

Gender bias and Gender gap

Women more often face barriers to success in science especially working in male-scientists dominated teams. These following resources aim to highlight and advise on how to pass being excluded at work:

4 Ways Women Can Build Relationships When They Feel Excluded at Work

by: *Brenda F. Wensil and Kathryn Heath* who say that leveraging informal norms, making meaningless time more meaningful, suiting yourself and facing forward are four ways that can build relationships when they feel excluded at work.

“... developing informal relationships is one of the most important things women can do to advance their careers. With our livelihoods on the line, we need to turn this dynamic around... As women, we need to continue to work together to think of new solutions to this old problem. The higher we rise in organizations, the more important informal interactions become. Regardless of the venue or activity, relationship building is just another part of the job... Women themselves often can't or don't want to socialize after work or during work hours. They keep their heads down at the office to maximize their efforts, and then they feel the pressure to head home to spend time with their families (and often to start their “night shift” of cooking, laundry, homework help, and bedtime routines)... Many of our women coaching clients have told us things like: *I don't have time to go out with the group. Nothing gets done at these things anyway. It's all politics...* Regardless of the rationale, the effect is the same: doing less relationship building limits women's access to sponsorship and diminishes their chances for career advancement”

Business Harvard Review, July 27, 2018

https://hbr.org/2018/07/4-ways-women-can-build-relationships-when-they-feel-excluded-at-work?utm_medium=social&utm_campaign=hbr&utm_source=facebook&tpcc=orgsocial_edit&fbclid=IwAR3YBnYUUG2NhWbdhCuiGL_IN0U_oEwnUTmy3aLiT-WG0jmSYPHuLVE2BxY

How to Close the Gender Gap

by: *Colleen Ammerman and Boris Groysberg* who say that when women and men don't have equal opportunities to shine and grow, work itself becomes gendered, with lower-status roles seen as the province of female employees. Having their own research describe common forms of gender discrimination in seven key areas of talent management: attracting candidates, hiring employees, integrating newcomers into the organization, developing employees, assessing performance, managing compensation and promotion, and retaining employees.

“Most companies say they're committed to advancing women into leadership roles. What they may fail to recognize, though, is that systemic barriers are holding women back. As a result, women remain disadvantaged at every stage of their employment and underrepresented in positions of power... Women's career opportunities may seem limitless today. Women make up about half of all college-educated workers in the United States, and they hold jobs in virtually every industry, working in more than 300 occupations tracked by the federal government. Yet women remain underrepresented in positions of power, often dramatically so: Just 8% of *Fortune* 500 companies are led by women, and less than 1% by women of color... Fundamentally, this gender imbalance reflects a systemic talent-management problem. In the

words of a (male) C-level executive at a major investment bank, “The more senior the group, the fewer women there are. And yet if you look at some of the younger groups—people that are right out of college or a little further along in their careers—there’s a more balanced representation. We’re losing very high-quality talent, and there’s no reason we should have this much asymmetry as we progress... When women and men don’t have equal opportunities to shine and grow, work itself becomes gendered, with lower-status projects and roles seen as the province of female employees. Even within jobs, “task segregation” occurs, with women expected to handle less-rewarding work. Women are also more likely to be asked to volunteer for duties that do not advance their standing or development - “office housework” that adds little to their résumés. Moreover, when they decline to perform such tasks, they are viewed negatively...”.

From the other hand, “colleagues’ perceptions can make or break women’s careers. As one executive put it, “For women it kills you if you’re not likable.”

“Narrowing the gender gap should be a deliberate, ongoing process. Measurement of outcomes such as turnover, hiring rates, compensation, and promotions is essential, and all managers must engage in continual learning and reflection. Change is affected by people, not policy. Implementing the right tools and frameworks is critical, but without managers who are invested in monitoring the results and being accountable for them, the best practices will fall short of their potential for fostering equality.”

Business Harvard Review, May-June 2021

<https://hbr.org/2021/05/how-to-close-the-gender-gap?registration=success>

Global Gender Gap Report

following: *Wikipedia*

“The Global Gender Gap Report was first published in 2006 by the World Economic Forum. The Global Gender Gap Index is an index designed to measure gender equality. It assesses countries on how well they are dividing their resources and opportunities among their male and female populations, regardless of the overall levels of these resources and opportunities. By providing a comprehensible framework for assessing and comparing global gender gaps and by revealing those countries that are role models in dividing these resources equitably between women and men, the Report serves as a catalyst for greater awareness as well as greater exchange between policymakers.

For the World Economic Forum Global Gender Gap Index (WEC GGGI) ranking, “the highest possible score is 1.0 (equality or better for women, except for lifespan (106% or better for women) and gender parity at birth (94.4% or better for women) and the lowest possible score is 0. Data for some countries are unavailable. The three highest-ranking countries have closed over 84% of their gender gaps, while the lowest-ranking country has closed only a little over 50% of its gender gap...The report measures women's disadvantage compared to men, and is not a measure of equality of the gender gap. Gender imbalances to the advantage of women do not affect the score. So, for example, the indicator "number of years of a female head of state (last 50 years) over male value" would score 1 if the number of years was 25, but would still score 1 if the number of years was 50. Due to this methodology, gender gaps that favor women over men are reported as equality and would not cause deficits of equality in other areas to become less visible in the score, excepted for life expectancy. To put it more simply: women could be better off in all areas and still the index would deem that country perfectly equal. The index is designed to "measure gender-based gaps in access to resources and opportunities in countries rather than the actual level of the available resources and opportunities in those countries.”

For more details (like WEF GGI ranking scores) we invite you to go to the following Wikipedia post:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_Gender_Gap_Report