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## Introduction

There are two purposes of this document: one positive and one normative. The first purpose is to state objectively how the U. S. junior academic job market for economists works; specifically, to state the deadlines involved, outline what salaries and benefits have recently been offered, list rankings of departments, and describe what a job candidate should expect at different stages of the hiring process. The second purpose, normative in nature, is to offer advice on how job candidates should conduct their searches in order to be more successful.

In offering advice, this document takes as given many of the most important factors that drive hiring decisions: the quality of your research, your graduate institution, and the identity and recommendation of your advisor. Instead, the advice herein focuses on relatively superficial things, but some hiring decisions are made (whether consciously or unconsciously) on the basis of superficial qualities of the candidates. I hope that you will find this guide helpful, but every job market search is different and I cannot guarantee that the experiences reflected here will match your own.

There has been a fair amount written on the subject of the economics job market and it is reasonable to ask why there is a need for this document. First, our job market is continuously evolving and much of what is in print on the subject is out of date; e.g. the papers published in the American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings in volumes 49 (1959), 52 (1962), 61 (1971), and 69 (1979). Second, the topic is so broad that it is difficult for any single paper to be comprehensive; job candidates face high time costs to independently compile information from the many published papers. Third, many practical details of the job search have never been published. To fill this gap, unpublished guides have circulated for years, including several that influenced this document: McLaughlin (1986), Conlin and Dickert (1995), Mustard (1997), Murray (1998), Domowitz (2001), and Falcon and Crack (2001). In the context of the previous literature, this document has three goals: report the still-timely findings from published papers, describe the practical details and offer the advice that in the past were communicated orally or through unpublished guides, and provide links to internet resources.

This paper is outlined largely according to the chronology of a job search, but includes at the end special sections on diversity, dual job searches, and a glossary.

1) Preparing to Go on the Job Market
2) Applying for Academic Jobs
3) Interviewing at the ASSA Meetings
4) Campus Visits
a. Interviews
b. The Job Talk
c. Dinner with Faculty
5) Negotiating
6) Special Topics:
a. Diversity
b. The Dual Job Search (Spouses)
7) Glossary of Job Market Terms

The timing with which you will pass through stages of the job market depends on the market segments in which you participate. Specifically, Carson and Navarro (1988) define three segments of the academic job market for new economists:

1. The pre-emptive market: conducted at an accelerated pace by (usually top-ranked) departments seeking to interview early the candidates they identify as a close match. Carson and Navarro (1988) found that during 1985-86, 70\% of the top-20 economics departments (as ranked by the NRC in 1995) participated in this pre-emptive market. Informal recommendation and scouting play a greater role in candidate selection in the pre-emptive market than in the two subsequent market segments.
2. The primary market: Carson and Navarro (1988) found that the primary market processed $75 \%$ of all job openings. Initial interviews in the primary market take place at the ASSA meetings in early January.
3. The secondary market: used by departments in two instances: first, if their top candidates in the primary market all either proved to be poor matches or declined offers; and second, if the department advertised a job opening so late as to be unable to interview at the ASSA meetings. The secondary market schedule of flyouts begins after the primary market has begun to clear. The secondary market accounted for $22 \%$ of all openings filled in the Carson and Navarro (1988) sample.
The schedule with which you will pass through the various stages of the job search for each of these three market segments is listed in Table 1. Unless stated otherwise, the timing of events reported in this document is that for the primary market.

## INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

There are two major types of academic employers of economists: research institutions and teaching institutions. In research institutions tenure decisions are based primarily on research. In teaching institutions teaching proficiency is a much greater factor in tenure decisions. This document is primarily targeted to the audience of applicants to research universities, simply because that is the sector with which I am most familiar.

This document will detail the quantity of new economics Ph.D.s supplied, the quantity demanded by academia, and the average starting salary of a new economics Ph.D. in academia. As a quick summary, in the year 2000, 948 people received Ph.D.s in economics from U. S. institutions (NSF et al., 2001), 1,635 new academic jobs (both junior and senior) were posted in Job Openings for Economists (Siegfried, 2001), and the average nine-month salary offered to new assistant professors in Ph.D.-granting economics departments was $\$ 65,770$ (Shbikat et al., 2002). For 2001, data is not yet available on the number of economics Ph.D.s awarded, but 1,589 new academic jobs (both junior and senior) were posted in Job Openings for Economists (Siegfried, 2002), and the average nine-month salary offered to new assistant professors in Ph.D.-granting economics departments was $\$ 66,949$ (Deck et al., 2002).

Success in the job market is a good match of applicant and department. In order for you to find a good match, it is crucial that you understand where you fit in the field of economics: you will need to know in what field(s) of economics you will work, the type of research you will pursue,
and your comparative advantages as a researcher. It may be difficult for you, as a graduate student, to know where you fit in the discipline, that information will help you immensely on the job market. An important way that you can increase the odds of finding a good match is to be honest with your interviewers about the type of economist you are and what you are looking for in a match.

During your search, you might want to keep in mind two basic facts about the job market for new economics Ph.D.s. The first is trickle down. Each year, almost every economics Ph.D. program produces more new Ph.D.s than it will hire. As a result, candidates from the top departments tend to trickle down, filling openings at lower-ranked departments, crowding the graduates of those departments to jobs in departments further down the rankings. Stock, Alston, and Milkman (2000) find that the vast majority of new economics Ph.D.s in 1995-96 moved to jobs in departments ranked at least 50 points below their graduate department; excluding moves to unranked departments, the average drop was 59 ranks. On the bright side, the second basic fact is that almost everyone finds a job. In surveys of new economics Ph.D.s in the late 1990s, both Siegfried and Stock (1999) and Stock et al. (2000) find that only 3\% were unemployed shortly after the job search season.

Good luck!

## 1. Preparing to Go on the Job Market

There are many things that you need do the spring and summer before you go on the job market:

- Prepare your curriculum vitae (CV) immediately; it can take a surprisingly long time. There is no single style that you must use; study the CVs of the previous year's job candidates from top Ph.D. programs. The National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) web site lists links to the job placement web pages (which will contain the candidates' CVs) for the major economics departments in the U.S.; the URL is http://www.nber.org/candidates/ Also, your department may have on file copies of job candidate CVs for recent years; examine the CVs of those who got good jobs.
- Keep your CV continuously up to date. The date your CV was revised should appear somewhere on the document. Also keep detailed lists of every presentation, every award and grant you receive, the journals for which you have refereed, and every mention of your work in the popular press. Some of this may not appear on your current CV but you will modify your CV over time and create different versions. An up-to-date master list of all of your accomplishments will make it easy for you to create a CV for any given circumstance.
- Create a website that contains electronic versions of your CV and your job market paper.
- Figure out which faculty you will want to write your letters of recommendation and cultivate your relationship with them. Senior faculty are usually more influential than junior faculty. Ask around to find out which professors in your program have a history of placing their students in good jobs; having an advisor who calls around to vouch for you helps enormously in getting initial interviews.
- Present your work early and often. You want to figure out as soon as possible what other people think are the weak points in your work, and then work to strengthen those areas. It will also enhance your presentation skills.
- Get as much done on your job market paper as possible as early as possible. You want to minimize your stress when on the job market.
- Determine for which jobs you are best suited (in terms of field, type of department, type of university). Consider economics departments, business schools, and schools of public policy. Health economists will also want to consider schools of public health and medical schools. You may also want to consider searches in government (e.g. the Federal Reserve banks, the Bureau of Labor Statistics), international organizations (e.g. the World Bank, the IMF), think tanks (e.g. RAND, Mathematica), and the private sector-all of which are outside the scope of this document.
- Ask recent graduates of your program for advice. Junior faculty are also helpful. Senior faculty may be helpful if they have recently pushed their students on the market; senior faculty who have not may be seriously out of touch with the current job market.
- Buy at least two very nice and professional outfits. You don't want to be frantically searching for appropriate outfits in the days just before interviews.
- Buy a briefcase in which to carry copies of your CV, papers, and the materials that will be handed to you during your interviews.
- Buy a carry-on bag that has a "suiter". You want a carry-on because the risk of your luggage being lost is higher if you check it (the only time my luggage has ever been lost by an airline was on my first job market flyout). You want your carry-on to have a suiter
so that you can keep your outfits relatively wrinkle-free.
- Join airline frequent flier programs and hotel frequent stayer programs.
- Consider buying a handheld organizer (e.g. Palm or Handspring). Your schedule will be hectic during the job market and such a device may be the best way to stay organized. Keep it backed up on your PC so that even if you lose the organizer there exists a backup record of your appointments. If you are going to use an organizer, get it early and become comfortable with it before the job market gets very busy; you don't want to be having technical difficulties when you are most anxious and overworked.
- Consider buying a laptop so that while you're traveling on the job market you can check email from hotels. You will need to stay in close email contact throughout the market.

Sometimes graduate students who don't feel fully ready consider going on the market selectively, applying to only a few places, and then going on the market in earnest the next year. My opinion is that this is a bad strategy. There are high fixed costs (both money and time) to going on the market. Moreover, departments may notice that you have been on the market two years in a row and assume that you bombed on the market the first time out. You should make sure that you are ready and then conduct a full market search. Alternatively, you could apply for postdocs and then conduct a full market search in two years.

At the end of summer, try to have your job market paper completed.
Find out which faculty member will serve as your department's Job Placement Coordinator and determine how they do their job. Find out if your department ranks job candidates by field.

Determine whether your department offers financial support to its job candidates. Some departments offer no financial support at all, but others subsidize mailing costs or pay for travel to conferences at which you will interview.

Determine all of the deadlines for your department: e.g. for CVs (to be compiled into a departmental mailing) and for requesting letters of recommendation. Your politeness and punctuality will help your department to help you with your job search.

## 2. Applying for Academic Jobs

In early fall, look for job openings in your field. You can look on the following websites.

- Job Openings for Economists (JOE). Jobs are posted monthly (except January and July) around the fifth day of the month. The October and November editions contain the most listings, but check earlier months as well, because listings are not repeated in consecutive months. JOE is available online at http://www.eco.utexas.edu/joe/ For the secondary market, look for postings in February. In a survey of new Ph.D. economists who graduated during 1996-97, Siegfried and Stock (2000) find that JOE was rated the most effective method of job search.
- The Association of Public Policy Analysis and Management. Jobs are posted continuously. Also, you may post your CV on their website. http://qsilver.queensu.ca/~appamwww/
- The Economics Research Network: http://www.ssrn.com/update/ern/index.html
- The Financial Economics Network: http://www.ssrn.com/fen/index.html
- Health economists may also want to look at the International Health Economics Association web page: http://www.healtheconomics.org
- The Chronicle of Higher Education carries job advertisements in its print and internet versions. New job announcements are posted every business day, and remain online for 30 days. Most economics departments do not advertise their positions in the Chronicle, but you might find ads from interdisciplinary or unorthodox departments. http://chronicle.merit.edu/jobs/
- The Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession web page lists job openings. http://www.cswep.org/positionsavailable.html

Job advertisements will usually list a desired field of specialization within economics. Sometimes the search is very narrowly focused on that field and sometimes it is just a general guideline and in reality the department expects to hire the best available candidate, regardless of field. You can contact the search chair to ask about the breadth of the search.

Evidence of the demand for new economists appears in Tables 2, which lists the number of new academic jobs (at both the junior and senior levels) posted in JOE by month for the past five years. In 2001, a total of 1,589 academic jobs were advertised. Traditionally, the October issue of JOE contains the most new job advertisements, but issues for November and December are also big. In contrast, the issues of JOE published March through June contain relatively few new jobs.

## INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Table 3A lists the number of new Ph.D.s in economics and econometrics granted by U. S. institutions in recent years. In 2000, 1999, and 1998 the number of jobs listed in JOE has exceeded the number of new economics Ph.D.s in the U.S.; however, jobs at the senior level are
included in the JOE totals. Also, it should be noted that the set of people competing for junior academic jobs includes not just those listed in Table 3A but also people who earned their economics Ph.D. in universities outside the U. S., current junior faculty and postdocs seeking new jobs, and to some extent those earning their Ph.D.s in public policy or business.

Table 3B provides historical background on the supply of economics Ph.D.s in the United States. The number of economics Ph.D.s granted has more than doubled from the early 1960s to the late 1990s. Other important trends from the early 1960s to the late 1990s are that the percentage of economics doctorates awarded to women has risen from $4.2 \%$ to $24.9 \%$ and the percentage of economics doctorates awarded to non-U.S. citizens has risen from $21.5 \%$ to $52.1 \%$.

## INSERT TABLES 3A \& 3B HERE

Table 4 lists the number of times in each of the last several years that JOE job advertisements have listed specific areas of economics as the focus of their search (these totals include both junior and senior positions, and nonacademic as well as academic jobs). Consistently, the most commonly-listed fields of specialization sought are: Mathematical and Quantitative Methods, Industrial Organization, Microeconomics, International, and Money and Macro. Fields that are rarely listed as the focus of a job search include: Methodology and History of Economic Thought, Economic Systems, and Economic History.

## INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

For how many jobs should you apply? That depends on how broadly you are marketing yourself. In Stock et al. (2000)'s sample of economics job candidates during 1995-96, the average applicant sent 76 applications; $25 \%$ sent 100 or more. List (2000) reports that the mean number of applications for academic jobs in a sample of job seekers at the 1997 ASSA meetings was 40.9 , with a standard deviation of 31.6.

You might find rankings of departments to be useful in focusing your search. There are several sources for rankings of economics departments, each of which uses either or both of two criteria to rank departments: 1) faculty publications and 2) surveys that request academics or administrators to rank departments in terms of academic reputation.

