

Antman, Francisca M.; Doran, Kirk; Qian, Xuechao; Weinberg, Bruce A.

Working Paper

Half Empty and Half Full? Women in Economics and the Rise in Gender-Related Research

IZA Discussion Papers, No. 16980

Provided in Cooperation with:

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

Suggested Citation: Antman, Francisca M.; Doran, Kirk; Qian, Xuechao; Weinberg, Bruce A. (2024) : Half Empty and Half Full? Women in Economics and the Rise in Gender-Related Research, IZA Discussion Papers, No. 16980, Institute of Labor Economics (IZA), Bonn

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/299908>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 16980

**Half Empty and Half Full?
Women in Economics and the Rise in
Gender-Related Research**

Francisca M. Antman
Kirk B. Doran
Xuechao Qian
Bruce A. Weinberg

MAY 2024

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 16980

Half Empty and Half Full? Women in Economics and the Rise in Gender-Related Research

Francisca M. Antman
University of Colorado Boulder and IZA

Xuechao Qian
Stanford University

Kirk B. Doran
University of Notre Dame and IZA

Bruce A. Weinberg
The Ohio State University, IZA and NBER

MAY 2024

Any opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but IZA takes no institutional policy positions. The IZA research network is committed to the IZA Guiding Principles of Research Integrity.

The IZA Institute of Labor Economics is an independent economic research institute that conducts research in labor economics and offers evidence-based policy advice on labor market issues. Supported by the Deutsche Post Foundation, IZA runs the world's largest network of economists, whose research aims to provide answers to the global labor market challenges of our time. Our key objective is to build bridges between academic research, policymakers and society.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ISSN: 2365-9793

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

Schaumburg-Lippe-Straße 5–9
53113 Bonn, Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0
Email: publications@iza.org

www.iza.org

ABSTRACT

Half Empty and Half Full? Women in Economics and the Rise in Gender-Related Research*

Using the EconLit dissertation database and large-scale algorithmic methods that identify author demographics from names, we investigate the connection between the gender of economics dissertators and dissertation topics. Despite stagnation in the share of women among economics Ph.D.s in recent years, there has been a remarkable rise in gender-related dissertations in economics over time and in many sub-fields. Women economists are significantly more likely to write gender-related dissertations and bring gender-related topics into a wide range of fields within economics. Men in economics have also substantially increased their interest in gender-related topics.

JEL Classification: I23, J16, O30

Keywords: economic research, gender, dissertation

Corresponding author:

Xuechao Qian
Graduate School of Business
Stanford University
450 Jane Stanford Way
Stanford, CA 94305
USA

E-mail: xcqian@stanford.edu

* We thank Shaienne Osterreich and participants at the 2024 ASSA meeting for their feedback. Tiger Sun and Sheng Qu provided excellent research assistance. This project was supported by the National Science Foundation, under NSF Award Number SES: 2121120.

1 Introduction

Although women have made great strides in the economics profession since the 1970s, progress toward increasing their representation has recently stalled at multiple levels (Lundberg and Stearns, 2019). This includes among doctoral degree holders, where women’s share of all Ph.D.s in economics appears to have plateaued at close to one-third since 2005 (Chari, 2023). The persistent underrepresentation of women raises the question of what ideas are lost when women are absent. On a broader level, this is closely linked with the larger question of how researcher identity shapes research ideas and innovation¹. In a related paper (Antman et al., 2024), we find differences in the fields of study by the racial/ethnic background of researchers, but limited evidence that doctoral recipients from underrepresented minority groups are more likely to pursue race-related research than non-Hispanic White Ph.D.s. While other research has documented important differences in field of study for men and women economics Ph.D.s (Fortin et al., 2021; Lundberg and Stearns, 2019), little is known about the specific research topics pursued by women, and thus, how the representation of women might change the scope of research in economics as a whole or the topics that are studied within sub-fields of economics.

