

DM 1 – Women in STEM

DOCUMENT 1	DOCUMENT 2	DOCUMENT 3	DOCUMENT 4
An infographic summing up a report on the diversity gap in Silicon Valley Tech companies, released by Boston Consulting Group, 2015	Opinion Piece written by Rebecca Wang a graduate student in engineering, <i>The Stanford Daily</i> , Jan 2022	A guest essay written by Ginny Rometty, the former CEO of IBM, <i>The Economist</i> , March 2023	An opinion piece written collectively, for the analysis magazine <i>The Diplomatic Courier</i> , February 2023
<i>Shows all the stages at which women, Black and Latino people disappear along the education or the start-up route</i>	<i>Examines the transition from academia and industry for women and the reasons why women ‘disappear’</i>	<i>Draws on her personal experience at IBM to show the best ways to increase women’s access to good tech jobs</i>	<i>Examines the phenomenon of horizontal gender disparity, its effects and factors, and issues recommendations</i>
- Girls make up nearly half of the 5 to 17 population, Latinos almost a quarter and Black people just under 15% And yet - Women only account for 23 % (less than a quarter of positions in tech) Latinos for 5 % (the biggest drop) and Blacks for 5. > The discrepancy is even starker for board or leadership positions (where these groups are strikingly underrepresented) The retention rate is telling > Women but more significantly Blacks and Latinos are less or far less likely to stay in STEM Despite the parity in the age group and despite the fact that women outnumber men in undergraduate studies overall, they make up only 20% of STEM students in high school and even less in engineering major. - The dropout rate is higher for Latinos and Blacks - The proportion of women and minorities in Start-ups is extremely low. - Two factors are outlined: - the founders tend to employ people who just like them - venture capitalism is based on recognisable patterns > reproduction of the same mode	At school (= school includes higher education) she felt she could cope with gender disparity - in undergraduate and graduate engineering classes, proportion of female students just below / around 20% - felt she could manage gender disparity / deal with being different - at school being successful meant getting good grades: objective evaluation of one’s work But difficult experience of her internship - internship in space tech company - was the only woman or one of a handful of women depending on the services (anyway below 10 %) - felt she did not belong / out of place - felt that it could affect her performance - quandary / dilemma (1 31 – 35 and 1 38 – 40) > Accept the jokes and different treatment or fight to be treated like a man > Stay and face the difficulties / low prospects or leave and contribute to the “leaking” - was tempted to leave the field / the sector Examines the factors leading women to disappear - Choice or result of discrimination? - results of a study: > lack of interest small factor > “socialised out of STEM” bec of - Lower salaries - Fewer advancement prospects - Family matters - Impact of lack of representation - feels at work the way you are evaluated & viewed is more subjective / biased - feels she needs more role models in graduate school More needs to be done. Urgently to tackle unequal representation	Blunt assessment of economic and employment inequalities faced by women - pay gap (77% of what men earn on average) - underrepresentation (20% in engineering and tech jobs) > less financial stability and possibility to provide for their family Tells her personal success story to show how women can flourish in STEM - maths at school ; engineering at university (only woman); gained a scholarship from GM - worked her way up at IBM from basic engineering job to CEO Has learned the best ways to boost women’s access to best tech jobs - give up the four-year degree requirement and aim to recruit on people’s skills and aptitude instead > 60% of people don’t have 4-year degree so ‘degree inflation’ deprives them of opportunities > positions filled more quickly then (she gives one ex at IBM) > resulted in very significant rise in employees from underrepresented groups - create more education options - New programme developed: high school + applied science degree in 6 years: shorter / more applied (P-tech programme?) - develop more apprenticeships schemes even in such fields > Other companies should do the same / develop similar schemes Giving women more career opportunities in tech and STEM is essential for a society - They no longer must feel ‘discouraged, overlooked, derailed ‘ > disheartened / dispirited / scared / discouraged > ignored, disregarded, slighted, failed, bypassed > unsuccessful, a failure	Quick remark about the fact that women outperform men at school - HOWEVER Two persisting trends: Horizontal gender segregation Underrepresentation of women in STEM - 30% of female undergrads in STEM, 20% in ICT - the argument about less mathematical abilities does not stand > so key question: what are the socio-psychological factors behind gender disparities in STEM Why those disparities matter - it contributes to the gender pay gap (since tech jobs are better paid on average) - it is worse if low retention rate because less women get higher better-paid positions - it worsens the already concerning labor shortage in the ever-growing tech sector (> crucial to attract underrepresented groups to fill gaps) - it affects innovation: less diverse STEM workers means less adapted products What’s behind them? (what the research shows) - stereotypical representations: STEM associated with masculinity / women with good results in maths less feminine (☹️) - these stereotypes cause fear and underperformance - so girls pursue studies and careers in fields which they THINK correspond to their strength and is more valued for girls (language / humanities) What they recommend - fight the stereotypes by providing encouragement and role models - better support (mentoring / encouragement at home and school / gender specific actions) - Explain that studying and working in STEM can be combined with lagge and humanities