- National Research Council. The most recent rankings are published in Goldberger et al. (1995). (Although it was published in 1995 it is often referred to as the 1993 NRC study.) 107 departments in economics are rated on the "scholarly quality of program faculty" and on "program effectiveness in educating research scholars and scientists". The NRC rankings are the gold standard; they take into account faculty publications and citations (during 1988-1992), federal grant support (during 1986-1992), and faculty awards, as well as academic reputation (which is derived from a Spring 1993 survey of a random sample of 234 "key" economics faculty identified by graduate deans). The NRC rankings are also the only ones to include confidence intervals, which are critical when comparing department ranks. The NRC issued rankings once earlier using data from 1982; see Jones et al. (1982). Some of the 1993 study is available online at: http://www.nap.edu/html/researchdoc/
- U. S. News and World Report: Since 1994, USN\&WR has published annual rankings of graduate departments. While the rankings are published annually, USN\&WR re-ranks only a rotating subset of departments each year. These rankings do not take into account faculty publications; the rankings are based entirely on a poll of department chairs and administrators. The sample size is, to my knowledge, not revealed. In general, USN\&WR is much more vague than the NRC about study methodology. Their most recent rankings, from U. S. News and World Report (2001), appear online at: http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/beyond/bcrank.htm
- Dusansky and Vernon (1998). They do not survey faculty to determine academic reputation but instead base their rankings exclusively on weighted volume of top-quality publications of faculty during the period 1990-1994. Their findings are eyebrow-raising in that the two University of Texas-Austin-affiliated authors conclude that, among economics departments in the U. S., their home department ranked $11^{\text {th }}$ (ahead of Chicago, University of California-Berkeley, Minnesota, and Wisconsin), whereas the NRC ranks their department $31^{\text {st }}$. An earlier paper, Conroy and Dusansky (1995), uses a similar methodology.
- Scott and Mitias (1996). Like Dusansky and Vernon (1998), Scott and Mitias use volume of publications as a way to rank U. S. economics departments. However, the two count publications over different time periods; whereas Dusansky and Vernon examine 1990-1994, Scott and Mitias cover 1984-1993. Scott and Mitias report counts of total pages in 36 top journals and also total pages in only five top journals.
The rankings from these sources are listed in Table 5.


## INSERT TABLE 5 HERE

The NRC did not rank business Ph.D. programs. Several sources rank MBA programs, but these rankings are less helpful for your search because they reflect things like starting salary of MBA graduates, satisfaction of MBA students with the teaching, and other factors which are only weakly correlated with the quality of the department from the point of view of a junior professor. However, if you are curious, below are listed the URLs at which you can find rankings of MBA programs from the following sources:
Business Week:
http://www.businessweek.com/bschools/00/
U.S. News and World Report:
http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/beyond/gradrank/mba/gdmbat1.htm
Wall Street Journal:
http://www.careerjournal.com/specialreports/bschoolguide/results.html
Forbes:
http://www.forbes.com/bschools
Financial Times:
http://career.ft.com/ft/gx.cgi/ftc?pagename=View\&c=Article\&cid=FT3MBN476IC\&live=true
Joseph Tracy and Joel Waldfogel:
http://papers.nber.org/papers/W4609.pdf
Nor are there any good rankings of public policy departments. The NRC did not rank public
policy Ph.D. programs. U.S. News and World Report ranks masters degree programs in public affairs, which are unsatisfactory for several reasons. First, good masters degree programs are less likely to indicate good junior faculty environments than are good Ph.D. programs. Second, compared to public policy departments, public affairs departments are more heavily staffed by political scientists than economists. If you are curious, the latest U.S. News and World Report rankings of masters degree programs in public affairs are online at:
http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/beyond/gradrank/gbpubadm.htm
Encourage your advisors to call anyone they know in the department and to vouch for you. (While such informal contacts are important for getting an initial interview, after that you are on your own. Nobody can get the job for you - you have to perform well in the interviews and in your job talk.) Incidentally, if your committee refuses to make any calls or emails on your behalf, don't worry - you will still get interviews.

Talk to your letter-writers about where you plan to apply and ask for their advice. Make sure that they are aware of what type of job you want and of any restrictions on your search. You might want to ask if they are able to write a good letter, or to ask if they could write a better letter if you limited your search to certain departments. Give copies of your CV and cover letter to your letter-writers so they can see how you are marketing yourself.

It makes sense to have more letter-writers than is required. That way, even if one is late, the consideration of your application is not delayed. Stock et al. (2000) find that $13 \%$ of interviewing departments treated incomplete files as ineligible for review and that $42 \%$ of departments did not notify candidates that their file was incomplete unless the candidate looked promising.

There are two conferences at which you could interview prior to the ASSA meetings. The first is the Association of Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM) meetings, usually scheduled for the last week in October or first week in November; the URL for the 2001 APPAM meetings is:
http://qsilver.queensu.ca/appam/conferences/fall/dc01/
Public policy schools are more likely than economics departments to interview there. The second is the Southern Economics Association (SEA) meetings, held in the middle of November. The URL for the 2001 SEA meetings is: http://www.etnetpubs.com/conferenceprograms/sea/general.htm
As the title of the conference suggests, economics departments in the Southern U.S. are more likely than departments from other regions of the U.S. to interview at the SEA meetings. The job markets at these two meetings are very small relative to that at the ASSA meetings. Stock et al. (2000) find that, of participants in the economics job market in 1995-96, only $6 \%$ of departments and only $11 \%$ of applicants participated in interviews at the SEA meetings.

In early September the ASSA will send out to AEA members a brochure that includes information on reserving hotel rooms for the conference. As early as possible make your hotel reservations, for two reasons. First, hotel choices diminish as the conference nears; if you wait too long you may be forced to stay in a nonconference hotel far from your interviews. Second,
after a cutoff date you will not be listed in the Hotel Directory, which employers can use to contact you during the meetings. When making hotel reservations, you might want to ask for a room close to ground level; that way, if elevators are slowed by the huge traffic of job candidates scrambling to their interviews, you can take the stairs to exit the hotel or reach your room from the lobby. Most years, the ASSA reserves an all-suite hotel for interviews; you might want to reserve a room in a hotel near to the all-suite interview hotel, or you might want to reserve a room at the headquarters hotel, which has bulletin boards on which your interviewers will list their hotel room numbers.

Plan to arrive a day before the conference begins so that you can scout out the hotel locations; also, it will make your life less stressful if your flight happens to be delayed.

The ASSA brochure advertises the Illinois Skills Match as a job placement service. This service is free but is not a replacement for mailing your job packets. Stock et al. (2000) found that only $21 \%$ of departments during 1995-96 used the professional placement service at either the AEA or Southern Economics Association meetings. The professional placement service is probably more useful for those in the teaching college market than those in the research university market.

Likewise, your department's mailing of CVs is not a substitute for a job packet mailing. Stock et al. (2000) found that only about half of hiring departments even review the packets of CVs, and only about $20 \%$ reported scheduling an interview on the basis of the CV packet.

In your cover letter, list the research focus of the search and where you saw the job advertisement. Departments may have multiple searches underway and you want to be sure that your application is reviewed by the appropriate committee. If you are applying to more than one opening at the same department, you should send as many job market packets as jobs for which you are applying so that your materials can be referred to each search committee.

By early November at the latest give an electronic mail merge file (in Microsoft Word, probably) to the secretaries of the faculty who will be writing you letters of recommendation. You should check with the secretaries periodically to make sure the letters have been mailed. You should be very nice to these secretaries because they are performing an important service for you.

Try to have your packets sent by November 1. They absolutely must arrive by Thanksgiving. The packets will consist of a cover letter that you have tailored to that particular job and university, your CV, your job market paper, and all other completed papers, especially those that are published. Photocopy your papers double-sided to save on mailing costs. If you are sending multiple papers be sure to point out which one is your job market paper, either in your cover letter or on the paper's title page. Rarely, a job advertisement will also request your graduate school transcript. The U. S. Postal Service's Priority Mail system is a good way to send your job market packets: it is relatively fast (around 3 days) and relatively cheap. When I did a job market mailing in 2001 it cost about $\$ 9$ per packet for photocopying and postage.

In your cover letter and on your CV list a phone number at which you can be reached if the department wishes to interview you. Make sure that you list a number connected to voice mail
or an answering machine. If you list a phone number associated with an office used by a large number of graduate students you may fail to receive some messages. Most departments are now making contact via email but you still want to receive any interview requests that do come by telephone. You will also probably want a cell phone so that you can stay in contact with interviewers while traveling.

You may get requests for your job market packet. Even if you have already mailed a packet in response to a job advertisement from that department, send another packet to any individual requesting one.

For the primary market, expect to get your first requests for interviews in the first week of December and most of them in the second and third weeks of December. However, the variance is large and you may receive requests as early as before Thanksgiving and as late as a few days before the ASSA meetings; be sure to check your email and voice mail over the winter holidays.

When you receive a call requesting an interview, make sure that in the course of the conversation you record the following information:

- The name of the person calling
- Their department and institution
- For which position you are being interviewed (if there were multiple job listings from this department).
- The date, time, and length of the interview
- The hotel in which the interview will take place
- How you can find out the exact room in which the interview will take place (Can they give you a disclosure code for the AEA Room Information Booth? Will you need to call an interviewer during the meetings? Will you need to check a bulletin board in the conference hotel?)
- Which faculty members will be conducting the interview (may not be available)
- Who is on the search committee

If you have a cell phone, give the number to each interviewing department so they may reach you while you are traveling.

As you begin to receive requests for interviews, be respectful of other candidates on the job market. Share information with other candidates but don't flaunt your successes.

Two papers, Stock et al. (2000) and List (2000), yield clues as to how many interviews you should expect. Stock et al. (2000) found that $95 \%$ of applicants during 1995-96 had at least one interview; on average, these people had nine total interviews. The average number of AEA interviews by graduate school rank is listed in Table 6; candidates from the top 25 departments report more interviews at the AEA meetings than do candidates from lower-ranked departments. List (2000) found in his sample of job seekers at the 1997 ASSA meetings that, of those who had applied for any academic jobs, $20 \%$ had no interviews for academic jobs at the ASSA meetings. The mean number of academic interviews for the entire sample was 5.99 , with a
standard deviation of 6.62. List also finds that a job candidate from a top-19 institution, as ranked by Scott and Mitias (1996), received between 1 and 1.6 more academic interviews than candidates from lesser-ranked departments.

## INSERT TABLE 6 HERE

If you aren't getting any calls by the second week of December set up an emergency meeting with your advisors and ask them to email or call around on your behalf. You might also consider emailing certain faculty members at the institutions with which you would most like to interview.

Keep a strict list of everyone you talk to at each university. Update it after conference interviews and campus visits. You don't want to go on your campus interview and forget which people you have already met or chatted with on the phone.

Should you ever decline an interview? Yes, if there is no way that you would take the job. Don't waste your time and theirs. Don't accept interviews solely because "it will be good practice". It's not good practice if it's not a good match.

Interviews at the AEA meetings can last from 30 to 60 minutes. When scheduling interviews, leave an absolute minimum of 15 minutes between interviews so that you can move from room to room and hotel to hotel. You might want to study a map of hotel locations in the convention city and try to schedule interviews in the same hotel in adjacent time slots and to leave extra time between interviews that are physically distant.

There is learning by doing in interviews. For this reason you might want to schedule your most important interviews for the middle of the conference (and the middle of the day), and schedule marginal interviews for the beginning of the conference (and the beginning of the day).

Ask the junior faculty in your department if they would conduct mock interviews so you can practice.

Before you depart for the ASSA meetings, have your job talk ready; you may be invited for campus visits immediately after the ASSA meetings.

## 3. Interviewing at the ASSA Meetings

The vast majority of interviews for economists on the academic job market take place at the Allied Social Science Associations meetings. Departments generally rent a hotel room or suite into which applicants stream for tightly scheduled 30-60 minute appointments throughout the meetings. Occasionally departments will interview at a table in a ballroom or take you to a meal. Interviews held in small hotel rooms may feel quite crowded, with interviewers perched on beds or leaning against walls. In the course of the ASSA meetings, departments may interview two dozen applicants for each job; the search chair (or entire committee) may sit in on every interview and as a result your interviewers may be more fatigued than you!

Before the meetings, contact the departments to ask which faculty members will be conducting the interview. Review their publication records and research interests and think of how to make a research connection to each of them. Take careful note of the papers in your area the interviewers have published; understand how your work relates to theirs.

Before interviewing, learn as much as you can about the individual members of the department (even those not interviewing you), the department itself, and the University. The internet makes this easy. Know what degrees the department offers and know the relevant units on campus. Be prepared for the fact that interviewers may refer to university-specific programs or administrative units using acronyms.

Arrive a day before the conference begins so that you can scout hotel locations, determine the exact rooms in which the interviews will take place (via phone calls to interviewers or postings on a bulletin board in the conference hotel), and relax a bit.

When traveling, be sure to arrive at the airport early (at least an hour in advance of your flight). Since the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, airport check-in times have increased in mean and variance. Expect to be searched, which may include having to turn on all electronic devices, stand and be scanned with a metal detector, be asked to remove your shoes and flip your belt buckle. Note that December 31, 2002 is the current Department of Transportation deadline for all checked bags to be screened. This may lead to even longer delays after the first of the year, precisely at the time you will be traveling to the ASSA meetings.

The AEA maintains a "Job Interview Suite \& Room Information Booth" in the conference headquarters hotel. Interviewers may give you a disclosure code when they schedule your interview. At the booth will be posted a list of disclosure codes and the hotel names and room numbers associated with them.

Work together with the other grad students from your department who are on the market to determine interview locations. Share information. If there is a grad student from your department at the meetings who is not on the job market, you could ask that person to determine interview locations for the grad students who are on the market. Since outgoing calls from hotels are expensive, you might find it cheaper to use a cell phone when calling other hotels to
determine interview locations.
Even though you may not attend any sessions, register for the conference and wear your conference name tag during your interviews.

Expect that occasionally interviewers will be running late and may ask you to stand waiting in the hotel hallway.

Begin the interview by introducing yourself and shaking hands with your interviewers.
In each interview, keep in mind the parameters of the search (i.e. the field desired). Be prepared to explain why you are qualified in that field. You might think this is unnecessary; after all, they've contacted you for the interview. However, getting the interview merely means that a few people in the department think you are worth talking to; there could still be serious disagreement over whether you are qualified in the field so come prepared to present and defend your fieldspecific credentials.

You want to show interest in the field of economics generally, not just in your job talk paper. Be receptive to alternative approaches-don't be defensive about comments on your work. Have an intellectual discussion in the interview. Be relaxed enough to go with the flow of the conversation; don't appear scripted. Ideally you will show that you are interested in finding the right answer, not just in getting a paper in print. Show that you have many research projects in mind.

Know where your research fits in the literature. Be able to explain how your current work fits into a larger plan for establishing your place in that literature.

Interviewers are looking for a good colleague. Make eye contact, smile, and be friendly.
If English is your second language, interviewers may be evaluating whether your English skills are sufficiently advanced for you to teach successfully at their institution. It is important for you to speak clearly, particularly for departments that put a heavy emphasis on undergraduate teaching.

If you have a lot of interviews, you may have very little time to eat. You must make sure to eat in order to remain responsive, cheerful, and relaxed. Bring granola bars or other portable snacks with you in your briefcase and eat between interviews.

The ASSA meetings will be physically, mentally, and emotionally demanding. Try to minimize the shock on your body by as much as possible keeping to your regular schedule. If you exercise, keep to your usual regimen. If you tend to eat a light breakfast, do the same at the meetings. If you drink the same tea every morning, bring some of it with you; you may find it reassuring. Don't overindulge in caffeine; you may not find convenient bathrooms. You will be running between hotels so before each interview remember to glance in a hallway or lobby mirror to make sure that your appearance is neat.

