

Testing the Presence of Implicit Hiring Quotas with Application to German Universities

Lena Janys^{*†}

June 23, 2022

Abstract

It is widely accepted that women are underrepresented in academia in general and economics in particular. This paper introduces a test to detect an under-researched form of hiring bias: implicit quotas. I derive a test under the Null of random hiring that requires no information about individual hires under some assumptions. I derive the asymptotic distribution of this test statistic and, as an alternative, propose a parametric bootstrap procedure that samples from the exact distribution. This test can be used to analyze a variety of other hiring settings. I analyze the distribution of female professors at German universities across 50 different disciplines. I show that the distribution of women, given the average number of women in the respective field, is highly unlikely to result from a random allocation of women across departments and more likely to stem from an implicit quota of one or two women on the department level. I also show that a large part of the variation in the share of women across STEM and non-STEM disciplines could be explained by a two-women quota on the department level. These findings have important implications for the potential effectiveness of policies aimed at reducing underrepresentation and providing evidence of how stakeholders perceive and evaluate diversity.

^{*}University of Bonn (Department of Economics), Hausdorff Center of Mathematics and IZA

[†]I thank Christina Felfe, Joachim Freyberger, Guido Friebel, Hans-Martin von Gaudecker, Daniela Grunow, Astrid Kunze, Shelly Lundberg, Pia Pinger, Jesper Roine, Amelie Schiprowski, Christopher Walsh and Lingwei Wu, as well as participants of the “CEPR Women in Economics workshop”, the workshop “The Determinants of Careers for Women and Men: Institutions, Professions, Organizations and Households” and the “Forum for Research on Gender Economics (FROGEE) webinar” for helpful comments and suggestions. The beta-version of the R-package to calculate all quantities is available on my GitHub-page <https://github.com/LJanys/Implicit-quota-package>.

1 Introduction

Although the share of women among college graduates and women’s labor market participation has increased dramatically, the share of women among high-ranking professionals has remained low. For example, in 2019, women accounted for just 27.8% of board members of the largest publicly-listed companies registered in EU countries, and only about 17% of senior executives are female (see (Eurostat (2020a))).¹ Women only hold 32% of seats in European parliaments, and there were only four female heads of government (15%) in 2019 (see Eurostat (2020b)).

Proving discrimination in hiring is difficult, as researchers rarely observe enough information on hiring committees and candidates to make definitive judgments (see for example Arcidiacono et al. (2020)). To detect discrimination against women in academia in the form of a two-women quota, for example, we would need to have detailed information on individual candidates qualifications, the preferences and the information set of the hiring committee and the number of women already at the department.

In this paper, I introduce a statistical tool to detect implicit quotas that requires much less information to make statements about hiring bias. This tool can be used in many different contexts where one can reasonably assume that hiring probabilities for women or other underrepresented groups are approximately the same across units, such as on the level of partner in top law firms or at management levels across different firm locations.

Many initiatives aim to remove possible barriers to women’s advancement: reducing (implicit-) biases in hiring processes, mandating wage transparency, and improve access to reliable childcare, all of which might affect the representation of women, in particular in the mid- or long run.

One further measure which has – by design – significant effects on the representation of women in the short run are *explicit* quotas. There is a large and growing liter-

¹In Germany, the share of female board members among the 30 largest publicly-traded companies in the DAX even fell and is currently at only 12.5% AllBright Stiftung (2020)

ature showing positive effects in that explicit quotas raise female participation. Explicit quotas have, for example, been analyzed in the context of company boards or election lists, see for example [Bertrand et al. \(2018\)](#) evaluating a Norwegian board reform, and [Maida and Weber \(2019\)](#) on an Italian board reform. [Bagues and Campa \(2021\)](#) analyze a Spanish quota where at least 40% of candidates on ballots were mandated to be of either gender. [Balafoutas and Sutter \(2012\)](#) show that explicit quotas increase willingness for competition without decreasing group performance. However: evidence of other potential benefits of explicit quotas, such as firm performance or potential spillover effects on lower-level managerial/electoral positions, is mixed. Additionally, there are some drawbacks associated with explicit quotas. Talent might be misallocated, which would harm both employers, as well as female professionals who will not necessarily be matched with an employer where they can develop their full potential, as pointed out by, e.g., [Bagues and Campa \(2021\)](#).

In the absence of explicit quotas, there might still be quantity restrictions on diversity, what I call *implicit quotas* in the paper. Donors, politicians, NGOs, and society as a whole put pressure on organizations and institutions to commit to increasing the representation of women without having an explicit quota or sometimes without even having an explicit target. Diversity pressure seems to be quite common: many political institutions, professional organizations, and firms explicitly mention that they want to increase the share of women. However, evidence on implicit quotas is highly sparse, with the notable exception of [Chang et al. \(2019\)](#), who study female representation in boards and find a two-women quota on the boards of the largest publicly listed companies in America.

