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Gender and Career Progression. BoE/Fed/ECB Conference
In Economics.

Figure 1. Distribution of Questions Asked By Gender of the Presenter

A. Male Distribution

B. Female Distribution

(Dupas et al., 2019)
In Astronomy.

Figure 2. Number of questions asked per talk as a function of the speaker’s gender.

(Davenport et al., 2014)
In Engineering.

Figure 1. Total Number of Questions by Gender.

Figure 2. Number of Follow-ups by Gender.

(Blair-Loy et al., 2017)
In Engineering.

“Under the condition of at least one question being asked during the talk, women receive six more questions than men do, on average. Further, a higher proportion of women’s talk time is spent on audience members’ speech. This means that, generally, women have less time to present their prepared talk and slides.

The larger number of questions women receive on average is mostly driven by the larger number of follow-up questions. These are questions piled on to previous questions and thus may indicate a challenge to the presenter’s competence—not only in their prepared talk but also in their response to questions. ... Even short-listed women with impressive CVs may still be assumed to be less competent, are challenged, sometimes excessively, and therefore have less time to present a coherent and compelling talk” (Blair-Loy et al., 2017; 15).
In Economics. Speaker confidence.

A. Pooled Sample of Seminars (N=467)

- Extremely Confident
- Very Confident
- Quite Confident
- Not Confident
- Not at All Confident

Men: [Graph showing percentage]
Women: [Graph showing percentage]

*Denotes statistically significant difference

Dupas et al., 2019
In Economics. Fairness of Questions

B. Job Market Talks Only (N=176)

Dupas et al., 2019
Whose asking?
“Although female presenters attract larger audiences, the gender disparity in the number of questions asked appears to be driven by male faculty asking more questions, even when we control for attendance.” (Dupas et al., 2019; 23).
In Biology.

(Hinsley et al., 2017)
In Astronomy.

Figure 5. Gender ratio of questioners as a function of speaker gender for the sessions our survey gathered at least 1 talk from. The bars are labeled with chair- and question-gender pairs (e.g., FC FQ = Female Chair + Female Questions, and so on.)

(McDermott et al., 2014)
In Biology/Zoology.

(Carter et al., 2018)
In Economics

“Women receive a greater number of suggestions and clarifying questions as well as questions that are considered patronizing or hostile. Overall, the questions asked of female presenters are less likely to seem fair and more likely to seem unfair— particularly during job market talks —at least according to the subjective judgements of our coders.” (Dupas et al., 2019; 23).
Some more interesting interpretations.

- **Home institution fixed effects.** Will these be capturing co-author effects. Can this be considered as well? (McDowell et al., 2006)

- **Coders.** We know students are harsher evaluating female faculty (Boring et al., 2016), why aren’t the coders showing a difference in interpreting question type by gender of asker?

- **Seminar institution fixed effect.** Dominant regular attenders will be flushed out by these ... is it possible to investigate these type of participants more?


Fig 1. The reputation model. This assumes people have two properties of interest: their Scientific contribution, which can be considered as the type of information that people add to their CV and their Behaviour and appearance. The Scientific contribution is partly determined by the behaviour through the degree of self-promotion, such as volunteering to give talks. We divide reputation into Scientific reputation, how good a scientist someone is considered to be, which is determined by a combination of the Scientific contribution and Behaviour and appearance through discrimination and stereotyping. The balance of these is likely to differ between contexts, for example assessing applicants for a job may be based largely on comparing CVs, while deciding who to invite to a workshop may be a less evidence-based process for which impressions play a greater role. There is also the Social reputation, for example how enjoyable company a person is perceived to be. By Status in the scientific community we are thinking of formal positions, such as invitations to be an editor or positions within academic organisations. Invitations will consider both their scientific and social reputations. Status will feedback into reputation. Finally, there are positive feedback loops between Reputation and Scientific contribution, for example through invitations to join projects or good students or postdocs being keen to join the group, as well as between reputation and behaviours, for example by being more confident.