CSWEP NEWS

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

2019 ISSUE II

IN THIS ISSUE

Interview with AEA Ombudsperson Leto Copeley

Leto Copeley

Sharon Oster

Introduction

Recently, the American Economic Association announced the appointment of an ombudsperson to address issues of harassment and discrimination in the economics profession. Any AEA member who believes they have suffered harassment or discrimination or any person who believes they have suffered harassment or discrimination by an AEA member or in the context of an AEA-sponsored activity, as well as anyone who has witnessed such conduct, is encouraged to contact the ombudsperson.

As AEA President Ben Bernanke wrote in his letter to AEA members, "Our hope is that the ombudsperson will be a resource for addressing issues of harassment and discrimination throughout the profession." Per the original AEA communication, the ombudsperson is prepared to respond to complaints or concerns about harassment or discrimination in three ways:

1. Although she does not serve as legal counsel to individuals reporting harassment or discrimination, she stands ready to advise on next steps (including seeking formal counsel), to provide the complainant (AEA member or person questioning the conduct of an AEA member) with relevant information or materials, or to make referrals to agencies or organizations as appropriate for personal assistance or legal consultation.
2. For allegations of harassment or discrimination in the context of AEA-sponsored activities or involving AEA officers or employees, the ombudsperson may at her discretion conduct an investigation and relay the findings to the AEA Executive Committee, which will then decide whether to take any further action. Investigations into allegations regarding persons who are neither employees nor officers of the AEA will be undertaken only with the permission of the complainant(s).
3. With (and only with) the permission of the complainant, the ombudsperson will create a permanent and confidential record of any communication that includes an allegation of harassment by or of an AEA member or in the context of an AEA-sponsored activity. The reason for the recordkeeping is both for legal purposes and to help identify repeat offenders or patterns of abuse; however, records will not be shared with anyone without reconfirmation of permission from the original caller.

continues on page 12

Contributors

Shahina Amin
Lawrence Jepson Professor of International Economics, University of Northern Iowa

Evan Buntrock
Senior Economist, Amazon.com

Misty L. Heggeness
Principal Economist/ Senior Advisor for Evaluations and Experiments, U.S. Census Bureau

Gowun Park
Assistant Professor of Economics, Simpson College

Judith A. Chevalier, Chair
William S. Beinecke Professor of Economics and Finance
School of Management, Yale University

Kasey Buckles
Brian and Jeannelle Brady Associate Professor of Economics, University of Notre Dame

Leto Copeley
Partner, Copeley, Johnson, & Groninger, PLLC, and Ombudsperson, American Economic Association

Sharon M. Oster
Professor Emerita of Management and Entrepreneurship, Yale University

CSWEP News Staff

Judith Chevalier, Editor

Kate Silz-Carson, Oversight Editor

Shahina Amin, Co-Editor

Leda Black, Graphic Designer

From the Chair

Judith A. Chevalier

There are big changes afoot in the economics profession and I am proud of the role that CSWEP is playing in contributing to them. The AEA recently released the preliminary report of the AEA Climate Survey and we expect the full report to be released soon. I recommend that report to all *Newsletter* readers. If you follow @AEACSWEP on Twitter, you will have seen that we tweeted out some visualizations of the data from the preliminary report. The Climate Survey shows what many of us suspected. Marginalized groups—women, minorities, disabled economists, and LGBTQ economists—have vastly different experiences of the profession than do others.

One set of statistics from Appendix Table 10 of the preliminary climate report resonates with me particularly. It illustrates differences in the perceptions of different groups about professional climate. For example, the share of male economists who agree with the statement "women are respected within the field" is 52%. For women economists, 16% agree. For the statement "people who are not white are respected in the field," 49% of whites agree vs. 27% of non-whites. For "people with a disability are respected in the field," 60% of those without a disability agree vs. 39% of those with one. Similarly, for "people who are not heterosexual are respected in the field," 59% of heterosexuals agree vs. 25% of people with other sexual orientations. Clearly, individuals that are not in marginalized groups have difficulty perceiving the challenges faced by their colleagues who are members of marginalized groups. We need to do better.

The AEA is taking some steps. The AEA adopted a new code of conduct and a process for vetting officers, journal editors, and prize winners. Amanda Bayer is chairing a committee on disseminating best practices in professional conduct. Our board member Sebnem Kalemli-Ozcan is serving on this committee. Sam Allgood is chairing a committee (on which board member Ann Owen and I serve) that is working on improve the profession's outreach to diverse high school students and undergraduates. The AEA has created a formal permanent committee on the status of LGBTQ economists, and has also appointed an ombudsperson to receive and investigate reports of harassment. These are important steps, and I am pleased to see the AEA taking these steps. However, CSWEP will continue to advocate for more action to be taken on improving the representation and status of women in the profession. I am also looking forward to ramping up our cooperation with CSMGEP (the Committee on the Status of Minority Groups in the Economics Profession) and the newly-formed AEA Committee on the Status of LGBTQ+ individuals.

We will try to report on the AEA's activities in the Newsletter. As a first step, in this issue, we feature an interview with the AEA's new ombudsperson Leto Copeley. CSWEP has been at the forefront of raising awareness of harassment in the profession; we devoted a recent Newsletter to this topic. The role of the ombudsperson in crucial if the AEA is to play a role in addressing harassment in the profession. The purpose of this interview is to help Newsletter readers better get to know Ms. Copeley and understand the work that she is doing.

In this *News*, our Focus section returns to a topic of perennial interest to economists—the economics job market. These articles, commissioned by Board member and co-editor Shahina Amin address aspects of the job market that have received less attention: non-academic job search, the employer-side of hiring, interviewing for an industry job, and online interviews. These excellent articles represent part of CSWEP's continuing effort to demystify access points into the profession and level the

continues on page 15

FOCUS
Advice for Job Seekers

Shahina Amin

Over the years, CSWEP News has devoted many issues to advising job seekers on how to prepare for the PhD economists' job search process. These include *Managing a Job Search as a Couple* (edited by Shelly Lundberg) in 2016, *Navigating the Job Market 2.0* (edited by Cecilia Conrad) in 2014, *The International Job Market for Economists* (edited by Kevin Lang) in 2012, *Navigating the Job Market as Dual Career Economists* (edited by Julie Hotchkiss) in 2009, and *Navigating the Job Market* (edited by Anna Paulson) in 2007. Some of the topics that are included in the issues on navigating the job market include advising new PhDs, the importance of cover letters, finding the right match, interviewing at liberal arts colleges, economics careers in litigation, and what to do after you have a job offer.

Besides devoting space over the years in the CSWEP News, CSWEP has devoted considerable effort at national and regional conferences to address the job search process and mentoring economists. There are certain aspects of the market that have not changed much over the years such as the importance of the cover letter and CV, and different approaches in applying to R1 universities and liberal arts colleges. There are other aspects that have changed. Technological advances have changed job search, interviews, and how we present ourselves online. Tenure track academic jobs are a smaller share of total job opportunities and one must not ignore the opportunities available outside of academia, particularly, industry jobs. Given the intensity and competitiveness of the market, job seekers need to be prepared.

