the time pressure of

the tenure clock, which means that the long process of submission and resubmission, revise-and-resubmit, and ultimate publication can be exceedingly frustrating. Although I have no statistics to back it up, my perception is that the competition for journal space has gotten tighter over time, at least if you only count journals with a reasonably high quality bar. Certainly that is true of the very top journals, whose total number of published pages has not expanded much over the long term but which have experienced a steady upward trend in submission volume. But it is probably also true of lower-ranked journals, despite growth in the number of journals to choose from.

I have been fortunate—or unfortunate, depending on your view—to have edited three journals. I began with the *Journal of Human Resources* and, after that, became one of three coeditors at the *Review of Economics and Statistics*. At both of these journals, I was reasonably successful in significantly increasing the quality of published papers, for which I was rewarded—no good deed goes unpunished—by being given the job of running the *American Economic Review*, the most time-consuming professional task I have ever undertaken. But my experience has given me quite a bit of information on what it takes to get published and at different journals—a field journal like *JHR*, a second-tier general-interest journal like *REStat*, and a top journal.

One thing to say at the start, and to state the obvious, is that doing good research is the best way to increase the probability of getting published. I find that some economists overemphasize the strategic and game-theoretic aspects of getting published. While they are important and, in fact, that is partly what I am going to talk about, your first job is to have strong content.

For myself, I start thinking about journals at the very earliest point—when I first have an idea. I always say to myself, “This would be an interesting paper to do; it might make it into journal X.” I suspect that everyone does this. Often, after you get into doing the research, you change your mind about the type of journal you think you will submit to, but at least you generally start with something in mind. Given this, you have to understand the landscape of the economics journals: the top 5 (or 6); the top second-ranked general-interest journals; top field journals; and the rest of field journals. Most people put the *AER*, the *Journal of Political Economy*, the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, the *Review of Economic Studies*, and *Econometrica* in the top 5, and some would include the *International Economic Review*. In the next tier I would put the four *American Economic Journals* (even though they are not completely general-interest), *REStat*, and *IER*, if it doesn’t go into the top rank. Below that are the many field journals, some of which are demonstrably better than others and which are too numerous for me to mention.

The introduction of the *AEJs* has helped the situation enormously. Those journals offer another point on the journal quality spectrum, offering publication to papers that aren’t quite strong enough for the top journals but that deserve to have higher recognition than if they were to appear in field journals. In addition, my view is that the papers appearing in the *AEJs* are papers that would have otherwise been published in the top field journals, so there is now more space in the latter as well (holding the total volume of research fixed).

Everyone always thinks ahead of time about what I like to call their “Oster sequence,” the sequence of journals they will submit to, starting from the best it might have a shot at and then working down. This term comes from a well-known paper by Sharon Oster published in the June 1980 *AER*, which formalized the dynamic problem of journal selection and discussed the roles of discount rates, probabilities of acceptance, and other factors. You always need to think



carefully about the journal you submit to, and you need to research the kinds of papers that have been published there; whether the journal seems to be open to your type of work; who the editor is and what his or her orientation is; and who the associate editors are, because they are likely to be referees for your paper.

Now let me say a few things about the all-important question of what editors look for (aside from, to repeat, strong content). I will list three characteristics: (1) the importance of the question and of the main results; (2) the clarity, organization, and length of the paper; and (3) its degree of novelty in either method or data.

Editors always read the introduction to a paper first to see what the paper is about and to make a judgment about the importance of the question and how interesting the findings are. At the top journals, of course, editors are looking for papers that address important questions in the literature and that seem to have a truly major contribution to make to that literature; at lower ranked journals, it is sufficient that the paper simply makes a more modest contribution, examining some existing question with new data, new methods, or from some new angle. Most of us write papers that fall in different places on this spectrum, some papers which we hope will have a major impact and others which we know to be more modest, workmanlike contributions.

One of the implications of this fact is that you should work very hard on your introduction. The introduction is absolutely key to a paper's success. You have to grab the attention of the editor and the referees. You have to be a good "salesman" for your work. It has to be well-written, succinct, and to the point (as an editor, I have always disliked long, windy introductions that explain in exhausting detail the background literature, what the paper does, etc.—I just want a simple summary). You should expect to write and rewrite your introduction repeatedly. Many papers get sent back to the authors without refereeing right at this stage—the question does not seem that important for the journal they edit.

I should also note that non-native-English speakers should work hard to get the English right and, if necessary, hire native English speakers to edit their papers. It is no doubt unfair, but editors and referees often take poor English as a signal of low quality.

Editors also skim a paper to see if it is well organized, proceeding logically from one section to the next, and to see if the points are made clearly. Length is also impor-

tant, and editors look to see if the length is appropriate for the type of paper it is; for example, a straightforward field-level contribution should not have to be long. Use appendices for supplementary material that is not absolutely required for the exposition. Also make sure it looks nice on the page—liberal spacing, not too small a font, easy-to-read tables, and completely free of typos. All of these issues are important to referees as well—they get annoyed if a paper is badly organized and explicated or hard to read visually and are particularly annoyed if a paper is too long, forcing them to spend more time on it than they think is justified by its scope and importance.

Novelty in method or data is particularly important at the top journals, where novelty is given more weight than at lower-ranked ones. Nevertheless, it gets positive weight at all journals. If a paper has this kind of contribution, it needs to be emphasized in the introduction and should be one of the selling points of the paper.

All these considerations add up to the same thing—work very hard on the writing and organization of your papers.

