

ISERP

Working Paper 07-15

Gender Inequalities in Education

CLAUDIA BUCHMANN

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

THOMAS DIPRETE

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

ANNE MCDANIEL

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY



COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK

DECEMBER 2007

INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH AND POLICY

PIONEERING SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH AND SHAPING PUBLIC POLICY

GENDER INEQUALITIES IN EDUCATION*

Claudia Buchmann¹

Department of Sociology
Ohio State University

Thomas DiPrete²

Department of Sociology
Columbia University

Anne McDaniel³

Department of Sociology
Ohio State University

ISERP Working Paper 07-15

December 2007

* Prepared for Annual Review of Sociology, Volume 34, September 15, 2007

¹ Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210
email: buchmann.4@osu.edu

² Department of Sociology, 1180 Amsterdam Avenue, 401 Fayerweather Hall, Mail Code 2562, New York, NY 10027. Email: rad61@columbia.edu.

³ Department of Sociology, 1180 Amsterdam Avenue, 401 Fayerweather Hall, Mail Code 2562, New York, NY 10027. Tel: 614-688-4352. Email: mcdaniel.145@sociology.osu.edu.

Abstract

The terrain of gender inequalities in education has seen much change in recent decades. This chapter reviews the empirical research and theoretical perspectives on gender inequalities in educational performance and attainment from early childhood to young adulthood. Much of the literature on children and adolescents attends to performance differences between girls and boys. Of course achievement in elementary and secondary school is linked to the level of education one ultimately attains including high school completion, enrollment in post secondary education, college completion and graduate and professional school experiences. We recommend three directions for future research: (a) interdisciplinary efforts to understand gender differences in cognitive development and non-cognitive abilities in early childhood, (b) research on the structure and practices of schooling, and (c) analyses of the intersectionality of gender with race, ethnicity, class, and immigrant statuses in creating complex patterns of inequalities in educational experiences and outcomes.

Introduction

Just over a decade a decade ago, Jacobs (1996:156) noted that the literature on gender inequalities in education “often treats all aspects of education as disadvantaging women.” This assessment is less valid today, as much research now examines the ways in which girls and women are advantaged in some aspects of education, as well as those in which they continue to trail boys and men. While girls have long gotten better grades in school than boys, this point was not central to the literature because women did not translate their better performance into higher levels educational attainment relative to men (Mickelson 1989). But in a rare example of a reversal of a once persistent pattern of stratification, women now far outnumber men among new college graduates in most industrialized societies. With increasing awareness of this and other changes, new questions about gender inequalities in education emerge.

This chapter provides a selective, cross-disciplinary review of the literature on gender inequalities in educational performance and attainment from early childhood to young adulthood. In addition to mapping the terrain of current gender inequalities for a wide range of educational indicators, we discuss the theoretical perspectives that have been used or could prove useful for explaining these inequalities and suggest how future research could advance understanding of the complex nature of differences between males’ and females’ educational experiences. Most research assumes that individuals progress through the educational system in a linear and sequential mode and that early school experiences set the stage for those that follow (Pallas 2003). Research also tends to be bifurcated between that which focuses on educational outcomes and experiences during childhood and adolescence (corresponding with primary and secondary school) and that which focuses on educational attainment and higher education. Following these tendencies, we structure our review into three main sections. In the first, we assess the current

state of knowledge regarding gender inequalities in primary and secondary school, from children's earliest experiences with formal schooling, as they enter kindergarten through the end of compulsory schooling, which in most industrialized societies is demarcated by the end of secondary school. This section focuses on educational achievement, as much of the literature on gender differences during childhood and adolescence attends to performance differences between girls and boys. Of course performance in elementary and secondary school is linked to the level of schooling one ultimately attains. The second section provides an empirical overview of gender inequalities in young adulthood and beyond in terms of educational attainment, including high school completion, enrollment in post secondary education, college completion and graduate and professional school experiences. Great variation exists in the pathways of individuals from high school into college and the completion of a college degree (Goldrick-Rab 2006). Within this apparently endless variation, however, there are gendered patterns that demand examination. In the third and final section, we offer several fruitful directions for future research.

While this review covers a wide purview of the educational life course, several topics remain beyond its scope. Because we focus on formal schooling bounded by entry into kindergarten through completion of college, we do not consider research on gender differences in very early childhood and preschool (see Kraft & Nickel 1995 for a review) or continuing and adult education (Jacobs & Stoner-Eby 1998; Jacobs & King 2002). We focus on U.S.-based research, but incorporate literature from other industrialized countries and cross-national research where noteworthy. Patterns of gender inequalities in developing societies are quite different from those in most industrialized societies and space limitations preclude us from considering this important topic here (but see King & Hill 1993; Buchmann & Hannum 2001).

From Kindergarten through High School

In the US, most children start formal schooling at the age of 5, but approximately 10% of children either begin kindergarten the year after they meet age requirements or repeat kindergarten a second year. Parents decide when their children begin school and, along with teachers, determine whether children are promoted to the next grade. Delayed entry into kindergarten, also called academic redshirting, is more common among boys and practiced more often by families of high socioeconomic status (Graue & DiPerna 2000). Nationally representative data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study of the Kindergarten Cohort (ECLS-K) indicate that boys comprise about 60 percent of the children whose entry into kindergarten was delayed a year after they were age-eligible and 66 percent of those who repeated kindergarten for a second year (Malone et al. 2006). Boys are also more likely than girls to be retained a grade or more during elementary school (Alexander et al. 2003; Entwisle et al. 2007).

These differences in early school trajectories are important to bear in mind when comparing boys and girls in terms of their academic performance. In age-based comparisons, girls will have attained a slightly higher average grade level than boys. In grade-based comparisons, most common in research, boys will be slightly older on average than girls in chronological age. The matter is made even more confusing due to the different developmental trajectories of girls and boys, with girls tending to mature more quickly than boys (Tanner 1978; Gullo & Burton 1992). It could be argued that comparisons using chronological age ignore sex differences in maturational tempo and result in comparing more mature girls to less mature boys (Eaton & Yu 1989), yet these complexities are infrequently considered in the literature on gender differences in academic performance.

Gender Differences in Academic Performance

Research on gender differences in academic performance tends to focus more on secondary school populations than on young children, but this is beginning to change as new data sources (such as the ECLS-K) have become available. Academic performance is measured either through standardized tests and other assessments or through school grades and report cards. The two measures capture different elements of academic performance and ability, as is evident by the generalization that males tend to obtain higher scores on standardized tests while females tend to get higher grades (Duckworth & Seligman 2006).

Test Scores. Gender differences in test scores have been the subject of much research for many decades. Maccoby & Jacklin's (1974) important book *The Psychology of Sex Differences* provided a comprehensive analysis of more than 1,600 studies in the areas of achievement, personality, and social relations and served to stimulate much interest and new research on gender differences in achievement in particular. Despite the large literature in this area (see Willingham & Cole 1997 for a review), disagreement remains on several fronts, including when in the life course gender differences in math performance emerge (Leahy & Guo 2001), whether males are more variable than females on measures of achievement (Willingham & Cole 1997), and whether sex differences in test scores are declining over time. Some researchers argue that gender gaps in test scores have narrowed in recent decades (Feingold 1988; Hyde et al. 1990) but on the basis of their meta-analysis of test results for writing, math, and science, Hedges & Nowell (1995) conclude that gender gaps in test scores have remained relatively stable over the past 30 years.

Results from various national and international large-scale assessments indicate that boys have higher test scores in mathematics and girls have higher test scores in reading (Baker &

Jones 1993; Beller & Gafni 1996; Nowell & Hedges 1998; Gallagher & Kaufman 2005; Marks 2007), but there is considerable cross-national variation in the size of these gaps. There is also a life-course component to gender differences in test scores; research consistently finds generally similar performance of girls and boys in mathematics and reading in the early grades and a growing male advantage in math scores and growing female advantage in reading scores as they move through school (Maccoby & Jacklin 1974; Willingham & Cole 1997). These gender-based performance differences persist in standardized tests, such as the SAT, used in higher education admissions, although they tend to be small and the distributions of male and female scores overlap substantially (Hyde 2005; Kobrin et al. 2007). But inferring gender differences in math and verbal abilities from gender differences in SAT scores is problematic because the sample of SAT test takers is not representative of the general population and because more females than males take the SAT, so the sample of males is more highly selected (Spelke 2005).

Some evidence suggests that gender gaps in test scores are more pronounced among low income children (Hinshaw 1992) but results are not definitive. For example, Entwisle et al. (2007) find that while girls and boys start first grade with similar reading scores, a female-favorable gap in reading emerges by fifth grade, but only for children from economically disadvantaged families; middle and high income boys and girls had very similar reading scores. On the other hand, with nationally-representative data, T.A. DiPrete & J. Booher-Jennings (unpublished observations) find that girls have higher reading scores than boys across all levels of socioeconomic status.

Grades and behaviors related to school success. Girls have long obtained higher grades in school than boys. Even in the 1950s and 1960s girls earned higher grades than boys and had higher class standing in high school (Alexander & Eckland 1974; Alexander & McDill 1976;

Mickelson 1989). Today, at all levels of schooling from kindergarten through high school and even in college, girls earn higher grades than boys in all major subjects, including math and science (Perkins et al. 2004).