DOCUMENT 1	DOCUMENT 2	DOCUMENT 3	DOCUMENT 4
An infographic summing up a report on the diversity gap in Silicon Valley Tech companies, released by Boston Consulting Group, 2015	Opinion Piece written by Rebecca Wang a graduate student in engineering, <i>The Stanford Daily</i> , Jan 2022	A guest essay written by Ginny Rometty, the former CEO of IBM, <i>The Economist</i> , March 2023	An opinion piece written collectively, for the analysis magazine <i>The Diplomatic Courier</i> , February 2023
<i>Shows all the stages at which women, Black and Latino people disappear along the education or the start-up route</i>	<i>Examines the transition from academia and industry for women and the reasons why women 'disappear'</i>	<i>Draws on her personal experience at IBM to show the best ways to increase women's access to good tech jobs</i>	<i>Examines the phenomenon of horizontal gender disparity, its effects and factors, and issues recommendations</i>
- Girls make up nearly half of the 5 to 17 population, Latinos almost a quarter and Black people just under 15% And yet - Women only account for 23 % (less than a quarter of positions in tech) Latinos for 5 % (the biggest drop) and Blacks for 5. > The discrepancy is even starker for board or leadership positions (where these groups are strikingly underrepresented) • The retention rate is telling > Women but more significantly Blacks and Latinos are less or far less likely to stay in STEM • Despite the parity in the age group and despite the fact that women outnumber men in undergraduate studies overall, they make up only 20% of STEM students in high school and even less in engineering major. The dropout rate is higher for Latinos and Blacks • The proportion of women and minorities in Start-ups is extremely low. Two factors are outlined: - the founders tend to employ people who just like them - venture capitalism is based on recognisable patterns > reproduction of the same mode	At school (= school includes higher education) she felt she could cope with gender disparity - in undergraduate and graduate engineering classes, proportion of female students just below / around 20% - felt she could manage gender disparity / deal with being different - at school being successful meant getting good grades: objective evaluation of one's work But difficult experience of her internship - internship in space tech company - was the only woman or one of a handful of women depending on the services (anyway below 10 %) - felt she did not belong / out of place - felt that it could affect her performance quandary / dilemma (1 31 – 35 and 1 38 – 40) > Accept the jokes and different treatment or fight to be treated like a man > Stay and face the difficulties / low prospects or leave and contribute to the "leaking" - was tempted to leave the field / the sector Examines the factors leading women to disappear - Choice or result of discrimination? - results of a study: > lack of interest small factor > "socialised out of STEM" bec of - Lower salaries - Fewer advancement prospects - Family matters - Impact of lack of representation - feels at work the way you are evaluated & viewed is more subjective / biased - feels she needs more role models in graduate school More needs to be done. Urgently to tackle unequal representation	Blunt assessment of economic and employment inequalities faced by women - pay gap (77% of what men earn on average) - underrepresentation (20% in engineering and tech jobs) > less financial stability and possibility to provide for their family Tells her personal success story to show how women can flourish in STEM - maths at school ; engineering at university (only woman); gained a scholarship from GM - worked her way up at IBM from basic engineering job to CEO Has learned the best ways to boost women's access to best tech jobs - give up the four-year degree requirement and aim to recruit on people's skills and aptitude instead > 60% of people don't have 4-year degree so 'degree inflation' deprives them of opportunities > positions filled more quickly then (she gives one ex at IBM) > resulted in very significant rise in employees from underrepresented groups create more education options - New programme developed: high school + applied science degree in 6 years: shorter / more applied (P-tech programme?) develop more apprenticeships schemes even in such fields > Other companies should do the same / develop similar schemes Giving women more career opportunities in tech and STEM is essential for a society - They no longer must feel 'discouraged, overlooked, derailed ' > disheartened / dispirited / scared / discouraged > ignored, disregarded, slighted, failed, bypassed > unsuccessful, a failure	Quick remark about the fact that women outperform men at school - HOWEVER Two persisting trends: Horizontal gender segregation Underrepresentation of women in STEM 30% of female undergrads in STEM, 20% in ICT - the argument about less mathematical abilities does not stand > so key question: what are the socio-psychological factors behind gender disparities in STEM Why those disparities matter - it contributes to the gender pay gap (since tech jobs are better paid on average) - it is worse if low retention rate because less women get higher better-paid positions - it worsens the already concerning labor shortage in the ever-growing tech sector (> crucial to attract underrepresented groups to fill gaps) - it affects innovation: less diverse STEM workers means less adapted products What's behind them? (what the research shows) - stereotypical representations: STEM associated with masculinity / women with good results in maths less feminine (☹) - these stereotypes cause fear and underperformance - so girls pursue studies and careers in fields which they THINK correspond to their strength and is more valued for girls (language / humanities) What they recommend - fight the stereotypes by providing encouragement and role models - better support (mentoring / encouragement at home and school / gender specific actions) - Explain that studying and working in STEM can be combined with lagge and humanities

DOCUMENT 1	DOCUMENT 2	DOCUMENT 3	DOCUMENT 4
An infographic summing up a report on the diversity gap in Silicon Valley Tech companies, released by Boston Consulting Group, 2015	Opinion Piece written by Rebecca Wang a graduate student in engineering, <i>The Stanford Daily</i> , Jan 2022	A guest essay written by Ginny Rometty, the former CEO of IBM, <i>The Economist</i> , March 2023	An opinion piece written collectively, for the analysis magazine <i>The Diplomatic Courier</i> , February 2023
<i>Shows all the stages at which women, Black and Latino people disappear along the education or the start-up route</i>	<i>Examines the transition from academia and industry for women and the reasons why women 'disappear'</i>	<i>Draws on her personal experience at IBM to show the best ways to increase women's access to good tech jobs</i>	<i>Examines the phenomenon of horizontal gender disparity, its effects and factors, and issues recommendations</i>
- Girls make up nearly half of the 5 to 17 population, Latinos almost a quarter and Black people just under 15% And yet - Women only account for 23 % (less than a quarter of positions in tech) Latinos for 5 % (the biggest drop) and Blacks for 5. > The discrepancy is even starker for board or leadership positions (where these groups are strikingly underrepresented) • The retention rate is telling > Women but more significantly Blacks and Latinos are less or far less likely to stay in STEM • Despite the parity in the age group and despite the fact that women outnumber men in undergraduate studies overall, they make up only 20% of STEM students in high school and even less in engineering major. The dropout rate is higher for Latinos and Blacks • The proportion of women and minorities in Start-ups is extremely low. Two factors are outlined: - the founders tend to employ people who just like them - venture capitalism is based on recognisable patterns > reproduction of the same mode 	• At school (= school includes higher education) she felt she could cope with gender disparity - in undergraduate and graduate engineering classes, proportion of female students just below / around 20% - felt she could manage gender disparity / deal with being different - at school being successful meant getting good grades: objective evaluation of one's work • But difficult experience of her internship - internship in space tech company - was the only woman or one of a handful of women depending on the services (anyway below 10 %) - felt she did not belong / out of place - felt that it could affect her performance - quandary / dilemma (131 – 35 and 138 – 40) > Accept the jokes and different treatment or fight to be treated like a man > Stay and face the difficulties / low prospects or leave and contribute to the "leaking" - was tempted to leave the field / the sector • Examines the factors leading women to disappear - Choice or result of discrimination? - results of a study: > lack of interest small factor > "socialised out of STEM" bec of - Lower salaries - Fewer advancement prospects - Family matters - Impact of lack of representation - feels at work the way you are evaluated & viewed is more subjective / biased - feels she needs more role models in graduate school • More needs to be done. Urgently to tackle unequal representation	• Blunt assessment of economic and employment inequalities faced by women - pay gap (77% of what men earn on average) - underrepresentation (20% in engineering and tech jobs) > less financial stability and possibility to provide for their family • Tells her personal success story to show how women can flourish in STEM - maths at school ; engineering at university (only woman); gained a scholarship from GM - worked her way up at IBM from basic engineering job to CEO • Has learned the best ways to boost women's access to best tech jobs - give up the four-year degree requirement and aim to recruit on people's skills and aptitude instead > 60% of people don't have 4-year degree so 'degree inflation' deprives them of opportunities > positions filled more quickly then (she gives one ex at IBM) > resulted in very significant rise in employees from underrepresented groups - create more education options - New programme developed: high school + applied science degree in 6 years: shorter / more applied (P-tech programme?) - develop more apprenticeships schemes even in such fields > Other companies should do the same / develop similar schemes • Giving women more career opportunities in tech and STEM is essential for a society - They no longer must feel 'discouraged, overlooked, derailed ' > disheartened / dispirited / scared / discouraged > ignored, disregarded, slighted, failed, bypassed > unsuccessful, a failure	• Quick remark about the fact that women outperform men at school - HOWEVER • Two persisting trends: Horizontal gender segregation Underrepresentation of women in STEM - 30% of female undergrads in STEM, 20% in ICT - the argument about less mathematical abilities does not stand > so key question: what are the socio-psychological factors behind gender disparities in STEM • Why those disparities matter - it contributes to the gender pay gap (since tech jobs are better paid on average) - it is worse if low retention rate because less women get higher better-paid positions - it worsens the already concerning labor shortage in the ever-growing tech sector (> crucial to attract underrepresented groups to fill gaps) - it affects innovation: less diverse STEM workers means less adapted products • What's behind them? (what the research shows) - stereotypical representations: STEM associated with masculinity / women with good results in maths less feminine (☹) - these stereotypes cause fear and underperformance - so girls pursue studies and careers in fields which they THINK correspond to their strength and is more valued for girls (language / humanities) • What they recommend - fight the stereotypes by providing encouragement and role models - better support (mentoring / encouragement at home and school / gender specific actions) - Explain that studying and working in STEM can be combined with lagge and humanities