Universities are particularly prone to implicit quotas: the share of female professors is low (see, e.g., [Lundberg and Stearns \(2019\)](#) and [Auriol et al. \(2020\)](#)) and increasing the share of women via explicit quotas is, for legal and political reasons, difficult to implement.² A low share of female professors in universities probably has substantial costs for society: (1) a large share of young professionals study and receive their education from professors in uni-

²See for example the recent ruling against the Eindhoven University of Technology's gender quota program by the dutch human rights commission, for [Human Rights \(2020\)](#).

versities, which might affect many decisions in later life; (2) male professors might focus on different contents and methods; (3) female professors provide role models which could affect many decisions of young female (but also male) professionals. For example, female role models might affect educational choices and aspirations (Beaman et al. (2012)), specialization choices (Porter and Serra (2020), Buser et al. (2014)), labor supply in later life or allocation of paid and unpaid labor in households. Unsurprisingly, politicians, student representations, donors, third-party funding agencies, and the general public pressure universities to increase the share of women.

This is also the case in Germany, where this study takes place: Universities have to report regularly to the government about the share of women in professorial and academic positions. The German Research Foundation (DFG) requests that in all funding applications, regardless of discipline, applicants report the gender dimensions of the project. In the case of large funding requests, applicants have to state explicitly the share of women who are participating and explicitly outline strategies to increase diversity. The pressure is also reflected in job ads by German universities: Almost all job ads for professorships in Germany explicitly mention that universities have the goal to increase the representation of women and mention that they explicitly invite applications from female applicants.

In this paper, I study the distribution of women in German universities. I develop a test for implicit quotas and derive its asymptotic distribution, and propose a parametric bootstrap alternative using the exact distribution. I show that there is an implicit quota of two women per department and that an implicit quota can explain differences in the relative representation of women across disciplines.

German universities are ideal for studying this topic as Germany has a homogenous nationwide system that is entirely publicly funded, and almost all universities offer a wide array of disciplines. This homogeneity is essential to identify potential implicit quotas because it is more likely that the assumptions, especially an approximately constant hiring probability within disciplines, are met.

My results show that (1) the current allocation of women across departments is highly improbable in a world where candidates are drawn “gender blind” from a Bernoulli distribution with the share of female professors p . Specifically, there are “too few” departments with no female professors and “too many” with one or two female professors across disciplines.³ (2) I show that these results are highly unlikely to be due to chance. (3) These deviations from the expected value are not driven by individual disciplines. (4) I find no evidence that fields with a higher share of women in the discipline are different in their implicit quotas; and can show that the distribution of female shares across *disciplines* could be well-explained by a two-women quota per department in all disciplines.

These results are inconsistent with either (purely) statistical or taste-based discrimination and require more complex decision rules as an explanation.⁴

My results show that politicians and donors have to be aware of potential implicit quotas that could become entrenched without the accountability of an explicit target. This likely requires different monitoring to detect whether the shares are increasing beyond certain thresholds. While this analysis is not dynamic and does not predict whether in a few years implicit quotas will increase too, e.g., 3-4 women, we can make inferences based on another statistic: the implicit quota is centered around the *number* of women in the department, *not* around the discipline mean. This implies that administrative pressures are on large and small departments alike to conform to a particular number of women and not to the overall share in the discipline.

In the presence of implicit quotas, it is doubtful whether analyzing productivity indicators, such as publications and citations, is necessarily informative because: (1) match quality might be worse for women, as the probability of being hired at a particular institution relies

³Chang et al. (2019) coin the term “tweenism” for this type implicit quota

⁴Bayer and Rouse (2016) categorize research findings in economics into supply-side factors (i.e. hostile work environments, (Wu (2018)) and demands side factors (such as a lower probability to get published or accepted at conferences (conditional on paper quality and a range of controls) (Card et al. (2020), Hospido and Sanz (2019), higher discounting of women’s contributions when working with male co-authors (Sarsons (2017), more “unfair” questions during seminars (Dupas et al. (2020) or lower teaching evaluations (Boring (2017), Mengel et al. (2019)). Neither of these is a sufficient explanation for the presence of implicit quotas.

on factors outside their control (i.e., the sum of the women already at the department). (2) if women are more likely to be hired when there are no women but less likely to be hired when there are already two, then the characteristics of the third woman in a department will potentially be very different from the first one. Analyses such as [Huang et al. \(2020\)](#) who analyze productivity patterns of scientists in different disciplines, will mask significant heterogeneity.⁵

In my data application, I can distinguish between the distribution being centered around the *mean* and being centered around a particular number of women (due to the variability of department sizes), which can give us additional insights into how people perceive diversity. If tokenism plays a role and implicit quotas are the result of a shift in social pressure (either by the university administration or funding agencies), it is unclear whether the “acceptable number” of women will increase over time, or whether there will be stagnation, since there is no explicit target. There is also evidence that implicit quotas can be self-reinforcing. In a recent experimental paper, [Paryavi et al. \(2019\)](#) analyze how descriptive norms in gender composition are acted upon by men and find that descriptive norms do not lead to prescriptive norms and can even lead to backlash if male “employers” are informed that others have hired more women. The presence of implicit quotas can also be informative about how employers, the public, or other stakeholders perceive diversity.

2 Data and Background

Here I will briefly describe the general institutional setup in Germany and the data I use.