As early as kindergarten, girls have better reading skills than boys (West et al. 2001; Tach & Farkas 2006) and boys continue to have more problems with reading in elementary school (Trzesniewski et al. 2006). Boys are overrepresented in populations with reading disabilities, antisocial behavior, mental retardation, attention disorders, dyslexia, stuttering and delayed speech (Halpern 1997; Muter 2003; Rutter et al. 2004). Moffitt et al. (2001) find that males are at higher risk for anti-social behavior that is neuro-developmental in origin, but for anti-social behavior that originates in the context of social relationships, gender differences are negligible. Trzesniewski et al. (2006) demonstrate that for boys, antisocial behavior and reading difficulties go hand in hand, with antisocial behavior leading to poor reading skills and vice versa. Emotional and behavioral problems early in childhood also contribute to educational outcomes later in life, such as the likelihood of repeating a grade in secondary school, completing high school, and enrolling in college (Shanahan 2000; McLeod & Kaiser 2004).

Girls also have advantages in social skills and classroom behavior. Analyses of ECLS-K data find that as early as kindergarten, “boys display more developmental disabilities, more disruptive conduct in class and less positive orientations to learning activities” (Zill & West 2001). For example, according to parent and teacher reports, twice as many boys as girls have difficulty paying attention in kindergarten, and girls are more often demonstrate persistence in completing tasks and an eagerness to learn. These female advantages in orientation to learning and other social skills grow larger during the early elementary school years and plausibly account for a portion of the more rapid reading gains that girls achieve during this period (T.A

DiPrete & J. Booher-Jennings, unpublished observations). During adolescence, high school teachers consistently rate girls as putting forth more effort and as being less disruptive than boys (Downey & Vogt Yuan 2005). Relative to adolescent boys, adolescent girls possess higher levels of other non-cognitive skills such as attentiveness and organizational skills (Farkas et al. 1990; Jacob 2002), self-discipline (Silverman 2003; Duckworth & Seligman 2006), leadership qualities and interest in school, all of which facilitate academic success (Rosenbaum 2001). These gender differences in non-cognitive skills may be central in explaining why boys get higher test scores in some domains but girls generally get higher grades. Farkas et al. (1990) show that teachers' judgments of student non-cognitive characteristics are powerful determinants of course grades even when cognitive performances are controlled.

Finally, where females once lagged behind males in the rigor of their high school coursework, they now outpace males. Until recently, girls trailed boys in the number and intensity of the mathematics courses they took, but this gender gap in access to opportunities to learn mathematics has narrowed considerably (Catsambis 1994, 2005). Today boys and girls take equally demanding math classes in high school, and in those courses girls get better grades (Gallagher & Kaufman 2005). Female high school graduates are more likely to have taken biology and chemistry courses than males (Xie & Shauman 2003). Girls have also come to outpace boys in the number of college preparatory courses and Advanced Placement (AP) examinations they take (Bae et al. 2000; Freeman 2004). Girls are more involved in extracurricular activities than boys, with the notable exception of participation on athletic teams (Bae et al. 2000) and participate in more cultural activities within and outside of school (Dumais 2002). All of these advantages are related to both academic success in high school and the

likelihood of enrolling in college and ultimate educational attainment, as we discuss in detail below.

EXPLAINING GENDER GAPS FROM KINDERGARTEN TO HIGH SCHOOL

In the search for explanations of gender inequalities, sociological research tends to ignore biological differences and focus solely on social and economic factors (Huber 2008, this volume). As Halpern and colleagues point out: “Opponents of the idea that biology has contributed even a small part to male and female differences are quick to label biological explanations as sexist...[but] biological hypotheses are not necessarily sexist. There does not have to be a ‘smarter sex’ with a ‘better biology’ to conclude that there are biological origins to any cognitive ability” (Halpern et al. 2005:53). Some sex differences in some cognitive tasks are well established. Spelke (2005:953) summarizes the nuanced patterns of cognitive differences as follows: “girls and women tend to excel on tests of verbal fluency, arithmetic calculation, and memory for the spatial locations of objects. Boys and men tend to excel on tests of verbal analogies, mathematical word problems, and memory for the geometric configuration of an environment.” Nonetheless, compared to larger, more reliable sex differences in measures of motor behavior, sexuality and aggression, sex differences in cognition are small, leading Spelke to conclude that males and females have equal aptitude for mathematics and science.

Larger sex differences in performance on complex quantitative tasks emerge during or after elementary school and grow larger with age making it “difficult to tease apart the biological and social factors that produce them” (Spelke 2005:953). Indeed, much evidence indicates that intrinsic capacities and environmental experiences play interrelated roles in the complex process

of learning (Dehaene 1997; Spelke & Newport 1998; Halpern 2000). Research that focuses exclusively on social and environmental factors provides an incomplete picture of the complex nature of gender differences in educational performance. For example, T.A. DiPrete & J. Booher-Jennings (unpublished observations) show that the standard set of socioeconomic and demographic variables cannot explain gender differences in social development in kindergarten.

There are also longstanding questions of how traditional gender stereotypes and norms influence students' perceptions of their own abilities and the socialization of girls and boys within their families and schools. One interesting line of research regarding the relevance of stereotypes examines the relationship between stereotype threat, or the fear of conforming to stereotypes about a subgroup to which one belongs, and women's poorer performance on math tests. Steele and colleagues argue that because of conventional notions that men outperform women on standardized tests, especially in mathematics, women experience a heightened anxiety during test taking that interferes with their test performance (Steele 1997; Spencer et al. 1999).

Of course it has long been known that many aspects of one's family of origin are integrally related to both educational performance and attainment. Aside from the potential role of family background and educationally-relevant resources, which we discuss in greater detail below, some studies find differences in parental involvement depending on the gender of the child. Stevenson & Baker (1987) found that parents are more involved in school activities with sons and more involved in home activities with daughters; as children grow older, parental involvement with boys declines but their involvement with girls remains constant. Muller (1998) finds that parental involvement in children's schooling is not gender specific and further speculates that parental involvement may even serve to counteract gender stereotypes about math and science as male domains. On the other hand, Entwisle et al. (2007) maintain that the large

growth in the gender reading score gap between first and fifth grade among low income students is due in part to parents' lower reading expectations of boys. Similarly, Mandara (2006) proposes that certain parenting styles, such as those lacking an authoritative component, exacerbate gender differences in education among African Americans. The empirical basis for all these claims is questionable for the simple reason that parenting styles and parental expectations may be responsive to the personalities and behavior of children, and thus be consequences rather than causes of gender differences. Research designs for measuring the causal influence of parental behavior on children uncontaminated by the responsiveness of parental behavior to the characteristics of their children are rare in this literature.

Research on gender gaps in educational performance have also looked to teachers and the environments within schools and classrooms for possible explanations. In the past, girls and boys were often allocated to different tracks in high school (Hallinan & Sorensen 1987; Entwisle et al. 1994) but today, as noted above, girls and boys course taking patterns are more similar. The female advantage in grades is not due to females taking easier courses in high school (Leonard & Jiang 1999) or college (Buchmann & DiPrete 2006).

There is an ongoing, contentious debate regarding whether teachers systematically favor one gender over the other, though the identity of the putative "victim" gender has changed over time. Research based on classroom observation in the early 1990s talked about "How Schools Shortchange Girls," with teachers calling on and praising boys more often than girls (American Association of University Women 1992; Sadker & Sadker 1994) only to be followed more recently by arguments that schools favor girls and contribute to a "War Against Boys" (Sommers 2000).

The empirical evidence on whether and how the gender of teachers plays a role in causing gender differences in educational outcomes is inconclusive. Some large scale studies find that males perform no better when taught by male teachers than by female teachers (Sokal et al. 2007). In contrast, Dee (2005, 2006) finds that having a female teacher instead of a male teacher in the subjects of science, social studies, and English in middle school raises the achievement of girls and lowers the achievement of boys, producing an overall gender gap of 8 percent of a standard deviation (Dee 2006:70). However, it is by no means clear whether these effects arise from gender bias in teaching or whether they demonstrate that the effectiveness of instruction is partly a matter of fit and that students learn more on average from teachers of the same gender. Moreover, because the students in Dee's sample were not randomly assigned to teachers, it is possible that male students with low performance were assigned to male teachers as a strategy for improving their performance (Sokal et al. 2007).

From High School to College

One of the most striking features of statistics on college going in recent years is the growing gap between men and women. Young women consistently outperform their male peers in high school graduation, college entry and college completion. Trend statistics in the United States reflect a striking reversal of a gender gap in college completion that once favored males. In 1960, 65% of all bachelor degrees were awarded to men. Women continued to lag behind men in college graduation rates until 1982 when they reached parity with men. From 1982 onward the percentage of bachelor's degrees awarded to women continued to climb such that by 2005 women received 58% of all bachelor's degrees (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES] 2007) and comprised 56% of all college students. The US Department of Education predicts the "new" female-favorable gaps in college enrollment and completion will continue to

widen over the next decade. The probability of completing college is contingent on many factors, including the likelihood of finishing high school, the timing of transition to college, the type of college attended, and the course of study while in college. A growing body of research demonstrates that women now gain an advantage over men from most of these contingencies.