If researcher background meaningfully shapes research pursuits, one might expect women to be more likely to pursue gender-related research topics. On the other hand, women might be less likely to pursue gender-related research topics if they expect greater repercussions from deviating from traditional economics research areas. We use 3 decades (1991-2021) of the EconLit dissertation database to investigate the link between the gender of economic dissertation authors and economic research topics.² These comprehensive data allow us to conclusively link gender and economic research, in part because dissertations are solo-authored, and arguably represent the broadest possible population of entering economists. As a result, we are able to paint a picture of the profession using a population that is both surely a measure of what topics are salient in society and the discipline at a given time, and also a leading indicator for its future – new doctorates.

Using these data, we find a remarkable rise in gender-related research in economics over time and by sub-field. We show that women economists are significantly more likely to pursue gender-related dissertation topics. Moreover, women bring gender-related topics into a wider range of fields within economics, thus expanding the scope of economic research more broadly. The rise in gender-related research in economics dissertations does not appear to be fully driven by the gender mix of dissertators - the share of dissertations written by women has held constant as research on gender has increased. It appears that

¹Research on all fields of study, not just economics, suggests a link between diversity of researchers and innovation (Hofstra et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2022), but does not tie specific areas of research to researcher identity.

²See <https://www.aeaweb.org/econlit/>

men in economics have substantially increased their interest in gender-related topics as well.

2 Data and Methods

Our primary data source is the EconLit dissertation database which is available through institutional license and includes information on publication year, author, title, key words, and subject code, as per the Journal of Economic Literature (JEL). Our sample comprises 31,223 doctoral recipients in Economics from 1991 to 2021.³ We use these data to construct measures of gender-related research. Our primary measure of gender-related research is an indicator variable equal to one if any of the JEL codes associated with a dissertation is J16: , which includes the “Economics of Gender”.⁴ To probe robustness, we also define an alternative broader outcome variable, an indicator equal to one if a dissertation’s keywords include any of the following terms: Women, Gender, Female, Fertility, Sex, Mother, and Maternal, in addition to the JEL code J16, to identify research that is gender-related.⁵ We focus on the gender of recent doctoral recipients, which we impute from their names algorithmically.⁶ Note that imputing gender based on names is a commonly used method for overcoming data limitations in the literature on diversity in science (Yang et al., 2022) and economics (Lundberg and Stearns, 2019).⁷

3 Results

3.1 Trends

(Figure 1 here)

We begin our analysis by examining trends in research on gender-related topics and the share of women entering the economics profession. As shown in Figure 1, the share of

³The sample used in the regression analysis drops to 24,723 due to missing values in cases where the gender imputation is uncertain.

⁴J16: Economics of Gender; Non-labor Discrimination.

⁵Our definitions of gender-related research include all JEL codes or keywords associated with the dissertation, and are not limited to the primary JEL research area.

⁶We use Python packages: gender-guesser and ethnicolr to impute gender and race/ethnicity based on author names, in keeping with other work - for example, Hofstra et al. (2020). Our imputed race variables allow us to construct a mutually exclusive and exhaustive set of dummy variables indicating whether the author is non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, non-Hispanic Asian (who we refer to as “Asian”), and Hispanic, where non-Hispanic Whites are the reference category in regression analyses below.

⁷Ross et al. (2022) validate a similar approach. While gender imputations can have good performance, they are far from perfect, especially for Asian names. Fortunately, our trends echo those from official reports, suggesting that imputation error does not bias our results. A limitation is that our gender measure is both binary (or ternary with an uncertain category) and static, limiting our ability to address non-binary and fluid gender identities.

economics dissertations related to gender increased from roughly 2% between 2000-2009 to 9% by 2021 for both measures. By contrast, the figure shows that the share of women among economics dissertators held relatively steady over this period, which is consistent with the relative stagnation of women’s representation observed elsewhere (Lundberg and Stearns, 2019; Chari, 2023). Thus, there is a striking divergence between trends in the share of women entering the profession and the share of research on gender-related topics among new Ph.D. economists.