AEA interviews generally begin with the question: tell us about your dissertation. In response, explain your paper in broad terms. The interviewers may know nothing about your field, so be sure to explain the economic intuition and logic of what you are doing and try to frame your research as interesting to a wide audience. Have canned 5-minute and 1-minute talks that you have rehearsed until they are extremely polished. (However, don't give the impression of reciting from a memorized script - talk naturally.) Talk about the issues you want to talk about, that you feel comfortable with. Don't open doors you don't want opened. The interview isn't a seminar -- don't have an introduction, methods section, etc. Don't be afraid to admit the limitations of your work; the last thing you want to do is defend something that's not defensible.

Have a mental list of the most important things you want to communicate during the interview. Work these in when conversation lags. If there are reasons that you especially want the job, be sure to mention them. Recruitment committees want to find people who really want the job and are likely to accept an offer.

It's OK to ask for the motivation behind an interviewer's question, or to ask for clarification.
After a dozen or so interviews you may forget what you've already said in that particular interview. Pay attention to what you've already said and try not to repeat yourself.

Following are some questions you might hear about your research:

- Tell us about your dissertation/job market paper.
- How did you get the idea for this paper? (Interviewers may be curious if your advisor simply handed you the dissertation idea.)
- To what journal will you send it?
- In general, what journals do you consider to be the appropriate outlets for your work?
- When will you finish your dissertation? (The correct answer is you will defend and graduate before you start the new job.)
- Questions about any paper listed on your vita. (Interviewers may want to make sure that your other "working papers" really exist and aren't just ideas.)
- Which senior economists do you wish to emulate? Why?
- Do you plan to continue collaborating with your coauthors/advisors?
- What is your research agenda for the next five years? What are the next three papers you will write?
- Will your research use structural models or a more reduced form approach?
- Do you think you'd be happy in a department like ours? (Especially likely to be asked by interdisciplinary departments.)

You may be interrupted during your responses. This is normal and you should not panic or get angry.

Do not try to dodge questions; to attempt to do so would insult the intelligence of your questioners. Consider all questions seriously and answer them as best you can.

Following are some questions you might hear about teaching:

- What is your teaching experience?
- What would you like to teach? What texts or journal articles would you use to teach those courses? How would you design the course?
- How would you teach it/What is your teaching philosophy?
- How would you teach to our students (undergrads / masters / nontraditional / PhD students) in particular?

Following are some other questions interviewers might ask:

- Why are you interested in our school?
- Is the location of our school (rural, regional) a problem?
- Where else are you interviewing?
- How's the market this year?
- What is your greatest strength? What is your greatest weakness?
- Are you on the market jointly with someone else?

Towards the end of the interview generally time is reserved for you to ask the interviewers questions. Here are some suggested questions you can ask them:

- Would you describe your department's research environment?
- Would you describe the seminar schedule? Are there separate seminars for each field?
- Is there much mentoring of junior faculty by senior faculty?
- What is the balance of assistant, associate, and full professors?
- What do you think are the strengths and weaknesses of your department?
- How strong are the links between different units of the University?
- In which journals do you want your faculty to publish?
- What are the computer facilities like?
- Would I have an opportunity to teach graduate students?
- Will I be able to teach courses in my field or will I be teaching large introductory classes?
- How do you see me fitting in your department?
- What is the teaching load? What is the typical course reduction for new faculty? Are faculty allowed to use grant money to buy teaching reductions for the purposes of research?
- What is the quality of the graduate students? To which fields are they most attracted? Are they involved with the research of the faculty? Are there resources to support grad students as RAs? Does the university help facilitate interaction with grad students as research assistants or coauthors? What is your goal in educating graduate students: to produce academics and researchers?
- Do the faculty coauthor with each other?
- Is there much interaction across fields within the department?
- I saw on your web page that you have N faculty; is that the number of lines in the department?
- What are your expectations about grant-writing by junior faculty?

Don't be afraid to refer to a list of questions for each department. Doing so will help you to remember to ask the important questions, allow you to keep track of the answers, and it signals to the interviewers that you've done your homework and are taking the interview seriously.

At the end of the interview, be sure to ask whom you should contact if you have any questions and when they plan to make their decisions about campus visits. Some may not make decisions for weeks while others may be calling candidates the next day.

You may have some interviews that go very badly, leaving you feeling shaken. You must divorce it from your mind immediately and go to the next interview as relaxed, cheerful, and natural as you were before your bad experience.

Send thank you notes to your interviewers (email is OK but handwritten notes make a more positive impression).

## 4. Campus Visits

Departments vary greatly in how soon they meet after the ASSA meetings to decide which interviewees to invite for a campus visit. Some departments may call you just days after the ASSA meetings, others may wait until the end of January or even the beginning of February. Candidates in whom the department is particularly interested may be invited for a campus visit prior to the ASSA meetings as part of the pre-emptive market. If you are getting few or no campus visits by early February, meet with your advisors to discuss the problem and continue to apply for newly-posted jobs in Job Openings for Economists and the websites listed earlier.

Stock et al. (2000) found that, of interviewees at the AEA meetings, $68 \%$ received invitations for campus visits, averaging 3.2 invitations. Table 6 indicates that there is no clear pattern of the probability of a candidate receiving any invitations for campus visits by the ranking of the candidate's graduate school. However, candidates from the top 25 departments reported roughly twice as many invitations for campus visits than did candidates from lower-ranked departments. (Information on the quality of the department inviting the candidate is not reported.)

You will not be informed if you are not going to be invited for a campus visit.
Should you ever decline a campus visit? Yes, if there is no way that you would take the job. Don't accept flyouts solely because you think it will be good practice; it's not good practice if it's not a good match. Don't accept flyouts solely to increase your exposure. Campus visits can be extremely fatiguing; you don't want to agree to ten campus visits and then be exhausted by the time you need to make a good impression for the department that is your top choice. Declining campus visits to departments you would never join is also a decent thing to do because departments have limited resources. If you receive many calls for campus visits, schedule your top four or five immediately and ask the others if you can call them in a few weeks to schedule the visit. Later, you can decline the invitation if things are going well.

Try to combine multiple campus visits with a single flight (especially if the flight is crosscountry); you can divide cost of flight between the schools so that everyone gains from combining the trips.

On your campus visit you will present your job paper in a formal workshop and will meet individually or in very small groups with about a dozen faculty or deans; you may have little in common with some of these people. You will also have at least one dinner with a small group of faculty, which, though informal, is a very important part of the vetting process. Most departments invite three people per opening for campus visits; a campus visit indicates that you are a finalist.

Keep in mind that your interaction with economists on the job market is just the first stage in a repeat game. The people with whom you are interviewing will be in the same profession as you for decades. Be courteous and friendly and even if they never make you a job offer they will remember you well. If you are arrogant or abrasive you will make things harder for yourself in the future - some of your interviewers (yes, even those in poorly-ranked departments) will be
refereeing your papers, evaluating your grant applications, and perhaps writing your tenure letters.

During your campus visit, don't be too intimate:

- Don't tease
- Don't flirt, even if you think someone is flirting with you-you're more likely to be hyperaware of little things and to misinterpret.
- Don't touch people in a familiar way (e.g. punching someone's shoulder in a jocular way, putting your arm around the back of someone's chair when you're sitting next to them, touching the person to whom you are talking)
- Don't address people in an overly informal way. Be aware of how people prefer to be addressed; for example, in some instances you should address people as Doctor or Professor, and even when going by first names be sure you use the right form of the first name; if someone prefers to be called Catherine you don't want to call her Cathy.
- Don't joke around too much--you're likely to be a little hyperactive because of adrenaline and you may sound shrill or nasty or your humor may fall flat. You may be misinterpreted.
- Don't tell personal stories. This is especially true of drinking stories or dating stories.

While you don't want to be too intimate you also don't want to be aloof or stiff or unfriendly. It's a delicate balance. You want to come across as a relaxed and friendly future colleague.

Don't be too quiet. Initiate conversations. Go out of your way to say hi to people who are in your field or who have worked on a similar topic, even if they're not on your schedule; they will be expecting it.

At the end of your campus visit, ask whom you should contact if you have any questions and when they plan to make their decision. Again, departments differ in their ability to make a quick decision.

Departmental policies for reimbursement vary widely; some departments may have you book your ticket through a university travel office and have the hotel bill them directly so that you don't need to charge anything to your credit card; other departments may ask you to pay out of pocket for travel and hotel and submit the receipts for reimbursement. If you have lots of campus visits scheduled this can quickly exhaust your credit card's limit. Call the credit card company and ask for additional credit before you begin traveling. If you do pay out of pocket, don't forget to get a receipt for your airfare - with e-tickets so popular now you may not have any other printed receipt. Submit receipts to departments for reimbursement immediately after each trip is completed; if you wait to submit them you could easily lose the receipts or forget.

Send a written thank-you note to the search chair after the campus visit.
The rest of this section on campus visits is divided according to your three activities during the visit: the interviews with individual or small groups of faculty, your job market talk, and the dinner with faculty.

## a) Campus Visits -- Interviews

Before departing for your campus visit, request a detailed itinerary of your visit. Visit the departmental web page and familiarize yourself with each faculty member you are scheduled to meet. In particular, look through their CVs to see if they have ever published in your area. Make notes and list a few things to chat about with each person.

It is your job to make sure there are no dead times in an interview. Come with enough questions to fill a forty-five minute interview. It's OK to repeat the questions in interviews with different people. People will be taken aback if you say you have no questions and they will think that you have no serious interest in their department. Remember that interviewers may have been assigned to interview you and will be annoyed if you make it any more work for them.

Bring a sheet listing your questions and record the answers; you will appear well prepared and interested. Some questions you might ask the Dean:

- How do you envision the department changing in the future? What are your goals as Dean?
- What resources are available to help new faculty jump-start their research agenda?
- How do you evaluate faculty for contract renewal and for tenure?
- What do you think are the strengths and weaknesses of the department?
- How strong are the links between the department and other units of the University?
- Which department were you in before you went into administration?

Some questions you might ask of the department Chair:

- How do you envision the department changing in the future? What are your goals as the chair?
- Is the administration supportive of the department (e.g. has there generally been agreement on tenure cases, is the Dean generous with resources)?
- What resources are available to help new faculty jump-start their research agenda?
- How do you evaluate faculty for contract renewal and for tenure?
- Is there much mentoring of junior faculty by senior faculty?
- In which journals do you want your faculty to publish?
- What are the computer facilities like?
- Would I have an opportunity to teach graduate students?
- Will I be able to teach courses in my field or will I be teaching large introductory classes?
- How do you see me fitting in your department?
- What is the teaching load? What is the typical course reduction for new faculty? Are faculty allowed to use grant money to buy teaching reductions for the purposes of
research?
- What is the quality of the graduate students? Where have the best graduate students in your program placed recently? To which fields are they most attracted? Are they involved with the research of the faculty? Are there resources to support grad students as RAs? Does the university help facilitate interaction with grad students as research assistants or coauthors?
- What is your goal in educating graduate students: to produce academics and researchers?
- Do the faculty coauthor with each other?
- Is there much interaction across fields within the department?
- I saw on your web page that you have N faculty; is that the number of lines in the department?
- What are your expectations about grant-writing by junior faculty?

Some questions you might ask of the other senior faculty:

- What is your main research project at the moment? (If at all possible know in advance the research interests of each person with whom you will be meeting.)
- Are you happy with the research environment here?
- Are you satisfied with the computer facilities?
- What is the quality of the graduate students? Where have the best graduate students in your program placed recently? To which fields are they most attracted? Are they involved with the research of the faculty? Are there resources to support grad students as RAs? Does the university help facilitate interaction with grad students as research assistants or coauthors?
- Do the faculty coauthor with each other?
- Is there much interaction across fields within the department?
- How does this department compare to the others you've been in?
- What kind of courses are you teaching, and how much control did you have over that?
- Does the department allow one to buy out of courses if one has external funding?
- What seminars do you regularly attend?
- Are there any units outside of the department I should know about, for example, any interdisciplinary centers that offer research grants?
- Where do you see the department going in the near future? Is there an intention to build in any particular area?
- How does the budgetary future of the department look? Will there be more junior faculty hired in the near future? If it is a state university, how sensitive is the department's budget to the state legislature?
- How have recent graduate students from this department fared on the academic job market?
- How do you like living here?

Do not ask about salary. In general, the only time to discuss it is after you have received an offer.

Your more sensitive questions (e.g. about recent tenure cases in the department) should be
reserved for private discussions with friendly junior faculty. In general you might want to ask junior faculty an open-ended question like "So, is there anything I should know about the department?" Here are some other questions you might want to ask junior faculty:

- What is your main research project at the moment? (Again, you should know in advance their general research areas.)
- Are you happy with the research environment here?
- Are you satisfied with the computer facilities?
- Do the faculty coauthor with each other?
- Is there much interaction across fields within the department?
- Are you satisfied with the mentoring of junior by senior faculty?
- What kind of courses are you teaching, and how much control did you have over that?
- What seminars do you regularly attend?
- Are there any units outside of the department I should know about, for example, any centers offering research grants?
- Were you satisfied with the start-up package provided to you as a new faculty member?
- How much committee work or service work have you had to do?
- Are the junior faculty happy with the review process? Do the juniors feel like they've been treated fairly in the reviews? What has happened in the last few tenure reviews?
- Are there any political issues I should know about within the department?
- In general, is there anything I should know about the department?
- How do you like living here? Where do the junior faculty choose to live?

There are two ways that junior faculty interviewers can see you: 1) as a competitor; or 2) as a potential colleague and collaborator. Try to persuade them to see you as \#2 instead of \#1. If they see you as $\# 1$, they may be thinking: this person has had better luck than I and hasn't really earned this position, this person has more publications than I so there must be something wrong with their work, this person may know more than me (and they'll act off-putting or defensive). If they see you as \#2, they may think: what could we collaborate on, this person would be great to have in the next office, I bet he or she would read my work and give great comments, this person would help me be more productive, etc.

It may help to know a friend of the interviewer, someone who tells you to say hi to the interviewer; this serves as a reminder at the very least that if the interviewer treats you badly one of their friends will hear about it. At best it makes them see you as a "friend in law."

It is very important to ask other people about their research and discuss it in an interested way.
Don't belittle your own work out of a sense of modesty (or anything else). You should be excited about your work, enjoy it, and take pride in it.

Being a "nice person" counts for an awful lot. People are looking for good colleagues and neighbors. Personality concerns can veto appointments, no matter what the other qualities of a candidate.

