

First published 2012
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Simultaneously published in the UK
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2012 JoAnn Moody

The right of JoAnn Moody to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted by her in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Moody, JoAnn, 1945–

Faculty diversity : removing the barriers / by JoAnn Moody.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Faculty integration—United States. 2. Minority college teachers—Selection and appointment—United States. I. Title.

LB2332.6.M66 2012

378.1'2089—dc23

2011029455

ISBN: 978-0-415-87845-6 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-415-87846-3 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-0-203-80539-8 (ebk)

Typeset in Sabon
by EvS Communication Network, Inc.

Printed and bound in the United States of America on acid-free paper
by Walsworth Publishing Company, Marceline, MO.

FACULTY DIVERSITY

Removing the Barriers

Second Edition

JoAnn Moody

Printed and bound in the United States of America
By Edwards Brothers Malloy on sustainably sourced paper.

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

COGNITIVE ERRORS THAT CONTAMINATE ACADEMIC EVALUATIONS AND BLOCK FACULTY DIVERSITY

Regarding our job candidates, I just don't think Mercedes would be a good fit. Honestly, I can't see any of us having a beer with her at the corner pub. While it would be terrific to have a teacher and researcher who is Mexican American, we need to find someone who is a better fit.

(An anonymous member of a faculty search committee)

For the first four minutes of Todd's job talk, I noticed that he was shaking in his boots. We certainly don't need a high-maintenance, low-confidence kind of guy around here. No way.

(Another anonymous member of the committee)

The ideal ... of the doctor as a dispassionate and rational actor is misguided. As ... cognitive psychologists have shown, when people are confronted with uncertainty—the situation of every doctor attempting to diagnose a patient—they are susceptible to unconscious emotions and personal biases, and are more likely to make cognitive errors.

(Harvard Medical Professor Jerome Groopman, 2007b, p. 41)

Across the country, I am amazed to find that evaluation committees try very, very hard to read the minds of various candidates they are considering (for instance 'I'm sure she won't accept our job offer because her partner is still in a post-doc in L.A. Have no doubt: she'll turn us down).

(Gilda Barabino, Georgia Tech and Emory University Biomedical Engineering Professor and also Associate Chair for Graduate Studies, conversation with Prof. Barabino, 2011)

Every day at colleges, universities, professional schools, research institutes, and government labs, we find evaluation and decision-making

processes underway. Those doing the evaluations will usually be reaching important decisions about students, staff, colleagues and prospective colleagues, and others. Yet we are learning, from the research of cognitive scientists, that many of the selection and evaluation processes we undertake on a daily basis are alarmingly “contaminated,” despite our good intentions. The contaminants—generically termed “cognitive shortcuts and errors”—are present as we gather and sort through information, interpret it, and reach decisions about the following: candidates for jobs, tenure/promotion, and contract renewals; applications for grants; nominations for awards and leadership posts; and colleagues’ and students’ professional and academic performance, mastery of new concepts and skills, publications, exhibits, and other demonstrations of mastery and creativity.

During these cognitive processes, most of us *unwittingly* commit a variety of errors and automatically take shortcuts. A chronic one, regularly showing up in our personal and professional lives, is the confusion between causation and correlation. Who among us is immune from that error? Unfortunately, there are many more confusions and traps. If we are rushed and distracted, then cognitive errors and shortcuts demonstrably multiply. When those involved in evaluation and decision-making are not coached and not given opportunities to be thorough, deliberate, and self-correcting, then dysfunction results and unsound conclusions are reached about colleagues as well as prospective colleagues and potential award recipients.

Cognitive errors, intensified by organizational dysfunctions, can of course bring about the unfair measurement and evaluation of *anyone* included in the selection process. But I will suggest here and in other chapters that these errors have disproportionately damaging effects on under-represented women in predominantly male fields (whom I will abbreviate as URW) as well as especially damaging impacts on members of colonized, non-immigrant groups (NIs). The errors—usually made quickly and automatically—result in the under-valuing and frequent rejection of URW and NIs and therefore inadvertently block campuses’ and schools’ progress on diversifying their faculty ranks. A very serious roadblock needs to be removed.

Setting the Stage

Before continuing, it’s important for the reader to know how I will be using the term non-immigrant (NI). I mean the term, discussed in detail in Chapter 3, to include five groups: African Americans, Mexican Americans, American Indians, Puerto Rican Americans, and Native Hawaiians. These non-immigrant groups were incorporated into this country through force (enslaving, conquering, possessing, dispossessing, deni-

grating). By contrast, immigrant groups were not subject to such force: they arrived through their own volition.

Who exactly are the fortunate immigrant groups who exercised the choice to settle here, despite encountering hardships and struggles? Immigrant groups include: the dominant European Americans; Asian Americans with their several subgroups, some of whom are now regarded in the United States as “honorary whites”; newcomers from Africa, the Caribbean, the Middle East, Eastern Europe, and so on; and recent and non-so-recent arrivals from South and Central America, some of whom are also regarded as “honorary whites” (Lopez, 2006a; Wu, 2002; and a dozen other scholars). Immigrant groups are motivated by choice and ambition. They are usually accompanied by and aided in establishing their new lives by other newcomers—newcomers who share some of their habits and values because they in fact have also come from the *same* village or area in the old world.

In this first chapter, I will focus on thirteen cognitive errors that show up repeatedly in academe. These have serious consequences for URW and NI groups. In Chapter 2, I will delve deeply into two additional and highly significant errors: negative bias/stereotyping and positive bias/stereotyping, which also have serious consequences for URW and NI groups. Further, in almost every chapter of this book including this first one, I will outline dysfunctional practices that exacerbate the frequency and severity of the fifteen cognitive errors (such as rushing and overloading evaluation and decision-making committees or failing to adequately prepare, assist, and then monitor those involved in the processes).

Finally, I will suggest ways to end these organizational bad practices as well as to reduce the cognitive errors and shortcuts committed by individuals, in usually innocent and unknowing ways. (For more on this subject see Moody, 2010, *Rising Above Cognitive Errors*.)

An Overview of Cognitive Errors

Consider diagnoses of medical disorders. In examining and interacting with patients and reviewing lab results, practitioners must be able to resist predictable and preventable errors, including first impressions; rushing to judgment; bias based on gender or group membership; and failing to factor in atypical symptoms and instead selectively choosing data that confirm one’s original hunches (see Groopman, *How Doctors Think*, 2007; also Dawson and Arkes, 1987; Redelmeier, 2005; Bond, 2004; Croskerry, 2003).

Likewise, behavioral economists and legal and cognitive experts (such as Sunstein, Thaler, Kahneman, Greenwald, Krieger) have identified shortcuts and biases that corrupt “rational” thinking, the estimate of probabilities, and sound decision-making and investing. Who

is susceptible to these shortcuts and to what economists Robert Shiller and George Akerlof call “animal spirits” in their book by the same name (2009)? Lawyers, judges, juries, investors (big and small), professional financial managers, Federal Reserve Bank directors, philosophers, campus presidents, and, of course, the general public are susceptible. As one example, how one chooses to frame a problem can easily shut down open-minded exploration and foreclose certain solutions. Anchoring (i.e., fierce adherence to one’s first impression) will corrupt deliberations as will a number of other predictable cognitive errors.

Recognizing the prevalence and danger of cognitive errors, several law and medical schools have begun coaching their students and residents to form self-correction habits and to routinely rely on safeguard protocols, reminders, and checklists (Gawande, *The Checklist Manifesto*, 2009). Likewise senior decision-makers at colleges, universities, and professional schools—as well as their gate-keeping bodies such as search committees—are receiving instruction in cognitive errors and in structural ways to minimize the errors and improve peer review. Such instruction of individuals and committees plus larger organizational changes are *long overdue*.

Thirteen Cognitive Errors

I will begin the discussion of cognitive errors by focusing first on *the tendency to rely on first impressions*. I will then examine in turn twelve other errors that evaluation and decision-making committees are capable of recognizing and rising above—when they are appropriately coached, assisted, and monitored.

1. First Impressions

Probably most of us are perennially reminding ourselves to stop judging a book by its cover. Unless we remain on guard, we will unfairly make conclusions about a candidate or applicant or new acquaintance in a matter of seconds, based on whether their dress or cologne or posture or laughter or something else pleases or displeases us. Our own personal values and preferences (and, of course, our learned stereotypes about certain groups, which I will consider in Chapter 2) can inordinately influence us to make fast and unexamined assumptions and even decisions about a person’s worth or appeal.

For instance, you might hear a powerful gate-keeper observe: *Well, that ponytail and those blue jeans clinched it for me, as soon as I saw him walk towards us. Clearly, that applicant is disrespecting us and still thinks he’s in graduate school.* Responding to the same candidate at the same moment in time, a second person might observe: *I got a kick out of the ponytail and jeans. I bet he’d be a sharp person for our emergency-*

room team. Both of these rapid-fire assumptions could be fuel for sloppy decision-making about the applicant.

2. Elitism

This error involves feeling superior or wanting to feel superior. Elitism (commonly known as snobbery) could take the form of downgrading on the basis of the candidate’s undergraduate or doctoral campus, regional accent, dress, jewelry, social class, ethnic background, and so on (Moody, *Rising*, 2010; Padilla and Chavez, 1995). A search committee member might complain: *She’s so very Southern—I’m not sure I can stand that syrupy accent. These folks always sound illiterate to me.* Or conversely, giving extra points on the basis of the candidate’s alma mater, accent, dress, or other items can be a manifestation of elitism. An evaluation committee member might observe about a candidate: *Isn’t it nice to hear his English accent? Always sounds classy. He would be a wonderful choice for our fellowship.*

Other examples of elitism are easy to find: Fearing that a NI colleague from a stigmatized group will somehow lessen the quality and standing of the department, a committee member might say: *Well, shouldn’t we always ask if a particular hire like Dewayne is likely to bolster our place in the business school ratings wars? I think that’s okay. I mean, Dewayne’s scholarship is a bit out of the mainstream and could weaken us.* Another similar example might be: *Are we sure Ricardo will be productive enough to keep up with our publishing standards? I’m not so sure.*

Elitism can, of course, prompt a committee member to feel validated because the candidate will bring some extra snob appeal. *I think Les’s doctorate from Princeton is just the kind of boost in prestige that we could use around here. I see no reason why we can’t take that degree at face value and forego the so-called ‘weighing’ of what Les has done at Princeton with what the other candidates have accomplished at their hard-scrabble places. To me, that’s an awful waste of our time.*

3. Raising the Bar

This error involves raising requirements for a job or an award *during* the very process of evaluation. The raising is usually felt to be necessary because of the decision-maker’s realization that the candidate is a member of a suspect group regarded as inferior (such as URW in science fields and NIs in almost every field). You may hear:

Say, don’t we need more writing samples from Latorya? I know we asked for only three law review articles or other compositions from applicants. OK, hers are solid. But I’d feel better, to tell you the truth, if we had a few more in this particular case. I just want to be sure she’s really qualified. I have to admit I’m uneasy for some reason.

A second instance: Another committee member agrees and says, *Well, I wish Latorya had a doctorate from the Ivy League or maybe Berkeley. Can't we informally decide right now that Latorya and other candidates have to possess those credentials? I think we can.*

My point is that "raising the bar" is unfair and yet unwittingly done in evaluations. Unfortunately, power-holders don't stop to ponder why they may be uncomfortable and why they desire both more evidence and more qualifications for one candidate but not for another. Perhaps group membership is implicated.

4. Premature Ranking/Digging In

All too often, evaluators at every kind of educational institution rush to give numerical preferences to the applicants they are considering. I often wonder if this haste-to-rank brings relief to evaluators and falsely assures them that they have now *escaped* both personal subjectivity and embarrassing vulnerability to cognitive errors. Perhaps they finally feel they have achieved objectivity and fairness. Ranking, after all, gets you "a number" and that guarantees objectivity, doesn't it? Embracing such *false precision* is unfortunately what many of us indulge in.

The superficial rush to rank candidates leads evaluators to prematurely state their position (*he's clearly number one*); close their minds to new evidence; and then defend their stated position to the death. Rather than developing a pool of acceptable and qualified candidates and then comparing, contrasting, and mulling over candidates' different strengths with one's colleagues, some evaluators prefer to simplify their task and go for the simple numbers.

Here is one illustration of premature ranking and digging in: *Well, I don't want to waste time here in summarizing each candidate's strengths and weaknesses, as the dean suggested. That seems to me just a useless writing exercise proposed by our dean, an overzealous former English professor. I've got enough evidence to make up my mind about who should be number one, number two, and number three. I just hope we can hire number one and not be stuck with the others.*

Another illustration: *Let's go through the categories we're using and assign points to each of the serious candidates for this job. I totally trust everyone here so you don't have to give me subtle and complicated reasons for your actions. With this straight-forward, no-nonsense approach, we can quickly add up the points and we've got a decision on our first choice—all in twenty-five minutes or less. I'm a big believer in mathematical, objective approaches to these decisions.*

Rushing to rank is a mistake because it obviates engagement with colleagues in these cognitively beneficial tasks: higher-order thinking, sifting through and interpreting evidence, comparing and contrasting, and "weighing" the importance of different items of evidence on the table.

Rushing to rank easily fades into *rushing to judgment*. Admittedly, this rushing to judgment *could* stand on its own as a cognitive error. But in this publication, I have not treated it this way.

5. The Longing to Clone

The longing to clone (reproduce yourself or your clan as nearly as you can) appears in the search process when committee members undervalue a candidate's educational credentials and career trajectory simply because they are not the same as most of those on the evaluation committee. You might hear a committee member ask: *Hey, have we ever chosen anyone with a doctorate from the University of Southwestern Nevada? We don't know anything about that place. No one here ever went to that school, did they? No way.* Or you might hear during tenure-review deliberations: *I am dubious about this woman's seriousness as a researcher. Her dropping out for several years to raise little kids—this is not a confidence-builder in my book. Alarm bells are going off in my head. None of the rest of us ever had such leaves—it's a dangerous move, no matter what your gender.*

In another instance of cloning, a committee member seeks candidates who resemble a colleague who has retired or died. You might hear: *I can't believe that Tony has been gone for three years now. He was the perfect colleague and tax expert. Isn't it time we found someone just like him?*

While the sentiment about missing Tony's presence is understandable, the danger comes when the committee constructs a very narrow net in order to find a Tony-like replacement and recreate the past. Casting a narrow net can do a disservice to the growth and evolution of the school and will shrink the number of qualified candidates who might be given serious consideration.

