

Advances in Complex Systems
© World Scientific Publishing Company

Gender Disparities in Science? Dropout, Productivity, Collaborations and Success of Male and Female Computer Scientists

Mohsen Jadidi*

*GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Cologne, Address
Cologne, 50667, Germany
mohsen.jadidi@gesis.org*

Fariba Karimi

*GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Cologne, Address
Cologne, 50667, Germany
University of Koblenz-Landau
fariba.karimi@gesis.org*

Claudia Wagner

*GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Cologne, Address
Cologne, 50667, Germany
University of Koblenz-Landau
claudia.wagner@gesis.org*

Scientific collaborations shape novel ideas and new discoveries and help scientists to advance their scientific career through publishing high impact publications and grant proposals. Recent studies however show that gender inequality is still present in many scientific practices ranging from hiring to peer review processes and grant applications. While empirical findings highlight that collaborations impact success and gender inequality is present in science, we know little about gender-specific differences in collaboration patterns, how they change over time and how they impact scientific success. In this paper we close this gap by studying gender-differences in dropout rates, productivity and collaboration patterns of more than one million computer scientists over the course of 47 years. We investigate which collaboration patterns are related with scientific success and if these patterns are similar for male and female scientists. Our results highlight that while subtle gender disparities in dropout rates, productivity and collaboration patterns exist, successful male and female scientists reveal the same collaboration patterns: compared with scientists in the same career age, they tend to collaborate with more colleagues than other scientists, establish longer lasting and repetitive collaborations, bring people together that have not been collaborating before and collaborate with successful scientists.

Keywords: computational social science — network analysis — gender bias — science of success

*Corresponding author.

Collaboration is the core task of any scientific discourse. In the course of a collaboration, new ideas shape and eventually result in new discoveries and scientific publications [26]. As a result, collaborations impact researchers' scientific career and academic success [31, 30, 38, 39]. For example, previous research has shown that the centrality of a scientist in a collaboration network is associated with his/her success [38, 39] and co-authorship strength is related to high productivity and citations [30, 31].

At the same time gender inequality is still rife in science, for example, in hiring [27], grant applications [21, 45], peer reviews [28, 11], earnings [10, 51], tenure [41], satisfaction [10], patenting [7], productivity [50, 8], labor division in scientific collaborations [23], internationality of collaborations [16] and scientific success [16]. For example, a report from 2006 showed that only one quarter of full professors are female and they earn 80% of their male colleagues on average [51]. More recent research showed that women are more likely to take executive roles in collaborations [23], their collaborations are more domestically oriented and papers with women as lead author (i.e. solo author, first author or last author) receive fewer citations [16].

While empirical findings highlight that collaborations impact success and that gender inequalities are present in science in various forms, little is known about gender-specific differences in collaboration patterns and how these differences may impact career success. A mentionable exception is a very recent study that investigated if female and male researchers in science, technology, engineering and mathematical (STEM) disciplines differ in their collaboration patterns [53]. While this work offers interesting insights into the average number of co-authors and strength of collaboration among male and female researchers across various disciplines, it does not analyze the temporal evolution of collaboration patterns across career ages and how different network features relate to scientific success.

In this work, we aim to close this gap by presenting an empirical study on the temporal collaboration network of researchers that contribute to the field of computer science and explore which patterns are related with scientific success (measured by number of citations and h-index). We analyze gender-differences in dropout rates, productivity and collaboration patterns and explore if successful male and female scientists show the same collaboration behavior. This study is conducted over time since the collaboration network as well as the success and productivity of scientists naturally change with career age. We use a panel regression method to explain the relation between the success of scientists at different career ages and various features that characterize their collaboration behavior in the past.

Our results show that (1) the dropout rate of women is consistently higher than the dropout rate of men, especially at the beginning of an academic career (40% of men and 47% of women stop publishing after the year in which they published their first publication); (2) the average productivity of men is higher and the productivity gap is increasing over time. However this difference can be explained by the higher number of senior male scientists. We do not find any significant differences in the average productivity of men and women within the same career age; (3) the

overall gender homophily has been increasing over the past few years. In particular homophily among women is higher than it is among men when controlling for network topology and size. We only find small differences between the degree, k-core and clustering coefficient of men and women over time; (4) we find that the number of collaborators, the collaboration duration and strength, the success of collaborators and the ability to bring other scientists together are positively correlated with success. We do not find any gender-specific differences in how collaboration behaviour impacts scientific success.

1. Data

To construct a time-evolving collaboration network we use DBLP [20], a comprehensive collection of computer science publications from major and minor journals and conferences. While DBLP offers name-disambiguation [35, 20, 36], it does not provide information about citations. Therefore, we use publication titles to combine the DBLP dataset with the Aminer dataset [43] that contains all citation relations among papers in DBLP.

To infer the gender of authors we use a method that combines the result of a name-based (Genderize.io^a) and an image-based (Face++^b) gender detection services. Previous research has shown that the accuracy of this method for most countries is above 90% (see *Mixed1* in Table 1) [13]. Since we have a very low accuracy for Chinese and Korean names, we label their gender as unknown in order to reduce noise in our analysis. To detect Chinese names we compile a list of 202,045 unique names using “China Biographical Database Project (CBDB)”^c. For compiling a list of Korean names with use Wikipedia as our data source. To do this, we extract the page titles of all the backlinks to the Wikipedia page “Korean names”^d. The page titles include the names of prominent Korean figures (e.g., singers) with a Wikipedia page that describe the origin of the name of that person (e.g., Wikipedia page of a Korean singer and actor^e). Using this method we compile a list of 6,451 unique Korean names.

Our data consists of 3,085,544 publications and 7,849,398 citations that have been created in the time span of 47 years, between 1970 and 2016. Among all publication, 717,471 papers (23%) receive at least one citation from other papers inside the DBLP corpus.