Academia is gossipy. Many interviewers will ask you confidentially, "What's it like working with Professor X?" or "I've heard Professor X can be hard to deal with." Until you have a degree in hand and a job contract signed it's unwise to tell anecdotes about your advisors. Even then, you should expect that your comments will be repeated.

## b) Campus Visits - The Job Talk

It is very important to have an extremely polished and professional job talk. Practice it again and again. Rehearse answers to anticipated questions. Know it well enough that you can make a lot of eye contact instead of reading off of overheads. At some point you'll become sick of your job talk but be sure to maintain your enthusiasm and keep it fresh.

At the beginning of your talk, provide an outline of the talk and quickly summarize your findings. You might be tempted to wait until the end of the seminar to announce your findings, but this isn't a murder mystery in which knowing the ending ruins the show. You want people to know your findings as soon as possible. Sometimes you will run out of time before you finish your talk and you don't want people leaving your job talk wondering about the bottom line.

Put your research in the context of the previous literature, but spend little time critiquing the previous literature. Instead of emphasizing the negative aspects of what others have done, emphasize the positive aspects of what you've done.

Make sure that, when you are citing literature, you are correctly pronouncing the authors names.
There are two media you could use in your job talk: overhead projector slides or PowerPoint. The advantages of using PowerPoint are that you can change your talk up to the last second, it encourages organization, and may produce more legible visuals. The disadvantages are that some departments may not have an LCD projector (be sure to confirm that ahead of time!), and PowerPoint encourages simplification, which may make some people suspicious.

No matter which medium you use, make sure that your slides are legible. Do not put up a photocopied table from your dissertation - it is likely to be illegible. For PowerPoint, a font size of 24 is the minimum.

A great reference on the effective presentation of quantitative information via graphs and charts is the set of books by Edward R. Tufte; e.g. Tufte (1983).

As stated above, it is very important to come across as a nice person. That said, a little fire in the belly is a good thing. If someone harasses you in a workshop or an interview you don't need to keep a smile plastered to your face; it can be a good thing to have a controlled episode of annoyance. Uncontrolled outbursts of anger or frustration are always bad. This is a very fine line to walk.

During job talk, if there is a major disagreement about facts, and you are concerned about losing too much of the seminar time, you can say something like: "We should probably talk about this after the workshop, because I had a different impression of the facts ... OK?" This will acknowledge their point without agreeing with it and allow you to proceed with your presentation. As a speaker, being able to control a seminar in a diplomatic way is a difficult and very valuable skill. Domowitz (2001) goes so far as to say, regarding your job talk seminar, that "Loss of control = loss of job."

Do not try to dodge questions during your job talk; to attempt to do so would insult the intelligence of your audience. Consider all questions seriously and answer them as best you can.

When people give you comments, write them down. This serves several purposes: 1) it indicates that you are listening to what people are saying; 2) it shows that you want to improve your research; and 3) it can be used to provide closure when there's a disagreement -- you can note the person's complaint, thank them, put down the pad and move on with your talk.

In some job talks you will be confronted with a question that you don't handle well. When you return home from the visit, you can email the questioner, remind him or her of the question and provide the best answer that you can craft and conclude by asking if that strikes them as a reasonable answer. In other words, even if you fumble the ball during the job talk, it is still possible to make a good impression by remembering the question and trying to find the right answer.

## c) Campus Visits - Dinner with Faculty

Much of the advice in section 3a) Campus Visits - Interviews also applies to the dinner with faculty. The few remaining comments here concern the mechanics of the meal itself.

Brush up on your dining etiquette. Departments will likely take you to one of the best restaurants in town and you may be confronted with issues of etiquette that you rarely face. Know that your bread plate is the one to the left (above your fork) and that your glasses are those to the right. Know that you start with the outside silverware and work in. Knowing the basic rules can spare you embarrassment. For example, at one recruitment dinner I attended, a bottle of wine came to the table. The candidate picked it up first and filled his wine glass to the brim and then looked on, visibly embarrassed, as everyone else at the table filled their wine glasses halfway. It's unlikely that you would lose a job offer because of bad table manners, but you don't want to feel embarrassed and out of place at a time you want to be bonding with your dinner companions.

At dinner, drink what others are drinking (probably wine) but in minimal quantities. Perhaps have one glass of wine that you don't entirely finish. Under no circumstances should you have more than two drinks. Don't order a cocktail like a martini. You may not do or say something stupid every time you're tipsy, but it's likely that most of the stupid things you could do or say would occur when you're tipsy.

You should expect that there will be times during dinner that your companions will talk amongst themselves about departmental matters. While you might feel ignored, and perhaps anxious that you are a boring dinner companion, don't panic. This happens at virtually every recruitment dinner and is no reflection on you. If it happens, just politely and attentively listen to the discussion, and participate when it feels natural.

Be very polite and nice to waiters and waitresses (and secretaries). No matter how nice you are to the interviewers, if you are rude to support staff no one will think you're a nice person.

Even if you were invited for a campus visit, you may not be officially notified if another candidate has been offered, and accepted, the job.

## 5. Negotiating

In the Stock et al. (2000) sample, $80 \%$ of respondents received at least one job offer. Of those that received any, the average number of offers received was 1.8. Table 6 indicates that, of candidates receiving any offers, the average candidate from a top- 25 department received one additional offer relative to the average candidate from a lower-ranked department.

A very good book to read on the subject of negotiating is Fisher, Ury, and Patton (1991). One point of the book is that you must appeal to an objective standard (here, the fair market salary and benefit package) and not give in to pressure from the other side.

What might be included in an offer? Aside from salary, it might include summer support (each month of which is equal to a ninth of your nine-month salary), course reductions, research funds, office setup budget, office computer budget, and perhaps a travel budget. Each of these may be negotiable, but you will probably have to have other offers to convince a department to sweeten their initial offer.

What have market salaries been recently? The Center for Business and Economic Research at the University of Arkansas has conducted surveys of economics departments to determine what salaries and benefits they had offered recent Ph.D. hires; these reports can be found online at http://www.uark.edu/depts/cberinfo/aea/
In Deck et al. (2002), the most recent such CBER report, economics departments were asked: "For a new Ph.D. with degree in hand, what DID you offer as a 9-month salary for appointment in the 2001-2002 academic year? If this varied across people, please give an average." The summary statistics associated with survey respondents' answers are listed in Table 7. The average salary offered to new Ph.D.s during 2001 by Ph.D.-granting departments in the sample was $\$ 66,949$. The top 30 departments offered, on average, $\$ 72,836$. The average salary offered by departments in the sample that do not have a Ph.D. program was considerably lower: $\$ 55,958$.

## INSERT TABLE 7 HERE

Another source of information on recent market salaries for new economics Ph.D.s comes from the American Economic Association's Universal Academic Questionnaire. Each fall, the AEA surveys the chairs of economics departments on the number and salaries of their faculty, by rank. Note that academic economists working outside of economics departments are not reflected in this survey. Since 1999, the summary statistics of these questionnaires have been reported in the American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings. Listed in Table 8 are the employment conditions for new assistant professors in economics holding their Ph.D.

## INSERT TABLE 8 HERE

Table 8 indicates two things. First, average compensation for new economics professors is considerably higher, and average teaching load is considerably lower, in Ph.D.-granting departments than in those that did not grant Ph.D.s. The average Ph.D.-granting department paid $\$ 69,112$ for a teaching load of 3.6 courses, while departments in which a bachelors was the
highest degree paid $\$ 57,107$ for a teaching load of 5.4 courses. Second, average compensation for new economics Ph.D.s has risen rapidly in the last several years.

Nobody knows in advance what the market salary will be; each year it gets worked out between January and March. There can be tremendous variation in the salaries that are offered. Departments that have not hired a junior person for a few years may be out of touch and offer appallingly low salaries relative to better-informed departments. Suggestive evidence of what range of salaries you should expect in the coming year comes from the CBER report, which asked: "For a new Ph.D. with degree in hand, what is the 9-month salary you EXPECT to offer for the 2002-2003 academic year?" The summary statistics associated with survey respondents' answers are listed in Table 9. The average Ph.D.-granting department expects to offer its new hires $\$ 68,912$. Predictably, departments ranked in the top 30 expect to pay slightly more $(\$ 73,885)$, and those that do not offer Ph.D.s expect to pay considerably less $(\$ 56,677)$. You might wonder how accurate these expectations prove to be; the CBER report compared expected to actual salaries in 2001-2002 and found that actual offers were on average $2.7 \%$ higher than what the institution reported expecting to offer.

## INSERT TABLE 9 HERE

The CBER report also asked hiring institutions about the benefits offered. Information about new hires' summer salary benefits appear in Table 10. Roughly two-thirds of surveyed departments offered summer salary last year, for an average of 2.1 summers. Information about pension benefits is reported in Table 11. Average housing subsidies (which are relatively rare) are reported in Table 12. Average teaching reductions are listed in Table 13. 54.2\% of surveyed departments offered a teaching reduction. Of those offering a teaching reduction, the average reduction was 1.2 courses for an average of 1.9 years.

## INSERT TABLES 10-13 HERE

In addition, the survey results reported in Deck et al. (2002) indicate that over $88 \%$ of all new Ph.D. hires (but everyone hired by a Ph.D.-granting institution) was reimbursed for moving expenses and given a new office computer.

What cannot be negotiated? The generosity of the retirement program, life insurance benefits, and any housing subsidy are generally set at the college or university level and cannot be enriched.

Salaries in business schools are generally higher than those in other academic units. Stock and Siegfried (2001) found in a survey of new economics Ph.D.s from 1996-97 that the salaries of new economics hires in business schools were $19 \%$ higher than those in other academic units.

The best source of current data on business school salaries comes from the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) annual salary survey of business schools. The most recent AACSB survey results (in which 474 participating schools provided data on 24,183 business faculty members across all ranks), contained in Table 14, list average salaries
for newly-hired assistant professors in 2001-2002 in business schools, by field. The average salary of new business school hires in the field of economics was $\$ 64,500$ in 2002 (note that this is inconsistent with the finding in Stock and Siegfried (2001) of a $19 \%$ salary premium for economists in business schools).

## INSERT TABLE 14 HERE

Faculty salaries at private universities tend to be higher than those at public universities. Alexander (2001) studies salary data for all disciplines generated by the American Association of University Professors from 1979-1980 to 1997-1998. He finds that since 1980 the privatepublic gap in salary has risen substantially. The sizes of these gaps by Carnegie classification of the university are listed in Table 15. For each Carnegie classification, the salary gap between private and public universities grew between 1980 and 1998. In 1998, in the nation's largest research universities, the private-public gap in the annual salary of assistant professors was $\$ 6,700$. Clery and Lee (2001) confirm this finding using slightly more recent data. They find that the average salary of assistant professors in all disciplines working in Ph.D.-granting institutions in 1999-2000 was $\$ 50,996$ in private universities and $\$ 47,486$ in public universities.

## INSERT TABLE 15 HERE

Another consideration is that departmental budgets and hiring are more variable in public than in private institutions. In private institutions, expenditures are usually based on a moving average of endowment income to smooth expenditures. Public institutions, on the other hand, can be at the mercy of year-to-year variations in state legislature appropriations -- hiring and raises may be strongly correlated with the business cycle. One economist described departmental resources in his public university economics department as "Years of famine and then the sugar dump truck pulls up."

Talk to other people on the job market to find out what other schools are paying. Don't be surprised when they won't tell you.

Salary is important in ways you may not recognize. A fixed percentage of it will be put into your retirement fund. Subsequent annual raises will be a percentage of it. Each month of summer money is equal to a ninth of it. Some schools provide life insurance equal to a multiple of your salary.

Assistant professors in departments with lower probabilities of tenure receive a small salary premium. Ehrenberg, Pieper, and Willis (1998) analyze data from 1974-1981 and find that a reduction in the probability of tenure by 0.1 is associated with a $0.68 \%$ higher salary.

Spending more than five years in a Ph .D. program appears to be unrelated to the probability of securing a permanent full-time job (as opposed to either unemployment, a part-time job, or a temporary job). It may, however, be associated with lower salaries among men; see Stock and Siegfried (2001).

There are useful relocation calculators on the internet that will help you evaluate the relative attractiveness of different communities. A calculator that allows you to compare the cost of living in different communities of the United States is located at:
http://www.homefair.com/calc/salcalc.html
And one that allows you to compare crime rates in different communities is located at: http://www.homefair.com/calc/crime.html
Money's Best Places to Live provides information about weather, crime, housing, education, health, and other quality of life characteristics in over 300 U . S. cities:
http://money.cnn.com/best/bplive/
If a department will be making you an offer, you will likely be notified by a phone call from the search committee chair. Get the offer in writing as soon as possible. A fax of the offer is OK but they should also mail you a signed copy. You should have all aspects of the offer in writing. An oral promise from the chair isn't enough because the chair might step down or be replaced.

Departments generally give you 10-14 days to consider their offer. Feel free to wait until the deadline to see if they're willing to improve the offer. Be certain to wait if you are waiting to hear from other places.

An important thing to keep in mind is that you will never have more leverage than after the department has made an offer but before you have accepted.

Once you have a single offer, call the other departments you have visited and tell them that you're hoping to hear from them soon because you already have an offer. Many departments move slowly and they may need a stimulus like this just to get the recruitment committee to meet.

Departments are most likely to improve their offer when you have a richer offer from a better department of the same type. A richer offer from a far worse department may not be interpreted as a serious alternative. Economics and public policy departments often do not try to match the higher salaries of business schools. Academic departments are unlikely to match offers from the private sector.

You may ask to have written into your letter the number of preps you will have (i.e. different classes you will teach) as an assistant professor. All else equal, you would like to teach fewer different classes, as that will mean less time for class preparation and more time for research.

Do not be so aggressive in negotiations that you create hard feelings. I have heard faculty darkly muttering about job candidates from years ago who led them on for a month before turning them down, or who asked for so much that the department was outraged. Don't be a jerk and string along departments for your own vanity. Once an offer is dominated by others, turn it down. Keep in mind that your job market interactions are just the first period of a repeat game.

It's possible to be firm and yet still friendly in negotiating. For example, you can say that you're having a hard time making up your mind and you're really hoping that they can do something to
make the decision easier.
Talk to junior faculty already in the department to find out what is easiest for the department to provide. At some universities, parking is so scarce that departments are angered if you simply ask for it. At big sports universities, it may be hopeless to ask for basketball or football tickets. Some departments find it easier to increase research funds, others find it easier to increase salary.

Consider short-term versus long-term benefits of each package. Many offers are front-loaded in that teaching reductions are only for the first semester or the research fund disappears after a year.

As a faculty member, two important inputs to your research are your fellow faculty and your graduate students. Domowitz (2001) makes the important point that the distribution of quality faculty across departments is less skewed than you think but the distribution of quality graduate students across departments is more skewed than you think.