I should also say a word about citations. As an editor, I was always annoyed if a paper was coming out of a fairly large literature yet the citation list was minimal. That made me think that the author was playing games and citing only people the author thought would be friendly to the paper. You should never play games like that, because the editor will often notice that some important papers aren't cited and will immediately send the paper to one of the authors of such papers to referee. In addition, today, all editors use the internet as a search tool and can immediately determine who has written papers on the subject.

Eventually, you will get a decision back. Most journals have reduced their decision times, though not all; my rule at the *AER* was that I was not offended if authors sent a polite note of inquiry after six months (although we had very few that took that long). Most papers are rejected, even those authored by the top economists in the profession, and this falls out of the Oster solution as optimal. One rule I have is, (almost) never, never complain about a decision. Most rejections are made not just on the basis of the factual objections of the referees, but by their "feeling" about the paper as well as the editor's. Everyone recognizes that there is some randomness in the process, even editors, and fortunately there are many

continued on page 10

## Hints for Having a Painless Publishing Experience

—Patricia M. Anderson, Dartmouth College & NBER



In my years as a co-editor at the *Journal of Human Resources*, I feel that I have gained some insights into the publishing process beyond those gleaned from simply being a writer of research papers. Before delving into the details of the lessons learned specifically from being an editor, I want to start by mentioning a few more general issues, with a special emphasis on things that have changed (mainly for the better) since I was first submitting papers. First, essentially all journals have gone to an electronic system for managing their submissions. This change not only makes it easier for the authors (no more mailing out papers in triplicate!), but it has cut a few time-consuming steps out of the process, helping reduce turnaround times. Electronic management also virtually eliminates the chance that your submission will actually be lost. I think many economists of my age heard the (likely apocryphal) story of someone's paper that had been sent to a top journal, after which they waited a year without receiving referee reports. According to the story, upon checking with the managing editor, it was determined that the submission had fallen behind a filing cabinet. The moral of that story was to follow-up on your submissions with the managing editor after four to six months. Today, an author can generally follow a paper's progress online and can rest assured that it has not been lost along the way.

Second, and likely not unrelated to electronic tracking, journals seem to be making more of an effort to provide good turnaround times. At the *JHR*, the average time from submission to decision was just under 27 days in 2010. Limiting the sample only to papers sent out for review, the average was just under 92 days, or about three months. The difference in these statistics brings up an important issue—the desk reject. At the *JHR*, about 74 percent of submissions were not sent out for review, meaning the author heard back on average in about nine days. The overall rate of desk rejects at the *JHR* may be slightly inflated

by the fact that the name of the journal encourages inappropriate submissions from fields like human resource management. Nonetheless, the desk reject is an important tool in the editor's kit, and young scholars should not take such a quick rejection as a signal that they are a failure. Rather, the editor is typically exercising a judgment that even a well-done paper on this topic will not be of enough interest to the journal's readers to be one of the small percentage of submitted papers that will ultimately get published in the journal (at the *JHR*, the acceptance rate has been between 5 and 7 percent in recent years). By providing a quick turnaround, and perhaps a few small suggestions for either improvement or for an appropriate outlet, the desk reject lets the author move on in a timely manner. There is nothing more disheartening as an author than waiting many months for referee reports that are generally positive, but that ultimately conclude that the paper is just not suitable for this journal. Many times, editors can reach that conclusion on their own and save the author some time (and help keep referees from becoming too overburdened). While I have never received a complaint after a desk reject, I have received many a "Thank You" for providing quick turnaround with some helpful comments. My guess is that if you never get a desk reject, you may be shooting too low on average with your submissions. That said, you do want to take into account what the most appropriate outlet is likely to be—just don't continually sell yourself short. If you think your current paper is better than others you've written, go ahead and submit to a journal above where your other papers have come out.

At the same time, though, don't treat a journal submission as just a chance to get some good comments on your paper. Get comments from friends and colleagues that allow for a round of revisions before you submit. You want your submitted paper to be polished and ready for circulation. As an editor, when I get a paper that is riddled with typos, I can't help but have that color my view of the overall enterprise. If the au-

continued on page 11

## Reflections of a Founding Editor

—Shoshana Grossbard, San Diego State University & University of Zaragoza



Founding a new journal and nurturing it through infancy has been one of the most exhilarating experiences in my career. Here are some reflections as we get ready to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the founding of the *Review of Economics of the Household*.

**The expected happened.** I was right in perceiving great potential for a journal that integrates various sub-fields of economics dealing with household decisions. The original aims and scope of the journal stated that it “intends to become a major outlet for high-quality empirical and theoretical research on the economic behavior of households.” This happened. The journal has gained a respectable place among economics journals, especially in the fields of population economics, health economics, intra-household allocation, time use research, migration, economics of gender, and the economics of farm households. *REHO*'s recent acceptance by the Social Science Citation Index (included in ISI/Web of Science) indicates recognition of the quality and value of the journal.

**The unexpected happened.** The fields attracting more submissions are not necessarily those I thought would be most prominent; the relative importance of sub-fields evolves over time. While I was preparing the proposal that led to *REHO* I thought the concept of household production would be central, reflecting my own bias as a disciple of Gary Becker and Jacob Mincer, the founders of the New Home Economics. Consumer Economics and the Economics of Labor Supply appeared high on my list of topics the journal would cover. However, we get very few submissions in these areas. Lately, an increasing number of submissions dealing with savings have been received, a welcome but unexpected development. Within a year or two it became clear that papers related to Health Economics would be well represented. This sub-field of household economics, dealing principally with various aspects of the demand for health by households, gained increased importance, especially after Mike Grossman became one of the co-editors.

