

# Diversity & Equity in Business Schools

Brian Rubineau, McGill University

Moderator: Elizabeth Evans, Mount Royal University

October 19, 2017

## **This session:**

Brian presents a synthesis  
Elizabeth moderates discussion

## **After:**

Notes from discussion shared

# Good news / Bad news

**Bad news:** Pervasive, Extremely difficult to change

**Good news:** Sol'ns mostly known, B-Schools ideal setting

# What is equity?



**Requires:  
Investigation AND  
Being open to change**

# Good news: Academics investigate well

# Bad news: Academics don't change well

**Good news:  
Academics (think we're) more  
open to evidence-based change  
than most settings**



# Career Development for Women in Academic Medicine

## Multiple Interventions in a Department of Medicine

Linda P. Fried, MD, MPH; Clair A. Francomano, MD; Susan M. MacDonald, MD; Elizabeth M. Wagner, PhD; Emma J. Stokes, PhD; Kathryn M. Carbone, MD; Wilma B. Bias, PhD; Mary M. Newman, MD; John D. Stobo, MD

**Objective.**—To determine the gender-based career obstacles for women in an academic department of medicine and to report the interventions to correct such obstacles (resulting from the evaluation) and the results of these interventions.

**Design.**—Intervention study, before-after trial, with assessment of faculty concerns and perceived change through structured, self-administered questionnaires.

**Setting.**—The Department of Medicine, The Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Md.

**Participants.**—Full-time faculty.

**Interventions.**—Multifaceted intervention from 1990 through 1995 to correct gender-based career obstacles reported by women faculty, including problem identification, leadership, and education of faculty, and interventions to improve faculty development, mentoring, and rewards and to reduce isolation and structural career impediments.

**Main Outcome Measures.**—Retention and promotion of deserving women faculty, salary equity, quality of mentoring, decreased isolation from information and colleagues, integration of women faculty into the scientific community, and decreased manifestations of gender bias.

**Results.**—Junior women were retained and promoted, reversing previous experience, with a 550% increase in the number of women at the associate professor rank over 5 years (from 4 in 1990 to 26 in 1995). Interim 3-year follow-up showed a 183% increase in the proportion of women faculty who expected they would still be in academic medicine in 10 years (from 23% [7/30] in 1990 to 65% [30/46] in 1993). One half to two thirds of women faculty reported improvements in timeliness of promotions, manifestations of gender bias, access to information needed for faculty development, isolation, and salary equity. Men also reported improvements in these areas.

**Conclusions.**—The outcomes reported here indicate that it is possible to make substantive improvements in the development of women's careers, that an institutional strategy to this end can be successful in retaining women in academic medicine, and that such interventions are likely to benefit all faculty. Long-term interventions appear essential.

appointed in 1980, only 5% of became professors, compared with 15% of men, despite comparable opportunities of leaving academic medicine for and men over this period.<sup>10</sup> Women received lower salaries in corresponding positions.<sup>3,9,10</sup>

These data suggest that the portion of women faculty at senior leadership levels may not result from cohort effect alone. Among the subtle factors that may underlie the lesser likelihood of success for women in academic scientific careers are access to mentoring<sup>12-14</sup> and to information, including promotions, salary, and recognition.<sup>14-16</sup> Other key factors include isolation from colleagues and career professional information.<sup>14,16,17</sup> It has been shown that women receive fewer resources to accomplish their goals, including necessary personnel, space, and equipment.<sup>10,15</sup> Further, academic institutions are often organized on the assumption of a "social and emotional support structure provided to the scientist by an unpaid full-time wife or done without,"<sup>16</sup> leading to structural, institutional impediments for individuals without this structure. Outright gender discrimination is another obstacle.<sup>6,7,14</sup> When these findings prevail, there has been a comprehensive evaluation of the difference in career development between women.<sup>1</sup>