In this issue, four economists focus on four specific aspects of the job market that have received less attention: non-academic job search, the employer-side of hiring, interviewing for an industry job, and online interviews. Misty Heggeness of the U.S. Census Bureau calls herself "non-traditional." She shares her vast experience in the field of non-academic research. She effectively describes the two types of research jobs that are available outside of academia: "The One-of-Ones" (when you are the sole economist in the institution) and "the One-of-Many" (you are one of many economists in the institution). She elaborates on the pros and cons of both types of jobs. Misty also explains how the job search process for a government job differs from an academic job search process. Kasey Buckles of the University of Notre Dame shares her experience of hiring about 25 assistant professors over her tenure at her university. In her step-by-step guide, she offers advice about what to do first, how to survive the interviews and the importance of sending early signals to the potential employer as to why you would be a good fit. You may have heard some of these things before but reiteration of the points emphasize how important these are in today's job market. What has not been discussed much in our profession is how to be successful in the job search process in industry. Evan Buntrock of Amazon explains how the interview process is different for industry jobs. Over his four years at Amazon, Evan has conducted behavioral interviews with over 200 economist applicants. His experience is that economists perform poorly in behavioral interviews because in graduate school we mostly teach and conduct research. We might be good at presenting our job market paper, but we are likely to be uncomfortable sharing a life experience in response to a behavioral question (such as, how do you deal with negative feedback?). Evan's essay provides insight into how to approach these types of interviews. In the face of tight budgets and technological advances, online interviews (via Skype or Zoom) are becoming common as a first screening of candidates. Gowun Park of Simpson College shares her experience about how to be successful in this kind of interview. She also provides advice on how to accomplish the important task of cleaning up social media posts.

We might be good at presenting our job market paper, but we are likely to be uncomfortable sharing a life experience in response to a behavioral question . . .

These essays provide fresh ideas on how to be a better candidate in situations and from perspectives that have received less attention. In a field like economics it is better to learn your options and what kind of job will best fit your life style. It is crucial that newly-minted PhD candidates take the time to understand these opportunities and the search process so as to land the best possible match. ■

Who Said Being a PhD Job Market Candidate Would Be Easy? Finding that Perfect-for-You Job

Misty L. Heggeness[1]

You have done it. You are about to accomplish a huge milestone by going on the market this year. Congrats on getting this far! Now what? Are you considering a research economist gig in federal, state, or local government? In this article, I share my own experiences and provide some essential insights into maneuvering that job market. While the focus is on research policy jobs, the advice applies more broadly to the entire job market process.

Two Types of Research Jobs

There are two kinds of PhD research jobs in the non-academic job market, and while all jobs are diverse and unique, I divide them broadly into two major categories: one-of-one jobs and one-of-many jobs.

The One-of-Ones

In the one-of-one jobs, you are the star. You have been hired to fulfill some need the agency or office has for the skill set of a trained PhD economist. I consider these the more risky jobs. While the rewards can be amazing (everyone needs you and you will, in fact, be a star and novelty), the risks are also high. Bosses and colleagues will lead you down alternative (non-research) work paths, and you will continually have to explain your competitive advantage and the best way to put your skills to work for the agency.

I have had a handful of these jobs. Some allowed me to reap huge benefits as "the economist" in the room. For example, I did a stint in the National Institutes of Health where I was one-of-one and was able to build from scratch an amazing economic analysis team, start innovative research projects relevant for the agency and of interest to me, and enhance my professional network in exciting ways. You will find that in a one-of-one position, bolstering your network and relying on outside colleagues is a priority requirement.

I have also been in positions where one-of-one resulted in managers expecting me to conform to the work being done by other non-researchers in the office—primarily grants management and other administrative tasks. One of the major risks in a one-of-one position is that the people around you don't get you and don't know how to use your skill set to the advantage of the office.

Here is where these positions are more risky. You may have to constantly educate those around you about who you are and what you bring to the table because the environment is inherently interdisciplinary. If you do have a one-of-one job that goes south, use your network (which you should have been building anyway—see above) to help you either figure out a path for effectively explaining your research skills and added value (especially if you love the mission of the job) or help you find another job that is a better fit.

Picking your first job is a big deal but don't put too much stress on yourself. A job that is a perfect fit for you today evolves (as do you) and may not be the perfect fit for you tomorrow. Be flexible. Be in the moment. Go for the job that you are the most passionate about now. If it doesn't work out, use your self-efficacy in the future to find a different job that is a better fit for you in that (future) moment. You are only human after all.

The One-of-Manys

Now, let's talk about those one-of-many jobs. I have had those too, and they can be amazingly awesome. You are surrounded by other like-minded colleagues and, generally, have a boss who was trained like you and gets, without needing any discussion, who you are supposed to be professionally. You have easy access to smart, intelligent collaborators and together you will make each other much more efficient and productive. Your organization will see economies-of-scale in returns just by creating a team environment that incubates and encourages innovation in your area of expertise.

Unlike the academic market, where your expertise within your department is usually one-of-one and competition sometimes discourages interaction, here there are tons of incentives to collaborate. You are surrounded by others who share your research interests and want to talk, interact, and hash out ideas. If you are a social butterfly, the one-of-many non-academic job is for you!

Some caveats. The one-of-many job means that—stating the obvious—there are more of you than just you. Making yourself stand out can be a challenge and advancement can be slower (sometimes stagnant). It will require you to think more deeply about who you are professionally, who you want to be, and your actions towards getting you there will need to be more intentional. You can (and should) collaborate with amazing internal and external researchers. But, finding those external researchers can sometimes take more effort or be a more intimidating process because, most likely, you will have to approach them and articulate why they would be wise to partner up with you.

But, I believe in you! And, if you end up in one of these positions, the best way to be successful and advance is to stay true to who you are and identify where your true passion lies—follow that path and, in most cases, you can't go wrong. People will see your passion and be drawn to it.

1. The opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and not the U.S. Census Bureau.

Other Considerations

There are pros and cons to everything. A non-academic job does not have the stress of tenure requirements and pressures of publishing in peer-reviewed journals. The non-academic job also generally comes with the flexibility of working a 40-hour workweek and having your evening and weekends to yourself. However, you are expected to be in your office and available during business hours (not true in academia), and you can experience stress in terms of forced timelines due to policy and programmatic constraints. I have had projects where I needed to work evenings and weekends to meet deadlines. There is also the culture shock in some agencies of having to clock in and clock out and documenting your productivity by the hour.

Government employment is evolving. To be sure, recent years have seen an increase in longer government shutdowns due to budgetary issues, hiring and pay increase freezes, and the bureaucratic process for starting up new projects and aligning budgets is increasingly complex. Morale has been declining. Nevertheless, there is still space to do amazing work, inform relevant policy discussions, and make a difference.

Tips for Maneuvering Government Job Applications

Number One: Know your audience.

Applying for non-academic jobs can be exhausting! In the academic market, you do you. You are an expert in your field. People want to hear about you and your amazingness and how your unique amazingness will shine as you move forward in your career developing the amazing being you were always meant to be. They will not direct your research or give you a list of their priorities. It is all about you!

Now, turn to the non-academic setting. All of a sudden, it's not *entirely* all about you. The real world can hit you smack in the face. Don't get me wrong, in the non-academic setting, we still care about your amazingness, and we still want you to shine. The difference is that your non-research time will be spent on production and policy activities instead of teaching—and, as such, we need to know that our production and policy work is going to be a good fit for you.

