In “When Teamwork Doesn’t Work for Women,” Justin Wolfers reports on the research of Heather Sarsons. Below are a few of the arguments contained in that piece.

1. **Overall Argument** – *explanation*

   P1. “Economics remains a stubbornly male-dominated profession”

   P2. If there is a systematic bias in economics against women academics, then that would explain P1 (**)

   P3. There is a systematic bias in economics against women academics (*)

   C. Therefore, we can explain P1 on the basis of gender bias

2. (*) **Defending P3** – *justification*

   P1’. We can measure how much credit an academic receives for a publication by determining how much that publication influences the probability that one will receive tenure

   P2’. If there is no systematic bias against women academics, then women would receive full credit for single authored papers and the same credit as men for co-authored papers.

   P3’. Women who single author a publication receive full credit.

   P4’. Women who publish a paper collaboratively with only male co-authors receive no credit

   P5’. Women who publish a paper collaboratively with male and female co-authors receive partial credit

   P6’. Men who publish a paper collaboratively – regardless of co-authors – receive full credit

   P7’. Given P4 – P6, women do not receive the same credit as men for co-authored papers

   C’. Therefore, there is a systematic bias in economics against women academics (P2 and P7)

   - P4 is supported by Wolfers’ own situation
• P4 – P6 represent an attempt on Sarson’s part to disaggregate the result in the first figure

3. (** Defending P2 – explanation

P1”. Female economists publish just as much as male economists, but are twice as likely to be denied tenure

P2”. P1 is true even after you adjust for possible confounds (e.g., different tenure rates, different fields)

P3”. If women are twice as likely to be denied tenure in economics than men, then that would explain when economics is a “stubbornly male-dominated profession”

P4”. If there is a systematic bias against women in economics, then that would explain why women are twice as likely to be denied tenure in economics than men

P5”. Given P3 and P4, being twice as likely to be denied tenure explains why economics is stubbornly male given that there is systematic bias, since it supplied the mechanism whereby bias can determine who is in the profession

C”. Therefore, we can explain P2 in the overall argument on the basis of tenure decisions