**Competition can be useful.** Experience has reinforced my confidence in the market mechanism and my belief that competition is sometimes productive. *REHO* is published by a private company: Springer. The company that launched us, Kluwer, was also private. The profit motive was and remains an important incentive behind these publishers' support for the journal.

Competition with other journals plays a role in explaining why we get submissions in some fields more than others. Authors of labor supply articles have plenty of outlets to choose from, but the same can't be said about articles on time uses related to parenting or exercise.

Competition also influences my decisions as editor. Journals compete in quality and speed of processing manuscripts. One of the ways by which we shorten production time is by not sending a revision to reviewers and instead reading the paper ourselves. We often send a revision to one referee only.

**It is useful to have mentors.** CSWEP is great at encouraging mentoring. When I needed such a program it had not yet started. About twenty years ago, I organized my own mentoring program and appointed six wonderful and extremely accomplished economists to a virtual board of editors: Gary Becker, Clive Granger, Jim Heckman, Jack Hirshleifer, Edward Lazear, and Jacob Mincer. Luckily, they all accepted my invitation. (A few years later I tried to add women to that board and contacted two women who are prominent in fields related to mine, but they turned me down.) I would send my mentors reports about my work about every six months and they often responded with encouraging words. In 2001, when I wrote the *REHO* proposal and sent it to them, all six mentors agreed to serve on the board of editors, a tremendous boost. Sadly, three out of the six have passed away since *REHO* was founded.

**On good referees from the editors' viewpoint.** The co-editors, special issue editors, and I invest much effort in selecting the very best referees we can find. It is hard to believe, but some people actually like to act

continued on page 12

## ABCs of R&Rs

—Hope Corman, *Rider University & NBER* and  
Nancy Reichman, *Robert Wood Johnson Medical School & Princeton University*



The much anticipated letter has arrived, probably by email. The good news is that the editor is willing to consider a revised version of your paper. The bad news is that the criticisms may seem harsh. The letter

may seem more like a rejection than an indication that the journal is interested in your paper. Consider the following language, which is from an initial decision letter we received for a paper that ended up getting accepted: “Given the major points of concern identified by the reviewers, you face formidable challenges in crafting a paper that will be acceptable for [JOURNAL NAME].” The moral of the story is that no matter how negative the tone or how extensive the criticisms, you have “passed go” if the editor extends the opportunity to submit a revised paper. Congratulations!

And so the process of responding begins. At first you may feel hurt, angry, or puzzled by the comments on your masterpiece. However, we have found that no matter how useless some reviewers’ reports may seem on the first read, almost all reports contain something potentially of value that can be used to improve the paper. At a minimum, they will lead you to clarify the text or give you ideas. We recommend taking a day, a week, or even more to cool off before thoroughly digesting the comments, keeping in mind that there are costs to waiting: (1) You could get “scooped.” (2) Your topic may be time-sensitive and interest may wane. (3) Editors come and go, and there are strong advantages to having the same editor throughout the process. (4) Reviewers’ interest and/or availability may decline over time, lessening the chance of smooth sailing during the revision process. (5) Your paper-specific human capital may depreciate (e.g., you may forget particulars of your data and methodology and have to spend considerable time reinventing the wheel). (6) The literature marches on and papers under review need to be up-to-date. (7) For most academic careers, publications are often the single most

important benchmark of productivity and impact.

The first decision you need to make is whether to revise the paper for this journal. We believe that the answer should almost always be yes, although in certain cases the costs may outweigh the benefits (for example, you may be asked by the editor to go in a direction that you feel would strongly detract from the paper). In such cases, it would be rational not to proceed, but it is important not to make this decision in a vacuum. Make sure you fully understand the points that the reviewers are making. For example, if you are dealing with a multidisciplinary journal, the reviewers may use terms such as “structural model” that have very different meanings for economists than they do for scholars in other social sciences. Ask your advisor or colleagues for advice in both interpreting the critiques and making your decision. We urge you to keep an open mind, as suggested revisions that initially seem onerous often up being less difficult to implement than expected. You may even think of a creative Pareto-efficient strategy to deal with a particularly challenging critique.

Once you have made the decision to revise and resubmit (the modal choice), you need to hold your breath and dive in. It is always a good idea at this point to look at recent papers in the journal to get reacquainted with the writing style and format. Editors seem favorably disposed to papers that “look and smell” like one of their own. Some journals give you an explicit due date for the revision, so read the editor’s letter carefully. But, regardless, get started right away.

The first step in responding to an R&R is to devise strategies for responding to the editor’s and reviewers’ comments. The decision letter you received has several components. First, there is a letter from the editor, which may be very brief (simply instructing you to respond to the reviewers) or more detailed (with guidance as to the most important reviewer points to address). If the editor offers guidance, follow it. If not, go ahead and address the reviewers’ comments to the best of your ability. The process of preparing your response and revising your manuscript will most likely



be iterative. We recommend starting with the critiques and creating a working document that includes the editor and reviewer comments—literally cut-and-pasted from the decision letter (that way, you will not inadvertently leave anything out). The first section of the working document becomes a response to the editor and the following sections become responses to each of the reviewers. We find it useful to develop the response document as much as possible before tackling the paper, allowing us to clarify and develop our strategies for addressing the various critiques. Then we go back and forth between the two documents, editing and consolidating as appropriate.