Generally, our production and policy activities are not as flexible as identifying the type of class you would like to teach. We have mandates and requirements that drive the work. So, when you interview for non-academic jobs, the best way to have a successful interview is to show interest in the work of that agency and ask questions about who they are and why they exist. At the end of the day, just as they want to make sure you will be a good fit for them, you also need to make sure they will be a good fit for you!

Number Two: Do not, and I repeat, do not underestimate yourself.

When you fill out online applications for a non-academic job, know your audience (see *Number One*)! The first line of review will be a human resources analyst responsible for ensuring a diverse pool of candidates for positions running the gamut from administrative staff to executive officers. When they ask you if you are an expert in [*insert your field*] and you think, "Well, no, the expert is my advisor." STOP. For that human resource analyst, YOU ARE AN EXPERT. The fact that you spent years of your life dedicated to an excruciating process that left you feeling raw inside and wondering about your core existence gives you enough credentials to BE AN EXPERT in your field. We cannot interview you unless you convince the first line of defense, our HR departments (who do not have the bandwidth to deeply understand our PhD fields), that you are legit.

So, my advice to all job market candidates is this: When you sit down in front of that computer screen to fill out any job application, bring your fullest, most self-confident self to the table. Do not be shy; be the confident self you have always aspired to be and respond to the self-assessment questions in a way that earnestly reflects the value of experiences accumulated on your CV.

Number Three: Be authentic.

This is a general rule for life but it is particularly important when you are on the job market. You will interview for positions with potential employers in amazing organizations, but the position may not be a good fit for you. That is okay. You might also interview with organizations that are not in the top ten or are not those fantastic tenure-track academic jobs everyone tells you that you must get in order to validate your existence, and you might be pleasantly surprised at how exciting the work sounds or how lovely and amazing your interviewers and potential colleagues are. Follow your gut! In the end, this is your one life to live and only you can validate what makes you happy.

At this moment, I feel the need to share a personal story. I am almost a decade out from receiving my PhD from a *gasp* *Applied* Econ program. You can consider me non-traditional: undergrad in Spanish and Family Social Science and Master in Public Policy and Social Work. I took evening courses in calculus and linear algebra to get into my PhD program. Some could say I came to the game (identifying my passion for economics) late. I grew up in a single-parent household in Fargo, ND, with a working-class mother who proudly spent her entire career in the federal government. Neither of my parents have 4-year college degrees. And, while my grandfather taught chemistry at North Dakota State University, no one in my family had a PhD. My high school guidance counselor discouraged me from moving to the *big city* of Minneapolis to study at such a huge university where I was sure to get lost in the masses. Sometimes, I look back and am amazed I made it this far and found my way into such a fascinating, spectacular science that I love to the core of my existence.

Fast forward to today. I am no *influencer*, but in December 2018, I tweeted this:

continues on page 13

Advice for Job Seekers: Insights from an R1 University

Kasey Buckles

When I joined the Department of Economics at the University of Notre Dame in 2005, fresh out of graduate school, there were only ten members in the department. There are now over forty of us. As part of this rapid growth, I have helped my department recruit on the junior market every year, including serving three years as the chair of the recruiting committee. I estimate that I have been involved in hiring about twenty-five assistant professors, and at some point I will sit down and calculate the number of packets reviewed, candidates interviewed, recruiting dinners eaten, job talks attended, and offers negotiated as part of this effort. Today, I will try to put that work to good use by sharing some of what I have learned in my years on the demand side of the junior market, with a focus on two things that are particularly important at a research university.

Have a plan for what comes next

First, your job market paper and the other available working papers on your website are a recruiting committee's best evidence of the kind of scholar you currently are. Accordingly, in the months leading up to the interview and flyout stage, your attention should be on packaging your papers, your job talk, your CV, and your website to best showcase the work you have done. There are many excellent sources of advice on how to do this (for example, John Cawley's annual guide[1] and the resources curated by Amanda Agan on her website[2]), and the counsel of your advisor and committee will be invaluable here.

However, once you are at the interview stage and beyond, recruiting committees will want to learn more about the kind of researcher you are going to *become*. You want to do what you can to help them envision you as someone with a clear research agenda who will hit the ground running. To do this, you should be prepared to talk in some detail about your future plans, in a way that is ambitious (but realistic) and informed.

One exercise I recommend to prepare for these conversations is to draft an "aspirational CV." That is, think about what you would like your CV to look like in five to seven years, around the time you would come up for tenure, and write it down. Put the chapters of your dissertation on the CV—where do you think they are likely to be published? What about the next few projects? Even if they are only ideas at this point, what is the topic, and what publication outlets will you be targeting? Which conferences will it make sense for you to submit your work to and attend? Has this aspirational version of yourself been awarded any grants or fellowships? Would someone with this CV be viewed as an expert in one or two specific areas?

This aspirational CV is for *you*, to help you formulate a clear vision of your research agenda and goals. It is not something you will share with others, though you might discuss it with an advisor or mentor, to see if you are striking the right balance between aiming high and being realistic. But once you have done it, you should be well-prepared to communicate this vision of yourself as a scholar to others. (This is also a wonderful exercise to repeat throughout your career to identify your goals and to help with planning.)

Beyond this high-level view of your future as a scholar, you should be able to discuss one or two new projects in some detail. If they are already in progress, be specific about the stage they are in and the next steps. If not, you should at least be able to clearly articulate the research question, the knowledge gap that the project will fill, and have some ideas about what data and methods you will use. You want to show that you have given the idea some serious thought—talking about a half-baked idea will probably hurt more than it helps. I also recommend that at least one of these future projects does not involve your advisor, so that you can demonstrate a plan for establishing your scholarly independence.

Show your interest

My second piece of advice is to recognize that part of selling yourself to a department is making sure they know that you would seriously consider accepting an offer from them. This of course applies to all jobs that economics PhDs might be seeking, but it is something that I think many candidates who are aiming for an R1 job fail to appreciate.

Most departments are facing constraints from their administrations on the number and timing of interviews, flyouts, and job offers. We therefore have to make tough decisions when allocating them, and the calculation involves not only figuring out who we would most like to hire, but also estimating the probability that the candidate will accept. We do not want to waste resources pursuing candidates who will never accept an offer, no matter how much we might love them.

Early in the job market process, you should find ways to send signals to schools that you have a particular interest in—both formal signals through the AEA's system, but also informally through advisors. In my experience these signals are especially helpful when the candidate is someone we think could place in higher-ranked department, but who indicates that there are specific reasons we might appeal to them (they have family in the area or an attraction to our university's mission, for example).

1. https://www.aeaweb.org/content/file?id=869
2. https://sites.google.com/site/amandayagan/writingadvice

Insights from an R1 University

In the interview and flyout stage, you can convey your genuine interest by doing some research in advance and asking sincere questions about the university and broader community. This is especially important if you are outside of a major metropolitan area or outside of the top fifteen departments (who will probably assume that you are interested). Prior to the interview, familiarize yourself with the research of those you will be meeting, so that you are prepared to talk about areas of common interest. If there is something unique that you genuinely like about the department, mention it in your interview. On a flyout, ask where the assistant professors tend to live, ask them what they like about the city or town, ask them about the level of community among the junior faculty. Ask about the seminar series, opportunities to present your work, and about interactions with graduate students. Listen to the answers and use these as a starting point for a conversation.