6. Good Fit/Bad Fit

Increasingly, gate-keeping individuals and committees ponder and worry whether a job candidate would be a "good fit" or "bad fit" for their department. It is, of course, necessary for a candidate to be able to meet the agreed-on needs of the department, the students, the institution, and perhaps the community. Further, candidates being seriously scrutinized should possess the professional qualifications and competencies listed in the position description. But these elements are usually not what is meant by "fit." Instead "fit" is often stretched to mean: "Will I feel comfortable and culturally at ease with this new hire? Or will I have to spend energy to learn some new ways to relate to this person? Will we have to do a lot of hand-holding with this colleague? Who has the time?"

In other words, the longing to clone and to remain intact as a monoculture within the department may be prompting the complaint that the

candidate “just won’t fit with us.” The same longing to clone can appear in tenure reviews when the candidate is faulted for not being sufficiently collegial. In fact, the American Association of University Professors has begun to warn campuses to resist the slippery use of “collegial” as the reason for denying tenure and/or promotion. The vague term and concept seem to lie in the eyes of the beholder and the power-holder. All of us should be on guard against rampant subjectivity when the question is posed: “Is this a good fit?” The weighing of good fit and bad fit should be done very carefully and with the presence of abundant evidence and details, rather than opinions and personal leanings. I often remark to my consulting clients that I will be pleased if they come to *intensely worry* about how their evaluation committees are handling the good fit/bad fit discussion. Such worry, I hope, will prompt leaders to provide and require more preparation of evaluation committees as well as to issue warnings and reminders about treacherous shortcuts to avoid, such as rushing superficially through the weighing of “fit.” Far too often, committees fail to be on guard. Far too often, they use “good fit/bad fit” as what I would call a “trump card” in the evaluation process.

As one illustration, you may hear: *Well, I think Mercedes doesn't deserve tenure. We've lived with her long enough to know that she's really very, very different from the rest of us. Sure, she can do the job and do it rather well. But to be blunt, she's just not the kind of person I like to spend time with, especially socially. She's never going to become a soccer mom in this town, if you know what I mean. We can do better.*

Another example: *Timothy will stick out in our department, as I'm sure everyone here senses. Won't he be hard to relate to? He is so clearly a New York City kind of a person. He's just too different from the rest of us. We've got a bad fit here, I think. On the other hand, Jerry would be great for us. He can hit the ground running and will be able to read our minds—well, at least most of the time. That's the beauty of his coming here. He'll fit right into everything, very fast. He's just like us—that's the long and short of it.*

7. Provincialism

Closely related to cloning, this error means undervaluing something outside your own province, circle, or clan. Several comprehensive studies have shown that evaluation committees often tend to trust only those letters of recommendation or external review that are written by people they personally know (Sagaria, 2002) or who are in certain respected networks. This could be termed an “affiliation bonus” (Wenneras and Wold, 1997).

You might hear a committee member disclose: *Listen, I'm uneasy because I have never met this referee. I have a gut feeling that we shouldn't give his letter much credence. I just have no confidence in*

what is being said. In effect, the committee member is announcing: “I trust only those from my own clan or network.”

Another example: *Here's a funny, old-fashioned letter. I'm not sure we should really believe all these superlatives. The author writes what could only be termed a 'very peculiar' external review letter. Yes, yes, I know we have debated whether we should give external referees more guidelines. Maybe we should. But anyway, I have the distinct feeling that this particular author wouldn't be able to follow our guidelines. She's clearly living in an earlier century.*

8. Extraneous Myths and Assumptions (Including “Psychoanalyzing” the Candidate)

Personal opinions and misinformation should be suspect during evaluations. So too should second-guessing, mind-reading, or what I prefer to call “psychoanalyzing the candidate.” Here are several illustrations of misinformation and of psychoanalysis.

- *Sally is bound to be unhappy with our harsh winters and our family-centered town. I'm certain of that.*
- *Really, there are no qualified women or minorities for us to hire. I wish there were. The pool is bone-dry (paraphrased from Smith, 1996).*
- *No one from Georgia Tech would want to come here. I know some of those folks. I'm positive about that.*
- *Minorities like Tonya will be receiving a dozen early-career awards in the next year or two. After all, we're now in the decade of “Let's celebrate the minority scientist.” So I say we by-pass Tonya because she'll be getting plenty of prestigious recognition from other folks.*
- *Zack will find it too rural here. I wish we had cosmopolitan and diverse neighborhoods for him but we don't.*
- *This candidate will turn down our offer in an instant. Our measly salary will insult this finance whiz. Let's not set ourselves up for rejection.*
- *This candidate will not be satisfied with a small medical school like ours, no matter what she said. I can only see her thriving at a huge research university.*
- *Her husband has a great job in New Jersey. So put two and two together. This candidate won't accept an offer from us. We're too far away.*
- *Ricardo is playing us for a fool. What I mean is this: he can't be serious about coming to our campus. He's just adding us to his list of eager suitors. Under-represented minorities like Ricardo get a hundred job offers. We don't have a chance, and we should face up to that painful fact (paraphrased from Smith, 1996).*

- *I worry that this campus can't provide Yolanda with a Puerto Rican-American faculty mentor. She deserves a mentor who has the same ethnic background. She needs that kind of person to help her learn the ropes and understand what she's up against here. It would be a disservice to bring her in when we are empty-handed in this area. It just wouldn't be in her best interest.*

9. Wishful Thinking; Rhetoric not Evidence

By wishful thinking, I mean not only holding to a notion in spite of overwhelming evidence to the contrary but also casually allowing this notion to cloud one's cognitive processes. A common form of wishful thinking is this: insisting that America and its colleges, universities, and professional schools operate as a *meritocracy* where whom you know and what status and privileges you start with are immaterial.

An illustration: *There is absolutely no subjectivity or favoritism involved when we seek merit and excellence in candidates. We should be proud that all of our grant winners have cultural anthropology doctorates from Yale and Texas. After all, they're the best and the brightest in my book.*

Another instance of wishful, non-critical thinking occurs when someone insists that they (or the committee) are color-blind and gender-blind and therefore there is no need for them to be more careful than usual in their deliberations. *Listen, I don't really see gender or race in people. Really, I don't. It doesn't matter to me whether a job candidate is black, white, green, polka dot, or purple. Really, it doesn't. I don't see why you're asking me, of all people, to bend over backwards to recruit more and more minority candidates. Give me a break.*

In my other publications, I discuss how the gender-blind and color-blind assertion is almost always a self-serving, disingenuous rhetorical plea by a *majority* person (for non-majorities to make such an assertion would be absurd). With this plea, the majority person seems to be claiming some sort of political innocence and otherworldly infallibility as well as disclaiming any responsibility for past or current discrimination and devaluation of women and minorities. Further, the gender-blind and color-blind assertion deliberately calls into question the wisdom of trying to identify and perhaps hire women and non-immigrants. Faculty search committees should deal with this line of resistance *before* they commence their work. Otherwise, the assertion at certain points can confuse and even unravel the committee's efforts to diversify its departmental faculty.

A number of scholars agree with Penn State Professor Frances Rains that the color-blind assertion attempts to "trivialize the substance and weight of the intertwined histories of Whites and people of color" (1999 p. 93), histories intertwined in the U.S. since the beginning of English settlements in the 17th century (also see Dahl, 2001; Fair, 1997; Guinier

and Torres, 2000; Takaki, 1993; Gaertner and Dovidio, 1986; Moody, "Rising," 2010). While *on the surface* the color-blind, gender-blind assertion may sound admirable, it usually plays out as a disingenuous and trivializing stance that, I maintain, can slow down actual diversifying at schools and campuses.

Finally, wishful thinking can also be illustrated when a group of evaluators is satisfied with the mere uttering of one individual's opinions and hunches—and does not insist on evidence and verifiable facts. Perhaps the evaluation committee members don't wish to or feel they can't take the time to do the required digging and hard work that must precede the consideration and weighing of evidence. Accepting opinions and wishful thinking are so much easier.

Ironically, most of the cognitive errors being discussed in this book could be characterized as what happens when time-consuming digging for evidence and then careful sifting through it are in fact *abandoned*. Instead, decision-makers unfortunately allow short-cut stating of opinions, personal likes and dislikes, and standard stereotypes to thrive.

10. Self-Fulfilling Prophecy

Some experts would prefer to call this error "channeling," which has been described as structuring our interaction with someone so that we can receive information congruent with our assumptions or so that we can avoid information incongruent with our assumptions. If you have high expectations for someone, you may unthinkingly set up situations—sometimes called *priming*—so that person is likely to be spotlighted in a positive way and earn extra points. Or conversely, if you have low expectations for someone, you can easily set up situations so that these low expectations will be confirmed (Nahavandi and Malekzadeh, 1999).

An example of self-fulfilling prophecy might unfold in this way. You believe the job candidate coming for an interview tomorrow is head and shoulders above all the other candidates. Consequently, you ask one of your most senior and well-informed colleagues to meet the candidate at the airport. Primed by this colleague, the candidate will be better prepared than other candidates for issues he or she will face in the upcoming interviews and evaluation process.

Yet another illustration of self-fulfilling prophecy might occur in a situation like this: the committee has chosen three candidates to interview. In your judgment as chair of the committee, two candidates look more attractive on paper than the third. Based on your reading of the files, you decide to place personal phone calls to the two you regard as stronger, to answer their questions. But you ask the *department secretary* to call the third one. It shouldn't be surprising if the third candidate doesn't do as well as the others during the visit. Although this slighting of one

applicant is probably unintentional, the slighting can activate the self-fulfilling prophecy.

11. Seizing a Pretext

Seizing a pretext is creating a smoke screen to hide one's real concerns or agenda. By seizing on a pretextual reason, a power-holder can come to the decision desired while keeping hidden or obscure the real reason for the decision.

One example involves assigning excessive weight to something trivial, in order to justify quick dismissal of the candidate. Someone might say: *Raquel seemed so nervous during the first five minutes of her job talk. Why keep her in the running for the administrative position? We don't need a timid mouse to work with.* What this evaluator may be really doing is setting up a superficial and false reason for a thumbs-down verdict.

In another example of seizing a pretext, a tenure and promotion committee decides to "selectively exclude favorable [teaching] ratings and focus on the two courses in which a professor had difficulties" and then to use this "contrivance" as a key reason for refusing tenure to the candidate. Such a deliberate and outrageous smoke screen was uncovered by a judge in a case discussed in *Tenure Denied: Cases of Sex Discrimination in Academia* (American Association of University Women, pp. 56-57). Pretextual reasons, when they go unchallenged, ensure contaminated results.

12. Assuming Character over Context

Assuming character over context means that a judge does not consider the particular context and any extenuating circumstances within that context but instead thinks automatically that an individual's personal characteristics explain her or his behavior. (Some social scientists call this an "attribution" error.)

Here is one example of character over context: A committee member might say, *Well, I didn't like the offbanded way that Walter responded to your question about his most recent public health report, at dinner last night. I mean, is he really serious about this job or not?* Here the committee member ignores the social nature of the dinner setting. Perhaps the candidate thought it would be inappropriate to get into a long discussion of his research since that would be the focus of his two-hour presentation the next day.

Another example of character over context: A committee member hastily concludes, *You know, Sheila didn't seem very lively when I saw her after my 4 p.m. seminar. I don't think we want a low-energy person joining our technology-transfer team.* Here the committee person ignores the context that the interview is late in the day after a lengthy

series of interviews for the applicant. That context might well have been the explanation for Sheila's behavior.

A third illustration of this particular cognitive error concerns teaching evaluations. Over the years, various personnel and tenure review committees on a campus might have noticed that women and non-immigrant instructors usually earn lower teaching evaluation ratings from students than do male majority instructors who are usually viewed as the "norm." Despite this familiar pattern, few committee members have ever bothered to check external studies to see if group-bias and gender-bias could help explain this pattern (they do). Instead, the committees blithely assume that URW and NIs themselves are totally responsible for their lower ranking and should pay the consequences.

13. Momentum of the Group

If most members of an evaluation committee are favoring one candidate, then it will be more difficult for the remaining members to resist that push towards consensus. The remaining members will have to work harder to get a full hearing for other candidates. Sometimes the struggle doesn't seem to be worth it.

Here is one example: *Okay, this is the last time that I try to call attention to other worthy applicants. Come on, hear me out. Let me go over the strengths and weaknesses, as I see them, of two more promising folks. Hey, listen to me, please.*

The difficulties involved in resisting the group consensus and trying to get the group to extend its deliberations are evident in this example: *Yes, I know we're all exhausted. I know we've spent more time on this stage of the search process that we intended. Nevertheless, I want to make sure we give a full hearing to the only African American in our pool of finalists. Why should he be dismissed quickly when we invested plenty of thought and care in the others? Is he here just for the sake of symbolic value and to reassure our dean that we did indeed try to diversify our faculty? Please, hear me out. Please.*

Another example illustrates the power of the group's considerable momentum: *Stop and think, Patrick. Doesn't it make you wonder why all the rest of us are behind Candidate A and you're the only holdout? Are you sure you're not just trying to make some ideological point or be a royal pain? I'm just kidding, of course.*

Organizational Dysfunctions that Exacerbate Cognitive Errors and Unsound Evaluations

The thirteen errors and shortcuts just named are likely to be made—unwittingly and repeatedly—by *individuals* during evaluation processes.

These contaminants can and often do undermine what should be the evidence-based rigor and equity of evaluation reviews.

But when the larger conditions and practices within a lab, institute, department, division, or larger *organization* are dysfunctional, then the severity of an individual's and a review committee's errors (and the consequences of those errors) is unfortunately magnified. I now want to highlight bad practices frequently manifested at the organizational level that do indeed serve as magnifiers. How to fix these bad practices will receive attention especially in Chapters 4 and 5.