The second step is to convince the editor that you have improved the paper in response to the critiques. Under the best of circumstances, the editor will not send the revised paper and responses back to the old referees or to new ones. This is your goal, and providing a response to the editor that is clear, informative, and to-the-point will maximize your chances of making that happen. Editors vary in how they handle R&Rs (some always send the revision back to the original reviewers and others rarely do), but, all else equal, the more complicated your response, the more likely the editor will send the paper out for re-review or even reject the paper at this stage (this unfortunate outcome seems to be happening more and more these days). Be aware that there can be multiple rounds of review, and do what you can to minimize the number of iterations. In your response to the editor, clearly and concisely summarize the major issues raised by the reviewers along with the essence of how you addressed them. That is, you should assist the editor in navigating the reviewer comments and your detailed responses to them. Do not list your points to the editor in order of the reviewer comments. Rather, lay out the key issues in descending order of importance. If a major issue was raised by more than one reviewer, it should be at or near the top of your list. Minor issues should not be addressed in your response to the editor aside from indicating that they have been addressed and are detailed in your responses to the reviewers.

Your next job is to satisfy the reviewers. Assume that the editor will send them the revised paper along with your detailed responses to all of the critiques. Doing a thorough job demonstrates that you took the reviewers' comments seriously and may put you in the good graces of the editor, the original reviewers, and any new review-

ers who may be consulted. In your responses to the reviewers, you should consolidate very minor critiques. For example, a reviewer may detail dozens of grammatical or copyediting issues. In such cases, it is expedient to note that the manuscript has been carefully edited and that the suggested formatting changes, when still applicable, have been made.

The last job is to assemble the final documents. In your responses to the editor and reviewers, your tone should be respectful and appreciative. Give the reviewers credit for helping you improve the paper (which almost always ends up being the case!). Thoughtfully and directly respond to each and every comment, even those that do not result in changes to the paper. Your responses to specific critiques should refer to relevant page numbers in the revised manuscript when appropriate. If you are dealing with a multidisciplinary journal, do not use econ-specific jargon and be sure to tie in literature from other disciplines. Finally: Copyediting counts.

Below, we list a series of R&R-related questions that are often posed, along with our best answers. We hope you find these helpful as you navigate the process, keeping in mind that responding to an R&R is an art rather than a science.

#### **How long and detailed should your responses be?**

As short as appropriate. Some responses need no elaboration. For example, a reviewer may want you to provide a more detailed definition of a variable. In that case, your response can be as simple as “Done (see page X).” However, critiques that are more nuanced may require more space. For example, methodological issues may have been raised that required you to conduct a number of supplementary analyses. In such cases, you need to explain how the additional analyses address the issues at hand, which of these you now show or refer to in the paper (and on what pages), and which you did not include in the revised paper and why.

#### **What should you do if you disagree with a comment?**

Sometimes it is simply an issue of clarification. Other times, a reviewer wants significant changes that you believe would weaken the paper. For example, he or she may suggest specific instrumental variables that are not theoretically valid or want you to change your theoretical framing. In such cases, you should explain as respectfully as possible why you think the suggestion would not

continued on page 13

## Getting Published (Moffitt) continued from page 5

other journals to submit to. For myself, I have complained only once in my entire career, and that was when an editor did not know my field at all and one referee was absolutely wrong about everything, even the facts. I politely asked the editor to send it to an additional referee, which he did, and the paper was eventually accepted. The moral is not that you should expect high rates of success of appeals, but that you should expect to complain only about once in your entire career.

If your paper is rejected, many cynics say that you should simply resubmit it immediately to a different journal, based on what I think is the mistaken view that all referee reports and editor decisions are arbitrary. This is too extreme, for while there is randomness in the process, usually the referee and editor remarks signal either substantive problems or expositional problems that need to be addressed. This is not always the case, for sometimes it is merely “your paper is not enough of a contribution, even though it is fine,” in which case you should immediately send it off elsewhere. But, generally, it is worth taking a couple of months to address what you judge to be the most important substantive and expositional problems, to the extent you can. What you need to avoid is hanging on to it for too long and revising too much in response to specific or minor editor or referee comments that may not appear in the reports at the next journal.

When you do receive a revise-and-resubmit, you need to work very, very hard on the revision. You need to respond in detail to all the referee comments, although you don't have to accept them all. Many journals today make an up-or-down decision at the first revision—either the paper looks like it is eventually going to be acceptable, or there is still a lot of doubt, in which case the process is cut off.

Let me end with a final note of my feelings about Comments, most of which are “unfriendly” (“friendly” Comments extend a previous papers' work, usually in a complimentary way, reinforcing the original conclusions). As an editor, I always really liked to see Comments come in, because I was always afraid that the referees and I had missed something wrong in a paper and, if so, I wanted to know that (not all editors feel this way; many of them do not publish Comments as a matter of policy). On the other hand, I do not think it is advisable to write many of them, because they too easily embroil the author in an extended debate with the original authors, who will often have the last word anyway if they are allowed a Reply. I especially think it is problematic for untenured academics to write Comments. So my advice would be do write Comments sparingly and to do so only when you have a very strong case to make.