2.1 Universities in Germany

There are about 70 Universities in Germany, of which most offer the full spectrum of study disciplines. There are 17 Universities of Technologies more tailored towards the natural sci-

⁵In fact, one of their key findings, that research productivity differences have increased over time could be at least partially explained by an increase in quality heterogeneity.

ences and engineering but employ faculty in social science or humanities disciplines. This feature of the German academic system allows us to identify implicit quotas since there needs to be “enough” observed variation across departments and (relatively) homogenous hiring criteria across universities. In general, the “Fachbereich” (subject area/department) makes official hiring decisions. Disciplines are organized in so-called faculties (“Fakultäten”). The associated faculty- or Fachbereichs-council forms a hiring committee typically mostly comprised of professors within a discipline that screens applicants and makes a formal hiring recommendation in the form of a (ranked) list with one or more suitable candidates to the official faculty council. If the faculty council approves the list, it is put up to a vote to the academic senate of the entire university and then signed by the university’s president. In practice, the list recommendations of the hiring committee are rarely overturned at subsequent stages, although there exists no data to explore this further. However, the diversity incentives and the average make-up of the hiring committees make me confident that the actual hiring decision is taken on the discipline level.

2.2 Data and Definitions

I examine the distribution of female faculty in all German universities using administrative data from the German Federal Statistical Office (DeStatis) in 2015. This data contains information on all non-administrative employees at German universities.⁶ For professors, it contains, among other things, information on the discipline, their gender, their salary category, their university, the year of their first appointment as a professor, and their year of birth.

University I only consider universities and not universities of applied sciences because these do not overlap in their hiring pool and have different populations of students and

⁶“Personalstatistik: Wissenschaftliches Personal”

working conditions.⁷

Faculty According to the administrative classification, I restrict the sample to professors, both tenured and untenured, including assistant- associate and full professor level, but not substitute professors. I do not condition on civil servant status or full-time employment, although neither of these would change the sample in a significant way.

Discipline I define discipline according to the administrative three-digit classification of the statistical office.⁸ The list of disciplines is given in Table (??) below. Some disciplines did not meet this minimum threshold and were excluded.

Department I define a department as all faculty that are employed within a discipline at the same university, as there is no direct department designator in the administrative data. However, professorships are allocated according to a so-called position plan (“Stellenplan”). This means that the ministry of culture in each state allocates the number of professorships to universities and the respective teaching and research units (so-called “Lehr- und Forschungsbereiche”). The discipline code that I use here corresponds to these “Lehr- und Forschungsbereiche”. Universities cannot independently create professorships without approval. Once a position is created, a specific teaching load (depending on the state and the seniority of the position, i.e., Assistant/Associate/Full Professor) is allocated to this “Lehr- und Forschungsbereich”, e.g., economics. Hence, these organizational units are then responsible for this increase in the overall teaching load, and there is no incentive to “give away” this position to a different organizational unit, i.e., department. Furthermore, what I observe here is the allocation of the *position* to the teaching and research unit (e.g., economics), not

⁷Note that the official statistics that are published on the official materials by DeStatis do not contain information on university status, so I coded status as a university myself. This recoding was unproblematic since the actual names of the universities are in the data and status is unambiguous, but it does mean that some officially published statistics are not directly comparable.

⁸“Schlüsselverzeichnis für die Personalstatistik”, which is also used to define disciplines used for allocating third-party funding at the German Research Foundation (DFG).

the actual classification of the researcher. Therefore the unit the position is allocated to is most likely also the unit that makes the hiring decision.

Figure (1) shows the (ordered) shares of female professors by discipline. Economics is highlighted for reference. The black horizontal line indicates 0.5, i.e., there is no discipline where women hold most professorships.




Figure 1: Share of female faculty by discipline, ordered, economics is highlighted for reference. The black horizontal line indicates 0.5, i.e. there is no discipline where women hold a majority of professorships.

The final sample contains $N = 1737$ departments across 50 disciplines.

3 Method

Analyzing implicit quotas is difficult: First, whether or not hiring is gender blind is in most cases unobservable, and the decision rule used by employers can only be inferred from observed outcomes using mostly unobservable individual characteristics. (see e.g.

Arcidiacono et al. (2020)). Second, because the implicit quota itself is not known, the probability of hiring/admitting a woman is not *uniformly* lower given the same observable characteristics but depends on others from the same group already in the pool. Here, I exploit the fact that many departments at different universities offer the same discipline and thus hire from the same hiring pool. Let $s \in \{1, \dots, S\}$ an index for the discipline. For a given probability of hiring a woman p_s in discipline s for – which corresponds to the observed share of women within a discipline– the distribution of women across departments should follow a known distribution. Intuitively, if the number of departments is large enough, even for p_s quite low or quite high, we would expect “tail events” such as departments with zero women or departments with many women to occur. The challenge then becomes how to quantify and formally argue what an “unusual distribution” looks like.