We limit our discussion to gender inequalities in the quantity of education received, or what Charles & Bradley (2002) have termed *the vertical dimension* of educational stratification. Gender differences in fields of specialization (major) and type of institution (elite vs. non-elite, public vs. private) represent distinctions of the type of education received within a given level of education, or *the horizontal dimension* of segregation. Although women outnumber men overall in their college attendance and graduation rates, we still need to consider questions regarding differences in the college experiences of men and women. Despite their greater numerical representation, are women concentrated in less prestigious institutions and in less well-remunerated fields of study? Or are their growing numbers accompanied by advances into more lucrative occupations? Gerber & Cheung (2008) address these questions in detail in their review of gender differences in horizontal stratification in this volume.

The Transition from High School to College

In the United States, completing high school is the first step to gaining access to postsecondary education. Many youth are excluded from the pool of eligible college students because they have not completed high school. The “status dropout rate” reflects the percentage of people ages 16-24 who are not enrolled in high school and who have not earned a high school diploma or a Certificate of General Educational Development (GED). Since 1990, the status dropout rate of females has been lower than that of males. During the 1990s it appeared that male and female dropout rates were becoming similar but since 1996, female dropout rates

declined further and the gap widened again. In 2005, almost 11% of males age 16-24 were dropouts, compared to 8% of females (NCES 2007). Dropout rates vary substantially by ethnic group, but the male disadvantage holds for all major groups. In 2005, male dropout rates for whites, blacks and Hispanics were 6, 12, and 26 percent respectively, compared to female dropout rates of 5% for whites, 9% for blacks, and 18% for Hispanics (NCES 2007). Among high school graduates, more males than females acquire a GED, which is an indicator of a lower level of college preparedness than a traditional high school diploma (S. Dynarski, unpublished observations).

Students who enroll in college directly after high school have higher rates of overall college enrollment, persistence in college, and graduation (Bozick & DeLuca 2005; Horn & Premo 1995). While men used to be more likely than women to enroll in college directly after high school, since 1996 the reverse has been true: males are substantially more likely than females to not enroll or delay enrollment in college. In 2000, 66% of women compared to 60% of men enrolled in college immediately after high school (Freeman 2004). The female advantage in immediate college enrollment holds for all socioeconomic status groups, though it is smaller for those of high SES backgrounds (King 2000; Bozick & DeLuca 2005).

The proportion of both men and women enrolling in college has increased since the 1970s, but the increase for women has been much more substantial. In 2005, women comprised 57% of all students at degree granting institutions (NCES 2007). Among low-income students, young women are roughly 25% more likely than young men to enroll in some form of postsecondary education (Jacob 2002:589).

Completing College

Women currently earn 58% percent of all bachelor's degrees awarded in the United States (NCES 2007). The female advantage in degree completion exists for all racial groups, but there are important variations by race and ethnicity in the size of the gap. It is largest for blacks but it is also large for Hispanics and Native Americans. Women earn 66% of all bachelor's degrees awarded to blacks; the figures are 61% for Hispanics, 60% for Native Americans, 55% for Asians and 57% for whites (NCES 2007). Note that the especially large gender gap for blacks does not constitute a reversal but, rather, a continuation of a long female favorable trend. As early as 1954, when the great majority of black college students were enrolled in historically black colleges and universities (HCBUs), women comprised 58% of students enrolled in HCBUs. When the Census Bureau began tracking bachelor's degrees by race and gender in 1974, women earned 57% of all degrees awarded to blacks (*Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* 1999:7).

Beyond the United States, higher proportions of females than males currently attain tertiary education in most European countries as well as in Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. Among the 30 member nations of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the once prevalent male advantage in college completion has disappeared in all but four countries -- Switzerland, Turkey, Japan and Korea (OECD 2006).

In the United States, one major reason that women earn more degrees than men is their lower rate of dropout, once enrolled (Buchmann & DiPrete 2006). Women also earn their degrees more quickly than do men. Freeman (2004) found 66% of women who enrolled in college in 1995-96 had completed a bachelor's degree by 2001 as compared to only 59% of men. Men were more likely to have no degree and to not be enrolled but they were also more likely to still be enrolled in a bachelor's degree program than women. While 50% of black and Hispanic

women had completed a bachelor's degree in this period, only 37% of black men and 43% of Hispanic men had done so.

Finally, women have made substantial gains in graduate and professional degrees. In 1970, women earned 40% of master's degrees and a mere 14% of doctorate degrees. Currently, women are more likely than men to attend graduate school and they earn 59% of master's degrees and 49% of doctorate degrees (NCES 2007). Similar trends have occurred within professional degrees. In 1970, women earned 5% of law degrees, 8% of medical degrees, and 1% of dentistry degrees (Freeman 2004). Currently, women earn 49% of law degrees, 47% of medical degrees, and 44% of dentistry degrees (NCES 2007).

EXPLAINING GENDER GAPS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The reversal from a male advantage to a female one in college enrollment and completion is an important topic of study both in its own right and because of its potential impacts on labor markets, marriage markets, family formation, and other arenas. Clearly, understanding the nature, causes and consequences of the changing gender gaps in higher education is an important task for social scientists. This section focuses on individual and institutional explanations for the rising female advantage in higher education. In addition to discussing the findings of research in this emerging area, we discuss other plausible explanations, some of which have not been assessed empirically to date, even though they are often current topics for speculation in the popular press.

Individual-level Factors

Status attainment and rational choice perspectives primarily focus on family or individual-level explanations for variations in postsecondary enrollment. Status attainment theory examines differences in access to resources, broadly defined, related to attending and

completing college. Rational choice perspectives consider how incentives and constraints shape individuals' decisions regarding whether or not to attain higher education. Those individuals for whom the benefits of attending college exceed the costs, including opportunity costs, should be most likely to attain a college degree (but see Beattie 2002). These perspectives overlap, and both are useful for advancing our understanding of gender disparities in transitions into and out of higher education.

Family Resources. A large body of research in the fields of sociology, much of it in the status attainment tradition, (Blau & Duncan 1967; Jencks 1972), and economics (Liebowitz 1977; Becker 1991) demonstrates the importance of parental education and other family-related resources for an individual's educational attainment. Resources related to family background exert their influence at each level of educational attainment, partly through academic performance, and partly through educational transitions, given performance. Resources such as financial capital, social capital, access to role models, mentors and information, individual attitudes (especially aspirations), and prior academic performance are important determinants of inequalities in educational attainment. These resources, which are amassed from family, neighborhood and school environments, are an important part of the explanation for ethnic and racial differences in educational attainment in particular; children of different race and ethnicity come from families, neighborhoods, and schools with different average levels of resources. Girls and boys, however, are not segregated by family or neighborhood, and in the US generally they are not segregated by school. Resources may be an important part of explanation for the historical male advantage in educational attainment, but that resource story concerns the process by which environmentally available resources differentially flow to one gender or another. Moreover, with gender inequality changing so rapidly, it is likely that gender-specific flows of

resources have changed considerably over the past 50 years, and therefore, we must treat the results of published research in this area as historically contingent.

Even when girls and boys share the same household, family resources need not be equally distributed across sons and daughters. For example, socialization arguments emphasize the importance of role modeling, i.e., that children model their parents as they form their own educational and occupational aspirations and attainment. Some scholars argue that role modeling is sex specific, such that girls look more to their mothers and boys more to their fathers as they develop their educational and occupational aspirations (Rosen & Aneshensel 1978). According to this perspective, after controlling for the overall educational level of the parents, daughters should do relatively better in households with a better-educated mother than in households with a better-educated father and sons should be affected more negatively than daughters by the absence of a father in the home.

Buchmann & DiPrete (2006) find that the relationship between family background and college completion has changed for men and women over the second half of the 20th century. In cohorts born before the mid-1960s, the gender gap favoring males was small or nonexistent and daughters were able to reach parity with sons only in the minority of families with two college-educated parents. Parents with less education (high school or less) appeared to favor sons over daughters and the gender gap in college completion favoring males was largest among these less-educated families. For cohorts born after the mid-1960s, the male advantage declined and even reversed in households with less-educated parents or those with an absent father. This change produced a situation where the female advantage emerged first among families with absent or less-educated fathers. It remains largest there, but has gradually extended to all family types. These findings offer little support for gender-role socialization; instead Buchmann & DiPrete

(2006) argue that the pattern reflects a growing vulnerability of sons of less-educated or absent fathers.

Academic Performance. Gender differences in academic performance and behaviors during high school discussed above are likely related to the female advantage in college enrollment and completion, but research has not sorted out all the mechanisms that link performance in high school with college outcomes. Perhaps females' higher aspirations to attend college explain, in part, their greater performance in high school. In 1980 more male than female high-school seniors (60% vs. 54%) expected to graduate from four-year college, but by 2001 82% of female high-school seniors compared to 76% of male high-school seniors expected to do so (Freeman 2004:66). The reversal of the gender gap in educational expectations from one favoring males to one favoring females is not limited to the United States, in nearly all OECD-member countries young women are more likely to expect to attend college than their male counterparts (Buchmann & Dalton 2002; McDaniel 2007).

