# ECONM Code of Conduct

The MUNEC Code of Conduct is a shared statement of our commitment to upholding the ethical and professional standards we use as the basis for our daily and long-term decisions and actions. It is designed to ensure a safe and non-discriminatory educational and work environment at the Economics Department at LMU Munich.[1]

We strive for diversity at our department at all levels. Economics research often informs policies that affect all members of society. We believe that therefore our research should involve diverse perspectives representing society.

We recognize that the economics profession, including our department, suffers from a lack of diversity due to the under-representation of women and other historically under-represented groups. We further recognize our responsibility to promote the advancement of under-represented and under-included groups at all levels within our department.

All members of the Economics Department are expected to refrain from any form of discrimination, harassment, or bullying, particularly in situations that may involve power differentials. Members of the Economics Department must comply with our discrimination and harassment policy at all times:

Discrimination & Harassment Policy

We provide guidelines for multiple situations related to your position at LMU. This includes:

Research | Hiring | Teaching | PhD Supervising | Seminars / Conferences

For any of the above situations and beyond, members of the Economics Department are expected to comply with the guidelines. At the end of each section, links to best practices from other

[1] This Code of Conduct and the guidelines build on a wide set of best practices from international institutions, including the American Economic Association (AEA), Arizona State University, Brown University, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), the European Economic Association (EEA), the Federal Reserve Board, the German Economic Association (VfS), Harvard University, the LMU women's representative, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), the National Tax Association (NTA) and the University of Oxford.

institutions, information or research related to the respective topic are provided. In addition, contact details for the respective contact person(s) at the department and/or at the LMU are provided for each section.

## *Contact Persons*

The below list provides an overview of contact persons at the Economics Department as well as at LMU. In cases of violations of the principles stated in this code of conduct, or doubts about whether they are being followed, we strongly encourage contacting them.

In some cases, there may be uncertainty about whom to contact. In this case, the PhD and junior faculty representatives are the first contact persons for PhD students and junior faculty members, respectively. Senior faculty members may contact the dean of the Economics Department. The same holds true for cases where there may be doubts about whether the listed contact person is the right person to talk to. In addition, all members of the Economics Department are encouraged to contact an LMU ombudsperson if they do not feel comfortable talking to the department's contact person.

### Economics Department

PhD Representatives:

Amelie Grosenick, amelie.grosenick@econ.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 3105
Martin Haas, martin.haas@econ.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 1207

Junior Faculty Representatives:

Valeria Burdea, valeria.burdea@econ.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 2926
Anna Kerkhof, kerkhof@ifo.de, +49 89 9224 1316

Women's Representative for Academic Staff:

Jelena Todorović Bojović, jelena.todorovic@econ.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 3303
Deputies:
Martina Magli, martina.magli@econ.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 2276
Silke Englmaier, silke.englmaier@econ.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 2218
Sarah Weise, sarah.weise@econ.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 6902

Ombudspersons:

Valeria Burdea, valeria.burdea@econ.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 2926
Carsten Eckel, carsten.eckel@econ.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 5824
Claudia Steinwender, claudia.steinwender@econ.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 2874
N.N.

Dean:

Davide Cantoni, davide.cantoni@econ.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 6260

Vice Dean:

Florian Englmaier, florian.englmaier@econ.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 5642

Dean of Studies:

Andreas Haufler, andreas.haufler@econ.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 3858

Dean of Research:
Joachim Winter, winter@lmu.de, +49 89 2180 2459

MGSE Director:
Carsten Eckel, carsten.eckel@econ.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 5824

## LMU

Anti-discrimination officers (academic staff)
Irene Götz, irene.goetz@lmu.de, +49 89 2180 3328
Andreas Ladurner, andreas.ladurner@bmc.med.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 77095

Anti-discrimination officers (non-academic staff)
Ines Steinbach, ines.steinbach@econ.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 2519
Sabine Thomas, sabine.thomas@bmc.med.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 75892

