

Note: This is a manuscript version of an article which is to be published as Kessel & Nelson. Statistical Trends in Women's Participation in Science: Commentary on Valla and Ceci (2011), *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, <http://pss.sagepub.com/content/current>. The three tables mentioned in the text appear at the end of this manuscript.

Statistical Trends in Women's Participation in Science

A Comment on "Can Sex Differences in Science Be Tied to the Long Reach of Prenatal Hormones?"

Cathy Kessel
Berkeley, California

Donna J. Nelson
Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Oklahoma
Department of Chemical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Author note

Cathy Kessel, Berkeley, California; Donna J. Nelson, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Oklahoma and Department of Chemical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The research of Nelson's reported here was supported by National Institutes of Health grant R01GM088614 and National Science Foundation grant 0545361. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Institutes of Health or the National Science Foundation.

Abstract

“Can Sex Differences in Science Be Tied to the Long Reach of Prenatal Hormones?” describes women's participation in science and claims that the increases in quantitative fields (e.g., mathematics, engineering, and physical sciences) are an exception to the statement that “Women's growth in the scientific workforce has been meteoric over the past 40 years.” We disagree and present statistics demonstrating a more positive view of the increase of the number of women in quantitative fields.

Valla and Ceci (this issue), like many analyses of gender differences in cognition, brain activity, or abilities, cites many statistics about women's participation in science. In this commentary, we examine two examples of statements made in the article and demonstrate that a more careful analysis of the data reveals a more positive view of the increase of the number of women in quantitative fields.

1. The authors state: “Women's growth in the scientific workforce has been meteoric over the past 40 years.” But that statement is followed by: “However, there is one glaring exception to women's progress in scientific careers. In fields that are highly quantitative, women's success has been far less pronounced.”

Women dramatically increased their share of PhDs in all sciences during those years. The authors refer to some of the statistics in Table 1, which shows percentages of women earning PhDs in various scientific fields in 1970 and 2006. These percentages can be compared in two ways: as a difference (percentage in 2006 minus percentage in 1970) or as a magnitude (percentage in 2006 divided by percentage in 1970). Although the differences in percentages are greater in the non-quantitative fields, the magnitudes of the increases are greater in the quantitative fields. The representation of women in psychology has tripled and has almost quadrupled in other life sciences. However, in mathematics and physical sciences, women's share of PhDs has increased approximately five-fold. The representation of women in engineering in 2006 is over 40 times that in 1970. We argue that this demonstrates *more* success in the quantitative fields across those years.

Women are also becoming faculty members at a better rate in the quantitative sciences. The authors give statistics for women's representation among PhD recipients, among all professors, and among full professors; however, statistics for assistant professors are not given. Any discussion of women's progress in academic science must examine recent hiring. This requires comparing women's representation among PhD recipients versus among assistant professors.

One way to quantify this comparison is to compute utilization by discipline—in this case, the percentage of female assistant professors divided by the percentage of PhDs. A utilization of 1.00 would indicate that women are represented equally among PhD recipients and among assistant professors in the same discipline. A smaller utilization indicates that the proportion of women decreases from PhD to assistant professor. Table 2 shows that utilization in “highly quantitative” disciplines (e.g., mathematics, engineering, and physical sciences) is generally greater than in the life sciences and in most cases at least comparable to the social sciences. A similar, though less pronounced, finding appears in the analogous FY 2002 survey (Nelson, 2005, Table

5), so this trend has been in place for a number of years. Thus, in terms of utilization of PhDs in academe, women are much more successful in mathematics, engineering, and physics than in the life sciences (biological sciences and psychology) and fare as well as or better than those in sociology and political science.

2. Valla and Ceci state: "There is nowhere close to one-third women occupying math-intensive positions in disciplines such as physics, engineering, computer science, economics, chemistry, and mathematics."

This broad statement does not specify or restrict any level of workforce, and is not true for some categories of academic institutions. For example, in 2005 the representation of women among tenure-track faculty of mathematical sciences departments ranged from almost one-quarter to one-third at four-year institutions (see Table 3). In mathematical sciences departments at two-year institutions, women were half of the permanent faculty.

Conclusion. Any discussion of the lines of research considered in "Can Sex Differences in Science Be Tied to the Long Reach of Prenatal Hormones?"—preferences, abilities, or brain organization—must accurately cite and analyze such empirical findings about women's participation in science.