Example 1. *Suppose that for discipline s there are $n_s = 20$ different departments of different sizes. Let k_s be the list of department sizes in discipline s with the first five elements of $k_s = \left(20 \ 23 \ 30 \ 34 \ 32 \ 36 \ \dots\right)$. Suppose that the share of women in discipline s is $p_s = 0.2$. One realization (drawn from a Bernoulli distribution for each department) could be, $\mathbf{x}_s = \left(6 \ 6 \ 10 \ 9 \ 11 \ \dots\right)$, i.e., in department 1, there are 20 faculty members and six of those are women, in department 2 there are 23 faculty members of which also 6 are women, etc. If we repeat this for different disciplines s with (potentially) different p_s, k_s , then the difference between the expected number of departments with 0, 1, 2, ... female faculty and the realized values should average out over the different disciplines. If the empirically observed distribution does not average out and/or if the share of departments which deviate in a positive or negative direction is significantly larger than 0.5, this can be interpreted as evidence against a random allocation and for manipulation. I formalize this intuition below.*

3.1 Testable predictions

If the distribution of female faculty across departments is random and depends only on the overall discipline probability p_s , we would like to make testable statements about the

deviations of the observed number of departments with z female faculty in discipline s H_{zs} from their expected value. Let z denote the number of women in each department, e.g., $z = 0$ denotes zero women department, $z = 1$ denotes one-woman department.

Then, under the Null of random hiring we would like to test whether

$$\frac{\sqrt{S}\{\frac{1}{S}\sum_{s=1}^S(H_{zs}) - \mathbb{E}[H_{zs}]\}}{\sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^S Var(H_{zs})/S}} \stackrel{d}{\sim} F(z)_{H_0} \quad (1)$$

with $F(z)_{H_0}$ from a known distribution.

If we knew the exact distribution under the Null, testing this would be straightforward. I will show below that the exact distribution is cumbersome to calculate and therefore propose two alternative strategies to quantify the randomness of the result: First, I derive the limiting distribution of this test statistic under the Null. Second, as an alternative, I propose a parametric bootstrap procedure to calculate the confidence intervals, which are based on simulations from the exact distribution and thus might have more realistic finite sample properties. At the same time, consistency is implied by the asymptotic normality result. Third, I discuss the individual binomial draws' independence assumption that is crucial for deriving the asymptotic distribution and the parametric bootstrap procedure.

Let $s \in \{1, \dots, S\}$ be the index for the discipline. We can formalize the method described above, by thinking about each employment decision as a separate Bernoulli experiment with associated success probability $X \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_s)$. The success probability corresponds to the average share of women in the discipline, so that every employment decision is like tossing a coin with the outcome "woman is hired" occurring with probability p_s .

Let d be the index for the department. Suppose that there are n_s departments in discipline s . Moreover, let n_{ds} be the number of department members of department $d \in \{1, \dots, n_s\}$ in discipline s . For each department d , we can define the binomial random variable

$$Y_{ds} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_{ds}} X_i \quad (2)$$

with $X_i \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \text{Bernoulli}(p_s)$, where p_s is the share of women in discipline s and n_{ds} is the size of department d in discipline s . Clearly, $Y_{ds} \sim \text{Bin}(p_s, n_{ds})$. Thus for each department we can calculate the probability of observing z women explicitly as

$$p_{ds}(z) := P(Y_{ds} = z) = \binom{n_{ds}}{z} p_s^z (1 - p_s)^{n_{ds} - z} \quad (3)$$

Assuming that hiring decisions across universities are independent, for any integer z , the number of departments with exactly z women in discipline s is given by

$$H_{zs} = \sum_{d=1}^{n_s} \mathbf{1}(Y_{ds} = z) \quad (4)$$

In turn, the expected number of departments with exactly z women in discipline s is given by

$$\begin{aligned} f_{zs} = \mathbb{E}[H_{zs}] &= \sum_{d=1}^{n_s} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}(Y_{ds} = z)] \\ &= \sum_{d=1}^{n_s} \mathbb{P}(Y_{ds} = z) = p_{ds}(z) \\ &= \sum_{d=1}^{n_s} \binom{n_{ds}}{z} p_s^z (1 - p_s)^{n_{ds} - z} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

As $\mathbf{1}(Y_{ds} = z) \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_{zd_s})$, for each s , H_{zs} is the sum of k_{n_s} independent, but not-identical Bernoulli random variables. If all departments within a discipline had the same size and we assume that $p_{zd_s} = p_s$, H_{zs} would follow a binomial distribution. However, since this is not the case, H_{zs} follows a so-called poisson binomial distribution with mean $\mu_{sz} = \sum_{d=1}^{n_s} p_{zd_s}$ and variance $\sigma_{sz}^2 = \sum_{d=1}^{n_s} (1 - p_{zd_s}) p_{zd_s}$, see also ??.

3.2 Asymptotic distribution of the test statistic

Ultimately, our objective is to test something about the distribution of H_{zs} (as in Equation (6)), i.e., we want to show that

$$\frac{\sqrt{S}\{\frac{1}{S}\sum_{s=1}^S(H_{zs}) - \mathbb{E}[H_{zs}]\}}{\sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^S \text{Var}(H_{zs})/S}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1) \quad (6)$$

as $S \rightarrow \infty$.

To show this, I will first show that the random variable $H_{zs} = \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{d=1}^{n_s} \mathbf{1}(Y_{ds} = z)$ is asymptotically normally distributed for each s and z .