**CAUTION: ~~“Best practices”~~**

# “Best practices” myth

- Kalev Dobbin & Kelly 2006 – systematic, large-sample, organization-level analysis of practices associated with promoting diversity.
  - Training and evaluation/accountability – no effects
  - Mentoring and networking – mild effects
  - Structural changes in leadership towards diversity goals – strongest effects
  - BUT – correlational
- Ferguson 2015 – (quasi) causal analysis (regression discontinuity)
  - **No effects net of self-selection into diversity improvement efforts**

# Best Practices or Best Guesses? Assessing the Efficacy of Corporate Affirmative Action and Diversity Policies

Alexandra Kalev  
*University of California, Berkeley*

Frank Dobbin  
*Harvard University*

Erin Kelly  
*University of Minnesota*

*Employers have experimented with three broad approaches to promoting diversity. Some programs are designed to establish organizational responsibility for diversity, others to moderate managerial bias through training and feedback, and still others to reduce the social isolation of women and minority workers. These approaches find support in academic theories of how organizations achieve goals, how stereotyping shapes hiring and promotion, and how networks influence careers. This is the first systematic analysis of their efficacy. The analyses rely on federal data describing the workforces of 708 private sector establishments from 1971 to 2002, coupled with survey data on their employment practices. Efforts to moderate managerial bias through diversity training and diversity evaluations are least effective at increasing the share of white women, black women, and black men in management. Efforts to attack social isolation through mentoring and networking show modest effects. Efforts to establish responsibility for diversity lead to the broadest increases in managerial diversity. Moreover, organizations that establish responsibility see better effects from diversity training and evaluations, networking, and mentoring. Employers subject to federal affirmative action edicts, who typically assign responsibility for compliance to a manager, also see stronger effects from some programs. This work lays the foundation for an institutional theory of the remediation of workplace inequality.*

# The Control of Managerial Discretion: Evidence from Unionization's Impact on Employment Segregation<sup>1</sup>

John-Paul Ferguson  
*Stanford University*

Does limiting managers' discretion limit organizations' scope for discrimination? Social-psychological research argues that it limits opportunities to exercise cognitive biases. Organizational research has found that formal personnel practices that establish accountability for workplace diversity have increased women and minority representation in management. However, drawing causal inferences from such studies is complicated because adopting such policies may be endogenous to the firm's wish to hire and promote women and minorities. This study uses unionization elections to conduct a regression-discontinuity test from which stronger causal inferences can be made. It finds that while unionization is associated with more representative workplaces and more women and minorities in management, these effects disappear close to the discontinuity threshold. Most of the effects of unionization on workforce diversity may be attributable to the unobserved drivers of selection into unionization. This has similar implications for the causal effects of diversity policies adopted by managers.

# Key: Commitment to improve

# After commitment, then what? How?



**First: “Why?”**  
**“Why” matters**

# Why diversity?

- Because under-representation reflects bias and/or inequities, and we seek to be fair, equitable, and just.
- Because under-representation hinders our ability to support our students, staff, faculty, and community stakeholders fully; and we seek to better serve, support and reflect our students and our community.
- Because stymied efforts towards representation reflect BOTH an under-utilization of human potential AND a learning opportunity re: failing to meet goals; and we value learning and the positive changes learning affords.



# Why diversity?

- Because under-representation reflects bias and/or inequities, and we seek to be fair, equitable, and just.

**Implied Goal: Hitting the numbers. Representativeness is the solution.**

- Because under-representation hinders our ability to support our students, staff, faculty, and community stakeholders fully; and we seek to better serve, support and reflect our students and our community.

**Implied goal: Segment/group-specific / siloed responses and offerings.**

- Because stymied efforts towards representation reflect BOTH an under-utilization of human potential AND a learning opportunity re: failing to meet goals; and we value learning and the positive changes learning affords.

