

# Explaining the Gender Gap in Math Test Scores: The Role of Competition

Muriel Niederle and Lise Vesterlund

Over the past 60 years, there have been substantial improvements in the college preparation of female students and the college gender gap has changed dramatically. Goldin, Katz, and Kuziemko (2006) show that female high school students now outperform male students in most subjects and in particular on verbal test scores. The ratio of male to female college graduates has not only decreased, but reversed itself, and the majority of college graduates are now female.

The gender gap in mathematics has also changed. The number of math and science courses taken by female high school students has increased and now the mean and standard deviation in performance on math test scores are only slightly larger for males than for females. Despite minor differences in mean performance, Hedges and Nowell (1995) show that many more boys than girls perform at the right tail of the distribution. This gender gap has been documented for a series of math tests including the AP calculus test, the mathematics SAT, and the quantitative portion of the Graduate Record Exam (GRE). Over the past 20 years, the fraction of males to females who score in the top five percent in high school math has remained constant at two to one (Xie and Shauman, 2003). Examining students who scored 800 on the math SAT in 2007, Ellison and Swanson (in this issue) also find a two to one male–female ratio. Furthermore, they find that the gender gap widens dramatically when examining the right tail

■ *Muriel Niederle is Associate Professor of Economics, Stanford University, Stanford, California. She is also a Research Associate, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Lise Vesterlund is the Andrew W. Mellon Professor of Economics, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Their e-mail addresses are <niederle@stanford.edu> and <vester@pitt.edu>, respectively.*

doi=10.1257/jep.24.2.129

of the performance distributions for students who participate in the American Mathematics Competitions.

Substantial research has sought to understand why more boys than girls excel in math. However, given the many dimensions in which girls outperform boys, it may seem misplaced to focus on the dimension in which girls are falling short. Why not examine the gender gap in verbal test scores where females outperform males? One reason is that in contrast to, say, verbal test scores, math test scores serve as a good predictor of future income. Although the magnitude of the effect of math performance on future income varies by study, the significant and positive effect is consistently documented (for examples and discussion, see Paglin and Rufolo, 1990; Murnane, Willet, and Levy, 1995; Grogger and Eide, 1995; Weinberger, 1999, 2001; Murnane, Willett, Duhaldeborde, and Tyler, 2000; Altonjii and Blank, 1999).

So why do girls and boys differ in the likelihood that they excel in math? One argument is that boys have and develop superior spatial skills and that this gives them an advantage in math. This difference could have an evolutionary foundation, as male tasks such as hunting may have required greater spatial orientation than typical female tasks (Gaulin and Hoffman, 1988). In addition, or alternatively, it could be because boys tend to engage in play that is more movement-oriented and therefore grow up in more spatially complex environments (Berenbaum, Martin, Hanish, Briggs, and Fabes, 2008).

The objective of this paper is not to discuss whether the mathematical skills of males and females differ, be it a result of nurture or nature. Rather we argue that the reported test scores do not necessarily match the gender differences in math skills. We will present results that suggest that the abundant and disturbing evidence of a large gender gap in mathematics performance at high percentiles in part may be explained by the differential manner in which men and women respond to competitive test-taking environments.

We provide evidence of a significant and substantial gender difference in the extent to which skills are reflected in a competitive performance. The effects in mixed-sex settings range from women failing to perform well in competitions (Gneezy, Niederle, and Rustichini, 2003) to women shying away from environments in which they have to compete (Niederle and Vesterlund, 2007). We find that the response to competition differs for men and women, and in the examined environment, gender difference in competitive performance does not reflect the difference in noncompetitive performance.

We use the insights from these studies to argue that the competitive pressures associated with test taking may result in performances that do not reflect those of less-competitive settings. Of particular concern is that the distortion is likely to vary by gender and that it may cause gender differences in performance to be particularly large in mathematics and for the right tail of the performance distribution. Thus the gender gap in math test scores may exaggerate the math advantage of males over females. Due to the way tests are administered and rewards are allocated in academic competition, there is reason to suspect that

females are failing to realize their full potential or to have that potential recognized by society.

## **Gender Differences in Competitive Performance and Selection**


### **Performance in Competitive Environments**

Clear evidence that incentive schemes may generate gender differences in performance has been shown by Gneezy, Niederle, and Rustichini (2003). In an experiment conducted at the Technion in Israel, individuals were presented with an incentive scheme and asked to solve mazes on the Internet for 15 minutes. Four different incentive schemes were examined. Thirty women and 30 men perform under each incentive scheme, with no one performing under more than one incentive scheme. Though gender was not explicitly mentioned, participants could see one another and determine the gender composition of the group.

In a noncompetitive environment, three men and three women receive an individual piece-rate payment of \$0.50 for every maze he or she solves. In this environment, the gender gap in performance is small, with men solving an average of 11.2 mazes and women solving 9.7 mazes. The emphasis is not on determining whether this gender gap in performance reflects differences in ability, experience or performance costs, but rather on determining how the gender gap responds to an increase in competition. That is, will the performance gap seen in a competitive environment reflect the gap seen in this noncompetitive piece-rate environment? To examine performance under competitive pressure, Gneezy, Niederle, and Rustichini (2003) ask a different set of participants to compete in groups of three men and three women under a tournament incentive scheme. The participant with the highest performance in each group receives a payment of \$3 per maze, while the other members of the group receive no payment. Compared to the piece-rate incentive, the mixed-sex tournament significantly increases the average performance of men while that of women is unchanged. This creates a significant gender gap in performance of 4.2 mazes, which substantially exceeds the average performance difference of 1.5 in the noncompetitive environment. Thus the gender gap in performance under competition is three times greater than that seen under the piece-rate payment. Results are summarized in Figure 1, first showing the gender-gap in performance in the piece rate and last in the mixed-sex tournament.

Differences in performance between the piece rate and the tournament can stem from the introduction of competition, but also from the fact that the tournament compensation is more uncertain. To determine whether the differential response to competition is driven by gender differences in risk aversion, a random-pay scheme was implemented where participants understood that one member of each group (of three men and three women) would be selected randomly after the performance to receive a payment similar to the tournament payment of \$3 for every maze solved, while the others would receive nothing. If gender differences

*Figure 1*  
**Average Performance of 30 Men and 30 Women in Each Treatment**



Source: Gneezy, Niederle, and Rustichini (2003).

in risk aversion played a substantial role in explaining the behavior in mixed-sex tournaments then we would expect the random-pay treatment to generate a large gender difference in performance as well.<sup>1</sup> In contrast, Figure 1 shows that the average performance gap under random pay is similar to the one in the piece rate.

A final treatment examines performance in single-sex tournaments, with six men or six women in each group. In this case, both men and women improve their performance compared to noncompetitive incentive schemes. The resulting gender gap in mean performance is 1.7 in the single-sex tournament, which is similar to the gaps of 1.5 in the piece-rate and the random-pay treatment, but much smaller than the 4.2 gap in the mixed-sex tournaments. The gap in the mixed-sex tournament is significantly higher than in the three other treatments. Hence, it is not the case that the women in this study generally are unwilling or unable to perform well in competitions, but rather that they do not compete well in competitions against men.<sup>2</sup>

How does competition influence the gender composition of the top performers? Due to the number of subjects, the top two quintiles are examined—the best 40 percent of performers. In both of the noncompetitive treatments and in the single-sex tournament, women account for 40 percent of those in the top two quintiles.

<sup>1</sup>Eckel and Grossman (2008) and Croson and Gneezy (2009) summarize the experimental economics literature and conclude that women exhibit greater risk aversion. Byrnes, Miller, and Shafer (1999) present a meta-analysis of 150 psychology studies and demonstrate that while women in some situations are significantly more averse to risk, many studies find no gender difference.

<sup>2</sup>Gneezy and Rustichini (2004) document results in 40-meter running competitions among 10 year-olds. Children first run 40 meters separately, and then compete against another child with a similar performance. They find no initial gender difference in speed. However, in general boys win the competition against girls independent of the girl's initial performance. In same-sex competitions the likelihood of winning the competition is almost the same for the faster child as it is for the slower child.

Thus if the tournaments were run in single-sex groups, one may falsely conclude that men and women have similar responses to competition. However, running mixed-sex tournaments significantly decreases the fraction of women with a performance in the top two performance quintiles from 40 to 24 percent. Thus in mixed-sex competitions we see a decrease in the relative performance of women and in the fraction of women in the top two performance quintiles.


### **Entering Competitions**

If women are uncomfortable performing in a competitive setting, then they may be less likely to enter competitive settings. In Niederle and Vesterlund (2007), we examine whether men and women differ in their willingness to enter a mixed-sex competition. Forty men and 40 women from the subject pool at the Pittsburgh Experimental Economic Lab participated in the experiment. Participants were asked to add up sets of five two-digit numbers for five minutes under different compensation schemes. For each compensation scheme, we measured the participant's performance by the number of problems the participant solved correctly under the compensation scheme. No participant was restricted in the number of problems that could be solved. Participants were not informed of the performance by anyone else until the end of the study and were told of each compensation scheme only immediately before performing the task. At the end of the experiment, we randomly selected one of the compensation schemes and participants were paid for their performance under the selected compensation scheme.

Participants first performed the task under a noncompetitive piece rate where they received 50 cents per correctly solved problem. Subsequently they performed in tournaments of two men and two women. While gender was never mentioned during the experiment, individuals could see their competitors and determine the gender composition of the group. Only the person with the largest number of correctly solved problems was paid and received \$2 per correct problem. The other members of the group received no payment. Under the piece rate, men and women solved an average of 10.7 and 10.2 problems, respectively, and under the tournament they solved 12.1 and 11.8, respectively. Neither case demonstrates a significant gender difference in performance. Thus, for this very short task of simple math problems, men and women did not differ in their ability to compete in mixed-sex groups. In fact, for this specific short task, changes in incentives do not appear to have a large effect on performance. Later examinations suggest that the increase in performance from the piece rate to the tournament is driven largely by experience.

Having performed both under the piece rate and the tournament compensation scheme, participants were asked which of the two they would prefer for their performance on a subsequent five-minute addition task. To secure that the individual's choice only depends on the participant's beliefs on relative performance, we designed the choice as an individual decision. Specifically, a participant who selected the tournament would win if his or her new performance exceeded the performance of the three other group members from the previous competition.

Figure 2

**Proportion Selecting Tournament**

Source: Niederle and Vesterlund (2007).

Given the lack of a gender gap in performance, maximization of earnings predicts no gender difference in choice of compensation scheme. In contrast to the prediction, we observe a substantial gender gap in tournament entry. Seventy-three percent of the men and 35 percent of the women entered the tournament.<sup>3</sup>

Figure 2A shows the proportion of men and women who enter the subsequent tournament for each initial tournament performance quartile. Neither the tournament-entry decisions of men nor those of women are very sensitive to the individual's performance, and independent of the performance quartile, men are much more likely to enter the tournament. On average, men in the worst performance quartile enter the tournament more than women in the best performance quartile.

To study the effect of beliefs about relative performance, participants were asked to rank their performance in the initial tournament. Any correct guess was rewarded by \$1. Accounting for ties, at most 30 percent of men and women should guess that they are the best in their group of four. We find that 75 percent of men compared to 43 percent of women guessed that they were the best. While both men and women are overconfident, men are more overconfident than women. Figure 2B shows that while beliefs predict tournament entry for both men and women, a substantial gender gap in entry remains. Among those who reported that they thought they were best in their group of four, 80 percent of men enter

<sup>3</sup> A gender gap in willingness to compete has also been documented by Niederle, Segal, and Vesterlund (2008), Dargnies (2009), Cason, Masters, and Sheremeta (2009), Gneezy and Rustichini (2005), Gupta, Poulsen, and Villeval (2005), Herreiner and Pannell (2009), Prize (2008a), Sutter and Rützler (2009), and Wozniak (2009). Gneezy, Leonard, and List (2009) replicate the finding in a patriarchal African society but not in a matrilineal Indian one. Prize (2008b) examines men and women who are equally confident and find that there is no gender difference in competitive entry.

the tournament compared to only 50 percent of women. This 30 percentage point gender gap in tournament entry remains among those who thought they were second out of four. With 84 percent of participants guessing that they were ranked first or second, it follows that there is a substantial gender gap in competitive entry even conditional on beliefs. Regressions confirm this result when controlling for both performance and beliefs.

Other possible reasons for the different compensation choices of men and women may be that they differ in their attitudes toward risk and feedback on relative performance. The compensation scheme associated with the tournament is more risky and results in the participant receiving feedback on relative performance. In our study, we find little evidence that these factors play a large role in explaining gender differences in tournament entry.<sup>4</sup> Controlling for the effects of beliefs, risk and feedback aversion, there remains a substantial and significant gender difference in tournament entry. We attribute this remaining difference to men and women differing in their attitude towards placing themselves in environments where they have to compete against others.

Our results show that women shy away from competition while men embrace it and this difference is explained by gender differences in confidence and in attitudes toward competition. A consequence is that from a payoff-maximizing perspective, too few high-performing women and too many low-performing men enter the tournament. Perhaps most important is that the fraction of women who win the competitions drops dramatically. Based on the participants' performance distribution, we can predict their likelihood of winning the competition. When women have no option but to compete in randomly generated groups, they are predicted to win 48 percent of competitions; however, if competitions were run solely among those who opt to compete, we instead predict that 29 percent of competitions would be won by women. Thus selection alone causes very few women to win competitions.