1. Overloading and Rushing the Search Committee

It is common to abruptly "thrust" a search committee or other evaluation entity into its complex task without adequate time to prepare or to execute with care. I have repeatedly heard this complaint from committee members. "No wonder," they tell me, "we can't think straight. No wonder that we keep reproducing ourselves year after year. No wonder that we can't manage to do active searches but just keep on doing wholesale screening out of candidates. We have a mess here."

Unfortunately, it is standard procedure to rush and overwhelm evaluation committees. Cognitive errors and shortcuts will thrive in frenetic situations. "When people are distracted or put under pressure to respond quickly," they become far more vulnerable to cognitive errors and "faulty decision-making," according to Steven Pinker and a number of other cognitive researchers whose work parallels his (Pinker, 2002, p. 205; also Martell, 1991; Croskerry, 2000, 2003; Groopman, 2007a,b).

Rather than committee members being relieved of some of their routine duties, they are usually given their search or other evaluation assignment as an overload to their regular work. Not receiving extra secretarial support or assistance from the dean's office, the members and the chair struggle on their own to plow quickly through applications instead of carefully considering which candidates would bring new skills and strengths to their department or school.

Finally, search and other evaluation committees are sometimes hastily formed. If there is a renewed commitment in the hiring department and school to identify and hire more under-represented women and non-immigrant, domestic minorities, then this renewed commitment should be reflected in those who are chosen to carry out the search (Whetten and Cameron, 2002). To keep the committee alert to opportunities for identifying and hiring more members of under-represented U.S. groups (not international or immigrant) and more women, I recommend that one committee member be designated as the Diversity Advocate. (Stanford Medical School uses the term "Good Practices Monitor" while several ADVANCE-National Science Foundation campuses use the term "Equity Advisor.") After some coaching, this Advocate or Monitor will

be able to effectively remind members of the importance of hiring under-represented colleagues and can gently press everyone to do more outreach to diversify the applicant pool. And, of course, the Advocate can assist the committee chair in helping to keep the evaluation on track and away from cognitive errors and a rush to judgment.

2. No Coaching and No Practice for the Committee

Corporations habitually spend time and money ensuring that the managers who hire new employees are well-trained and practiced in search and interview methods. But professional schools and campuses often neglect this dimension—perhaps assuming that anyone can do a job search, just as anyone can teach. (Not true, of course.)

One single job search often requires enormous "economic, administrative, emotional, and interpersonal resources" from the search members and the school as a whole. When one accounts for the cost of job advertisements, for the time spent by search members, staff, and deans as they sort and review applications and support materials, for the travel expense of bringing finalists to campus for interview, then the total sum arrived at "is about the same as the first-year salary of that new faculty member (at least in the humanities)" (Dettmar, 2004, p. B8). If the new hire works in a specialty that requires scientific equipment and special resources, then the start-up cost is much, much higher. Thus, it is worthwhile to improve search practices in order to increase the likelihood of hiring a sound person who will stay and succeed.

What passes for preparation is woefully inadequate at most places: provosts, deans, human resource directors, or affirmative action officers will distribute to search committees a list of illegal questions to avoid asking job candidates (regarding marital status, age, sexual orientation, disability, family, pregnancy, religion) but will do *nothing more* to prepare the committees. With only this cursory list of "don'ts" in hand, the committee members often feel confused and hamstrung. For instance, when they may want to court a candidate by offering to help find employment for his/her significant other, the committee members remain quiet because they believe broaching that topic is illegal. Silence on this topic is a *bad* practice. Numerous studies of new hires, including Cathy Trower's COACHE program, underscore that assistance with spousal hiring can be a *deal-maker* or a *deal-breaker* during the hiring season (see the Harvard website for details about the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education).

What the committee desperately needs to know are acceptable and legal ways to discuss this deal-maker or deal-breaker. Some job candidates, invariably, will be shy and hesitant about bringing up the dual-hire topic on their own: this is yet another reason for interviewers to take the lead. As one example, Associate Vice Chancellor and physicist Bernice

Durand at the University of Wisconsin-Madison delivers the following deft and perfectly legal statement to every finalist during their campus visit: "If information about dual-career assistance interests you, it's right here in this packet of materials I'm giving you. Please let me know of questions you may have before your campus visit ends, or you can email or phone me after your visit is completed" (conversation with Durand, 2009). Another legal, effective example: "We on the search committee are sending a brochure to *all* candidates being interviewed by us over the phone. This brochure describes how spouses and significant others (of those we hire) will be assisted in identifying and finding jobs in this geographical area. For more info, candidates should contact the person in the provost's office who is named in that brochure."

Failing to coach evaluation committees—and especially committee chairs—is a *dire* mistake. While the provost or the dean may resort to impressive arguments and rhetorical flourishes as they charge the committees to be fair and careful in their deliberations, such an abstract pep-talk does little good, in my experience. Instead of delivering a pep-talk, these power-holders should ensure that evaluation and selection committees engage in thorough preparation as well as in thoughtful review of the cognitive errors and corrupters discussed in this publication. Following this review, committee members should be given *practice sessions* to sharpen their skills and alertness.

Deans and provosts might wish to adapt some new strategies currently being adopted by several medical schools and teaching hospitals. These medical institutions are beginning to coach medical students, residents, and physicians to better understand—and then reduce—their unwitting reliance on cognitive errors and shortcuts. Several approaches have recently been launched, which I will quickly list.

- Simulations with a mannequin can bring to light medical residents' shortcuts and lead them to cultivate *mandatory mindfulness* and resistance to the particular errors each of them tends to repeatedly make. (The use of simulations was borrowed from the aviation industry's training of pilots with computerized flight simulations.)
- Many more active-learning *exercises* are being developed because lectures by experts have proven ineffective. Passive listening does not build skills.
- Clinicians are warned that they must be extra cautious when dealing with a number of predictably complex and ambiguous situations (such as abdominal pain in an elderly patient) that are habitually and quickly mis-diagnosed by novices *and* veterans.
- Medical residents and others are cautioned to seek second opinions and feedback from other experts—so that they can grasp alternative perspectives and treatments and enhance their thinking *out-*

side their own cognitive boxes (Gallagher, 2003; Bond et al., 2006; Croskerry, 2000; Redelmeier, 2005; Pronovost, 2009).

It is also encouraging to see that a subset of medical experts is constructing a new professional society devoted to "Diagnostic Error in Medicine," with its first international conference held in 2008. The quickening attention to cognitive errors is encouraging and overdue. My guess is that some of the self-correction techniques being developed will find their way—and indeed should find their way—into academic evaluations and decision-making.

3. Failure to Consult Relevant Parties

Before the search or evaluation commences, the committee should have time to consult and discuss with the department chair, the dean, the hospital director, the technology-transfer officer (or any other relevant officials) *the various programmatic needs and opportunities* to be considered and decided on before the process goes forward. Because this all-important ground rule is often ignored, committee members in the midst of their work are likely to become flummoxed and even enraged with one another: "Wait a minute! You're dead wrong. That's not the reason we're trying to fill the vacancy. I never heard and certainly never agreed to such nonsense" or "The dean is simply not going to get a patent law expert though he is pushing us relentlessly. He's wasted his time. I refuse to go along with him or with the rest of you. That's my position."

4. No Ground Rules

Other key issues must be clarified before the committee is activated. These clarifications should lead to the construction of ground rules to govern the committee's work. Examples include:

- How will committee members help one another rise above cognitive shortcuts and errors?
- What are the job criteria we agree to use for the selection process? Do we agree that we won't create additional criteria half-way through our process?
- What are the *preferred* versus the *required* credentials, experience, achievements, and/or skills we are seeking? Using the word *preferred* will open the door to "equivalent" expertise—expertise that often goes unrecognized when evaluation groups construct their searches or award selections in the same old way, year after year (Turner, 2002, p. 17)
- How will all committee members (or certain designated ones) undertake pro-active outreach early on in the evaluation process, so that

a *broad net is being used*—rather than a cut-and-dried narrow net probably used by previous committees.

A number of other ground rules for evaluation committees will be set forth in nuts-and-bolts specificity in Chapter 4 on Faculty Recruitment. Ground rules usually end up saving time because the evaluation chair can reel in members from wild-goose chases by referring back to what everyone agreed in the beginning. Further, ground rules can put a welcome damper on what one dean vividly labeled the “psycho-dramas” that take place when two evaluators begin to express aggravation and anger towards one another. In this case, the evaluation committee chair will be able to refer back to one or more ground rules that heighten his/her authority and help the committee move ahead.

5. Absence of Reminders and Checklists

Given that cognitive errors and shortcuts are so automatic and deep-seated, there *must* be reminders to committees about the contaminating power of these errors on their evaluation and decision processes. Why not give each evaluation committee member a large index card that lists all the errors, so committee members can handily refresh their memory? Or on the wall of the meeting room, why not hang a banner that lists the errors? Or how about some sort of posted checklist like those often seen in hospitals: *Remember to wash your hands often; confirm the identity of the patient; be sure to operate on the correct leg; check for drug allergies; be sure to carefully monitor this, that, and the other.*

Medical checklists are increasingly regarded as an essential tool for reducing errors, complications, and patient suffering. Drawing on his own work as well as that of other medical experts mentioned directly above, Surgery Professor Atul Gawande (2009) shows that checklists can serve as invaluable precautions against a number of bad practices: the rush to judgment; lazy guessing about the causes of a problem; overconfidence about one’s infallible judgment. Moreover, checklists can deflate deference to hierarchy that leads junior associates to stifle their own warnings to senior colleagues about errors and complications they see. (By the way, pilots and co-pilots were infamous for doing this but now use checklists to help diminish the junior’s excessive deference to the senior; checklists in use by airlines have influenced the construction of medical checklists.)

At colleges, universities, and professional schools, checklists to prevent errors in peer review and evaluations should be more widely used. As an interesting aside from Gawande, checklists were developed several decades ago by the U.S. Air Force to help pilots fly increasingly complicated airplanes. But my guess is that surely in the past there were a number of experienced craftsmen, alchemists and chemists, farmers,

psychologists, teachers, parents, and other experts across the globe who learned—perhaps the hard way—that they needed their own personal checklists to ensure quality control in their work. Checklists, to my mind, are often the sign of a humble but competent practitioner. Discovering more and more about the predictable limitations of the human brain (as well as its astounding capabilities, of course), neuroscientists currently are recommending more checklists, reminders, retrievals, and practice exercises (especially quizzes) to improve cognitive functioning and the daily performances of our trades. In other words, consuming more caffeine isn’t enough!

6. Lack of Attention to Internal and External Monitoring/Accountability

In academe, should evaluation committees be better monitored? I would argue *yes*. For instance, an associate dean could check in every two weeks or so with each evaluation committee chair, to see if perennial errors and bad habits are being avoided by the committee. In addition, Equity Advisors (senior faculty leaders who have received special coaching) could provide assistance to search committees when they encounter problems.

The committee chair is seldom expected to update the dean, provost, equity advisors, or diversity council on how the various stages of an ongoing search or evaluation are progressing. Far more disclosure is needed in these processes.

Annual assessments of the job-performance of deans and department chairs rarely consider the results produced by the search and evaluation committees in the units for which these administrators are responsible. Indeed, many institutions do not have any sort of performance reviews of their department chairs or program directors, a puzzling situation that should be corrected.

Committees and schools also should be reminded that the outside world is concerned about critical issues, such as gender imbalance. The media and legislative groups may begin to scrutinize their behavior. For example, in 2004, after media criticism of gender imbalance, Canadian universities heard the wake-up call: they nominated and chose a much higher number of women to be Canada Research Chairs (see “Women Make Gains,” 2004). Likewise, several California state legislators a few years ago called on the University of California System to disclose the representation of women in all faculty ranks. Not surprisingly, gender imbalance was evident in the numbers, and pro-active steps were launched to resolve that imbalance.

Recently, a number of campuses and professional schools have started collecting data regarding hiring results by gender and ethnicity, and are making the information readily available to those involved in hiring, to the campus community, to state legislators and auditors, and to regional

and national accrediting associations. The provost and others should also periodically review data regarding start-up packages offered and accepted by new hires in all fields. Regular reviews such as these will usually lead to the detection of patterns that need explanation or correction.

7. Lack of Debriefing and Systematic Improvement

Year in and year out, most searches and evaluations go forward without considering the past experiences and hard-earned wisdom of those who have gone before.

At the present time, only a few schools tap into the wisdom of former search and tenure review chairs and invite these leaders to meet with new search and tenure chairs. Why not make these leaders' caveats and recommendations available in a comprehensive evaluation primer? Within the demystifying primer could be other important items: case studies of actual successful and unsuccessful searches, practice exercises, and a summary of model ground rules that other schools and departments have used to govern evaluations and decision-making.

There could be debriefing of every evaluation committee in order to add its own "lessons learned" to the primer. Because so little institutional history and wisdom are being recorded at the present time, each committee packs up and sets out on its own—with the likelihood that it will make some predictably amateurish mistakes. Job candidates themselves have insights to share. An associate dean (or perhaps several Equity Advisors) could make it a habit to interview from time to time a number of candidates who turned down the campus's job offers as well as candidates who were not offered jobs.

* * * * *

The *organizational* bad practices just sketched (overloading; no preparation as well as no practice, ground rules, checklists, reminders, monitoring, or debriefing) will boost the spread of the contaminating thirteen cognitive errors. These bad practices will also appreciably intensify the reliance on positive and negative biases by *individuals* in during evaluation and decision-making processes. The biases are rampant in academe; they are routinely applied to gender and to group membership. In Chapter 2, I will delve into negative bias/stereotype (Cognitive Error #14) and positive bias/stereotype (Error #15). In that next chapter, I will trace how these biases both subtly and frontally manifest themselves and then suggest how organizational reforms could reduce their power. In Chapters 4–6, I devote a great deal of attention to how academics and committees—step by step—can prevent or shrink these two biases as well as the other thirteen cognitive errors.