If $p_{ds}(z) = p$, then (H_{zs}) would be binomial random variables. However, since these are independent but not identical random variables, we need to use an asymptotic argument that allows for non-identical department sizes and thus not identical $p_{ds}(z)$. The Lyapunov central limit theorem applies to sums of random variables which are independent but not identical (?).⁹

Lyapunov Central Limit Theorem Suppose $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ is a sequence of independent random variables, each with finite expected value μ_i and variance σ_i^2 and let $s_n^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2$. If for some $\delta > 0$, Lyapunov's condition $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{s_n^{2+\delta}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[|X_i - \mu_i|^{2+\delta} \right] = 0$ is satisfied, then a sum of $\frac{X_i - \mu_i}{s_n}$ converges in distribution to a standard normal random variable, as n goes to infinity: $\frac{1}{s_n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu_i) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$

Let $\delta = 1$, then this condition is fulfilled as long as for each X_i , the third moment exists. In our case, the $\mathbf{1}(Y_{ds} = z)$ are Bernoulli and all higher order moments exist and we therefore conclude that for each s and z ,

$$\frac{\sqrt{n_s} \left\{ \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{d=1}^{n_s} (\mathbf{1}(Y_{ds} = z) - p_{ds}(z)) \right\}}{\sqrt{\sum_{d=1}^{n_s} (1 - p_{ds}(z)) p_{ds}(z) / n_s}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1) \quad (7)$$

⁹There exist other approximations for Poisson binomial random variables, and if n_d is very small, it might be feasible to calculate exact expressions of the mean and variance based on convolution, see (Liu and Quertermous, 2018). However, we are ultimately interested in the distribution of the sum across many different disciplines, and it is not clear that any reasonable closed-form solution exists in that case.

Therefore, our original problem reduces to finding the asymptotic distribution of a sum of asymptotically normal random variables and we can write

$$\frac{\sqrt{S}\{\frac{1}{S}\sum_{s=1}^S(H_{zs}) - \mathbb{E}[H_{zs}]\}}{\sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^S Var(H_{zs})/S}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \quad (8)$$

where $Var(H_{zs}) = \sum_{d=1}^n (1 - p_{ds}(z)) p_{ds}(z)$. In practical terms, this means that for the normal approximation to be reasonable in finite samples, we need a reasonable sample size for both the number of departments within a discipline (n_s) and the number of disciplines (S) to justify the normal approximation in terms of its functional performance.¹⁰

3.3 Parametric Bootstrap

As an alternative to the asymptotic test procedure, I introduce a parametric bootstrap procedure in which I first draw a random value from a Binomial distribution with the \hat{p}_s and k_s from the data. I calculate the deviation from the analytical expected value and treat the resulting deviations as one bootstrap observation. Let B be the number of bootstrap draws with $b = 1, \dots, B$ and * denote a bootstrap sample. The general method is the following:

1. For each department d in each discipline s I draw $Y_{ds}^{*1}, \dots, Y_{ds}^{*B}$.
2. Calculate the number of departments with exactly z women, $H_{zs}^{*1}, \dots, H_{zs}^{*B}$ for $z = 0, \dots, 10$.
3. Compare the empirical bootstrap distribution of the H_{zs}^{*b} with the true, analytical $p_{ds}(z)$ according to (3).

¹⁰There are theoretical results available to calculate rates of convergence for non-identical random variables depending on existing moments, see e.g [Tyurin \(2009\)](#).

3.4 Independence

Both the asymptotic normality result and the parametric bootstrap rely on the independence of the individual draws in the sense that I have to assume that the appointments *within* disciplines *across* departments are independent of each other. This assumption is usually justified in this context, as the hiring of professors is essentially sampling with replacement, i.e., the success probability is approximately constant, and knowledge of the outcome of a previous hiring decision at a different department should not influence the gender of the next hire. I *also* have to assume that appointments within departments are independent of each other. However, it is not possible to hire the same *persons* twice; however, given a sufficient pool of alternative hires outside the current pool and with the overall number of departments and professors large, the change in the overall probability of hiring a woman is \approx unchanged when one woman is removed from the pool. Thus, in reality, each department faces the “leave-one-out” probability p_{sd}^{loo} of hiring a woman instead of the overall probability p_s for each hiring position. To check whether this is a threat to the constant probability assumption, I calculate how much success probabilities p_{sd}^{loo} differ from the overall probability p_s . Table (3) in the Appendix shows the standard deviation of the leave-one-out probabilities within individual disciplines. They are all (very) small and only for 0.041 percent of departments (with 1737 departments from 50 different disciplines) is the t-test for equality of means of the “leave-one-out” mean and the overall mean rejected with $\alpha = 0.05$. Thus, the possible dependence that own department introduces is highly unlikely to influence the bootstrap results, confirmed when I implemented the adjusted procedure. However, an adjusted bootstrap procedure might be a good alternative where the dependence is more problematic. An alternative would be to sample from a different exact distribution in the parametric bootstrap procedure that allows for dependence structures such as the hypergeometric distribution. The asymptotic arguments presented above should carry over this case.

4 Results

4.1 Descriptives

Share of female professors across disciplines The mean share of female professors varies significantly across disciplines. Traditional STEM subjects, law, and economics have a relatively low share of female professors, ranging from about 7 % in electrical engineering, 16 % in mathematics, and (18 %) in economics. The share is higher in other disciplines in the social sciences or the humanities. For example, political science has a share of 26 %; history has 30 % and german (40 %). However, it is notable that there is no discipline where women hold a majority of positions: the highest share of female professors is in cultural studies, where women hold about 48 % of positions. In 2015, 50 % of male employed professors were appointed in 2004 or after, while 50 % of currently employed female professors were appointed in 2008 or after.