At the same time, females' higher educational aspirations and higher college graduation rates likely stem from the female advantage in academic performance that develops over the educational career. Some research finds that the female-favorable gap in postsecondary enrollment is due in part to young women's better grades and tests scores and the greater number of math and science courses they take in high school (Goldin et al. 2006; Cho 2007) as well as their tendency to spend more time on homework and avoid disciplinary problems (Jacob 2002) relative to their male counterparts. Gender differences in high school behaviors also lay the foundation for women's better academic performance in college, which in turn plays a large role in producing the female advantage in college completion (Buchmann & DiPrete 2006).

Incentives and Returns to College. Differences in the returns to attending and completing college also may play an important role in shaping individual decisions regarding how much education to acquire. One plausible reason for the rising rates of women's college enrollment and completion is that the returns to college have been rising more for women than for men. Research finds that while women's wage returns to higher education have increased, male returns have increased even more rapidly, due to declining opportunities for high-wage, male-dominated manufacturing jobs for high-school educated workers (Averett & Burton 1996; Charles & Luoh 2003; Perna 2003). But DiPrete & Buchmann (2006) argue that wage returns comprise too narrow a basis for evaluating the relative returns to higher education for men and women. They assess whether the growing female advantage in college completion is related to changes in the returns to higher education for women and men in terms of earnings, the probability of getting married and staying married, the family standard of living, and insurance against poverty. Via a trend analysis of the value of higher education for each of these outcomes measured against the baseline value of a high school education, they find that standard-of-living and insurance-against-poverty returns to higher education have risen faster for women than for men. Thus it is plausible that the female-favorable trend in college completion may derive at least in part from student responses to gender-specific changes in the value of higher education.

DiPrete & Buchmann (2006) show that the total returns to a college degree have also risen for men, albeit not as rapidly as for women. For men the rise is driven partly by the well-known rising return to education in the labor market. Moreover, the earnings value of a spouse to men has risen as female earnings have risen and the financial vulnerability of men to divorce has risen (McManus & DiPrete 2001). Arguably, one puzzling aspect of the reversal of the gender gap in college completion is the slow pace of growth in men's rates of college completion

even in the face of rising returns to college for men. Research suggests a socialization-based disadvantage for males that is relatively stronger in families with low-educated or absent fathers (Buchmann & DiPrete 2006). But whether this disadvantage plays out through a lack of knowledge about the value of postsecondary education and the way to convert it to success in the labor market, through a lower priority placed on education relative to other perhaps short-term goals, or through some other mechanism is not yet clear.

Institutional Factors

Beyond the factors that shape individuals' resources and incentives to attain a college education, institutional-level factors also likely shape gendered patterns of college access and success. These include socio-cultural changes in gender roles and expectations about life-course trajectories for women and men. Shifts in the structure of the labor market such as declining discrimination against women and changes in occupational sex-segregation also impact individual incentives to attend college, as do changes in institutions of higher education themselves, such as the growth of community colleges, the rising costs of higher education, and changes in financial aid regulations. We also need to consider the role of the military, which may compete with higher education for young adults, especially young men, in shaping gender-specific patterns of participation in higher education.

Gender Role Attitudes. In the US, there have been large changes in gender-role attitudes in recent decades with the clear trend of declining numbers of Americans expressing support for traditional gender roles and far greater numbers expressing more egalitarian views (Brewster & Padavic 2000; Brooks & Bolzendahl 2004). Recent research finds support for a causal relationship between gender-role attitudes and subsequent behaviors and attitudes as diverse as childbearing (Kaufman 2000), voting behavior (Brooks 2000) and marital satisfaction (Amato &

Booth 1995). Changes in gender-role attitudes are also related to the rise college attendance of young women, but in complex ways and coupled with other factors (DiPrete & Buchmann 2006; Goldin 2006). Goldin et al. (2006) show that young women's rising expectations for future employment encouraged them to attend and complete college, but a rapid rise in the median age of first marriage among college students in recent decades also played a role. While higher rates of college completion and rising rates of graduate/professional education likely contributed to the rising median age of first marriage, the rising age of first marriage also probably reinforced the rising trend in college completion; as women married later, they could take college more seriously and form their identities before getting married and having a family. The access of reliable contraception in the form of the birth control pill positively impacted women's college attendance and a host of related factors, including their age of first marriage, professional labor force participation, and age at first birth (Goldin & Katz 2002; Goldin 2006).

Labor Markets. Important changes in the labor market in recent decades also have undoubtedly impacted women's choices to attend college. Between the 1970s and 1990s the gender wage gap declined. While women in all segments of the earnings distribution saw increases in their wages, women with high levels of human capital (in terms of education and labor force experience) saw the greatest increase in their wages (Spain & Bianchi 1996; Morris & Western 1999). Moreover, research indicates that returns to labor force experience increased by a larger amount for women than for men during this period (Blau & Kahn 1997), due to rising levels of women's human capital, but also due to the passage and enforcement of antidiscrimination laws (Goldin 2006). Occupational sex segregation also fell between 1970 and 1990, although the rate of decline slowed in the second decade (Morris & Western 1999). This meant that more women entered prestigious and often better paid positions in occupational

sectors such as law, business, and the sciences (Goldin 2006). All of these factors are related to women's rapidly rising rates of college enrollment and completion from the 1980s onward.

Educational Institutions. Changes in higher education institutions also may have altered the access or pathways to college in gender-specific ways. The second half of the 20th century witnessed the dramatic expansion of both the community college system and the 4-year college system. If community college serves as a springboard to enrollment and graduation from a 4-year college, the expansion of the community college system may have been responsible, in part, for the female-favorable trend in college completion. But Buchmann & DiPrete (2006) find that while women enroll in 2-year colleges at a slightly higher rate than men, the female advantage in 2-year college attendance has little impact on their advantage in 4-year college completion.

Other major changes in higher education have been the rising cost of tuition, declining levels of grant-based financial aid, and increases in student loans (Alon 2007). Cursory evidence suggests that women and men receive similar levels of financial support from their families (Jacobs 1999), but it is possible that changes in financial aid or the increasing cost of college are affecting men and women differently. Some recent research indicates that women are more responsive than men to programs that decrease college costs (Seftor & Turner 2002; S. Dynarksi, unpublished observations), suggesting that policies aimed at making college more affordable will exacerbate the female advantage in college enrollment. This is an important topic for further research.

Military Service. Finally, to what degree does the military compete with higher education for young adults, especially young men? The US military recruits about 200,000 enlisted personnel each year, almost all of whom are high school graduates. The size of the military has remained quite stable in the past 20 years; since 1975 it has comprised less than 1%

of the total population. In 2007, active duty personnel comprised almost 1.4 million people, 85% of whom are men (U.S. Department of Defense 2007). The enlisted population is disproportionately young, with more than 50% under the age of 25, so it is possible that military service competes with college as a destination for young adults, and especially young men. Yet, decisions to enlist in the military and to enroll in college need not be mutually exclusive. Many of the young people who enlist after high school cite the educational benefits that will be available to them to get a college education either during or after their military services as a primary motivation to enlist (Kleykamp 2006). Thus for some, military service may make enrolling in college possible, albeit at a later point in life. Moreover, of the 20,000 officers commissioned by the armed forces each year, nearly all are college graduates and about 40% received their commission through participation in a university's Reserve Officer Training Program (ROTC) (Segal & Segal 2004:8). For this group, military enlistment occurs after completing college.

Nonetheless, men who serve in the military receive less education than those who do not serve. Among high school graduates, veterans serving during the peacetime cold war period were less likely to attain a college education than were non-veterans at all levels of socioeconomic status (MacLean 2005). This difference held even among those who reported plans to attend college. It is possible that merely delaying college enrollment reduces the likelihood of attending or completing college, perhaps due to a sense that one has become "too old" for college, or perhaps because serious romantic involvement is more likely as one ages (Hogan 1981). It is not known whether military service reduces the likelihood of attaining a college degree or whether the military differentially selects young people who are less committed to post-secondary education (MacLean & Elder 2007). MacLean's (2005) findings

are at least consistent with the idea that military service competes with higher education for young men. To the best of our knowledge, no research has examined the relationship between military service and educational attainment for women or whether the effects of military service found in the past remain the same for military personnel today. These are important questions for future research.

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Gender inequalities in education have seen much change, with young women gaining advantages over young men in ways that could not have been anticipated just two decades ago. The future promises to bring more change than stability to the arena of gender inequalities in education. Throughout this paper we have highlighted some important questions for future research: How should research appropriately account for the different developmental trajectories of girls and boys when comparing them in terms of abilities and performance? Have gender differences in test scores declined over time? How can research examine the causal influences of parents' and teachers' perceptions and behaviors on children, when these perceptions and behaviors themselves are influenced by children's personalities and behaviors? Among those who enroll in college, why are young men less likely to enroll in college immediately after graduating high school? Why have men's rates of college completion apparently not kept pace with the rising returns to college for men? Do changes in college costs and the types of financial aid available affect men and women differently?

In addition to research designed to answer these questions, we believe there are three research agendas that would prove especially useful in advancing our understanding of gender inequalities in education.