Taking these studies together, the evidence suggests that in mixed-sex environments where there appear to be no or small gender differences in noncompetitive performance, men nonetheless outperform women in competitions and more frequently select a competitive compensation. We can draw a strong parallel between the two research findings by interpreting the lower performance of women in the mixed-sex tournaments in Gneezy, Niederle, and Rustichini (2003) as women choosing not to compete, and hence not exerting a lot of effort. The high female performance in the single-sex tournament shows that it is possible for women to perform well in competitions. However, the results of both studies suggest that women may not perform to their maximal ability in mixed-sex competitions.

<sup>4</sup>The evidence on the extent to which gender differences in tournament entry is explained by gender differences in risk attitudes is mixed (for example, Cason, Masters, and Sheremeta, 2009; Gupta, Poulsen, and Villevall, 2005; Dohmen and Falk, 2006).

## The Effect of Competition on Math Test Scores

While test scores traditionally were thought to measure an individual's cognitive ability, researchers have come to recognize that test scores are influenced by cognitive as well as noncognitive abilities (for example, Cunha and Heckman, 2007; Segal, 2008). In particular, noncognitive factors such as motivation, drive, and obedience may not only affect an individual's investments in cognitive skills, but also the individual's test score performance. In a nice demonstration of the effect of incentives on performance, Gneezy and Rustichini (2000) have participants solve a 20-minute IQ test under varying incentive schemes. They show that performance is lower when individuals are given a low piece-rate per correct answer, rather than a high piece-rate or even zero payment. Thus, students who have similar skills may receive different test scores if the incentives associated with a high performance differ or are perceived to differ. This suggests that test scores may reflect much more than cognitive skills.

A noncognitive skill that may influence test scores is an individual's response to competitive pressure. The studies described above show that men and women differ in their response to competition when performing in mixed-sex environments. Thus, a very competitive test may result in gender differences in test scores that need not reflect the magnitude or the direction of gender differences in performance seen in less competitive environments.

Örs, Palomino, and Peyrache (2008) elegantly show the relevance of this point in practice. They examine the performance of women and men in an entry exam to a very selective French business school (HEC) to determine whether the observed gender differences in test scores reflect differential responses to competitive environments rather than differences in skills. The entry exam is very competitive: only about 13 percent of candidates are accepted. Comparing scores from this exam reveals that the performance distribution for males has a higher mean and fatter tails than that for females. This gender gap in performance is then compared both to the outcome of the national high school graduation exam, and for admitted students, to their performance in the first year. While both of these performances are measured in stressful environments, they are much less competitive than the entry exam. The performance of women is found to dominate that of men, both on the high school exam and during the first year at the business school. Of particular interest is that females from the same cohort of candidates performed significantly better than males on the national high school graduation exam two years prior to sitting for the admission exam. Furthermore, among those admitted to the program they find that within the first year of the M.Sc. program, females outperform males. Caution should however be used when comparing these results to those on the entry exam; not only is this a truncated sample of the original distribution, it is also one from which certain students may have exited. The authors also control for explanations pertaining to risk aversion and specific test-taking strategies. They find that for each student the variance of grades across different subjects is not



higher for male than female students. This excludes a difference in strategies where a student studies a few topics intensively rather than studying all topics on a subject. Furthermore, they show that the same differences arise when focusing separately on the math and non-math parts of the exam. They conclude that the differences in the gender gap between the entry exam and the high school exam, as well as with the first-year performance, result from men and women differing in their response to competition.

Although no comparable study has been conducted in the United States, Örs, Palomino, and Peyrache (2008) note that their results are consistent with the observation that female grade point averages in both high school and college exceed those of males when controlling for their SAT scores (for example, Rothstein, 2004).

These findings suggest that caution is needed when using test scores to infer gender differences in skills. However, it is not clear why this should be more of an issue when looking at math rather than say verbal test scores or why a bias in math may be exacerbated at the right tail of the distribution. We will argue that the gender differences that were found to play an important role in our study of mixed-sex competition (Niederle and Vesterlund, 2007), namely confidence and attitudes towards competition, are likely to influence performance on competitive math tests and that these differences may play a substantial role at the right tail of the distribution.

### **Confidence, Stereotypes, and Math Tests**

We begin by discussing why gender differences in confidence may be particularly large in mathematics. Girls and boys with the same math test scores have very different assessments of their relative ability (for example, Eccles, 1998). Conditional on math performance, boys are more overconfident than girls, and this gender gap is greatest among gifted children (Preckel, Goetz, Pekrun, and Kleine, 2008). The strong gender stereotype that boys are better at math may help to explain this gender gap in confidence. This stereotype is further reinforced by the fact that the fraction of male teachers in math-intensive courses is higher than for other classes.<sup>5</sup> Another source through which stereotypes may affect beliefs is shown by Jacobs (1991), who found that mothers who endorsed a male-math stereotype underestimated their daughters' ability in math. These perceptions were shown to be particularly important for a child's confidence because a child's self-evaluation of academic competency appears to be more strongly related to

<sup>5</sup> Dee (2007) and Carrell, Page, and West (2009) study the effect of a teacher's gender on performance. Having a female math or science teacher improves the math and science performances by females, and the effect is particularly large for the gifted female students. Using the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), Dee (2007) estimates that in 12<sup>th</sup> grade 44 percent of science teachers and 52 percent of math teachers are female, compared to 71 percent in reading. See Bettinger and Long (2005) for evidence on college instruction.

their parents' appraisals of their academic ability than to their actual academic performance.<sup>6</sup>

The findings by Pope and Sydnor (in this issue) are very much in line with stereotypes influencing test performance at the tail. Looking at U.S. data, they find large variation in the gender ratios of 8<sup>th</sup> graders scoring in the top 75<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). The test is taken by a sample of children in public schools. Consistent with beliefs influencing behavior, they show that in regions where men and women are viewed as more equal there are smaller gender disparities in stereotypically male-dominated tests of math and science and in stereotypically female-dominated tests of reading.

The relationship between perception of women and the math performance gap has also been documented across OECD countries. Guiso, Monte, Sapienza, and Zingales (2008) use the 2003 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) evaluating 15-year-old students from 40 countries in identical tests in mathematics and reading. The tests were designed by the OECD to be free of cultural biases. They use several measures for the gender equality of a country, including the World Economic Forum's Gender Gap Index or GGI (Hausmann, Tyson, and Zahidi, 2006). Examples of European countries with high GGI scores are countries like Sweden, Finland, and Norway, while low-GGI countries are France, Greece, and Italy. In countries that score highly on gender equality, Guiso, Monte, Sapienza, and Zingales (2008) find a smaller gender gap in mean math performance as well as in the tail of the distribution. In contrast to Pope and Sydnor (this issue), they find a positive correlation between math and reading with women performing well on both tasks in societies with greater gender equality.

Looking at the very highest performing women in mathematics, Hyde and Mertz (2009) examine the proportion of women among delegates at the International Mathematical Olympiad (IMO) in the last two decades for countries that achieved a median rank among the top 30 in recent years. The proportion of females in a country's IMO team is not correlated with median team rank. However, they find a positive correlation between the percentage of girls in a country's IMO team during the past two decades and its 2007 Gender Gap Index. Ellison and Swanson (this issue) do not replicate this finding and argue that this may be because they examine a larger set of countries. They note that when examining the very high-achieving students the gender gap is very large, and particularly troubling is that top-performing girls in this set are concentrated in a few elite schools compared to the top-performing boys.

The strong stereotype of male superior math performance may influence the confidence of females and affect their performance on competitive math tests. This

<sup>6</sup> Stereotypes may not only influence a child's confidence directly and the manner in which the child responds to competition, it may also influence the likelihood by which the child "chokes" in any performance setting. Stereotype threat theory (Steele, 1997) argues that a strong stereotype may harm the stereotyped individual's performance on a task because they fear confirming it. Spencer, Steele, and Quinn (1999) show that the effect of stereotype threat may be removed if in describing a test it is stated that the "math test had revealed no gender difference in the past."

effect is likely to be exacerbated for those at the tail of the distribution for whom the gender gap in confidence may be large.

### **Attitudes towards Competition and Math Tests**

Why might gender differences in competitive attitudes be more of an issue on math tests? One reason may be that math answers are either right or wrong, thus in contrast to verbal test scores, math test scores may better predict actual rank as well as future relative performances. Another reason is that more boys select math-intensive majors, which in turn increases the fraction of relevant male competitors on math tests relative to that on say verbal tests. As shown by Gneezy, Niederle, and Rustichini (2003), a woman's competitive performance is sensitive to the gender of her competitors. While women in this study improved their performance when competing in all-female groups, this was not the case in mixed-sex groups.

In Niederle, Segal, and Vesterlund (2008), we extend our earlier study of mixed-sex competition (Niederle and Vesterlund, 2007) to parse the effects of the gender composition of competitors. The initial finding that gender differences in confidence and attitudes toward competition help explain tournament entry led us to examine the compensation choices of men and women in an "affirmative-action" tournament where for every two winners we require that at least one winner must be a woman. Such a requirement not only increases the probability that women will win the tournament, it also makes the competition more gender-specific. In the affirmative-action tournament, a woman will win the competition if she is either the best-performing woman or has one of the two highest performances in the group; a man on the other hand will have to both be the best-performing man and have one of the two highest performances in the group. Increasing the number of same-sex competitors may affect the decision to enter a tournament because both the gender gap in beliefs as well as in attitudes to competition could be smaller in more gender-specific competitions. If women are more comfortable competing against women, this may influence their compensation choices.

The experiment was conducted at the Harvard Business School, using students from the Computer Lab for Experimental Research (CLER) subject pool. Participants in the experiment compete in groups of three men and three women. They are presented with two different compensation choices. In the standard tournament choice, they choose between a 50-cent piece rate and a tournament where the two participants with the largest number of correctly solved problems each will be paid \$1.50 per correctly solved problem and the remaining four members will receive no payment. In the second choice, participants instead choose between a 50-cent piece rate and a \$1.50 affirmative-action tournament. The two winners of the affirmative-action tournament are the highest performing woman and the highest performer of the remaining five members of the group.

Our study shows that when women are guaranteed equal representation among winners, more women and fewer men enter competitions and the change exceeds that predicted by the changes in the probability of winning that result from the introduction of affirmative action. The response causes the fraction of

entrants who are women to increase from 29 to 64 percent. The excessive response is explained to a large extent by changes in beliefs on the chances of winning the competition and attitudes toward competition. Specifically, men are less overconfident and women less reluctant to compete in groups where their own gender is better represented.

The sensitivity to gender composition is also shown by Huguet and Régner (2007). When girls are led to believe that a task measures math ability, then they are found to underperform in mixed-sex groups, but not in all-female groups. A natural question may be why women are more apprehensive toward competitions against males. One explanation may be that it is more threatening to compete against individuals who are overconfident and very eager to compete and win.

The reported studies suggest that a woman's performance and willingness to compete is sensitive to the gender of those she is competing with. If a large fraction of competitors on math tests are male, then gender differences in attitudes toward competition may play a particularly large role, and this effect may be exacerbated at the more male-dominated upper tail.

## Conclusions

A series of studies have shown that males and females differ in their response to competition. We have argued that such gender differences may cause test scores to magnify and potentially distort underlying gender differences in skills. In light of the role played by beliefs on relative performance and women's sensitivity to competition against men, these factors may be particularly important when assessing math skills.

The reported studies suggest that competitive pressure may cause gender differences in test scores that exaggerate the underlying gender differences in math skills. Needless to say, this distortion is not a concern if an individual's test score is not simply meant to reflect math skills, but rather math skills under competitive pressure. Certainly math test scores may be very good predictors of winners of the American Mathematics Competition. However there are many circumstances where math test scores are used for the sole purpose of assessing math skills. In those situations, we may need to be cautious of the bias that the competitive environment imposes on women.

We have focused on explaining how a differential response to competition may distort gender differences in test scores. However, sensitivity to competitive pressure is also likely to influence the investment in and selection into male-dominated or math-intensive fields where there are strong stereotypes on female inabilities. If educational investments vary by gender, and these influence a student's preparedness when taking the test, then this may further explain the differences in math test scores.

At the high school level, there is little evidence that girls on average invest less in math than boys. Goldin, Katz, and Kuziemko (2006) show that girls and

boys take advanced math classes at similar rates, and Guiso, Monte, Sapienza, and Zingales (2008) find that if anything girls spend more time on math homework than boys. While these studies demonstrate that on average there are no gender differences in math skill investments, it would be of interest to determine whether the same holds at the upper tail of the distribution.