Average department size Departments in the humanities, where the average share of women is higher than in STEM subjects, law, and economics, tend to be much smaller. In cultural studies, the average department only has six professors, where the average electrical engineering department has about 19, and the average economics department has about 22. Again, the other social sciences are in between. This is broadly consistent across countries, e.g., in 2010, the average physics department employed 29.2 full-time faculty vs. history, which had an average department size of 16.5 in 2007 among Ph.D. granting institutions.¹¹

4.2 Results

Here I present the deviations from the expected value as outlined above, both overall and by discipline. To characterize whether the distribution of women is unusual and violates the Null of random hiring, I will present both the result from the test statistic in Equation (8)

¹¹see [White et al. \(2012\)](#) and [Townsend \(2010\)](#).

and the parametric bootstrap procedure.

4.3 Main results

The top panel of Figure (2) shows graphically the deviation of the number of departments with exactly z women, for $z = 0, 1, \dots, 10$, summed over all disciplines, shaded by the p-values using critical values from (6), with darker shades indicating lower p-values. The deviations and p-values can also be found in Table (1). Under random assignment, we would expect the overall deviations to be small and the accompanying p-values to be large. The results, however, indicate that the hypothesis of random assignment can be rejected. There are too few departments with exactly zero women (there are about 20 departments less than expected with an associated p-value of 0.03) and too few departments with three women (with p-value 0.09), four women (p-value 0.28, five women (p-value 0.08) and seven women (p-value 0.18). On the other hand, there are about 12 departments too many with precisely one woman (p-value 0.21) and 47 too many departments with two women (p-value 0.01). This indicates a two-women implicit quota and that departments specifically try to avoid having no female professors. As an alternative to the test above, I depict the results from the parametric bootstrap procedure described in Section (3.3) in Figure (3). The transparent diamonds represent individual bootstrap draws, the grey triangles represent the empirical 90% interval, and the black dots are the observed deviations from the data. The results are generally in line with the results from the test in terms of the empirical p-values. Both the observed deviations for zero women, two and three women lie unambiguously outside the 90% interval. Therefore, the results from the bootstrap procedure confirm the presence of a two-women department implicit quota and an aversion against zero women in the department.

When I compare the two methods, the bootstrap implies that for larger z , there is more uncertainty than the asymptotic approximation would suggest. Intuitively this makes sense, as with the overall small p_s , we would only expect very few departments with *many* women. Therefore even minor deviations (because actual observations are integers and expected val-

ues are not) would be significant compared to the normal distribution. There exist continuity adjustments for normal approximations of the binomial distribution (see, e.g., [Feller \(2015\)](#)), and this could probably be applied in this situation if one wanted to avoid the parametric bootstrap procedure.

	Deviations	p-value
0	-20.080	0.031
1	12.350	0.212
2	46.940	0.012
3	-29.270	0.092
4	-10.060	0.283
5	-10.460	0.083
6	3.670	0.230
7	-13.690	0.181
8	4.340	0.025
9	2.590	0.270
10	-0.060	0.084

Table 1: Summed Deviations and p-values the asymptotic test in (8).

Deviation from expected Number of Departments with zero to 10 women

Mean over all 50 disciplines, shaded by p-value, $p_{min} = 0.011$, $p_{max} = 0.27$




Figure 2: Deviation from expected value (in absolute numbers), shaded by joint P-Value, the darker the shading, the lower the p-value. Lowest p-value corresponds to the deviation from exactly 2 women departments with a p-value of 0.011.

Deviation from expected number of departments
Including bootstrapped 90 percent bands




Figure 3: Deviation from expected value summed over all disciplines and divided by the absolute number of disciplines.

4.4 Effects of a fictional quota

Given the analysis above, we might speculate about implicit quotas in specific disciplines or we might hypothesize that disciplines that have a low share of female professors provide a more hostile environment and therefore are more likely to discriminate against women. However, the correlation ρ_z between having a negative deviation from the expected number of zero women departments and the share of women is $\rho_0 = -0.035$ (p-value 0.86) and $\rho_3 = 0.07$ (p-value 0.62). Equally, there is no clear correlation with being a STEM/non-STEM discipline. These results suggest that the “type” of discipline with an implicit quota is not easily

categorized. This result might seem puzzling at first glance, but when considering the bimodal distribution of average department sizes, it becomes clear that implementing a quota would have heterogeneous effects on the share of women within the discipline, depending on the average department size. Most of the non-STEM fields (with the notable exceptions economics and law) which have the largest share of female faculty have average department sizes below ten professors: this implies that a two women quota would mechanically lead to a much higher female share in these disciplines than in mathematics or economics, where the average department size is much larger. This exercise shows that we cannot rule out that non-STEM disciplines in the humanities have a larger share of female professors because an implicit quota has a heterogeneous effect depending on average department sizes in the discipline rather than discipline-specific characteristics. To illustrate this point, consider Figure (4): here I simulate the hypothetical shares of women within subjects that would result from taking the vector of real department sizes k_s for all disciplines s and imposing a two women quota per department, as shown for an example in Table (2) for Economics.