DOCUMENT 1	DOCUMENT 2	DOCUMENT 3	DOCUMENT 4
An infographic summing up a report on the diversity gap in Silicon Valley Tech companies, released by Boston Consulting Group, 2015	Opinion Piece written by Rebecca Wang a graduate student in engineering, <i>The Stanford Daily</i> , Jan 2022	A guest essay written by Ginny Rometty, the former CEO of IBM, <i>The Economist</i> , March 2023	An opinion piece written collectively, for the analysis magazine <i>The Diplomatic Courier</i> , February 2023
<i>Shows all the stages at which women, Black and Latino people disappear along the education or the start-up route</i>	<i>Examines the transition from academia and industry for women and the reasons why women 'disappear'</i>	<i>Draws on her personal experience at IBM to show the best ways to increase women's access to good tech jobs</i>	<i>Examines the phenomenon of horizontal gender disparity, its effects and factors, and issues recommendations</i>
- Girls make up nearly half of the 5 to 17 population, Latinos almost a quarter and Black people just under 15% And yet - Women only account for 23 % (less than a quarter of positions in tech) Latinos for 5 % (the biggest drop) and Blacks for 5. > The discrepancy is even starker for board or leadership positions (where these groups are strikingly underrepresented) The retention rate is telling > Women but more significantly Blacks and Latinos are less or far less likely to stay in STEM Despite the parity in the age group and despite the fact that women outnumber men in undergraduate studies overall, they make up only 20% of STEM students in high school and even less in engineering major. - The dropout rate is higher for Latinos and Blacks - The proportion of women and minorities in Start-ups is extremely low. - Two factors are outlined: - the founders tend to employ people who just like them - venture capitalism is based on recognisable patterns > reproduction of the same mode	At school (= school includes higher education) she felt she could cope with gender disparity - in undergraduate and graduate engineering classes, proportion of female students just below / around 20% - felt she could manage gender disparity / deal with being different - at school being successful meant getting good grades: objective evaluation of one's work But difficult experience of her internship - internship in space tech company - was the only woman or one of a handful of women depending on the services (anyway below 10 %) - felt she did not belong / out of place - felt that it could affect her performance - quandary / dilemma (1 31 – 35 and 1 38 – 40) > Accept the jokes and different treatment or fight to be treated like a man > Stay and face the difficulties / low prospects or leave and contribute to the “leaking” - was tempted to leave the field / the sector Examines the factors leading women to disappear - Choice or result of discrimination? - results of a study: > lack of interest small factor > “socialised out of STEM” bec of - Lower salaries - Fewer advancement prospects - Family matters - Impact of lack of representation - feels at work the way you are evaluated & viewed is more subjective / biased - feels she needs more role models in graduate school More needs to be done. Urgently to tackle unequal representation	Blunt assessment of economic and employment inequalities faced by women - pay gap (77% of what men earn on average) - underrepresentation (20% in engineering and tech jobs) > less financial stability and possibility to provide for their family Tells her personal success story to show how women can flourish in STEM - maths at school ; engineering at university (only woman); gained a scholarship from GM - worked her way up at IBM from basic engineering job to CEO Has learned the best ways to boost women's access to best tech jobs - give up the four-year degree requirement and aim to recruit on people's skills and aptitude instead > 60% of people don't have 4-year degree so ‘degree inflation’ deprives them of opportunities > positions filled more quickly then (she gives one ex at IBM) > resulted in very significant rise in employees from underrepresented groups - create more education options - New programme developed: high school + applied science degree in 6 years: shorter / more applied (P-tech programme?) - develop more apprenticeships schemes even in such fields > Other companies should do the same / develop similar schemes Giving women more career opportunities in tech and STEM is essential for a society - They no longer must feel ‘discouraged, overlooked, derailed ‘ > disheartened / dispirited / scared / discouraged > ignored, disregarded, slighted, failed, bypassed > unsuccessful, a failure	Quick remark about the fact that women outperform men at school - HOWEVER Two persisting trends: Horizontal gender segregation Underrepresentation of women in STEM - 30% of female undergrads in STEM, 20% in ICT - the argument about less mathematical abilities does not stand > so key question: what are the socio-psychological factors behind gender disparities in STEM Why those disparities matter - it contributes to the gender pay gap (since tech jobs are better paid on average) - it is worse if low retention rate because less women get higher better-paid positions - it worsens the already concerning labor shortage in the ever-growing tech sector (> crucial to attract underrepresented groups to fill gaps) - it affects innovation: less diverse STEM workers means less adapted products What's behind them? (what the research shows) - stereotypical representations: STEM associated with masculinity / women with good results in maths less feminine (☹) - these stereotypes cause fear and underperformance - so girls pursue studies and careers in fields which they THINK correspond to their strength and is more valued for girls (language / humanities) What they recommend - fight the stereotypes by providing encouragement and role models - better support (mentoring / encouragement at home and school / gender specific actions) - Explain that studying and working in STEM can be combined with lagge and humanities