At the college level, there are substantial gender differences in math-related investment. It is important however to note that these investments need not reflect differences in skills. In an experiment using Stanford undergraduates, Niederle and Yestrumskas (2008) show that females may be less likely to choose a difficult task. They first have women and men solve an easy task. When asked to choose the difficulty for a subsequent performance task, men select a challenging task over an easy task 50 percent more often than women, even when controlling for initial performance and beliefs about one's performance. This result is consistent with those of LeFevre, Kulak, and Heymans (1992) and Weinberger (2005) who find that among equally gifted students, males are many times more likely to select college majors that are considered to be high in math content. Furthermore, the drop-out rate for these majors is much greater for women.

Many factors may explain why fewer women end up completing math-intensive college course work. Partial explanations may be found in examining the explanations women give for dropping out of these courses. A report entitled "Women's Experiences in College Engineering," funded by the National Science Foundation and the Sloan Foundation, writes that the exit of many young women is not driven by ability, but rather that this decision is influenced by women negatively interpreting their grades and having low self-confidence (Goodman Research Group, 2002). Furthermore these women mention that negative aspects of their schools' climate, such as competition, lack of support, and discouraging faculty and peers, cause them to reevaluate their field of study. In an earlier study of engineering student performance and retention, Felder, Felder, Mauney, Hamrin, and Dietz (1995) find similar effects.

A crucial question is whether it is possible to alter how women perceive and experience math-intensive studies. Advocates for single-sex education have long argued that the gender composition in the classroom can influence a girl's investment in both math and science. Indeed the evidence presented in a recent study by Fryer and Levitt (2009) suggests that single-sex education may improve the confidence of girls and cause them to hold less stereotypical views of gender roles. In a cross-country analysis, Fryer and Levitt find that there is no gender gap in math performance in Middle Eastern countries with same-sex schooling, and this causes them to speculate that perhaps the relationship between single-sex schooling and the absence of a gender gap in math performance may be causal. Unfortunately, it is difficult to use cross-country data to determine the effect of single-sex education. The U.S. evidence of single-sex schooling is far from conclusive: while some find that girls from single-sex schools are more likely to subsequently enter sciences, others fail to find such an effect (for discussion, see Campbell and Sanders, 2002). As single-sex schools in the United States are private, self-selection may play a

significant role so identification of an effect of single-sex schooling on math achievements is difficult.<sup>7</sup>

In conclusion, gender differences in competitive attitudes may cause mathematics test scores to give a biased representation of the underlying gender differences in math skills. Our results suggest that it may be important to examine whether changes in testing or evaluation can allow more females to realize their potential and better measure their current math interests and math skills.

## References

- Altonji, Joseph G., and Rebecca Blank.** 1999. "Race and Gender in the Labor Market." In *Handbook of Labor Economics*, vol. 3c, ed. O. Ashenfelter, and D. Card, 3144–3259. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science
- Berenbaum, Sheri A., Carol Lynn Martin, Laura D. Hanish, Phillip T. Briggs, and Richard A. Fabes.** 2008. "Sex Differences in Children's Play." Chap. 14 in *Sex Differences in the Brain: From Genes to Behavior*, ed. J. B. Becker, K. J. Berkley, N. Geary, E. Hampson, J. Herman, and E. Young. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bettinger, Eric, and Bridget Long.** 2005. "Do Faculty Serve as Role Models? The Impact of Instructor Gender on Female Students." *American Economic Review*, 95(2): 152–57.
- Booth, Alison L., and Patrick J. Nolen.** 2009. "Choosing to Compete: How Different Are Girls and Boys?" IZA Working Paper 4027, Institute for the Study of Labor.
- Byrnes, James P., David C. Miller, and William D. Schafer.** 1999. "Gender Differences in Risk Taking: A Meta-Analysis." *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(3): 367–83.
- Campbell, Patricia B, and Jo Sanders.** 2002. "Challenging the System: Assumptions and Data Behind the Push for Single-Sex Schooling." Chap. 3 in *Gender in Policy and Practice: Perspectives on Single-Sex and Coeducational Schooling*, ed. A. Datnow and L. Hubbard. RoutledgeFalmer.
- Carrell Scott E, Marianne E. Page, and James E. West.** 2009. "Sex and Science: How Professor Gender Perpetuates the Gender Gap." NBER Working Paper w14959.
- Cason, Timothy N., William A. Masters, and Roman M. Sheremeta.** 2009. "Entry into Winner-Take-All and Proportional-Prize Contests: An Experimental Study." <http://www.krannert.purdue.edu/faculty/cason/papers/EntryWithProportionalPrizes.pdf>.
- Croson, Rachel, and Uri Gneezy.** 2009. "Gender Differences in Preferences." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 47(2): 1–27.
- Cunha, Flavio, and James Heckman.** 2007. "The Technology of Skill Formation." *American Economic Review*, 97(2): 31–47.
- Dargnies, Marie-Pierre.** 2009. "Team Competition: Eliminating the Gender Gap in Competitiveness." [http://mariepierre.dargnies.free.fr/data/doc/pdf/jmp\\_team.pdf](http://mariepierre.dargnies.free.fr/data/doc/pdf/jmp_team.pdf).
- Dee, Thomas S.** 2007. "Teachers and the Gender Gaps in Student Achievement." *Journal of Human Resources*, 42(3): 528–554.
- Dohmen, Thomas Johannes, and Armin Falk.** 2006. "Performance Pay and Multi-dimensional Sorting: Productivity, Preferences and Gender." IZA Discussion Paper No. 2001.
- Eccles, Jacquelynne S.** 1998. "Perceived Control and the Development of Academic Motivation: Commentary." *Monographs of the Society for*

<sup>7</sup> Booth and Nolen (2009) examine tournament-entry decision by boys and girls in mixed- and single-sex schools. They find that girls from selective single-sex schools are more likely to enter competitions against boys than girls from nonselective mixed-sex schools. Unfortunately it is not possible to determine whether this response results from the superior performance by students at the single-sex schools.

*Research in Child Development*, 63(2/3): 221–31.

**Eckel, Catherine C., and Philip J. Grossman.** 2008. “Men, Women, and Risk Aversion: Experimental Evidence.” Chap. 113 in *Handbook of Experimental Economics Results*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science, North-Holland.

**Felder, Richard, Gary Felder, Merideth Mauney, Charles Hamrin, Jacquelin Dietz.** 1995. “A Longitudinal Study of Engineering Student Performance and Retention III: Gender Differences in Student Performance and Attitudes.” *Journal of Engineering Education*, 84(2): 151–63.

**Fryer, Roland, and Steven Levitt.** 2009. “An Empirical Analysis of the Gender Gap in Mathematics.” Unpublished paper. (Forthcoming in *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*.)

**Gaulin, Steven, and Harol Hoffman.** 1988. “Evolution and Development of Sex Differences in Spatial Ability.” Chap. 7 in *Human Reproductive Behavior: A Darwinian Perspective*, ed. Laura Betzig, Monique Borgerhoff Mulder, and Paul Turke. Cambridge University Press.

**Gneezy, Uri, Kenneth L. Leonard, and John A. List.** 2009. “Gender Differences in Competition: Evidence from a Matrilineal and a Patriarchal Society.” *Econometrica*, 77(5): 1637–64.

**Gneezy, Uri, Muriel Niederle, and Aldo Rustichini.** 2003. “Performance in Competitive Environments: Gender Differences.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(3): 1049–74.

**Gneezy, Uri, and Aldo Rustichini.** 2000. “Pay Enough or Don’t Pay At All.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115(3): 791–810.

**Gneezy, Uri, and Aldo Rustichini.** 2004. “Gender and Competition at a Young Age.” *American Economic Review*, 94(2): 377–81.

**Gneezy, Uri, and Aldo Rustichini.** 2005. “Executive versus Teachers: Gender, Competition and Self-Selection.” Unpublished paper.

**Goldin, Claudia, Lawrence F. Katz, and Ilyana Kuziemko.** 2006. “The Homecoming of American College Women: The Reversal of the College Gender Gap.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 20(4): 133–56.

**Goodman Research Group, Inc.** 2002. “Final Report of the The Women’s Experience in College Engineering Project.” [http://www.grginc.com/WECE\\_FINAL\\_REPORT.pdf](http://www.grginc.com/WECE_FINAL_REPORT.pdf).

**Grogger, Jeff, and Eric Eide.** 1995. “Changes in College Skills and the Rise in the College Wage Premium.” *Journal of Human Resources*, 30(2): 280–310

**Guiso, Luigi, Ferdinando Monte, Paolo Sapienza, and Luigi Zingales.** 2008. “Culture, Gender and Math.” *Science*, 320(5880): 1164–1165.

**Gupta, Nabanita Datta, Anders Poulsen, and Marie-Claire Villeval.** 2005. “Male and Female

Competitive Behavior—Experimental Evidence.” GATE Working Paper 0512, Groupe d’Analyse et de Théorie Economique (GATE), Centre national de la recherche scientifique (CNRS), Université Lyon 2, Ecole Normale Supérieure, Ecully, France.

**Hausmann, Ricardo, Laura D. Tyson, and Saadia Zahidi.** 2006. *The Global Gender Gap Report*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Economic Forum.

**Hedges, Larry V., and Amy Nowell.** 1995. “Sex Differences in Mental Test Scores, Variability, and Numbers of High-Scoring Individuals.” *Science*, 269(5220): 41–45.

**Herreiner, Dorteia, and Kerry Pannell.** 2009. “Women’s Competition Aversion in Promotion Settings: Experimental Evidence.” Unpublished paper.

**Huguet, Pascal, and Isabelle Régner.** 2007. Stereotype Threat among School Girls in Quasi-Ordinary Classroom Circumstances. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(3): 545–60.

**Hyde, Janet S., and Janet E. Mertz.** 2009. “Gender, Culture and Mathematics Performance.” *PNAS*, June 2, 106(22): 8801–07.

**Jacobs, Janis E.** 1991. “Influence of Gender Stereotypes on Parent and Child Mathematics Attitudes.” *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83(4): 518.

**LeFevre, Jo-Anne, Alison G. Kulak, and Stephanie L. Heymans.** 1992. “Factors Influencing the Selection of University Majors Varying in Mathematical Content.” *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 24(3): 276–89.

**Murnane, Richard J., John B. Willett, Yves Duhaldeborde, and John H. Tyler.** 2000. “How Important Are the Cognitive Skills of Teenagers in Predicting Subsequent Earnings?” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 19(4): 547–68.

**Murnane Richard J., John B. Willett, and Frank Levy.** 1995. “The Growing Importance of Cognitive Skills in Wage Determination.” NBER Working Paper w5076.

**Niederle, Muriel, Carmit Segal, and Lise Vesterlund.** 2008. “How Costly is Diversity? Affirmative Action in Light of Gender Differences in Competitiveness.” NBER Working Paper 13923.

**Niederle, Muriel, and Lise Vesterlund.** 2007. “Do Women Shy Away from Competition? Do Men Compete Too Much?” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(3): 1067–1101.

**Niederle, Muriel, and Alexandra H. Yestrumskas.** 2008. “Gender Differences in Seeking Challenges: The Role of Institutions.” NBER Working Paper, w13922.

**Örs, Evren, Frederic Palomino, and Eloic Peyrache.** 2008. “Performance Gender-Gap: Does Competition Matter?” CEPR Working Paper 6891.

- Paglin, Morton, and Anthony M. Rufolo.** 1990. "Heterogeneous Human Capital, Occupational Choice, and Male-Female Earnings Differences." *Journal of Labor Economics*, 8(1, Part 1): 123–44.
- Preckel, Franzis, Thomas Goetz, Reinhard Pekrun, and Michael Kleine.** 2008. "Gender Differences in Gifted and Average-Ability Students: Comparing Girls' and Boys' Achievement, Self-Concept, Interest, and Motivation in Mathematics." *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 52(2): 146–59.
- Prize, Curtis.** 2008a. "Gender, Competition, and Managerial Decisions." <http://web.usi.edu/crprice/womenmanagers-rnov08.pdf>.
- Prize, Curtis.** 2008b. "Do Women Shy Away From Competition? Do Men Compete Too Much?: A (Failed) Replication." [http://web.usi.edu/crprice/nvreplication\\_submit.pdf](http://web.usi.edu/crprice/nvreplication_submit.pdf).
- Rothstein, Jesse.** 2004. "College Performance Predictions and the SAT." *Journal of Econometrics*, 121(1–2): 297–317.
- Segal, Carmit.** 2008. "Motivation, Test Scores, and Economic Success." UPF Working Paper 1124.
- Spencer, Steven J., Claude M. Steele, and Diane M. Quinn.** 1999. "Stereotype Threat and Women's Math Performance." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35(1): 4–28.
- Steele, Claude M.** 1997. "A Threat in the Air: How Stereotypes Shape the Intellectual Identities and Performance of Women and African Americans." *American Psychologist*, 52(6): 613–29.
- Sutter, Matthias, and Daniela Rützler.** 2009. "Gender Differences in Competition and the Influence of Age: Only Three-Year Old Girls Compete as Much as Boys." Unpublished paper.
- Weinberger, Catherine J.** 1999. "Mathematical College Majors and the Gender Gap in Wages." *Industrial Relations*, 38(July): 407–13.
- Weinberger, Catherine J.** 2001. "Is Teaching More Girls More Math the Key to Higher Wages?" Chap. 11 in *Squaring Up: Policy Strategies to Raise Women's Incomes in the United States*, ed. Mary C. King. University of Michigan Press.
- Weinberger, Catherine J.** 2005. "Is the Science and Engineering Workforce Drawn from the Far Upper Tail of the Math Ability Distribution?" <http://econ.ucsb.edu/~weinberg/uppertail.pdf>.
- Wozniak, David.** 2009. "Choices about Competition: Differences by Gender and Hormonal Fluctuations, and the Role of Relative Performance Feedback." [http://www.uoregon.edu/~dwozniak/Wozniak\\_Competition\\_09.pdf](http://www.uoregon.edu/~dwozniak/Wozniak_Competition_09.pdf).
- Xie, Yu, and Kimberlee A. Shauman.** 2003. *Women in Science: Career Processes and Outcomes*. Harvard University Press.



