More Participation by Women in Behavior Analysis: Reply to Neef

David L. Myers

Georgia Mental Health Institute and Men Stopping Violence

Neef (this issue) acknowledges that "Myers demonstrates that sex discrimination is indeed a problem" (p. 357). Then, she asks, "is the evidence of it in the practices of our journals and governing boards?" (p. 357). My argument is that past practices have led to delays in the following initial appointments of women: the *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior (JEAB)* editorial board (13 years) and associate editor (20 years), the *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis (JABA)* editorial board (5 years) and associate editor (6 years), and the Society for the Experimental Analysis of Behavior (15 years). Why so long? These delays strike me as far beyond those that could reasonably be attributed to the unavailability of qualified women. These appointments occurred from 1970 to 1977, coinciding with (and perhaps catalyzed by) the beginning of the latest women's rights movement in the United States.

It appears that Neef advocates the group of individuals who have coauthored at least 10 *JABA* articles as a more appropriate benchmark for editorial leadership than my figures based on percentage of all articles for which women were first authors. On the one hand, Neef's point, that proportionally as many or more of these highly capable women have served on the *JABA* editorial board or as editor or associate editor as (highly capable) men have, is well taken. On the other hand, the resulting benchmark of 11% women is distressingly low.

Furthermore, the variable that I have called percentage of first authors who are women is actually the percentage of ar-

ticles for which the first author is a woman. Because women publish fewer articles per person than men do, and if this is true in *JABA*, then actually more than 31% of the *JABA* first authors from 1983 to 1992 have been women. I advocate the higher benchmark.

The comparison between the number of women in Neef's pool of frequently published individuals and the number in my pool of first authorship resembles the distinction between the applicant pool and the availability pool, respectively, in affirmative action (Bronstein & Pfennig, 1988). Neef implies that efforts could address the lower submission rates of women; a similar facet of affirmative action involves increasing the applicant pool (frequently published women in the present case) to coincide more closely with the availability pool (first authors who are women).

I indicated another substantial discrepancy between an availability pool and a corresponding applicant pool: Respectively, those pools are the student members, who are 55% to 60% women, and the full members of the Association for Behavior Analysis, who are 31% women. We should also address this discrepancy.

Fox (1991) described several organizational factors that affect academic productivity and publication. These factors operate differently for men and women scientists, usually to a woman's disadvantage. One is an "old boys' network" (Fox, 1991, p. 194), in which women are less involved than men: Women are less likely than men to serve as editors, journal referees, officers of professional associations, and grant reviewers, and are less likely to spend time off campus in consulting and lecturing. Collaboration on research and publication has become routine; however, women are more likely to work by themselves, be single authors,

Address correspondence concerning this article to David L. Myers, Quality Improvement, Georgia Mental Health Institute, 1256 Briarcliff Rd.; Atlanta, GA 30306-2694.

and have fewer collaborators, and are less likely to collaborate with senior faculty or prominent and established researchers than men are. Efforts by behavior analysis to increase women's involvement in the field should consider these factors.

Neef's criterion of numerous publications has some implications. The use of number and rate is based on the axiom that "more is better." Number and rate (of publications, in this case) are cornerstones of behavior analysis, which is, like most of the sciences and other disciplines, defined largely by men. Because women publish less often than men, the numerous-publication criterion continues to discriminate against women, unless women change their behavior.

One alternative is to acknowledge that women (and men) who publish less often are important contributors to the profession and can offer effective leadership. For example, after controlling for number of publications, there is no difference between men and women in the number of citations attracted per published paper (Astin, 1991; Over, 1982). Recall that women are more likely than men to do research by themselves, be single authors, and have fewer collaborators when they do collaborate. This implies that a woman makes a proportionally greater contribution on collaborative work (fewer collaborators), and has to work harder in general on her work because it is more likely to be solo work.

Neef also refers to "competing demands of other leadership responsibilities" (p. 358). For many women, those other responsibilities include predominant responsibility for homemaking and child rearing, lower likelihood of appointment at a major research university, and greater teaching loads (Fox, 1991). If some of these demands are within our ability to change, I urge all of us to support those changes.

In my evaluation of the editorship data, I labeled as "entitlement" (a form of voluntary affirmative action) the 1976 to 1977 (really 1975 to 1978) appointments of women to 42% of the *JABA* associate editorships and the concomitant increase

in the percentage of editorial board members who are women. This was confirmed by the editor (W. S. Agras, personal communication, June 25, 1993). The affirmative action nature of these appointments should not be taken as impugning the qualifications of the women appointed; the appointments of more women to *JABA* editorial roles were and continue to be overdue.

Nevertheless, it is interesting that, since 1980, no more than 20% (i.e., one per year) of *JABA* associate editors has been a woman. Gender equity ratios for *JABA* editorial board members and associate editors were at least 1.00 from about 1974 to 1981, but have been less than 1.00 since 1982 (except for 4 years when there were fewer papers with female first authors).

To elucidate these trends better, I have placed the three separate graphs of *JABA* participation from Figure 1 of Myers (1993) on a single plot, shown in the present Figure 1. Of note is that there were two stable periods of percentage of papers with a female first author, from 1968 to 1976 ($M = 15\%$ women) and from 1981 to the present ($M = 31\%$ women). This increase in women's first authorship was preceded, by a few years, by substantial increases in female associate editors and female members of the editorial board (the former was a transient increase). I will not speculate about the nature of any relationship between the increase in editorial roles and the ensuing increase in authorship. However, the data do imply that the increases in editorial roles for women that occurred from 1975 to 1978 have some relationship to promoting publication by women.

As Neef indicates, the accomplishments of individuals from adversely affected groups may be tainted if the accomplishments occur in an affirmative action climate. However, the continued inequity and glacially slow progress toward equal treatment in the absence of affirmative action taint the culture that tolerates continued inequity. By calling the delay in appointing a woman to the editorship of *JABA* an example of "gate-

Figure 1. Percentage of female associate editors, female editorial board members, and papers with female first authors in the *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis* from 1968 to 1992.

keeping," I implied the query, "Why not sooner?" It seems that anyone who makes it through the gate is extraordinarily qualified.

REFERENCES

- Astin, H. S. (1991). Citation classics: Women's and men's perceptions of their contributions to science. In H. Zuckerman, J. R. Cole, & J. T. Bruer (Eds.), *The outer circle: Women in the scientific community* (pp. 57-70). New York: Norton.
- Bronstein, P., & Pfennig, J. (1988). Misperceptions of women and affirmative action principles in faculty hiring: Response to Elliott's comment on Bronstein et al. *American Psychologist*, 43, 668-669.
- Fox, M. F. (1991). Gender, environmental milieu, and productivity in science. In H. Zuckerman, J. R. Cole, & J. T. Bruer (Eds.), *The outer circle: Women in the scientific community* (pp. 188-204). New York: Norton.
- Myers, D. L. (1993). Participation by women in behavior analysis. II: 1992. *The Behavior Analyst*, 16, 75-86.
- Over, R. (1982). Research productivity and impact of male and female psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 37, 24-31.