First, we build a collaboration network where each node represents an author and each edge a co-authorship relation. Each edge is labeled by one or multiple date(s) that correspond to the publication date(s) of papers. We later use this information to study the network evolution over time. The complete collaboration

^a<https://genderize.io/>

^b<https://www.faceplusplus.com/>

^c<http://projects.iq.harvard.edu/cbdb/home>

^dhttps://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Korean_name

^ehttps://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ahn_Jae-wook

Table 1: The proportion of correct guesses for various gender detection methods for scientists across different countries. For most countries the mixed approaches that combine image- and name-based gender detection perform best.

	# instances	SSA	IPUMS	Sexmachine	Genderize	Face++	Mixed1	Mixed2
United States	419	0.82	0.76	0.84	0.83	0.91	0.91	0.90
China	113	0.20	0.11	0.67	0.28	0.65	0.50	0.56
United Kingdom	96	0.94	0.92	0.92	0.94	0.81	0.98	0.94
Germany	82	0.87	0.88	0.96	0.94	0.87	0.96	0.93
Italy	75	0.93	0.92	0.94	0.98	0.79	0.99	1
Canada	60	0.87	0.77	0.86	0.91	0.90	0.96	0.93
France	58	0.93	0.92	0.80	0.96	0.81	0.97	1
Japan	56	0.79	0.70	1	0.90	0.62	0.91	0.94
Brazil	44	0.29	0.29	0.15	0.44	0.81	0.90	0.93
Spain	39	0.96	0.92	0.92	1	0.92	1	1
Australia	31	0.89	0.89	0.90	0.86	0.86	0.94	0.93
India	29	0.67	0.17	0.71	0.78	0.83	0.83	0.93
South Korea	27	0.04	0.00	0.58	0.11	0.74	0.37	0.66
Switzerland	25	0.78	0.70	0.56	0.83	0.88	0.90	0.92
Turkey	21	0.43	0.14	0.79	0.81	0.86	1	1

network consists of 1,634,682 nodes and 7,304,250 edges. 699,370 (\approx %43) nodes were identified as men, 227,473 were identified as women (\approx %14), and for 707,839 authors (\approx %43) we could not infer their gender (e.g., Chinese or Korean names, only initials).

We infer the *career ages* of scientists by comparing the first and last publication record inside the DBLP corpus. For example, a scientist who has only published papers in 1995, in 2000 and in 2005, has a career length of 11 years. In 1995 her career age is 1, in 2000 it is 6 and in 2005 it is 11.

Figure 1 (left) shows that the scientific community is growing rapidly in recent years and is becoming more gender balanced. The inset shows while in 1970 there were 16 times more men than women publishing in computer science venues, in 2015 we only find 3 times more men than women. Figure 1 (right) shows the proportion of men and women that are part of the Largest Connected Component (LCC). For example, in 2000 around 20% of men and 10% of women belonged to the LCC. The proportion increased to around 85% and 80% in 2015 for men and women, respectively. The plot suggests that the proportion of men in the LCC has always been higher than those of women. However, the gap is closing in recent years. The inset shows the gender ratio in LCC. The male-female ratio in LCC is always 1% higher than men-to-women ratio in the complete network (figure 1 (left) inset). This indicates that despite the growth of the female population in CS, their collaborations tend to be limited to scientists who are not part of the well-connected part of computer science community. There are no women in the LCC in 1970 and 1971.




Fig. 1: **Left: Presence of men and women in the community.** The main figure shows the total number of men and women in yearly snapshots of the network. The inset shows the relative size of men compared to women. Women are always underrepresented in the community. However the gap is decreasing over time. **Right: Growth of Largest Connected Component (LCC).** The main figure shows the proportion of men and women that belong to the LCC in yearly snapshots of the network. For example in the year 2000, around 20% of men and 10% of women were part of the LCC. There is always a higher proportion of men that belong to the LCC. The inset shows that the men-to-women ratio in the LCC is also decreasing over time. There are no women in the LCC in 1970 and 1971.

2. Results

To investigate the evolution of gender disparities in the computer science community between 1970 to 2015, we compare male and female scientists on four dimensions: 1) *dropouts* (number of male and female scientists that stop publishing), 2) *productivity* (number of publications), 3) *collaboration patterns* and 4) *success* (number of citations and h-index).

2.1. Dropout

Leaky pipelines are frequently claimed to cause gender disparities in science. The scientific career pipeline is called *leaky* if people of certain groups drop out at higher rates than expected. To compare the dropout rates of male and female scientists we first infer their career ages based on their publications. We assume that a scientist who has not published any paper within a time window of 10 years or more, has left academia since staying in academia involves publishing. Unfortunately, scientists who died will also be counted as dropouts, but we do not expect that the proportion of men and women who die in the same career age is significantly different. Since our




Fig. 2: **Dropout rate:** Proportion of men and women that stop publishing in different career ages. Most scientists (40% of men and 47% of women) dropout one year after their first publications. The first point on the x- and y-axis refers to the percentage of women/men that were active at the beginning of career age 2 but dropped out afterwards. After the drastic dropout at the beginning, the dropout rate shows three phases. The first phase corresponds to early career researchers ($age \leq 10$) for which we observe a dropout rate between 2% and 9% every year. In career age 11 and 12, the rate of dropout increases to 17% for women and 15% for men. In the second phase related to the mid career researchers ($10 < age \leq 25$), the dropout rate fluctuates between 13% and 17%. The third phase corresponds to senior researchers with career age 25 and higher; the rate of dropout fluctuates between 15% to 20%. Women consistently have higher dropout rates (2% higher than men) across all career ages.

dropout definition requires to observe at least 10 years after each publication, we limit our dataset to scientists who published at least one publication before 2006. That means people who started their scientific career after 2006 are not included in our analysis.