(Figure 2 here)

Figure 2 shows that women are, perhaps unsurprisingly, considerably more likely to write dissertations on gender-related topics. At the same time, research on gender flat-lined between the late 1990s and 2010 among women and increased only very gradually among men. It then increased substantially for both women and men after 2010. Thus, the recent increase in research on gender occurred because men and women were both increasingly likely to focus on gender in their dissertations. Indeed, because there are more than twice as many men as women writing dissertations in economics, the increase in dissertations on gender among men was an important driver of the overall increase.

3.2 Field Differences

(Figure 3 here)

Of course, gender-related dissertations are not evenly distributed across fields of research. Rather, as shown in Figure 3, they are concentrated in applied micro fields, with gender-related dissertations accounting for roughly 15% of dissertations in Labor/Demography and 11% in Health/Education. By contrast, far fewer than 5% of dissertations are on gender in most other fields. These differences are, no doubt, at least partially due to variation in the salience of gender as a topic in some fields versus others (e.g., health economics versus monetary economics). However, these relationships do not appear to be entirely fixed over time. Furthermore, Figure 3 shows that the share of gender-related dissertations increased in the applied micro fields of Public, Labor/Demography, and Health/Education by 10-15 percentage points (pp) from 1991-2009 to 2010-2021 while most of the other fields increased from near zero to a few percentage points.

(Figure 4 here)

The salience of gender-related topics in each field is closely linked with the share of women dissertators in each field. As shown in Figure 4, women make up over 40% of dissertators in Labor/Demography and in Health/Education, but between 20-25% in both Math/Quantitative and Macro/Monetary, respectively. Moreover, the share of dissertators in each field who are women has been remarkably stable over time. The

main exceptions are Development and Public, where the share of women is over 35% in the 2010-2021 period – almost 10pp higher than in the 1991-2009 period. The relative stability of the gender mix of fields, however, is consistent with the constancy of the gender share of dissertators as a whole and contrasts with the share of research that is related to gender, which increased quite substantially in the latter period.

It is also noteworthy that the variation across fields in the share of dissertators who are women is small compared to the differences across fields in the share of dissertations on gender topics. The fact that the share of research on gender varies so much more across fields than the gender mix of researchers suggests that the cross-field differences in research are not driven by mechanical differences in the gender composition of fields alone. Rather, the share of women and men conducting research on gender varies across fields. We hypothesize that the rise in gender-related research in economics reflects an overall increase more than a rise in the representation of women in any particular field. For instance, it is possible that a higher share of women may generate a spillover effect on the research topics among women and men in the field, and that this spillover effect may have accelerated over time.

3.3 Individual-Level Analysis

([Table 1](#) and [Table 2](#) here)

To further explore these questions, [Table 1](#) reports results from a linear regression of whether a dissertation is on a gender-related topic on a gender indicator, other demographic characteristics, as well as Ph.D. institution and graduation year fixed effects. Column (1) shows that women are 4.6pp more likely to do gender-related research than men using our narrow definition of gender-related research or 5.1pp using the broader definition (Panel B, Column (1)). This is a sizable difference given the average share of gender-related dissertations in the sample (about 3.4%). Moreover, Column (1) shows no differences across racial or ethnic groups.

Column (2) adds primary field fixed effects to our institution and Ph.D. cohort fixed effects. There are, as we have seen, large differences in the fields in which women and men conduct research, and these account for roughly a quarter of the gender differences in the probability of doing gender-related research. Still, women are about 3.6pp more likely to write a dissertation on a gender-related topic relative to men, even after controlling for primary research field.

Columns (3) and (4) report estimates that combine Black and Hispanic authors as one group and include Asians with non-Hispanic Whites as the omitted group. Columns (5) and (6) allow for interactions between gender and our indicator for Black or Hispanic. Neither specification indicates that the relationship between gender and doing gender-related research varies with race and ethnicity. Columns (1) through (6) in

Panel B repeat these specifications for the broader definition of gender-related research. This definition generates somewhat larger estimates for the difference between men and women conducting gender-related research (coefficients ranging from 3.9pp to 5.1pp), but overall the results are very similar to those using the JEL-only based definition.