Conflict Resolution Officers for Professors and Academic Staff
Dieter Frey, dieter.frey@psy.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 5181
Stefan Zahler, stefan.zahler@cup.uni-muenchen.de, +49 89 2180 77196
Deputy:
Frank Fischer, empirische.paedagogik@psy.lmu.de, +49 89 2180 5146

Women's Representative for Academic Staff:
Margit Weber, frauenbeauftragte@lmu.de, +49 89 2180 3644

Equal Opportunities Officer for Non-Academic Staff:
Viola Lind, gleichstellung@lrz.uni-muenchen.de, +49 89 2180 1483

LMU Representative for the Disabled:
Markus Ludwig, sbv@lmu.de, +49 89 2180 5786

## *Discrimination & Harassment Policy*

The Economics Department at LMU is dedicated to providing a discrimination- and harassment-free experience for **anyone** at our department. This includes staff, faculty, (PhD) students, seminar participants and guests at our department.

We **do not** tolerate discrimination or harassment in any form, whether in person or virtual, verbally, in written or any other way.

Discrimination is the prejudicial treatment of individuals on the basis of gender, sexual orientation, race, disability, physical appearance, body size, age, religion, migratory or socio-economic background. Although anyone can be a target of inappropriate conduct, we recognize that discrimination and harassment disproportionately target certain groups, including – but not restricted to - women, people of color, or disabled people.

Harassment includes all kinds of unwelcome conduct. We define conduct as unwelcome if a person (1) did not request or invite it and (2) regarded the unrequested or uninvited conduct as undesirable or offensive. Harassment includes but is not limited to:

- Verbal comments that reinforce stereotypes or discrimination of any kind (related to gender, sexual orientation, race, disability, physical appearance, body size, age, religion, migratory or socio-economic background)
- Verbal comments perceived to be disrespectful or hurtful
- Insinuating jokes, sexist behavior or remarks concerning appearance, behavior, or private life
- The display of sexual images in public spaces
- Deliberate intimidation, stalking, following, harassing photography or recording
- Inappropriate physical contact or unwelcome sexual attention

The above points are expected to be minimal consensus for all of us. We expect you to follow these rules at all times.

Behavior of faculty members and LMU employees at every level that violates the above principles will not be tolerated. This includes both engagement in harassment, as well as allowing such behavior to continue.

Any kind of (suspected) discrimination or harassment is to be reported. Our action is required irrespective of whether we witness suspected harassment ourselves or receive a complaint about it from a third person.

For any case of (suspected) discrimination or harassment, please contact the LMU anti-discrimination officers (see *Contact Persons* for reference).

## *Research Principles*

The Economics Department at LMU Munich is dedicated to promoting and disseminating economic research that meets the standards of good scientific practice. In advancing these objectives, all faculty members are expected to follow standard principles of scientific integrity and to abide by codes of professional ethics when carrying out research, participating in research meetings, and interacting with other scholars. Research misconduct, defined to include the fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism of research findings, will not be tolerated.

We embrace transparent and open discussions. Therefore, members of the Economics Department are expected to disclose all financial and other relationships that could be perceived as bearing on their research findings. In addition, members of the Economics Department are expected to treat others in the scientific community, including students, colleagues, research assistants, and collaborators, with respect and to create an open and inclusive professional culture, that sparks the exchange of ideas.

### Collaboration / Co-Authorship

The prevalence of collaboration and co-authorship has been increasing in Economics over the past decades and co-authorship is an important driver for networks in the profession. When collaborating with one or several co-author(s), members of the Economics Department are expected to follow standards for ordering in the profession (i.e., alphabetically or randomized[2]) when ordering the authors on the paper / project as long as there are no sound reasons not to do so. These reasons may include publication in (non-economic) journals that have different standards. Individual characteristics, such as differences in the seniority of co-authors, do not qualify as sound reason.