Figure 2 shows the percentage of men and women who dropped out at different stages of their academic career. Between career age one and two (not shown in this Figure), 40% of men and 47% of women stop publishing and consequently drop out. After this sharp drop in the beginning, the dropout rate is rather stable (around 5% for men and around 9% for women). The dropout rate drastically increases after career age 10 which corresponds to the phase in which some scientists get tenure and others leave. We also find that the dropout rate of women is around 2% higher than those of men in all career stages.




Fig. 3: **Left: Productivity gap (calendar year)** Average productivity of men and women over calendar years. Although it increases for both gender, men tend to be slightly more productive than women. In this analysis we neglect the year 2016 as it might be effected by censoring bias and missing publications. **Middle: Productivity gap (career path):** Average productivity of men and women in different career ages. Three phases can be detected: 1) career age 1-24: increase of productivity over time, 2) career age 24-31: stable productivity, 3) career age 31-47: decreases of productivity over time. The average productivity of men and women at the same career stage is very similar. **Right: Seniority gap** Proportion of male and female senior scientists with at least 16 years experience that were active in this year. One can see that, e.g., in 1990 around 7% male and 3% female senior scientists were actively publishing papers at computer science conferences and journals. The observed similarities in the productivity of men and women over the course of their career path (middle) suggest that the increasing difference in the average productivity of men and women over calendar years (left) can in part be explained by a higher number of senior male scientists in the academic system (right).

2.2. Productivity

The *productivity puzzle* refers to the unknown causes of the lower publication rate of women compared to men in various fields [5]. Many studies have provided explanations of possible underlying causes of this productivity gap in science [50, 3, 49, 8, 5, 33, 42]. For example Duch et al. found that women publish significantly fewer papers in fields where research is expensive [8]. Therefore differences in the research funding could be one factor behind the productivity puzzle. Other studies pointed to discrimination in the peer-review process [49, 14], the employment position (i.e. being a professor or a post-doc) [3], family responsibilities [33, 42], and international collaboration [34] as factors that may explain the lower productivity of women.

Our results show that the average productivity, regardless of gender, has been increasing over time (cf. Figure 3, left). However, men on average tend to have higher publication rates than women in all calendar years and the gap is widening after 2005. Interestingly, if we compare the average productivity of men and women

in the same career age, we see only small differences (cf. Figure 3, middle). In fact phases of productivity are very similar for men and women: within the first 24 years scientists tend to increase their productivity each year, the next 7 years (up to career age 31) the average productivity is rather stable and scientists produce on average around 3.5 publications per year. Finally a drop in productivity in the last 15 years of career (career age 32 to 47) can be observed. This is in line with previous studies that found a similar pattern of productivity over the chronological age of scientists, which is positively correlated with their career age (see e.g. [32, 1, 46, 18]). However, the productivity trajectory of scientists varies for high, medium and low impact researchers [40] and for researchers in different disciplines [2, 15]. Recent research also highlights that while the aggregated pattern of productivity is surprisingly similar for researchers that are placed in institutions of different prestige rank, high diversity can be observed in the production trajectories of individual scientists [48].

A potential explanation for the increasing difference in the average productivity of men and women over calendar years are differences in seniority. Figure 3 (right) supports this hypothesis by showing that the ratio of senior male to senior female scientists (i.e. scientists with career age 15+) starts to increase around 2005, the year in which the average productivity gap starts to increase. The lower rate of senior female scientists explains the lower average productivity of women and is in part also a consequence of the consistently higher dropout rate of women in all career stages that may prevent them from reaching higher career ages.

2.3. *Collaboration pattern*

Previous studies on scientific collaboration suggest that men and women tend to show different collaboration behaviours across their scientific career, such as differences in number of new and repeating collaborations [15, 53], authorship position [50] and degree of homophilic collaborations [24, 9] and tendency to have interdisciplinary collaborations [17, 37]. However, these studies have either focused on a specific country or ignored the time dimension (e.g. ignoring collaboration evolution). Here we seek to investigate *how the patterns of collaborations of male and female computer scientists are evolving over time*.

Figure 4 shows the growth of the degree, k-core (nodes of degree k or higher) (top right) and clustering coefficient (lower left) in 6 decades for men and women. By looking at the tail of degree and k-core distributions we observe that collaboration at macro level, regardless of gender, has been increasing over decades. We also observe that men have slightly broader degree and k-core distribution compared to women in earlier years. As the network grows and the number of women increases, women stretch their degree and k-core similar to men, in particular after the year 2000. Overall, by looking at the average position of men and women in the evolving collaboration network, we observe small differences in recent years. With respect to clustering, women tend to have slightly higher probability for higher clustering




Fig. 4: Evolution of degree and k-core distribution over 6 decades: Main figures show the degree distribution of male and female scientists. The top-right and bottom-left insets show the k-core and clustering coefficient distributions, respectively. Each plot refers to one specific year and depicts the status of the network at the end of this year including all collaborations that happened between the beginning of 1970 and the end of the depicted year. As the network grows, the degree and k-core grow and women become more connected to the central community in the network. The collaboration gap has been narrowing over time as more women join the network. In the beginning (1970 and 1980) women tend to collaborate with less people (lower degree) and with people that were less well connected (lower k-core). Further women tend to collaborate slightly more with colleagues that also collaborate with each other (higher clustering coefficient). Consequently women are less likely to bridge the structural holes between others.

which indicates that they are involved in denser collaboration. This means, women are less likely to collaborate with people that are unconnected among themselves and are consequently less likely to bridge the structural holes between different sub-communities. This is an intriguing result since previous work has shown that nodes that bridge structural holes tend to be more influential [44, 4] and also our work shows that low clustering is related with scientific success.