NEGATIVE BIAS AND POSITIVE BIAS

Two Powerful Cognitive Errors that Impede the Advancement of Some Faculty and Speed the Advancement of Others

Intellectually, any woman and any black person must [constantly] prove that she or he is not dumb ... it is tiresome in the extreme ... and even attending social gatherings—where one is always on show, always standing for The Negro—saps one's energy.

(Princeton History Professor Nell Painter, who has African-American ancestry; quoted in Reiss, 1997, pp. 6–7)

We European-American males have the experience of "having our voices heard, of not having to explain or defend our legitimate citizenship or identity, of seeing our images projected in a positive light, of remaining insulated from other people's realities, of being represented in positions of power, and of being able to tell our own stories.

(Western Washington State University Adjunct Professor of Social Justice and Education Gary Howard, 1999, p. 62)

I was born white, male, and in America. I won the lottery.

(Billionaire investor and philanthropist Warren Buffett, quoted in Miles, 2004, p. 89)

As these observations make clear, some individuals in this country (such as Painter) are assigned a negative bias which means that their worthiness, intelligence, and leadership potential will be questioned and often undervalued. I find it helpful to refer to these unfortunate experiences as "penalties." By contrast, those sufficiently lucky to be assigned a positive bias, such as Howard and Buffett, will usually reap the opposite. Penn State University Professor Frances Rains has called these fortunate experiences "hidden profits" (1999).

Individuals encountering negative bias about their capabilities will usually number only a few among faculty members; boards of trustees of campuses and professional schools; legislators in Congress and in the states; investment teams at Goldman Sachs and other Wall Street

and financial corporations; CEOs, members of boards of directors, and entrepreneurs of large and medium-sized businesses, and on and on.

By contrast, those with a positive bias will probably be over-represented in these spheres—or, if you prefer, they will exhibit far-above-average representation. (U.S. President Barack Obama is an “interesting case,” I readily admit. In Chapter 3, I will explain why I believe the president as well as Colin Powell, the former head of the Joint Chief of Staffs, mostly escaped the negative bias and stigma that would have curtailed some of their ambition and success.)

Negative bias and positive bias are two enormously important cognitive traps that all of us wander into unknowingly and frequently. *Negative bias* will be classified as Cognitive Error #14. *Positive bias* will be Error #15. I would venture a guess that these two errors actually outweigh—in frequency and importance—any of the other errors discussed and illustrated in the previous chapter. My goal in this chapter will be to briefly review some of what scholars and researchers have learned about negative and positive biases and how they are manifested.

At times, my discussion will fold in findings from neuroscientists (some are named in Chapter 1) who are probing ways to reduce the power and effects of cognitive errors. In general, researchers conclude that our brains (especially the amygdala and its allies) prefer to stick with familiar and quick-to-access categories. To form new categories and cognitive habits, we must muster considerable concentration and engage in retrieval, reminders, priming and practicing, testing, and above all constant *self-correction*. It's not easy. (Consult especially the prolific work of social-cognition expert Susan Fiske described at the Princeton website.) Later in this chapter, I want to concretely illustrate how negative and positive biases are experienced on a daily basis by faculty members and how the biases produce predictable disadvantages for members of some groups and predictable advantages for members of others. In this last section, I hope that faculty members' personal testimonies and disclosures about the two biases as well as broader ethnographic evidence will move our understanding from the conceptual realm to the “on-the-ground” realm. This seems important.

SECTION A

Negative Bias (Cognitive Error #14) and Positive Bias (Cognitive Error #15)—and their Application to Gender and to Group Membership

What exactly is a bias or a stereotype? (I will use these two words interchangeably.) Most of us are probably familiar with the notion of a stereo-

type—that's been a part of our vocabulary and thinking for decades. All of us have probably heard some of the following generalizations:

Tall men make better leaders. Asians and Asian Americans are innately better at math and engineering than any other ethnic group. White men can't jump. Women are emotional. Men are rational. People in wheelchairs are usually mentally handicapped, too. Those who can, do; those who can't, teach.

In that short list, notice that we heard negative stereotypes (also called negative biases) about some groups but also positive stereotypes (positive biases) about others. This illustrates an important fact to remember: stereotypes can be positive as well as negative. A stereotype can be defined as a broad generalization about a particular group and the assumption that a member of the group embodies the generalized traits of that group. Just how pervasively these generalizations enter into and contaminate our cognitive processes of evaluating, judging, and deciding is the concern of dozens of experts—brain specialists, social scientists, cultural anthropologists, lawyers and law professors, courtroom judges, medical diagnosticians, and management experts. I recommend the findings of experts listed in the Bibliography, such as: Biernat; Blair and Banaji; Delgado; Fiske; Foschi; Fried; Greenwald; Groopman; Hollinger; Kahneman; Kanter; Kobrynowicz and Biernat; Kunda, Sinclair, and Griffin; Martell, Lane, and Emrich; Martell; Massey; McIntosh; Mervis; Moskowitz, Gollwitzer, and Wasel; Nahavandi and Malekzadeh; Nosek; Pinker; Rosser; Sagaria; Sanchirico; Steele and Aronson; Sturm and Guinier; Trix and Psenka; Valian; Weneras and Wold; C. Williams; C.L. Williams; Wilson and Brekke.

Negative Bias: Regarding Gender

Believing women are innately less competent than men is a pernicious assumption found in many countries and cultures. U.S. society, for instance, is still male-dominated, male-identified, male-centered, and systematically devalues women especially in traditionally male fields. “Most organizations have been created by and for men and are based on male experiences” (Meyerson and Fletcher, 2000, p. 132). Quickly review in your mind who in this country holds almost all the powerful political, economic, legal, religious, intellectual, and military positions (Lopez, 2006, p. B7). It is deemed extraordinary when a woman achieves such a position. Men rule, most especially European-American males. Further, conventional male values—strength, decisiveness, aggression, thick skin, self-sufficiency, control over emotions, forceful leadership—are frequently accepted as the norm in this society. For women,

the conventions are almost the exact opposite, and women's care-giving propensity is expected and in fact vigorously reinforced by the larger society. Further, women's inferiority to men is broadcast and accepted in countless ways.

Remember former Harvard President Larry Summers's *faux pas* a few years ago? At a national conference, he mused that women are perhaps innately inferior to men in science areas and therefore they would not rise to top posts. Many faculty on his campus immediately and vociferously protested; the presidents of several major universities published a letter of reprimand. After reflection, Summers retracted his claim and observed: "I think it was, in retrospect, an act of spectacular imprudence." He says that he deeply regrets if girls and women have been discouraged by his off-the-cuff remark (quoted in Leonhardt, 2007, p. 25). Like Summers, many of us aren't fully cognizant of our gender biases (though fortunately there are ways that we can learn to recognize, self-correct, and rise above them).

Negative bias against women is ubiquitous, as numerous studies have documented. An ambitious enterprise to detect this and other patterns of biases (and recommend how to overcome them) has been launched by three major researchers and their labs at the universities of Washington and Virginia and at Harvard. These three researchers have created a website for self-administered Implicit Association. More than five million visitors in various countries have taken the on-line tests since 1998 (see <http://www.projectimplicit.net/generalinfo>). The website contains articles (written by members of the U.S. labs and also by scholars throughout the world) about how to recognize and correct for these automatic biases.

How does gender bias manifest itself in academic life? Admittedly in the 21st century, it would be rare for us to hear virulent anti-woman rhetoric in academe and observe pernicious behavior toward women. But nevertheless, subtle undermining and shortchanging will occur. For instance, disparagement of women applicants for medical school posts was spotlighted in a comprehensive study of more than 300 letters of recommendation used in hiring and promotion processes at a large medical school. The study found that competent women faculty were underestimated and stereotypically described as "caring," "refreshing," and "diligent." By contrast, competent male faculty were praised in specific ways for their research brilliance and for their concrete career achievements (Trix and Psenka, 2003). A recent study by Rice University researchers finds the same situation in their analysis of 624 letters of recommendation submitted for applicants seeking junior faculty positions at a research university (Madera, Hebl, and Martin, 2009).

The two anthropologists who conducted the medical school study went on to issue these four warnings to academics involved in the gate-

keeping processes of screening, hiring, making awards, and reviewing candidates for tenure and promotion: (1) double-check and eradicate from your own verbal and written evaluations superficial assumptions related to gender schema; (2) be on guard against omitting essential topics (such as concrete career achievements) that are related to gender schema; (3) make sure that colleagues understand how the evaluations of applicants may be typically positively biased towards males and negatively prejudiced towards females; (4) coach female colleagues on how they can ensure that department chairs evaluate their individual promise and professional accomplishments rather than fall back on belittling gender stereotypes (Trix and Psenka, 2003).

Job evaluations can in fact be riddled with subjectivity and involve shifting standards. The result is that "only super-duper women rise to the top," according to a female vice provost for faculty affairs, "because the mediocre ones are beaten out by the mediocre men. They [the women] have to prove themselves, to have published 26 articles, look the part, be assertive, tough-minded." A female presidential candidate, the vice provost adds, would be assumed by college trustees to possess far less business sense than a male candidate, though their backgrounds were almost identical (quoted in Glazer-Raymo, 1999, p. 161).

A similar point is made by Joan Steitz, Professor of Molecular Biophysics and Biochemistry at Yale University. Women "superstars" in predominantly male departments, she observes, seem to have an easier time in advancing their careers than do "sort of average" women who are bunched in the middle with "most of their male colleagues." Steitz believes that women, unlike men, seem to have a difficult time in the middle being accepted as equal colleagues. Their evaluations do not result in their being granted fair and full recognition for their accomplishments (2001, quoted in "Tomorrow's Professor" Listserve operated by Professor Richard Reis and headquartered at Stanford University). To adapt a quip attributed to former Congresswoman Bella Abzug, "Our struggle today is not to have a female Einstein get fairly evaluated and promoted in academe. It is for a woman *schlemiel* to get as quickly promoted as a male *schlemiel*."

The shabby treatment of female tenured science faculty at MIT reveals "the lens of prejudice and discrimination" unwittingly used by male colleagues. The MIT senior women in the science division numbered just over a dozen among almost 200 male faculty. The women's investigation in the late 1990s demonstrated that they had been "marginalized, excluded from full participation in the academic process, and undervalued" at their home institution even though they had been inducted into the National Academies and recognized as international experts. The MIT President and the Dean of Science both expressed shock when they found these gross inequities: the women faculty members' lab areas,

bridge funding from the Institute, and actual salaries were much smaller than their male colleagues; and no woman had ever chaired a science department. Clearly, these women were being constricted by gender bias and a glass ceiling not affecting their male co-workers (see MIT Newsletter website for details about how the inequities are being resolved).

Inequities mount up and have a cumulative effect. This fact has been proven by computer modeling, when only a tiny 1 percent discounting is shown to result in women's slower advancement in the professions (Martell, 1991). Certainly the MIT women were being discounted at a *much higher* percentage rate. The National Academy of Sciences, citing dozens of studies about gender bias, concludes that the *accumulation* of biased discounting has a substantial effect on the careers of women in science and engineering fields (see the Academy's *Beyond Bias and Barriers: Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering* (2006). Two quotations from the report (p. 114) are especially telling:

Through a scientific or engineering career, advancement depends on judgments of one's performance by more senior scientists and engineers. A substantial body of research shows these judgments contain arbitrary and subjective components that disadvantage women. The criteria underlying the judgments developed over many decades when women scientists and engineers were a tiny and often marginal presence and men were considered the norm.

Incidents of bias against individuals not in the majority group tend to have accumulated effects. Small preferences for the majority group can accumulate and create large differences in prestige, power, and position. In academic science and engineering, the advantages have accrued to white men and have translated into larger salaries, faster promotions, and more publications and honors relative to women.

In short, the repeated discounting of women's accomplishments and innate abilities produces a cumulative effect. The cumulative effect even of small slights and shortchanging will mount up ("molehills create mountains," to use a helpful metaphor from Hunter College Distinguished Professor Virginia Valian). The result can demoralize women and derail their careers and their contributions to science, medicine, law, arts and humanities, business, government, and other domains (Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Valian, 2000a,b).

How do women business leaders fare in their various workplaces? Details abound in *Our Separate Ways: Black and White Women and the Struggle for Professional Identity* by Ella Bell, Visiting Professor of

Business at Dartmouth College and Stella Nkomo, Professor of Business at the University of South Africa. In their study comprising 120 black and white women in business careers, the authors found that women in business continue, as a matter of course, to have their authority and judgment questioned and their ideas undervalued. Undermining of their expertise is especially true for African and African-American women (Bell and Nkomo, 2001).

A comprehensive study of 3,200 engineers in 24 U.S. corporations demonstrates how negative bias prominently threads through job evaluations of women workers (DiTomaso, Farris, and Cordero, 1993). The study demonstrated that not only access to constructive work experiences but also positive evaluation of job performance were secured most often by majority U.S.-born males. They were followed, in invariable order, by: European-born majority males; then U.S.-born majority women; then East Asian men; Hispanic men; African-American men. At the bottom were *African-American* and other non-immigrant women who were the most disadvantaged in their access to constructive work experiences and positive evaluation of job performance. In short, the thinking processes of corporate power-holders (usually majority males) together with conventions and customs in the workplace clearly influence who gets ahead in the corporation and who does not.

Organizational behavior Professors Afsaneh Nahavandi (Arizona State University-West) and Ali Malekzadeh (St. Cloud State University) reinforce this point in their textbook (1999). One extremely common manifestation of negative bias occurs through a psychological process called "channeling"—this is "the process of limiting our interaction with another so that we avoid receiving information that contradicts our judgment." In other words, we set up a situation to gather the data needed to confirm our notion about the other person.

Professors Malekzadeh and Nahavandi continue: "Women are generally perceived by both male and female managers to be less competent, less capable of leading, and more likely to quit because of family pressures." The negative perception quickly leads to action that confirms these perceptions: managers "provide women with fewer training opportunities, limited exposure to diverse experiences, and more routine, less challenging assignments. In many professions, women are bypassed for key promotions because the position requires that they supervise men." Can it be surprising, the authors ask, that many women leave less challenging jobs or feel stymied by underemployment? The clear caveat is this: "Organizations that channel women's behavior because of gender stereotypes assure that the stereotypes become reality" (1999, p. 167). This process could be called self-fulfilling prophecy, as I discussed in Chapter 1.