If you accept a job at a research university, research will determine your success as an academic. Figure out what you need to be productive (research funds, teaching reductions, etc.) and in negotiations try to improve these factors.

## 6a. Special Topics: Diversity

If you are a member of a historically disadvantaged minority group (e.g. African-American, Hispanic, Native American) it is to your advantage to find a way to indicate that on your CV; it will increase your chances of being interviewed. You could indicate this information by listing any minority scholarships you have received or your membership in any minority student associations. Typically Asian-Americans and anyone without U.S. citizenship are not counted as historically disadvantaged minorities.

The U. S. Equal Opportunity Commission enforces legislation that bans discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, national origin, age, disability, marital status, political affiliation, pregnancy status, and sexual orientation. While the EEOC forbids employers from discriminating on the basis of these factors, it has varying guidelines as to whether employers may ask applicants about these factors. For example, the EEOC states that questions that tend to disclose race or ethnicity constitute suggestive evidence that race will be unlawfully used as a basis for hiring. On the other hand, the EEOC does not explicitly forbid employers from asking applicants about their age; however, since such questions may deter applicants from further pursuing employment, or may indicate the intent to discriminate, such questions are closely scrutinized. There is no EEOC list of "forbidden questions" for interviewers. For more information about EEOC regulations, see the EEOC website:
http://www.eeoc.gov/regs/index.html
Schools may mail self-identification cards on which they request that applicants record their race and ethnicity and return the card to the school. Compliance is completely voluntary. This information will not be linked to your application but are used to gather aggregate statistics on the race and ethnicity of applicants.

Citizenship of the applicant may affect the probability of interview at lower-ranked, but not at top-ranked, economics departments. Carson and Navarro (1988) find in their survey of economics departments that hired during 1985-86 that the job candidate having U. S. citizenship was ranked as of "great importance" or "moderate importance" in the decision to interview by $26 \%$ of departments ranked below the top 20 but by $0 \%$ of the departments ranked in the top 20 .

There does not appear to be a gender difference in the salaries of newly-hired academic economists. Formby et al. (1993) studied 1987 data from 258 U. S. economics departments and found that controlling for other determinants of earnings, there was no statistically significant correlation between gender and salary.

All applicants should be sensitive to issues of diversity. Men may be closely monitored for sexist behavior or language.

The percentage of new Ph.D.s, job candidates, and new hires in different sectors of employment that were female is listed in Table 16. On average during 1996-2000, roughly $29 \%$ of new

Ph.D.s, and slightly over a quarter of all job market candidates, were women. The third and fourth rows of Table 16 indicate that during this period, relative to their share of all job market candidates, women tended to be over-represented among new hires by non-Ph.D. granting departments, and tended to be slightly underrepresented among new hires by Ph.D.-granting departments.
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## 6b. Special Topics: The Dual Job Search (Spouses)

At the beginning of your job search, sit down with your spouse and discuss possible outcomes to the job market and how you as a couple would handle them. Under what circumstances would you live apart? How far apart are you willing to live? Could you afford to maintain two households? How much are you each willing to compromise your careers for your relationship?

Determine with your spouse your preferences for geography and other factors. Decide what types of jobs (if any) you could never accept; for example, you might rule out all jobs in the Northeast U. S. and all jobs in large cities. Each month that JOE is published, sit down again with your spouse and jointly decide which jobs fit your criteria and which jobs you would not accept even if they were offered to you. Do not apply to jobs that you would not accept; it is a waste of resources and time for both you and the employer. Feel free to share your preferences with prospective employers; this can assist you and the employers in finding a good match.

You may find it helpful to read columns in the Chronicle of Higher Education devoted to dual academic career couples. You can search for them in the Chronicle's online Career Network section: http://chronicle.com/jobs/archive/topical/

Some interviewers ask about marital status (though many in a roundabout way; for example: Do you have any pets? Who is taking care of them while you're away?). Discuss your marital status if asked; you'll look uptight and recalcitrant if you resist.

If your spouse is also an academic, it is in your best interest to reveal this to the employer sooner rather than later. Many departments and universities have formal systems in place to help accommodate academic couples. If an employer does not accommodate academic spouses, this is information that you want to have as soon as possible. Nothing good can come from concealing information about your spouse's job search; keep in mind that your goal on the job market is to find a good match with an employer. If you wait until you have an offer in hand to ask for help with an academic spouse's job search then you have waited too long; even when systems are in place to help with this issue, the process takes weeks.

It is not necessary to describe your dual job search in your letters of application, but you could describe it briefly at the end of your ASSA interview. You can provide the rest of the details on your campus visits. By the time you conclude each campus visit, the prospective employer should understand your preferences and constraints with respect to your "two-body problem."

Academic departments cannot generally find a job for a nonacademic spouse, but they may be able to refer the spouse to local labor market resources.

If your spouse is applying for another academic job at the same university, make sure that both search committees know this. Search committees are aware of the difficulty dual-career spouses have in finding dual job matches, and may jump at the chance to resolve two job searches quickly.

If your spouse has good job market prospects in the vicinity of the university to which you are applying, it is in your interest to reveal this information to the search committee. Keep in mind that people dislike uncertainty; if they know that the job and area are a good fit for you and your spouse, then they will assign a higher expected probability that you will accept the job if offered. Search committees want the offers they make to be accepted, so this may make you a more attractive candidate.

Dual academic career couples enjoy maximum flexibility if they are both on the job market at the same time. If both partners are not at the same stage of graduate studies, the partner who is farther along could consider a postdoc while waiting for the other to finish. Alternatively, the partner further along could conduct an unrestricted search and go back on the junior market when the second partner goes on the market.

Table 17 describes the presence of maternity leave policies in departments hiring newly minted economics Ph.D.s during 2001-2002. Roughly $90 \%$ of Ph.D.-granting departments in the sample stopped the tenure clock for at least a semester for maternity leave, but only in about $70 \%$ of departments was that a formal policy. Maternity leave policies were less common in departments that offered a bachelors or masters as the highest degree. Your plans to have children are private and not appropriate to discuss with prospective employers. If you have questions about the institution's maternity leave policy you should search the institution's web page for that information rather than ask interviewers.
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## 7. Glossary of Job Market Terms

Academia: Academia was a public garden, near Athens, where Plato lectured his pupils. The school became known as the Academy and the teachers and pupils as Academics. Today colleges and universities are referred to collectively as academia or the academy, and professors are known as academics.

Adjunct Professor: A person whose primary employment is outside the university but is hired to teach a few specific courses for a limited period of time. One of several non-tenure-track academic appointments; for others, see instructor, lecturer, and visiting professor.

Allied Social Science Associations (ASSA): The AEA holds in early January joint meetings with other social science associations, e.g. the American Finance Association (AFA), the American Agricultural Economic Association (AAEA), the Econometric Society (ES), the Industrial Relations Research Association (IRRA), and the Association for Social Economics (ASE). These meetings are collectively called the meeting of the Allied Social Science Associations. The vast majority of your initial academic job interviews will take place at the ASSA meetings, held in early January.

American Economic Association (AEA): The professional organization of economists. Their annual meeting is held in early January as part of the Meeting of the ASSA. The AEA website is http://www.vanderbilt.edu/AEA/index.htm . Student membership in the AEA is available at bargain rates and includes membership to three journals: the American Economic Review, the Journal of Economic Perspectives, and the Journal of Economic Literature.

Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM): The professional organization of academics working in the area of public policy. They hold their annual meeting at the end of October or beginning of November. The APPAM website
http://qsilver.queensu.ca/~appamwww/ contains job postings. You may also post your CV on the APPAM website. If you are interested in working in a department of public policy, you should watch the website for job openings and attend these meetings. Interviews at the APPAM meetings tend to be less formal than those at the ASSA meetings.

Assistant Professor: The lowest of three tenure-track or tenured faculty positions. Your first tenure-track job will almost certainly be at the assistant professor level. Assistant professors are subject to at least a third-year review at which point progress towards tenure is assessed; failure to make acceptable progress can result in the termination of your contract. In the vast majority of cases, after the third-year review the assistant professor is told to publish more and work harder and is granted a second three-year contract. At most economics departments and schools of public policy, you will have a six-year tenure clock; at the end of the six years a tenure review will be conducted. If you are approved for tenure then you will be promoted to associate professor. The salaries of assistant professors are driven by three things: 1) the salary at which one was hired, which is determined largely by the market-clearing salary for that year and the presence of alternative offers; 2) annual raises, which are usually a few percent per year;
and 3) when the department raises the assistant professor's salary because the assistant professor has received an outside offer of employment. There is often movement of assistant professors across departments around three years after the initial hire. Assistant professors may not be allowed to vote on certain issues during faculty meetings, such as a tenure review; university policy varies.

Associate Professor: the middle rank of the three tenure-track or tenured faculty positions. Generally one is promoted to associate professor after spending several years as an assistant professor and passing muster in a tenure review. There are associate professors with tenure and associate professors without tenure; university policy varies. Although promotion to associate entails a raise, it is not true that all associate professors make more than assistant professors. The reason is that salaries for associate professors change on the basis of two things: 1) annual raises which are usually a few percent per year; 2 ) when the department responds to an outside offer of employment. Associate professors promoted years ago and who have not received outside offers may find that they are earning less than some assistant professors. While the length of the tenure clock (which dictates the maximum length of time one can spend as an assistant professor before being considered for promotion to associate professor) is usually set, the length of time one must serve as an associate professor before being considered for professor is often left vague.

Campus Visit: see Flyout.
Carnegie Classification: A typology of American colleges and universities developed by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Institutions are divided into categories such as Extensive Doctoral/Research Universities, Intensive Doctoral/Research Universities, Masters Colleges and Universities, Baccalaureate Colleges, Associates Colleges, Specialized Institutions, and Tribal Colleges and Universities. Universities may tout their status as an extensive Doctoral Research University claiming that it indicates the university's commitment to graduate education.

Chair: 1) abbreviation for the chairperson of the department, as in "She is the chair of the economics department." 2) abbreviation for endowed chair, as in "She has a chair in the economics department."

Committee Work: Another thing you'll spend your time on as a professor, in addition to research, teaching, and advising students. Different types of committees on which you may be asked to serve include those for: search (for new faculty), curriculum, and benefits. Departments should try to minimize the amount of committee work given to assistant professors so that they have a better chance of publishing the research necessary to pass the tenure review.

Cover letter: a letter sent as part of your application for a job. The letter should politely request an interview, list the reasons that you believe that you are a good match for that particular job, list the items that are included in the mailing (such as research papers and your curriculum vitae) and provide your contact information.

Curriculum Vitae: In Latin, it means "course of life" but here refers to a resume tailored for academic jobs. It should list your contact information and details about your education, employment, publications, research experience, and teaching experience. The term curriculum vitae is often abbreviated either CV or c.v. There is a widespread but mistaken notion that vita is singular and vitae is plural; in fact, vitae is correct for both the singular and plural.

Dead Wood: slang for faculty who do not contribute to the productivity of the department through either research or grant-writing but who cannot be easily removed because they have tenure. Often a relative term used to refer to colleagues who have been in the department ten years longer than the speaker.

Dean: a university administrator with power over department chairs but lesser in rank than the provost. Deans often have control over the number of lines assigned to each department and can veto the tenure recommendations of departments.

Dual Job Search: a search that is conducted jointly by two people; for example, a husband and wife. Dual job searches can be difficult and stressful, as they involve the two-body problem.

Emeritus: an honorary title awarded to retired faculty. Typically emeriti are given an office, library privileges, and the right to participate in commencement but do not remain voting members of the faculty.

Endowed Chair: A faculty line that has been endowed with outside funds that provide for salary and often research funds. Given these extra perks, endowed chairs are generally awarded to particularly distinguished faculty and are used to recruit prestigious senior faculty from other universities. Endowed chairs are often named for the source of their endowment; for this reason you may see senior faculty referred to as, e.g., the John and Jane Doe Distinguished Professor in Economics. Sometimes appointments to endowed chairs are for a specific numbers of years, but appointments may be renewed.

Flyout: Also called a campus visit. It is an invitation to visit the campus, meet with faculty, and give a job talk. Generally occur after the initial interviews at the ASSA meetings. Often only the top three candidates are initially invited.

Hard Money: A salary offer is considered to be hard money if the faculty member is guaranteed the salary even if she never receives any outside grants. Most offers in economics departments are hard money. This is in contrast to soft money positions.

Instructor: Instructor is one of several non-tenure-track academic appointments; for others, see adjunct professor, lecturer, and visiting professor. Often instructor refers to someone who teaches a class but does not have a Ph.D.; for example, a graduate student hired to teach a class may be labeled an instructor.

Job Openings for Economists (JOE): The primary list of academic job openings in economics and related fields. A publication of the AEA and the economics department at the University of

Texas at Austin, JOE is published every month except January and July. Each issue is released around the fifth day of the month. The website is located at: http://www.eco.utexas.edu/joe/

Job Talk: A formal 60- or 90-minute presentation of your research for the purposes of allowing prospective employers to gauge several things: the quality of your research, your communication skills, and your ability to think on your feet. The atmosphere of a job talk varies greatly depending on the department's culture; faculty may sit attentively to hear an entire presentation before asking polite questions, or (Chicago) faculty may interrupt immediately with aggressive challenges to the presenter's work.

Joint Appointment: the state of having appointments in multiple academic units of a college or university. Joint appointments are most common with two departments, occasionally three, and rarely four or more. If you are offered a joint appointment, ascertain in which department is the primary appointment (i.e. in which department is your line) - that department would have the most influence over your tenure review. For an appointment joint between very different units, the appointee may find it difficult to satisfy all the stakeholders during each review.

Junior Faculty: faculty without tenure; i.e. assistant professors and untenured associate professors.

Land-Grant Institution: a college or university designated by its state legislature or the U. S. Congress to receive funds under one of three pieces of legislation designed to increase the efficiency of agricultural production and educate farmers and rural populations in agriculture and the mechanical arts. Those three such pieces of legislation are:

1) The Morrill Act of 1862 , which gave 17.5 million acres of federal land to the states. Most of this land was sold by the states and the income was used to support the land-grant colleges and universities.
2) The Morrill Act of 1890 , which required states that maintained separate colleges for blacks and whites to equitably divide the funds received under the 1862 Act; this caused the creation of 16 black land-grant colleges in the southern U. S.
3) The National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Act of 1994, which conferred land-grant status on 29 Native American colleges.
There are currently 105 land-grant institutions designated to receive funds from at least one of these three pieces of legislation. The mission of land grant institutions was widened by two pieces of legislation: the Hatch Act of 1887, which supports agricultural experiment stations, and the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which supports extension work in agriculture and home economics. The U. S. Department of Agriculture administers the federal appropriation to states for their land-grant systems, which currently total roughly $\$ 550$ million per year. For some people, the term "land-grant institution" has less than positive connotations; the reason is that many states used the land-grant legislation as an opportunity to start new agricultural universities that were not as strong in classical education as older universities. Today the land-grant institutions are very diverse, including institutions that focus more on agriculture than the social sciences, but also universities with highly-ranked economics departments, such as Cornell, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the Universities of California-Berkeley, MarylandCollege Park, Minnesota-Twin Cities, and Wisconsin-Madison.