---

## Honoring Ferber continued from page 1

about Marianne Ferber's contributions, both professional and personal. Francine D. Blau, Cornell University, presented “The Transmission of Women's Fertility, Human Capital and Work Orientation Across Immigrant Generations” (co-authored with Lawrence M. Kahn, Cornell University, Albert Yung-Hsu Liu, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., Kerry L. Papps, University of Oxford). Her paper focuses on the transmission of gender roles (female labor supply & fertility) from immigrants to children. Data on 2nd generation children are from the 1995–2006 CPS and data on their likely parents are from the 1970–2000 Censuses. Among the findings, immigrant fertility and labor supply positively affects second generation fertility and labor supply. Nonetheless, she and her co-authors find evidence of considerable assimilation over generations.

Robert A. Pollak, Washington University, presented “Specialization and the Division of Labor in Families.” He began by describing the 1977 work by Ferber and Birnbaum as a “perceptive critique of many aspects of the New Home Economics and a paper that deserved more attention than it has received.” His paper, which offers a further critique, shows that under certain conditions (decreasing returns to

scale, which might occur because individuals become less productive when they become tired or bored), efficiency may require that both spouses spend time in the home and the market.

Robin L. Bartlett, Denison University, presented “Queering Economics.” In her paper she explains how the McIntosh Model (1983), originally applied to integrating women into the curriculum, can be applied to incorporating sexual minorities in the content of economics.

Finally, Julie A. Nelson, University of Massachusetts Boston, presented “Gender and the Economics of Care.” Her presentation centered on why many think so differently about care work (e.g. motivated by love) versus paid work (e.g. motivated by money). She challenges this “dualistic” thinking and poses the question, why not love AND money? Discussants, Carole A. Green, University of South Florida, and Lisa Saunders, University of Massachusetts Amherst, interspersed thoughtful commentary on the papers with observations about Marianne's career and influence. At the conclusion, Marianne offered her own insights about the various presentations.

## Painless Publishing continued from page 6

thors could not be bothered with spell-check, how careless might they have been in other aspects? The manuscript is your first impression with the editor, and you want to make it as good of one as possible. Unfortunately, I think the desire to submit a paper that anticipates as many potential referee suggestions as possible has backfired recently: papers have become incredibly long. The *JHR* has recently had to enact and enforce a strict limit of 45 pages (including tables, figures, references, etc.). I find that a paper that is relatively short and to the point is a pleasure to read. Typically, writing a streamlined paper requires more thought about what the contribution of the paper is, what its strengths (and weaknesses) are, and what the reader should take from the paper than does writing a bloated paper. Thus, a more streamlined paper is typically a stronger paper. The key to streamlining is not just to cut for cutting's sake—the paper still needs to be clear and replicable—but to be concise in one's explanations and to be judicious about how additional results are reported. It is a rare case that the ninth or tenth table is really necessary for making the paper's point. A shorter, well-thought-out paper is likely to be better received (especially by the referees) than one that seems like a forced march through every idea that popped into the author's head while working on the project.

Okay, so you have crafted a thoughtful, well-written paper, submitted it to an appropriate journal, followed its progress on-line, and have received your referee reports. Now what? Whether you received a rejection or a revise and resubmit, your first task is to carefully read over the referees' comments. If the editorial decision was a rejection, consider if the comments provide helpful guidance in crafting an improved paper. If so, make those changes and send it off to a new journal, starting the process anew. If you received a revise and resubmit, you will have to be less choosy about incorporating the referees' suggestions in your revised manuscript. In general, you want your revision to be as responsive as possible to the referees' comments, and then you will write up a summary letter indicating how the suggestions were incorporated. Occasionally you will find seemingly conflicting advice from referees. If the editor has not indicated which referee to take more seriously, go ahead and take the advice you think will make your revision the best. Just be sure that your resubmission letter makes clear that you agreed with the advice of referee #2, and thus did such and such, even though it conflicted with the advice of referee # 1. At other times, you may get comments that seem to indicate the referee did not read (or understand) your paper, because the suggestion has already been incorporated (or it is impossible to do so). Rather than just cursing the referee, first take a closer look at the sec-

tion of the paper that you thought made clear you had already done it (or could not possibly do it). Perhaps it is not as clear as you thought, so try rewriting the section to make it clearer. Your cover letter can acknowledge that your paper had already incorporated that suggestion, but you have clarified that point. Similarly, the letter can explain why it is impossible to incorporate the suggestion or that the paper has clarified that point.

Finally, at times you may find yourself vehemently disagreeing with a referee. If you have really thought carefully through the issue and the editor has provided no guidance as to the relative importance of the referees' suggestions, a reasonable approach may be to try and convince the editor of the validity of your viewpoint. Try not to be combative, but calmly present your argument against incorporating the suggestion. For empirical suggestions, you may have the best luck with an approach that presents the requested results to the editor/referees but persuasively argues for why they add little to the bottom-line message of the paper. You can also offer to add a footnote mentioning the new result and offering to make details available upon request. Overall, the goal of your resubmission letter should be to convince the editor that your revised paper is responsive to the comments you received, greatly improved, and ready for acceptance. Such a paper may well avoid another round with the referees. Even if it does go back to the referees, your goal is the same—convince them that their comments were appreciated and resulted in this now-publishable paper.

### **CeMENT Regional** **MENTORING EVENT** **November 19–21!**

CSWEP has received funding from the American Economic Association to continue its successful series of mentoring workshops to help junior economists overcome the tenure hurdle, with a special focus on addressing the unique challenges that women face at the beginning of their careers. There will be a regional Mentoring event in conjunction with the Southern Economics Association meetings November 19–21, 2011 in Washington, D.C., and a national event in 2012.

