

IMPACT ON GRANTS AND FUNDING



Mutz et al. 2015. Does Gender Matter in Grant Peer Review? An Empirical Investigation Using the Example of the Austrian Science Fund. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie* (2012), 220, pp. 121-129. Available from <https://doi.org/10.1027/2151-2604/a000103>

Van der Lee, R. and Ellemers, N. 2015. *PNAS*. Vol 112 No.40. pp. 12349-12353. Available from <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1510159112>

Gender contributes to personal research funding success in The Netherlands

Abstract:

Women remain underrepresented in academia as they continue to face a leadership gap, salary gap, and funding gap. Closing the funding gap is of particular importance, because this may directly retain women in academia and foster the closing of other gaps. In this study, we examined the grant funding rates of a national full population of early career scientists. Our results reveal gender bias favoring male applicants over female applicants in the prioritization of their “quality of researcher” (but not “quality of proposal”) evaluations and success rates, as well as in the language use in instructional and evaluation materials. This work illuminates how and when the funding gap and the subsequent underrepresentation of women in academia are perpetuated.

Van der Lee, R. and Ellemers, N. 2015. PNAS. Vol 112 No.40. pp. 12349-12353. Available from <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1510159112>

Does Gender Matter in Grant Peer Review?

An Empirical Investigation Using the Example of the Austrian Science Fund

Abstract:

One of the most frequently voiced criticisms of the peer review process is gender bias. In this study we evaluated the grant peer review process (external reviewers' ratings, and board of trustees' final decision: approval or no approval for funding) at the Austrian Science Fund with respect to gender. The data consisted of 8,496 research proposals (census) across all disciplines from 1999 to 2009, which were rated on a scale from 1 to 100 (poor to excellent) by 18,357 external reviewers in 23,977 reviews. In line with the current state of research, we found that the final decision was not associated with applicant's gender or with any correspondence between gender of applicants and reviewers. However, the decisions on the grant applications showed a robust female reviewer salience effect. The approval probability decreases (up to 10%), when there is parity or a majority of women in the group of reviewers. Our results confirm an overall gender null hypothesis for the peer review process of men's and women's grant applications in contrast to claims that women's grants are systematically downrated.

Mutz et al. 2015. Does Gender Matter in Grant Peer Review? An Empirical Investigation Using the Example of the Austrian Science Fund. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie* (2012), 220, pp. 121-129. Available from <https://doi.org/10.1027/2151-2604/a000103>