For the quantitative comparison of the distributions for men and women, we use Kolmogorov-Smirnov D-test that measures the maximum difference between two Complementary Cumulative Distribution Functions (CCDF):

$$D = \max |F_{women}(k) - F_{men}(k)| \quad (1)$$

where $F_{women}(k)$ and $F_{men}(k)$ denote the CCDF of the distribution for women and men respectively. The value for the D-statistic ranges between 0 to 1. The larger

D, the larger the differences between the two distributions. Table 2 represents the D-statistics and corresponding p-values for degree, k-core and clustering distributions over the decades. In general, we observe small but significant differences between the distributions. In most cases differences increase over time.

Table 2: **Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) D-test**: Each value shows the D-statistic comparing degree, k-core and clustering coefficient distributions of men and women for each decade. The difference between the distributions seems to be significant but small for all decades except the earlier ones. *Note*: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2015
degree	0.000	0.007***	0.023***	0.062***	0.074***	0.054***
k-core	0.000	0.007***	0.023***	0.062***	0.073***	0.037***
clustering coefficient	0.000	0.000	0.004**	0.017***	0.037***	0.037***

Homophily, the tendency to associate or connect to similar others, is one of the fundamental factors that shape social ties [25]. Homophilic behavior combined with group size differences can limit minorities to stretch their overall degree [12]. Consequently, it can impact the opportunities afforded to minorities to access novel ideas and information. Since we are interested in observing how homophily is changing over time, we analyze the collaboration behavior of scientists within each year separately rather than looking at the accumulated collaboration network for each year.

To capture the global changes of homophily, we use Newman assortativity measure (r) that captures the extent to which collaboration ties exist across genders ($r < 0$) and among the same gender ($r > 0$) compared to what we would expect from the node's degree [29]. Figure 5 (left) shows assortativity mixing using a moving average window of 6 years. The figure suggests assortativity was relatively stable in the past but started to increase in 2000.

The increasing trend in gender assortativity requires a detail analysis to uncover whether the increase is mainly produced by the behavior of one group or both groups. To assess the homophily for each gender separately, we look at the proportion of links between women (H_f) and men (H_m):

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_m &= \frac{E_{m,m}}{E_{m,m} + E_{f,m}} \\
 H_f &= \frac{E_{f,f}}{E_{f,f} + E_{f,m}}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2}$$

$E_{m,m}$ refers to male-to-male edges, $E_{f,f}$ to female-female edges, and $E_{f,m}$ to male-female edges. For example, $H_f = 1$ means that we observe 100% homophilic behavior among female scientists – i.e. that all women have chosen only other women as collaboration partners. To assess the significance of the observed homophily, we need




Fig. 5: **Gender assortativity and homophily.** Left panel shows the Newman *gender assortativity* (r) computed on a yearly snapshot of the collaboration network – i.e. a network including only collaborations that happened within this calendar year. The gender assortativity has fluctuations over the years but with overall increasing trend. Right panel shows the z-score of homophily computed using equation 2. The z-score is calculated for each yearly snapshot of our empirical network and 100 instances of the corresponding null model (i.e. a network in which we reshuffle the links but keep the degree intact). Therefore, $z\text{-score}(H)$ indicates the deviation (in terms of standard deviation) from the homophily we would expect in the randomized network. We compute the z-score separately for both groups, men and women. In both cases we average the results using an average window of 5 years to smooth the curve. The figure suggests both genders, specially in recent years, have engaged in more homophilic collaborations than expected. However, the gap between the homophilic behavior of men and women is increasing over time. Interestingly, the tendency of women to collaborate with other women is more pronounced than the tendency of men to collaborate with other men.

to compare it with a null model in which we keep the network size and the degree of the nodes intact and reshuffle the edges. Using this model we generate for each yearly snapshot of our empirical observed collaboration network 100 synthetic networks and measure the mean and the standard deviation of the homophily for men and women separately. This allows us to create an expectation for the homophily value that we expect to observe for men and women when they are gender-blind during the collaboration partner selection.

Figure 5 (right) shows the averaged *z-score* of the observed homophily which indicates how many standard deviations the empirical homophily deviates from the expectation if the interactions would not be impacted by gender. Interestingly, we again see that the homophilic behavior of men and women is increasing over time. However, the homophilic behavior of women exceeds the expectation more than those of men.

Table 3: **Regression sample size:** Beside the number of authors we also list the number of observations since we have multiple observations per author (one for each year in which they were active). We limit our analysis to authors with at least 10 years career length and 5 publications, since we are interested in the collaborations of active scientists who have chosen to stay in academia.

	Men	Women	Total
Number of authors	72,076	13,746	85,822
Number of observations	734,474	131,194	865,668

2.4. Success

Finally we aim to understand the relationship between collaboration patterns, gender and scientific success. Specifically, we seek to answer *which collaboration patterns are related with the scientific success and are these patterns similar for male and female scientists.*

We create two different models that describe the relationship between the collaboration behavior of scientists and their success (measured via number of citations and h-index). The first model (*ego model*) only relies on ego-centric properties of a node such as degree centrality and clustering coefficient. Furthermore, we use *collaboration strength* (number of collaborations between each pair of authors) and *collaboration duration* (the duration between first and last collaborations) as additional features. The second model (*1-hop model*) extends the ego model by including information about the properties of a node’s neighbours; e.g. the median degree or career age of neighbours. Since the distribution of neighbours’ properties can be skewed we use the median rather than the mean.

The academic system naturally changes over time (e.g., with respect to size, number of relevant venues, publication and citation practices). Therefore comparing scientists that started their career in different decades may confound our results. To control this effect we add the starting decade of an author’s career to our model-

To unfold the role of gender on collaboration behaviour and success, we include gender as an interaction term in our models.

