Team work and gender hiring outcomes

In Sarsons, H., K. Gërxhani, E. Reuben and A. Schram (2019), 'Gender Differences in Recognition for Group Work,' (*Working paper*), we ask the following question: Does gender influence how credit for group work is allocated? Using data from academic economists' CVs, we test whether coauthored and solo-authored publications matter differently for tenure for men and women. Because coauthors are listed alphabetically in economics, coauthored papers do not provide specific information about each contributor's skills or ability. Solo-authored papers, on the other hand, provide a relatively clear signal of ability. We find that conditional on publication quality and other observables, men are tenured at roughly the same rate regardless of whether they coauthor or solo-author. Women, however, become less likely to receive tenure the more they coauthor. The result is most pronounced for women coauthoring with men and less pronounced among women who coauthor with other women. Two experiments suggest that both stereotypes surrounding a task as well as the evaluators' gender affect who receives credit. Taken together, our results are best explained by gender and stereotypes having a noticeable influence on the allocation of credit for group work.

Gender inequalities in academia

In Gërxhani, K., N. Kulic and F. Liechti (2019), 'Gender Inequalities in Academia' (w*ork in progress),* we focus on demand side processes, and particularly two forms of bias: direct gender bias in screening process due to discriminatory behavior of selectors and indirect gender bias in screening process due to double standards in evaluation on network information. The first contribution of this project lies in testing the status characteristics and double standard theory in entry level jobs in academia and decomposition of origins of bias (status discrimination based on gender, motherhood and partnership). Its second contribution falls within social network literature: we test whether there are gendered differentiated standards in evaluation of network information at a promotion level in academia. More specifically, the project analyzes whether the status and the strength of ties, as two mechanisms through which social network support acts out, play out differently for men and women in academia. The project relies on a factorial survey (FS) experiment that is run among senior academic faculty of Italian universities. In such survey experiments respondents are asked to evaluate descriptions of hypothetical situations (vignettes).

Segregated occupations and social contacts

In Gërxhani, K., S. Steinmetz and E. Zschirnt (2019), 'Hiring same-gender applicants for jobs in gender-segregated occupations: experimental evidence' (w*ork in progress),* we focus on the role of same-gender referrals in male-dominated and female-dominated occupations, distinguishing between two conditions: one in which there are no clear signals about applicants' performance (thus leaving room for evaluation bias) and one in which male and female applicants show that they performed equally well in the past (in which case differential hiring by gender would imply that employers are using a double standard in their evaluation). We study whether employers react differently to applications of same-gender referrals (i.e. males referred by males and females referred by females) in two job types (i.e. typical within male- and female-

dominated occupations), and analyze whether gender-homophilous ties affect hiring in conditions of poor (evaluation bias condition) or strong (double standard condition) signaling.