This may seem obvious, but in my many years of recruiting, I am still surprised by how many candidates don't seem to get it. And I have been in many recruiting meetings where a faculty member has said, "I love the candidate but there is a zero percent chance they will accept, so let's not waste an offer." Of course, if there truly is a zero percent chance you would accept, you are doing everyone a favor by indicating as much. But if the probability is greater than zero, you want to make sure that is clear from your words and actions.

As a final note on this topic, I not only want to encourage you to act interested, but to be interested. By asking questions and being engaged in conversations about the department and community, you will learn whether the job will be a good fit for you. Department rankings, salaries, and teaching loads are important considerations when weighing a job offer, but liking where you live and work are important too. Be curious and open-minded, and you may be surprised by where it leads you. ■

Industry Interviews on the Job Market

Evan Buntrock

Industry interviews are quite different from academic fly outs. You'll face a variety of interviews, including behavioral interviews, technical interviews, research presentations, and coding interviews. Econ PhD programs do a great job preparing their students to present their research, and LeetCode or InterviewCake are tremendous resources for coding interview preparation. In this essay, I'll focus on technical and behavioral interviews.

You'll get some combination of these at every tech firm. The proportion of the interviews will vary with the company (some companies are mostly technical, some mostly behavioral) and the order of the interviews will be effectively random—they depend on the availability of the interviewers. Usually hiring managers conduct behavioral interviews and economists or data scientists conduct technical interviews. In addition to the examples I provide here, you can find more examples of compelling stories, advice on resume building, technical interview preparation at econphdinterviews.com.

The Technical Interview: Your Bread and Butter

The technical interview can be either a program evaluation interview or a forecasting interview. Because most of my experience is with program evaluation interviews, my advice focuses on these. Economists are hired because they have specific skills, so you need to show strength in those skills during the technical interview. Most of the candidates eliminated in interviews are eliminated as a result of bad technical interviews. The best practices I provide below should generalize across firms. What I say may seem obvious, but I've seen most of these violated at some point.

The Right Mindset

There are two major guidelines for a technical interview:

Lead the interview. Propose solutions and ask what we'd prefer. Solving a problem implies understanding it, and that means asking questions. When you ask questions, the interviewer can clarify what they want; this prevents wasted time in the interview and in real life when you're working with the business. In addition, asking questions provides a natural break so we can redirect you (if we need to) without being rude.

Stay in territory you know well. It's fine to be honest if you don't know something; we aren't attached to one particular method to solving a problem. Don't try to BS us. We have more experience than you, and we have plenty of time to check your answer after the interview. Someone who pretends to know something they don't will eventually get themselves—and possibly their manager—fired.

Interview Framework

The following general framework can be useful for causal/program evaluation interviews as well as forecasting interviews.

1. Establish what question you need to answer. The best way to do this is to ask about the business' goals—what do they want to know and why? A good interviewer will not let you go down a full interview on the wrong track. But they will look very unfavorably on you if they have to reroute you from answering the wrong question.

2. Agree on a specific outcome metric the business cares about: Examples include click-through rate, units sold, revenue, and profit. Generally, this will be your dependent variable in your estimation equation. ➡

3. Think about how you could identify what you want under ideal conditions. When you have an idea, present it to the interviewer as a hypothetical and a means of clarification about the problem you want to solve. "If I could run an experiment by randomly varying treatment T at level J among the units, I would identify the average treatment effect of X on Y. Is that what we want to know?" Don't just assume you can run an experiment. In many industries, experiments are costly and rarely approved. In many cases, the interviewer actually needs to test you on a quasi-experimental method to get a measure of those skills, which may be used more often at the firm. Think about relevant quasi-experimental methods such as diff-in-diff, regression discontinuity, instrumental variables or two-stage least squares, and matching. Once you think you've found some identifying variation, pose the solution to your interviewer as a question. Get their buy-in before you proceed. Discuss the identifying assumptions and to what extent they can be validated; we have to explain them to the business and check them to build confidence. If you're worried about the cost, time taken, ethics, or business concerns, raise those questions as well.

4. Discuss the details. Once you and the interviewer reach agreement on (3), you can now start fleshing out the details of the design you've conceived. At this point, the interviewer is assessing your understanding of the method and the amount of supervision you'd need to use it on day one.

Behavioral Interviews: The Most Important Story You'll Tell

In my four years at Amazon, I've given behavioral interviews to over 200 economist applicants.

I only remember two of those interviews.

Given that every company I know of uses behavioral interviews, it's depressing that so few candidates shine in them. In these interviews, you are asked to provide examples of when you demonstrated the core elements that are most important to your long-term success. They are a chance to talk about your experience and frame yourself in the most positive light. There's no excuse for failing to impress.

Economists are taught that presenting their research is like telling a story. For industry interviews, we're interested in your personal story—we're evaluating you, not your paper.

A great personal story will make you stand out from the (literally) dozens of other candidates interviewing for the same role. Despite the best efforts of companies and interviewers, hiring is an emotion-driven process. Managers are terrified of the time, financial, and morale cost to their team of making a bad hire. Consequently, to be hired, you need to make at least one of your interviewers tell the manager, "Cindy is one in a thousand; you'd be crazy not to offer her the job."

The Core of a Great Story

There are two main components to telling a great story: choice of subject and narration.

The choice of subject is where I see most people go wrong. You must choose a story that shows you being exceptional in some of the following elements:

Achieving outcomes. You need to show you can succeed and reach a goal.

Conflict resolution. If other people don't agree that your work is great, you accomplish nothing. You need to demonstrate that you can build consensus.

Strategy. Planning is half the battle; you'll face tradeoffs while juggling competing priorities.

Persistence. Getting stuck extends beyond your dissertation. Many problems require tenacity.

Creativity. There's a limit to how hard you can work; you'll have to work smarter eventually.

Learning something new. You have nine to ten years of higher education, but you'll only use a fraction of what you learned on your job. You'll need to pick up skills on the fly.

All industry jobs require these. Every behavioral interview question that I've asked, been asked, or seen others ask is explicitly or implicitly inquiring into your past performance in these dimensions.

Step 1: Choosing the Right Story

Your goal should be to pick three stories that collectively show you demonstrating these six elements at least once. You want to limit the number of stories that cover all the elements because it's easier to practice and get comfortable with a smaller number of stories. The corollary is that you need a more powerful, flexible story to answer different types of behavioral questions. Usually, you've found a good story candidate if, in the course of that story, you exceptionally demonstrate at least three of the above six elements.

It's hard to objectively judge how impressive your own story is, but one important test is to ask: what about this story is unusual? That's a reasonable proxy for exceptional. For example, it's not unusual for PhD economists to conduct an experiment as part of their dissertation. It is unusual for them to conduct a lab experiment when no one at their school does experimental work and there are no facilities. For the candidate to do this, he had to plan the experiment for months and over the course of two years frequently follow up with the IRB, facilities coordinators, sources of funding, and subjects. To achieve his goal, he had to learn a lot along the way about experiment design, administration, and marketing to recruit subjects. That story hits four of the six elements!