To quantify the scientific success, our dependent variable, we use two common measures: *number of citations* and *h-index*. While number of citations can be driven by single high impact papers, the h-index combines the assessment of both quantity (number of papers) and quality (impact or citations). That means, a scientist needs to produce a high number of high quality papers in order to obtain a high h-index.

Since our dependent and independent variables naturally grow with career age, we compute the corresponding z-score values for each feature within each career age separately and use this value instead of raw values. For example, for each scientist i we measure how much his or her citations at career age t , $c_{i,t}$, deviate (in terms of standard deviation) from the average number of citations scientists receive at

career age t :

$$Z_{i,t} = \frac{c_{i,t} - \langle c_t^{(\cdot)}(t) \rangle}{\sigma[c_t^{(\cdot)}(t)]} \quad (3)$$

We fit these models to the population of scientists with at least 10 years career length and 5 publications. This way we focus only on people who have decided to pursue an academic career. For each scientist we record his collaboration features through his career from the corresponding network. Therefore, our panel data consists of multiple observations (at least 5) for each author, one for each career age. Furthermore, we ignore the first 4 career ages to give authors enough time accumulate citations. Table 3 shows the size of our panel.

To account for within-subject correlation and unbalanced observations for subjects (e.g., missing observations), we use the General Estimation Equation (GEE) regression model [22] with an *exchangeable* correlation structure and a Gaussian link function. This correlation structure captures our assumptions that the correlation between each pair of observations is the same. To be more precise, we assume the correlation between observations for each author in different time point (career ages) is fixed and does not change over time. To assess the goodness of the fit we use the marginal R^2 which is an extension of R^2 statistics for GEE models [54]. Similar to R^2 , marginal R^2 can be interpreted as the proportion of variance in the response variable explained by the fitted model.

Table 4 shows the coefficients of the model using citations as a proxy for success, while Table 5 shows the results using h-index as success proxy. Both models, the *ego model* and *1-hop model*, indicate that scientists with more collaboration partners (i.e. higher degree) and stronger collaboration ties (i.e., repetitive and long lasting collaborations) are more successful than other scientists in the same career age, no matter if h-index or citation counts are used to measure success. This means, successful scientists keep adding new collaborators and increase their social circle, while investing in a few strong collaboration ties at the same time. New collaborators can diversify the network of a scientist and therefore help to increase his or her visibility within the community, while life-long research partnerships may lead to very efficient collaborations that increase the productivity and success of scientists [30].

We also find a significant negative association between clustering coefficient and the number of citations in all models which indicates that *structural diversity is related with scientific success*. A scientist with a low clustering coefficient functions as a bridge that brings other scientists together who would potentially not collaborate otherwise. Also previous work has shown that structural diversity leads to a positional advantage that makes nodes more powerful and influential [44, 4].

In addition to the effect of ego-centric features, the *1-hop models* show that collaborating with successful scientists (i.e. the median number of citation of neighbours is high) and with scientists that bridge structural holes in the collaboration network (i.e. the median clustering coefficient of neighbours is low) is positively

Table 4: **GEE model for number of citations.** The model shows the correlation between collaboration features and the number of citations. The ego model shows that above-average degree, collaboration duration and collaboration strength are significantly positively related with scientific success, while clustering coefficient is significantly negatively associated with success. The 1-hop neighbourhood model confirms these observations and also shows that someone who collaborates with successful scientists and scientists who function as bridges is more likely to be successful. We control for the effect of the decade in which a scientist started his or her career. *Note:* ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

	ego model	ego model +interactions	1-hop model	1-hop model +interactions
Intercept	-0.038(-3.496)***	-0.039(-3.492)***	-0.007(-0.638)	-0.006(-0.583)
decade(reference=1970)[1980]	0.027(2.598)**	0.026(2.532)*	0.015(1.501)	0.014(1.449)
decade(reference=1970)[1990]	0.059(5.888)***	0.058(5.734)***	0.038(4.021)***	0.037(3.877)***
decade(reference=1970)[2000]	0.004(0.345)	0.002(0.19)	-0.033(-3.092)**	-0.035(-3.204)**
decade(reference=1970)[2010]	-0.072(-5.407)***	-0.074(-5.547)***	-0.13(-10.042)***	-0.131(-10.172)***
gender[f]		0.014(2.457)*		0.007(1.341)
clust	-0.019(-16.532)***	-0.02(-14.971)***	-0.021(-11.689)***	-0.021(-9.77)***
clust*gender[f]		0.002(0.671)		0.0(0.008)
degree	0.29(28.519)***	0.291(25.616)***	0.279(23.529)***	0.28(20.916)***
degree*gender[f]		-0.009(-0.408)		-0.012(-0.499)
median collaboration duration	0.058(32.431)***	0.059(29.441)***	0.04(19.703)***	0.04(17.663)***
median collaboration duration*gender[f]		-0.002(-0.363)		-0.003(-0.689)
median collaboration strength	0.014(7.587)***	0.016(7.2)***	0.007(3.947)***	0.008(4.301)***
median collaboration strength*gender[f]		-0.01(-2.415)		-0.009(-2.428)
neighbours median age			-0.007(-2.195)	-0.007(-2.056)
neighbours median age*gender[f]				0.002(0.371)
neighbours median clust			-0.014(-7.343)***	-0.015(-6.71)***
neighbours median clust*gender[f]				0.006(1.719)
neighbours median degree			-0.003(-0.265)	-0.002(-0.147)
neighbours median degree*gender[f]				-0.005(-0.289)
neighbours median n citations			0.171(6.653)***	0.175(5.679)***
neighbours median n citations*gender[f]				-0.022(-0.651)
R^2	0.068	0.068	0.105	0.106

related with the success (h-index and citations) of a researcher. We did not find any evidence that the degree and scientific age of the collaborators impact the success of a scientist when the number of citations is used as success measure, but they positively impact her h-index. This indicates that scientists who collaborate with active senior scientists tend to be more productive and successful than the average scientist with the same career age. But, high impact publications can also be produced by scientists that do not collaborate with active senior scientists.