I. The persistent shortage of women in tech matters,

(Gender disparity in STEM is structural and does have impacts on society and the economy)

II. ... reflects the societal and cultural pressure placed on women in this sector...

(What seems to be failing in the transition from school to the world of work / Not only are STEM female students fewer, but the retention rate is low)

III. ... and requires urgent action and new models

(Therefore, because it is so impactful, challenging assumptions and offering new education)

Méthodologie de l'introduction – Quelques exemples, quelques défauts

A/ The underrepresentation of women in STEM, a persistent challenge

For 8 years, one if IBM's CEOs was a woman, which is quite unusual because only 24% of leadership positions are held by women. This situation is conveyed in the opinion piece: "Women are shunning STEM, that has to change", from The Diplomatic Courier in which three women wrote about the effects and causes. Plenty of figures about women in STEM are illustrated by the Boston Consulting Group's infographic. It shows that women move away from STEM, like the opinion piece from Stanford Daily in which Rebecca Wang, an engineer, highlights the lack of women. Also, Ginny Rometty wrote a guest essay in The Economist to tell her own experience to become an IBM's CEO as a woman. How does society influence girls to stay away from STEM?

- 1/ Firstly, there are many factors to explain the underrepresentation of women
- 2/ Thereby there is a low retention rate of women in STEM
- 3/ How could this situation evolve?

B/ There are not enough women in STEM

It is a dreadful fact that women represent less than a quarter of tech positions. The infographic released by Boston Consulting Group reports statistics about women and minorities in start-ups and STEM studies. The two opinion pieces, published respectively in The Stanford Daily and The Diplomatic Courier, written by women, and a guest essay by Ginny Rometty in The Economist present a more personal and committed view of the situation. One can ask what is the condition of women in STEM?

- 1/ Women are definitely underrepresented and it can be explained by different reasons
- 2/ As a consequence, women face difficulties in this field
- 3/ How can the situation be improved?

C/ "Is it our own choice or external factors influencing their choice, that leads women to disappear?" This is the question that Rebecca Wang, an engineer, asks in an article from The Stanford Daily. Indeed, the underrepresentation of women in STEM raises questions about our society's functioning. How

can we explain the important disappearance of women in STEM. This problem will be examined using four documents, all written between 2015 and 2023. The column from The Stanford Daily and the essay from The Economist are both written by women, Rebecca Wang and Ginny Rometty, who talk about their experience as women in STEM. While a graph from The Boston Consulting Group highlights the leaking of women in STEM career, an opinion piece written by The Diplomatic Courier warns about the consequences of this phenomenon.

D/ Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics industry is developing rapidly but women are not really a part of it. An opinion piece from The Stanford Daily, published in January 2022 tells the story of Rebecca Wang, a graduate student in engineering, approaching the subject. In The Economist, the former CEO of IBM wrote a guest essay about her experience in the STEM industry. In The Diplomatic Courier, an opinion piece published in February 2023 develops the phenomenon of gender disparity. An infographic document by Boston Consulting Group in 2015 reports about the diversity gap in Silicon Valley tech companies. With these documents a question arises. How are women represented in STEM?

E/ The STEM field neither attracts nor retains women

At a time when women are achieving more and more victories in their fight for empowerment, STEM remains one of the most affected sector in terms of gender inequality. Indeed, in an opinion piece published in The Stanford Daily in January 2022, Rebecca Wang deplores the underrepresentation of women in STEM. The Boston Consulting Group's graph from 2015 highlights that women are disappearing at every stage of the education and workplace path. Many factors are at fault, both economic and sociological, as pointed out by the collective opinion piece published in 2023 by The D.C. In her guest essay written for The Economist in 2023, Ginny Rometty testifies about her career in STEM as a female and the solutions she developed. Why are women underrepresented in STEM?

- Serious impact on the tech sector (document 4) > labour shortage and lack of innovation

Proposition d'introduction et de plan

The STEM industry needs to attract and retain more women

Although girls make up half of the under-20s in the U.S., the proportion of women occupying STEM positions remains low (, at around one fifth). An infographic on the diversity gap in high tech companies released by Boston Consulting Group in 2015 shows the stages at which women (, Blacks and Latinos) disappear along the education and start-up routes to these positions. Both drawing from their experiences, (graduate student) Rebecca Wang examined the strenuous transition from university to workplace in the Stanford Daily in January 2022 while Ginny Rometty, in a guest essay for *The Economist* published on March 8th 2023, refers to her career at IBM to list the best ways to increase women's access to tech jobs. Similarly, the authors of the opinion piece published in *The Diplomatic Courier* on February 10th 2023 made suggestions after examining the effects of and factors behind horizontal disparity. How impactful is gender disparity / the structural gender inequality in the tech industry? (129 – 140)

I. The persistent shortage of women in tech matters, (Gender disparity in STEM is structural and does have impacts on society and the economy)

A/ The **figures** on ratio of women in STEM are telling: all documents point to proportions of around 20% in STEM undergraduate and graduate programmes and tech jobs. The discrepancy is even starker for leadership positions / top jobs as indicated in the graph.

