

Diversity Literacy Workshop Glossary

Accumulation of disadvantage

The cumulative impact of the small effects of bias or stereotyping where the impact of a particular instance of the stereotype effect may be negligible. In practice, people may accrue disadvantages such as lost opportunities and career moves from the accumulation of small or even unintended biases (Agars). Alternatively, success can be seen as the accumulation of small advantages, exploiting small gains to get bigger ones; hence, small but systematic undervaluations can affect cumulative disadvantages (Valian).

Affirmative Action Availability, Utilization Rates, and Annual Goals

Availability rates for tenure track positions are determined by figures on the number of qualified graduates in a particular disciplinary area according to the U.S. Department of Education and other government sources. Utilization rates are determined by the numbers of self-reported minority and female faculty by department. Annual goals are determined by campus administrators (department chairs and deans) based on comparisons of availability and under-utilization figures.

Ascriptive inequality

Systematic inequality based on ascriptive factors such as race and sex and produced through nonconscious processes that favor in-groups as much as disadvantaging outgroups. While in-groups may earn micro-advantages that can provide resources for further opportunities, normative out-groups may experience micro-inequities that result from the absence of advantages and ambivalence or indifference from gatekeepers rather than overt discrimination that nonetheless limit mobility and access (Roos & Gatta).

Bias

- **Unintended bias (also unconscious bias):** positively or negatively valenced generalizations about particular qualifications, people, or groups that are conditioned by personal experience, socialization, and cultural understandings. These responses occur at a pre-conscious level and operate as "mental habits" that can undermine rational decision-making. Examples include expectations about physical and/or social characteristics associated with race, sex, age, and ethnicity; assumptions about which people are likely to match certain job descriptions; and attitudes about academic institutions, publications, types of research and scholarship (Fine & Hanedlman; Isaacs, et al.).
- **Bias embedded in social processes:** social processes such as negotiation or mentoring that develop over time and incorporate stereotypes or decision making biases (Agars).
- **Affirmative action bias:** the perception that the accomplishments and opportunities of women and minority members are due as much to diversity and inclusion programs as to the qualifications and efforts of these individuals. Also that correcting for gender and racial biases means lowering standards.

Diversity champion

Search committee member who is invested in identifying women and minority candidates, often by expanding professional networks and rethinking traditional selection criteria (June).

Campus (or department) climate

A set of broadly shared perceptions, human resource and administrative practices, and objective factors (for example, demographics, salary levels, teaching loads, etc.) that create the workplace environment.

Conscious discrimination

The explicit behavioral and attitudinal differentiation of an individual or group on the basis of stereotypes or negative associations that has unjust or prejudicial impact.

Gender bias

A systematic difference in ratings or perceptions of men and women with identical qualifications that favors or disadvantages one gender (Isaac, et al.).

Gender congruence

The expectation that all candidates will conform to the gender norms that accord with traditional social roles. For example, women who are perceived as aggressive rather than polite and pleasant may be perceived as violating normative expectations while a positive evaluation of a woman mentor for her caring attitude toward her mentorees affirms gender congruence (Isaacs, et al.).

Gender schemas

Schemas are the often nonconscious cognitive representations that serve as hypotheses for interpreting social events, predicting the behavior of others, and orienting personal expectations, choices, and actions. Gender schemas are hypotheses about what defines being male and being female and what differentiates female and male. The extent to which gender schema mesh with schema for social roles and professional expectations may affect gender bias or invoke screening filters or gender stereotypes (Valian).

IAT (Implicit Association Test)

A computer-based test that measures implicit mental associations through reaction speed (Raymond; Fine & Handelman).

Implicit discrimination

Negative evaluations based on the evaluator's unconscious mental associations between the target person or group and a given attribute. These associations are unintentional, outside the discriminator's awareness, and negatively valenced. Factors such as time pressure, multiple cognitive demands, inattention to task, ambiguity, and stress increase the influence of these associations (Raymond; Fine & Handelman).

Intersectionality

The shifting relations of privilege and disadvantage that a person may experience based on membership in multiple, overlapping groups including race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, religion, age, weight, income, educational level, profession or occupation, and others. This concept recognizes that individuals 1) belong to more than one social category simultaneously and 2) may experience either privileges or disadvantages on that basis depending on circumstances and relationships. Intersectionality as a research concept directs attention to the complexities of dynamic overlaps among diverse identities, power inequities, social contexts, and social meanings (Collins & Bilge).