**Applications will be accepted until June 10.**  
Applications may be input at: <http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/WEB22BT2QCUPTL>

## Founding Editor continued from page 7

as referees! For a majority it is not too much fun but they do it because it is part of good citizenship in the economics profession. I note marked differences between Europeans and North Americans in this regard: Europeans tend to be much slower in writing their reports. A relatively high fraction of first-time European referees wait so long with their reports that I have to tell them that they are no longer needed. Sometimes editors compare notes about people they avoid appointing as referees. You don't want to be on editors' black lists! One day it will be your paper they will handle.

**On good referees from the authors' viewpoint.** Editors often pick referees from manuscripts' references. Authors are advised to be accurate and fair in their references to previous literature. The author you cite may be your referee. For many reasons, including increasing the probability that the referee will be sympathetic to your work, it is a good idea to create and maintain contact with scholars in your field who stem from the same intellectual family tree. For instance, learn more about the work of other students who studied with the same professor you did but at different times. If one of these ends up being your referee, chances are he will be sympathetic to your work. On the same theme, the journal's editor may be more sympathetic to your work if you cite articles previously published in the same journal. Even if the editor does not give preferences to articles with such citations, there may be a better match between you and the referee if she has already published in the same journal.

**Special issues are win/win propositions.** Articles in special issues are more likely to be read. It is easier for authors to get an article published if submitted for a special issue. From my perspective, advantages of appointing special issue editors include the facts that they are specialists in a given area, increase the number of good submissions and tend to find excellent referees. Special issues seem to save transaction costs in a number of places along the academic production chain.

### More advice to authors

- **We prefer short submissions.** If your paper is bulky, especially after revisions you made to please referees, consider placing big chunks into appendices. These can eventually appear as part of a companion working paper or be made available to readers upon request. This is especially appropriate for robustness checks.
- **I prefer papers that combine theory and empirical work.** Household economics tends to be very focused on empirical research. I see the need for more theory, especially when it leads to testable predictions.
- **If you get a Revise and Resubmit,** make sure to include a cover letter to each referee and to the editor(s) in which

you specify the changes you made to the paper in response to their letters. It is better to address all issues raised by referees, but not absolutely essential. The more well-known you are, the more you can afford to refuse to do some revisions. In the journal's early years, a well-known scholar refused to make any changes recommended by the referees. He got away with it! I knew that if I didn't accept the paper, it would easily have been accepted elsewhere. But unless you can play the name recognition card you are better off following referee suggestions judiciously. If in doubt about the need to perform a particular change, don't hesitate to email the editor and ask.

- **If you get a rejection,** don't fight with editors. Move on.
- **Writing is very important.** You may need to hire an editor, especially if English is not your first language. I do that. For example, a paid editor went through the piece you just read!

### Books to Note!

Rachel Connolly, author, ***Professor Mommy: How to Find Success in the Work/Family Balancing Act of the Academy***, will be published by Rowman and Littlefield and should be out by mid-July.

Committee on Gender Differences in the Careers of Science, Engineering, and Mathematics Faculty; Committee on Women in Science, Engineering and Medicine; Committee on National Statistics; National Research Council: ***Gender Differences at Critical Transitions in the Careers of Science, Engineering, and Mathematics Faculty***. ISBN: 978-0-309-11463-9. (2010).

Panel to Advance a Research Program on the Design of National Health Accounts; National Research Council: ***Accounting for Health and Health Care: Approaches to Measuring the Sources and Costs of Their Improvement***. ISBN: 978-0-309-15769-0. (2010).

Kaye Husbands Fealing, Julia I. Lane, John H. Marburger III and Stephanie S. Shipp, eds.: ***The Science of Science Policy: A Handbook***. Stanford University Press (2011)

## ABCs of R&Rs continued from page 9

strengthen your paper. At the same time, be as positive as possible about the suggestion. In this situation, you can give the editor a more direct and detailed argument about why you “respectfully disagree” with a particular point (e.g., you are being told to use an estimation technique that you believe is out-of-date). You do not need to change your paper in response to every single comment, but you need to address each one head on.

### **What should you do when reviewers want you to provide more description or analysis but the editor wants you to shorten the paper?**

One strategy is to provide supplementary tables or descriptive appendices for the reviewers (these can be mentioned briefly in the text but not shown, perhaps indicating that they are available upon request). Another is to include the materials as appendices to the paper itself and leave it to the editor to decide whether to keep those extra materials in the paper. Some journals allow supplementary materials to be posted in an online version.

### **What should you do when reviewers disagree with one another and the editor doesn't provide guidance?**

Try to make all of the reviewers happy whenever possible. If you must take sides, decide which you agree with and craft responses to each reviewer that are consistent with that strategy. To the reviewer whose advice you didn't follow, carefully explain why (e.g., the other reviewer gave a conflicting comment; you gave it a lot of thought and found merit to both sides, but in the end decided to follow the other reviewer because...). If possible, let that reviewer win on another point.

### **What should you do if a reviewer is asking you to do something that has a great deal of merit in theory, but is impossible to implement (e.g., find perfect instrumental variables)?**

In both your response and the paper, acknowledge that what is suggested is the ideal and that not being able to implement it is a limitation of your study. At the same time, be certain to play up your study's contributions. All papers have limitations, but each should make a clear and significant contribution to the literature despite them.