Finally, [Table 2](#) suggests that women bring gender-related research into a wide range of fields within economics. Specifically, it shows that women’s greater likelihood of focusing on gender-related research holds in fields with high and low shares of women, even after controlling for field fixed effects.

4 Conclusions

We see recent trends in gender-related research and the gender composition of new economics Ph.D.s as both promising and discouraging. Given the relative importance of economists as policy advisors and the continued salience of gender in determining economic outcomes in society, the fact that the share of dissertations that are gender-related has doubled to nearly 10% by the end of our sample period is promising. On the other hand, the fact that women’s share of Ph.D.s in economics appears to have plateaued at one-third of all economics doctoral degrees is discouraging since it suggests significant barriers remain to achieving equitable representation of women in the profession.

Our analysis further shows that women economists have contributed significantly to expanding the scope of research in the economics profession in a multitude of ways. Women are not only significantly more likely to pursue gender-related dissertation topics; they also bring gender-related topics into a wider range of fields within economics. At the same time, our descriptive evidence suggests that men in economics have substantially increased their interest in gender-related topics. While this may be due to an increased societal focus on gender, another possible explanation, which we leave for future research, is that women’s presence in the economics profession has had spillover effects through Ph.D. advisors and cohorts that has developed over time.


We also note that our study is not without limitations, the most obvious of which are the limits to imputing gender and racial background of dissertation authors. Another limitation is that we are not able to distinguish between international and domestic graduate students, as country of origin is likely to be an important explanatory variable determining research focus. While gender imputations can perform well ([Ross et al., 2022](#)), and our descriptive trends are relatively consistent with official reports ([Chari, 2023](#)), self-reported demographic data on researchers could substantially improve our analysis. Future data collection efforts should aim to combine self-reported demographic and socioeconomic background information with research output for the broad population

of researchers to better understand the link between demographic diversity and knowledge creation.

References


- Antman, F. M., Doran, K. B., Qian, X., and Weinberg, B. A. (2024). Demographic diversity and economic research: Fields of specialization and research on race, ethnicity, and inequality.
- Chari, A. (2023). Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession. *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, 113:815–839.
- Fortin, N., Lemieux, T., and Rehavi, M. (2021). Gender Differences in Fields of Specialization and Placement Outcomes among PhDs in Economics. *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, 111:74–79.
- Hofstra, B., Kulkarni, V. V., Munoz-Najar Galvez, S., He, B., Jurafsky, D., and McFarland, D. A. (2020). The Diversity–Innovation Paradox in Science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(17):9284–9291.
- Lundberg, S. and Stearns, J. (2019). Women in Economics: Stalled Progress. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 33(1):3–22.
- Ross, M. B., Glennon, B. M., Murciano-Goroff, R., Berkes, E. G., Weinberg, B. A., and Lane, J. I. (2022). Women are credited less in science than men. *Nature*, 608(7921):135–145.
- Yang, Y., Tian, T. Y., Woodruff, T. K., Jones, B. F., and Uzzi, B. (2022). Gender-diverse teams produce more novel and higher-impact scientific ideas. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(36):e2200841119.

Figure 1: SHARE OF GENDER-RELATED TOPICS AND WOMEN DISSERTATORS OVER TIME




Notes: This figure plots the yearly share of dissertations with gender-related topics (left axis) and the share of women among dissertators (right axis).

Figure 2: SHARE OF GENDER-RELATED TOPICS AMONG WOMEN AND MEN




Notes: This figure shows the yearly share of dissertations with gender-related topics among women and men.

Figure 3: SHARE OF DISSERTATIONS ON GENDER-RELATED TOPICS, BY FIELD



Notes: This figure shows the share of dissertations related to gender within each field and in two periods: 1991-2009 and 2010-2021.

Figure 4: NUMBER OF MEN AND WOMEN AND SHARE OF WOMEN AMONG DISSERTATORS, BY FIELD



Notes: This figure shows the number of women and men (left axis) and the share of women among dissertators (right axis) within each field and in two periods: 1991-2009 and 2010-2021.