Subject	Size	Fe. Faculty	Code	Size	FE Faculty	Quota
Econ	6	0	Econ	6		2
Econ	16	2	Econ	16		2
Econ	12	2	Econ	12		2
Econ	7	1	Econ	7		2
Econ	23	5	Econ	23		2
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮		⋮

Table 2: Left are the department size and the real number of female faculty, the right panel shows the actual number replaced by the shares.

Distribution of female share across disciplines

Real shares vs. simulated shares with a quota




Figure 4: Density plot for the distribution of real and simulated shares of female faculty across disciplines.

A two-women quota per department would lead to a mean female share of $\mu_f^s = 0.254$, instead of the actual share $\mu_f = 0.257$. It can reproduce the bimodal distribution of the female share distribution, although the peaks are slightly shifted to the left. This exercise does not intend to state that this type of quota is consciously implemented, but that a certain adherence to “field standard” hiring may lead to a distribution of female shares very similar to the one we observe.

5 Conclusion and Discussion

This paper introduced a tool to detect an under-researched form of hiring bias: implicit quotas. I derive a test under the Null of random hiring that requires no information about individual hires under some assumptions. I derive the asymptotic distribution of this test statistic and, as an alternative, propose a parametric bootstrap procedure that samples from

the exact distribution. This test can be used to analyze a variety of other hiring settings.

Analyzing employment patterns of female professors across departments and disciplines allows me to show that there exists a one- to two-women quota on the department level, which traditional explanations cannot explain for the underrepresentation of women among academics at the professor level. I also show that this type of implicit quota can potentially explain part of the gap in the female professor share among disciplines. The fact that I can distinguish between the implicit quota being centered around the mean (i.e., around the relative share of female professors in a discipline, which is not the case) and a specific discrete number poses exciting questions that I have not seen addressed before, namely how humans perceive structures that have the “correct level” of diversity.

It is important to emphasize that the observed patterns described above only allow me to make statements about whether or not the observed distribution is random: we cannot say whether the “real/natural” proportion of female professors p_s (without the implicit quota) would be larger, smaller or precisely the same. Furthermore, direct discrimination in implicit quotas (which leads to discrimination in both directions), gender differences in personal attributes, preferences, and implicit biases are not mutually exclusive. There is even a plausible link between biases and direct discrimination; as [Goldin \(2014\)](#) argues, if men perceive women as less qualified and care about the prestige of their profession, they may fear that a woman’s entering a profession signals a change in the prestige of the profession and therefore might block entry to otherwise qualified women.

The analysis in this paper is sufficient to show that hiring is not “gender blind”. My work, therefore, has several implications for both further research and policy.

Concerning research, any ex-post analysis of performance measures and researcher productivity should be conducted only with the caveat in mind that there might be implicit quotas that could potentially lead to substantially more quality *heterogeneity* among the underrepresented groups that might be obscured when researchers only consider averages.

Concerning policy, my results imply that funders and organizations that engage in diversity pressure without explicit targets should be conscious of the potential for implicit quotas and carefully monitor progress. My results also imply that if policymakers have a specific diversity target in mind, then an explicit quota might be more effective, as implicit quotas might incur the exact costs as explicit quotas while not achieving the same level of progress.

References

- ALLBRIGHT STIFTUNG, B. (2020): “AllBright Bericht: Deutscher Sonderweg: Frauenanteil in DAX-Vorständen sinkt in der Krise,” .
- ARCIDIACONO, P., J. KINSLER, AND T. RANSOM (2020): “Asian American Discrimination in Harvard Admissions,” *NBER Working Paper*.
- AURIOL, E., G. FRIEBEL, AND S. WILHELM (2020): “Women in European Economics,” *Women in Economics, edited by S. Lundberg*, 26–30.
- BAGUES, M. AND P. CAMPA (2021): “Can gender quotas in candidate lists empower women? Evidence from a regression discontinuity design,” *Journal of Public Economics*, 194, 104315.
- BALAFOUTAS, L. AND M. SUTTER (2012): “Affirmative action policies promote women and do not harm efficiency in the laboratory,” *Science*, 335, 579–582.
- BAYER, A. AND C. E. ROUSE (2016): “Diversity in the economics profession: A new attack on an old problem,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 30, 221–42.
- BEAMAN, L., E. DUFLO, R. PANDE, AND P. TOPALOVA (2012): “Female leadership raises aspirations and educational attainment for girls: A policy experiment in India,” *science*, 335, 582–586.
- BERTRAND, M., S. E. BLACK, S. JENSEN, AND A. LLERAS-MUNEY (2018): “Breaking the glass ceiling? The effect of board quotas on female labour market outcomes in Norway,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 86, 191–239.
- BORING, A. (2017): “Gender biases in student evaluations of teaching,” *Journal of public economics*, 145, 27–41.
- BUSER, T., M. NIEDERLE, AND H. OOSTERBEEK (2014): “Gender, competitiveness, and career choices,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 129, 1409–1447.

