

## Too Many Biologists: A Reply from Adamo

Author: Adamo, Shelley A.

Source: BioScience, 63(5) : 318-319

Published By: American Institute of Biological Sciences

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2013.63.5.23>

---

BioOne Complete ([complete.BioOne.org](http://complete.BioOne.org)) is a full-text database of 200 subscribed and open-access titles in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Complete website, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at [www.bioone.org/terms-of-use](http://www.bioone.org/terms-of-use).

Usage of BioOne Complete content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non - commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

---

BioOne sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

intended to deter forest managers from cautiously exploring AM as a tool for climate change adaptation. In fact, as the climate changes, plantations regenerated using local seed sources are also expected to experience suboptimal growing conditions and changes in the frequency and magnitude of extreme events such as droughts and heat waves; thus, risks exist in the absence of AM, as well. The issues raised here underline the importance of managing risks at reforestation sites through recognized strategies such as employing multiple seed sources, using established field trials to guide seed movements, and exercising caution and humility when calculating migration distances.

JOHN H. PEDLAR  
DANIEL W. MCKENNEY  
ISABELLE AUBIN  
LOUIS R. IVERSON  
RICHARD S. WINDER  
CATHERINE STE-MARIE  
GREGORY A. O'NEILL

*John H. Pedlar (john.pedlar@nrcan-rcan.gc.ca), Daniel W. McKenney, Isabelle Aubin, Richard S. Winder, and Catherine Ste-Marie are affiliated with the Canadian Forest Service, part of Natural Resources Canada: JHP, DWM, and IA are with the Great Lakes Forestry Centre, in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario; RSW is with the Pacific Forestry Centre, in Victoria, British Columbia; and CS-M is located in Ottawa, Ontario. Louis R. Iverson is affiliated with the Northern Research Center, US Department of Agriculture Forest Service, in Delaware, Ohio. Gregory A. O'Neill is affiliated with the Kalamalka Research Station, under the British Columbia Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations, in Vernon, British Columbia, Canada.*

#### References cited

- Gu L, Hanson PJ, Post WM, Kaiser DP, Yang B, Nemani R, Pallardy SG, Meyers T. 2008. The 2007 eastern US spring freezes: Increased cold damage in a warming world? *BioScience* 58: 253–262.
- Pedlar JH, McKenney DW, Aubin I, Beardmore T, Beaulieu J, Iverson L, O'Neill GA, Winder RS, Ste-Marie C. 2012. Placing forestry in the assisted migration debate. *BioScience* 62: 835–842.

Reyer CPO, et al. 2013. A plant's perspective of extremes: Terrestrial plant responses to changing climatic variability. *Global Change Biology* 19: 75–89.

Seneviratne SI, et al. 2012. Changes in climate extremes and their impacts on the natural physical environment. Pages 109–230 in Field CB, et al. eds. *Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation*. Cambridge University Press.

Sillmann J, Kharin VV, Zhang X, Zwiers FW, Bronaugh D. 2013. Climate extremes indices in the CMIP5 multimodel ensemble: Part 1. Model evaluation in the present climate. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*. (4 March 2013; <http://online.library.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jgrd.50203/abstract>)

doi:10.1525/bio.2013.63.5.21

#### Gender Bias Also Contributes to the Attrition of Women in Science

I read with interest the recent article by Adamo (2013). The underrepresentation of women across many subfields of academic science and medicine is a pressing issue, with serious implications for the future of our national competitiveness and scientific progress. Therefore, I was pleased to see this article exploring potential factors contributing to the attrition of women within the biological sciences and attempting to draw valuable lessons from the comparatively successful retention efforts in medical fields. However, I was struck by the author's omission of a discussion of gender bias as a potential factor contributing to the scarcity of women.

Recent research conducted by me and an interdisciplinary team of coauthors (Moss-Racusin et al. 2012) builds on a large body of social science work and demonstrates that both male and female science faculty members exhibit robust, measurable gender biases benefiting their male students. More specifically, biology, chemistry, and physics faculty members at research-intensive universities across the United States judged a female student to be less competent, less hireable, and less deserving of mentoring than an identical male student and also paid the female student almost \$4000 per year less for a lab manager position. These data suggest that, in addition

to the workload and motherhood factors discussed by Adamo, subtle gender biases favoring men may contribute to the gender disparity within science fields.

Indeed, gender bias may play a direct role in driving women out of science (e.g., if they encounter an obviously biased professor) but could also be playing a more subtle role (e.g., if women's motivation and enthusiasm for science are undercut by inadequate mentoring, unfair pay, and downgraded evaluations of their competence). Therefore, although I wholeheartedly agree that the scientific community should work to identify and interrupt the processes that undermine women's full participation in science, I would argue that gender bias should be considered as a potential cause for the loss of women in science, along with the other variables that Adamo considered.