Table 1: AUTHOR DEMOGRAPHICS AND RESEARCH ON GENDER

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Panel A	Gender-related research: JEL (sample mean: 0.034)					
Female	0.046*** (0.003)	0.036*** (0.003)	0.046*** (0.003)	0.036*** (0.003)	0.046*** (0.003)	0.036*** (0.003)
Asian	-0.003 (0.003)	0.003 (0.003)				
Hispanic	0.000 (0.003)	0.004 (0.003)				
Non-His black	-0.001 (0.006)	0.001 (0.006)				
Black/Hispanic			0.001 (0.003)	0.003 (0.003)	0.001 (0.003)	0.004 (0.003)
Female* Black/Hispanic					-0.002 (0.009)	-0.004 (0.009)
Primary field F.E.		Y		Y		Y
R-squared	0.051	0.096	0.051	0.096	0.051	0.096
Panel B	Gender-related research: JEL+key words (sample mean: 0.040)					
Female	0.051*** (0.003)	0.039*** (0.003)	0.051*** (0.003)	0.039*** (0.003)	0.052*** (0.004)	0.040*** (0.003)
Asian	-0.003 (0.003)	0.004 (0.003)				
Hispanic	-0.002 (0.004)	0.002 (0.004)				
Non-His black	-0.000 (0.007)	0.002 (0.007)				
Black/Hispanic			-0.001 (0.003)	0.001 (0.003)	0.000 (0.003)	0.003 (0.003)
Female* Black/Hispanic					-0.004 (0.009)	-0.007 (0.009)
Primary field F.E.		Y		Y		Y
R-squared	0.053	0.107	0.053	0.107	0.053	0.107

Notes: Size is 24,723 in all regressions. Ph.D. cohort / year and institution fixed effects are controlled. Standard errors are clustered at institution-cohort level. Significant level at ***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1.

Table 2: AUTHOR DEMOGRAPHICS AND RESEARCH ON GENDER, BY FIELD LEVEL SHARE OF WOMEN

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Panel A	Gender-related research: JEL (share of women < 26.4%)					
Female	0.025*** (0.004)	0.025*** (0.004)	0.025*** (0.004)	0.025*** (0.004)	0.025*** (0.004)	0.025*** (0.004)
Primary field F.E.		Y		Y		Y
R-squared	0.047	0.051	0.046	0.051	0.046	0.051
Panel B	Gender-related research: JEL+key words (share of women < 26.4%)					
Female	0.027*** (0.004)	0.026*** (0.004)	0.027*** (0.004)	0.026*** (0.004)	0.027*** (0.004)	0.027*** (0.004)
Primary field F.E.		Y		Y		Y
R-squared	0.051	0.056	0.051	0.056	0.051	0.056
Panel C	Gender-related research: JEL (share of women ≥ 26.4%)					
Female	0.055*** (0.005)	0.045*** (0.004)	0.055*** (0.005)	0.045*** (0.004)	0.056*** (0.005)	0.046*** (0.005)
Primary field F.E.		Y		Y		Y
R-squared	0.075	0.119	0.075	0.119	0.075	0.119
Panel D	Gender-related research: JEL+key words (share of women ≥ 26.4%)					
Female	0.061*** (0.005)	0.049*** (0.005)	0.061*** (0.005)	0.049*** (0.005)	0.063*** (0.005)	0.051*** (0.005)
Primary field F.E.		Y		Y		Y
R-squared	0.077	0.128	0.077	0.128	0.077	0.128

Notes: Sample mean of the share of women dissertators across fields is 26.4%. Fields with higher shares of women dissertators are (N=12,825): Financial Economics, International Economics, Agricultural and Environmental Economics, Development, Public Economics, Labor and Demographic Economics, and Health, Education, and Welfare. Fields with lower shares of women dissertators are (N=11,895): Mathematical and Quantitative Methods, Macroeconomics and Monetary Economics, Industrial Organization, Microeconomics, and all the others. Ph.D. cohort / year and institution fixed effects are controlled. Standard errors are clustered at institution-cohort level. Significant level at ***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1.