Another shortchanging of women appeared in an audit at the Swedish Research Council. Peer reviewers, it was discovered, usually assumed that women applicants for post-doctoral grants possessed less scientific competence than men applicants with the *same* credentials and qualifications. To be competitive, the women had to be extraordinary. They had to have “published three extra papers” in high-impact journals like *Nature* and *Science* or “20 extra papers” in excellent but less prestigious journals. In short, a female applicant “had to be 2.5 times more productive than the average male applicant to receive the same competence score as he” (Wenneras and Wold, “Nepotism and Sexism,” 1997, p. 342; also see Rosser, 2004). The ratio of 2.5 to 1 is astounding.

What is one remedy for such inequity? Removing names from the applicant proposals (called a “blind review”) quickly resulted in women receiving close to one-half of the Swedish grants. A parallel remedy has been implemented in another venue: symphony orchestras. During musical auditions for orchestra employment, a new procedure has resulted in far more women being hired: the procedure requires applicants to play *behind a curtain*. The structural change (the curtain) guarantees anonymity and defeats the evaluators’ unexamined tendency to devalue women’s performances and promise. Several academic journals have switched to blind review (no names appear on the articles submitted for review and publication). The result has been a significant increase in published papers by women scholars (Budden et al., 2008).

Blind review is also recommended by Zurich researcher Lutz Bornmann who has extensively studied the biases within peer review in science. Peer review is widely regarded as the best way to be sure of “good science” and be sure taxpayers’ money is wisely spent on grants. But in fact, as Bornmann points out, “there are robust gender differences in grant peer-review procedures” that result in women receiving far fewer grants (2007, p. 566). Blind review is one remedy for the gender inequity. Another remedy is to widen the rules for submitting nominations for awards (the U.S. National Institutes of Health’s Pioneer Awards Program now accepts only self-nominations rather than institutional submissions because women were very rarely nominated). Third, some funding and award agencies are spending more time in training peer reviewers. These simple steps have already resulted in greater equity (Bornmann, 2007).

Negative Bias: Regarding Group Membership

Before turning from gender bias to group bias, I think it wise to interject a brief discussion about semantics. In this book, readers will probably notice that I deliberately avoid several popular terms (like “the white race” and “the black race”) and choose instead other ways to identify certain ethnic groups. There are certain terms I myself try to

avoid: *minority, under-represented minority, people of color, Hispanic, Latino/a, Black, White*. And wherever possible, I avoid using the word “race” because it is, as most of us agree by now, not a real biological category. But, of course, it remains a very powerful social construction. One has only to look at the U.S. Census’s use of the word to see how pervasive it is. (As one expert has mused, if we agree that “race” was socially and politically constructed, then why can’t we undo that construction, piece by piece? This is beyond my power but not beyond my wishing.)

In this book, I will eschew “race” and instead employ the following words and hyphenated descriptors: *non-immigrants (NI)*; *majority group* which signifies the *European-American group*; *under-represented women (URW)*; *colonized groups* which to me means the same as non-immigrant groups; hyphenated ethnicities such as *European-American, Mexican-American, Chinese-American, Cuban-American individuals and groups*, and so on; and finally *communities of descent*, which will mean ethnic lineage traced to specific places such as India, Korea, China, Haiti, Ireland, and so on (this is historian David Hollinger’s term, 2005, 2011).

As a further clarification, when I use the interchangeable terms *non-immigrant groups* or *colonized groups* in this country, I am intending to include only these five: African Americans, Mexican Americans, American Indians and Alaskan Natives, Native Hawaiians, and Puerto Rican Americans. Chapter 3, I trust, will make very clear why only these five should be described as non-immigrant, colonized groups and why and how these groups came to be associated with a negative bias regarding their intellectual capabilities and promise. In fact, these groups were forcibly and unfairly assigned an extraordinary negative bias called a “stigma.” This is the term used by sociologist Erving Goffman (1963) to denote the assignment of a spoiled identity that disqualifies members of a particular group from full societal acceptance and respect. Obviously dealing with and pushing back on a negative bias—let alone a more intense stigma—turns into an unenviable and “tiresome” task, as Professor Nell Painter has phrased it (Reiss, 1997). Earlier in this chapter, I described how under-represented women in predominantly male settings and departments have to spend extra time and energy in order to push back and cope with their under-valuation and short-changing. And I listed some strategies (such as blind peer review and heightened self-correction by evaluators) that are bringing about greater equity and recognition for women.

In this next section, I will do the same as I spotlight the colonized, NI groups listed above. Let us begin. One stunning example of negative group bias has been sketched out by MIT Emeritus Management Professor Thomas Allen, himself European American. As both a faculty

member and administrator, he observed that "racism is so ingrained in this society that people don't see it in themselves." Repeatedly he saw the following scenario play out: "Without even thinking, two people will walk in—one's white, one's black—and they [his colleagues] assume the black isn't capable. Yet they don't know a thing about either one of them, nothing." As a dean, he was repeatedly frustrated and angered by his majority-group colleagues. When he would bring in an African-American job candidate, Allen's colleagues in subtle but unmistakable ways "would discount that person right away." They would assume that this candidate was "not as capable" as the majority candidate.

While Allen didn't see this behavior in everyone, he saw it "in so many people who you wouldn't expect it from, people who espouse liberal values." He strenuously and wittily underscores: "These aren't rednecks I'm talking about." Rather, these are educated colleagues who "make wonderful talk" about equal opportunity and democratic values but unconsciously make "simplistic and damaging assumptions" about who can be competent and who cannot (quoted in C. Williams, 2001, pp. 314–19).

As several cognitive scientists have pointed out, for those surrounded by a negative stereotype "far more evidence is required for a judge to be certain that an individual possesses an *unexpected* attribute." The unexpected attribute is *competence* while the expected attribute is *incompetence*, according to University of Kansas Psychology Professor Monica Biernat (2003, p. 1020) whose lab does meticulous tracking of shifting standards. (See also Sagaria, 2002, on filters applied differently to different groups of job candidates.) If a member of a search committee assumes a job applicant from an under-represented group is possibly substandard, then that committee member will predictably raise the bar and insist on far more evidence than required before he/she can accept the applicant as worthy of consideration. It is a common practice for faculty search committees to seek from under-represented candidates (but not others) extra assurances that they are qualified, such as additional writing samples, letters of recommendation, and so on (Reyes and Halcon, 1991). This sort of raising the bar is one of the cognitive errors discussed in Chapter 1.

Negative group bias regarding competency can also lead search committees to insist that non-immigrant, under-represented candidates must have earned doctorates and must have performed their residencies or post-doc training at the most prestigious places—a requirement that is not usually essential for other applicants. Majority candidates will probably enjoy the assumption of being competent and well-qualified and will have *extra points added* to their evaluations, albeit unwittingly. On the other hand, those with negative bias will have *points subtracted* by evaluators, albeit unwittingly.

University of Pittsburgh Emeritus Law Professor Richard Delgado has observed similar standard-shifting in law schools' academic searches and decision-making. He points out that when the archetypal academic search committee is seeking a new colleague and after several months of work has not located the "superhuman, mythic figure who is Black or Hispanic," then the committee turns to a non-mythic, *average* candidate who is almost always "white, male, and straight." The committee has confidence that the choice they are reaching is a sound one: this is because the lower standard of evidence—applied to a positively stereotyped person—is being unwittingly used (Delgado, "Storytelling," 1998, p. 265).

Another manifestation of negative bias was uncovered by Robert Haro, an educational researcher in the Southwest. He interviewed "Latino/a leaders in higher education" as well as a number of European-American trustees and members of hiring committees at twenty-five colleges and universities. (I will use the word "Latino/a" here because Professor Haro does so.) On the basis of 120 personal interviews, Haro found that Latinos/as are often stereotypically and negatively treated: their academic credentials and experience are viewed as suspect and their styles of personal interaction discounted as inappropriate. For instance, European-American job candidates for a college presidency were not required to have had previous experience as an academic dean or provost but Latino/a candidates were. European-American candidates might squeeze by with a doctorate from less than a top research university but *not* a Latino/a. Latina candidates were sometimes pronounced to be inappropriately dressed and wearing "cheap and distracting" jewelry, in the words of a trustee and a member of a search committee (Haro, 2001, p. 32).

What is the negative stereotype being spotlighted in these studies and anecdotes? *It is, of course, the presumption of inferiority and incompetence*—and this presumption about URW and non-immigrant groups NIs endures and endures even in the face of abundant evidence of their accomplishments and leadership. Internal surveys of University of Michigan faculty repeatedly reveal that professors in these categories at the Big Ten University frequently feel they are discriminated against, scrutinized far more than majority male professors, and undervalued as intellectuals. A number of European-American male faculty members at Michigan agree that they too had seen such undervaluing and intense scrutiny of their colleagues. Other campuses' annual and biennial climate surveys reveal very similar patterns.

Can it be any wonder that colonized, non-immigrant groups in the faculty ranks often lament that they are never given the benefit of the doubt, that they are always "on stage," and that they feel they are always being sternly judged? Sociologist Lois Benjamin found that almost all

of the one hundred of African-American professionals she interviewed for her book *The Black Elite* felt they were indeed on “perennial probation” and had to prove themselves twice as accomplished as majority colleagues in academe, law, and medicine (Benjamin, 1998, p. 28; see also Cooper and Stevens, 2002; Hollinger, 2011).

In his decades of faculty-development work on campuses throughout the country, Robert Boice has found that under-represented faculty from colonized groups have to deal constantly with insinuations that they are unworthy. They must brace themselves for almost daily snubs and put-downs, both large and small. Boice’s finding is compellingly reinforced by two nationally distributed films that feature more than twenty minority professors in various academic disciplines: *Through My Lens* (produced and distributed by the University of Michigan) and *Shattering the Silences* (produced by the Public Broadcasting Company and now distributed by several outlets). These two eye-opening films make painfully clear the costs exacted from under-represented male and female faculty as they undertake their daily struggles for professional recognition and dignity and for fair evaluations of their teaching and scholarship.

Both male and female members of colonized, non-immigrant groups in this country often have to deal with “stereotype fatigue.” In a study of African-American physicians and professors in academic medicine, the professionals could not recall a single positive “race-related experience” within any of the medical institutions where they had worked, but they easily recalled an abundance of negative ones.

Apparently, medical workplaces and their administrators diligently ignore the negative stereotype (the proverbial elephant in the room). Every under-represented doctor in the above study reported that the relevance of race is *never* acknowledged and that no informal or formal discussions are ever held about the elephant and how to shrink its size or even remove it from the room. A family medicine physician observed: “We have, as a society, figured out ways to systematically deny that racism exists. And so have the medical institutions that train us. There is no way to have a discussion about it because it has been decided that it doesn’t exist.” Stereotype fatigue results from having to accept this heavy silence and avoidance while simultaneously having to “deal with the pressure of whatever stereotypes people may have about race ... and it is a daily stress at work. It’s exhausting for me” (both quotes included in Nunez-Smith et al., 2007, p. 49). This is surely a classic crazy-making situation: silence on the one hand and omnipresent stereotyping on the other.

Well-known cognitive scientist Steven Pinker will be given the last word about negative stereotyping. He warns: “If subjective decisions about people, such as [college] admissions, hiring, credit, and salaries, are based in part on group-wide averages, they will conspire to make the rich richer and the poor poorer” (2002, p. 206).

Positive Stereotype/Bias: Regarding Gender and Group Membership

Now let’s turn to positive stereotypes and to the experiences of those who enjoy such a positive assumption by others about their capabilities. As you would guess, those with what might called a “positive halo” are *presumed to be competent and bona fide*. They will not bump up against implicit quotas limiting their representation to no more than three or so, in a department or on a campus. They will collect more positive points for their achievements, relative to those coping with a negative stereotype. Their extra points will mount up and result in cumulative advantages and advancement, relative to those viewed negatively.

Those with the positive bias are anointed, in a way, with the presumption of competence and deserved authority. The phrase “well-qualified white man” is simply *not* in the lexicon (conversation with Professor Nell Painter, 2005). Due to this presumption of worthiness, it can be easy for those with the positive bias to slip into a state of feeling entitled to success and deference. This entitlement can be understandably viewed as arrogance by those lacking the positive halo (Thompson and Louque, 2005; Boice, “Lessons,” 1992; D. Smith, 1996, 2000, 2009). By contrast, those with a negative bias are often doubted by others and sometimes by themselves (“maybe I’m an imposter?”). While in graduate school, James Bonilla felt he did not belong; in fact, he felt at times like he was play-acting. He repeatedly mulled over: “What is a working-class, New York Puerto Rican trying to do entering the ivory tower?” Only with the bolstering and encouragement of the other two members of his writing support group was he able to overcome his “internalized fear and racial vulnerability” (Bonilla, quoted in Moody, 1996, p. 8). Bonilla now works as an associate professor at Hamline University.

A European-American professor, Frederick Frank, discloses that “while I worked like a Trojan to earn my way in this life, I nevertheless assert that a good measure of my success” results from societal perception. This professor is surrounded by the favorable stereotype of being competent. In such an advantageous position, he is sure he has gotten “breaks” and at times received “more positive evaluations” of his job performance, more positive “than I expected or deserved.” He concludes: “I try to be grateful” (Frank, 1999, p. 148).

Expressing similar gratitude, Management Professor Peter Couch admits that his being a white male has brought him “extra” points and extra opportunities at every stage of his academic career. “I have always found myself in a world of opportunities—opportunities that I [naively] thought were available to anyone energetic and capable” (Couch, quoted in Gallos and Ramsey, 1997, p. 21).

The fundamental privilege of being in the European-American majority group, according to Wellesley College researcher Peggy McIntosh, is that you “take for granted” the legitimacy and power that such social status automatically bestows on you. In fact, those with such status are taught to be *oblivious* to their social privilege and unearned advantages (1989, p. 3). “To be white in America is not to have to think about it” (quoted in Doane, 1999, p. 75). Being oblivious means you believe you are the norm. You don’t think of yourself as having race, privilege, and perhaps even ethnicity—you’re an American.