Another example: it's not unusual to be a TA, get some negative feedback from your students, and make changes. It is unusual to look up who won the department's best TA award the prior year, sit in on their lectures, and take notes about what they do well. It's also unusual to schedule an extra section where you have the students go through supplemental homework you designed yourself to give struggling students extra practice. As a result, the student had

How to Handle an Interview: On-site versus Skype

Gowun Park

Congratulations! Your hard work on the application packet has resulted in an initial interview request. How do you increase your chance of connecting to the next round in this initial interview? Two years ago, I was busy applying for jobs while finishing my dissertation about U.S. income/wage inequality. The following year, I accepted an offer for a tenure-track position at a liberal arts college and in this fall, I am starting my third year as an assistant professor. In this essay, I provide some advice I wish I had known when I had the first interview based on my job market experience. The initial interview often takes two possible formats: on-site/in-person interview or Skype/similar alternatives interview. This initial interview usually lasts about 30 minutes. The interviewers either ask different questions to different interviewees or use a fixed (same) questionnaire for all interviewees. I will start with general tips for both on-site and Skype interviews, then introduce additional tips for when you are preparing the Skype interview.

Warning: Your interview has begun already

Nowadays, the advanced features of all social media platforms, such as Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, etc., prompt you to be a suggested network on interviewers' social media platforms as soon as they receive your email or phone number. This means that they may access your private postings on your social media—occasionally including your party pictures or non-professional comments. If you are an active user of these social media platforms, this is your chance to clean up or hide some of your postings, especially those that you do not want your future employers to access. Similarly, if you have a website, does it look professional? Is the web address professional? These little things can create a good—or bad—first impression.

Before the interview

Whether you are scheduled for interviews for jobs in academia or industry, there are a few homework assignments you must do before the interview.

Learn about the mission/vision statement of the college/company.

You can easily find this information on their website. This is important to know because you need to understand what they value. Read the mission/vision statement carefully including the wording and then customize your answers to be aligned with this statement. It also may provide strong reasoning for why you think you would be a good fit for the college/company.

Google the members of your search committee/interviewers.

Before your interview, you may receive an email with who your interviewers will be. If they do not provide interviewers' names, you may request this information as well. Once you find out their names, search on their websites for their positions, fields of study/areas of interest, and/or what they are teaching/working. Not only will this make you feel more at ease during your interview since you already know something

Industry Interviews

unusual results—in his second year on the job, he was voted the department's best TA. This story also hits at least four of the six elements.

Even supposing there's nothing exceptional about your TA, RA, or dissertation work—which I doubt—your hobbies (or former jobs) can provide exceptional stories. When I asked my colleagues for examples of impressive behavioral interview stories, they mentioned PhD candidates who had become Zumba instructors or created national championship bridge teams at their university. Provided it highlights the above elements, a "non-work" story is a great way to stand out from the crowd.

Step 2: Tell Your Story Vibrantly

Now that you've chosen a strong subject, it's time to flesh out the details. Who were the different people you were trying to please? How was success defined differently for them than for you? What worked best to convince them to support you? What were some key milestones on the path to success? If you had to sacrifice something to meet a goal, how did you know you'd made the right choice? If you did something creative, how did you verify that it actually worked? If you can, add numbers that give us a sense of magnitude—how many students were you teaching, what was your rating (e.g. 4.75 out of 5), and what percentile was that among other TAs?

Make sure to identify something you could have done better. People want to see greatness, but also humility and the desire to grow. You need to find a meaningful mistake you made (not 'I worked too hard.') that isn't a red flag (not 'In retrospect, embezzling money to fund my experiment added too much stress to my life.').

Now that you have a detailed narrative of your three stories, practice telling it out loud. You can find an endless list of practice behavioral questions on the internet; sites like Glassdoor might also reveal pet favorites of different companies. Practice with friends. Better yet, practice with MBA students—who tend to be skilled at behavioral interviews—or with someone at your university's career center. Ask which story (if any) they find impressive. Ask if they felt a part of the story was a red flag. Pay attention to their follow up questions; this will tell you what's missing from your story and you can add those details to your next version. ■

about them and can maybe anticipate questions, but it is also a great way for you to think of how to articulate what your potential contribution to the department would be.

Be familiar with their vocabulary.

Each specific field and/or job has its own unique jargon. For instance, in academia, the following terms and concepts are considered buzzwords: empowered learner, student engagement, core competency, etc. These are often used in casual discussion. In the same way, jobs in industry require knowing much technical jargon. Therefore, it is important for you to know their language in order to have an accurate understanding of what exactly they are asking you during the interview. Furthermore, it will show them that you are part of the field/industry already and that you will hit the ground running. Study the jargon used in the field, and make sure you know it.

Think about your exit question.

Usually, at the end of the interview, the interviewer gives you an opportunity to ask a question. If you want to make a good last impression, think carefully before the interview what your exit questions will be. What would be a good exit question? A good exit question should definitely not be a question whose answer can be found on their website. It should certainly be a question related to the job you are applying to. More specifically, the question had better be related to what they are looking for in the job. You can figure out this riddle from their job announcement. Reread the job announcement and have it fresh in your mind.

During the interview

Be honest.

Sometimes in the middle of the interview, you may face a question you really do not know how to answer. Or sometimes the interviewer may make a very rude comment on your job market paper. When these moments come—I definitely hope not—I advise you to be honest. Although it may be tempting to pretend you know everything, the interviewer, who already may have met with hundreds of applicants over the course of a lifetime and has expertise in that field, will easily notice what you are really trying to do. Thus, give the interviewer the best but honest answer you can. Admit the weakness of your paper and say that you are looking forward to working further on your paper. Also, if you have particular needs, let them know (e.g. visa sponsorship, relocation, or job opportunity for your spouse). Do not pretend you know everything because they are not looking for some superhuman.

Be yourself.

In a similar vein, try to be yourself and do not pretend to be someone else. In your case, you are looking for the job you may work in for the next five or ten years or even longer. At the same time, the interviewers are basically looking for someone they can work with probably for the next five or ten years. The consequence is that if you get the job by pretending to be someone else, you have to continue pretending.

Differentiate yourself.

The interviewers have possibly already been meeting with dozens of applicants and asking the same questions during the last two days. If you give them cookie-cutter answers as all other applicants did, you will just bore them. Think about how to differentiate yourself among many other applicants for the job. Do you have any unique experience related to the job? Do you have any special skills that will help your performance on the task? Let them know how/why you are unique and point out something only you can do.

For the Skype interview

These are additional preparations you need to do for the Skype—or any similar platform—interview.

Create your Skype account username thoughtfully.

Before the interview date, you need to create a Skype account. But first, think about your account username (ID) because your Skype username is visible to all interviewers. If you have a non-professional username you may need to create a new account.

You need to know their Skype username.

It is YOUR responsibility to know their Skype account username before the interview. When you schedule the Skype interview with them, you should ask for their Skype account username or ask them to add you on their Skype contact list. If you request to be added on their Skype contact list, make sure you accept their invitation before the interview. Log onto your Skype account at least ten minutes before your interview and check that everything works properly (microphone, speakers, video).

Check and check again.

You need to practice with a friend before your interview to test your sound and internet speed. Record your voice/video to check your tone or body language during the interview. The internet speed is essential to consider since your video quality will depend on the speed. One more important thing to check is your background: you should check what is behind you and what your background looks like on the Skype screen. If it does not look professional or if it looks too cluttered, clean up your background or reserve an office space in your school.