Lecturer: A person with graduate training hired to teach in a non-tenure-track capacity. Lecturers are usually paid significantly less, and may be asked to teach significantly more, than assistant professors. Lecturers tend to have little job security; their contracts are generally for a single year, renewable at the discretion of the department, and they are rarely are promoted to assistant professor. Whereas the term instructor is often used to refer to someone teaching a class who does not a Ph.D., the term lecturer is usually reserved for a teacher with a Ph.D. Lecturer is one of several non-tenure-track academic appointments; for others, see adjunct professor, instructor, and visiting professor.

Line: a funded slot for a faculty member within an academic unit. For example, you might be told that a position is joint between economics, public policy, and business, but that the line is in the business school. Before accepting a job you should be certain in what department your line is located; that department will have the most power over your tenure review. Lines are often associated with a salary range, and to accommodate faculty at higher salaries, lines might be combined. Lines can also be left open and the freed salary used to hire multiple lecturers to fill teaching needs. The provost and the dean determine how many lines are assigned to each department. Sometimes the provost or dean will take back unfilled lines. The fear of that happening may cause a department to tenure someone it wouldn't otherwise; i.e. the department might prefer to tenure a less-than-qualified person rather than lose the line. When a department is operating at less than full strength it will have fewer faculty than lines; you might want to ask during interviews how many lines are in the department. Sometimes departments refer to a line by its former occupant, as in "Professor X is in Jane Doe's line," or "We still have to hire someone in the John Doe line."

National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER): A nonprofit nationwide organization of roughly 600 economists with offices in Cambridge, New York, and Palo Alto. On its website at http://www.nber.org/candidates/ the NBER has historically listed links to the job placement webpages for the major economics departments in the U.S.

Nine-month contract: A faculty contract in which the salary covers nine months of the year, and the faculty member may write for outside grants to provide summer salary. Most economics departments are on nine-month contracts.

Postdoc: an abbreviation for postdoctoral researcher. A postdoc is a fellowship that supports one to three years of full-time research after one has completed one's dissertation. In the hard sciences almost all academics complete postdocs before starting as assistant professors. Fewer academics in economics than in the hard sciences do postdocs but the practice has become more common over time. A postdoc is a very useful way of getting your research program underway before having to teach as an assistant professor. Postdocs generally pay only slightly more than graduate fellowships, but there are some exceptions, such as the Robert Wood Johnson postdoc in health policy research, which pays a salary similar to that of an assistant professor. Some postdocs are formal programs sponsored year after year by organizations (e.g. National Institute on Aging, National Institute on Child Health and Human Development, the NBER) whereas others are ad hoc -- for example, a professor might hire a postdoc to help her with a specific
project. Another distinction to make among postdocs is that some fund you to do your own research whereas others make you a full-time worker on a project of the employer's design.

Preps: slang for class preparations. For example, if you are teaching two sections of the same class, you only have one prep, but if you are teaching two different classes at the same time you have two preps. All else equal, you would like to minimize the number of new preps (different classes you must teach) as an assistant professor.

Professor: the highest-ranking of the three tenure-track or tenured faculty positions. Professors are generally paid more than associate professors and are virtually always better paid than assistant professors. Some professors have an endowed chair.

Provost: a high-ranking university administrator whose job is to oversee the academic mission of the university. In recent years, as university professors have had to devote more time to fundraising and less to managing the university, Provosts have become more powerful influences on academic life. Provosts usually have the final say in the tenure review and also have control over the number of lines in each academic unit.

Review: Prior to the tenure review, departments typically require a formal meeting of the departmental faculty to assess the progress of each tenure-track faculty member in terms of research, teaching, and committee work. Such a review is usually held in the third year (and is referred to as a third-year review). Some institutions review their junior faculty every year.

Sabbatical: A period of paid leave from teaching, advising, and committee work in order to pursue scholarly goals, often away from the university. Typically one receives one semester at full pay or one year at half pay, every six years. This tradition has roots in the Old Testament injunction to let land lay fallow every seven years in order to allow the land to regain its fecundity; likewise, the sabbatical should be a break from your usual duties that increases your productivity upon your return. The word sabbatical refers to the fact that the seventh year of fallow agriculture is analogous to the seventh day of rest (the Sabbath) dictated in the Ten Commandments. Some believe that it is important to leave the university town for one's sabbatical, to avoid being sucked back into the committee work and advising from which one is on leave. A person on sabbatical is a sabbaticant. The noun form is sabbatical; i.e. "He is on sabbatical." The adjective is sabbatic; i.e. "She is on sabbatic leave." At some institutions one is eligible for a sabbatical only after one has tenure.

Search Committee: A group of several faculty who have been delegated by the department with the task of reviewing applications and interviewing prospective applicants. Policy varies, but many search committees pick the three finalists to invite to campus, after which the entire faculty will vote on the question of to whom to make an offer. The search committee chair is the ultimate arbiter within the committee; you should know who is the search committee chair at each place you have a campus visit.

Senior Faculty: faculty with tenure; i.e. professors and tenured associate professors.

Soft Money: A salary offer is considered to be soft money if the faculty member is eventually expected to raise a significant fraction of the salary through outside grants. Few economics departments have soft money positions, but they are common in schools of public health and in certain think tanks. See hard money for a contrast.

Start-Up Package: a "package" of benefits offered to new faculty to help them settle in the new department and jump-start their research agendas. It may include a one-time research budget, a one-course reduction in teaching load for the first year, and other perks.

Summer Money / Summer Support: If you have a nine-month contract, you may apply for grants to pay your summer salary. Often departments will offer summer money to the job candidates they are trying to attract; for example, they might offer a month of summer money for each of the first two summers. A month of summer money is equal to one-ninth of the salary on your nine-month contract. Faculty with twelve-month contracts are generally not eligible for summer money.

Teaching Load: how many courses you will be required to teach in an academic year. For example, someone who is required to teach two courses in the fall semester and two more in the spring semester might say that they have a "two-two" teaching load. Departments usually reduce the teaching load by one course during an assistant professor's first year.

Tenure: it means a lot less than you think. You've probably heard that it means you're guaranteed a job for life. Wrong-usually tenure is with the department, not the university, so if the university sees a lot of dead wood in a department, it can simply eliminate the entire department and all of the faculty are out of work (this happened to the School of Education at the University of Chicago and the Sociology Department at Washington University of St. Louis). Generally, the department cannot fire the tenured faculty member, but there is nothing to prevent the department from making a tenured faculty member so uncomfortable or miserable that they retire or quit. Ways of driving out a tenured faculty member include: freezing their salary, moving them to a terrible office, taking away administrative support, and raising their teaching load. Keep in mind that your goal as an assistant professor is not to get tenure at your current institution, it is to develop a national reputation for high-quality research - as a by-product, that will ensure you tenure somewhere.

Tenure Clock: the length of time (between 6 and 12 years) one spends as a tenure-track faculty member before being considered for tenure.

Tenure Review: the process of deciding whether to tenure a junior faculty member. The tenure review is based on several factors, including success in research (measured by publications in respected journals and receipt of peer-reviewed grants), success in teaching, and how well the faculty member is regarded by outside letter writers. Often the candidate is allowed to submit a list of possible letter writers, to which the tenure review committee, the Dean, and the Provost may add additional names. Tenure letters are in some cases a matter of public record, and even if they aren't, the proceedings of tenure review committees may not be kept secret in practice, so some people who would write negative tenure letters may simply refuse, claiming that they're
too busy. As a result, tenure review committees interpret refusals as a signal that the candidate being reviewed is of poor quality. After receiving the reports from outside letter-writers, the department will vote on whether to approve the candidate for tenure. If the department votes affirmatively, the Dean will decide whether to approve the vote, and then the Provost has final say over whether the candidate should be tenured. In some cases, a university-wide review committee reports to the Provost. The decisions of the Dean and Provost are not rubber stamps; it is not uncommon for people who received unanimous votes for tenure by their departments to be vetoed by the Dean or Provost. For this reason, in the year of their tenure review, some candidates go on the national job market. This is useful for two reasons: 1) if the faculty are rejected for tenure at their home institution they will have already lined up their next job; 2) the presence of outside offers may increase the likelihood that the home institution will offer tenure and/or increase their compensation package in order to retain the faculty member. Typically, junior faculty who are refused tenure are allowed to stay on the faculty for one full year after their tenure review. After that year, however, the junior faculty member who was denied tenure must depart for employment elsewhere.

Tenure Track: a description of an academic job that is either tenured or untenured with a promise of tenure review after a certain period of time. Professor, associate professor, and assistant professor are tenure track academic appointments. Adjunct professor, instructor, lecturer, and visiting professor are non-tenure track appointments.

Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association-College Retirement Equities Fund (TIAACREF): A financial services company that administers defined-contribution retirement accounts for many universities and colleges. Contributions by the faculty member and institutions are portable; i.e. faculty aren't faced with the problem of "golden handcuffs" - being forced to stay at an institution because retirement savings would be lost if they left.

Twelve-Month Contract: A contract that includes a salary that covers all twelve months of the year. One implication of this type of contract is that you generally cannot supplement your salary through summer money.

Two-Body Problem: The added difficulty of finding a job for your spouse or significant other in the same geographic area that you find a job. The two-body problem is faced by candidates in a dual job search.

Visiting Professor: a non-tenure-track academic position, usually held for a single year, often by academics who have tenure or are tenure-track at another university. Some assistant professors make a conscious effort to serve as visiting professors at one or two strategically chosen departments so that in their tenure review, they are well-known to potential letter-writers from outside their institution.
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Table 1:
Schedule of Job Search
By Job Market Segment

| Segment of <br> Market | Applying for <br> Jobs | First Interview <br> Conducted at <br> ASSA Meetings? | Campus Visits | Offers and <br> Negotiations |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-Emptive | October- <br> November | No | December | December |
| Primary | October- <br> December | Yes | January-February | February-March |
| Secondary | October- <br> February | Maybe | February-April | March-May |

Notes:
Segments are defined according to Carson and Navarro (1988).

Table 2:
Number of New Academic Jobs Posted in JOE
By Month, 1996-2001

| Month | $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 6}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| February | 93 | 108 | 106 | 91 | 93 | 76 |
| March | 69 | 56 | 29 |  |  |  |
| April | 71 | 64 | 85 | 74 | 46 | 45 |
| May | 29 | 48 | 33 |  |  |  |
| June | 39 | 27 | 27 | 59 | 67 | 41 |
| August | 108 | 126 | 130 | 93 | 83 | 50 |
| September | 144 | 154 | 99 |  |  |  |
| October | 495 | 456 | 483 | 510 | 386 | 401 |
| November | 341 | 320 | 350 | 317 | 271 | 264 |
| December | 200 | 276 | 198 | 226 | 208 | 162 |
| Total | 1589 | 1635 | 1540 | 1370 | 1154 | 1039 |

Notes:
Includes both junior and senior openings.
Issues for March, May, and September began in 1999.
Sources: Siegfried (2002, 2001), Table 1, and Hinshaw (2000, 1999, 1998, 1997), Tables 1.

Table 3A:
Number of Recipients
of an Economics Doctorate
at U.S. Universities, 1998-2000

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 8}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Economics Ph.D.s Granted by U.S. Universities | 948 | 927 | 998 |
| $\quad$ Gender |  |  |  |
| Men | $72.9 \%$ | $72.4 \%$ | $72.5 \%$ |
| Women | $26.9 \%$ | $27.2 \%$ | $27.2 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| U.S. Citizens $\quad$ Citizenship | $41.5 \%$ | $43.1 \%$ | $41.0 \%$ |
| Non-U.S. Citizens with Permanent Visas | $5.4 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ |
| Non-U.S. Citizens with Temporary Visas | $48.6 \%$ | $45.0 \%$ | $41.3 \%$ |

Notes: Totals include doctorates in economics and econometrics.
Source: NSF (2001, 2000, 1999), Appendix Tables A-3a. The Survey of Earned Doctorates is a census of all individuals receiving a research doctorate from a U.S. institution in the academic year (July 1st through June 30th of the next year).
Percents do not sum to $100 \%$ because of non-response and rounding.

Table 3B:
Number of Recipients
of an Economics Doctorate at U.S. Universities,
by 5-Year Period 1960-1999

|  | $\mathbf{1 9 9 5 -}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}-$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 5}-$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}-$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7 5}-$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6 5 -}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6 0 -}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6 4}$ |
| Economics Ph.D.s Granted | 4,944 | 4,526 | 4,241 | 3,958 | 4,219 | 4,359 | 3,333 | 2,160 |
| by U.S. Universities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Gender of Economics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Ph.D. Recipient |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men | 75.1 | 78.1 | 81.9 | 85.8 | 89.4 | 93.2 | 95.1 | 95.8 |
| Women | 24.9 | 21.9 | 18.1 | 14.2 | 10.6 | 6.8 | 4.9 | 4.2 |
| $\quad$ Citizenship of Economics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Ph.D. Recipient | 42.9 | 43.1 | 51.5 | 61.3 | 68.4 | 71.3 | 71.9 | 75.7 |
| U.S. Citizens | 52.1 | 54.0 | 41.5 | 34.6 | 29.1 | 26.7 | 25.3 | 21.5 |
| Non-U.S. Citizens |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes: Totals include doctorates in economics and econometrics.
Source: Data from the Survey of Earned Doctorates reported in Table A of Scott and Siegfried (2002).

Percents do not sum to $100 \%$ because of non-response and rounding.