**This article has been cited by:**

1. Vincenzo Galasso, Paola Profeta. 2024. Gender Differences in Math Tests: the Role of Time Pressure. *The Economic Journal* **134**:664, 3461-3475. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Radhika Kapoor, Erin Fahle, Klint Kanopka, David Klinowski, Ana Trindade Ribeiro, Benjamin W. Domingue. 2024. Differences in Time Usage as a Competing Hypothesis for Observed Group Differences in Accuracy with an Application to Observed Gender Differences in PISA Data. *Journal of Educational Measurement* **10**. . [[Crossref](#)]
3. Isabel J. Raabe, Per Block. 2024. The gendered maths confidence gap, social influence and social integration. *European Societies* **26**:5, 1596-1631. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Leo Bao, Difang Huang, Chen Lin. 2024. Can Artificial Intelligence Improve Gender Equality? Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *Management Science* **121**. . [[Crossref](#)]
5. Diana Ngo, Andrew Dustan. 2024. Preferences, Access, and the STEM Gender Gap in Centralized High School Assignment. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **16**:4, 257-287. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
6. Haimeng Teng, Qiang Wu. 2024. Do Female CEOs Manage Costs Differently? Evidence From Asymmetric Cost Behavior. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance* **73**. . [[Crossref](#)]
7. Robin L. Snipes, Jennifer P. Pitts, Phillip C. Bryant, Tobias M. Huning, Alexandra Snipes. 2024. Job Satisfaction and Politics in the Modern Workplace: An Empirical Examination of the Moderating Effects of Gender and Age on the Perception of Organizational Politics-Job Satisfaction Relationship. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* **36**:3, 337-365. [[Crossref](#)]
8. Yan Liu, Natasha S. Maltais, Marina Milner-Bolotin, Svetlana Chachashvili-Bolotin. 2024. Investigating adolescent psychological wellbeing in an educational context using PISA 2018 Canadian data. *Frontiers in Psychology* **15**. . [[Crossref](#)]
9. Kseniia Marcq, Johan Braeken. 2024. Gender differences in item nonresponse in the PISA 2018 student questionnaire. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability* **36**:3, 301-336. [[Crossref](#)]
10. Paula Apascaritei, Jonas Radl, Madeline Swarr. 2024. Material incentives moderate gender differences in cognitive effort among children. *Learning and Individual Differences* **114**, 102494. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Mehmet Hilmi Saglam, Talha Goktenturk. 2024. Mathematically high and low performances tell us different stories: Uncovering motivation-related factors via the ecological model. *Learning and Individual Differences* **114**, 102513. [[Crossref](#)]
12. Pilar Beneito, Javier Soria-Espín, Óscar Vicente-Chirivella. 2024. Month of birth and aspirational career choice: a gender perspective. *Education Economics* **32**:4, 413-439. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Von Christopher G Chua. 2024. Engendering gendered mathematics education in the Philippines: Is equality to access enough?. *Power and Education* **16**:2, 139-149. [[Crossref](#)]
14. William Chakabwata. Globalisation Gender Sensitivity in the Teaching of Mathematics in Higher Education 145-171. [[Crossref](#)]
15. Maria Laura Di Tommaso, Dalit Contini, Dalila De Rosa, Francesca Ferrara, Daniela Piazzalunga, Ornella Robutti. 2024. Tackling the gender gap in mathematics with active learning methodologies. *Economics of Education Review* **100**, 102538. [[Crossref](#)]
16. Liu Yang, Lei Zhang. 2024. Online teaching, gender differences and education outcomes: Evidence from Chinese urban high schools during the COVID-19. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **52**:2, 534-553. [[Crossref](#)]
17. Aomar IBOURK, Karim EL AYNAOUI. 2024. Gender gap in school learning: Micro-level evidence from Morocco. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity* **10**:2, 100289. [[Crossref](#)]

18. Gregorio Gimenez, Mauro Mediavilla, David Giuliodori, Gisela Carolina Rusteholz. 2024. Bullying at School and Students' Learning Outcomes: International Perspective and Gender Analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 39:11-12, 2733-2760. [[Crossref](#)]
19. J. OShaughnessy. 2024. Promoting Women in Mathematics through Creating a Learning Community and Encouraging Double Majors. *PRIMUS* 34:5, 509-520. [[Crossref](#)]
20. Serkan Arıkan. 2024. Investigating Differential Item Functioning of an International Mathematics Competition Items across Gender Groups. *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Eğitim Dergisi* 41:1, 53-69. [[Crossref](#)]
21. Maliheh Paryavi. 2024. Women lean back when representing others in competitions. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* 109, 102142. [[Crossref](#)]
22. Ahmad Shah Mobariz, Shishir Shakya. 2024. Cultural influences on gender gap in test scores: findings from Afghanistan's university entrance examination. *Applied Economics Letters* 1-4. [[Crossref](#)]
23. Vlada Repeykova, Teemu Toivainen, Maxim Likhonov, Kim van Broekhoven, Yulia Kovas. 2024. Nothing But Stereotypes? Negligible Sex Differences Across Creativity Measures in Science, Arts, and Sports Adolescent High Achievers. *The Journal of Creative Behavior* 58:1, 47-65. [[Crossref](#)]
24. Annemette Kjærgaard, Julie Buhl-Wiggers, Elisabeth Naima Mikkelsen. 2024. Does gradeless learning affect students' academic performance? A study of effects over time. *Studies in Higher Education* 49:2, 336-350. [[Crossref](#)]
25. Oliver Fabel, Sandra Mauser, Yingchao Zhang. 2024. Performance contests and merit pay with empathic employees. *Managerial and Decision Economics* 45:1, 353-372. [[Crossref](#)]
26. Seijoon Park. 2024. Does the relationship between competitiveness and student achievement vary based on the culture of competitiveness? Evidence from PISA 2018. *International Journal of Educational Research* 127, 102438. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Ritika Gupta. Fixing the Leaky Pipeline: Affirmative Action in Local Elite Colleges and Subject Choice 105, . [[Crossref](#)]
28. Simon Calmar Andersen, Henrik Hansen, Lóa Björk Jóelsdóttir, Helena Skyt Nielsen. 2024. The male shortcut to math achievement. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 79. . [[Crossref](#)]
29. Katja Rost, Malte Doehne. The Gender-Equality Paradox in Management 115, . [[Crossref](#)]
30. Fanghua Li, Y. Jane Zhang. 2024. Response to Competition: Gender, Domains and STEM Choice. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 101. . [[Crossref](#)]
31. Maryam Dilmaghani, David Smerdon. 2024. Gender Differences in Corrupt Behaviour: Evidence from Elite Chess Tournaments. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 27. . [[Crossref](#)]
32. Volker Schöer, Jose G. Clavel. 2024. Dialogic teaching practices and student performance in mathematics in Asian countries. *AIMS Mathematics* 9:10, 28671-28697. [[Crossref](#)]
33. Nicolas Jalabert. 2024. Publications scientifiques et différences de genre : le cas des doctorant·es français·es. *Formation emploi* 167, 57-89. [[Crossref](#)]
34. Michael Kaganovich, Morgan Taylor, Ruli Xiao. 2023. Gender Differences in Persistence in a Field of Study: This Isn't All about Grades. *Journal of Human Capital* 17:4, 503-556. [[Crossref](#)]
35. Guihua Xie, Xinyu Liu. 2023. Gender in mathematics: how gender role perception influences mathematical capability in junior high school. *The Journal of Chinese Sociology* 10:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
36. James Cowan, Dan Goldhaber, Zeyu Jin, Roddy Theobald. 2023. Assessing Licensure Test Performance and Predictive Validity for Different Teacher Subgroups. *American Educational Research Journal* 60:6, 1095-1138. [[Crossref](#)]
37. Mario Fernandes, Simon Hilber, Jan-Egbert Sturm, Andreas Walter. 2023. Closing the gender gap in academia? Evidence from an affirmative action program. *Research Policy* 52:9, 104865. [[Crossref](#)]

38. Klarita Gërxxhani, Jordi Brandts, Arthur Schram. 2023. Competition and Gender Inequality: A Comprehensive Analysis of Effects and Mechanisms. *American Journal of Sociology* **129**:3, 715-752. [[Crossref](#)]
39. Maria Jose Roa, Sonia Di Giannatale, Alejandra Villegas, Jonathan Barboza. 2023. Are women more financially vulnerable than men? A tale of missed economic opportunities from Latin America. *Development Policy Review* **41**:6. . [[Crossref](#)]
40. Kevin J. Boudreau, Nilam Kaushik. 2023. Gender Differences in Responses to Competitive Organization? A Field Experiment on Differences Between STEM and Non-STEM Fields from an Internet-of-Things Platform. *Organization Science* **34**:6, 2119-2142. [[Crossref](#)]
41. Fanny Adams Quagraine, Alan Anis Mirhage Kabalan, Samuel Adams, Afia Dentaa Dankwa. 2023. 3Ps model of entrepreneurial resourcefulness among micro-youth entrepreneurs. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies* **15**:5, 1194-1214. [[Crossref](#)]
42. Yangqiuting Li, Chandralekha Singh. 2023. Sense of belonging is an important predictor of introductory physics students' academic performance. *Physical Review Physics Education Research* **19**:2. . [[Crossref](#)]
43. Cristina Borra, Maria Iacovou, Almudena Sevilla. 2023. Adolescent development and the math gender gap. *European Economic Review* **158**, 104542. [[Crossref](#)]
44. Giulietta Zanga, Elena De Gioannis. 2023. Discrimination in grading: A scoping review of studies on teachers' discrimination in school. *Studies in Educational Evaluation* **78**, 101284. [[Crossref](#)]
45. Tracey West, David Butler, Liam Smith. 2023. Slugged! Can financial literacy shield against price manipulation at the shops?. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* **47**:5, 1853-1870. [[Crossref](#)]
46. Montserrat Díaz-Fernández, Mar Llorente-Marrón, Virginia Cocina-Díaz, Victor Asensi. 2023. COVID-19 and Access to Medical Professional Careers: Does Gender Matter?. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **20**:15, 6477. [[Crossref](#)]
47. Nursel Selver Ruzgar, Clare Chua-Chow. 2023. Perception of Students on Online Exams and How Sequential Exams and the Lockdown Browser Affect Student Anxiety and Performance. *WSEAS TRANSACTIONS ON COMPUTER RESEARCH* **11**, 92-110. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Lorenzo Mazza, Alessandro Gambini. 2023. The phenomenon of the gender gap among gifted students: the situation in Italy based on analysis of results in mathematics competitions. *Teaching Mathematics and its Applications: An International Journal of the IMA* **42**:2, 170-186. [[Crossref](#)]
49. Zehua Shi. 2023. Do classroom teachers matter for academic achievement of students? Evidence from random assignment of students to teachers in China. *Applied Economics* **55**:26, 3043-3061. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Åshild A. Johnsen, Henning Finseraas, Torbjørn Hanson, Andreas Kotsadam. 2023. The malleability of competitive preferences. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* **104**, 102015. [[Crossref](#)]
51. Doriana Cucinelli, Maria Gaia Soana. 2023. Are financially illiterate individuals all the same? A study on incorrect and "do not know" answers to financial knowledge questions. *International Journal of Bank Marketing* **41**:4, 697-726. [[Crossref](#)]
52. Doras Sibanda, Jaqueline Naidoo. 2023. Gender Gaps in Mathematics Achievement in TIMSS 2015: Evidence from Grade 9 South African Learners. *African Journal of Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education* **27**:2, 222-234. [[Crossref](#)]
53. Helena Holmlund, Helmut Rainer, Patrick Reich. 2023. All geared towards success? Cultural origins of gender gaps in student achievement. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **209**, 222-242. [[Crossref](#)]
54. Ali Meftah Gerged, Mi Tran, Eshani S. Beddewela. 2023. Engendering Pro-Sustainable Performance Through a Multi-Layered Gender Diversity Criterion: Evidence From the Hospitality and Tourism Sector. *Journal of Travel Research* **62**:5, 1047-1076. [[Crossref](#)]