One last piece of advice

See every interview as an opportunity to learn about the interview process.

If an interview goes badly, do not get discouraged because that can and does happen to everyone. Rather, think back on it, analyze why it went badly, learn what needs to be learned (e.g., vocabulary, topics, answers to particular questions, interviewers' backgrounds), resolve to not make the same mistake next time, and then shake it off.

All the best luck on your next interview! ■

IN MEMORIAM
Alice Rivlin

Alice Rivlin, a pioneer in applying economics to policy issues, died at age 88 on May 14 in Washington DC. Dr. Rivlin was the inaugural winner of the Carolyn Shaw Bell Award when it was created in 1998 as part of the 25th anniversary of the founding of CSWEP. She leaves her husband economist Sidney Winter, three children, their spouses, four grandchildren, and two stepsons.

Dr. Rivlin had a longstanding association with the Brookings Institution but also served in government in numerous capacities. She was named deputy assistant secretary for program analysis of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1966. She was the founding director of the Congressional Budget Office, serving from its creation in 1975 to 1983. She was named director of the White House Office of Management and Budget in 1994. From 1996 to 1999, she served as vice chair of the Federal Reserve. She also led the financial control board created by Congress in 1995 to address the financial crisis of the District of Columbia. She received a MacArthur Foundation Fellowship in 1983 and was President of the American Economic Association in 1986.

In addition to her substantial contributions to public policy, Dr. Rivlin leaves a large body of scholarly work on a variety of subjects, but especially on education, families, and households. She coedited a series of books entitled *Restoring Fiscal Sanity* which addressed a variety of budgetary challenges. She authored several influential books including *Systematic Thinking for Social Action* and *Caring for the Disabled Elderly: Who will Pay?*

Dr. Rivlin excelled as a woman in economics during a time when women were rare and often unwelcome in the field. She reflected on her experiences in a CSWEP interview conducted by Hali Edison in 1998 (https://www.aeaweb.org/about-aea/committees/cswep/about/awards/bell/rivlin). There, Dr. Rivlin talks about how she discovered her love of economics and the extraordinary sexism she faced in her career. For example, early in her career, the chair of a department explicitly told her that her work was exceptional but that the dean had expressly forbidden the department from considering women for a position!

Dr. Rivlin also served a devoted mentor to numerous women with an interest in economics and policy. For example, Celina Su, the Marilyn J. Gittel Chair in Urban Studies at the Graduate Center and Professor of Political Science at Brooklyn College and author of "Landia," a volume of poetry, recalls the mentoring she received from Dr. Rivlin. Su writes, "She remains among the most generous people I have ever met, a true mentor." Su recalls being invited along as a research assistant on a work trip with Dr. Rivlin. "Even though she had a paid-for first class ticket for herself, she downgraded her seat to be in coach with me. . . . When I got into grad school and worried about how to pay for it, she assured me that I belonged there even if I didn't immediately receive a full fellowship. . . . She loved the poetry of Muriel Rukeyser and encouraged me to continue to take my poetry writing practice seriously. I can think of few people who have impacted me and my life so profoundly in such a short span of time. I will miss her."

Diane Lim, Washington DC-based policy economist and author of the *EconomistMom* blog also recounted Dr. Rivlin's mentorship. She writes, " I think the thing that I appreciated the most about her was that as accomplished as she was, she would never focus on her own successes (not even holding herself up as an "example"/role model) when she spoke with such confidence and enthusiasm...[but she was] really like a "cheerleader" to her younger female colleagues like me... It's what kept me coming back to her for advice and reassurance all these years, because she always seemed to provide such unusually kind and generous advice."

The Bell Award is intended to honor 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." Dr. Rivlin powerfully exemplified all of the attributes cited in the award, and left an important legacy for policymakers and economists both personally and professionally. ■

Join the CSWEP Liaison Network!

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

Interview with Leto Copeley continued from page 1

In order to help *News* readers better understand the role of the ombudsperson, Sharon Oster interviewed the new ombudsperson, Leto Copeley.

Oster: ***I understand you trained as a lawyer. How did you get into this line of work?***

Copeley: I began my legal career as a litigator in the field of employment discrimination. That got me involved in sexual harassment cases, and then later led to work on sexual abuse cases, particularly involving children. At some point, along with my law partner Valerie Johnson, I began a podcast called "The Law Sisters," where we focused on the general topic of sexual harassment and other kinds of discrimination. Harvey Weinstein and the #MeToo movement started getting publicity shortly after we began and demand for our ideas grew. As part of my own work and interests, I have trained as a mediator and have also provided training on sexual harassment. All of these experiences helped to prepare me for the work I am doing. When Ben Bernanke called me to ask me to serve as an ombudsperson for the AEA, it was hard to say no!

Oster: ***In terms of collecting information, your role as the AEA ombudsperson is quite broad: as long as either the complainant or the alleged perpetrator is an AEA member, a report can be filed regardless of where or when the incident occurred. Why was the information gathering role defined so broadly?***

Copeley: The broad reach of my role as ombudsperson in collecting information via complaint reports was part of the organizational design suggested by the AEA Executive Committee. From the beginning, I received the message from President Ben Bernanke that he and the committee members were determined to change the climate of the economics profession, to the greatest extent possible given their roles.

We know from examples like Harvey Weinstein that people engaged in sexual harassment rarely stop with one victim and will likely assault victims in a variety of settings. The AEA felt strongly that they could play an important role in gathering information from multiple settings that individual employers, like universities, could not easily play. I think the ability of people to call me and talk about incidents that happened in different settings and even some years ago is a very important part of my role and really distinguishes the AEA operation.

So potential perpetrators should take notice, just as lying to an investigator can be worse than the original crime, retaliation can get you in bigger trouble than the original conduct you were charged with.

Oster: ***Your role in terms of launching formal investigations based on reports you receive is more limited, as we will discuss shortly. In settings in which the reports you receive do not lead to a formal investigation by your office, what role does your information gathering play?***

Copeley: Many victims of sexual harassment and discrimination feel very alone; some even blame themselves at least in part for the harassment. But, as I suggested earlier, we know most perpetrators are serial offenders. People call me and they may tell me about a situation that sounds quite offensive. Without making an ultimate finding I can at least tell someone that the conduct they have described is unacceptable. Often it's helpful for someone to get confirmation that this is the kind of conduct the AEA wants to get rid of. So one of the important jobs I can do as ombudsperson is to help victims feel supported because there is a lot of pressure on most people not to divulge acts of harassment or discrimination.

Then, with the permission of complainants, I can share the fact among victims when there have been multiple complaints about the same person. This information may encourage someone to file a formal complaint at the home institution of the alleged perpetrator. But even if no formal investigation occurs, helping victims know that the organization is listening can be very important. As economists might put it, filing a complaint can create a public good for other victims.

Oster: ***Often times harassment and/or discrimination are actions of more powerful people used against the less powerful. Many people thus worry about retaliation if they file a report. How do you handle this concern?***

Copeley: I firmly believe that harassment and discrimination are about the exercise of power! Let me say this—although people worry with good reason about retaliation for making a complaint, retaliation, when it is proved, often provides even stronger proof of discrimination. So retaliation can hurt the retaliator quite a bit.