**Implied goal: learning & change; results unanticipated from the outset.**

## Cultural Diversity at Work: The Effects of Diversity Perspectives on Work Group Processes and Outcomes

Robin J. Ely and  
David A. Thomas

*Harvard University*

This paper develops theory about the conditions under which cultural diversity enhances or detracts from work group functioning. From qualitative research in three culturally diverse organizations, we identified three different perspectives on workforce diversity: the integration-and-learning perspective, the access-and-legitimacy perspective, and the discrimination-and-fairness perspective. The perspective on diversity a work group held influenced how people expressed and managed tensions related to diversity, whether those who had been traditionally underrepresented in the organization felt respected and valued by their colleagues, and how people interpreted the meaning of their racial identity at work. These, in turn, had implications for how well the work group and its members functioned. All three perspectives on diversity had been successful in motivating managers to diversify their staffs, but **only the integration-and-learning perspective provided the rationale and guidance needed to achieve sustained benefits from diversity.** By identifying the conditions that intervene between the demographic composition of a work group and its functioning, our research helps to explain mixed results on the relationship between cultural diversity and work group outcomes. ●



**Good news:  
Academics (think we're)  
focused on learning**

**BUT**

**Best practices = No learning**

**Best practices = No learning  
After “why”: How to FIGURE  
OUT how to improve?**

# Suggestion: Academically

With fearless curiosity, accepting uncertainty  
Willing to experiment, to try, to learn, to change

# E.g.: Hiring Committees

- Depends on: Level
- Admin: Ask about diversity perspective, gauge willingness to learn
- Faculty: Depends on: department / area / committee
  - Engage as a learning oppty.: question & experiment (incentives may help)
  - Un-objectionable de-biasing trials – orchestra screens (provide support/assistance)
  - Learn: interview, de-brief, lessons, other peer departments

# Good news / Bad news

**Bad news:** Pervasive, Extremely difficult to change

**Good news:** Sol'ns mostly known, B-Schools ideal setting



# Discussion

Brian.rubineau@mcgill.ca

*Equality is not when a female Einstein gets promoted to assistant professor: Equality is when a female schlemiel moves ahead as fast as a male schlemiel.*

- Ewald B. Nyquist

# Thank you!

Brian.rubineau@mcgill.ca

# Diversity / Quality Tradeoff?

# Diversity / Quality Tradeoff? Evidence?

# Does Gender-Balancing the Board Reduce Firm Value?

Finance

A board gender quota reduces firm value if it forces the appointment of under-qualified female directors. We examine this costly constraint hypothesis using the natural experiment created by Norway's 2005 board gender-quota law. This law drove the average fraction of female directors from 5% in 2001 to 40% by 2008, producing a large exogenous shock to director experience and independence. However, statistically robust analyses of quota-induced shareholder announcement returns, and of long-run stock and accounting performance, fail to reject the hypothesis of a zero valuation effect of this shock to board composition. Moreover, firms did not expand board size, nor is there significant evidence of quota-induced corporate conversions to a (non-public) legal form exempted from the quota law. Finally, our evidence on female director turnover and a novel network-based measure of director gender power gap also fails to suggest that qualified female directors were in short supply.

---

Keywords: Gender quota, director independence, valuation effect, long-run performance, corporate conversion, busy directors, director network power

JEL Classifications: G34, G35

# Inequalities in Service

## A Closer Look at Faculty Service: What Affects Participation on Committees?

There are, however, some differences in participation that should be noted. Female faculty at doctoral institutions appear to serve on one half more committees than male faculty, with much of this excess participation due to participation in “other” committees. They also report spending more time on committee work than males spend. Female faculty at

536 *The Journal of Higher Education*

*The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 78, No. 5 (September/October 2007)  
Copyright © 2007 by The Ohio State University