1). Research needs to examine gender inequalities in education early in the life course: female-favorable trends in college enrollment and completion are likely due, in part, to gender differences in earlier childhood experiences. Recent important advances in biology, genetics, psychology, neuroscience, and other arenas (Kimura 1999; Halpern 2000; Cahill 2005; Spelke 2005) that shed light on gender differences in cognitive development and skills as well as non-cognitive abilities in early childhood. Sociologists would do well to become more educated about these advances, or they risk becoming increasingly irrelevant in the important public and scholarly debates about the intersection of biological and social factors related to gender differences that emerge early in childhood and gender differences more generally (Freese et al. 2002).

Data from new longitudinal surveys such as the ECLS-B, ECLS-K and the National Children's Study, some of which gather data on biological as well as psychosocial environmental influences on well-being will enable researchers to advance knowledge on gender differences in development, cognition and a wide range of other factors in the next decade. Sociologists' nearly exclusive focus on the social and economic determinants of behavior may change as an interdisciplinary group of scholars increasingly attends to the potential importance of gene-environment interactions and interactions between the social environment and a variety of psychobiological systems (Adam et al. 2007) More than ever, the study of gender differences in early childhood must be an interdisciplinary enterprise, with connected efforts in sociology, psychology, biology, neuroscience, genetics and other disciplines.

2). There is a great need for research on how the structure and practices of schooling relate to gender differences in educational outcomes. For example, the National Association for Single-Sex Public Education reports that, as of April 2006, at least 223 public schools in the

United States were offering gender-separate educational opportunities, up from just 4 in 1998. Most of these cases involved coeducational schools with single-sex classrooms, but 44 were wholly single-sex schools (Dee 2006). It would not be surprising to learn that this rise in single-sex schooling has developed in response to public concerns about boys' poor academic performance gaining attention on magazine covers (e.g., "The Problem With Boys" Newsweek 2006) and bestselling books like *Raising Cain: Protecting the Emotional Lives of Boys* (Kindlon & Thompson 2000). Single-sex schooling may be a reasonable policy response to the underperformance of boys, but to implement such massive changes to any educational system without empirically-based assessments of the consequences of such changes is shortsighted. For example, recent research by Wong et al. (2002) on Hong Kong schools found that girls do better in single-sex classrooms while boys do better in mixed-sex classrooms. Other research shows that the performance of both boys and girls improves when the proportion of female students in the classroom increases (Hoxby 2000; Lavy & Schlosser 2007). These studies suggest that an increase in single-sex schooling might exacerbate rather than ameliorate the relative underachievement of boys.

3). Future research must investigate gender differences by race, ethnicity, SES and immigrant status. Such research should attend to vulnerable segments of the population and males who may particularly at risk for poor performance and low educational attainment. A rare example of such work is Nancy Lopez's (2003) ethnographic study of 66 low-income, second generation Dominican, West Indian and Haitian young adults who grew up in New York City during the 1970s-1990s. Through her interviews, Lopez finds that gendered norms within families, including those that provide strong social controls and responsibilities for daughters and but more lax regulations and too much independence for sons, can put sons and daughters within

the same family on very different educational pathways. Other important evidence on how gender differences may be conditioned by race and socioeconomic status comes from the work of Entwisle et al. (2007) who find that gender gap in reading at the start of elementary school is greater for children from disadvantaged backgrounds than for children from non-disadvantaged backgrounds. These studies should serve as exemplars for future research that examines the intersectionality of gender with race, ethnicity, class, and immigrant statuses in creating complex patterns of inequalities in educational experiences and outcomes.

In sum, there is much that is not understood about the nature, causes and consequences of the changing gender gaps in education across the life course. The rapidly shifting terrain of gender inequalities raise important questions for researchers, policy makers, and educators who want to understand how to improve the educational performance and attainment of all youth – males and females alike – and for educational institutions striving to respond to the needs of their students. Clearly, much work remains to be done.

LITERATURE CITED

- Adam E, Klimes-Dougan B, Gunnar MR. 2007. Social regulation of the adrenocortical response to stress in infants, children, and adolescents: implications for psychopathology and education. In *Human Behavior, Learning, and the Developing Brain: Atypical Development*, ed. D Coch, G Dawson, KW Fischer, 264-304. 2nd ed. New York: Guilford
- Alexander KL, Eckland BK. 1974. Sex differences in the educational attainment process. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 39(5):668-82
- Alexander KL, Entwisle DR, Dauber SL. 2003. *On the Success of Failure: A Reassessment of the Effects of Retention in the Primary School Grades*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Alexander KL, McDill E. 1976. Selection and allocation within schools: some causes and consequences of curriculum placement. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 41(6):963-80
- Alon S. 2007. The influence of financial aid in leveling group differences in graduating from elite institutions. *Econ. Educ. Rev.* 26(3):296-311
- Amato PR, Booth A. 1995. Changes in gender role attitudes and perceived marital quality. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 60(1):58-66
- American Association University Women. 1992. *How Schools Shortchange Girls*. Washington, DC: AAUW & Natl. Educ. Assoc.
- Averett S, Burton ML. 1996. College attendance and the college wage premium: differences by gender. *Econ. Educ. Rev.* 15(1):37-49
- Bae Y, Choy S, Geddes C, Sable J, Snyder T. 2000. *Trends in Educational Equity of Girls and Women*. Washington, DC: Natl. Cent. Educ. Stat.

- Baker DP, Jones DP. 1993. Creating gender equality: cross-national gender stratification and mathematical performance. *Sociol. Educ.* 66(2):91-103
- Beattie IR. 2002. Are all adolescent econometricians created equal? Race, class, and gender differences in college enrollment. *Sociol. Educ.* 75(1):19-43
- Becker G. 1991. *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Beller M, Gafni N. 1996. The 1991 international assessment of educational progress in mathematics and sciences: the gender differences perspective. *J. Educ. Psych.* 88(2):365-77
- Blau FD, Kahn LM. 1997. Swimming upstream: trends in the gender wage differential in the 1980s. *J. Lab. Econ.* 15(1):1-42
- Blau PM, Duncan OD. 1967. *The American Occupation Structure*. New York: John Wiley
- Bozick R, DeLuca S. 2005. Better late than never? Delayed enrollment in the high school to college transition. *Soc. Forces* 84(1):527-50
- Brewster K, Padavic I. 2000. Change in gender-ideology, 1977-1996: the contributions of intracohort change and population turnover. *J. Marr. Fam.* 62(2):477-87
- Brooks C. 2000. Civil rights liberalism and the suppression of a republic political realignment in the United States, 1972 to 1996. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 65(4):483-505
- Brooks C, Bolzendahl C. 2004. The transformation of US gender role attitudes: cohort replacement, social-structural change and ideological learning. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 33(1):106-133
- Buchmann C, Dalton B. 2002. Interpersonal influences and educational aspirations in 12 countries: the importance of institutional context. *Sociol. Educ.* 75(2):99-122

- Buchmann C, DiPrete TA. 2006. The growing female advantage in college completion: the role of family background and academic achievement. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 71(4): 515-41
- Buchmann C, Hannum E. 2001. Education and stratification in developing countries: a review of theories and research. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 27:77-102
- Cahill L. 2005. His brain, her brain. *Sci. Am.* 292(5):40-47
- Catsambis S. 1994. The path to math: gender and racial-ethnic differences in mathematics participation from middle school to high school. *Sociol. Educ.* 67(3):199-215
- Catsambis S. 2005. The gender gap in mathematics: merely a step function? See Gallagher and Kaufman 2005, pp. 220-45
- Charles KK, Luoh MC. 2003. Gender differences in completed schooling. *Rev. Econ. Stat.* 85(3):559-77
- Charles M, Bradley K. 2002. Equal but separate? A cross-national study of sex segregation in higher education. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 67(4):573-99
- Cho D. 2007. The role of high school performance in explaining women's rising college enrollment. *Econ. Educ. Rev.* 26(4):450-62
- Dee T. 2005. A teacher like me: does race, ethnicity or gender matter? *Am. Econ. Rev.* 95(2):158-65
- Dee T. 2006. The why chromosome: how a teacher's gender affects boys and girls. *Educ. Next* (Fall):69-75
- Dehaene S. 1997. *The Number Sense: How the Mind Creates Mathematics*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- DiPrete TA, Buchmann C. 2006. Gender-specific trends in the values of education and

- the emerging gender gap in college completion. *Demography* 43(1):1-24
- Downey DB, Vogt Yuan AS. 2005. Sex differences in school performance during high school: puzzling patterns and possible explanations. *Sociol. Q.* 46(2):299-321
- Duckworth AL, Seligman MEP. 2006. Self-discipline gives girls the edge: gender in self-discipline, grades, and achievement test scores. *J. Educ. Psych.* 98(1):198-208
- Dumais SA. 2002. Cultural capital, gender, and school success: the role of habitus. *Sociol. Educ.* 75(1):44-68
- Eaton WO, Yu AP. 1989. Are sex differences in child motor activity level a function of sex differences in maturational status? *Child Dev.* 60(4):1005-11
- Entwisle DR, Alexander KL, Olson LS. 1994. The gender gap in math: its possible origins in neighborhood effects. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 59(6):822-38
- Entwisle DR, Alexander KL, Olson LS. 2007. Early schooling: the handicap of being poor and male. *Sociol. Educ.* 80(2):114-38
- Farkas G, Grobe RP, Sheehan D, Shuan Y. 1990. Cultural resources and school success: gender, ethnicity, and poverty groups within an urban school district. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 55(1):127-42
- Feingold A. 1988. Cognitive gender differences are disappearing. *Am. Psychol.* 43(2):95-103
- Freeman CE. 2004. *Trends in Educational Equity for Girls and Women*. Washington, DC: Natl. Cent. Educ. Stat.
- Freese J, Li JA, Wade LD. 2003. The potential relevances of biology to social inquiry. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 29:233-56