Numerous reports have shown that there are glass borders, glass ceilings, “Keep Out” signs, and jealously guarded stations of inside information at every turn, for women seeking to enter male occupations and for under-represented groups seeking high-paying and prestigious occupations and professions (Massey, 2011). In seeking desirable jobs, majority males will be aided by the phenomenon that *like people hire like people*. Employers tend to hire those who look, think, and speak like themselves, unless they become conscious of this evaluative bias and concentrate to overcome it. Without a doubt, majority employers faced with equally qualified applicants “prefer white to black or Latino job applicants three to one” (Fischer et al., 1996, p. 182). A wry story captures the *reproduction* principle of hiring: An elderly, European-American manager is preparing to meet job candidates. Leaning into the intercom on his desk, he instructs his secretary to “Send in someone who reminds me of myself as a young buck.” In other words, this employer is putting up a “Welcome” sign for those who are clones of himself.

In his national research studies, Sociology Professor Ronald Breiger at the University of Arizona has found that professional, managerial, and even technical workers are almost three times as likely to have secured their jobs through personal contacts as through direct application or responding to newspaper advertisements. The jobs with “the highest pay and prestige and affording the greatest satisfaction to their incumbents, were most likely” to be filled through personal contacts (Breiger, 1988, p. 78). Because URW and NI faculty usually are outsiders with fewer personal contacts, they have to work extremely hard to secure academic posts and promotions. In recognition of this, I make it a point in my consulting to help them build very wide professional networks to compensate for being outside the usual circles of academic tradition and influence.

Many European Americans realize on a “gut” level that they are indeed fortunate to belong to the majority group imprinted with the positive bias.

I grew up in an affluent Connecticut suburb in the 1960s. Secure behind old stone walls and trimmed hedges, safeguarded by burglar alarms, this was a world far removed from any dis-

cussion of race. It was a world of good schools, safe streets and perfect teeth.... In this world, people of color were the ones who came to your house to work, and they worked hard ... [but] the better jobs went to the plumbers, the electricians, the painters: people from the ethnic white working class of the town, most of them Italian.... There were also a few Black kids at the school, but almost no one knew them.... Everyone liked them, wondered how they did it, but most thanked God every day that they had been born white. (Correspondents of the New York Times, 2001, pp. 335–36)

These illustrations point out the clear and daily benefits of belonging to a group viewed as competent and sound. Members of such a positively regarded group, according to a number of experts, are likely to:

- receive the benefit of the doubt if there is ambiguous evidence about how well they performed or behaved;
- receive more “points” for their achievements;
- find that their “points” accumulate faster and produce a sturdy base of successes;
- are assured that their successes are unlikely to be questioned or suspected;
- find they do not face a quota system that restricts them to only token representation (meaning one of a few) and restricts them to marginal power in an organization;
- find they do not have to worry about their race and in fact can be oblivious to it; and
- finally, enjoy greater deference inside and outside their traditional venues, whether that is the college classroom, the laboratory, the boardroom, the courtroom, the operating room, or the legislature.

Reflecting on this state of affairs, a European-American professor confesses that “for all of us white guys who are honest enough to admit it, we know in our heart that we have been blessed by birth to have had options not available to those who are not white and not male” (Frank, 1999, p. 75). In a similar vein, President John F. Kennedy once archly observed that majorities who touted the astounding progress being made by non-majorities in this society, nevertheless, would not for a moment consider exchanging places with them. Being a majority insider has its incontestable privileges and hidden profits.

But what about a male with a positive bias who chooses to work in a female-dominated profession such as nursing, social work, or librarianship? Certainly he would be a “token” (meaning he is the only one or one of a few “others” who are different from the rest). A solo or one of

a few, according to organizational experts, usually occupies a stressful and awkward position because those in the majority give skewed attention to the solo and often misinterpret his/her real motives and performance. Yet this man, albeit unusual in nursing or library work, nevertheless brings his higher status and positive stereotype of competence with him. Instead of being devalued and hitting a glass ceiling (as a woman, for instance, in science and engineering would almost certainly experience), the male solo will typically find himself on a "glass escalator" that somehow brings quick recognition, promotion, and a corner office as a dean or director (C. L. Williams, 1992; Yoder, 1994; Kanter, 1977, 1997).

In short, those assigned a positive stereotype will receive substantial hidden profits that advance them on a cumulative basis in both traditional and *non-traditional* settings. Those assigned a negative stereotype will be dealt extra penalties, taxes, and glass ceilings that will hamper their advancement on a cumulative basis (see C. L. Williams, 1992; C. Williams, 2001; Steele and Aronson, 1995; McIntosh, 1998 and 1999; Valian, 2000a,b; Rosser, 2004).

European-American males' privileges and positive-bias "halo" are givens. Yet increasingly, *certain* Asian-American and Central and South American subgroups have privileges and positive bias that they too can take for granted. These groups, beneficiaries of exceptional conditions, have recently sought and been granted the high status of "honorary whites" meaning honorary European Americans (Lopez, "Colorblind," 2006, p. B8). In Chapter 3, I will return to this development.

How do negative and positive stereotypes about groups arise and then endure? The stereotypes are the outcomes of political power exercised at various times by the dominant European-American group in this country. In Chapter 3, I will make this clear through synthesizing the work of dozens of anthropologists, political scientists, economists, historians, novelists, and sociologists. These experts have found that those American citizens whose ancestors started out in this country as the conquered, dispossessed, and enslaved (that is, incorporated by *force, not choice*) are usually branded with a long-lasting negative stereotype. This stereotype continues, generation after generation. The groups treated with overwhelming force by the dominant majority group include: American Indians, African Americans, Puerto Rican Americans, Mexican Americans, and Native Hawaiians.

By contrast, voluntary immigrants who exercised choice in settling here usually enjoy a positive stereotype, much higher status than colonized and conquered groups, and societal expectations that they are likely to succeed in attaining the American dream. Immigrants benefit because they and their ancestors exercised varying degrees of choice as they entered the country. These groups include members of the very pow-

erful and dominant European-American group as well as some Asian-American groups and many recent immigrants from Central and South American who have come to be regarded as "honorary whites" in this country (see Takaki, Lopez, Wu, Hollinger, Tapia, Waters; citations in Bibliography; also see Chapter 3 of this book).

What about European-American women's status and treatment? These will vary, largely depending on whether the women are trying to enter and succeed in fields and in institutions traditionally closed to them. Some of the situations in which negative bias and glass ceilings severely restrict majority women were discussed earlier in this chapter.

SECTION B

How Negative Bias and Positive Bias Affect Faculty Members' Professional Lives on a Daily Basis

This section moves from the *concept* of bias/stereotype to the *effects* of bias. I provide here personal observations and disclosures from faculty who enjoy a positive bias but also from those who chafe under a negative one. Let us start with a stunning observation from a professor of surgery at an academic institution. Asked how he is viewed by others at work, he explains: "I think race permeates every aspect of my job; so ... when I walk onto a ward or on the floor, I'm a black guy before I'm the doctor. I'm still a black guy before I'm the guy in charge, before I'm the attending of record, so that permeates everything" (quoted in Nunez-Smith et al., 2006, pp. 46-47). Pushing through that dynamic on a daily basis requires enormous energy and patience. This is a hidden penalty. Those with a positive group bias find themselves enjoying a hidden profit when they escape that dynamic.

Another substantial and predictable penalty is meted out at professional schools, colleges, universities, government labs and institutes: URW and members of NI groups are asked and expected to symbolically serve as "the diversity member" on numerous tasks forces and committees. This overload can weaken a professor's career, whether she/he is a brand-new hire or a mid-career, seasoned veteran. Another physician/faculty member vividly recounts how the requests play out: "At work ... whenever they want to diversify something, they call me. When they don't need that, when they would need someone purely for individual intellectual capacity, I am not the first person they think about." This committee overload is a widespread burden for URW and NIs, as countless studies have demonstrated. Yet again, a severe penalty is being meted out. In Chapter 5, I advise department chairs and other leaders why and how they must deactivate this penalty and service overload.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will touch on other penalties (for those with a negative bias) and on other profits (for those with a positive one). Contrasting one disadvantage/penalty with a *corresponding* advantage/profit is the way I will organize this section.

1. **Disadvantage:** Professors dealing with negative bias will frequently experience unfair evaluations of their work and have to deal with the suspicion from some colleagues and students that they are perhaps innately incompetent.

Advantage: Professors dealing with positive bias will usually be granted unfair, overly generous evaluations and will enjoy others' presumption that they are perhaps innately competent or superior.

Early on, University of Massachusetts-Amherst Professor Sonia Nieto recognized the stereotypical reactions that she knew she would have to overcome on a regular basis. While she proudly speaks Spanish and proudly claims her Puerto Rican heritage, she nonetheless has "strived to make it very clear that I was intelligent" *in spite of* these cultural markers that distinguish her from mainstream scholars (2000, p. xxiv). As one African American on a majority campus puts it, "Man, from the day we're hired until the day we're retired, we are on probation!" (quoted in Moore and Wagstaff, 1974, p. 9). Hampton University sociologist Lois Benjamin likewise found that almost all of the one hundred African-American professionals she interviewed for her book *The Black Elite* felt they were on "perennial probation" and had to prove themselves *twice* as accomplished as majority colleagues in academe, law, and medicine (Benjamin, 1999, p. 28; also see Cooper and Stevens, 2002; Hollinger, 2011). My conversations with a score of non-immigrant faculty re-enforce this sense of being kept on never-ending probation.

Unfair evaluations deeply concern Cornell University Environmental Studies/Biology Professor Eloy Rodriguez (the first U.S.-born Mexican American to hold an endowed science chair). He warns that women and minorities still face formidable obstacles to succeeding at majority campuses. Throughout his academic career, based first on the West Coast and now on the East Coast, Rodriguez has seen "sexism" and "racism" operating in a host of recruitment committees and tenure and promotion committees at various campuses. To level the playing field, he urges departments and campuses to reduce the *enormous subjectivity* that academic decision-makers can indulge in as they make personnel decisions: "The measurements being used for the tenure decision must be clearly set forth, and campuses and departments must be mindful and vigilant against exclusionary patterns in their evaluations and their granting of tenure" (personal conversation, 2008).

Because positive-biased colleagues do not suffer from these formidable obstacles in their reviews by power-holders, they can be more relaxed and

at times "fade into the woodwork" without anyone noticing. They can be irritable or aggressive at times without worrying that such atypical behavior will be used against them in future evaluations. They can win professional society or book awards and not have to endure whispers behind their back that their work is actually over-rated. As one majority professor anonymously disclosed to me, "Even getting a Pulitzer Prize would not count as much for a recipient of color as for a white male. I'm certain of that." In other words, that negative presumption subtracts points from the achievements and recognition of under-represented minorities and women.

Job evaluations have been the object of study by several medical experts and national task forces. "Medical school faculty of African descent have lower job satisfaction and are promoted less frequently than their nonminority counterparts who have similar productivity and similar academic accomplishments" (Nunez-Smith et al., 2007, p. 45). This conclusion—and recommendations for remedying the situation—appear *regularly* in editorials in medical journals. It is typical for under-represented physicians and professors to underscore how much energy and intellect they must expend as they push back on the stereotype that follows them from the classroom, to grand rounds, to the surgical area, and on and on. "It's exhausting." Their majority colleagues almost always have no clue and no interest in the extra expenditures required of them.

In fact, medical and academic institutions concentrate on ignoring and denying that negative and positive stereotypes may be operative in their workplaces. After reviewing a score of studies, medical professors Joseph Betancourt and Andrea Reid call on institutions to hold "open and honest dialogue" and to "openly acknowledge that race matters as much in the health care workplace as it does in society." They continue: "All health care professionals should be taught about the impact of stereotyping and prejudice as part of their employee orientation and ongoing in-service training (for example, in grand rounds)." And finally, organizations should make sure that senior colleagues and chair are developing, mentoring, and monitoring the progress of negatively stereotyped professionals (Betancourt and Reid, 2007, p. 69). In other words, the elephant in the room should be attended to.

Evaluation of Job Performance in the Classroom

Students are very likely to hold and act out stereotypical views about who is the norm and who is intellectually worthy—and who is *not*. Professor Painter observes that in academia "students of all races and genders seem extremely judgmental toward non-white, non-male faculty ... Time and time again I've seen white women and people of color harassed,

questioned, and rebuked by students who accept just about any behavior from white male faculty" (quoted in Reiss, 1997; the same point is discussed in Harlow, 2003 and Moody, *Demystifying*, 2010). Even *established, tenured* professors from disfavored groups also have to deal with this continuous jousting and testing by students and at times receive lower-than-deserved ratings (source: my conversations with dozens of such faculty, during my consulting work). In fact, some non-majority students may participate in this testing and jousting because they, too, have internalized the norm that *only* majority males (and no one else) are automatically entitled to legitimacy and authority. Because of the internalization of the norm, some students in their written evaluations of courses taught by under-represented faculty may be disproportionately harsh. Several provosts have shown me just how outrageously cruel some students' additional comments can be. Not surprisingly, course instructors with a negative bias may have to devote extra energy and concentration to psychologically managing classroom dynamics—dynamics that are more complex than those faced by other instructors (Harlow, 2003; Stanley, 2006; also my own conversations with non-majority instructors, both adjunct and tenure-track).

Those with a positive bias usually avoid these taxes. "Professors of the dominant group are assured of addressing (in classroom lectures or other settings) individuals and groups of their own racial and ethnic composition." They do not have to expend extra energy and are likely to receive deference and the benefit of the doubt when they stumble (Turner, 2001, p. 122). They are the norm, after all. They are allowed to be average. By contrast, to beat back a negative presumption calls for exceptional endurance. New Mexico State University Professor Herman Garcia has joked that progress will be reached when Mexican-American and other under-represented groups throughout academia can save energy and feel as relaxed "about being mediocre" as many majorities now seem to feel (quoted in Padilla, 1995, p. 156).