# Job Satisfaction in Academia: Why Are Some Faculty Members Happier Than Others?

Vicki L. Hesli, *University of Iowa*

Jae Mook Lee, *Yonsei University*

## ABSTRACT

In studying the correlates of job satisfaction among political science faculty we confirm some findings from other disciplines, such as the relationship between institutional type and satisfaction. We demonstrate that those working in top-ranked departments or in private institutions tend to have higher levels of satisfaction with their jobs and with their contributions to the profession. Both job satisfaction and professional satisfaction tend to be highest among full professors; and greater productivity in terms of publishing is independently linked to greater levels of professional satisfaction. In contrast, comparatively higher undergraduate teaching loads undermine professional satisfaction. We also determine that men and women do not differ systematically from one another in their satisfaction levels. We do, however, document significantly lower levels of satisfaction among racial minorities in political science departments. In exploring this finding, we uncover reports of discrimination and dramatic differences in levels of collegiality experienced by different subgroups of faculty members. Experiences with discrimination undermine job satisfaction and are more frequently reported by women than men and are more common among minority faculty than nonminorities.

# Asked More Often: Gender Differences in Faculty Workload in Research Universities and the Work Interactions That Shape Them

KerryAnn O'Meara

Alexandra Kuvaeva

Gudrun Nyunt

*University of Maryland*

Chelsea Waugaman

*Clemson University*

Rose Jackson

*The Universities at Shady Grove*

*American Educational Research Journal*

*Month XXXX, Vol. XX, No. X, pp. 1–33*

*DOI: 10.3102/0002831217716767*

*© 2017 AERA. <http://aerj.aera.net>*

*Guided by research on gendered organizations and faculty careers, we examined gender differences in how research university faculty spend their work time. We used time-diary methods to understand faculty work activities at a microlevel of detail, as recorded by faculty themselves over 4 weeks. We also explored workplace interactions that shape faculty workload. Similar to past studies, we found women faculty spending more time on campus service, student advising, and teaching-related activities and men spending more time on research. We also found that women received more new work requests than men and that men and women received different kinds of work requests. We consider implications for future research and the career advancement of women faculty in research universities.*

# Biases in Academia

# Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students

“In a randomized double-blind study ( $n = 127$ ), science faculty from research-intensive universities rated the application materials of a student—who was randomly assigned either a male or female name—for a laboratory manager position. Faculty participants rated the male applicant as significantly more competent and hireable than the (identical) female applicant. These participants also selected a higher starting salary and offered more career mentoring to the male applicant. **The gender of the faculty participants did not affect responses, such that female and male faculty were equally likely to exhibit bias against the female student.** Mediation analyses indicated that the female student was less likely to be hired because she was viewed as less competent. We also assessed faculty participants' preexisting subtle bias against women using a standard instrument and found that preexisting subtle bias against women played a moderating role”



# Temporal Distance and Discrimination: An Audit Study in Academia

Psychological Science  
XX(X) 1–8  
© The Author(s) 2012  
Reprints and permission:  
[sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav](http://sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav)  
DOI: 10.1177/0956797611434539  
<http://pss.sagepub.com>  


**Katherine L. Milkman<sup>1</sup>, Modupe Akinola<sup>2</sup>, and Dolly Chugh<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania; <sup>2</sup>Columbia Business School, Columbia University; and

<sup>3</sup>Stern School of Business, New York University

## Abstract

Through a field experiment set in academia (with a sample of 6,548 professors), we found that decisions about distant-future events were more likely to generate discrimination against women and minorities (relative to Caucasian males) than were decisions about near-future events. In our study, faculty members received e-mails from fictional prospective doctoral students seeking to schedule a meeting either that day or in 1 week; students' names signaled their race (Caucasian, African American, Hispanic, Indian, or Chinese) and gender. When the requests were to meet in 1 week, Caucasian males were granted access to faculty members 26% more often than were women and minorities; also, compared with women and minorities, Caucasian males received more and faster responses. However, these patterns were essentially eliminated when

# Many other domains as well

- Teaching ratings
- Grant evaluations
- Mentoring
- Recommendation letters
- Persistence after rejection



**More a  
SYSTEMIC flaw and failing  
than an  
individual flaw or failing**

**Purging transgressors is  
unlikely to yield desired change  
because they are more  
symptom than source**



# STILL requires counter-action

# Suggestion: Academically

With fearless curiosity, accepting uncertainty  
Willing to experiment, to try, to learn, to change