### **What should you do when reviewers want you to incorporate specific papers in your literature review?**

Do so if at all relevant. Sometimes such suggestions are helpful, other times not. Rarely does weaving in a few citations detract from your paper. If a reviewer gives you a long list of papers to cite, select the few that are most relevant.

### **What should you do if you discover a coding or transcription error in the original version that, if unexplained, would make it difficult to reconcile the results in the original and revised versions?**

Correct the mistake and be sure to candidly address the issue (and its implications) in your response to the editors and reviewers. Do not try to hide it!

### **Should you contact the editor for clarification or guidance during the process?**

Editors generally do not like complications, and by initiating extra correspondence you are making yourself complicated. However, there are exceptions (in terms of situations or editors), so be sure to get good advice.

### **What should you do if your revision is rejected?**

First, know that this happens to everyone at some point and can even happen when you think you have done a stellar job. The process can be idiosyncratic and subject to forces not under your control (such as changes in editorship). You may consider contacting the editor and asking him or her to reconsider the paper, but we do not recommend that strategy as we have never seen it lead to a successful outcome. We recommend knowing in advance what your backup journal will be and moving on. Over time you will develop a thicker skin, and it is important to keep your papers in circulation.

## Call for Nominations

### **2011 Carolyn Shaw Bell Award**

The Carolyn Shaw Bell Award was created in January 1998 as part of the 25th Anniversary celebration of the founding of CSWEP. Carolyn Shaw Bell, the Katharine Coman Chair Professor Emerita of Wellesley College, was the first Chair of CSWEP. (To read a short biography of Carolyn Shaw Bell, see our Winter 2005 CSWEP Newsletter.) The Carolyn Shaw Bell Award (“Bell Award”) is given annually to an individual who has furthered the status of women in the economics profession, through example, achievements, increasing our understanding of how women can advance in the economics profession, or mentoring others. All nominations should include a nomination letter, updated CV and two or more supporting letters, preferably at least one from a mentee.

Inquiries, nominations and donations may be sent to:

Barbara Fraumeni, CSWEP Chair  
Muskie School of Public Service  
University of Southern Maine  
P.O. Box 9300  
Wishcamper Center  
Portland, ME 04104-9300  
cswep@usm.maine.edu

**Closing date for nominations for the 2011 award is September 15, 2011.**

## Annual and Regional Meetings

### CSWEP Sponsored Sessions at the Western Economic Association 86th Annual Conference

*June 29–July 3, 2011*

*San Diego Marriott Hotel & Marina*

Visit the WEA at their website: <http://www.weai.org/index.html>

#### Paper Session: Education

**Chair:** Cory Koedel (University of Missouri)

**Discussants:** Jennifer Imazeki (San Diego State University) and Choon Wang (World Bank & Monash University)

*Closing the Gap*, Celeste Carruthers (University of Tennessee) and Marianne H. Wanamaker (University of Tennessee)

*How Much Does Length of School Year Matter? Evidence from Hurricane Ike*, Sally Kwak (University of Hawaii)

*Teacher Pension Systems and the Labor Market for School Principals*, Jason Grissom (University of Missouri), Cory Koedel (University of Missouri), Shawn Ni (University of Missouri) and Michael Podgursky (University of Missouri)

*School Principals and School Performance*, Damon Clark (University of Florida), Paco Martorell (RAND) and Jonah Rockoff (Columbia University)

## Calls for Papers and Abstracts

### Eastern Economic Association Meeting Call for Papers

*March 9–11, 2012,*

*Boston Park Plaza, Boston, MA*

CSWEP will sponsor a number of sessions at the annual meeting of the Eastern Economic Association. *Two sessions are available* for persons submitting an entire session (3 or 4 papers) or a complete panel on a specific topic in any area in economics. The organizer should prepare a proposal for a panel (including chair and participants) or session (including chair, abstracts, and discussants) and submit by e-mail before **September 15, 2011**.

One or two additional sessions will be organized by the Eastern Representative. Abstracts for papers in the topic areas of **gender, health economics, labor economics, and economic demography** are particularly solicited, but abstracts in other areas will be accepted by e-mail by **September 15, 2011**. Abstracts should be approximately one page in length and include paper title, names of authors, affiliation and rank, and e-mail contact information as well as mailing address.

All information should be e-mailed to:

Dr. Susan L. Averett, CSWEP Eastern Representative  
Dana Professor of Economics  
Lafayette College  
Easton, PA 18042  
Email: [Averetts@lafayette.edu](mailto:Averetts@lafayette.edu)  
Phone: 610-330-5307  
Fax: 610-330-5715

### Midwest Economic Association Meeting Call for Papers

*March 29–April 1, 2012,*

*Hotel Orrington, Chicago, IL*

CSWEP will sponsor *up to two paper sessions and one panel session* at the 2012 Midwest Economics Association meeting to be held in Chicago, IL, March 29–April 1, 2012, at the Hotel Orrington (on Chicago's North Shore, across from Northwestern University). The deadline for submission of abstracts or session proposals is **October 2, 2012**.

One or two sessions are available for persons submitting an entire session (3 or 4 papers) or a complete panel on a **specific topic in any area of economics**. The organizer should prepare a proposal for a panel (including chair and participants) or session (including chair, abstracts and discussants) and submit by email by October 2, 2012.

One or two additional sessions will be organized by the Midwest Representative. Abstracts for papers in any area of economics will be accepted by email until October 2, 2012.