- Gallagher AM, Kaufman JC, ed. 2005. *Gender Differences in Mathematics: an Integrative Psychological Approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Gerber T, Cheung SY. 2008. Horizontal stratification in post-secondary education: forms, explanations, and implications. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 34
- Goldin C. 2006. The quiet revolution that transformed women's employment, education, and family. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 96(2):1-21
- Goldin C, Katz LF. 2002. The power of the pill: oral contraceptives and women's career and marriage decisions. *J. Pol. Econ.* 110(4):730-70
- Goldin C, Katz LF, Kuziemko I. 2006. The homecoming of American college women: the reversal of the college gender gap. *J. Econ. Persp.* 20(4):133-56
- Goldrick-Rab S. 2006. Following their every move: an investigation of social class differences in college pathways. *Sociol. Educ.* 79(1):61-79
- Graue ME, Perna J. 2000. Redshirting and early retention: who gets the "gift of time" and what are its outcomes? *Am. Educ. Res. J.* 37(2):509-34
- Gullo DF, Burton CB. 1992. Age of entry, preschool experience and sex as antecedents of academic readiness in kindergarten. *Early Childhood Res. Q.* 7(2):175-86
- Hallinan MT, Sorensen AB. 1987. Ability grouping and sex differences in mathematics achievement. *Sociol. Educ.* 60(2):63-72
- Halpern DF. 1997. Sex differences in intelligence: implications for education. *Am. Psychol.* 52(10):1091-1102
- Halpern DF. 2000. *Sex Differences in Cognitive Ability*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

- Halpern DF, Wai J, Saw A. 2005. A psychobiosocial model: why females are sometimes greater than and sometimes less than males in math achievement. See Gallagher and Kaufman 2005, pp. 48-72
- Hedges LV, Nowell A. 1995. Sex differences in mental test scores, variability, and numbers of high-scoring individuals. *Science* 269(5220):41-5
- Hinshaw SP. 1992. Externalizing behavior problems and academic underachievement in childhood and adolescence: causal relationships and underlying mechanisms. *Psychol. Bull.* 111(1):127-55.
- Hogan DP. 1981. *Transitions and Social Change: The Early Lives of American Men*. New York: Academic
- Horn LJ, Premo MD. 1995. *Profile of Undergraduates in US Postsecondary Education Institutions: 1992-93, with an Essay on Undergraduates at Risk*. Washington, DC: Natl. Cent. Educ. Stat.
- Hoxby C. 2000. *Peer effects in the classroom: learning from gender and race variation*. Work. Pap., Natl. Bur. Econ. Res., Cambridge, MA
- Huber J. 2008. Prefatory. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 34
- Hyde JS. 2005. The gender similarities hypothesis. *Am. Psychol.* 60(6):581-92
- Hyde JS, Fennema E, Ryan M, Frost LA, Hopp C. 1990. Gender comparisons of mathematics attitudes and affect: a meta-analysis. *Psych. Women Q.* 14(3):299-342
- Jacob BA. 2002. Where the boys aren't: non-cognitive skills, returns to school and the gender gap in higher education. *Econ. Educ. Rev.* 21:589-98
- Jacobs JA. 1996. Gender inequality and higher education. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 22:153-85

- Jacobs JA. 1999. Gender and the stratification of colleges. *J. High. Educ.* 70(2):161-87
- Jacobs JA, King RB. 2002. Age and college completion: a life-history analysis of women aged 15-44. *Sociol. Educ.* 75(3):211-30
- Jacobs JA, Stoner-Eby S. 1998. Adult enrollment and educational attainment. *Annals Am. Acad. of Poli. Soc. Sci.* 559(1):91-108
- Jencks C. 1972. *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*. New York: Basic
- J. Blacks Higher Educ.* 1999. Special report: college degree awards: the ominous gender gap in African American higher education. 23:6-9
- Kaufman G. 2000. Do gender role attitudes matter? Family formation and dissolution among traditional and egalitarian men and women. *J. Fam. Issues* 21(1):128-44
- Kimura D. 1999. *Sex and Cognition*. Cambridge: MIT Press
- Kindlon D, Thompson M. 1999. *Raising Cain: Protecting the Emotional Life of Boys*. New York: Ballantine
- King EM, Hill MA. 1993. *Women's Education in Developing Countries: Barriers, Benefits, and Policies*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press
- King J. 2000. *Gender Equity in Higher Education*. Washington, DC: Am. Council Educ.
- Kleykamp MA. 2006. College, jobs, or the military? Enlistment during a time of war. *Soc. Sci. Q.* 87(2):272-90
- Kobrin JL, Sathy V, Shaw EJ. 2007. *A Historical View of Subgroup Performance Differences on the SAT Reasoning Test*. New York: College Board
- Kraft RH, Nickel LD. 1995. Sex-related differences in cognition: development during early childhood. *Learning Ind. Diff.* 7(3):249-71

- Lavy V, Schlosser A. 2007. *Mechanisms and impacts of gender peer effects at school*.
Work. Pap., Natl. Bur. Econ. Res., Cambridge, MA
- Leahey E, Guo G. 2001. Gender differences in mathematical trajectories. *Soc. Forces*
80(2):713-32
- Leibowitz A. 1977. Parental inputs and children's achievement. *J. Hum. Res.* 12(2):242-
51
- Leonard DK, Jiang J. 1999. Gender bias and the college predictions of the SATs: a cry of
despair. *Res. Higher Ed.* 40(4):375-407
- Lopez N. 2003. *Hopeful Girls, Troubled Boys: Race and Gender Disparity in Urban
Education*. New York: Routledge
- Maccoby EE, Jacklin CN. 1974. *The Psychology of Sex Differences*. Palo Alto, CA:
Stanford Univ. Press
- MacLean A. 2005. Lessons from the cold war: military service and college education.
Sociol. Educ. 78(3):250-66
- MacLean A, Elder GH. 2007. Military service in the life course. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.*
33:175-96
- Malone LM, West J, Denton KF, Park J. 2006. *The Early Reading and Mathematics
Achievement of Children Who Repeated Kindergarten or Who Began School a
Year Late*. Washington DC: Natl. Cent. Educ. Stat.
- Mandara J. 2006. The impact of family functioning on African American male's
academic achievement: a review and clarification of the empirical literature.
Teacher's Coll. Rec. 108(2):206-23
- Marks GN. 2007. Accounting for the gender gap in reading and mathematics:

- evidence from 31 countries. *Oxford Rev. Educ.* 34(1):1-21
- McDaniel AE. 2007. Gender gaps in educational and occupational expectations across 30 industrialized countries: A study of similarities and differences. Unpublished Master's Thesis. The Ohio State Univ.
- McLeod JD, Kaiser K. 2004. Childhood emotional and behavioral problems and educational attainment. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 69(5):636-58
- McManus P, DiPrete TA. 2001. Losers and winners: the financial consequences of divorce for men. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 66(2):246-68
- Mickelson RA. 1989. Why does Jane read and write so well? The anomaly of women's achievement. *Sociol. Educ.* 62(1):47-63
- Moffitt TE, Caspi A, Rutter M, Silva PA. 2001. *Sex Differences in Antisocial Behavior: Conduct Disorder, Delinquency, and Violence in the Dunedin Longitudinal Study*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Morris M, Western B. 1999. Inequality in earnings at the close of the twentieth century. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 25:623-57
- Muller C. 1998. Gender differences in parental involvement and adolescents' mathematics achievement. *Sociol. Educ.* 71(3):336-56
- Muter V. 2003. *Early Reading Development and Dyslexia*. London: Whurr
- NCES. 2007. *Digest of Educational Statistics*. Washington, DC: US Govt. Printing Off.
- Nowell A, Hedges LV. 1998. Trends in gender differences in academic achievement from 1960 to 1994: an analysis of differences in mean, variance, and extreme scores. *Sex Roles* 39(1-2):21-43
- OECD. 2006. *Education at a glance: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD

- Pallas AM. 2003. Educational transitions, trajectories and pathways. *In Handbook of the Life Course*, ed. JT Moritmer, MJ Shanahan, 8:165-84. New York: Kluwer Academic
- Perkins R, Kleiner B, Roey S, Brown J. 2004. *The High School Transcript Study: A Decade of Change in Curricula and Achievement, 1990-2000*. Washington, DC: Natl. Cent. Educ. Stat.
- Perna LW. 2003. The private benefits of higher education: an examination of the earnings premium. *Res. Higher Educ.* 44(4):451-72
- Rosen BC, Aneshensel CS. 1978. Sex differences in the educational-occupational expectation process. *Soc. Forces* 57(1):164-86
- Rosenbaum J. 2001. *Beyond College for All: Career Paths for the Forgotten Half*. New York: Russell Sage
- Rutter M, Caspi A, Fergusson D, Horwood J, Goodman R, et al. 2004. Sex differences in developmental reading disability. *J. Am. Med. Ass.* 291: 2007-12
- Sadker M, Sadker D. 1994. *Failing at Fairness: How America's Schools Cheat Girls*. New York: Maxwell Macmillan
- Seftor N, Turner S. 2002. Back to school: federal student aid policy and adult college enrollment. *J. Hum. Res.* 37(2):336-52
- Segal DR, Segal MW. 2004. America's military population. *Pop. Bull.* 59(4) Washington, DC: Pop. Ref. Bur.
- Shanahan MJ. 2000. Pathways to adulthood in changing societies: variability and mechanisms in life course perspective. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 26:667-92
- Silverman IW. 2003. Gender differences in delay of gratification: a meta-analysis. *Sex*

- Roles* 49(9-10):451-63
- Sokal L, Katz H, Chaszewski L, Wojick C. 2007. Good-bye, Mr.Chips: male teacher shortages and boys' reading achievement. *Sex Roles* 56(9-10):651-59
- Sommers CH. 2000. *The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism is Harming our Young Men*. New York: Touchstone
- Spain D, Bianchi SM. 1996. *Balancing Act: Motherhood, Marriage and Employment among American Women*. New York: Russell Sage
- Spelke ES. 2005. Sex differences in intrinsic aptitude for mathematics and science? A critical review. *Am. Psychol.* 60(9):950-58
- Spelke ES, Newport E. 1998. Nativism, empiricism and the development of knowledge. In *Handbook of Child Psychology. Vol. 1: Theoretical Models of Human Development*, ed. W Damon, RM Lerner, 275-340. New York: Wiley
- Spencer SJ, Steele CM, Quinn DM. 1999. Stereotype threat and women's math performance. *J. Exp. Soc. Psych.* 35(1):4-28
- Steele CM. 1997. A threat in the air: how stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *Am. Psychol.* 52(6):613-29
- Stevenson DL, Baker DP. 1987. The family-school relation and the child's school performance. *Child Dev.* 58(5):1348-57
- Tach LM, Farkas G. 2006. Learning-related behaviors, cognitive skills, and ability grouping when schooling begins. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 35(4):1048-79
- Tanner JM. 1978. *Foetus into Man: Physical Growth from Conception to Maturity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Trzesniewski KH, Moffitt TE, Caspi A, Taylor A, Maughan B. 2006. Revisiting the

- association between reading achievement and antisocial behavior: new evidence of an environmental explanation from a twin study. *Child Dev.* 77(1):72-88
- U.S. Dep. Defense. 2006. *Population Representation in the Military Services, Fiscal Year 2005*. Washington DC: US Govt. Printing Off.
- West J, Denton K, Reaney L. 2000. *The Kindergarten Year*. Washington, DC: Natl. Cent. Educ. Stat.
- Willingham WW, Cole SE. 1997. *Gender and fair assessment*. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Wong KC, Lam YR, Ho LM. 2002. The effects of schooling on gender differences. *Brit. Educ. Res. J.* 28(6):827-43
- Xie Y, Shauman KA. 2003. *Women in Science: Career Processes and Outcomes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Zill N, West J. 2001. *Entering Kindergarten: A Portrait of American Children When They Begin School: Findings from the Condition of Education 2000*. Washington DC: Natl. Cent. Educ. Stat.

KEY TERMS

Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten Cohort (p5)

ECLS-K follows a cohort of children in kindergarten in 1998-99 through eighth grade.

Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Birth Cohort (p29)

ECLS-B follows a cohort of children from their birth in 2001 through kindergarten entry.

National Children's Study (p29)

Will follow 100,000 children from birth to age 21 in order to study environmental and biological impacts on health and development.

ANNOTATED REFERENCES

Freeman CE. 2004. *Trends in Educational Equity for Girls and Women*. Washington, DC: Natl. Cent. Educ. Stat.

Report on women's status in education from preprimary school through college and later life outcomes

Freese J, Li JA, Wade LD. 2003. The potential relevances of biology to social inquiry. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 29:233-56

Argues sociology can benefit by acknowledging the contributions of biology

Gallagher AM, Kaufman JC, ed. 2005. *Gender Differences in Mathematics: an Integrative Psychological Approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
Overview of knowledge on gender differences in math including social, psychological, and biological influences

Jacobs JA. 1996. Gender inequality and higher education. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 22:153-85
An earlier review of women's access to higher education, college experiences, and postcollegiate outcomes

Spelke ES. 2005. Sex differences in intrinsic aptitude for mathematics and science? A critical review. *Am. Psychol.* 60(9):950-58
Summarizes literature on possible biological predispositions to math and science ability

Willingham WW, Cole NS. 1997. *Gender and fair assessment*. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Examines how test constructs, cohorts, samples, and score variability influence gender differences in test scores

Zill N, West J. 2001. *Entering Kindergarten: A Portrait of American Children When They Begin School: Findings from the Condition of Education 2000*. Washington DC: Natl. Cent. Educ. Stat.

Compares boys' and girls' school readiness, developmental difficulties, and behavior in kindergarten

ISERP Working Papers

2007

- 07-14:** “Intergenerational Influences of Wealth in Mexico,” Florencia Torche, Sociology, NYU, Seymour Spilerman, Sociology, Columbia University
- 07-13:** “Transfers from Migrants to their Children: Evidence that Altruism and Cultural Factors Matter,” François-Charles Wolff, Economics, Université de Nantes, NYU, Seymour Spilerman, Sociology, Columbia University, Claudine Attias-Donfut, Research Department, Caisse National d’Assurance Vieillesse
- 07-12:** “Household Wealth in Latin America,” Florencia Torche, Sociology, NYU, Seymour Spilerman, Sociology, Columbia University
- 07-11:** “Theoretical Formulations and Research Strategies in Sociology,” Seymour Spilerman, Sociology, Columbia University, Emanuele Gerratana, Economics, KOC University
- 07-10:** “Fiscal Spillovers between Local Governments: Keeping up with the Joneses’ School District,” Randall Reback, Barnard Economics, Columbia University
- 07-09:** “Long-Term Effects of a Recession at Labor Market Entry in Japan and the United States,” Yuji Genda, Institute of Social Science, University of Tokyo, Ayako Kondo, ISERP Graduate Fellow, Economics, Columbia University, Souichi Ohta, Economics, Keio University
- 07-08:** “Simultaneous Estimation of Hedonic Equations with Unbalanced Data,” Valerie A. Mueller, Earth Institute, Columbia University, Glenn Sheriff, School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University
- 07-07:** “Poverty Analysis Based on Kernel Density Estimates from Grouped Data,” Camelia Minoiu, Economics, Columbia University
- 07-06:** “Does Gaming the System Affect Students’ Academic Achievement?” Jennifer Booher-Jennings, Sociology, Columbia University, Andrew A. Beveridge, Sociology, Queens College and CUNY Graduate Center
- 07-05:** “Differential Effects of Graduating During a Recession across Race and Gender,” Ayako Kondo, Economics, Graduate Fellow, ISERP, Columbia University
- 07-04:** “PowerPoint Demonstrations: Digital Technologies of Persuasion,” David Stark, Sociology, Columbia University, Verena Paravel, Center on Organizational Innovation, ISERP, Columbia University
- 07-03:** “No Entiendo: The Effects of Bilingualism on Hispanic Earnings,” Jeronimo Cortina, Political Science, Columbia University, Rodolfo de la Garza, Political Science and International Affairs and Public Affairs, Columbia University, Pablo Pinto, Political Science, Columbia University
- 07-02:** “The Assessment of Poverty and Inequality through Parametric Estimation of Lorenz Curves,” Camelia Minoiu, Economics, Columbia University, Sanjay Reddy, Barnard Economics
- 07-01:** “Implementing Second-Best Environmental Policy under Adverse Selection,” Glenn Sheriff, School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University

2006

06-01: “The Impact of Parental Marital Disruption on Children’s Performance in School,” Christopher Weiss, ISERP, Columbia University, Kathleen Foley, University of Pennsylvania

06-02: “The Choice of Index Number: Part I, Valuation and Evaluation,” Sanjay Reddy, Barnard Economics, Benjamin Plener, Yale University

06-03: “Real Income Stagnation of Countries, 1960-2001,” Sanjay Reddy, Barnard Economics, Camelia Minoiu, Economics, Columbia University

06-04: “Chinese Poverty: Assessing the Impact of Alternative Assumptions,” Sanjay Reddy, Barnard Economics, Camelia Minoiu, Economics, Columbia University

06-05: “Spaghetti Politics,” Paolo Parigi, Sociology, Columbia University, Peter Bearman, Sociology, Columbia University

06-06: “Attention Felons: Evaluating Project Safe Neighborhoods in Chicago,” Andrew Papachristos, University of Chicago, Tracey Meares, University of Chicago, Jeffrey Fagan, Law, Columbia University

06-07: “Dynamics of Political Polarization,” Delia Baladassarri, Columbia University, Peter Bearman, Columbia University