55. Oscar Arias, Catalina Canals, Alejandra Mizala, Francisco Meneses. 2023. Gender gaps in Mathematics and Language: The bias of competitive achievement tests. *PLOS ONE* **18**:3, e0283384. [[Crossref](#)]
56. Sergi Sánchez-Coll. 2023. Born this way: the effect of an unexpected child benefit at birth on longer-term educational outcomes. *SERIEs* **14**:1, 105-141. [[Crossref](#)]
57. Lorena Espinoza Salfate, Gonzalo Guerrero, Joaquim Barbé Farré, Felipe Márquez Salinas. 2023. Design and Validation of a Classroom Observation Instrument to Evaluate the Quality of Mathematical Activity from a Gender Perspective. *Education Sciences* **13**:3, 266. [[Crossref](#)]
58. Juan Pedro Matzumura Kasano, Hugo F. Gutiérrez Crespo, Raúl Alberto Ruiz Arias, Isabel Alamo. 2023. Genitourinary syndrome in menopause: Impact of vaginal symptoms. *Journal of Turkish Society of Obstetric and Gynecology* **20**:1, 38-45. [[Crossref](#)]
59. Thomas Buser, Martijn J. van den Assem, Dennie van Dolder. 2023. Gender and willingness to compete for high stakes. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **206**, 350-370. [[Crossref](#)]
60. Elena De Gioannis, Federico Bianchi, Flaminio Squazzoni. 2023. Gender bias in the classroom: A network study on self and peer ability attribution. *Social Networks* **72**, 44-51. [[Crossref](#)]
61. Ridwan, Kismiantini. The effects of students' cooperative attitudes, competitive attitudes, and teachers' teaching styles on students' mathematics achievement: Indonesian case from PISA 2018 050015. [[Crossref](#)]
62. Bruna Borges, Fernanda Estevan, Louis-Philippe Morin. 2023. Gender Differences in Prioritizing Rewarding Tasks. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **14**. . [[Crossref](#)]
63. Michael Kaganovich. 2023. Trade-Offs in Choosing a College Major. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **23**. . [[Crossref](#)]
64. Nenad Vulović, Aleksandra Mihajlović, Jasmina Milinković. 2023. Gender differences at mathematics competitions in the Republic of Serbia. *Inovacije u nastavi* **36**:3, 119-135. [[Crossref](#)]
65. Sergio Longobardi, Margherita Maria Pagliuca, Andrea Regoli. 2022. School climate and academic performance of Italian students: the role of disciplinary behaviour and parental involvement. *Statistical Methods & Applications* **31**:5, 1355-1373. [[Crossref](#)]
66. Huicong Yang, Qiaochu Duan, Ming Peng, Ruolei Gu, Xiaojun Sun. 2022. Sex differences on the response to others' gains and losses under cooperation and competition. *International Journal of Psychophysiology* **182**, 211-219. [[Crossref](#)]
67. Siv-Elisabeth Skjelbred, Stephan Daus. 2022. Satisfaction is insufficient: Insights from a randomized, controlled trial of a marketing simulation game. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* **38**:6, 1686-1702. [[Crossref](#)]
68. Melvin Vooren, Carla Haerlemans, Wim Groot, Henriette Maassen van den Brink. 2022. Comparing success of female students to their male counterparts in the STEM fields: an empirical analysis from enrollment until graduation using longitudinal register data. *International Journal of STEM Education* **9**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
69. Lin Tan, Isabel S. Bradburn, David B. Knight, Timothy Kinoshita, Jacob Grohs. 2022. SAT patterns and engineering and computer science college majors: an intersectional, state-level study. *International Journal of STEM Education* **9**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
70. Erin Hengel. 2022. Publishing While Female: are Women Held to Higher Standards? Evidence from Peer Review. *The Economic Journal* **132**:648, 2951-2991. [[Crossref](#)]
71. Heidrun Stoeger, Norah Almulhim, Albert Ziegler. 2022. Correspondence Heuristic and Filter-Empowerment Heuristic: Investigating the Reversed Gender Achievement Gap in a Sample of Secondary School Students in Saudi Arabia within the Framework of Educational and Learning Capital. *Education Sciences* **12**:11, 811. [[Crossref](#)]

72. Felix Bransch, Michael Kvasnicka. 2022. Male Gatekeepers: Gender Bias in the Publishing Process?. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **202**, 714-732. [[Crossref](#)]
73. Eva Ranehill, Roberto A. Weber. 2022. Gender preference gaps and voting for redistribution. *Experimental Economics* **25**:3, 845-875. [[Crossref](#)]
74. Jari Huikku, Emma-Riikka Myllymäki, Hannu Ojala. 2022. Gender differences in the first course in accounting: An achievement goal approach. *The British Accounting Review* **54**:3, 101081. [[Crossref](#)]
75. Alessandra Cassar, Y. Jane Zhang. 2022. The competitive woman: Evolutionary insights and cross-cultural evidence into finding the Femina Economica. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **197**, 447-471. [[Crossref](#)]
76. Maryam Dilmaghani. 2022. Chess girls don't cry: Gender composition of games and effort in competitions among the super-elite. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **89**, 102482. [[Crossref](#)]
77. Christopher Roby. 2022. Social Information and Gender Differences in Competitive Preferences. *The American Economist* **67**:1, 24-45. [[Crossref](#)]
78. Michael L. Smith, Věra Sokolová. 2022. Gender gaps in educational pathways in the Czech Republic. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* **43**:2, 296-313. [[Crossref](#)]
79. Pedro Albarran, Marianna Battaglia, Marcello Sartarelli. 2022. The psychological effect of a math signal. *Economics of Education Review* **86**, 102202. [[Crossref](#)]
80. Christopher T. Bennett. 2022. Untested Admissions: Examining Changes in Application Behaviors and Student Demographics Under Test-Optional Policies. *American Educational Research Journal* **59**:1, 180-216. [[Crossref](#)]
81. Maryna Tverdostup, Tiitu Paas. 2022. Gender disparities in wage returns to human capital components: how different are European labour markets?. *Baltic Journal of Economics* **22**:1, 28-48. [[Crossref](#)]
82. Sangaralingam Ramesh. The Economics of Psychology 87-142. [[Crossref](#)]
83. J. Ignacio Conde-Ruiz, Juan José Ganuza, Paola Profeta. 2022. Statistical discrimination and committees. *European Economic Review* **141**, 103994. [[Crossref](#)]
84. Sebastian Camarero Garcia. 2022. Inequality of Educational Opportunities and the Role of Learning Intensity. *Labour Economics* **74**, 102084. [[Crossref](#)]
85. Thong Nguyen-Huy, Ravinesh C. Deo, Shahjahan Khan, Aruna Devi, Adewuyi Ayodele Adeyinka, Armando A. Apan, Zaher Mundher Yaseen. 2022. Student Performance Predictions for Advanced Engineering Mathematics Course With New Multivariate Copula Models. *IEEE Access* **10**, 45112-45136. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Michael Kaganovich, Morgan Taylor, Ruli Xiao. 2022. Gender Differences in Persistence in a Field of Study: This Isn't All about Grades. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **23**. . [[Crossref](#)]
87. Kevin Boudreau, Nilam Kaushik. 2022. Gender Differences in Response to Competitive Organization? Differences Across Fields from a Product Development Platform Field Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **7**. . [[Crossref](#)]
88. Cristina Borra, Maria Iacovou, Almudena Sevilla. 2022. Adolescence Development and the Math Gender Gap. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **115**. . [[Crossref](#)]
89. Zhengyang Bao, Difang Huang. 2022. Can Artificial Intelligence Improve Gender Equality? Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **108**. . [[Crossref](#)]
90. Yijin Shi. The Consequences of Higher Education: Gender Dilemmas in Contemporary American Female Employment 1104-1112. [[Crossref](#)]
91. Hendrik Jürges, Rasheda Khanam. 2021. Adolescents' time allocation and skill production. *Economics of Education Review* **85**, 102178. [[Crossref](#)]

92. Cecilia Machado, Christiane Szerman. 2021. Centralized college admissions and student composition. *Economics of Education Review* **85**, 102184. [[Crossref](#)]
93. Laura Bottazzi, Annamaria Lusardi. 2021. Stereotypes in financial literacy: Evidence from PISA. *Journal of Corporate Finance* **71**, 101831. [[Crossref](#)]
94. A. Kadir Bahar. 2021. Will We Ever Close the Gender Gap Among Top Mathematics Achievers? Analysis of Recent Trends by Race in Advanced Placement (AP) Exams. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted* **44**:4, 331-365. [[Crossref](#)]
95. Idaira Rodriguez Santana. 2021. Becoming a resident in a high demanded medical specialty: an unequal race? Evidence from the Spanish resident market. *Human Resources for Health* **19**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
96. Melchor Sánchez-Mendiola, Sandra Paola Rodríguez Castillo, Nancy Fabiola Pérez Herrera, Manuel García-Minjares, Adrián Martínez-González. 2021. Utilidad de la Plataforma “Prueb@te UNAM Licenciatura” para Ingresar a la Educación Superior. *Revista Iberoamericana de Evaluación Educativa* **14**:2, 21-36. [[Crossref](#)]
97. Vaitsa Giannouli, Magda Tsolaki. 2021. Financial Capacity and Illiteracy: Does Education Matter in Amnesic Mild Cognitive Impairment?. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease Reports* **5**:1, 715-719. [[Crossref](#)]
98. Vanessa Mertins, Christian Walter. 2021. In absence of money: a field experiment on volunteer work motivation. *Experimental Economics* **24**:3, 952-984. [[Crossref](#)]
99. Agung W. Setiawan. Female and Male Student's Performance in Indonesian Biomedical Engineering Education: Biomedical Measurement and Instrumentation 1-4. [[Crossref](#)]
100. Tanya LaMar, Jo Boaler. 2021. The importance and emergence of K-12 data science. *Phi Delta Kappan* **103**:1, 49-53. [[Crossref](#)]
101. Fernando Barrios Aguirre, Diego A. Forero, Martha Patricia Castellanos Saavedra, Sandra Yaneth Mora Malagón. 2021. The Impact of Computer and Internet at Home on Academic Results of the Saber 11 National Exam in Colombia. *Sage Open* **11**:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
102. Maryam Dilmaghani. 2021. The gender gap in competitive chess across countries: Commanding queens in command economies. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **49**:2, 425-441. [[Crossref](#)]
103. Xuan Jiang. 2021. Women in STEM: Ability, preference, and value. *Labour Economics* **70**, 101991. [[Crossref](#)]
104. Fernando Fraga-Varela, Esther Vila-Couñago, Ana Rodríguez-Groba. 2021. Serious Games and Mathematical Fluency: A Study from the Gender Perspective in Primary Education. *Sustainability* **13**:12, 6586. [[Crossref](#)]
105. Oded Gurantz. 2021. How College Credit in High School Impacts Postsecondary Course-Taking: The Role of Advanced Placement Exams. *Education Finance and Policy* **16**:2, 233-255. [[Crossref](#)]
106. A. Kadir Bahar. 2021. Trends in Gender Disparities Among High-Achieving Students in Mathematics: An Analysis of the American Mathematics Competition (AMC). *Gifted Child Quarterly* **65**:2, 167-184. [[Crossref](#)]
107. Michalis Drouvelis, Benjamin M. Marx. 2021. Dimensions of donation preferences: the structure of peer and income effects. *Experimental Economics* **24**:1, 274-302. [[Crossref](#)]
108. Emmanuel Nkemakolam Okwuduba, Kingsley Chinaza Nwosu, Ebele Chinelo Okigbo, Naomi Nkiru Samuel, Chinwe Achugbu. 2021. Impact of intrapersonal and interpersonal emotional intelligence and self-directed learning on academic performance among pre-university science students. *Heliyon* **7**:3, e06611. [[Crossref](#)]
109. E Sudihartinih, S Prabawanto. 2021. Prior knowledge of students in analytical geometry in terms of gender analyzed using the Rasch model. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **1806**:1, 012056. [[Crossref](#)]
110. Neil S. Williams, Alexandra Snipes, Shane P. Singh. 2021. Gender differences in the impact of electoral victory on satisfaction with democracy. *Electoral Studies* **69**, 102205. [[Crossref](#)]