Table 4:
Fields of Specialization Sought
In Job Openings for Economists
1996-2001

| JEL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Code | Field of Specialization Sought | $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 6}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | General Economics and Teaching | 82 | 94 | 102 | 95 | 69 | 32 |
| B | Methodology and History of <br>  <br> Economic Thought | 16 | 21 | 25 | 14 | 11 | 16 |
| C | Mathematical and Quantitative | 428 | 491 | 425 | 361 | 344 | 230 |
|  | Methods |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | Microeconomics | 357 | 385 | 370 | 321 | 279 | 198 |
| E | Macroeconomics and Monetary | 317 | 317 | 322 | 295 | 290 | 267 |
|  | Economics |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | International Economics | 307 | 364 | 302 | 323 | 282 | 253 |
| G | Financial Economics | 280 | 312 | 283 | 256 | 241 | 174 |
| H | Public Economics | 208 | 217 | 258 | 180 | 168 | 127 |
| I | Health, Education and Welfare | 211 | 201 | 199 | 202 | 126 | 102 |
| J | Labor and Demographic Economics | 237 | 267 | 203 | 201 | 165 | 126 |
| K | Law and Economics | 46 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 44 | 33 |
| L | Industrial Organization | 322 | 388 | 330 | 313 | 272 | 213 |
| M | Business Administration; Business | 87 | 119 | 94 | 95 | 76 | 61 |
|  | Economics; Marketing, Accounting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N | Economic History | 29 | 35 | 33 | 24 | 23 | 21 |
| O | Economic Development, | 174 | 149 | 149 | 157 | 140 | 121 |
|  | Technological Change |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P | Economic Systems | 23 | 28 | 37 | 32 | 26 | 27 |
| Q | Agricultural and Natural Resource | 178 | 231 | 206 | 187 | 175 | 132 |
| R | Economics |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban, Rural, and Regional | 84 | 100 | 102 | 68 | 84 | 53 |  |
| Z | Economics |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AF | Anyer Special Topics | 52 | 50 | 44 | 32 | 23 | 26 |
| ZZ | Administrative Positions | 303 | 290 | 223 | 195 | 190 | 179 |
| Total |  | 35 | 78 | 63 | 40 | 40 | 40 |

Notes:
Includes both junior and senior openings, and nonacademic as well as academic jobs.
Advertisements may list more than one field of specialization.
Sources: Siegfried (2002, 2001), Table 3, and Hinshaw (2000, 1999, 1998, 1997), Tables 3.

Table 5:
Rankings of U. S. Economics Departments

Economics Ph.D. Program

Harvard University
University of Chicago
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Stanford University
Princeton University
Yale University
University of California-Berkeley
University of Pennsylvania
Northwestern University
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
University of California-Los Angeles
Columbia University
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor
University of Rochester
University of Wisconsin-Madison
University of California-San Diego
New York University
Cornell University
California Institute Technology
University of Maryland - College Park
Boston University
Duke University
Brown University
University of Virginia
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
University of Washington-Seattle
Michigan State University
University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign
Washington University (St. Louis)
University of Iowa
University of Texas - Austin
Johns Hopkins University
Ohio State University-Columbus
Texas A\&M University
University of Pittsburgh
University of Arizona
Iowa State University

| National | National | National | National | U. S. News |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Research | Research | Research | Research | \& World | Dusansky \& | Scott \& |  |
| Council | Council | Council | Council | Report | Vernon | Mitias | Dusansky |
| 1995 | 1995 | 1982 | 1982 | $2001-02$ | 1998 | 1996 | 1995 |
| Research | Educational | Research | Educational |  |  |  |  |


| 1.5 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 17 | 4 | 3 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.5 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 14 |
| 5 | 2 | 5 | 3.5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 6 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 9 |
| 7 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 6 |
| 8 | 11 | 8 | 11 | 9 | 3 | 8 | 10 |
| 9 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 3 |
| 10 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 11 | 18 | 18 | 20 |
| 11 | 16 | 13 | 14 | 11 | 21 | 10 | 19 |
| 12 | 17 | 9 | 15 | 14 | 22 | 12 | 37 |
| 13 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 11 | 22 | 11 | 10 |
| 14 | 10 | 14 | 9 | 14 | 12 | 15 | 13 |
| 15 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 10 | 18 | 16 | 17 |
| 16 | 12 | 18 | 20 | 17 | 9 | 25 | 7 |
| 17 | 22 | 16 | 30.5 | 19 | 6 | 13 | 10 |
| 18 | 19 | 20 | 22 | 17 | 42 | 20 | 27 |
| 19 | 13 | 24 | 18 | 14 | 31 | 38 | 29 |
| 20 | 27 | 19 | 28 | 24 | 14 | 24 | 16 |
| 21 | 32 | 37 | 36.5 | 26 | 7 | 19 | 8 |
| 22 | 20 | 23 | 19 | 21 | 25 | 17 | 25 |
| 23 | 18 | 17 | 16 | 21 | 27 | 35 | 21 |
| 24 | 21 | 22 | 25 | 26 | 20 | 23 | 39 |
| 25 | 24 | 28 | 26 | 30 | 38 | 50 | 39 |
| 26 | 23 | 25 | 21 | 31 | 36 | 27 | 25 |
| 27 | 25 | 26 | 24 | 31 | 43 | 30 | 27 |
| 28 | 28 | 27 | 30.5 | 26 | 39 | 36 | 42 |
| 29 | 31 | 30 | 27 | 31 |  | 69 |  |
| 30 | 29 | 43 | 39.5 | 31 | 30 | 26 | 30 |
| 31 | 38 | 41 | 48 | 21 | 11 | 29 | 18 |
| 32 | 26 | 21 | 17 | 24 | 15 | 56 | 32 |
| 34 | 34.5 | 36 | 35 | 29 | 24 | 22 | 23 |
| 34 | 34.5 | 31 | 32 | 37 | 33 | 31 | 35 |
| 34 | 33 | 44 | 38 | 46 | 15 | 34 | 21 |
| 36.5 | 48 |  |  | 37 |  | 43 | 47 |
| 36.5 | 30 | 33 | 23 | 46 |  | 54 | 50 |


| University of California-Davis | 38 | 50 | 35 | 39.5 | 31 | 28 | 21 | 33 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State University of New York-Stony Brook | 39 | 40.5 | 38 | 36.5 |  |  | 66 | 43 |
| University of Southern California | 40 | 42.5 | 29 | 34 | 40 |  | 46 |  |
| University of Florida | 41 | 42.5 | 40 | 50.5 | 40 | 31 | 39 | 23 |
| North Carolina State University | 42 | 49 | 47 | 41 | 48 | 47 | 33 | 48 |
| Boston College | 43 | 46 | 50 | 52.5 | 40 | 35 | 48 | 46 |
| Indiana University-Bloomington | 44 | 36.5 | 48.5 | 46 | 40 |  | 28 | 31 |
| Pennsylvania State University-University Park | 45 | 39 | 46 | 49 | 31 | 28 | 40 | 44 |
| Rice University | 46 | 53 | 56 | 50.5 | 48 | 48 | 75 | 41 |
| George Mason University | 47 | 54 |  |  |  |  | 67 |  |
| Vanderbilt University | 48 | 45 | 34 | 33 | 40 | 40 | 49 |  |
| University of California-Santa Barbara | 49 | 47 | 42 | 42 | 40 | 33 | 37 | 36 |
| Purdue University | 50.5 | 36.5 | 32 | 29 | 39 |  | 77 |  |
| University of Massachusetts - Amherst | 50.5 | 44 | 39 | 47 |  |  |  |  |
| Rutgers State University - New Brunswick City University of New York - Graduate | 52 | 51 | 51 | 59.5 | 48 | 46 | 44 | 48 |
| School | 53 | 52 | 59 | 61 |  |  | 53 |  |
| University of Colorado-Boulder | 54.5 | 40.5 | 57 | 54 | 51 | 43 | 47 | 37 |
| Georgetown University | 54.5 | 58 | 78 | 74 | 51 | 50 | 58 |  |
| Syracuse University | 56 | 55 | 53 | 43.5 |  |  | 74 |  |
| University of Houston | 57 | 56 |  |  |  | 45 | 32 | 34 |
| State University of New York-Buffalo | 58 | 62.5 |  |  |  |  | 41 |  |
| Southern Methodist University | 59 | 64.5 | 48.5 | 52.5 |  |  | 64 | 45 |
| Claremont Graduate School | 60 | 60 | 45 | 43.5 | 51 |  |  |  |
| University of Oregon | 61 | 71 | 55 | 45 |  |  | 89 |  |
| Florida State University | 62 | 59 | 61 | 55.5 |  |  | 70 |  |
| University of Georgia | 63 | 67 |  |  |  |  | 76 |  |
| University of Kentucky | 64 | 61 | 60 | 67 |  |  | 60 |  |
| University of South Carolina | 65 | 74 | 69 | 76 |  |  | 84 |  |
| State University of New York-Binghamton | 66 | 62.5 | 58 | 59.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona State University | 67 | 64.5 |  |  |  |  | 59 |  |
| George Washington University | 68 | 66 | 54 | 57 |  |  | 93 |  |
| Georgia State University | 69 | 70 | 70 | 73 |  |  |  |  |
| University of Illinois - Chicago | 71 | 78 |  |  |  |  | 61 |  |
| American University | 71 | 73 | 67.5 | 70.5 |  |  |  |  |
| University of California-Riverside | 71 | 80 | 74 | 80 |  |  |  |  |
| University of Kansas | 73 | 69 | 65 | 65 |  |  | 98 |  |
| Auburn University | 74 | 87 |  |  |  |  | 83 |  |
| Clemson University | 75 | 57 |  |  |  |  | 52 |  |
| State University of New York-Albany | 77 | 77 | 73 | 67 |  | 48 | 63 |  |
| University of Wyoming | 77 | 75 |  |  |  |  | 90 |  |
| Southern Illinois University | 77 | 84.5 | 83 | 83 |  |  |  |  |
| University of Tennessee-Knoxville | 79 | 84.5 |  |  |  |  | 57 |  |
| Tulane University | 80 | 84.5 | 52 | 55.5 |  |  | 73 |  |
| Louisiana State | 81.5 | 68 |  |  |  |  | 81 |  |
| University of Notre Dame | 81.5 | 76 | 80 | 77 |  |  |  |  |
| Washington State University | 83 | 72 | 76.5 | 78 |  |  | 99 |  |
|  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |


| University of Connecticut | 84 | 84.5 | 63 | 63 |  |  | 96 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| University of Hawaii - Manoa | 85 | 91 | 76.5 | 75 |  |  |  |  |
| Oklahoma State University | 86 | 89 | 64 | 58 |  |  |  |  |
| University of Nebraska-Lincoln | 87 | 104.5 | 72 | 72 |  |  |  |  |
| University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee | 88 | 81.5 | 62 | 67 |  |  | 85 |  |
| Lehigh University | 89 | 88 |  |  |  |  | 95 |  |
| University of Utah | 90 | 90 | 66 | 64 |  |  |  |  |
| Temple University | 91 | 94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West Virginia University | 92 | 79 | 75 | 69 |  |  |  |  |
| University of Missouri-Columbia | 93 | 93 | 67.5 | 62 |  |  |  |  |
| Northern Illinois University | 94 | 98.5 | 81 | 84 |  |  |  |  |
| University of Alabama | 95 | 98.5 |  |  |  |  | 82 |  |
| Fordham University | 96 | 92 | 84 | 82 |  |  | 88 |  |
| University of Cincinnati | 97 | 97 | 79 | 79 |  |  |  |  |
| University of Texas - Dallas | 98 | 102 |  |  |  |  | 97 |  |
| Howard University | 99 | 103 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Colorado State University | 100 | 104.5 | 71 | 70.5 |  |  |  |  |
| University of New Hampshire | 101 | 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute | 102.5 | 95 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Missouri-Columbia | 102.5 | 81.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Colorado School of Mines | 104 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Utah State University | 105 | 96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clark University | 106 | 106 | 82 | 81 |  |  |  |  |
| Northeastern University | 107 | 107 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Carnegie Mellon University |  |  |  |  | 19 | 37 | 14 | 14 |
| University of California-Irvine |  |  |  |  |  | 26 | 42 |  |
| Dartmouth |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45 |  |
| VPI |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51 |  |
| Brandeis |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55 |  |
| University of Santa Clara |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62 |  |
| Williams College |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65 |  |
| Brigham Young University |  |  |  |  |  |  | 68 |  |
| University of California-Santa Cruz |  |  |  |  |  |  | 71 |  |
| University of New Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  | 72 |  |
| University of Massachusetts |  |  |  |  |  |  | 78 |  |
| Miami University (Ohio) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 79 |  |
| Illinois State University |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80 |  |
| Tufts University |  |  |  |  |  |  | 86 |  |
| University of Miami (Florida) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 87 |  |
| University of Delaware |  |  |  |  |  |  | 91 |  |
| Montana State |  |  |  |  |  |  | 92 |  |
| Wayne State |  |  |  |  |  |  | 94 |  |
| University of North Carolina - Greensboro |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |
| Virginia Tech |  |  |  |  |  | 41 |  |  |

Notes on Table 5: Rankings of U. S. Economics Departments
Sources:
Columns 1-4: Goldberger, Maher, and Flattau (1995), Appendix Table P-15.
Column 5: U. S. News and World Report (2001).
Column 6: Dusansky and Vernon (1998), Table 2.
Column 7: Scott and Mitias (1996), Table VI. These rankings reflect total pages published in five top economics journals.
Column 8: Conroy and Dusansky (1995), Table 1.
An Excel file containing the rankings listed in Table 5 is available for download at: http://www.people.cornell.edu/pages/jhc38/

Table 6:
Outcomes for New Economics Ph.D.s
On Junior Academic Job Market
By Graduate School Ranking 1995-96

| Outcome | Graduate School Ranking According to Scott and Mitias (1996) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1-25 | 26-50 | 51-75 | 76-100 | >101 |
| Received any interviews | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (59) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96 \% \\ & (45) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88 \% \\ & (33) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88 \% \\ & (17) \end{aligned}$ |
| Number of prearranged AEA interviews | $\begin{gathered} 11.71 \\ (59) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.78 \\ & (45) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.21 \\ & (33) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.54 \\ & (13) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.81 \\ & (16) \end{aligned}$ |
| Number of interviews per application | $\begin{gathered} .17 \\ (59) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .10 \\ & (45) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .06 \\ & (33) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} .09 \\ (13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} .08 \\ (16) \end{gathered}$ |
| Received at least one invitation for campus visit | $\begin{gathered} 83 \% \\ (59) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81 \% \\ & (43) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 86 \% \\ & (29) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92 \% \\ & (13) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73 \% \\ & (15) \end{aligned}$ |
| Number of invitations for campus visits | $\begin{aligned} & 5.06 \\ & (49) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.63 \\ & (35) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.72 \\ & (25) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.50 \\ & (12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.82 \\ & (11) \end{aligned}$ |
| Received any job offers | $\begin{aligned} & 83 \% \\ & (58) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82 \% \\ & (45) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \% \\ & (33) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92 \% \\ & (13) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71 \% \\ & (17) \end{aligned}$ |
| Number of job offers received | $\begin{aligned} & 2.46 \\ & (48) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.42 \\ & (36) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.43 \\ & (23) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.42 \\ & (12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.58 \\ & (12) \end{aligned}$ |
| Percentage of offers that were tenure track | 56\% | 49\% | 36\% | 12\% | 40\% |

Notes:
Source: Stock, Alston, and Milkman (2000), Table 7.
Sample size appears in parentheses below cell value.
For a listing of Scott and Mitias (1996) rankings, see Table 5 of this paper.
Sample description: Stock, Alston, and Milkman (2000) surveyed 897 job candidates, drawn from pool of applicants for positions at Kansas State, Weber State, and Murray State, and the packets of CVs sent from economics departments marketing their PhD graduates to the departments at Kansas State and Weber State. The response rate was 20.6\%.