B/ **Personal experience:** In their testimonies, both Rebecca Wang and Ginny Rometty

C/ **Impact:**

- Unease, fear, underperformance as mentioned both by RWX and in *The Diplomatic Courier*
- Pay gap (document 3 and document 4)

II. ... reflects the societal and cultural pressure placed on women in this sector...

(What seems to be failing in the transition from school to the world of work / Not only are STEM female students fewer, but the retention rate is low)

A/ **Stereotypical representations** can lead to horizontal discrimination and influence girls' choices early on as the experts explain in *The Diplomatic Courier*: they go for studies and careers deemed more feminine (than STEM)

B/ But the main problem are the **leaks along the pipelines**, from school (where female students are good, documents 1, 2 & 4) to the job market, and from bottom to top of the job ladder (all documents refer to this)

C/ Women are **deterred by** isolation (document 2), the lack of career and financial prospects (documents 3 and 4) and prejudices and pressure

- Vicious circle as R. Wang explains: they are tempted to leave, thus worsening the situation

III. ... and requires urgent action and new models

(Therefore, because it is so impactful, challenging assumptions and offering new education and recruitment models is necessary)

A/ Necessity to challenge **the deeply-rooted assumptions about what women are capable of**

Document 4 > girls go for so-called “feminine” fields

Document 1 > exposes practices consisting in playing it safe by recruiting / financing more of the same (men) in the Silicon Valley

B/ So **recruitment** has to change: this is what Ginny Rometty is calling for. IBM gave up the degree requirement to apply and work and thus boosted diversity

C/ Necessity to **rethink education** and the link with the industry by offering new schemes (document 4: mix with humanities for ex, document 3: develop apprenticeships and P-tech programmes)

D/ The three texts agree on the **urgent need to encourage and mentor** women to keep them, let them get better-paid top jobs. It is essential for society Ginny Rometty claims.

The STEM industry needs to attract and retain more women

Although girls make up half of the under-20s in the U.S., the proportion of women occupying STEM positions remains low (, at around one fifth). An infographic on the diversity gap in high tech companies released by Boston Consulting Group in 2015 shows the stages at which women (, Blacks and Latinos) disappear along the education and start-up routes to these positions. Both drawing from their experiences, (graduate student) Rebecca Wang examined the strenuous transition from university to workplace in the Stanford Daily in January 2022 while Ginny Rometty, in a guest essay for *The Economist* published on March 8th 2023, refers to her career at IBM to list the best ways to increase women's access to tech jobs. Similarly, the authors of the opinion piece published in *The Diplomatic Courier* on February 10th 2023 made suggestions after examining the effects of and factors behind horizontal disparity. How impactful is gender disparity / the structural gender inequality in the tech industry? (129 – 140)

I. The persistent shortage of women in tech matters.

(Gender disparity in STEM is structural and does have impacts on society and the economy)

A/ The **figures** on ratio of women in STEM are telling: all documents point to proportions of around 20% in STEM undergraduate and graduate programmes and tech jobs. The discrepancy is even starker for leadership positions / top jobs as indicated in the graph.

B/ **Personal experience:** In their testimonies, both Rebecca Wang and Ginny Rometty

C/ **Impact:**

- Unease, fear, underperformance as mentioned both by RWX and in *The Diplomatic Courier*
- Pay gap (document 3 and document 4)
- Serious impact on the tech sector (document 4) > labour shortage and lack of innovation

II. ... reflects the societal and cultural pressure placed on women in this sector...

(What seems to be failing in the transition from school to the world of work / Not only are STEM female students fewer, but the retention rate is low)

A/ **Stereotypical representations** can lead to horizontal discrimination and influence girls' choices early on as the experts explain in *The Diplomatic Courier*: they go for studies and careers deemed more feminine (than STEM)

B/ But the main problem are the **leaks along the pipelines**, from school (where female students are good, documents 1, 2 & 4) to the job market, and from bottom to top of the job ladder (all documents refer to this)

C/ Women are **deterred by** isolation (document 2), the lack of career and financial prospects (documents 3 and 4) and prejudices and pressure

- Vicious circle as R. Wang explains: they are tempted to leave, thus worsening the situation

III. ... and requires urgent action and new models

(Therefore, because it is so impactful, challenging assumptions and offering new education and recruitment models is necessary)

A/ Necessity to challenge **the deeply-rooted assumptions about what women are capable of**

Document 4 > girls go for so-called “feminine” fields

Document 1 > exposes practices consisting in playing it safe by recruiting / financing more of the same (men) in the Silicon Valley

B/ So **recruitment** has to change: this is what Ginny Rometty is calling for. IBM gave up the degree requirement to apply and work and thus boosted diversity

C/ Necessity to **rethink education** and the link with the industry by offering new schemes (document 4: mix with humanities for ex, document 3: develop apprenticeships and P-tech programmes)

D/ The three texts agree on the **urgent need to encourage and mentor** women to keep them, let them get better-paid top jobs. It is essential for society Ginny Rometty claims.

Extraits du rapport de jury Centrale (2024)

Les candidats ont, dans l'ensemble, bien appréhendé le dossier dont les enjeux principaux ont été saisis et restitués dans une langue globalement correcte. La nature des documents et leurs spécificités ont généralement été assez bien identifiées. Une très grande partie des candidats maîtrise bien les exigences méthodologiques de la synthèse et s'efforce de croiser les documents dans un développement aux parties distinctes et facilement identifiables.

Le document iconographique a été trop souvent survolé. Tous les éléments n'ont pas été pris en compte en relation avec les autres documents, ce qui est pourtant une étape préliminaire indispensable avant le travail de synthèse.

Notons enfin qu'un grand nombre de candidats n'ose pas dépasser un premier niveau de lecture et proposer autre chose qu'un plan clé en main, envisageant le problème soulevé par le dossier, ses causes et ses solutions. Le jury attendait, comme chaque année, qu'au-delà des évidences apparaissant en première lecture, les candidats tentent de prendre en compte certaines nuances du dossier. Le jury ne peut qu'encourager les candidats à prendre le temps de la réflexion et à choisir un axe pour leur synthèse qui mette en avant quelques nuances qui feront de leur restitution un discours non seulement fiable mais aussi éclairant.

