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Key Questions

• What are the characteristics of a good article?
  • Specifically, a good empirical *Feminist Economics* article

• How can you enhance your chances of publication?
  • Common problems to avoid

• What does the editorial process of *Feminist Economics* look like?
Common Starting Points

Crafting a paper from:
- A PhD dissertation or a Master’s Thesis
- A Report
- A paper rejected from another journal

→ Revise paper originally developed for different audience

From: international agency, a government agency, specialist group, conference, etc.

To: international, interdisciplinary feminist economist audience
Developing Your Article: A Good Fit for FE

Is your paper a good fit for *Feminist Economics*?

- Review the Journal’s website http://www.feministeconomics.org/
- Examine the Journal’s mission
- Look at past regular and special-theme issues
- Consider whether you could connect your paper to FE articles (to current debates)
Developing Your Article: Share Your Draft Paper with Others

• Form a network of peers (e.g. join a Thematic Group, formed at Berlin conference 2015)
• Present your paper at IAFFE conferences
• Respond to the feedback you get
• Ask others to comment on your paper
• Consider a co-author
Developing Your Article: For Non-native English Speakers

- Short sentences
- Use grammar and spell check
- Seek advice on usage/language
- Consider professional editing help
Developing Your Article: A Good Article

What are the characteristics of a good article? (for any journal)

- A well-focused research question, situated within the literature
- Makes the case for the importance, originality, and potential impact of the article
- Paper is clearly developed and tightly argued → Be Concise!
FE reviewers are asked:

1. Does the manuscript make an important **contribution** to feminist economic scholarship?

2. Does the manuscript build upon and adequately reference the **appropriate** literature?

3. Is the manuscript **clearly written and accessible** to a broad audience with any tables and figures clearly laid out?

4. Is the manuscript’s length appropriate to its purpose? Are there an appropriate number of tables and/or figures?

5. Is the manuscript appropriately worded for an international audience e.g. with specific country references and institutional definitions included where necessary? (Please see the journal’s policy on international orientation.)

6. If statistical techniques are used, is the journal's policy on statistical reporting adhered to? (Please see the journal's policy on statistical reporting.)
Common Problems

- *Introduction*: does not make the case for the paper (what is the research question; why important; how will analyze; likely contribution).

- *Contribution*: is not spelled out or is overclaimed. (Should be mentioned in Intro, Lit Review, Conclusion sections)

- *Literature Review*: does not engage in critical and thematic evaluation; does not move from general to specific literature(s)
  - Avoid lengthy presentation of literature that is familiar for FE audience
Common Problems (cont’d)

• **Methodology and Analysis:**

If the empirical methodology is formal/econometric analysis and:

The paper does not acknowledge and address

• Causality questions (endogeneity)
• Selection bias

Paper is not selective in reporting results (should focus on most relevant results)

Paper uses excessive jargon and displays of technical prowess at the expense of relevance
Common Problems (cont’d)

• Methodology and Analysis (cont’d)

If empirical analysis involves interpretive/qualitative methods, and the author fails to explain:

- Data *generation* method (the method of *accessing data*)
- Data *analysis* method

Lack of systematic presentation

Keep in mind that an online appendix can be used to place details
Common Problems: Statistical Reporting

- Does not report standard errors
- Discusses solely statistical significance of coefficients, not their economic importance

Check Miller and Rodgers (2008)

http://www.feministeconomics.org/pages/author-instructions/editorial-policies/
Common Problems: Lack of International Orientation

- Treats a phenomenon as though a particular country's experience is universal/speaks in general terms
- Does not explain country-specific economic behaviors and their international relevance (Why should readers from elsewhere care?)
- Does not include citations to contributions from other parts of the world to indicate wider relevance
- Does not specify geographical context of any cited studies
Developing your Article: A Good Article

On the structure of an empirical FE article, see powerpoint under “Author Instructions” → “Helpful Hints” at http://www.feministeconomics.org/

Structure of a Research Article
Overview of a Research Article

a. You place your study in the context of work that has already been done on the subject.

b. You describe your study.

c. You place your completed study and results in the context of the subject in general.

Common Submission Mistakes

- Submitting a paper rejected elsewhere without recasting it for FE ("fit" problem)
- No/cursory engagement with feminist economics literature
- Not conforming to manuscript-length policy of FE
- Including excessive tables/figures
  - You can designate tables/figures as online material to be posted on the publisher’s website
- Rare, but happens: Not hitting “submit” on Manuscript Central!

Follow procedures closely to avoid reviewing delays, rejection
Editorial Process of FE

• Layered:
  After submission to Manuscript Central
  → Journal office checks manuscript
  → Journal editors receive notice
  → Journal editors assign an Associate Editor
  → Associate Editor invites reviewers

• Time frame

• A resubmitted paper goes back to original reviewers (restart the above steps/process).
After the Review

Resubmission stage:

- If “Minor Revision,” have to resubmit in 90 days;
  “Major Revision”: in 9 months.
- If you need extra time to revise, alert the editors as soon as possible.
- Don’t ignore revision requests
- Be sure to include detailed response to each reviewer:
  - Reproduce each reviewer’s comments and respond
  - If you disagree, explain your position thoroughly & respectfully
After Acceptance

• Copy editing process:
  • Journal’s copyediting process is meant to improve paper’s readability and citations

• Two tracks: “fast track” to publisher and “in-house + publisher” track (sometimes also a third, in-between track: light editing in house)

• Respond punctually to queries and proofs; send in publishing agreement.

• Accepted paper gets into style-editing queue

• On-line publication is ahead of print copy; counts as publication of record
After Acceptance: Participating in a Community of Scholars

• Serve as Reviewer:
  • Offer to review papers, and if invited to do so, accept and do a careful, timely job
• Acknowledge the help of others in your paper(s)
Consider submitting to FE