Table 7:
Salary Offered to New
Ph.D. Hires in Economics, 2001-2002

|  | All PhD- <br> granting <br> Institutions | Top 30 <br> Institutions by <br> NRC Ranking | Bachelors and <br> Masters Degree <br> Granting <br> Institutions | All Institutions, <br> Including <br> Nonacademic |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean | $\$ 66,949$ | $\$ 72,836$ | $\$ 55,958$ | $\$ 62,680$ |
| Std. Deviation | $\$ 9,569$ | $\$ 3,894$ | $\$ 8,571$ | $\$ 11,415$ |
| Minimum | $\$ 34,852$ | $\$ 70,000$ | $\$ 39,000$ | $\$ 34,852$ |
| Maximum | $\$ 90,000$ | $\$ 85,000$ | $\$ 78,000$ | $\$ 90,000$ |
| N | 52 | 14 | 28 | 87 |

Source: Deck et al. (2002) p. 22.
Question asked: "For a new Ph.D. with degree-in-hand, what DID you offer as a 9-month salary for appointment in the 2001-02 academic year? If this varied across people, please give an average."

Table 8:
Employment Conditions
for New Assistant Professors in Economics
Holding Ph.D.
1998-1999 to 2001-2002

|  | Year | Salary | Additional <br> Compensation | Teaching Load <br> (Courses / Year) |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ph.D. Institutions | $2001-2002$ | $\$ 69,112(\mathrm{~N}=39)$ | $\$ 19,319(\mathrm{~N}=39)$ | $3.6(\mathrm{~N}=39)$ |
| Ph.D. Institutions | $2000-2001$ | $\$ 67,173(\mathrm{~N}=37)$ | $\$ 27,335(\mathrm{~N}=37)$ | $3.5(\mathrm{~N}=37)$ |
| Ph.D. Institutions | $1999-2000$ | $\$ 59,546(\mathrm{~N}=37)$ | $\$ 18,657(\mathrm{~N}=19)$ | $3.5(\mathrm{~N}=30)$ |
| Ph.D. Institutions | $1998-1999$ | $\$ 57,685(\mathrm{~N}=40)$ | $\$ 15,189(\mathrm{~N}=25)$ | $3.6(\mathrm{~N}=35)$ |
| M. A. Institutions | $2001-2002$ | $\$ 59,091(\mathrm{~N}=8)$ | $\$ 13,815(\mathrm{~N}=8)$ | $4.0(\mathrm{~N}=8)$ |
| M. A. Institutions | $2000-2001$ | $\$ 52,960(\mathrm{~N}=6)$ | $\$ 18,942(\mathrm{~N}=6)$ | $5.5(\mathrm{~N}=6)$ |
| M. A. Institutions | $1999-2000$ | $\$ 55,390(\mathrm{~N}=10)$ | $\$ 13,489(\mathrm{~N}=7)$ | $5.6(\mathrm{~N}=11)$ |
| M. A. Institutions | $1998-1999$ | $\$ 50,769(\mathrm{~N}=13)$ | $\$ 7,152(\mathrm{~N}=6)$ | $5.2(\mathrm{~N}=11)$ |
| B.A. Institutions | $2001-2002$ | $\$ 57,107(\mathrm{~N}=28)$ | $\$ 10,327(\mathrm{~N}=28)$ | $5.4(\mathrm{~N}=8)$ |
| B.A. Institutions | $2000-2001$ | $\$ 50,908(\mathrm{~N}=39)$ | $\$ 11,337(\mathrm{~N}=39)$ | $5.6(\mathrm{~N}=39)$ |
| B.A. Institutions | $1999-2000$ | $\$ 47,411(\mathrm{~N}=35)$ | $\$ 11,686(\mathrm{~N}=7)$ | $5.8(\mathrm{~N}=38)$ |
| B.A. Institutions | $1998-1999$ | $\$ 42,352(\mathrm{~N}=27)$ | $\$ 7,543(\mathrm{~N}=7)$ | $6.0(\mathrm{~N}=30)$ |

Notes:
Sample sizes in parentheses.
Additional Compensation includes guaranteed summer compensation over all years and other compensation of cash value to employees, such as a signing bonus. It does not include fringe benefits, moving expenses, or computers that remain the property of the institution.
Sources: Results of American Economic Association Universal Academic Questionnaire, a survey of economics departments taken each Fall, as reported in: Scott and Siegfried (2002, 2001, 2000, 1999), Tables 3.

Table 9:
Salary Expected to be Offered to New
Ph.D. Hires in Economics, 2002-03

|  | All PhD- <br> granting <br> Institutions | Top 30 <br> Institutions by <br> NRC Ranking | Bachelors and <br> Masters Degree <br> Granting <br> Institutions | All Institutions, <br> Including <br> Nonacademic |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean | $\$ 68,912$ | $\$ 73,885$ | $\$ 56,677$ | $\$ 64,104$ |
| Std. Deviation | $\$ 8,892$ | $\$ 3,380$ | $\$ 7,778$ | $\$ 10,888$ |
| Minimum | $\$ 34,852$ | $\$ 70,000$ | $\$ 45,000$ | $\$ 34,852$ |
| Maximum | $\$ 95,000$ | $\$ 80,000$ | $\$ 80,000$ | $\$ 95,000$ |
| Sample Size | 53 | 13 | 31 | 90 |

Source: Deck et al. (2002) p. 26.
Question asked: "For a new Ph.D. with degree-in-hand, what is the 9-month salary you EXPECT to offer for the 2002-2003 academic year?

Table 10:
Summer Salary Benefits Offered to New
Ph.D. Hires in Economics, 2001-2002

|  | All PhD- <br> granting <br> Institutions | Top 30 <br> Institutions by <br> NRC Ranking | Bachelors and <br> Masters Degree <br> Granting <br> Institutions | All Institutions, <br> Including <br> Nonacademic |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent Offering | $84.9 \%$ | $92.9 \%$ | $40.6 \%$ | $65.2 \%$ |
| Summer Salary | $(\mathrm{N}=53)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=14)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=32)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=92)$ |
| Average Number <br> of Summers | 2.2 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.1 |
|  | $(\mathrm{~N}=40)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=11)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=12)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=54)$ |
| Percent of <br> 9-Month Salary <br> Offered | $17.2 \%$ | $22.7 \%$ |  |  |

Source: Deck et al. (2002) p. 22-23.
Question asked: "For new instructors or assistant professors hired for the 2001-02 academic year, did you offer summer research support?
a. Yes or No
b. If YES, for how many summers was support offered?
c. For any summer research support, what percentage of the academic year salary was offered?"

Table 11:
Pension Plan Benefits of New
Ph.D. Hires in Economics, 2001-2002

|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { All PhD- } \\ \text { granting } \\ \text { Institutions } \end{gathered}$ | Top 30 Institutions by NRC Ranking | Bachelors and Masters Degree Granting Institutions | All Institutions, Including Nonacademic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% New Assistant |  |  |  |  |
| Professor Salary | 8.2\% | 8.8\% | 8.1\% | 8.1\% |
| Contributed By | ( $\mathrm{N}=54$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=11$ ) | $(\mathrm{N}=58)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=123$ ) |
| University to |  |  |  |  |
| Pension Plan |  |  |  |  |
| \% New Assistant |  |  |  |  |
| Professor Salary | 4.2\% | 3.5\% | 5.0\% | 4.8\% |
| Contributed By | ( $\mathrm{N}=47$ ) | $(\mathrm{N}=8)$ | ( $\mathrm{N}=45$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=100$ ) |
| Employee to |  |  |  |  |
| Pension Plan |  |  |  |  |

Source: Deck et al. (2002) p. 24.
Question asked: "What percentage of the new instructor or assistant professor salary is required as a contribution to your university's pension plan by:
a. The university or institution
b. The new employee"

Table 12:
Housing Subsidies Offered to New
Ph.D. Hires in Economics, 2001-2002

|  | All PhD- <br> granting <br> Institutions | Top 30 <br> Institutions by <br> NRC Ranking | Bachelors and <br> Masters <br> Degree <br> Granting <br> Institutions | All <br> Institutions, <br> Including <br> Nonacademic |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent Offering New | $17.3 \%$ | $35.7 \%$ | $16.1 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ |
| Hires A Housing | $(\mathrm{N}=52)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=14)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=31)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=90)$ |
| Allowance or Home <br> Purchase Subsidy |  |  |  |  |
| Mean Amount | $\$ 8,900$ | $\$ 9,000$ | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 5,980$ |
|  | $(\mathrm{~N}=6)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=3)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=2)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=9)$ |

Source: Deck et al. (2002) p. 23.
Question asked: "For new instructors or assistant professors hired for the 2001-02 academic year, did you offer a housing allowance or any other type of housing or home purchase subsidy?"

Table 13:
Teaching Reductions for New
Ph.D. Hires in Economics, 2001-2002

|  | All PhD- <br> granting <br> Institutions | Top 30 <br> Institutions by <br> NRC Ranking | Bachelors and <br> Masters <br> Degree <br> Granting <br> Institutions | All <br> Institutions, <br> Including <br> Nonacademic |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Usual Teaching Load: <br> Mean Semester <br> Courses/Year | 3.6 | 2.9 | 5.3 | 4.5 |
| (N=64) | $(\mathrm{N}=15)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=67)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=143)$ |  |
| Offer Reduced Teaching | $71.4 \%$ | $80.0 \%$ | $44.8 \%$ |  |
| Load? Percent Yes | $(\mathrm{N}=62)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=15)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=67)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=141)$ |
| Mean Courses Reduced | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
|  | $(\mathrm{~N}=45)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=12)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=30)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=77)$ |
| Number Years Reduced | 1.8 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.9 |
|  | $(\mathrm{~N}=54)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=12)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=29)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=84)$ |

Source: Deck et al. (2002) p. 26.
Quarter-system course loads are converted to semester-system course loads.
Questions asked:
"What is the normal teaching load in total courses for the academic year (quarter system courseloads converted to semesters)?
Does an incoming junior faculty member typically get any reduction from this normal load?
a. Number of courses reduced?
b. For how many years?"

Table 14:
Average Salary of Newly-Hired
Assistant Professors
In Business Schools,
By Field, 2000-2002

| Business School Faculty Field | $\mathbf{2 0 0 1 - 2 0 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 - 0 1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Accounting / Taxation | $\$ 86,300$ | $\$ 83,300$ |
| Computer Information Systems / Management Information | $\$ 82,100$ | $\$ 76,500$ |
| Systems |  |  |
| Economics / Managerial Economics | $\$ 64,500$ | $\$ 61,300$ |
| Finance / Banking / Real Estate / Insurance | $\$ 95,100$ | $\$ 88,600$ |
| Management / Behavioral Science / International Business / | $\$ 78,100$ | $\$ 71,900$ |
| Strategic Management |  |  |
| Marketing | $\$ 81,300$ | $\$ 74,400$ |
| Production / Operations Management | $\$ 86,100$ | $\$ 75,000$ |
| Quantitative Methods / Operations Research / Statistics | $\$ 72,200$ | $\$ 74,800$ |
| Overall average salary of new hires 2000-01 | $\$ 81,100$ | $\$ 75,400$ |

Source: Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (2002, 2001).

# Table 15: 

Gap in Salary of Assistant Professors
Between Private and Public Universities
by Carnegie Classification
1998 and 1980
(1998 Dollars)

| Carnegie <br> Classification | $\mathbf{1 9 9 7 - 1 9 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7 9 - 1 9 8 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Research I | $\$ 6,700$ | $\$ 900$ |
| Research II | $\$ 5,200$ | $\$ 530$ |
| Doctoral I | $\$ 6,300$ | $\$ 700$ |
| Doctoral II | $\$ 2,800$ | "equal" |

Notes: Research I and II universities award 50 or more doctorates per year.
Research I universities receive $\$ 40$ million or more per year in federal research funding.
Research II universities receive \$15.5-\$40 million per year in federal research funding.
Doctoral I universities award at least 40 doctorates per year.
Doctoral II universities award at least 10 doctorates per year.
A positive number means that the salary of assistant professors at private universities exceeds that of assistant professors at public universities.
Source: Alexander (2001).

Table 16:
Percent of New Ph.D.s, Job Market Candidates, And New Hires That Are Female 1996-2000

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 6}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Ph.D. Recipients | 30 | 28.0 | 34.0 | 29.6 | 27.7 | 28.2 |
| All Job Market Candidates | N.A. | 25.7 | 30.4 | 28.4 | 25.4 | 24.5 |
| Initial Job: U.S. Ph.D.-Granting Department | 30.0 | 26.6 | 30.5 | 24.4 | 20.2 | 20.2 |
| Initial Job: U.S. Non-Ph.D.-Granting Department | 45.0 | 35.2 | 31.3 | 36.9 | 35.5 | 26.4 |
| Number of Departments Reporting | N.A. | 76 | 77 | 92 | 95 | 98 |

Notes:
Cell values indicate percent female.
All Ph.D.-granting economics departments in the U.S. were surveyed; the number of departments reporting is listed in the last row.
Sources: Haworth (2002), Allen (2001), Table 1, and Bartlett (2000), Table 1.

Table 17:
Maternity Leave Policies for New
Ph.D. Hires in Economics, 2001-2002

|  | All PhD- <br> granting <br> Institutions | Top 30 <br> Institutions by <br> NRC Ranking | Bachelors and <br> Masters <br> Degree <br> Granting <br> Institutions | All <br> Institutions, <br> Including <br> Nonacademic |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Institution stops tenure <br> clock for maternity leave | $90.3 \%$ | $86.7 \%$ | $72.3 \%$ | $80.4 \%$ |
| $(\mathrm{~N}=62)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=15)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=65)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=138)$ |  |
| Percent for which <br> maternity leave is a <br> formal policy | $69.6 \%$ | $84.6 \%$ | $68.4 \%$ | $66.3 \%$ |

Source: Deck et al. (2002) p. 25.
Questions asked: "Does your institution stop the tenure clock for faculty members who want maternity leave for a semester or academic year?
a. If YES, is this a formal policy or informal policy?"
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