The group of co-authors should include only individuals who **substantially** contributed **intellectual and independent work** to the project. Giving feedback, answering questions or proof reading a paper does typically not qualify for co-authorship. Also, advising a PhD student does not qualify for being a co-author on their paper. Following standards in social sciences, purely supervised or instructed work, often referred to as research assistance, does typically not qualify for co-authorship. Likewise, everybody who puts in substantial intellectual and independent work in a project ought to be included in the list of co-authors. This holds true irrespective of the individual position and especially includes PhD students working with senior co-authors.
Both randomized and alphabetically ordered lists of co-authors do not give any information on the task sharing between the co-authors and consequently do not allow for giving some co-authors more credit than others. However, not all individuals get the same credit when working with co-authors because of (implicit) biases we have. Women for instance receive less credit for joint projects when they have male co-authors[3]. Thus, it is important to give credit to co-authors when presenting / talking about joint projects and to emphasize the contribution of co-authors that belong to an underrepresented group in Economics or are more junior.

---

[2] The American Economic Association provides a tool for randomization that publically archives the outcome to make it publically available: https://www.aeaweb.org /journals/policies/random-author-order/generator.

The contact person for research related topics is the Dean of Research of the Economics Department (see *Contact Persons* for reference). Please contact them in case of violations of the above principles or doubts about whether they are being followed.

### Resources on co-authorship


Card, David, Stefano DellaVigna, Patricia Funk, and Nagore Iriberri. "Are Referees and Editors in Economics Gender Neutral?." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 135, no. 1 (2020): 269-327. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjz035

Card, David, Stefano DellaVigna, Patricia Funk, and Nagore Iriberri. "Gender Differences in Peer Recognition by Economists." (2020).

Hsieh, Chih-Sheng, Michael. D. König, Xiaodong Liu, and Christian Zimmermann. "How researcher rankings and research funding instruments can gain from information about co-authorship networks." (2018). *VoxEU.Org*. https://voxeu.org/article/using-co-authorship-networks-improve-research-rankings-and-funding-instruments

Kuld, Lukas, and John O'Hagan. "Rise of multi-authored papers in economics: Demise of the 'lone star'and why?." *Scientometrics* 114, no. 3 (2018): 1207-1225. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2588-3

Kuld, Lukas, and John O'Hagan. "The trend of increasing co-authorship in economics: New evidence." *VoxEU. org* 16 (2017). *VoxEU.Org*. https://voxeu.org/article/growth-multi-authored-journal-articles-economics

Sarsons, Heather. "Recognition for group work: Gender differences in academia." *American Economic Review* 107, no. 5 (2017): 141-45. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20171126

Zimmermann, Christian, Chih-Sheng Hsieh, Michael D. König, and Xiaodong Liu. "Superstar Economists: Coauthorship Networks and Research Output." *FRB St. Louis Working Paper* 2018-28 (2018). https://doi.org/10.20955/wp.2018.028

## *Hiring*

We expect members of hiring committees to address potential implicit biases and to actively work on increasing diversity. This applies to **all positions**, including the recruitment of faculty, PhD students, MQE students and research assistants.

All members of the Economics Department are strongly encouraged to proactively share professional opportunities with women and members of underrepresented groups and to involve diverse groups of students in research as early as possible in their academic careers. The Economics Department wants to provide fair and equal opportunities for participation!

Setting specific criteria for evaluating candidates – for all levels of job vacancies and in advance of the search – allows for structured evaluations of candidates. This may help reduce the influence of implicit biases.[4] Personal recommendations of other (senior) economists can be an important tool in evaluating candidates, but should be subject to the same scrutiny with regard to potential (gender) biases as any other type of subjective evaluation. Building networks in the economics profession is easier for certain groups than for others, making certain groups more likely to have advocates than others.

Likewise, when interviewing candidates, a structured approach enhances comparability of different candidates. For instance, a set of core questions that is asked in every interview can be helpful. Answers to the same questions make the performance of interviewees more comparable than answers to different questions.

Interviews often involve situations where a candidate faces several faculty members. In these situations, the group of faculty members should be as diverse as possible, including heterogeneity among dimensions such as gender, seniority and nationality. All white/German/male interviewer panels should be avoided.