111. Francesca Borgonovi, Seong Won Han. 2021. Gender disparities in fear of failure among 15-year-old students: The role of gender inequality, the organisation of schooling and economic conditions. *Journal of Adolescence* **86**:1, 28-39. [[Crossref](#)]
112. Pedro Albarran, Marianna Battaglia, Marcello Sartarelli. 2021. The Psychological Effect of a Math Signal. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **114**. . [[Crossref](#)]
113. Åshild A. Johnsen, Henning Finseraas, Torbjørn Hanson, Andreas Kotsadam. 2021. The Formation of Competitive Preferences. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **62**. . [[Crossref](#)]
114. Åshild A. Johnsen, Henning Finseraas, Torbjørn Hanson, Andreas Kotsadam. 2021. The Formation of Competitive Preferences. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **62**. . [[Crossref](#)]
115. Maryam Dilmaghani. 2020. Gender differences in performance under time constraint: Evidence from chess tournaments. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* **89**, 101505. [[Crossref](#)]
116. Rohan Prabhu, Scarlett R. Miller, Timothy W. Simpson, Nicholas A. Meisel. 2020. Built to win? Exploring the role of competitive environments on students' creativity in design for additive manufacturing tasks. *Journal of Engineering Design* **31**:11-12, 574-604. [[Crossref](#)]
117. Joël Berger, Margit Osterloh, Katja Rost. 2020. Focal random selection closes the gender gap in competitiveness. *Science Advances* **6**:47. . [[Crossref](#)]
118. Pierre-Michel Menger, Colin Marchika, Yann Renisio, Pierre Verschuere. 2020. Formations et carrières mathématiques en France : un modèle typique d'excellence ?. *Revue française d'économie* **Vol. XXXV**:2, 155-217. [[Crossref](#)]
119. Pål Schøne, Kristine von Simson, Marte Strøm. 2020. Peer gender and educational choices. *Empirical Economics* **59**:4, 1763-1797. [[Crossref](#)]
120. Devin Abrahami, Christel Renoux, Hui Yin, Jean-Pascal Fournier, Laurent Azoulay. 2020. The Association between Oral Anticoagulants and Cancer Incidence among Individuals with Nonvalvular Atrial Fibrillation. *Thrombosis and Haemostasis* **120**:10, 1384-1394. [[Crossref](#)]
121. Abdullah Al-Bahrani, Whitney Buser, Darshak Patel. 2020. Early Causes of Financial Disquiet and the Gender Gap in Financial Literacy: Evidence from College Students in the Southeastern United States. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* **41**:3, 558-571. [[Crossref](#)]
122. j j, j j. 2020. Exploration of Korean Students' Mathematics Achievement, School Climate, and Well-being in PISA 2018 Results. *The Korean Society of Educational Studies in Mathematics - Journal of Educational Research in Mathematics* **30**:3, 465-486. [[Crossref](#)]
123. Perihan O. Saygin. 2020. Gender bias in standardized tests: evidence from a centralized college admissions system. *Empirical Economics* **59**:2, 1037-1065. [[Crossref](#)]
124. Alex Eble, Feng Hu. 2020. Child beliefs, societal beliefs, and teacher-student identity match. *Economics of Education Review* **77**, 101994. [[Crossref](#)]
125. Paola Bordón, Catalina Canals, Alejandra Mizala. 2020. The gender gap in college major choice in Chile. *Economics of Education Review* **77**, 102011. [[Crossref](#)]
126. Jana Cahliková, Lubomír Cingl, Ian Lively. 2020. How Stress Affects Performance and Competitiveness Across Gender. *Management Science* **66**:8, 3295-3310. [[Crossref](#)]
127. Robert Fairlie, Glenn Millhauser, Daniel Oliver, Randa Roland. 2020. The effects of male peers on the educational outcomes of female college students in STEM: Experimental evidence from partnerships in Chemistry courses. *PLOS ONE* **15**:7, e0235383. [[Crossref](#)]
128. Diemo Urbig, Werner Bönnte, Vivien D. Procher, Sandro Lombardo. 2020. Entrepreneurs embrace competition: evidence from a lab-in-the-field study. *Small Business Economics* **55**:1, 193-214. [[Crossref](#)]

129. Z. Eylem Gevrek, Deniz Gevrek, Christian Neumeier. 2020. Explaining the gender gaps in mathematics achievement and attitudes: The role of societal gender equality. *Economics of Education Review* **76**, 101978. [[Crossref](#)]
130. Zohal Hessami, Mariana Lopes da Fonseca. 2020. Female political representation and substantive effects on policies: A literature review. *European Journal of Political Economy* **63**, 101896. [[Crossref](#)]
131. Anne Lucietto, Meher Taleyarkhan, Therese Azevedo, Natalie Hobson. Math Anxiety in Female and Underrepresented Minority Students: A Literature Review . [[Crossref](#)]
132. Paola Profeta. *Gender Equality and Public Policy* **40**, . [[Crossref](#)]
133. Eszter Czibor, Sander Onderstal, Randolph Sloof, C. Mirjam van Praag. 2020. Does relative grading help male students? Evidence from a field experiment in the classroom. *Economics of Education Review* **75**, 101953. [[Crossref](#)]
134. M. Teresa Sena-Esteves, Cristina Morais, Margarida Ribeiro, Isabel Bras Pereira, Anabela Guedes, Filomena Soares, Celina Pinto Leao. Gender Differences in Students' Assessment in a Fluid Mechanics Course 1879-1883. [[Crossref](#)]
135. Eben B. Witherspoon, Christian D. Schunn. 2020. Locating and understanding the largest gender differences in pathways to science degrees. *Science Education* **104**:2, 144-163. [[Crossref](#)]
136. Philip D. Parker, Brooke Van Zanden, Herbert W. Marsh, Katherine Owen, Jasper J. Duineveld, Michael Noetel. 2020. The Intersection of Gender, Social Class, and Cultural Context: a Meta-Analysis. *Educational Psychology Review* **32**:1, 197-228. [[Crossref](#)]
137. Francesca Borgonovi, Samuel Greiff. 2020. Societal level gender inequalities amplify gender gaps in problem solving more than in academic disciplines. *Intelligence* **79**, 101422. [[Crossref](#)]
138. Steven W. Hemelt, Matthew A. Lenard. 2020. Math acceleration in elementary school: Access and effects on student outcomes. *Economics of Education Review* **74**, 101921. [[Crossref](#)]
139. Mohsen Javdani, Brian Krauth. 2020. Job satisfaction and co-worker pay in Canadian firms. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économie* **53**:1, 212-248. [[Crossref](#)]
140. Lara Winn, Randolph Cornelius. 2020. Self-Objectification and Cognitive Performance: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Frontiers in Psychology* **11**. . [[Crossref](#)]
141. Graziella Bertocchi, Monica Bozzano. Gender Gaps in Education 1-31. [[Crossref](#)]
142. Dennie van Dolder, Martijn J. van den Assem, Thomas Buser. 2020. Gender and Willingness to Compete for High Stakes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **106**. . [[Crossref](#)]
143. Ana María Lara-Porrás, María del Mar Rueda-García, David Molina-Muñoz. 2019. Identifying the factors influencing mathematical literacy in several Spanish regions. *South African Journal of Education* **39**:S2, 1-13. [[Crossref](#)]
144. Joel Rapp, Francesca Borgonovi. 2019. LA BRECHA DE GÉNERO EN MATEMÁTICAS Y EN LECTURA: LA PERSPECTIVA DEL ESTUDIANTE. *Journal of Supranational Policies of Education (JoSPoE)* :9, 6. [[Crossref](#)]
145. Chandan Jain. 2019. Analysing Changes in Gender Difference in Learning in Rural India over Time. *Journal of Quantitative Economics* **17**:4, 913-935. [[Crossref](#)]
146. Parneet Kaur, Harish Kumar, Sakshi Kaushal. Competitive Examinations in India: e-Assessment Based Case Study 162-165. [[Crossref](#)]
147. Y Ramdani, O Rohaeni, L Wachidah. 2019. Investigation of gender influence to enhance the indicator of mathematical competency of college students in integral calculus learning. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **1375**:1, 012066. [[Crossref](#)]



148. Selin Kesebir, Sun Young Lee, Andrew J. Elliot, Madan M. Pillutla. 2019. Lay beliefs about competition: Scale development and gender differences. *Motivation and Emotion* 43:5, 719-739. [[Crossref](#)]
149. Jeffrey A. Groen, Sabrina Wulff Pabilonia. 2019. Snooze or lose: High school start times and academic achievement. *Economics of Education Review* 72, 204-218. [[Crossref](#)]
150. Jessie Munton. 2019. Beyond accuracy: Epistemic flaws with statistical generalizations. *Philosophical Issues* 29:1, 228-240. [[Crossref](#)]
151. Eiji Yamamura. 2019. Gender wage gap and its effect on test scores of immigrant students. *Journal of Economic Studies* 46:4, 872-887. [[Crossref](#)]
152. Michela Carlana. 2019. Implicit Stereotypes: Evidence from Teachers' Gender Bias\*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 134:3, 1163-1224. [[Crossref](#)]
153. Alicja Zawistowska, Ireneusz Sadowski. 2019. Filtered Out, but Not by Skill: The Gender Gap in Pursing Mathematics at a High-Stakes Exam. *Sex Roles* 80:11-12, 724-734. [[Crossref](#)]
154. Francesca Cornaglia, Michalis Drouvelis, Paolo Masella. 2019. Competition and the role of group identity. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 162, 136-145. [[Crossref](#)]
155. Gerhard Riener, Valentin Wagner. 2019. On the design of non-monetary incentives in schools. *Education Economics* 27:3, 223-240. [[Crossref](#)]
156. Amy Sue Bix. 2019. Mastering the Hard Stuff: The History of College Concrete-Canoe Races and the Growth of Engineering Competition Culture. *Engineering Studies* 11:2, 109-134. [[Crossref](#)]
157. Thomas D. Jeitschko. 2019. Toward the Next Generation of Scholarship: Challenges and Opportunities for Full Participation in PhD Training in Economics. *AEA Papers and Proceedings* 109, 250-254. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
158. Natalie S. King, Rose M. Pringle. 2019. Black girls speak STEM: Counterstories of informal and formal learning experiences. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 56:5, 539-569. [[Crossref](#)]
159. Seul-Gi Lim, Soo-Hyung Lee. 2019. Dynamics and Determinants of the Gender Gap in Math Test Scores. *Journal of Curriculum and Evaluation* 22:2, 293-317. [[Crossref](#)]
160. Anat Bracha, Alma Cohen, Lynn Conell-Price. 2019. The heterogeneous effect of affirmative action on performance. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 158, 173-218. [[Crossref](#)]
161. Yan Lau. 2019. The dragon cohort of Hong Kong: traditional beliefs, demographics, and education. *Journal of Population Economics* 32:1, 219-246. [[Crossref](#)]
162. Jordan van Rijn. 2019. Does CEO Gender Matter at Financial Institutions? An Event-Study Analysis of Credit Union Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 20. . [[Crossref](#)]
163. Maryna Tverdostup, Tiiu Paas. 2019. Valuation of Human Capital and the Gender Wage Gap in Europe. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 3. . [[Crossref](#)]
164. Graziella Bertocchi, Monica Bozzano. 2019. Gender Gaps in Education. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 69. . [[Crossref](#)]
165. Mercedes VARONA ALABERN. 2018. Propuestas para elevar los deficientes niveles académicos masculinos. *Enseñanza & Teaching: Revista Interuniversitaria de Didáctica* 36:2, 145. [[Crossref](#)]
166. Julia E. M. Leiner, Thomas Scherndl, Tuulia M. Ortner. 2018. How Do Men and Women Perceive a High-Stakes Test Situation?. *Frontiers in Psychology* 9. . [[Crossref](#)]
167. R. E. O'Dea, M. Lagisz, M. D. Jennions, S. Nakagawa. 2018. Gender differences in individual variation in academic grades fail to fit expected patterns for STEM. *Nature Communications* 9:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
168. Huong Thu Le, Ha Trong Nguyen. 2018. The evolution of the gender test score gap through seventh grade: new insights from Australia using unconditional quantile regression and decomposition. *IZA Journal of Labor Economics* 7:1. . [[Crossref](#)]

169. Sangyoon Park. 2018. Coeducation, academic performance, and subject choice: evidence from quasi-random classroom assignments. *Education Economics* **26**:6, 574-592. [[Crossref](#)]
170. Juan Sebastián Muñoz. 2018. The economics behind the math gender gap: Colombian evidence on the role of sample selection. *Journal of Development Economics* **135**, 368-391. [[Crossref](#)]
171. Michalis Drouvelis, Benjamin M. Marx. 2018. Prosociality spillovers of working with others. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **155**, 205-216. [[Crossref](#)]
172. Meereem Kim, Minho Kwak. 2018. [### # ###, ### ##### ## ### ## #: ##### ### TIMSS 2015 ## #### #####](#). *Journal of Curriculum and Evaluation* **21**:4, 99-124. [[Crossref](#)]
173. Helen Law. 2018. Gender and mathematics: Pathways to mathematically intensive fields of study in Australia. *Advances in Life Course Research* **37**, 42-56. [[Crossref](#)]
174. Quentin Lippmann, Claudia Senik. 2018. Math, girls and socialism. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **46**:3, 874-888. [[Crossref](#)]
175. Safwat Y. M. Diab, Marja Guillaume, Raija-Leena Punamäki. 2018. Ecological Approach to Academic Achievement in the Face of War and Military Violence: Mediating and Moderating Role of School, Family, and Child Characteristics. *The Elementary School Journal* **119**:1, 1-28. [[Crossref](#)]
176. Yang Song. 2018. Intended and unintended effects of student performance measurement reform in China. *China Economic Review* **50**, 133-152. [[Crossref](#)]
177. Matthew M. Symer, Jonathan S. Abelson, Lindsey Gade, Jialin Mao, Julie A. Sosa, Heather L. Yeo. 2018. Association between American Board of Surgery in-training examination score and attrition from general surgery residency. *Surgery* **164**:2, 206-211. [[Crossref](#)]
178. Helen Law. 2018. Why do adolescent boys dominate advanced mathematics subjects in the final year of secondary school in Australia?. *Australian Journal of Education* **62**:2, 169-191. [[Crossref](#)]
179. Moshe Justman, Susan J. Méndez. 2018. Gendered choices of STEM subjects for matriculation are not driven by prior differences in mathematical achievement. *Economics of Education Review* **64**, 282-297. [[Crossref](#)]
180. Ying Shi. 2018. The puzzle of missing female engineers: Academic preparation, ability beliefs, and preferences. *Economics of Education Review* **64**, 129-143. [[Crossref](#)]
181. Werner Bönnte, Vivien Procher, Diemo Urbig. 2018. Gender differences in selection into self-competition. *Applied Economics Letters* **25**:8, 539-543. [[Crossref](#)]
182. Elyès Jouini, Paul Karehnke, Clotilde Napp. 2018. Stereotypes, underconfidence and decision-making with an application to gender and math. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **148**, 34-45. [[Crossref](#)]
183. Silvia Saccardo, Aniel Pietrasz, Uri Gneezy. 2018. On the Size of the Gender Difference in Competitiveness. *Management Science* **64**:4, 1541-1554. [[Crossref](#)]
184. Miroslava Federičová, Filip Pertold, Michael L. Smith. 2018. Children left behind: self-confidence of pupils in competitive environments. *Education Economics* **26**:2, 145-160. [[Crossref](#)]
185. Charlotte R. Pennington, Linda K. Kaye, Adam W. Qureshi, Derek Heim. 2018. Controlling for Prior Attainment Reduces the Positive Influence that Single-Gender Classroom Initiatives Exert on High School Students' Scholastic Achievements. *Sex Roles* **78**:5-6, 385-393. [[Crossref](#)]
186. Ligaya Leah Lara Figueroa, Samsung Lim, Jihyun Lee. 2018. Modelling the effect of deprived physical urban environments on academic performance in the Philippines. *GeoJournal* **83**:1, 13-30. [[Crossref](#)]
187. Juanna Schrøter Joensen, Helena Skyt Nielsen. 2018. Spillovers in education choice. *Journal of Public Economics* **157**, 158-183. [[Crossref](#)]
188. Donna K. Ginther, Shulamit Kahn, Jessica McCloskey. Gender and Academics 5116-5133. [[Crossref](#)]