CORINNE A. MOSS-RACUSIN  
*Corinne A. Moss-Racusin (corinne.moss-racusin@yale.edu) is a postdoctoral associate with Yale University, in New Haven, Connecticut.*

#### References cited

- Adamo SA. 2013. Attrition of women in the biological sciences: Workload, motherhood, and other explanations revisited. *BioScience* 63: 43–48.
- Moss-Racusin CA, Dovidio JF, Brescoll VL, Graham MJ, Handelsman J. 2012. Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109: 16474–16479.

doi:10.1525/bio.2013.63.5.22

#### Too Many Biologists: A Reply from Adamo

I am in complete agreement with Moss-Racusin that gender bias remains a barrier to women's participation in science. This problem was nicely demonstrated in her and her colleagues' paper (Moss-Racusin et al. 2012) and has also been shown previously (e.g., Wennerås and Wold 1997). My article was not meant to be an exhaustive survey of the various factors that impede women scientists. I wanted to focus on one critical issue that I think has been neglected—that is, that the oversupply

of biologists disproportionately disadvantages women. It is this pressure that gives gender bias much of its bite. When competition is fierce, bias can be lethal.

As biologists, we know the power of the comparative approach. In this article, I was searching for the differences between medicine and science that might explain medicine's greater success at recruiting and retaining women. Women in medicine must also contend with gender bias (e.g., BMA 2004); this bias negatively affects the career trajectory of women physicians (Gartke and Dollin 2010). But it has not prevented the continued increase in the proportion of women in medicine (CMA 2010). To emulate medicine's success in attracting and retaining women, we will need to increase job security for trainees and make the competition for entry into our profession occur earlier in

training. I believe that these are important features that help medicine recruit an increasing number of women.

Part of my motivation for writing this article was that our current system rewards the overproduction of biologists. For example, in the Canadian system, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada awards one-third of an applicant's score for training students. No one would suggest that gender bias should be continued, but we seem unable or unwilling to discuss how our overproduction of biologists may reduce the participation of women in science. I hope the article might start this discussion.

SHELLEY A. ADAMO  
*Shelley A. Adamo (sadam@dal.ca)*  
 is a professor in the Department  
 of Psychology and Neuroscience  
 at Dalhousie University, in  
 Halifax, Canada.

## References cited

- [BMA] British Medical Association. 2004. Career barriers in medicine: Doctors' experiences. BMA.
- [CMA] Canadian Medical Association. 2010. National Physician Survey 2010. CMA. (4 March 2013; <http://nationalphysiciansurvey.ca/surveys/2010-survey>)
- Gartke K, Dollin J. 2010. FMWC Report to the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Status of Women (Women in Non-traditional Careers). Federation of Medical Women of Canada (FMWC).
- Moss-Racusin CA, Dovidio JE, Brescoll VL, Graham MJ, Handelsman J. 2012. Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109: 16474–16479.
- Wennerås C, Wold A. 1997. Nepotism and sexism in peer-review. *Nature* 387: 341–343.

doi:10.1525/bio.2013.63.5.23

# 2013 Tyler Prize



## Diana H. Wall, PhD

University Distinguished Professor & Professor of Biology  
 Director, School of Global Environmental Sustainability  
 Colorado State University

The Tyler Prize was established in 1973 by John and Alice Tyler as an international award honoring the achievements in environmental science, environmental health and energy of worldwide importance conferring great benefit on humanity. The Tyler Prize consists of a cash award of \$200,000 and a gold Tyler Prize medallion.

### Announcing the call for 2014 nominations. For information on the 2013 award or nomination procedures contact:

Amber Brown, Administrator, The Tyler Prize  
 Phone (213) 740-9760 • Fax (213) 740-1313  
 Email: [tylerprz@usc.edu](mailto:tylerprz@usc.edu) • Website: [www.tylerprize.usc.edu](http://www.tylerprize.usc.edu)

*The Tyler Prize is administered by The University of Southern California*

The Tyler Prize Executive Committee announces the awarding of the 2013 Tyler Prize for Environmental Achievement on its 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary to Professor Diana H. Wall for her world-spanning research and for passionate, innovative communication across generations on the vital components of soil; integrating plant pathology, species invasions, climate controls, hydrological cycle impact and physical processes into an understanding of biological functions, diversity and ecosystem services of this foundation element of environmental and human wellbeing.

<http://wp.natsci.colostate.edu/walllab/people/dr-diana-h-wall/>

### Recent Laureates

2012: Professor John. H. Seinfeld for his pioneering research leading to understanding of the origin, chemistry, and evolution of aerosols in the atmosphere.

2012: Professor Kirk R. Smith for his pioneering work at the intersection of environmental science and global public health, including establishing that indoor air pollution in the rural sectors of developing countries outweighs outdoor air pollution in cities as a global health hazard.

### Tyler Prize Executive Committee

The Tyler Prize is governed and awarded by the independent Tyler Prize Executive Committee.

- Dr. Owen T. Lind, *Chair, Baylor University*  
 Dr. Rosina M. Bierbaum, *University of Michigan*  
 Ms. Margaret Catley-Carlson, *Secretary General Advisory Committee on Water*  
 Dr. Alan P. Covich, *University of Georgia*  
 Dr. Robert A. Frosch, *Harvard University and Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution*  
 Dr. Arturo Gómez-Pompa, *University of California, Riverside and Universidad Veracruzana*  
 Dr. Judith E. McDowell, *Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution*  
 Ms. Julia Marton-Lefèvre, *(IUCN) International Union for Conservation of Nature*  
 Dr. Ralph Mitchell, *Harvard University*  
 Dr. Jonathan Patz, *University of Wisconsin*  
 Dr. Cornelius W. Sullivan, *University of Southern California*