06-08: “Why do Some Countries Produce So Much More Output per Worker than Others?” Emmanuel Pikoulakis, University of Hull Business School, Camelia Minoiu, Economics, Columbia University

06-09: “Trivers-Willard at Birth and One Year: Evidence from U.S. Natality Data 1983-2001,” Douglas Almond, Economics, Columbia University, Lena Edlund, Economics, Columbia University

06-10: “Forecasting House Seats from General Congressional Polls,” Robert Erikson, Political Science, Columbia University

06-11: “From Drafts to Checks: The Evolution of Correspondent Banking Networks and the Formation of the Modern U.S. Payments System, 1850-1914,” John James, Economics, University of Virginia, David Weiman, Economics, Barnard College, and History, Columbia University

2005

05-01: “Social Construction of Flows: Price Profiles Across Producers Gear to Market Context Upstream, Downstream and Cross-Stream,” Harrison White, Sociology, Columbia University

05-02: “Temporality and Intervention Effects: Trajectory Analysis of a Homeless Mental Health Program,” Mary Clare Lennon, Public Health, Columbia University, William McAllister, ISERP, Li Kuang, Public Health, Columbia University, Daniel Herman, Public Health, Columbia University

05-03: “Do Parents Help More Their Less Well-off Children?: Evidence from a Sample of Migrants to France,” François-Charles Wolff, Université de Nantes, Seymour Spilerman, Sociology, Columbia University, and Claudine Attias-Donfut, Caisse Nationale d’Assurance Vieillesse

05-04: "Politics, Public Bads, and Private Information," Glenn Sheriff, International and Public Affairs, Columbia University

05-05: "Determinants of Justification and Indulgence," Ran Kivetz, School of Business, Columbia University, Yuhuang Zheng, School of Business, Columbia University

05-06: "Political Competition and Policy Adoption: Market Reforms in Latin American Public Utilities," Victoria Murillo, International and Public Affairs, Columbia University, Cecilia Martinez-Gallardo, Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económica

05-07: "In Search of Lost Memories: Domestic Spheres and Identities in Roman Amheida, Egypt," Anna Lucille Boozer, Anthropology, ISERP Graduate Fellow, Columbia University

05-08: "Global Links, Local Roots: Varieties of Transnationalization and Forms of Civic Integration," David Stark, Sociology, Columbia University, Balazs Vedres, Central European University, Laszlo Bruszt, European University Institute

05-09: "Socio-Technologies of Assembly: Sense-Making and Demonstration in Rebuilding Lower Manhattan," Monique Girard, ISERP, Columbia University, David Stark, Sociology, Columbia University

2004

04-01: "Reducing Bias in Treatment Effect Estimation in Observational Studies Suffering from Missing Data," Jennifer Hill, International and Public Affairs, Columbia University

04-02: "Production Markets Broker Upstream to Downstream, balancing their volume and quality sensitivities to firms through an oriented market profile of signals," Harrison C. White, Sociology, Columbia University

04-03: "Measuring Economic Disadvantage During Childhood: A Group-Based Modeling Approach," Robert L. Wagmiller, Jr., SUNY Buffalo, Mary Clare Lennon, Public Health, Columbia University, Philip M. Alberti, Public Health, Columbia University, and J. Lawrence Aber, New York University

04-04: "Policymaking and Caseload Dynamics: Homeless Shelters," William McAllister, ISERP, and Gordon Berlin, Columbia University

04-05: "Fresh Starts: School Form and Student Outcomes," Christopher Weiss, ISERP, Columbia University and Peter S. Bearman, Sociology, ISERP, Columbia University

04-06: "Parental Wealth Effects On Living Standards and Asset Holdings: Results From Chile," Florencia Torche, Sociology, Queens College, Center for the Study of Wealth and Inequality, Columbia University and Seymour Spilerman, Sociology, Center for the Study of Wealth and Inequality, Columbia University

04-07: "Routes into Networks: The Structure of English Trade in the East Indies, 1601-1833," Emily Erikson, Sociology, ISERP, Columbia University and Peter Bearman, Sociology, ISERP, Columbia University

2003

03-01: “The Plasticity of Participation: Evidence From a Participatory Governance Experiment,” Shubham Chaudhuri, Economics, Columbia University, and Patrick Heller, Sociology, Brown University

03-02: “Factional Politics and Credit Networks in Revolutionary Vermont,” Henning Hillmann, Sociology, Columbia University

03-03: “ ‘Active Patients’ in Rural African Health Care: Implications for Welfare, Policy and Privatization,” Kenneth L. Leonard, Economics, Columbia University

03-04: “Living at the Edge: America’s Low-Income Children and Families,” Hsien-Hen Lu, Public Health, Columbia University, Julian Palmer, YOUNGHWAN SONG, Economics, Union College, Mary Clare Lennon, Public Health, Columbia University, Lawrence Aber, Public Health, Columbia University

2002

02-01: “Alternative Models of Dynamics in Binary Time-Series-Cross-Section Models: The Example of State Failure,” Nathaniel Beck, Political Science, UC San Diego, David Epstein, Political Science, Columbia, Simon Jackman, Political Science, Stanford and Sharyn O’Halloran, Political Science, Columbia

02-03: “Link, Search, Interact: The Co-Evolution of NGOs and Interactive Technology,” Jonathan Bach, Center on Organizational Innovation, Columbia University and David Stark, Center on Organizational Innovation, Columbia University

02-04: “Chains of Affection: The Structure of Adolescent Romantic and Sexual Networks,” Peter Bearman, Institute for Social and Economic Research and Policy, Columbia University, James Moody, Sociology, Ohio State, Katherine Stovel, Sociology, University of Washington

02-05: “Permanently Beta: Responsive Organization in the Internet Era,” Gina Neff, Center on Organizational Innovation (COI), Columbia University, and David Stark, Center on Organizational Innovation (COI), Columbia University

02-06: “Negotiating the End of Transition: A Network Approach to Political Discourse Dynamics, Hungary 1997,” Balázs Vedres, Columbia University, Péter Csígó, Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales

02-07: “The Influence of Women and Racial Minorities Under Panel Decision-Making in the U.S. Court of Appeals,” Sean Farhang, Political Science, Columbia University, Gregory Wawro, Political Science, Columbia University

02-08: “The Role of Effort Advantage in Consumer Response to Loyalty Programs: The Idiosyncratic Fit Heuristic” Ran Kivetz, Business, Columbia University, Itamar Simonson, Business, Stanford University

2001

01-01: “Pathways of Property Transformation: Enterprise Network Careers in Hungary, 1988-2000 Outline of an Analytic Strategy,” David Stark, Sociology, Columbia and Balázs Vedres, Sociology, Columbia

01-02: “Policy Space and Voting Coalitions in Congress: the Bearing of Policy on Politics, 1930-1954,” Ira Katznelson, John Lapinski, and Rose Razaghan, Political Science, Columbia

01-03: “Doing Fractions: An Analysis of Partisan ship in Post-Socialist Russia,” Andrew D. Buck, Sociology, Columbia

01-04: “Opposite-Sex Twins and Adolescent Same-Sex Attraction,” Peter Bearman, Sociology/ISERP and Hannah Brückner, Sociology, Yale

01-05: “On the Uneven Evolution of Human Know-How,” Richard R. Nelson, Business/SIPA, Columbia

01-06: “Self-Control for the Righteous: Toward a Theory of Luxury Pre-Commitment,” Ran Kivetz, Business, Columbia and Itamar Simonson, Business, Stanford

01-07: “Distributing Intelligence and Organizing Diversity in New Media Projects,” Monique Girard, ISERP, Columbia and David Stark, Sociology, Columbia

01-08: “Agricultural Biotechnology’s Complementary Intellectual Assets,” Gregory D. Graff, Agricultural and Resource Economics, Berkeley, Gordon C. Rausser, Agricultural Economics, Berkeley and Arthur A. Small, SIPA/Earth Institute, Columbia

For copies of ISERP Working Papers
Visit http://www.iserp.columbia.edu/research/working_papers/
write to iserp@columbia.edu or call 212-854-3081



ISERP

INSTITUTE FOR
SOCIAL AND
ECONOMIC
RESEARCH
AND POLICY

Institute for Social and Economic Research and Policy
Columbia University in the City of New York
420 West 118th Street
8th Floor, Mail Code 3355
New York, NY 10027
Tel: 212-854-3081
Fax: 212-854-8925
Email: iserp@columbia.edu
www.iserp.columbia.edu

EDITORIAL BOARD

Karen Barkey, Sociology
Peter Bearman, Sociology/ISERP
Alan Brinkley, History
Alessandra Casella, Economics
Ester Fuchs, Political Science/SIPA
John Huber, Political Science
Ira Katznelson, Political Science/History
Herbert Klein, History
Mary Clare Lennon, Sociomedical Sciences
Mahmood Mamdani, Anthropology/SIPA
Marianthi Markatou, Biostatistics
William McAllister, ISERP
Kathryn Neckerman, ISERP
Richard Nelson, Business/SIPA
Elliott Sclar, Urban Planning/SIPA
Seymour Spilerman, Sociology
Charles Tilly, Sociology
Harrison White, Sociology

ADMINISTRATION

Peter Bearman, Director
Kathryn Neckerman, Associate Director
Amira Ibrahim, Assistant Director