Un titre précis et informatif, qui indique clairement le thème du dossier, est requis. Nous n'avons constaté cette année que très peu d'oublis pour le titre. C'est une bonne chose puisque l'oubli du titre est sanctionné. Nous insistons sur le fait qu'il est inutile de chercher des titres accrocheurs, ou des jeux de mots plus ou moins judicieux. Il est irrecevable d'utiliser deux fois la même question pour le titre et la problématique.

Une introduction efficace pose le double défi de la concision et de la précision. L'exercice de synthèse invite certes à la première, mais on ne saurait proposer pour autant une introduction qui présente mécaniquement les sources, sans dire quoi que ce soit de leur substance. Il n'est pas davantage pertinent d'y faire un compte-rendu détaillé de la teneur de chaque document.

Il est fondamental de comprendre que la synthèse doit aboutir à **un texte adressé à un destinataire qui n'est pas censé avoir lu le dossier et l'en dispense**. Il convient par conséquent de bannir les références contextuelles aux sources, dès l'introduction ainsi que dans l'ensemble du devoir. **Des références telles que *document 1*, *the first document*, *the last document*, ou encore *doc.1*, qu'elles soient ou non entre parenthèses, sont facteurs de confusion.** Pour les mêmes raisons, faire référence aux documents par leur date (***the 2023 article***) est à **proscrire**, d'autant plus quand plusieurs documents ont été publiés la même année. En effet, ces modes de désignation des documents ne permettent pas de faire ressortir leur spécificité : si l'en-tête du sujet fait, par exemple, référence à trois « articles », nous soulignons néanmoins que ces trois textes ne sont pas de même nature. Qui plus est, certains offrent des points de vue et des exemples variés. Il convenait donc de distinguer clairement source et point de vue.

Pour davantage d'efficacité, il peut être utile de se poser a priori les questions suivantes :

- quelle est la nature des documents retenus ?
- de quelles aires géographiques émanent-ils ?
- quels sont les points de vue qu'ils choisissent d'adopter et quelles sont les opinions qu'ils expriment ?
- dans quelle chronologie s'inscrivent-ils ?

La prise en compte de ces éléments constitue une aide précieuse à la compréhension fine des documents et à la conceptualisation, qui doit permettre aux candidats de rendre compte des enjeux du dossier avec concision.

Il semble utile de rappeler qu'on attend des candidats qu'ils accordent une attention particulière à la formulation de la problématique. Comme chaque année, on trouve des copies dont l'introduction ne débouche sur aucune problématique, les candidats se contentant de présenter les sources dans l'ordre de leur apparition dans le dossier, avant de passer au développement, sans chercher à définir les enjeux du dossier.

Alternativement, on trouve aussi beaucoup de copies qui confondent encore thématique et problématique. C'est la présentation des sources qui doit permettre à la fois de faire ressortir les concepts sous-jacents aux documents et de montrer comment ils s'imbriquent. La problématique doit, quant à elle, rendre explicite l'enjeu de cette imbrication, en

incluant tous les documents. Faute d'attention suffisante portée à ces nuances, beaucoup de candidats ont eu du mal à cibler leur problématique de manière pertinente. Les problématiques binaires permettant de peser le pour et le contre de l'innovation technologique couvraient certes l'ensemble du dossier, mais elles ne permettaient que rarement de rendre compte de la façon dont les documents mettent en scène cette question, ce que manifeste pourtant explicitement le *cartoon* en recourant, notamment par le choix des tenues vestimentaires, à des stéréotypes du passé pour présenter une question d'actualité, et que les trois textes développent à leur manière. **Notons enfin qu'une problématique se définissant comme un ensemble de problèmes liés les uns aux autres, il est vivement conseillé d'éviter les questions fermées, nécessairement réductrices (*Should we fear technology ?*), et les questions enchainées qui ne seraient prétextes qu'à un catalogue (par exemple : *what is the problem with AI and what are the solutions ?*).**

Nous rappelons que le jury n'attend pas qu'un plan soit annoncé en introduction. En effet, la synthèse est un document à mots comptés, dont les différentes parties doivent s'articuler naturellement à l'aide de transitions claires (les « phrases d'ouvertures » mentionnées dans la partie suivante). Ainsi, terminer l'introduction avec l'annonce d'un plan la rallonge inutilement — sans compter que cette annonce s'avère la plupart du temps source de redites.

Il s'agit de proposer une restitution fiable et claire de tous les éléments du dossier. Les grandes lignes de chaque document doivent être restituées sans ambiguïté et les enjeux clairement précisés. Rappelons que la synthèse doit pouvoir être comprise par un destinataire qui n'aurait pas lu le dossier au préalable. Compte tenu du nombre de mots limités dont disposent les candidats, il est essentiel de bien hiérarchiser les informations et d'éviter les redites ou les développements inutiles comme les propos liminaires hypertrophiés. Une vue d'ensemble du dossier doit se faire jour très rapidement. Il convient donc de cadrer sans tarder les documents par exemple dans l'introduction ou dans les premières parties du devoir pour en dégager précisément les idées les plus saillantes.

Un très grand nombre de copies, passé ces repérages préliminaires, s'est limitée à dégager une analyse relativement binaire du dossier en

insistant sur l'opposition entre les avantages et les inconvénients du progrès technologique (voire seulement de l'intelligence artificielle). Cette démarche relativement binaire permettait certes de dégager certaines grandes lignes du dossier et a pu amener des copies à des notes relativement correctes mais ne proposait qu'une approche parcellaire du sujet. Le jury a en revanche valorisé les devoirs qui, après avoir posé des repérages solides, ont pu relever des nuances plus fines présentes dans les documents. Un écueil à éviter à ce stade serait de faire pencher la restitution vers l'un des points de vue proposés. On n'attend évidemment pas des candidats en quatre heures et 550 mots maximum qu'ils produisent une dissertation mais quelques remarques succinctes, fines, permettant de relever l'implicite de certains documents sont suffisantes pour témoigner d'une compréhension plus subtile des enjeux du sujet.