Evaluation of One's Research and Scholarship

National studies have underscored the shortchanging that URW and NIs often receive in their evaluations, as I mentioned earlier in this chapter. As one remedy for gender inequities, blind peer review is being tried (blind review means no names or affiliations appear on articles to be reviewed for publication or on grant proposals being considered for funding). In addition, there is increasing vigilance by reviewers to recognize and rise above their own negative and positive biases and slow down their deliberations so they can reach more evidence-based results. Some federal funding agencies now circulate reminders and give training sessions for their peer reviewers. All of these, as I observed earlier, are hopeful signs.

But other stumbling blocks remain. One is the difficulty of being invited into national and international networks of researchers where one's work can be discussed, critiqued, promoted, and published. These networks are also essential if one, in order to earn the rank of full professor, must build up an international reputation in a field. Further, career-advancement interactions constantly take place within these webs: "science like other institutions depends on the exchange of personal favors" (Stephen Cole, *Making Science*, 1992, p. 81) and on being embedded in opportunity-rich "network ties" (p. 176).

More steps must be taken to ensure that URW and NIs are able to join internationally and nationally powerful networks. (Various ADVANCE campus recipients are beginning to take exactly these steps; see the ADVANCE-National Science Foundation website.)

One clear pattern of academic advantage/disadvantage is observed again and again. The *super-star* academic role is almost totally reserved for majority men who possess a positive-bias halo. The department chair or others seem to pamper and groom this person to become the golden boy. "He is not a minority or a woman, and that person is regarded as the great star of the future, and he is given just a little bit more or even a lot more. He is the head of the parade." Such a star gets extra institutional funding and support; finds that promotion comes quickly; and enjoys a high salary. What is at work here? "Sometimes those 'golden boys,' in my mind, are not necessarily better than anyone else, but it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy" (quoted in Maher and Tetreault, 2007, pp. 100–1). Self-fulfilling prophecy is, of course, another cognitive error, as I discussed in Chapter 1.

Not every European-American man is, of course, being groomed to become an academic super-star. Nevertheless, it is clear that average men still enjoy privileges related to how they are evaluated in the workplace: they "are more likely to be given early opportunities to show what they can do at work ... to be mentored, to be given a second chance when they fail, and to be allowed to treat failure as a learning experience" (Johnson, 1997, p. 31). They enjoy more breathing room and latitude.

2. **Disadvantage:** Faculty with a negative bias are often viewed and treated as "outsiders" and, because of this, they have to endure extra psychological stresses and the general feeling of not belonging. This uneasy psychological context can undermine their confidence and success.

Advantage: Faculty with a positive bias are often viewed as "insiders" who belong and thus feel comfortable and accepted. This psychological context can boost their confidence and success.

Constant reminders that certain people do not belong in academe are highlighted in national studies and turn up in my consulting visits to various campuses. A NI senior male faculty member at a Midwest university

tells this story: "People ask me 'Why do I speak English so well? ... They've already superimposed on me that I don't belong here.... I used to think it was a harmless little question but now I feel that the message that I've received is that I don't belong. I don't look like I belong'" (quoted in Turner and Myers, 2000, p. 120). An African-American scientist reflects on his stressful experience in a majority setting: "Regarding racial prejudice in science, you should know that although people I work with are pretty open-minded and we have a lot in common (family, professional interests, politics, kids, etc.) ... as a black person you are never over the hump." Feeling that he must always be on guard, he tries to head off tensions and to stay on common ground with his colleagues—because "a split can always develop" (quoted in D. Smith, 1996, p. 103).

Assistant Professor of Education Ana Martínez-Alemán has written: "To be a professor is to be an anglo; to be a Latina is not to be an anglo. So how can I be both a Latina and a professor? To be a Latina professor, I conclude, means to be unlike and like me. *Que locura!* What madness!" (1995, p. 75). Dr. Martínez-Alemán, formerly at Grinnell College, is now at Boston College.

Law professor Patricia Williams expands on this point. "Those who privilege themselves as Un-raced—usually but not always those who are white—are always anxiously maintaining that it doesn't matter." Nevertheless, they feel pity towards those who are raced because they view race as a "social infirmity" (1997, p. 8) or "some sort of genetic leprosy or a biological train wreck" (p. 9). With such an attitude, those in the majority often feel a vast distance between "us" (other majorities like themselves) and "them" (non-majorities). Professor Williams, as an African American, sees no choice but to deal incessantly with that divide: "[I] have little room but to negotiate most of my daily lived encounters as one of 'them.' How alien this sounds. This split without, this split within" (p. 13).

For many years, Ethnic Studies Professor and Department Chair Evelyn Hu-DeHart was one of only three tenured non-majority women (a "solo" clearly) at the University of Colorado where there are more than one thousand faculty. (She is now at Brown University as Professor of History and Director of the Center for the Study of Race and Ethnicity.) At Boulder, Hu-DeHart had ample chances to observe that new faculty hires who are European-American males usually begin their careers as *insiders* and are the most easily accepted by departments already dominated by European-American males. This is because "a common language and other shared codes of communication already exist between them ... the risks of miscommunication, mistrust and missteps are minimal on both sides of this evolving relationship" (Hu-DeHart, 2000, p. 29). In other words, the insider is likely to save energy and time and enjoy a sense of belonging in the enterprise.

But for outsiders such as under-represented faculty, a much longer and more daunting cultural distance must be bridged, with great potential for mishaps, slights, and misunderstandings. To put it starkly, these faculty are frequently treated as "aliens" who do not belong in academe. This disheartening finding—from a survey of more than three thousand African-American faculty and administrators on majority campuses—still in my experience holds unfortunate validity (Moore and Wagstaff, 1974; Vargas, 2002).

3. Disadvantage: Those with a negative bias often have to spend precious time and energy deciphering the complex psychological dynamics and possible micro-aggressions unfolding between them and some of their majority students, colleagues, and administrators.

Advantage: Those with a positive bias tend to save time and energy by not being overly concerned about these dynamics.

Psychologists who have studied disfavored populations find that many suffer incessant "micro-aggressions" and put-downs by some members (but not all, of course) of the majority clan. These micro-aggressions function to reassert the supremacy of the dominant group over subordinate ones. Managing these slights plus sorting through and weighing what they might mean consume precious psychic energy. "In addition to maintaining an internal balance, the [slighted] individual must continue to maintain a social facade and some kind of adaptation to the offending stimuli so that he can preserve some social effectiveness," according to New York University Law Professor Peggy Davis who has African-American ancestry. "All of this requires a constant preoccupation" (2000, p. 145).

In addition, many URW and NIs find another management task to master: they must perform almost constant "smile work." That is, they must spend extra energy in being congenial and easy-going so that their majority colleagues do not view them as aggressive, threatening, or overly sensitive about the particular group membership allotted to them (Tierney and Bensimon, 1996, p. 83). Smile work is still part of the unspoken job description for URW and NI groups. I have no doubt of that.

Yet more energy must be expended as one ponders and tries to determine whether the perceived micro-aggression was in fact deliberate or accidental. Sorting through the dynamics and interchanges takes thought and care. Questions like the following race through one's head:

Did the dean just insult me or was that merely a canned joke she trots out for every new assistant professor?

How in the world could the computer for my office not be up and running when I arrive the week before I start teaching?

Is this just a typical technical snafu, or is this a sign that they don't really want me here?

Why was I not consulted before that report was sent off—doesn't my opinion count around here?

Faculty from non-immigrant groups must activate their emotional radar in order to think through, on a daily and at times an hourly basis: "Is this (event, person, demand, slight, racist remark, incident of exclusion, lack of professional opportunity, etc.) important enough to give it my energy?" (Turner, "Defining," 2001, p. 122; also see P. Williams, 1991). Following this mulling-over and sorting-through process, faculty members have to decide what they should do: perhaps confront the person who has harmed them; perhaps express their hurt or rage; perhaps assume the role of "cultural worker" and try to process the incident with the majority person (Martinez-Alemán, 1995, p. 70; the term "cultural worker" was coined, I believe, by Giroux, 1992). Of course, *any one* of these responses has the potential to boomerang and bring on even more stress. Yet another option is to swallow the pain and internalize the perceived slight. It is no wonder that "stereotype fatigue" is a major concern for under-represented faculty, as I have amply learned from my consulting practice.

4. Disadvantage: A quota system will often block the faculty hiring of those with a negative bias. Some departments, already having one member from a disfavored group, are likely to subscribe to the "one is sufficient" policy.

Advantage: Majority job candidates do not face such a quota barrier and thus enjoy improved chances of being hired.

Most of us probably would guess that a quota means more than one. But real life shows that a quota can be indeed "only one." Law Professor Derrick Bell has repeatedly called attention to an unspoken and rigid quota in academia: only one or only a very small handful of faculty from NI groups will be tolerated at mainstream law schools. This can be referred to as a tolerance for only *token* diversity, I suppose. An organizational psychologist would probably theorize that power-holders in the law schools (such the Harvard Law dean, in Bell's case) dread the power shift that might occur if the number of colonized, non-immigrant group members in their midst continues to climb.

When Bell persisted in bringing extraordinarily qualified job candidates in this category to the dean's attention, *the administrator complained and told Bell that Harvard Law School was not now and would not become a Woolworth's lunch counter in the South, destined to become integrated by non-majority activists.* Possessing such an atti-

tude, the dean could not see and genuinely appreciate the strengths of any new job candidates who possess non-majority status. Bell understandably maintains: once a token or very low number of such faculty is hired, a "real ceiling" is reached that prevents the hiring of any more "regardless of their qualifications" (Bell, 1992, p. 141) and thus blocks fair access and fair evaluation. A positively biased group such as European Americans would not be subject to such a ceiling that metaphorically permits only crawl space.

Other analysts have also focused on this unusual *quota* system. "Many colleges and universities operate under an unwritten quota system that manifests itself as reluctance to hire more than one minority faculty member per department." This "one-minority-per-pot" syndrome is best illustrated by the refrain heard from numerous department chairs across the country that "we hired a minority last year" and thus diversity has been satisfied (Reyes and Halcon, 1991, p. 75).

Being the lonely "quota" person in a majority department can understandably bring psychological disquiet. Tenured Professor Caroline Turner muses: "I have been at the University for thirteen years; in that period, I remain the only faculty member of color in my department. I listen to the assurances [that the department is open to hiring more minority candidates]. I look at the statistics." Yet the numbers, sadly, do *not* change (Turner, 2001, p. 133). How can a professor in such a situation not come to suspect departmental colleagues of paying merely lip service to equity? How can a professor not suspect from time to time that he/she is indeed being *used* as the symbolic token?

Notice this sad pattern: extra steps will probably have been taken to include non-immigrant job applicants in a hiring committee's candidate *pool*. But these special candidates have been placed there for show and will be restricted to serving as metaphorical *bridesmaids rather than brides*: "apparently, an applicant pool that includes minorities is considered by White faculty as evidence of a 'good faith effort' in hiring and integrating minorities—even if minorities are not ultimately hired." In fact, it is predictable that these "show" applicants will *not* be hired. The one-minority-only rule restricts the "career goals and aspirations of Hispanics and other minority faculty" and is partly to blame for the lack of diversity on America's campuses (Reyes and Halcon, 1991, p. 75). This is a reasonable assertion.

A quota system—that restricts certain groups to miniscule representation and marginal power in the organization—actually serves to privilege majority members and reserving for them far more latitude (no ceiling to hit, in other words). Competition for faculty posts is artificially manipulated in this way so that majority candidates are more likely to be *hired* and then, once hired, more likely to professionally thrive as a result of their majority status and positive bias.

5. **Disadvantage:** Because those with negative bias are typically underrated and treated as outsiders, they often need *visible and formal affirmative action programs* in order to have the chance to prove themselves. But a backlash is often involved.

Advantage: Those with a positive bias are often overrated, treated as insiders, and given privileged access to set-aside benefits. Thus, they enjoy de facto and *invisible affirmative action* on a continuous basis. There seems to be no backlash.

When under-represented women and non-immigrants are hired as faculty on predominantly majority campuses and professional schools, many of them, from time to time, will be characterized as political hires or affirmative action hires. Either characterization can be translated in this way: they are actually under-qualified for their posts. This dynamic plays out because of the confused and superficial debate about how faculty diversity will/may weaken intellectual excellence and the academic meritocracy. Being the subject of such a hurtful characterization causes considerable hurt, whether expressed openly by students or colleagues in a hallway, whispered loudly at cocktail parties, or assumed automatically by senior power-holders in closed-door deliberations. In Chapters 5 and 6, I outline how department chairs and assigned senior mentors must take pro-active steps to unravel this characterization and ensure that URM and NIs (at all levels) feel welcomed and valued.

Ironically, those who have benefitted enormously from *invisible affirmative action programs*—the European-American group (especially men)—rarely if ever are subject to teasing, assumptions, or judgments that they are in fact under-qualified for their positions. In Chapter 3, I will discuss the many ways that invisible affirmative action has boosted the advancement of this dominant immigrant group, including: the Homestead Acts, the G.I. Bill, the easy access to institutions denied for centuries to NIs and women (such as Harvard, the University of Virginia, and so on), and the fraternity-like exclusive networks where personal favors are exchanged that advance careers.

Currently, we are beginning to see the public questioning of one hitherto invisible affirmative action practice: preference in college admissions being granted to student applicants who are “legacy admits” (so-called because one of their parents previously graduated from that college or university). Legacy applicants, on average, have *seven* times the odds of being accepted than do non-legacy applicants (Lewin, 2011). The legacy practice, of course, gives even greater advantage to those already advantaged. Furthermore, these students—almost always of European descent—readily escape being discounted and stigmatized, simply because they blend into their larger majority group. In a real way, legacy students are being guaranteed “invisible” affirmative action.

Berkeley Professor Takaki insists in his publications that “throughout American history, there had always been affirmative action for white men.” For centuries, European-American men in educational, political, and employment realms did not have to compete with women or colonized groups. “Many of them are the beneficiaries of their history of exclusion based on race and gender, and pass their economic and social advantages on to white men in the next generation” (Takaki, 1987, p. 231). Academe is becoming more aware of this reproduction within its structures.