As for people considering contacting me as ombudsperson, first, please know I will never record a complainant's identity without their permission. It's my job to give a report to the AEA on an annual basis, but my report will *not* include individually identifying information. Then, even if someone files a report and tells me that I can make their information generally available and then some time later I get a second report about the same perpetrator, I will not reveal the first victim's name or contact information to victim two without once again getting specific permission.

Because I am trained as a lawyer, I do think it is important to acknowledge, however, that it is possible that in the context of a legal proceeding, AEA

ombuds records could be subpoenaed. However, the AEA is committed to resisting the disclosure of information, and our firm will refuse to disclose anything without a court order. Almost always in such cases, if a judge requires anything to be disclosed, it is very limited and case-specific. I would be happy to discuss this further with anyone who contacts me with a specific complaint.

The AEA Policy on Harassment and Discrimination provides that the organization may take action against a member who retaliates against someone who files a complaint or participates in the investigation of a complaint. Filing complaints and participating in investigations are considered "protected activity" under the law as well. So potential perpetrators should take notice, just as lying to an investigator can be worse than the original crime, retaliation can get you in bigger trouble than the original conduct you were charged with.

Oster: ***While your reach in terms of receiving complaints is quite broad, you are considerably more limited in terms of bringing an investigation. Can you describe for us the circumstances which would launch an investigation and the way that investigation would proceed?***

Copeley: In my role as ombudsperson I can bring a formal investigation under one of two circumstances: for a complaint about behavior in the context of an AEA-sponsored activity or one involving an AEA officer or employee.

The investigation would be a civil, rather than a criminal proceeding and would involve early notification of the alleged perpetrator of the accused conduct and interviews—preferably face to face—with all involved parties. Alleged perpetrators can decline to be interviewed, though most people would in my view not be well served by doing so, and I would not object to those being interviewed having a quiet advisor with them at the interview.

My findings would be reported to the AEA executive committee. In the event that the complaint is about one of the members of that committee, he or she would be recused.

Oster: ***Do you act as an ombudsperson for other organizations?***

Copeley: The AEA is my first experience with this role but since signing on, I have had several inquiries from other organizations. I think the AEA was early in identifying and implementing this role and I am excited to be part of it. ■

About CSWEP

A standing committee of the American Economic Association, the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession (CSWEP) is charged with serving professional women economists by promoting their careers and monitoring their progress. CSWEP sponsors mentoring programs, surveys economics departments and freely disseminates information on professional opportunities, career development and how the profession works, both on the web and via free digital subscriptions to the CSWEP *News*. To subscribe, email info@cswep.org.

Who Said it Would Be Easy?

continued from page 5

With the help of an @ShellyJLundberg (who mentored me into *finally* pushing that paper out the door) shout out, it is by far my most liked tweet. Twitter analytics (bless their soul) tells me almost 40,000 people have seen it. While my path was non-traditional, the reaction to this tweet tells me that my story resonates with people. We are all in this together, and we all need to lift each other up.

I am telling you this story not only because it is non-traditional but because it makes me proud. I stayed true to myself. My entire post-PhD research career has been in the federal government and has been wonderful. I have met amazing people. I continue to learn, develop, and grow. My passion for my work is strong and real. I could not imagine being anywhere else; I love my job.

I want that for you! The only way to get to that place is by being authentic—even when being authentic means you are non-traditional. Ignore the expectations others have for you. Do not compromise who you are or confuse your own happiness with the path others tell you to follow. Be you. Be authentic. And now, use these tips and go out and find that amazing job.

We are all cheering for you! ■

Calls, Announcements, and Sessions at Upcoming Meetings

Call for Participants and Topic Ideas

CSWEP Panels on Career Development @ 84th Midwest Economics Association Annual Meeting

27–29 March 2020
Hilton Orrington–Evanston, Evanston, IL

DEADLINE: 5 October 2019

CSWEP is organizing two panels on topics related to career development at the Midwest Economics Association Meetings to be held March 27–29, 2020 at the Hilton Orrington–Evanston in Evanston, Illinois. There is also a CSWEP networking lunch that you are welcome to attend. There will also be CSWEP Mentoring Breakfast for Junior Faculty in Non-Doctoral Programs that you can register for before the conference.

The panels and lunch will be held on the Friday of the conference. One panel will be geared to those looking for jobs (academic and nonacademic) and another panel will focus on mid-career issues. Each panel will have four participants who will each speak for about 10 minutes. The sessions are organized to allow for plenty of time for an active exchange of ideas and advice among the panelists and session attendees. The Mentoring Breakfast for Junior Faculty in Non-Doctoral Program will be on Saturday.

If you have specific suggestions regarding the topics to be covered or ideas for potential panelists (you can also suggest yourself), please submit your topics and ideas as soon as possible (no later than October 5, 2019) to Shahina Amin, CSWEP Midwest Rep, shahina.amin@uni.edu. To foster the exchange of new ideas, we especially seek individuals who have not previously served as panelists.

In addition to the CSWEP panels, networking lunch, and mentoring breakfast the MEA meetings provide a great opportunity to present your own research. For those interested in presenting a paper, you can find paper submission information on the MEA website, http://mea.grinnell.edu/.

CSWEP Call for Complete Sessions and Individual Papers

CSWEP Sessions @ Eastern Economic Association Meeting

27 February–1 March 2020
Sheraton Boston Hotel, Boston, MA

DEADLINE: 15 October 2019

CSWEP will sponsor a number of sessions at the annual meeting of the Eastern Economic Association.

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, as well as topics related to career development. 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. Please be sure to include the appropriate JEL code(s) and the names, affiliations and emails of all participants.

Additional sessions will be organized by the CSWEP Eastern Representative. Abstracts for papers in the topic areas of **gender, health economics, labor economics and public economics** are particularly solicited, but abstracts in other areas are also encouraged. Abstracts should be approximately one page in length and include paper title, appropriate JEL code(s), names of authors, affiliation and rank, and e-mail contact information.

All submissions should be e-mailed to the following address. **Decisions will be made before the final regular EEA deadline.**

Dr. Karen Conway
John A. Hogan Distinguished Professor of Economics
Peter T. Paul College of Business and Economics
University of New Hampshire
Email: ksconway@unh.edu
Phone: (603) 862-3386

If you have specific suggestions regarding career topics to be covered, potential panelists or any other way that CSWEP can offer resources in career development at the Eastern meetings, please submit your ideas to the above address as well.

Fall 2019 CSWEP Survey Coming Soon!

DEADLINE: 28 October 2019

Since 1972 CSWEP has undertaken the collection of data on the gender composition of faculty and students in both PhD granting and non-PhD granting U.S. economics departments. This 40+ years of data is unique in the social sciences and beyond and is presented in the CSWEP Annual Report. The 2019 survey was sent to all department chairs in mid-September and the completed survey is due October 28. CSWEP is very appreciative of the work of the 200+ department chairs and staff and the CSWEP liaisons who work to complete these surveys in a timely manner every year.