189. Lester Lusher, Vasil Yassenov. 2018. GENDER PERFORMANCE GAPS: QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL EVIDENCE ON THE ROLE OF GENDER DIFFERENCES IN SLEEP CYCLES. *Economic Inquiry* **56**:1, 252-262. [[Crossref](#)]
190. Lina Martínez, Natalia Serna. 2018. Disparities at the entrance door: gender gaps in elementary school. *Educação e Pesquisa* **44**:0. . [[Crossref](#)]
191. Sebastian Camarero Garcia. 2018. Inequality of Educational Opportunities and the Role of Learning Intensity: Evidence from a Quasi-Experiment in Germany. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **19**. . [[Crossref](#)]
192. Glenn David Ellison, Ashley Swanson. 2018. Dynamics of the Gender Gap in High Math Achievement. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **30**. . [[Crossref](#)]
193. Julian Hsu. 2018. Learning About College Major Match: Microfoundations From Dynamic Course-Taking. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **106**. . [[Crossref](#)]
194. Jeffrey A. Groen, Sabrina Wulff Pablonia. 2018. Snooze or Lose: High School Start Times and Academic Achievement. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **19**. . [[Crossref](#)]
195. Dagmara Celik Katreniak. 2018. Persistent Overconfidence: Evidence from a Randomized Control Trial in Uganda. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **103**. . [[Crossref](#)]
196. Anne Gielen, Esmee Zwiers. 2018. Biology and the Gender Gap in Educational Performance: The Role of Prenatal Testosterone in Test Scores. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **25**. . [[Crossref](#)]
197. Daniel Montolio, Pere A. Taberner. 2018. Gender Differences Under Test Pressure and Their Impact on Academic Performance: A Quasi-Experimental Design. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **14**. . [[Crossref](#)]
198. Werner Bönnte, Vivien D. Procher, Diemo Urbig, Martin Voracek. 2017. Digit Ratio (2D:4D) Predicts Self-Reported Measures of General Competitiveness, but Not Behavior in Economic Experiments. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience* **11**. . [[Crossref](#)]
199. Manli Li, Yu Zhang, Yihan Wang. 2017. Gender Gap in Mathematics and Physics in Chinese Middle Schools: A Case Study of a Beijing's District. *The Urban Review* **49**:4, 568-584. [[Crossref](#)]
200. Emma Duchini. 2017. Is college remedial education a worthy investment? New evidence from a sharp regression discontinuity design. *Economics of Education Review* **60**, 36-53. [[Crossref](#)]
201. Francine D. Blau, Lawrence M. Kahn. 2017. The Gender Wage Gap: Extent, Trends, and Explanations. *Journal of Economic Literature* **55**:3, 789-865. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
202. Ashley E. Martin, Katherine W. Phillips. 2017. What “blindness” to gender differences helps women see and do: Implications for confidence, agency, and action in male-dominated environments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **142**, 28-44. [[Crossref](#)]
203. Catherine Riegler-Crumb, Chelsea Moore, Jenny Buontempo. 2017. Shifting STEM Stereotypes? Considering the Role of Peer and Teacher Gender. *Journal of Research on Adolescence* **27**:3, 492-505. [[Crossref](#)]
204. Gerhard Riener, Valentin Wagner. 2017. Shying away from demanding tasks? Experimental evidence on gender differences in answering multiple-choice questions. *Economics of Education Review* **59**, 43-62. [[Crossref](#)]
205. Danny Cohen-Zada, Alex Krumer, Mosi Rosenboim, Offer Moshe Shapir. 2017. Choking under pressure and gender: Evidence from professional tennis. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **61**, 176-190. [[Crossref](#)]
206. Mattie Toma. 2017. Missed Shots at the Free-Throw Line. *Journal of Sports Economics* **18**:6, 539-559. [[Crossref](#)]
207. Michael Jetter, Jay K. Walker. 2017. Good Girl, Bad Boy? Evidence Consistent with Collusion in Professional Tennis. *Southern Economic Journal* **84**:1, 155-180. [[Crossref](#)]

208. Besiki L. Kutateladze, Victoria Z. Lawson. 2017. A New Look at Inequality: Introducing and Testing a Cross-Sectional Equality Measurement Framework in New York City. *Social Indicators Research* **132**:3, 993-1022. [[Crossref](#)]
209. Shauna L. Shames, Tess Wise. 2017. Gender, Diversity, and Methods in Political Science: A Theory of Selection and Survival Biases. *PS: Political Science & Politics* **50**:03, 811-823. [[Crossref](#)]
210. Debopam Bhattacharya, Shin Kanaya, Margaret Stevens. 2017. Are University Admissions Academically Fair?. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **99**:3, 449-464. [[Crossref](#)]
211. Alicja Zawistowska. 2017. GENDER DIFFERENCES IN HIGH-STAKES MATHS TESTING. FINDINGS FROM POLAND. *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric* **50**:1, 205-226. [[Crossref](#)]
212. Thomas Buser, Anna Dreber, Johanna Mollerstrom. 2017. The impact of stress on tournament entry. *Experimental Economics* **20**:2, 506-530. [[Crossref](#)]
213. Katie E. O. Swain, Pei-te Lien. 2017. Structural and Contextual Factors Regarding the Accessibility of Elective Office for Women of Color at the Local Level. *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* **38**:2, 128-150. [[Crossref](#)]
214. Ozkan Eren. 2017. Differential Peer Effects, Student Achievement, and Student Absenteeism: Evidence From a Large-Scale Randomized Experiment. *Demography* **54**:2, 745-773. [[Crossref](#)]
215. Jennifer G. Cromley, Julie L. Booth, Theodore W. Wills, Briana L. Chang, Nhi Tran, Michael Madeja, Thomas F. Shipley, William Zahner. 2017. Relation of Spatial Skills to Calculus Proficiency: A Brief Report. *Mathematical Thinking and Learning* **19**:1, 55-68. [[Crossref](#)]
216. Yan Lau. 2017. Do Standardized Tests Hurt Student Learning? Causal Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **84**. . [[Crossref](#)]
217. Seo-Young Cho. 2017. Explaining Gender Differences in Confidence and Overconfidence in Math. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **106**. . [[Crossref](#)]
218. Prashant Kumar Loyalka, May Maani, Yue Qu, Sean Sylvia. 2017. Absolute Versus Comparative Advantage: Consequences for Gender Gaps in STEM and College Access. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **91**. . [[Crossref](#)]
219. Lina Anaya, Frank P. Stafford, Gema Zamarro. 2017. Gender Gaps in Math Performance, Perceived Mathematical Ability and College STEM Education: The Role of Parental Occupation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **4**. . [[Crossref](#)]
220. Eva Ranehill, Roberto A. Weber. 2017. Do Gender Preference Gaps Impact Policy Outcomes?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **27**. . [[Crossref](#)]
221. Eugenio Garibaldi, Pietro Garibaldi. 2017. Ordering History Through the Timeline. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **1262**. . [[Crossref](#)]
222. Seo-Young Cho. 2017. The Role of Social Capital in Competition and Gender-Matching Environments - Evidence from East Asian Countries. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **107**. . [[Crossref](#)]
223. Hua Zhou, Di Mo, Chengchao Zhou, Alexis Medina, Yaojiang Shi, Linxiu Zhang, Scott Rozelle. 2016. The gender gap among school children in poor rural areas of western China: evidence from a multi-province dataset. *International Journal for Equity in Health* **15**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
224. Guillaume Beaurain, David Masclet. 2016. Does affirmative action reduce gender discrimination and enhance efficiency? New experimental evidence. *European Economic Review* **90**, 350-362. [[Crossref](#)]
225. Emmanuel Sirimal Silva, Mansi Ghodsi, Hossein Hassani, Katayoun Abbasirad. 2016. A quantitative exploration of the statistical and mathematical knowledge of university entrants into a UK Management School. *The International Journal of Management Education* **14**:3, 440-453. [[Crossref](#)]
226. Antonio Filippin, Paolo Crosetto. 2016. A Reconsideration of Gender Differences in Risk Attitudes. *Management Science* **62**:11, 3138-3160. [[Crossref](#)]

227. Prashant Bharadwaj, Giacomo De Giorgi, David Hansen, Christopher A. Neilson. 2016. The Gender Gap in Mathematics: Evidence from Chile. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 65:1, 141-166. [[Crossref](#)]
228. Anastasia Driva, Melanie Lührmann, Joachim Winter. 2016. Gender differences and stereotypes in financial literacy: Off to an early start. *Economics Letters* 146, 143-146. [[Crossref](#)]
229. Linda J. Sax, M. Allison Kanny, Jerry A. Jacobs, Hannah Whang, Dayna S. Weintraub, Amber Hroch. 2016. Understanding the Changing Dynamics of the Gender Gap in Undergraduate Engineering Majors: 1971–2011. *Research in Higher Education* 57:5, 570-600. [[Crossref](#)]
230. Ingvild Almås, Alexander W. Cappelen, Kjell G. Salvanes, Erik Ø. Sørensen, Bertil Tungodden. 2016. Willingness to Compete: Family Matters. *Management Science* 62:8, 2149-2162. [[Crossref](#)]
231. Francesca Borgonovi, Przemyslaw Biecek. 2016. An international comparison of students' ability to endure fatigue and maintain motivation during a low-stakes test. *Learning and Individual Differences* 49, 128-137. [[Crossref](#)]
232. Juanna Schrøter Joensen, Helena Skyt Nielsen. 2016. Mathematics and Gender: Heterogeneity in Causes and Consequences. *The Economic Journal* 126:593, 1129-1163. [[Crossref](#)]
233. Johann Engelbrecht, Jeanine Mwambakana. 2016. Validity and Diagnostic Attributes of a Mathematics Olympiad for Junior High School Contestants. *African Journal of Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education* 20:2, 175-188. [[Crossref](#)]
234. Julia B. Bear, Benjamin Collier. 2016. Where are the Women in Wikipedia? Understanding the Different Psychological Experiences of Men and Women in Wikipedia. *Sex Roles* 74:5-6, 254-265. [[Crossref](#)]
235. Mohammad Tariqul Islam Khan, Siow-Hooi Tan, Lee-Lee Chong. 2016. Gender differences in preferences for firm characteristics across different groups of investors. *Qualitative Research in Financial Markets* 8:1, 2-15. [[Crossref](#)]
236. Bettina J. Casad, William J. Bryant. 2016. Addressing Stereotype Threat is Critical to Diversity and Inclusion in Organizational Psychology. *Frontiers in Psychology* 7. . [[Crossref](#)]
237. Donna K. Ginther, Shulamit Kahn, Jessica McCloskey. Gender and Academics 1-18. [[Crossref](#)]
238. Allison Mann, Thomas DiPrete. 2016. The Consequences of the National Math and Science Performance Environment for Gender Differences in STEM Aspiration. *Sociological Science* 3, 568-603. [[Crossref](#)]
239. Michael Jetter, Jay K. Walker. 2016. Gender in Jeopardy!: The Role of Opponent Gender in High-Stakes Competition. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 53. . [[Crossref](#)]
240. Eiji Yamamura. 2016. Gender Wage Gap and Its Effect on Test Scores of Immigrant Students. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 46. . [[Crossref](#)]
241. Moshe Justman, Susan J. Mendez. 2016. Gendered Selection of STEM Subjects for Matriculation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 11. . [[Crossref](#)]
242. PPI Schhne, Kristine von Simson, Marte Strrm. 2016. Girls Helping Girls - The Impact of Female Peers on Grades and Educational Choices. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 66. . [[Crossref](#)]
243. Miroslava Federiiovv, Filip Pertold, Michael L Smith. 2016. Children Left Behind: Self-Confidence of Pupils in Competitive Environments. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 33. . [[Crossref](#)]
244. Juan Camilo Cárdenas, Anna Dreber, Emma von Essen, Eva Ranehill. 2015. Cooperativeness and competitiveness in children. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* 59, 32-41. [[Crossref](#)]
245. D. Mo, L. Zhang, J. Wang, W. Huang, Y. Shi, M. Boswell, S. Rozelle. 2015. Persistence of learning gains from computer assisted learning: Experimental evidence from China. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* 31:6, 562-581. [[Crossref](#)]