6. **Disadvantage:** A negatively stereotyped faculty member often has to deal with an uninviting territory in academe where there is little or no mentoring, inside information, or introductions to valuable connections and networks. Such deprivation is likely to hamper professional growth and satisfaction.

Advantage: A positively stereotyped faculty member in an accepting academic climate will receive numerous benefits that speed along professional achievement and satisfaction.

Because I have already touched on several disadvantages that impede non-immigrant, disfavored groups, I will be brief in this section. “Uninviting territory” does indeed await many as they enter and pursue their academic careers in majority settings. This is the conclusion of Harvard education professor Richard Chait and Harvard educational researcher Cathy Trower. Their comprehensive studies confirm what many others have found: social isolation, a dearth of mentors, and even explicit discrimination are common experiences for non-majority faculty in academe (Trower and Chait, 2002, p. 35; Gregory, 1995; Moore and Wagstaff, 1974; Turner and Myers, 2000; also the current COACHE findings at the COACHE website).

When senior leaders do reach out (an uncommon practice), they sometimes make superficial assumptions. One analyst found that prospective allies on medical school faculties, for example, “made assumptions about the [NI] physicians’ career goals on the basis of race ... presuming they would want to work directly in underserved communities of color rather than pursue academic careers of administrative and leadership positions” (Nunez-Smith et al, 2007, p. 48). Yet I want to point to heartening instances where under-represented faculty members are being magnificently mentored by European-American male and female faculty in the senior ranks. Go to University of Colorado-Denver Professor Brenda Allen’s second edition of *Difference Matters: Communicating Social Identity* (2011) and her article “Learning the Ropes” (2000) as well as Texas A&M University Professor Christine Stanley’s article “Cross-Race Faculty Mentoring” (2005). In my consulting, I make it

a point to ask URW and NIs about the mentoring they have cultivated and are receiving. Some are being well served by their departments and colleagues. Many are not.

Usually as a *rule* rather than as an exception, *majority insiders* anointed with a positive bias find that their backpack is filled with mentors and allies, roadmaps, a compass, emergency numbers to call, and other valuable contents—rather than a backpack containing extra taxes and penalties. Insiders can feel they already belong to a high-status club. A majority person can spend most of his/her time with majority people and not have to allocate extra energy to learning the language and customs of non-majorities. Being a member of the majority club also brings instant acceptance and validation, according to McIntosh and other analysts.

Networks for Insiders and Exclusion for Outsiders

Professional networks are a key to one's success. I have already cited several studies that show exclusion to be a serious deprivation. An African-American medical professor is well aware of this when he observes: "We don't get invited to the picnic or to the dinner parties ... and that is where those [leadership] jobs come up. We've not in the corridors of power ... We are not in those pipelines, and it has nothing to do with intellectual capacity or ambition" (quoted in Nunez-Smith et al., 2007, p. 48). Again, dozens of researchers have validated this observation.

The clannishness detrimental to URW faculty is captured in a nonsense manner by this Stanford female professor:

There are some groups of men ... tied by personal friendship and professional collaboration, with no women in their networks, who scratch each other's backs and put each other up for things and it works. They understand each other, they share interests, and they bond. They don't even notice how highly gendered this is. (quoted in Maher and Tetreault, 2007, p. 62)

Nor do these and like-situated male professors realize how ethnically exclusive their clans are. They claim repeatedly that individual merit and entrepreneurial behavior explain why they advance quite methodically. "Basic to this style is a profound public silence around the idea that White males belong to, or benefit from, any kind of group membership or that standards of accomplishment as articulated by that group may be culturally based and biased" (Maher and Tetreault, 2007, p. 62).

7. Disadvantage: A faculty member assigned a negative bias is often thought to represent his/her whole group and, as such, has to worry that

his/her behavior or performance can open or close doors of opportunity for an entire generation.

Advantage: A faculty member possessing a positive bias has far more latitude and tends to worry only about him/herself.

So many times, undergraduate and graduate students from disfavored groups are embarrassed when their majority professors naively call on them to provide the "Black viewpoint" or the "Puerto Rican" or "Latino/a" or "American Indian" perspective on an issue or a class assignment. The professors mistakenly assume that all members of a group think and behave similarly—but they, of course, do *not* assume the same about members of the European-American majority group. As one New England doctoral scholar complained to me, "I feel like I'm being asked to stand for my *entire* tribe. Is this goofy or what?" He explained that when this happens, he feels trapped in a no-win situation: if he scoffs at the professor's question, he can trigger hostility from some of his classmates and the instructor. If he responds as complexly as he can to the question, he wonders if "his people" will be honored or dishonored by his answer.

More than four dozen faculty (whom I have recently interviewed) report that they, too, have been asked to speak for their "entire tribe." Moreover, women and members of under-represented groups often feel that any performance problems they might have as individuals will have important negative consequences for all members of their group or for *all* women. As one person anonymously observed to me: "If a minority person does something magnificent, then it's an exceptional event. But if a minority person does something awful, then it's a typical event for 'those people.'" In other words, it is much easier to accrue lasting impressions of inferiority or incompetence for people in marginalized groups.

A majority person, in short, has far more latitude in this situation as well: "I can do well in a challenging situation without being called a credit to my race. I am never asked to speak for all the people of my racial group. My culture gives me little fear about ignoring the perspectives and powers of people of other races" (quote from McIntosh who has European-American ancestry, 1989, pp. 65–67).

8. Disadvantage: Faculty with an assigned negative bias are often unfairly constrained in their choice of scholarly pursuits and in fact face a "brown-on-brown" taboo.

Advantage: Faculty enjoying a positive bias can set themselves up as scholars of almost anything and expect fair evaluation of their scholarship.

Emeritus Professor of Political Science Willard Johnson recalls his lifelong struggle with his own department to "appreciate the quality and

relevance and significance of black scholarship. It is just an overwhelming problem." Why the "blindness" on many majority colleagues in those departments? Johnson believes it's because only scholarship on *their* majority group seems worthwhile to them (oral history interview, C. Williams, 2001, p. 191).

A Native American tenured professor, at a large four-year southwestern university, reports a continuous battle with most of his departmental colleagues over his research projects. They devalue his work for two reasons: because it is on American Indian topics and because he himself is American Indian—so in their minds he could not possibly perform "objective scientific research on his own people." Editors of mainstream journals also resist publication of his work because they believe that scholarship on Indian issues should be done by "objective non-Indian" academics. Needless to say, most editors of such journals are European American (see Shin, 1996).

The irony here, of course, is that majority academics can study and publish to their heart's content on issues related to majorities. Why is their objectivity not suspect? (Peterson-Hickey and Stein, 1998). Hisauro Garza, formerly a professor of Chicano and Latin American Studies at California State University-Fresno and now President of Sierra Research and Technical Services in California, analyzed the responses of 238 college faculty throughout the United States who were included in the National Latino Faculty Survey. Almost one half of these faculty felt that any kind of social science or humanities scholarship, if undertaken by Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans, is viewed as intellectually *inferior* by most members of their departments. If the scholarship focuses on minority issues, then the value of that research shrinks *even more*. But then an incredible shift of valuation happens: if European-Americans undertake research on minority issues, the value of that investigation *rises* dramatically (Garza, 1993, pp. 37–38).

Several analysts have graphically named this phenomenon the taboo against "brown-on-brown" scholarship, a taboo not affecting majority intellectuals who are granted great latitude to study *anything* of interest to them. For example, majority scholars are presumed to be objective and competent when they scrutinize majority group members' criminal activity and Ponzi schemes, mortgage-derivatives funds, musical and cultural contributions, political maneuvers, philanthropic causes, and so on. No one would say they are "too close" or "too similar" to their subjects.

9. Disadvantage: Because faculty with an assigned negative bias are likely to be treated as both super-visible and invisible, depending on the circumstances, they will have to cope with psychological dissonance. When deemed super-visible, they will be overloaded with student

advising and academic committee work. When deemed invisible, their opinions will be ignored.

Advantage: Majority faculty escape this psychological dissonance, the work overload from service and student advising, and the demoralization associated with being voiceless.

Being treated as "both super-visible and invisible," according to Simmons College Professor Sarah Nieves-Squires, is a jarring experience. "On the one hand," Nieves-Squires discloses, "a Hispanic's comments in classrooms or at staff and faculty meetings may be ignored; on the other, she or he constantly may be called upon to present the 'minority view' or the 'Hispanic woman's view' rather than her own views" (1991, p. 12). Such a crazy-making situation is also routinely experienced by several minority professors interviewed by Pennsylvania State University Professor Frances Rains and reported in her article, "Dancing on the Sharp Edge of the Sword: Women Faculty of Color in White Academe" (1999). Being ignored and being regarded as inconsequential can be characterized as "imposed" invisibility, according to Rains. One of her interviewees explains that "I am on several committees—and I can go to a meeting and if they're talking about anything other than minority issues, I'm invisible *even when I'm verbal*."

But dissonance can be just around the corner. If the conversation in the same committee meeting "turns to minority issues, then the talking stops, and the eyes drift to wherever I am, and I am supposed to expound on 'what it is to be a minority' or 'what Hispanics think'" (quoted in Rains, 1999, p. 160). The shift has clearly been made at this point so that the under-represented colleague is now assigned, according to Rains, "designated" visibility (p. 161).

Business expert Rosabeth Kanter, in her superb book *Men and Women of the Corporation*, elaborates on several aspects of this heightened visibility that tokens—the numerically rare—have to cope with in "skewed" organizations where they compose 15 percent or less of the total population. Kanter explains that tokens suffer from high *visibility* because they are a very few "Os" greatly outnumbered by "Xs"; from artificial *contrast* because the dominant group members tend to exaggerate, in their minds and their perceptions, the differences between themselves and the tokens; and from rampant *stereotyping* because the dominant group tends to deny the token any individuality and uniqueness and instead fits the token to the group stereotype (Kanter, 1997, pp. 206–42). I discuss the Solo Phenomenon at length in Chapter 6, where I argue that senior faculty mentors must understand and then take steps to reduce the extra stressors that solo mentees (one of a numerically few) often confront in majority settings.

Majorities in the corporation or academic department should be thankful they do not have to struggle with high visibility, artificial

contrast, or stereotyping—all of which their non-majority token peers are likely to face. These vulnerable colleagues, moreover, are very likely to be regarded by high-ranking administrators on a majority campus as embodiments of “diversity”—another form of designated super-visibility. Carrying such symbolic weight, they are asked or appointed to serve on an excessive number of departmental and campus committees so that each committee will have at least one “diverse” member in its composition. National studies have documented how frequently under-represented professors are *overloaded* with service and committee requirements which impede their scholarship, publishing, and assuming of leadership roles.

This is a most significant cultural tax that majority faculty escape, along with the excessive advising of students that usually falls again to non-majority faculty. In fact, department chairs often direct all under-represented students to the very few or the one token faculty in the department. Preventing both these overloads is the responsibility of the department chair, mentors, and administrators of mentoring programs. Another strategy (rarely followed, unfortunately) is to give solo faculty, when they come up for tenure-and-promotion review, considerable credit for the exceptional advising load they may have carried and the exceptional service contributions they may have made to various committees and the campus overall.

* * * * *

To recap, this second section of the chapter has isolated and examined nine important ways in which majority faculty members (with a positive bias surrounding them) are usually privileged and favored at majority colleges and universities—at the same time that faculty from certain other groups (with a negative bias around them) are usually disadvantaged and disfavored.

What must be seen *as a whole* is the elaborate and interlocked *system* of disadvantages/advantages that favor some and disfavor others. Institutional discrimination, as we have seen, “involves patterns of resource allocation, selection, advancement, and expectations” that perpetuate higher status and likely success for the favored group but just the opposite for all others (White and Cones, 1999, p. 81).

Conclusion and a Segue

The two enormously significant cognitive errors—positive bias and negative bias—deserve much more attention in academe, together with the thirteen other errors outlined in Chapter 1. All of us should spend

more time and brain power in resisting these errors and in reducing their power through our own *self-correction*.

But self-correction is not enough. I suggest that we need to dig deeper, to understand the origins of negative and positive biases. How did they take shape in this country? How and why were some people anointed with the positive bias and others branded with the negative bias? The answers are historical and political. The next chapter will provide detailed answers, derived from the findings of distinguished scholars in a variety of disciplines.

The next chapter will underscore that academics, at all times, must remain mindful of the enormous differences between, on the one hand, *European Americans and other immigrant groups* who chose to settle in this country and, on the other hand, *non-immigrant, colonized groups* who had no choice but were instead forced into subordinate roles in this country. If campuses wish to hire voluntary immigrants and international scholars as faculty, this is perfectly acceptable. But counting them as “diversity hires” is not. In Chapter 3, I will maintain that only members of five colonized, non-immigrant domestic groups should be regarded in this manner: **African Americans, Puerto Rican Americans, American Indians, Mexican Americans, and Native Hawaiians.**

Academics must become thoroughly grounded in the differences between voluntary, immigrant groups and involuntary, non-immigrant groups *before* they develop strategies for remedying the paucity of “diverse” faculty at their colleges, universities, research institutes and labs, and professional schools. Faculty Diversity Action Plans currently in place at many institutions are unsound primarily because their well-intentioned authors and implementers are “unclear on the concept.” That is, on a daily basis they confuse immigrant groups with non-immigrant groups.

Gaining clarity on the concept should not be the exclusive domain of a few dozen highly regarded researchers, authors, and analysts. Instead, all of us in academe should gain more clarity—this is the aim of Chapter 3. Only then are we ready to move on to consider what I refer to as my nuts-and-bolts, “how-to” chapters on faculty diversity. Chapters 4–6 will address these questions: What are the barriers to the recruitment of members from colonized, non-immigrant groups? What are the perennial barriers to retaining and mentoring them? How can careful and pro-active strategies enable academic leaders to push aside these particular barriers to recruitment, retention, and mentorship? What caveats and precautions (arising from my own consulting practice) should be shared with prime movers throughout the country who are intent on diversifying their faculty ranks?