Incremental effects of stereotypes

The impact of bias operating at successive decision-stages of career development and promotion (Agars).

Leaky pipeline

The discrepancy between a pool of available candidates for a promotion and the number of people from that pool who have been promoted. This metaphor is often applied to the greater attrition of women than men from the Bachelor's to the Master's to the PhD levels; also the decrease in women and minority candidates for faculty positions than are available in PhD programs and the presence of fewer and fewer faculty in associate professor and full professor positions (Valian).

Micro-inequities and micro-advantages

Small everyday practices and perceptions that enact subtle and often nonconscious inequities or advantages differentiating male, female, or minority faculty. These might include conversational patterns that marginalize a woman's input until a male colleague restates her points; qualifying the professional accomplishments of a female faculty member by praising her for her ability to balance work and family; or making space and personnel assignments based on unreflective assumptions about personal needs and responsibilities. While micro-inequities are disconfirming and perpetuate systematic disadvantages, micro-advantages are small acts of affirmation that can contribute to confidence and opportunity (Valian).

Sense of "fit"

The feeling of belonging or being unwelcome that affects levels of satisfaction and retention among junior faculty. Fit may include perceptions about department fairness, the quality of

professional and personal interactions among colleagues, and whether or not senior faculty seem interested in the professional development of junior faculty (Hill, Corbett, & St. Rose)

Sex-typed positions

Occupational positions historically or predominantly occupied by one gender and/or assumed to require traits stereotypically associated with one gender. Examples include mechanical engineer or CEO as male sex-typed positions and secretary or daycare worker as female sex-typed positions. Gender neutral positions include assistant trainee and compensation analyst (Isaacs, et al.).

Stereotypes

Widely held and socially intransigent generalizations about a group that are presumed to be true of every individual member of that group.

Stereotype priming

Activation of generalized assumptions about a target person or group that increases the salience of stereotypic perceptions. For example, the use of stereotypic titles such as “chairman” rather than “chair” may activate gender stereotypes that disadvantage female candidates for such a position. Alternatively, Priming with counterstereotypic information has been shown to intervene in gender-biased evaluations of candidates (Isaacs, et al.).

Stereotype threat

Anxiety created by the fear of validating a negative stereotype of a group in which an individual is a member (Agars).

Subtle sexism and racism

The perpetuation of prejudice and discrimination by means of implicit, unacknowledged, or accepted forms of devaluation and marginalization which may include conventional forms of politeness and civility (Agars).

References

- Agars, M. (2004). Reconsidering the impact of gender stereotypes on the advancement of women in organizations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28, 103-111.
- Collins, P. H. & Bilge, S. (2016). *Intersectionality*. Cambridge UK: Polity Press.
- Fine, E. & Handelsman, J. (2010). Raise awareness of unconscious assumptions and their influence on evaluation of applicants. In *Searching for Excellence and Diversity; A Guide for Search Committees*, pp. 35-42.
- Handley I. M., Brown, E. R., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Smith, J. L. (2015). Quality of evidence

- revealing subtle gender biases in science is in the eye of the beholder. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112(43):13201-13206.
- Hill, C., Corbett, C. & St. Rose, A. (2010). *Why so few? Women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Women.
- Isaac, C., Lee, B., & Carner, M. (2009). Interventions that affect gender bias in hiring: A systematic review. *Academic Medicine*, 84, 1440-1446.
- June, A. W. (2010, September 19). What search committees see across the table. *Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Lincoln, A. E., Pincus, S., Bandows Koster, J., Leboy, P. S. (2012). The Matilda Effect in science:
Awards and prizes in the US, 1990s and 2000s. *Social Studies of Science* 42(2):307-320.
- Raymond, J. (2013). Sexist attitudes: Most of us are biased. *Nature*, 495, 33–34.
- Reid, L. D. (2010). The role of perceived race and gender in the evaluation of college teaching on
RateMyProfessors.com. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 3(3):137-152.
- Mulhere, K. (2014). Study finds gender perception affects evaluations. *Inside Higher Ed* 10
- Roos, P. A., & Gatta, M. L. (2009). Gender (in)equity in the Academy: Subtle mechanisms and the production of inequality. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 27, 177-200.
- Valian, V. (2010). What works and what doesn't: How to increase the representation of women in academia and business. In B. Riegraf, B. Aulenbacher, E. Auwarter, & U. Muller (Eds.), *Gender Change in Academia: Mapping the Fields of Work, Knowledge, and Politics* (pp. 317-328). Wiesbauden, Germany: Springer.