- CARD, D., S. DELLA VIGNA, P. FUNK, AND N. IRIBERRI (2020): “Are Referees and Editors in Economics Gender Neutral?” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 135, 269–327.
- CHANG, E. H., K. L. MILKMAN, D. CHUGH, AND M. AKINOLA (2019): “Diversity thresholds: How social norms, visibility, and scrutiny relate to group composition,” *Academy of Management Journal*, 62, 144–171.
- DUPAS, P., A. MODESTINO, M. NIEDERLE, AND J. WOLFERS (2020): “Gender and the Dynamics of Economics Seminars,” Tech. rep.
- EUROSTAT (2020a): “Gender Statistics Database,” .
- (2020b): “Gender Statistics Database,” .
- FELLER, W. (2015): “On the normal approximation to the binomial distribution,” in *Selected Papers I*, Springer, 655–665.
- FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, T. N. I. (2020): “Advies aan minister Dekker voor Rechtsbescherming over het evenwichtiger maken van de man/vrouw verhouding vennootschappen,” .
- GOLDIN, C. (2014): “A pollution theory of discrimination: male and female differences in occupations and earnings,” in *Human capital in history: The American record*, University of Chicago Press, 313–348.
- HOSPIDO, L. AND C. SANZ (2019): “Gender gaps in the evaluation of research: evidence from submissions to economics conferences,” *IZA Discussion Paper*.
- HUANG, J., A. J. GATES, R. SINATRA, AND A.-L. BARABÁSI (2020): “Historical comparison of gender inequality in scientific careers across countries and disciplines,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117, 4609–4616.
- LIU, B. AND T. QUERTERMOUS (2018): “Approximating the Sum of Independent Non-Identical Binomial Random Variables.” *R Journal*, 10.

- LUNDBERG, S. AND J. STEARNS (2019): “Women in economics: Stalled progress,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 33, 3–22.
- MAIDA, A. AND A. WEBER (2019): “Female Leadership and Gender Gap within Firms: Evidence from an Italian Board Reform,” *IZA Discussion Paper*.
- MENGEL, F., J. SAUERMANN, AND U. ZÖLITZ (2019): “Gender bias in teaching evaluations,” *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 17, 535–566.
- PARYAVI, M., I. BOHNET, AND A. VAN GEEN (2019): “Descriptive norms and gender diversity: Reactance from men,” 2.
- PORTER, C. AND D. SERRA (2020): “Gender differences in the choice of major: The importance of female role models,” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 12, 226–54.
- SARSONS, H. (2017): “Recognition for group work: Gender differences in academia,” *American Economic Review*, 107, 141–45.
- TOWNSEND, R. B. (2010): “Putting Academic History in Context: A Survey of Humanities Departments,” *American Historical Association*.
- TYURIN, I. (2009): “New estimates of the convergence rate in the Lyapunov theorem,” .
- WHITE, S., R. IVIE, AND A. EPHRAIM (2012): “Number of Physics Faculty Members: Results from the 2010 Survey of Physics Degree-Granting Departments,” *American Institute of Physics*.
- WU, A. H. (2018): “Gendered language on the economics job market rumors forum,” *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, 108, 175–79.

Appendix

Discipline	Standard Deviation, Leave-one-out Shares	Shares
Humanities	0.0094	0.4006
Theology (protestant)	0.0059	0.2308
Theology (catholic)	0.0049	0.1924
Philosophy	0.0029	0.1616
History	0.0029	0.3068
Literature and comparative language studies	0.0114	0.4360
German Studies	0.0026	0.4185
English and American Studies	0.0034	0.4393
Roman Language Studies	0.0062	0.3985
Other Language/Cultural Studies	0.0073	0.4100
Cultural Studies	0.0115	0.4874
Sports	0.0050	0.2039
Law, Economics and Social Sciences, general	0.0095	0.2844
Political Sciences	0.0042	0.2565
Sociology	0.0027	0.3636
Social Work	0.0180	0.4702
Law	0.0022	0.1614
Economics	0.0012	0.1838
Psychology	0.0027	0.3919
Paedagogy	0.0024	0.4400
STEM, general	0.0402	0.2540
Mathematics	0.0016	0.1709
Physics and Astronomy	0.0012	0.0976
Chemistry	0.0015	0.1446
Pharmacy	0.0060	0.2187
Biology	0.0020	0.2252
Geology	0.0025	0.1284
Geography	0.0035	0.2434
Health Sciences, general	0.0196	0.4773
Preclinical Medicine	0.0035	0.1715
Clinical-theoretical Medicine	0.0027	0.1775
Clinical-Practical Medicine	0.0021	0.1236
Clinical-theoretical Veterinary Science	0.0221	0.2380
Clinical-practical Veterinary Science	0.0361	0.2962
Agricultural Science	0.0078	0.2013
Dietary Studies	0.0247	0.3638
Mechanical Engineering	0.0016	0.0887
Electrical Engineering	0.0024	0.0724
Architecture	0.0058	0.2476
Spatial Planning	0.0031	0.3022
Civil Engineering	0.0040	0.0961
Computer Science	0.0012	0.1062
Material Science	0.0102	0.1991
Art, general	0.0046	0.4422
Visual Arts	0.0043	0.3547
Design	0.0116	0.3624
Performing Arts	0.0084	0.3904
Music	0.0024	0.2315
Central scientific Departments	0.0072	0.3092
Institutes associated with Universities	0.0430	0.2781

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$

Table 3: Standard deviation leave-one-out means by discipline