Une synthèse efficace traduit l'habileté des candidats à proposer une lecture organisée et dynamique du dossier et doit témoigner d'une capacité de recul. Le développement du devoir doit répondre clairement à la problématique énoncée en introduction et permettre de **faire dialoguer les documents sans en négliger aucun**. La majorité des copies témoigne d'efforts réels de structuration et d'organisation des idées. L'entrée dans les parties est souvent annoncée par une phrase d'ouverture qui vient définir l'angle d'approche choisi à chaque étape. **Rappelons que la lecture de ces « it topic sentences » doit permettre d'apprécier ainsi la pertinence de la démarche proposée.** Lues successivement, elles doivent permettre de répondre à la problématique. Il convient donc d'y prêter une attention particulière et d'éviter de commencer une partie par un exemple ou une idée périphérique qui ne viendrait pas donner sa cohérence au paragraphe. Pour autant, beaucoup de copies peinent à convaincre faute de réelle logique argumentative. Une amorce trompeuse vient parfois tenter de masquer un empilement de remarques non hiérarchisées où le candidat se contente de passer d'un document à l'autre. Il faut tout aussi bien éviter de juxtaposer des idées que de s'appesantir sur un seul document. Les meilleurs devoirs allient une appréhension fine du dossier, une argumentation claire, logique et fluide et des croisements nombreux et convaincants entre les documents. Les idées doivent être hiérarchisées et le devoir doit offrir une vue d'ensemble du dossier. Nous rappelons que les idées restituées doivent être impérativement liées aux documents et que cet ancrage est absolument nécessaire à une

mise en relation efficace. Il est impossible d'apprécier la capacité des candidats à faire du lien si le lecteur se demande en permanence qui parle et s'interroge sur la source des propos rapportés. Il ne faut pas non plus confondre des points de vue évoqués dans un article et l'opinion de son auteur. Autre écueil, plus souvent rencontré au cours des corrections, la prise de position. Il est attendu des candidats qu'ils proposent une lecture neutre et objective du dossier et qu'ils fassent dialoguer des points de vue pluriels sur les questions examinées. Il ne faut surtout pas prendre parti pour tel ou tel auteur, ni s'engager personnellement, que ce soit dans le développement ou en conclusion. On emploiera donc avec beaucoup de prudence des adverbes comme *unfortunately* ou *worryingly* ou des modaux et on veillera à ce que les phrases d'accroche de chaque partie ne laissent pas penser que les candidats s'engagent personnellement dans le débat.

Le jury lit de moins en moins de devoirs sans structure et/ou à l'organisation chaotique mais observe que beaucoup de plans suivent une logique un peu mécanique du style problème / causes / solutions. Rappelons que si ces approches ont le mérite de permettre de structurer la synthèse, elles n'ont guère de chance de rendre compte avec finesse et nuance de la complexité des enjeux. Il faut donc s'adapter au sujet et proposer des pistes de lecture en plus grande congruence avec celui-là.

La conclusion n'est pas requise. En effet, le dernier argument présenté peut avoir une valeur conclusive. Elle est inutile si elle reprend des arguments déjà présentés et pénalisante si elle amène à introduire des arguments extérieurs au dossier ou des commentaires personnels. Nous attirons particulièrement l'attention sur l'utilisation des modaux en conclusion qui est maladroite et peut laisser penser que le candidat prend position, comme *we should react and be careful with AI*, énoncé modalisé à proscrire. Le jury précise que si une phrase peut avoir une valeur conclusive, il est néanmoins indispensable de veiller à ne pas ouvrir un nouveau questionnement ou à prendre position. La prise de recul doit se faire sur le dossier et montrer toute la cohérence de la démonstration.

Le jury tient à rassurer les candidats sur le décompte indispensable à effectuer, qui doit donner lieu à une indication chiffrée du nombre total de mots à la fin de la copie. Les sources, ainsi que le nom des auteurs,

peuvent être comptabilisés comme un seul mot (par exemple, *The Sunday Times* = 1, ou *The Economist* = 1). Toute omission ou tricherie manifeste sur ce décompte sera en revanche pénalisée.

Cette année encore, de nombreuses synthèses ont été rédigées dans un anglais de bonne facture, néanmoins d'autres devoirs présentent des lacunes linguistiques récurrentes qui hypothèquent parfois jusqu'à l'intelligibilité même du propos. Le jury a pu lire des copies qui témoignent quant à elles, un niveau de langue élevé, voire remarquable dans certains cas. Cela se manifeste par l'utilisation d'un lexique riche et précis, de structures variées, voire complexes. Toutefois, les candidats doivent veiller à ne pas tomber dans l'excès en multipliant les formules recherchées, ce qui pourrait donner à leur propos un caractère artificiel et nuire à la clarté de l'expression. En général, le discours est assez fluide, les variations qualitatives les plus importantes sont observées dans la maîtrise grammaticale.

Il s'agit d'évaluer la capacité des candidats à utiliser une langue syntaxiquement et grammaticalement correcte, en privilégiant toujours l'intelligibilité et la fluidité du discours.

En introduction, de nombreuses copies font preuve d'un manque de maîtrise de la syntaxe des questions : certaines comportent soit un auxiliaire mais mal placé, soit aucun auxiliaire, soit deux auxiliaires (**To what extent new technology can be a problem today ? *How and why technology became a problem ?* ou

**Does technology is a danger for the future ?*). Ce manque de maîtrise du questionnement, qu'il soit

direct ou indirect, est d'autant plus gênant qu'il est porté à l'attention du correcteur dès l'introduction, au moment de la formulation de la problématique.

Nous avons rencontré encore beaucoup de fautes de grammaire de base, comme les règles d'usage des adjectifs, qui sont invariables en anglais et se placent devant le nom ; l'emploi des indéterminables, et de manière plus générale la détermination nominale ; la construction du génitif saxon ; la maîtrise des verbes irréguliers ou des accords sujet-verbe, y compris dans les bonnes copies ; les opérateurs de convergence ou divergence (**the both documents* ; les pronoms relatifs (**according to Kamensky, which cartoon suggests*) ou encore l'utilisation des modaux, qui doivent être suivis d'une base verbale. Le lexique et l'orthographe sont

également à soigner. Il y a eu cette année de nombreuses confusions sur des termes propres au dossier tels que *progress* que l'on a trouvé orthographié **progresses* ou *information* que nous avons trouvé au pluriel **the access to informations*, mais aussi des erreurs récurrentes comme **to what extend* pour *to what extent*, **mentionned* pour *mentioned*, **deve-lopped* pour *developed*, **hapiness* pour *happiness*. Il y a eu une tendance à inventer des mots en calquant sur le français : *exemple to esquivre a potential disaster*.