For any position, the hiring committee is expected to be as transparent as possible about all steps of the recruitment process.

The contact person for hiring is the Dean of the Economics Department (see *Contact Persons* for reference). Please contact them in case of violations of the above principles or doubts about whether they are being followed.

### Resources on Recruitment

Bagues, Manuel, Mauro Sylos-Labini, and Natalia Zinovyeva. "Does the gender composition of scientific committees matter?." *American Economic Review* 107, no. 4 (2017): 1207-38.
https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20151211

[4] As an example of how such criteria may look like, you can find the Federal Reserve Board's evaluation criteria for hiring economists on the AEA's webpage (https://www.aeaweb.org/resources/best-practices/docs/economist-recruiting).

Javdani, Mohsen. (2019, February 25). The way to fix bias in economics is to recruit more women. *Financial Times*. https://www.ft.com/content/5b9b47d2-2e12-11e9-80d2-7b637a9e1ba1

Kessler, Judd. B., & Low, Corinne. (2020, July 24). Op-Ed: It will take a lot more than diversity training to end racial bias in hiring. *Los Angeles Times*. https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2020-07-24/employment-hiring-bias-racism-resumes

Wu, Alice H. "Gendered language on the economics job market rumors forum." In *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, vol. 108, pp. 175-79. 2018. https://doi.org/10.1257/pandp.20181101

## *Students / Teaching*

Most economics departments, including LMU's, face an extreme demographic imbalance. Be aware of this imbalance and its implications for students who belong to underrepresented groups. Make an effort to build a sense of belonging for all students.

Trivial or sexist or discriminatory examples in lectures, tutorials, and/or exams ought to be avoided and replaced with consequential and diverse applications. We expect our teachers to challenge stereotypes rather than reinforcing them.

Most people have implicit biases driving their decisions and behavior. Such biases may exist among a broad range of dimensions, including gender, sexual orientation, race, disability, physical appearance, body size, age, religion, migratory or socio-economic background. All members of the Economics Department are expected to address their own potential biases and to actively address them when evaluating or grading students. In addition, it is important that students are aware of the existence of biases, including their own biases, i.e. towards teachers.

Lecturers who use textbooks and/or reading lists for their teaching should be aware of potential biases those may have and point out these biases to their students. In addition, a diverse choice of literature is encouraged, regarding both authorship and topics. The gender and race balance of syllabuses and references can be assessed here: https://jlsumner.shinyapps.io/syllabustool/. Members of the Economics Department are encouraged to not only diversify the syllabus for their teaching but also to be intentional about citing a diverse set of authors for their research.

Students of different backgrounds may face very different starting points for their learning process. Lecturers should try to level the playing field for their students at the beginning of each semester and be aware that not all learning techniques work equally well for everybody.

Lecturers should be approachable for their students and actively offer different ways of contact. These may include standard on-site office hours, digital office hours, email or communication in whatever tool you use for your teaching (e.g., Moodle). Different individual circumstances may influence the students' availability of certain tools of communication.

The contact person for teaching and any kind of contact with students is the Dean of Studies of the Economics Department (see *Contact Persons* for reference). Please contact them in case of violations of the above principles or doubts about whether they are being followed.

**Resources on (implicit) biases:**

Boring, Anne. "Gender biases in student evaluations of teaching." *Journal of public economics,* 145 (2017): 27-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2016.11.006

Carlana, Michela. "Implicit stereotypes: Evidence from teachers' gender bias." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*134, no. 3 (2019): 1163-1224. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjz008

European Commission. "Implicit Gender Biases During Evaluations: How to Raise Awareness and Change Attitudes?" *[Workshop Report]* (2017). http://ec.europa.eu/research/swafs/pdf/pub_gender_equality/report_on_implicit_gender_biases_during_evaluations.pdf

Mengel, Friederike, Jan Sauermann, and Ulf Zölitz. "Gender bias in teaching evaluations." *Journal of the European Economic Association* 17, no. 2 (2019): 535-566. https://doi.org/10.1093/jeea/jvx057