Furthermore, our analysis shows that no significant gender-specific differences exist in how collaboration patterns impact success since no interactions between gender and collaboration patterns can be found. This indicates that *successful male*

Table 5: **GEE model for h-index.** The model shows the correlation between collaboration features and h-index. The ego model shows that above-average degree, collaboration duration and collaboration strength are significantly positively related with scientific success. The 1-hop neighbourhood model confirms these observations. The 1-hop model also shows that someone who collaborates with successful scientists is more likely to be successful. While the seniority and degree of a scientist's neighbours do not impact his or her number of citations, it does positively impact the h-index. We control for the effect of the decade in which a scientist started his or her career. *Note:* ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

	ego model	ego model +interactions	1-hop model	1-hop model +interactions
Intercept	-0.17(-11.471)***	-0.173(-11.634)***	-0.125(-8.787)***	-0.126(-8.824)***
decade(reference=1970)[1980]	0.017(1.049)	0.016(1.006)	-0.003(-0.172)	-0.003(-0.218)
decade(reference=1970)[1990]	0.089(5.834)***	0.087(5.731)***	0.056(3.881)***	0.055(3.773)***
decade(reference=1970)[2000]	0.138(9.055)***	0.136(8.89)***	0.083(5.699)***	0.081(5.534)***
decade(reference=2010)[2010]	0.153(8.07)***	0.151(7.923)***	0.07(3.825)***	0.067(3.687)***
gender[f]		0.028(3.714)***		0.021(2.865)**
clust	-0.01(-6.67)***	-0.009(-5.83)***	-0.014(-8.204)***	-0.014(-7.354)***
clust*gender[f]		0.002(0.526)		0.002(0.527)
degree	0.435(83.255)***	0.433(75.532)***	0.411(70.708)***	0.409(63.616)***
degree*gender[f]		0.015(1.075)		0.02(1.39)
median collaboration duration	0.085(67.974)***	0.086(62.74)***	0.061(40.156)***	0.061(36.808)***
median collaboration duration*gender[f]		-0.003(-0.874)		-0.003(-0.894)
median collaboration strength	0.028(10.104)***	0.028(8.632)***	0.017(7.623)***	0.018(6.752)***
median collaboration strength*gender[f]		-0.005(-1.042)		-0.004(-0.873)
neighbours median age			0.028(10.988)***	0.029(10.142)***
neighbours median age*gender[f]				-0.007(-1.177)
neighbours median clust			-0.014(-8.736)***	-0.015(-8.105)***
neighbours median clust*gender[f]				0.004(0.982)
neighbours median degree			0.028(2.887)**	0.032(2.818)**
neighbours median degree*gender[f]				-0.023(-1.725)
neighbours median n citations			0.124(6.451)***	0.123(5.51)***
neighbours median n citations*gender[f]				0.005(0.21)
R^2	0.225	0.225	0.312	0.313

and female scientists reveal the same collaboration behavior and no differences exist in which collaboration patterns may explain the success of men and women in science.

3. Discussion

Gender gap in academia, especially in STEM fields, has been a great concern over the past decades and many studies have tried to quantify the extent to which gender inequalities are present in science.

In this study we extend previous work by looking at the collaboration behaviour

of scientists over a period of 47 years, from 1970 to 2016. In particular, we focus on one field, computer science, with a collaborative community [52] and a wide gender gap [19].

To assess the gender gap, we first compare the *productivity* of men and women in terms of number of publications. In line with previous studies [5, 50, 3, 49, 8, 33, 42] our findings confirm that a productivity gap exists and our work also indicates that the gap is widening over the past few years. However, we also show that the productivity gap between male and female computer scientists can in part be explained by the distribution of the career ages of male and female scientist. Across all calendar years more senior male than senior female scientists were active in computer science and the average productivity of senior scientists is naturally higher than those of junior scientists.

The lower number of senior female scientists can in part be explained by the lower number of women in computer science in the past (e.g., in 1970, 16 times more men than women published at computer science venues). But also the dropout rate of women is consistently 2% higher than the dropout rate of men which may also contribute to the seniority gap between men and women.

Surprisingly, we observe an increasing trend in gender homophily over the years and in particular among women. The high homophily among women is alarming since recent research highlights the importance of diverse interactions in receiving visibility [12] and accessing novel ideas and information [6].

The evolution of the collaboration network suggests that in earlier years men tended to have broader degree (more collaborators) and k-core (more well-connected collaborators) compared to women but in recent years the gap is closing. Yet, men tend to have a slightly broader degree and k-core distribution than women. Additionally, women show slightly higher clustering compared to men suggesting that women are more involved in triadic relations. This indicates that women are less likely to collaborate with colleagues that are not connected among themselves and consequently women are less likely to bridge structural holes in the collaboration network.

As also suggested by previous work [44, 4], we find that scientists who function as bridges tend to be more successful. A scientist with a low clustering coefficient brings other scientists together who would probably not collaborate otherwise. Our success analysis reveals that successful scientists tend to collaborate with more colleagues than other scientists in the same career age, they establish long lasting and repetitive collaborations (i.e. they form strong ties), they bring people together that have not been collaborating before and they collaborate with other successful scientists. In part our results support findings from previous research that showed that publications co-authored with super ties (i.e. long lasting, repetitive collaborations) positively impact long-term citations [30]. Interestingly, Zeng et al. found that female scientists have a lower probability of repeating previous collaborations compared to men [53]. This is an intriguing result since our work shows that repetitive and long lasting collaborations have a positive impact on success.