Sachant que les candidats sont placés en position de médiateur entre le dossier et le lecteur de leur synthèse, il est attendu qu'ils reformulent les idées repérées et restituées. Le recours aux citations et aux emprunts lexicaux est donc à proscrire. **Le jury sanctionne la paraphrase.** L'emploi des temps avait une importance particulière cette année. En effet, utiliser le prétérit ou le plus que parfait pour évoquer Huxley permettait de bien mettre en valeur la dimension diachronique du dossier. À l'inverse, tout écrire au présent pouvait dans certains devoirs laisser penser que tous les textes étaient contemporains.

Nous aimerions à ce stade rappeler que les candidats doivent s'efforcer de rendre une copie lisible et propre. Certaines copies sont très difficiles à lire, d'une part à cause de la graphie et d'autre part à cause de nombreuses ratures et ajouts après coup, ce qui constitue un obstacle majeur à la correction pour l'ensemble des critères d'évaluation et se retrouve in fine pénalisé. Les candidats doivent absolument s'entraîner tout au long de l'année à rédiger en temps limité afin de pouvoir respecter le cadre imposé par l'exercice de la synthèse, notamment le respect et le comptage du nombre de mots qui doit être efficace pour ne pas avoir à rayer des paragraphes entiers à la relecture. Le jury leur conseille vivement de se munir d'un stylo à encre noire le jour de l'épreuve, dans la mesure où les copies sont numérisées avant d'être corrigées en ligne.

Nous avons également remarqué des tendances maladroites dans les références aux documents. En effet, les prépositions adéquates ne sont pas toujours maîtrisées (**on the Economist*). De plus, les candidats ne doivent pas appeler les auteurs des documents par leur prénom. « *Matthew* » n'est ainsi pas une façon appropriée de faire référence à l'auteur du *Sunday Times*. De même, certains candidats ont systématiquement indiqué les références aux documents entre parenthèses, à la fin de leurs phrases. Quand bien même ceci est toléré dans d'autres concours, le jury

n'accepte pas cette pratique, pour deux raisons, répétées chaque année : non seulement cette pratique nuit à la fluidité du propos, mais elle laisse entendre que c'est au lecteur de se reporter aux documents pour saisir ce dont il s'agit. Par exemple dire *today, many are worried about the consequences of AI (doc. 3 and 4)* implique qu'il faut aller chercher dans l'article du *Sunday Times* et dans celui de *The Economist* les éléments qui vont préciser cette référence confuse, faute de quoi, on aura inévitablement l'impression que ces deux documents s'accordent parfaitement. Or on sait qu'il n'en est rien.

Enfin, nous recommandons aux candidats d'accorder une attention toute particulière à la ponctuation. L'absence de majuscules, de points, ainsi que l'utilisation abusive des virgules gênent grandement la lecture du devoir qui en devient parfois incompréhensible. Attention au point d'exclamation qui peut montrer une opinion personnelle ce qui est strictement interdit en synthèse. De même, il n'est pas envisageable d'utiliser des signes de ponctuation pour indiquer le décompte partiel des mots.

Comme chaque année, nous avons remarqué que dans certaines copies les candidats tentent d'élever le niveau lexical, ce qui est à encourager, mais cela ne doit en aucun cas conduire à obscurcir le propos. Ceci a parfois eu pour effet de rendre le propos inintelligible au point qu'il était difficile de reconnaître les arguments reformulés.

Les citations avec ou sans guillemets sont pénalisées car elles constituent une forme d'évitement. On ne saurait trop encourager les candidats à prendre le temps de bien reformuler les idées clés relevées dans leur travail préliminaire, ce qui leur permettra, par la suite, d'affiner leur réflexion et d'appréhender les nuances et subtilités des documents. Il importe en effet que les candidats montrent ce qu'ils ont compris plutôt que de recopier ce qu'ils ont lu.

Il est également attendu des candidats qu'ils maîtrisent certains termes spécifiques à la synthèse : un dessin (*a drawing*) n'est pas la même chose qu'un dessin de presse (*a cartoon*). Pour faire référence au dossier, le plus souvent dans l'introduction, plusieurs solutions sont possibles (*a set, a cluster, a batch, a series, a collection of documents*, ou encore *a corpus...*), mais d'autres sont à éviter, comme le mot *dossier* en anglais, qui s'applique plutôt au domaine légal ou médical.

Comme évoqué ci-dessus, l'utilisation des modaux, *should* ou *must* en particulier, est malvenue dans une synthèse où le candidat est en position de médiateur entre le dossier et le lecteur de sa synthèse. Il y a cependant une différence majeure entre écrire « *we should regulate AI* » et « *the editorialist for The Economist is adamant that AI should be regulated* ». Notons donc de ce point de vue que le recours aux verbes de parole et la nuance entre ceux-là est un outil précieux pour qui doit rendre compte des propos convergents et divergents émanant de plusieurs sources. On lit trop souvent des énoncés tels que

« *The Economist says that AI may destroy civilization* » alors qu'en vérité ce propos n'est pas celui de l'éditorialiste mais celui d'experts dont l'éditorialiste entend invalider l'opinion. Il serait donc plus judicieux d'écrire « *The Economist concedes that AI may destroy civilization* ». En effet, dire quelque chose peut revenir à le concéder autant qu'à le mettre en doute ou à le professer : il est donc important d'être plus précis dans le choix du verbe car il ne s'agit absolument pas de la même chose.

Enfin, il convient d'être particulièrement vigilant dans le choix des mots de liaison. Si ces derniers sont utilisés de façon inappropriée pour connecter deux idées qui n'ont rien à voir l'une avec l'autre, les candidats font dire aux documents ce qu'ils ne disent pas en réalité, et le sens du propos est altéré. À l'opposé, la clarté et l'authenticité de la langue ont été valorisées.

Le jury tient à ce stade une nouvelle fois à remercier les enseignants pour l'excellente préparation prodiguée aux candidats qui, dans leur immense majorité, maîtrisent assez bien maintenant les attendus conceptuels et formels de la synthèse.