Özgümüs, Asri, Holger A. Rau, Stefan T. Trautmann, and Christian König-Kersting. "Gender Bias in the Evaluation of Teaching Materials." *Frontiers in Psychology* 11 (2020): 1074. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01074

Paredes, Valentina A., M. Daniele Paserman, and Francisco Pino. *Does Economics Make You Sexist?*. No. w27070. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2020. https://doi.org/10.3386/w27070

Peterson, David AM, Lori A. Biederman, David Andersen, Tessa M. Ditonto, and Kevin Roe. "Mitigating gender bias in student evaluations of teaching." *PLoS One* 14, no. 5 (2019): e0216241. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0216241

Rothermund, Klaus, and Dirk Wentura. "Underlying processes in the Implicit Association Test: Dissociating salience from associations." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*133, no. 2 (2004): 139. https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.133.2.139

Sarsons, Heather. "Recognition for group work: Gender differences in academia." *American Economic Review* 107, no. 5 (2017): 141-45. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20171126

Schmidt, Ben. "Gendered Language in Teaching Evaluations." (2019). http://benschmidt.org/profGender

**Resources on (How to Increase) Students' Diversity in Economics:**

Avilova, Tatyana, and Claudia Goldin. "What can UWE do for economics?." In *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, vol. 108, pp. 186-90. 2018.https://doi.org/10.3386/w24189

Bayer, Amanda, Gregory Bruich, Raj Chetty, and Andrew Housiaux. *Expanding and Diversifying the Pool of Undergraduates who Study Economics: Insights from a New Introductory Course at Harvard*. No. w26961. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2020. http://doi.org/10.3386/w26961

Buckles, Kasey. "Fixing the leaky pipeline: Strategies for making economics work for women at every stage." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 33, no. 1 (2019): 43-60. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.33.1.43

Daly, Mary. (2018, May 14). Economics trails the sciences in attracting a diverse student mix. *Financial Times*. https://www.ft.com/content/d47e885a-539b-11e8-84f4-43d65af59d43

Li, Hsueh-Hsiang. "Do mentoring, information, and nudge reduce the gender gap in economics majors?." *Economics of Education Review* 64 (2018): 165-183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2018.04.004

Porter, Catherine, and Danila Serra. "Gender differences in the choice of major: The importance of female role models." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 12, no. 3 (2020): 226-54.https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20180426

## *PhD Supervising*

Supervisors and first year mentors are responsible to help their PhD students orient themselves and to develop them.

We expect supervisors and first year mentors to hold regular supervision meetings with PhD students. Frequency and form of these meetings should be determined jointly with the PhD students. Supervisors and mentors should be clear about their expectations and open for the PhD students' needs. Individual requirements differ between PhD students. Some may need high level guidance while others need detailed feedback on a precise problem. For some PhD students, internal deadlines are helpful, while this may stress out others. Likewise, the required amount and type of supervision and guidance can also change over time for the same individual. Thus, supervision should be re-evaluated on a regular basis, jointly with the PhD students, and adapted if necessary.

Supervisors and mentors should try to be as consistent as possible in their advices and think about the implications of their advice, i.e., the resulting workload for the PhD students and what PhD students infer about their own ability/job market prospects. PhD students may need advice outside the expertise of their supervisors or mentors. In these cases, supervisors and mentors should try to connect them to someone else who is an expert in that area.

Supervisors and mentors are expected to be approachable for their PhD students for all questions and problems that may affect their PhD. This can include work related as well as private or personal factors. In case of (known) individual circumstances that may affect the PhD student's life and work, supervisors and mentors should offer the PhD student to talk about their situation and find the best solution for the individual situation. Relevant factors in a PhD student's life include, but are not limited to, the workplace environment both in the office and at home, potential language barriers for non-German speakers, parenthood, health status or private burdens such as the loss of friends or relatives.