CSWEP Sessions at Upcoming Meetings

Southern Economics Association Annual Meeting

23–25 November 2019
Marriott Harbor Beach Resort & Spa, Ft. Lauderdale, FL

CSWEP Sessions

Professional Development Panel: Department Chairs Offer Advice on Getting Appointed, Promoted, and Tenured (Joint CSMGEP/CSWEP Session)

Saturday, 23 November 2019, 8:00 am–9:45 am

Organizers: Ragan Petrie (Texas A&M University) and Ebonya Washington (Yale University)

Panelists: Scott L. Baier (Clemson University); Maureen Cropper (University of Maryland, College Park); Marionette Holmes (Spelman College); Manuel Santos (University of Miami); Omari H. Swinton (Howard University) and Laura Taylor (Georgia Institute of Technology)

Enduring Effects of Gender Norms

Saturday, 23 November 2019, 10:00 am–11:45 am

Chair: Francisca Antman (University of Colorado–Boulder)

Organizer: Ragan Petrie (Texas A&M University)

Plough, gender bias and the misallocation of trade credit
Jiafu An (University of Edinburgh)

Losers weepers? The impact of local labor demand shocks on gender attitudes
Shalise Ayromloo (University of Illinois–Chicago)

Marriage and gender norms
Francisca Antman (University of Colorado–Boulder)

Do financial conditions shape gender norms? Gendered labor dynamics over the credit boom-bust cycle
Tammy Lee (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

Gender Gap in Labor Market and Learning Outcomes

Saturday, 23 November 2019, 1:00 pm–2:45 pm

Chair: Molly Espey (Clemson University)

Organizer: Ragan Petrie (Texas A&M University)

Child care provision and women's careers in firms
Vidhi Chhaochharia (University of Miami)

Gender, effort, and peer evaluation in cooperative undergraduate economics courses
Molly Espey (Clemson University)

Do graduate school and advisor characteristics affect economists' later publication and co-authorship rates?
Sheena Murray (University of Tennessee–Chattanooga)

Gender and racial gaps in the labor market according to Mortensen and Pissarides
Anni Isojaervi (Iowa State University)

Professional Development Panel: Advice for Job Seekers and Managing an Early Career

Saturday, 23 November 2019, 3:00 pm–4:45 pm

Chair and Organizer: Ragan Petrie (Texas A&M)

Tips on going* Back *on the job market before tenure
Sheena Murray (University of Tennessee–Chatanooga)

When your job market focus is small liberal arts colleges
Sarah Reed (Chowan University)

From your first year to tenure: making a career at a liberal arts college
Marie Petkus (Centre College)

You do not need to do it alone: seeking and finding mentoring on the road to tenure in small departments
Orgul Ozturk (University of South Carolina)

Strategies for incorporating research into undergraduate classes
Elaine Frey (California State University–Long Beach)

How to promote an economics major to female undergraduates
Joy Buchanan (Samford University)

From the Chair continued from page 2

playing field between job seekers who have access to mentors and job seekers who do not. The emphasis in this Focus section is, as it should be, empowering job seekers to find the job that is the best fit their skills or interests. These articles will be useful not only for job seekers but also for those of us who want to do better at advising graduate students. They will be particularly helpful for advisors who want to assist students who are following career paths with which the advisor has less experience.

As part of our efforts to assist economists at all levels with professional development, we have revamped some parts of our website. If you visit the professional development section of our website, https://www.aeaweb.org/about-aea/committees/cswep/programs/resources, you will find a rich set of articles advising job seekers, including the new ones in this issue of the *News*. You will also find our ongoing listing of mentoring and career development workshops and advice for economists at other stages of the career.

CSWEP will have a full slate of activities at the San Diego ASSA meetings. In particular, look out for our panel co-hosted with CSMGEP on Sunday morning, "What Have We Learned about Mentoring? A Conversation among Mentoring Veterans, Eager Mentors, and Founders of New Mentoring Initiatives."[1] We are excited about the number of new groups that have sprung up with conferences and other activities designed to mentor and support diverse economists. We have brought together an exciting group of mentoring entrepreneurs to discuss opportunities for launching new initiatives.

1. https://bit.ly/2kTsJuR

Directory of CSWEP Board Members

Judith A. Chevalier, Chair
William S. Beinecke Professor of Economics and Finance
School of Management, Yale University
165 Whitney Avenue
New Haven, CT 06511
(203) 432-3122
judith.chevalier@yale.edu

Sebnem Kalemli-Ozcan, Assoc. Chair & Dir. of Mentoring
Neil Moskowitz Endowed Professor of Economics
Department of Economics, University of Maryland
4118D Tydings Hall
College Park, MD, 20742
(301) 405-3486
kalemli@econ.umd.edu

Margaret Levenstein, Assoc. Chair & Survey Director
Research Professor,
Institute for Social Research
Director, ICPSR, University of Michigan
330 Packard Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1248
(734) 615-8400
maggiel@umich.edu

Kate Silz-Carson, Newsletter Oversight Editor
Professor of Economics
U.S. Air Force Academy
2354 Fairchild Drive, Suite 6K110
USAF Academy, CO 80840-6299
(719) 333-2597
katherine.silz-carson@usafa.edu

Karen Smith Conway, Eastern Representative
John A. Hogan Distinguished Professor of Economics
University of New Hampshire
10 Garrison Avenue
Durham, NH 03824
(603) 862-3386
ksconway@unh.edu

Shahina Amin, Midwest Representative
Lawrence Jepson Professor of International Economics
Department of Economics, College of Business Administration
University of Northern Iowa
1227 West 27th Street
Cedar Falls, IA 50614-0129
(319) 273-2637
shahina.amin@uni.edu

Ragan Petrie, Southern Representative
Professor of Economics
Texas A&M University
4228 TAMU
College Station, TX 77843-4228
(979) 845-4593
rpetrie@tamu.edu

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

Sandra Black, At-Large
Audre and Bernard Rapoport Centennial Chair
in Economics and Public Policy
Department of Economics
The University of Texas at Austin
2225 Speedway
Austin, TX 78712
(512) 475-8519
sblack@austin.utexas.edu

Petra Moser, At-Large
Associate Professor of Economics
Leonard N. Stern School of Business
New York University
44 West Fourth Street, 7-69
New York, NY 10012
pmoser@stern.nyu.edu

Jonathan Guryan, At-Large
Professor of Human Development and Social Policy
Institute for Policy Research,
Northwestern University
2040 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60208
(773) 848-9408
j-guryan@northwestern.edu

Karen Pence, At-Large
Assistant Director of Division of Research Statistics
Federal Reserve Board
20th Street & Constitution Avenue NW
Washington DC, 20551
(202) 452-2342
karen.pence@frb.gov

Ann Owen, Ex-Officio, CeMENT Director
Professor of Economics
Hamilton College
198 College Hill Road
Clinton, NY 13323
(315) 859-4419
aowen@hamilton.edu

Martha Bailey, Ex-Officio, CeMENT Director
Department of Economics and Population
Studies Center
University of Michigan
611 Tappan Street, 207 Lorch Hall
Ann Arbor, MI, 48109-1220
(734) 647-6874
baileymj@umich.edu

Brag Box

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

Amanda Kowalski, the Gail Wilensky Professor of Applied Economics and Public Policy in the Department of Economics at the University of Michigan, was recently awarded the 2019 ASHEcon Medal by the American Society of Health Economists. According to the press release, the award is given to an economist age 40 or under who has made the most significant contributions to the field of health economics. Amanda was cited for her work combining theoretical models and econometric techniques in order to inform current debates in health policy. Congratulations to Amanda on this achievement!

We want to hear from you!

Send announcements to info@cswep.org.