246. Michael Jetter, Jay K. Walker. 2015. Game, set, and match: Do women and men perform differently in competitive situations?. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **119**, 96-108. [[Crossref](#)]
247. Karen Khachatryan, Anna Dreber, Emma von Essen, Eva Ranehill. 2015. Gender and preferences at a young age: Evidence from Armenia. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **118**, 318-332. [[Crossref](#)]
248. Maria Bigoni, Margherita Fort, Mattia Nardotto, Tommaso G. Reggiani. 2015. Cooperation or Competition? A Field Experiment on Non-monetary Learning Incentives. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy* **15**:4, 1753-1792. [[Crossref](#)]
249. Yon Mi Kim. 2015. The Relationships among Mathematics Achievement, Spatial Ability, and Verbal Achievement for Engineering Freshmen and Gender Differences. *Communications of Mathematical Education* **29**:3, 553-571. [[Crossref](#)]
250. Sally A. Lesik, Karen G. Santoro, Edward A. DePeau. 2015. Evaluating the effectiveness of a mathematics bridge program using propensity scores. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education* **7**:2, 331-345. [[Crossref](#)]
251. ###. 2015. Peer Effects in First Year High School Classes. *Teacher Education Research* **54**:3, 459-470. [[Crossref](#)]
252. Yu Xie, Michael Fang, Kimberlee Shauman. 2015. STEM Education. *Annual Review of Sociology* **41**:1, 331-357. [[Crossref](#)]
253. Andrew J. Hill. 2015. The Girl Next Door: The Effect of Opposite Gender Friends on High School Achievement. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **7**:3, 147-177. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
254. Gerald Eisenkopf, Zohal Hessami, Urs Fischbacher, Heinrich W. Ursprung. 2015. Academic performance and single-sex schooling: Evidence from a natural experiment in Switzerland. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **115**, 123-143. [[Crossref](#)]
255. Alexander Koch, Julia Nafziger, Helena Skyt Nielsen. 2015. Behavioral economics of education. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **115**, 3-17. [[Crossref](#)]
256. Nina Jalava, Juanna Schrøter Joensen, Elin Pellas. 2015. Grades and rank: Impacts of non-financial incentives on test performance. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **115**, 161-196. [[Crossref](#)]
257. Rudolf Kerschbamer. 2015. The geometry of distributional preferences and a non-parametric identification approach: The Equality Equivalence Test. *European Economic Review* **76**, 85-103. [[Crossref](#)]
258. David Masclet, Emmanuel Peterle, Sophie Larribeau. 2015. Gender differences in tournament and flat-wage schemes: An experimental study. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **47**, 103-115. [[Crossref](#)]
259. Louis-Philippe Morin. 2015. Do Men and Women Respond Differently to Competition? Evidence from a Major Education Reform. *Journal of Labor Economics* **33**:2, 443-491. [[Crossref](#)]
260. Daniel Suryadarma. 2015. Gender differences in numeracy in Indonesia: evidence from a longitudinal dataset. *Education Economics* **23**:2, 180-198. [[Crossref](#)]
261. Yu Zhang, Mun Tsang. 2015. Gender gap in the National College Entrance Exam performance in China: a case study of a typical Chinese municipality. *Asia Pacific Education Review* **16**:1, 27-36. [[Crossref](#)]
262. M. Anelli, G. Peri. 2015. Gender of Siblings and Choice of College Major. *CESifo Economic Studies* **61**:1, 53-71. [[Crossref](#)]
263. Juanna Schrøter Joensen, Helena Skyt Nielsen. 2015. Peer Effects in Math and Science. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **97**. . [[Crossref](#)]
264. Anat Bracha, Alma Cohen, Lynn Conell-Price. 2015. Affirmative Action and Stereotype Threat. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **335**. . [[Crossref](#)]

265. Juan-Camilo CCrdenas, Anna Dreber, Emma von Essen, Eva Ranehill. 2015. Cooperativeness and Competitiveness in Children. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **19**. . [[Crossref](#)]
266. Michael Jetter, Jay Walker. 2015. Game, Set, and Match: Do Women and Men Perform Differently in Competitive Situations?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **47**. . [[Crossref](#)]
267. Thomas Buser, Anna Dreber, Johanna Mollerstrom. 2015. Stress Reactions Cannot Explain the Gender Gap in Willingness to Compete. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **95**. . [[Crossref](#)]
268. Torberg Falch, Ole Henning Nyhus, Bjarne Strøm. 2014. Causal effects of mathematics. *Labour Economics* **31**, 174-187. [[Crossref](#)]
269. Stephen J. Ceci, Donna K. Ginther, Shulamit Kahn, Wendy M. Williams. 2014. Women in Academic Science. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* **15**:3, 75-141. [[Crossref](#)]
270. I. van Staveren. 2014. The Lehman Sisters hypothesis. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* **38**:5, 995-1014. [[Crossref](#)]
271. Matteo Migheli. 2014. Preferences for government interventions in the economy: Does gender matter?. *International Review of Law and Economics* **39**, 39-48. [[Crossref](#)]
272. Heeyoung Yoon, Dae Ryun Chang, Kyoungmi Lee. 2014. It has to be ME (not YOU): the role of competitive message on the effectiveness of sales promotion. *Journal of Global Scholars of Marketing Science* **24**:3, 339-349. [[Crossref](#)]
273. Daniel E. Ho, Mark G. Kelman. 2014. Does Class Size Affect the Gender Gap? A Natural Experiment in Law. *The Journal of Legal Studies* **43**:2, 291-321. [[Crossref](#)]
274. Alessandra Casarico. 2014. La diversità di genere: un valore economico. *SOCIOLOGIA DEL LAVORO* :134, 103-115. [[Crossref](#)]
275. Anna Dreber, Emma von Essen, Eva Ranehill. 2014. Gender and competition in adolescence: task matters. *Experimental Economics* **17**:1, 154-172. [[Crossref](#)]
276. Katherine Baldiga. 2014. Gender Differences in Willingness to Guess. *Management Science* **60**:2, 434-448. [[Crossref](#)]
277. Paola Profeta, Livia Amidani Aliberti, Alessandra Casarico, Marilisa D'Amico, Anna Puccio. Quotas on Boards: Evidence from the Literature 41-67. [[Crossref](#)]
278. David Wozniak, William T. Harbaugh, Ulrich Mayr. 2014. The Menstrual Cycle and Performance Feedback Alter Gender Differences in Competitive Choices. *Journal of Labor Economics* **32**:1, 161-198. [[Crossref](#)]
279. Karen Khachatryan, Anna Dreber, Emma von Essen, Eva Ranehill. 2014. Gender and Preferences at a Young Age: Evidence from Armenia. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **95**. . [[Crossref](#)]
280. Juan-Camilo CCrdenas, Anna Dreber, Emma von Essen, Eva Ranehill. 2014. Cooperativeness and Competitiveness in Children. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **19**. . [[Crossref](#)]
281. Natalia Nollenberger, Nuria Rodriguez-Planas, Almudena Sevilla Sanz. 2014. The Math Gender Gap: The Role of Culture. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **12**. . [[Crossref](#)]
282. Eszter Cibor, Sander Onderstal, Randolph Sloof, C. Mirjam Van Praag. 2014. Does Relative Grading Help Male Students? Evidence from a Field Experiment in the Classroom. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **94**. . [[Crossref](#)]
283. Alexander K. Koch, Julia Nafziger, Helena Skyt Nielsen. 2014. Behavioral Economics of Education. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **40**. . [[Crossref](#)]
284. Stephanie Moller, Elizabeth Stearns, Stephanie Southworth, Stephanie Potochnick. 2013. Changing course: the gender gap in college selectivity and opportunities to learn in the high school curriculum. *Gender and Education* **25**:7, 851-871. [[Crossref](#)]

285. Alina Botezat, Ruben R. Seiberlich. 2013. Educational performance gaps in Eastern Europe. *Economics of Transition* 21:4, 731-756. [[Crossref](#)]
286. Aedín Doris, Donal O'Neill, Olive Sweetman. 2013. Gender, single-sex schooling and maths achievement. *Economics of Education Review* 35, 104-119. [[Crossref](#)]
287. Evren Ors, Frédéric Palomino, Eloiç Peyrache. 2013. Performance Gender Gap: Does Competition Matter?. *Journal of Labor Economics* 31:3, 443-499. [[Crossref](#)]
288. K. Safarzynska. 2013. Socio-economic Determinants of Demand for Private Tutoring. *European Sociological Review* 29:2, 139-154. [[Crossref](#)]
289. Jennifer Raymond. 2013. Most of us are biased. *Nature* 495:7439, 33-34. [[Crossref](#)]
290. Muriel Niederle, Carmit Segal, Lise Vesterlund. 2013. How Costly Is Diversity? Affirmative Action in Light of Gender Differences in Competitiveness. *Management Science* 59:1, 1-16. [[Crossref](#)]
291. Juanna Schrrter Joensen, Helena Skyt Nielsen. 2013. Math and Gender: Is Math a Route to a High-Powered Career?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 30. . [[Crossref](#)]
292. Nina Jalava, Juanna Schrrter Joensen, Elin Maria Pellas. 2013. Grades and Rank: Impacts of Non-Financial Incentives on Test Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 94. . [[Crossref](#)]
293. Sean A. Forbes, Svetlana Chesser, Anthony J. Guarino. 2013. A Proof of Concept Study on Cortisol Response to Three Different Educational Environs (Alone, Same-Sex, and Mixed-Sex). *Creative Education* 04:04, 9-10. [[Crossref](#)]
294. Loukas Balafoutas, Rudolf Kerschbamer, Matthias Sutter. 2012. Distributional preferences and competitive behavior. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 83:1, 125-135. [[Crossref](#)]
295. Julia Müller, Christiane Schwieren. 2012. Can personality explain what is underlying women's unwillingness to compete?. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 33:3, 448-460. [[Crossref](#)]
296. Loukas Balafoutas, Matthias Sutter. 2012. Affirmative Action Policies Promote Women and Do Not Harm Efficiency in the Laboratory. *Science* 335:6068, 579-582. [[Crossref](#)]
297. Debopam Bhattacharya, Shin Kanaya, Margaret Stevens. 2012. Are University Admissions Academically Fair?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 3. . [[Crossref](#)]
298. Thomas Markussen, Ernesto Reuben, Jean-Robert Tyran. 2012. Competition, Cooperation, and Collective Choice. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 335. . [[Crossref](#)]
299. Shamsul Abdullah, Ku Nor Izah Ku Ismail, Lilach Nachum. 2012. Women on Boards of Malaysian Firms: Impact on Market and Accounting Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 25. . [[Crossref](#)]
300. Judith A. McDonald, Robert J. Thornton. 2011. Estimating Gender Wage Gaps. *The Journal of Economic Education* 42:4, 405-413. [[Crossref](#)]
301. Muriel Niederle, Lise Vesterlund. 2011. Gender and Competition. *Annual Review of Economics* 3:1, 601-630. [[Crossref](#)]
302. Rick K. Wilson. 2011. The Contribution of Behavioral Economics to Political Science. *Annual Review of Political Science* 14:1, 201-223. [[Crossref](#)]
303. Štěpán Jurajda,, Daniel Münich. 2011. Gender Gap in Performance under Competitive Pressure: Admissions to Czech Universities. *American Economic Review* 101:3, 514-518. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
304. Bertrand Marianne. New Perspectives on Gender 1543-1590. [[Crossref](#)]
305. Richard L. Fox, Jennifer L. Lawless. 2011. Gendered Perceptions and Political Candidacies: A Central Barrier to Women's Equality in Electoral Politics. *American Journal of Political Science* 55:1, 59-73. [[Crossref](#)]



306. Maria Bigoni, Margherita Fort, Mattia Nardotto, Tommaso Reggiani. 2011. Teams or Tournaments? A Field Experiment on Cooperation and Competition in Academic Achievement. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 1. . [[Crossref](#)]
307. David Wozniak, William T. Harbaugh, Ulrich Mayr. 2011. Gender Differences in the Demand and Effects of Relative Performance Feedback for Competitions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 80. . [[Crossref](#)]