Supervisors and mentors are expected to reach out to their PhD students. Many PhD students report compromised mental health after beginning their PhD which negatively affects their personal as well as their work situation. Supervisors and mentors are important contact persons for PhD students, so they should watch out for potential warning signs of mental health issues. According to the American Psychiatric Association (https://www.psychiatry.org/patients-families/warning-signs-of-mental-illness), these may include, but are not limited to, problems with concentration or logical thought, loss of interest and/or initiative, drop in functioning at work, mood changes, nervousness or social withdrawal.

It is important to account for fair task sharing between PhD students within a research group or a chair. Feedback from the PhD students about their perceived workload and task sharing can help to achieve this. Also, PhD students should not spend significant amounts of their time with tasks that are not related to their research, teaching or other tasks specified in their contracts. This may include tasks such as administrative duties or general service to the chair.

The contact persons for PhD students are the PhD representatives and the contact person for MGSE related issues is the director of the MGSE (see *Contact Persons* for reference). Please

contact them in case of violations of the above principles or doubts about whether they are being followed.

### Resources on PhD Supervising:

Boustan, Leah, and Andrew Langan. "Variation in Women's Success across PhD Programs in Economics." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 33, no. 1 (2019): 23-42. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.33.1.23

Mansour, Hani, Daniel I. Rees, Bryson M. Rintala, and Nathan N. Wozny. *The effects of professor gender on the post-graduation outcomes of female students*. No. w26822. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2020.https://doi.org/10.3386/w26822

### Resources on Family in Academia

Mason, Mary Ann, Angelica Stacy, Marc Goulden, Carol Hoffman, and Karie Frasch. "University of California faculty family friendly edge: An initiative for tenure-track faculty at the University of California." *Berkeley: University of California Berkeley* (2005). https://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/ucfamilyedge.pdf

### Personal Relationships

While we obviously do not wish to regulate the private lives of faculty members, we advise all faculty members to avoid close personal relationships with students (PhD as well as Master's and undergraduate students) or any person at the university for whom they have a professional responsibility. Personal relationships include, but are not limited to, marital, sexual, romantic or emotional relationships. Professional responsibilities include, but are not limited to, teaching, grading and supervising.

Close personal relationships across different hierarchical levels, i.e. between faculty members and students, always imply power differentials. Consequently, any close personal relationship is potentially exploitative or could at any time be perceived as exploitative. There can be problems in maintaining the boundaries of professional and personal life, potentially leading to abuse of power. Involved parties are always at risk of accusations of favouritism or bias. In addition, such relationships may impose negative effects for third parties. These include, but are not limited to, a hostile climate for a certain group of faculty members, i.e. women, disruptions of the teaching and learning environment and undermining the trust in academic processes.
Members of the faculty are expected to disclose close personal relationships with students or any person at the university for whom they have a professional responsibility to the Dean of the Department. This also includes pre-existing or former personal relationships. More generally, members of the faculty are expected to disclose any factors that (potentially) compromise their professional actions and decision making. We recommend to abstain from professional decisions and actions that affect others' outcome whenever there is a risk of being emotionally compromised.

## *Seminars / Conferences*

### Seminar Guideline

We want to provide a constructive culture in our seminars. We strive for fair and constructive seminars, such that all participants feel comfortable. Following modern standards in our field (e.g., AEA, MIT), we consider common seminar guidelines a valuable tool for attaining this. Seminar organizers are thus encouraged to implement and enforce the below rules in their research seminars. Organizers may want to point them out at the beginning of the seminar to make sure they are common knowledge. In addition, we advise all faculty to adapt their behavior according to the following principles[5]:

1. Allow presenters to frame their talk without interruption
2. Timing of questions
3. Be constructive and concise
4. Avoid sidebar conversations
5. Strive for fair and equal treatment

Below we provide tips and suggestions that can help to work towards fostering above principles:

1. Allow presenters to frame their talk without interruption
    - It is important to give presenters the chance to motivate and frame their talk at the beginning of their presentation
    - One possibility to achieve  this is an embargo for questions and comments in the first 3-/5-/10 minutes of a presentation (depending on the presentation length)
    - Purely clarifying questions may be exempted from this
2. Timing of questions
    - The responsibility of mediating the discussion should lie with the presenter
    - Raising your hand before interrupting the speaker allows them to take your question / comment at an appropriate moment
    - Always consider the appropriateness of the timing of your intervention and avoid interrupting the speaker or other participants mid-sentence.
    - Organizers should be prepared to intervene in real time if necessary to call attention to someone whose raised hand has been overlooked
3. Be constructive and concise
    - If you have a comment, make sure it can be helpful for the presenter
    - Seminars are about learning and giving valuable feedback to the presenter (not about showing off knowledge)
    - Listen to other people's questions to avoid asking the same question twice
4. Avoid sidebar conversations
    - Do not whisper (or talk!) during a presentation
    - If you have urgent clarifying questions to your neighbor: keep them short

[5] This is closely following the "Guidance for a Constructive Culture of Exchange in MIT Economics Seminars" that can be found here.

- Also: think about asking your question in public, it may be of more general interest

5. Strive for fair and equal treatment
    - Treat all speakers in the same and fair way
    - Our behavior is often driven by unconscious biases, for instance based on gender or race - try to actively address those
    - If comments are dismissed by speakers or if other participants get credit for slightly reformulating the same comment, seminar organizers and participants can help by re-emphasizing who made the comment.

The above seminar rules may not always be applicable and in certain settings, there may be sound reasons to deviate from these rules. For example, an embargo for early questions and comments may be less suitable in settings where internal presenters pitch (early stage) research ideas. If seminar organizers want to implement other rules than those stated above, we strongly encourage to discuss the rules within their group. Also for seminar specific rules, organizers may want to point them out at the beginning of the seminar to make sure they are common knowledge for all participants.

Some seminar participants, including PhD students, often do not speak up during seminars. One reason is that many do not feel comfortable speaking up. Thus, seminar organizers may want to actively encourage everybody in the seminar to participate and ask questions, especially PhD students. To further increase the interaction between seminar participants, we encourage seminar organizers to combine seminars with social events, such as joint lunch or coffee break afterwards. For virtual seminars, this could be a virtual coffee breaks or similar activities.

### Choice of Speakers

Organizers of seminars or conferences are expected to actively pursue diverse lists of seminar speakers. Setting up a diverse speaker list may sometimes be demanding given that networks in Economics often lack diversity. In that case, seminar organizers are encouraged to make use of below resources:

- For international economists, the Diversifying Economics Seminars Speakers List (https://econspeakerdiversity.shinyapps.io/EconSpeakerDiversity/) can be searched for underrepresented minorities, LGBTQ+, and female speakers by field. It was developed by the AEA Committees on the Status of Minority Groups, of LGBTQ+ Individuals, and of Women in the Economics Profession (CSMGEP, CSQIEP, and CSWEP).
- For European economists, the EEA provides a list of its current female members, sorted by field (https://www.eeassoc.org/index.php?site=&page=208&trsz=206).
- For economists from Germany, Austria and Switzerland, the List of Female Researchers in Economics from the German Economic Association (https://econ-female-researchers.org/en/researchers/) can be searched. It allows searches by field.

### Resources on Diversity and Discrimination in Economics Seminars:

Callahan, M. (2020, January 14). *Do Women in Economics Face Extra Scrutiny?* https://news.northeastern.edu/2020/01/14/is-there-implicit-gender-bias-in-the-field-of-economics/

Doleac, J., & Pancotti, E. (2020). *Econ Seminar Diversity*. https://econseminardiversity.shinyapps.io/EconSeminarDiversity/

Dupas, P., Sasser Modestino, A., Niederle, M., & Wolfers, J. (2019, October 21). *Gender and the Dynamics of Economics Seminars*. https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/conferences/shared/pdf/20191021_2nd_gender_conference/Mumford_-_discussion.pdf

This version: October 2023