Please email complete session proposals, panel discussion proposals, or abstracts of 1–2 pages (including names of authors with affiliations, addresses and paper title) by October 2, 2012 to:

Kaye Husbands Fealing  
CSWEP Midwest Representative  
E-mail: [kfealing@nas.edu](mailto:kfealing@nas.edu)

## Session Summaries

### CSWEP Sponsored Sessions at the 2011 AEA Annual Meeting

Sessions Summaries from the 2011 AEA Annual Meeting January 7–9, 2011 are posted on the "Session Summaries" page of the CSWEP website at: [CSWEP.org](http://CSWEP.org)

### CSWEP Sponsored Sessions at the Eastern Economic Association Meeting

2011 CSWEP Sponsored Sessions at the Eastern Economic Association Meeting (EEA), February 25–26, 2011, Sheraton Hotel, New York City are posted on the "Session Summaries" page of the CSWEP website at: [CSWEP.org](http://CSWEP.org)

## BRAG BOX

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

**Rachel Connolly** (Bowdoin College Bion R. Cram Professor of Economics, Chair of Economics Department) and **Kristen Ghodsee** (Bowdoin College John S. Osterweis Associate Professor in Gender Women's Studies Department) are the authors of a new book published by Rowman and Littlefield and coming out in July: *Professor Mommy: How to Find Success in the Work/Family Balancing Act of the Academy*.

**Christine Varney**, assistant attorney general at the US Department of Justice's antitrust division today announced that Yale economics professor Fiona Scott Morton will be the new deputy AAG for economics. She is the first female economics deputy in US history.

**Carmen M. Reinhart** and **Ken S. Rogoff** won the Paul Samuelson Award for Outstanding Scholarly Writing on Lifelong Financial Security from TIAA-CREF with *This Time is Different—Eight Centuries of Financial Folly* (Princeton University Press, 2009).

Already a CSWEP Associate? Consider joining the American Economic Association. CSWEP is a subcommittee of the AEA, which subsidizes many of our activities. In addition to all the perks associated with AEA membership, part of your dues will help to support CSWEP-sponsored programs, like the mentoring program. To join, go to <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/AEA>.

## CeMENT

# NATIONAL MENTORING EVENT

After the AEA/ASSA meetings in Chicago January 2012 the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession will be holding a National workshop aimed at mentoring junior faculty at institutions where tenure is primarily based on research output. Application and registration material will be available at <http://www.cswep.org/mentoring/register.htm> sometime in August.

Please share this announcement with junior faculty who you think might be interested in or benefit from these workshops.

## HAWORTH MENTORING FUNDS AVAILABLE

The **Joan Haworth Mentoring Fund** is for use by institutions and senior women to provide mentoring support in the form of supplemental travel expenses. The fund was provided by Joan Haworth, a long time Board member and membership chair, as well as the Chair of CSWEP for 2001 and 2002.

The objective of this fund is to encourage senior mentoring women and institutions to incorporate mentoring of junior professionals into their programs. It is designed to provide travel funds to permit mentors to either extend a visit to an institution for the purpose of mentoring or to visit an institution for that purpose alone.

Applications for funds may be submitted by the institution, junior women or the mentor herself. Guidelines for the expenses covered are the same as the AEA Guidelines for travel expenses.

The funds are administered through the AEA and granted by application to a sub-committee of the CSWEP Board.

All successful applicants will be required to submit a short description of their mentoring activities to CSWEP. These descriptions may include a video or audio tape of a presentation, the slides used in the presentation, any materials distributed or created during the mentoring activity and an assessment of the value of the activity and its' benefit to the professional development of the women mentored.

Download an application for support by the Joan Haworth Mentoring Fund at <http://www.aeaweb.org/committees/cswep/mentoring/fund.php>

Questions regarding this program should be directed to [cswep@usm.maine.edu](mailto:cswep@usm.maine.edu)



American Economic Association  
CSWEP  
c/o Barbara Fraumeni  
770 Middle Road  
Dresden, ME 04342

NONPROFIT ORG  
US POSTAGE  
PAID  
PORTLAND, ME  
PERMIT #6

## Upcoming Regional Meetings:

### Western Economic Association

<http://www.weainternational.org/>  
**2011 Annual Meeting June 29–July 3, 2011**  
San Diego, CA: San Diego Marriott Hotel & Marina

### Southern Economic Association

<http://www.southerneconomic.org/>  
**2011 Annual Meeting November 19–21, 2011**  
Washington, DC: Washington Marriott Wardman Park

### Eastern Economic Association

<http://www.ramapo.edu/eea/conference.html>  
**2012 Annual Meeting March 9–11, 2012**  
Boston, MA: Boston Park Plaza

### Midwest Economic Association

<http://web.grinell.edu/mea>  
**2012 Annual Meeting March 29–April 1, 2012**  
Chicago, IL: Hotel Orrington

## CSWEP Activities

As a standing Committee of the American Economic Association since 1971, CSWEP undertakes activities to monitor and improve the position of women in the economics profession through the Annual CSWEP Questionnaire (results of which are reported in the CSWEP Annual Report), internships with the Summer Fellows, mentoring opportunities through CeMENT and the Joan Haworth Mentoring Fund, recognition of women in the field with the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award and Elaine Bennett Research Prize, support of regional and annual meetings, organizing paper sessions and networking opportunities.

## NEWSLETTER STAFF

Barbara M. Fraumeni, Editor  
Susan Averett, Co-Editor  
Deb Arbiq, Assistant Editor

Madeline Zavodny, Oversight Editor  
Leda Black, Graphic Designer