References

- Burrelli, J. (2008). *Thirty-three years of women in S&E faculty positions* (NSF 08-308). Washington, DC: National Science Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/infbrief/nsf08308/>
- Nelson, D. (2005). *A national analysis of diversity in science and engineering faculties at research universities*. Norman, OK: Diversity in Science Association and University of Oklahoma. Retrieved from http://cheminfo.ou.edu/~djn/diversity/Faculty_Tables_FY07/FinalReport07.html
- Nelson, D., & Brammer, C. (2010). *A national analysis of minorities and women in science and engineering faculties at research universities*. Norman, OK: Diversity in Science Association and University of Oklahoma. Retrieved from http://cheminfo.ou.edu/~djn/diversity/Faculty_Tables_FY07/FinalReport07.html
- National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics. Survey of Doctorate Recipients: 2006. Employed doctoral scientists and engineers in 4-year educational institutions, by broad field of doctorate, sex, and tenure status: 2006.
- Valla, J., & Ceci, S. (2010). Can sex differences in science be tied to the long reach of prenatal hormones? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*.

Table 1. Changes in Proportion of Women Earning PhDs.

field	1970	2006	difference	magnitude
psychology	23.5%	71.3%	47.8%	3.0
biological, agricultural, health sciences	13.3%	51.8%	38.5%	3.9
mathematics	6.3%	29.6%	23.3%	4.7
physical sciences	5.5%	29.0%	23.5%	5.3
engineering	0.5%	20.2%	19.7%	40.4
overall: science, engineering, and health	9.3%	40.2%	30.9%	4.3

Note. Statistics from *Thirty-three Years of Women in S&E Faculty Positions* by J. Burrelli. Rows corresponding to “non-quantitative” fields are shaded. Fields appear in order of magnitude of multiplicative increase. The category “biological, agricultural, health sciences” corresponds to Burrelli’s classification “life sciences.” The latter does not include psychology which is sometimes classified as a life science.

Table 2. Female Faculty at Top 100 Departments in STEM and Other Disciplines in 2007

discipline	utilization	PhDs 96–05	rank			
			assistant	associate	full	all
chemistry	0.65	32.4%	21.2%	19.6%	9.7%	13.7%
psychology	0.72	67.8%	48.5%	43.9%	29.5%	37.3%
biological sciences	0.76	46.3%	35.0%	30.0%	17.4%	24.4%
earth sciences	0.89	31.8%	28.2%	20.9%	11.3%	16.5%
sociology	0.92	60.8%	56.1%	45.7%	28.2%	39.8%
mathematics	0.93	28.7%	26.8%	18.4%	7.1%	12.9%
computer science	0.94	21.2%	20.0%	11.6%	10.3%	13.2%
political science	0.95	38.9%	37.0%	29.3%	17.6%	26.1%
chemical engineering	1.02	23.7%	24.2%	17.6%	7.3%	12.6%
economics	1.02	30.2%	30.8%	20.3%	8.7%	16.3%
astronomy*	1.11	22.7%	25.3%	21.6%	12.3%	15.8%
civil engineering	1.12	22.0%	24.7%	14.5%	7.1%	13.0%
physics	1.17	14.3%	16.8%	13.4%	6.1%	9.1%
electrical engineering	1.26	12.3%	15.5%	12.5%	5.7%	9.5%
mechanical engineering	2.14	8.4%	18.0%	11.9%	4.4%	8.8%

Note. Statistics from *A National Analysis of Minorities and Women in Science and Engineering Faculties at Research Universities* by D. Nelson & C. Brammer. * indicates top 40 departments only. Utilization is percentage of assistant professors divided by percentage of PhDs and rounded to two significant digits. Disciplines appear in order of utilization. Rows corresponding to “non-quantitative” disciplines are shaded.

Table 3. Percentage and Number of Female Faculty in Mathematics Departments by Type of Institution

	Fall 1995	Fall 2000	Fall 2005
Four-year colleges			
Ph.D.-granting departments			
tenured faculty	7%	7%	9%
	317	346	427
tenure-track faculty	20%	22%	24%
	158	177	220
M.A.-granting departments			
tenured faculty	15%	19%	21%
	501	608	532
tenure-track faculty	29%	32%	33%
	235	276	337
B.A.-granting departments			
tenured faculty	20%	20%	24%
	994	972	1,373
tenure-track faculty	43%	32%	28%
	748	517	693
Two-year colleges			
full-time permanent faculty	40%	49%	50%
	2,999	3,423	4,373

Note. Statistics from *Statistical Abstract of Undergraduate Programs in the Mathematical Sciences in the United States: Fall CBMS 2005 Survey* by D. Lutzer, S. Rodi, E. Kirkman, & J. Maxwell, pp. 104, 170 and *Statistical Abstract of Undergraduate Programs in the Mathematical Sciences in the United States: Fall CBMS 2000 Survey* by D. Lutzer, J. Maxwell, & S. Rodi, pp. 97. These surveys report the responses of a stratified random sample of two- and four-year institutions.