We do not find any gender differences with respect to how collaboration behavior impacts scientific success. This suggests that successful male and female scientists reveal similar collaboration behavior and success is not directly impacted by gender when controlling for collaboration patterns, scientific age and start decade of a career. Also hiring outcomes (which are another measure of success) are not directly effected by gender after controlling for scholarly productivity and relative prestige between hiring and placing institution [47].

Our work does not allow to answer the causal question if certain collaboration strategies (e.g. repetitive collaborations or bringing people from different communities together) lead to success or if the observed patterns are a consequence of success. For example, successful people may be involved in repetitive collaborations because others want to collaborate with them again. It is very likely that these relationships are not unidirectional causal, but mediated by an unobserved variable, the skills and knowledge of a scientist.

Although our statistical models controlled for different factors such as career age, our work is limited to characteristics that are measurable and observable in our data. The main contribution of this work is a large scale temporal and gender-sensitive analysis of productivity, dropouts, collaboration patterns and success of computer scientists over the course of 47 years. We hope our results shed light into the understanding of collaboration patterns that are related with scientific success and gender differences in scientific collaborations, productivity and career paths. In future it would be interesting to extend this analysis to more academic fields and also explore disparities across ethnic groups.

Acknowledgements

We thank Markus Strohmaier and Haik Lietz for their invaluable comments on the paper.

References

- [1] Aksnes, D. W., Rorstad, K., Piro, F., and Sivertsen, G., Are female researchers less cited? a large-scale study of norwegian scientists, *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* **62** (2011) 628–636.
- [2] Bayer, A. E. and Dutton, J. E., Career age and research-professional activities of academic scientists: Tests of alternative nonlinear models and some implications for higher education faculty policies, *The Journal of Higher Education* **48** (1977) 259–282.
- [3] Bentley, J. T. and Adamson, R., Gender differences in the careers of academic scientists and engineers: A literature review, Special report, National Science Foundation (2003).
- [4] Burt, R., Structural holes and good ideas, *American Journal of Sociology* **110** (2004) 349–399.
- [5] Cole, J. R. and Zuckerman, H., The productivity puzzle: persistence and changes in patterns of publication of men and women scientists, *Advances in Motivation and Achievements* (1984).

- [6] DiMaggio, P. and Garip, F., How network externalities can exacerbate intergroup inequality 1, *American Journal of Sociology* **116** (2011) 1887–1933.
- [7] Ding, W. W., Murray, F., and Stuart, T. E., Gender differences in patenting in the academic life sciences, *Science* **313** (2006) 665–667.
- [8] Duch, J., Zeng, X. H. T., Sales-Pardo, M., Radicchi, F., Otis, S., Woodruff, T. K., and Amaral, L. A. N., The possible role of resource requirements and academic career-choice risk on gender differences in publication rate and impact, *PLoS ONE* **7** (2012).
- [9] Gallivan, M. and Ahuja, M., Co-authorship, homophily, and scholarly influence in information systems research, *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* **16** (2015) 980.
- [10] Holden, C., General contentment masks gender gap in first aaas salary and job survey, *Science* **294** (2001) 396–411.
- [11] Kaatz, A., Gutierrez, B., and Carnes, M., Threats to objectivity in peer review: the case of gender, *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences* **35** (2014) 371 – 373.
- [12] Karimi, F., Génois, M., Wagner, C., Singer, P., and Strohmaier, M., Visibility of minorities in social networks, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.00150* (2017).
- [13] Karimi, F., Wagner, C., Lemmerich, F., Jadidi, M., and Strohmaier, M., Inferring gender from names on the web: A comparative evaluation of gender detection methods, in *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference Companion on World Wide Web, WWW '16 Companion* (International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, Republic and Canton of Geneva, Switzerland, 2016), ISBN 978-1-4503-4144-8, pp. 53–54, doi:10.1145/2872518.2889385, <https://doi.org/10.1145/2872518.2889385>.
- [14] Knobloch-Westerwick, S., Glynn, C. J., and Huge, M., The matilda effect in science communication an experiment on gender bias in publication quality perceptions and collaboration interest, *Science Communication* **35** (2013) 603–625.
- [15] Kyvik, S. and Teigen, M., Child care, research collaboration, and gender differences in scientific productivity, *Science, Technology & Human Values* **21** (1996) 54–71.
- [16] Larivière, V., Ni, C., Gingras, Y., Cronin, B., and Sugimoto, C. R., Bibliometrics: Global gender disparities in science, *Nature* **504** (2013) 211–213.
- [17] Leahey, E., Gender differences in productivity: Research specialization as a missing link, *Gender & Society* **20** (2006) 754–780.
- [18] Lehman, H. C., Men’s creative production rate at different ages and in different countries, *The Scientific Monthly* **78** (1954) 321–326.
- [19] Leslie, S.-J., Cimpian, A., Meyer, M., and Freeland, E., Expectations of brilliance underlie gender distributions across academic disciplines, *Science* **347** (2015) 262–265.
- [20] Ley, M., DBLP - some lessons learned, *PVLDB* **2** (2009) 1493–1500.
- [21] Ley, T. J. and Hamilton, B. H., The gender gap in nih grant applications, *Science* **322** (2008) 1472–1474.
- [22] Liang, K.-Y. and Zeger, S. L., Longitudinal data analysis using generalized linear models, *Biometrika* **73** (1986) 13–22.
- [23] Macaluso, B., Larivière, V., Sugimoto, T., and Sugimoto, C., Is Science Built on the Shoulders of Women? A Study of Gender Differences in Contributorship, *Academic Medicine* **91** (2016) 1136–1142.
- [24] Mcdowell, J. M. and Smith, J. K., The effect of gender-sorting on propensity to coauthor: Implications for academic promotion, *Economic Inquiry* **30** (1992) 68–82.
- [25] Moody, J., Race, school integration, and friendship segregation in america1, *American journal of Sociology* **107** (2001) 679–716.
- [26] Moody, J., The structure of a social science collaboration network: Disciplinary co-

- hesion from 1963 to 1999, *American sociological review* **69** (2004) 213–238.
- [27] Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., and Handelsman, J., Science faculty’s subtle gender biases favor male students, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **109** (2012) 16474–16479.
- [28] Mutz, R., Bornmann, L., and Daniel, H.-D., Does gender matter in grant peer review?, *Zeitschrift für Psychologie* **220** (2012) 121–129.
- [29] Newman, M. E., Mixing patterns in networks, *Physical Review E* **67** (2003) 026126.
- [30] Petersen, A. M., Quantifying the impact of weak, strong, and super ties in scientific careers, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112** (2015) E4671–E4680.
- [31] Petersen, A. M., Fortunato, S., Pan, R. K., Kaski, K., Penner, O., Rungi, A., Riccaboni, M., Stanley, H. E., and Pammolli, F., Reputation and impact in academic careers, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **111** (2014) 15316–15321.
- [32] Phelan, T. J., Striking the mother lode in science: The importance of age, place, and time,, *The Journal of Higher Education* **65** (1994) 627–629.
- [33] Prozesky, H., A career-history analysis of gender differences in publication productivity among south african academics, *Science & Technology Studies* **28** (2008).
- [34] Prpić, K., Gender and productivity differentials in science, *Scientometrics* **55** (2002) 27–58.
- [35] Reitz, F. and Hoffmann, O., *Learning from the Past: An Analysis of Person Name Corrections in the DBLP Collection and Social Network Properties of Affected Entities* (Springer Vienna, Vienna, 2013), ISBN 978-3-7091-1346-2, pp. 427–453.
- [36] Reuther, P., Walter, B., Ley, M., Weber, A., and Klink, S., Managing the quality of person names in DBLP, in *Research and Advanced Technology for Digital Libraries, 10th European Conference, ECDL 2006, Alicante, Spain, September 17-22, 2006, Proceedings* (2006), pp. 508–511.
- [37] Rhoten, D. and Pfirman, S., Women in interdisciplinary science: Exploring preferences and consequences, *Research Policy* **36** (2007) 56 – 75.
- [38] Sarigöl, E., Pfitzner, R., Scholtes, I., Garas, A., and Schweitzer, F., Predicting scientific success based on coauthorship networks, *EPJ Data Science* (2014).
- [39] Servia-Rodríguez, S., Noulas, A., Mascolo, C., Fernández-Vilas, A., and Díaz-Redondo, R. P., The evolution of your success lies at the centre of your co-authorship network, *PloS one* **10** (2015) e0114302.
- [40] Sinatra, R., Wang, D., Deville, P., Song, C., and Barabási, A.-L., Quantifying the evolution of individual scientific impact, *Science* **354** (2016).
- [41] Spelke, E. S., Kinzler, K., and Shusterman, A., Sex differences in intrinsic aptitude for mathematics and science? a critical review, *American Psychologist* **60** (2005) 950–958.
- [42] Stack, S., Gender, children and research productivity, *Research in Higher Education* **45** (2004) 891–920.
- [43] Tang, J., Zhang, J., Yao, L., Li, J., Zhang, L., and Su, Z., Arnetminer: Extraction and mining of academic social networks, in *KDD’08* (2008), pp. 990–998.
- [44] Ugander, J., Backstrom, L., Marlow, C., and Kleinberg, J., Structural diversity in social contagion, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **109** (2012) 5962–5966.
- [45] Van der Lee, R. and Ellemers, N., Gender contributes to personal research funding success in The Netherlands, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* (2015).
- [46] Vasileiadou, E. and Vliegenthart, R., Research productivity in the era of the internet revisited, *Research Policy* **38** (2009) 1260 – 1268.
- [47] Way, S. F., Larremore, D. B., and Clauset, A., Gender, productivity, and prestige in computer science faculty hiring networks, in *Proceedings of the 25th Inter-*

20 *M. Jadidi, F. Karimi and C. Wagner*

- national Conference on World Wide Web*, WWW '16 (International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, Republic and Canton of Geneva, Switzerland, 2016), ISBN 978-1-4503-4143-1, pp. 1169–1179, doi:10.1145/2872427.2883073, <https://doi.org/10.1145/2872427.2883073>.
- [48] Way, S. F., Morgan, A. C., Clauset, A., and Larremore, D. B., The misleading narrative of the canonical faculty productivity trajectory, *CoRR* **abs/1612.08228** (2016).
- [49] Wenneras, C. and Wold, A., Nepotism and sexism in peer-review, *Nature* (1997).
- [50] West, J. D., Jacquet, J., King, M. M., Correll, S. J., and Bergstrom, C. T., The role of gender in scholarly authorship, *PLoS ONE* **8** (2013) e66212.
- [51] West, M. S. and Curtis, J. W., Aaup faculty gender equity indicators (2006).
- [52] Wuchty, S., Jones, B. F., and Uzzi, B., The increasing dominance of teams in production of knowledge, *Science* **316** (2007) 1036–1039.
- [53] Zeng, X. H. T., Duch, J., Sales-Pardo, M., Moreira, J. A., Radicchi, F., Ribeiro, H. V., Woodruff, T. K., and Amaral, L. A. N., Differences in collaboration patterns across discipline, career stage, and gender, *PLoS Biol* **14** (2016) e1002573.
- [54] Zheng, B., Summarizing the goodness of fit of generalized linear models for longitudinal data, *Statistics in Medicine* **19** (2000) 1265–1275.