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Implicit Bias Made Visible

QUITE! AND JUST LAST MONTH WE EVEN HAD A LADY CHEMIST ON OUR PANEL.

THEIR HYSTERICAL OVER-REACTION COULD DESTROY ACADÆMIA!

STORM IN A TEACUP! IT’S JUST A FACT THAT GIRLS AREN’T AS RATIONAL AS MEN.

Elsevier Publishing Campus
The Pay Gap Persists

2015 Wage Study – The Scientist
Academia Doesn’t Leak, It Gushes

First representation gap of women in science arises as early as Bachelor level and continues throughout the scientific career.
Not Just in Academia….

Juniper’s board has greater ratio of women than any other firm in Mass.

Mar 28, 2018, 11:23am EDT

▪ FYI—Juniper is a “Women’s Health” company
▪ Most “diverse” large company
  - Boston Scientific with 40%

• Why is this still news????
Harassment by “Respected Leaders”

Yes…still at University of Chicago studying (no kidding) “research on the evolution of human behavior”

Yes…still has a lab with 50% women
Overt Harassment Finally Starting to Backfire

Sexual harassment in science is not rare. Last year, a survey of 666 scientists found that nearly two-thirds had experienced some form of verbal sexual harassment while doing field research, while 1 in 5 had experienced sexual assault. Overwhelmingly, those experiencing harassment were students or postdocs.

Here’s How Geoff Marcy’s Sexual Harassment Went On For Decades, Azeen Ghorayshi, Buzzfeed
Overt Harassment Finally Starting to Backfire

Implicit bias refers to the attitudes or stereotypes that affect our understanding, actions and decisions in an unconscious manner.

https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/
Why is All This Important?

“Just because there isn’t a conscious bias doesn’t mean that it doesn’t exist..”

How Our Brains Work to Organize Lots of Information

• We use “schema”
  ▪ Mental shortcuts
  ▪ Used to organize or categorize information
  ▪ It is automatic
  ▪ It is very fast
Shorthand Schemas Can be Vital
But Sometimes Schemas Backfire

Trayvon Martin, RIP 2012
We All Do It…

Scientists rated a student’s competence, hireability, suggested salary and amount of mentoring they would offer

*Science faculty’s subtle gender biases favor male students*
Moss-Racusin et al PNAS, 2012
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A Thousand Little Cuts

I WANT TO DISPEL THE MYTH THAT WE'RE SEXIST IN OUR TREATMENT OF FEMALE ENGINEERS.

THE DIRECTORS HAVE AGREED TO AWARD BETTY THE TITLE OF COMPANY "FELLOW."

FELLOW?

YOU'LL STILL USE THE WOMEN'S REST ROOM OF COURSE.
“He is Accomplished and Intelligent”

Exploring the color of glass: letters of recommendation for female and male medical faculty

Trix and Psenka Discourse & Society 2003
“She Tries Hard…”

Trix and Psenka Discourse & Society 2003
Faint Praise—Who Would You Hire?

% of letters with doubt raising language, hedges, potential negatives, faint praise or irrelevancies

![Bar chart showing comparison between female and male applicants. Female applicants have 24% faint praise, while male applicants have 12%.](image-url)
#1 Structure Processes for Success

• **Inoculate against bias.** Require education for employment, pay, benefits

• **Mask the gender of candidates** When possible

• **Create heterogeneous committees** Be aspirational about what this should be

• **Evaluate accomplishments in public** Do not allow “gut feelings” as an excuse

*Derived from “Implicit Bias and the Workplace.” (2014) by Dean and Bandows Koster*
#2 Collect Data

- Review pay and promotion equity routinely
- Collect data about yourself – you are part of the problem
- Google studied male/female performance/influence scores on projects

**Contributions specifically attributed to the individuals**

**Contributions attributed to the “team”**
#3 Evaluate Subtle Messages

- **Microaggressions** Small cues about contribution and interaction
- **Environment** Consider design of physical space
- **Language** Job solicitations, letters of recommendation, honorary names to awards, lecture series, etc.
#4 Hold Everyone Accountable

- Empower everyone to call out bias!! Training goes nowhere if it isn’t a part of every day
- Be aware of “nested minorities”. It’s even worse for them (e.g. black and female, gay and disabled)
- See something, say something
Does unconscious bias have an effect on scientific publishing?
Gender in the Global Research Landscape

Analysis of research performance through a gender lens – across 20 years, 12 geographies, and 27 subject areas

Gender in the Global Research Landscape Report

- In general men published slightly more papers than women
- Citation impact for papers was very similar for men and women
- The download impact was slightly higher for women than for men
- In engineering, men are more likely to be the first or corresponding author than when women publish in the same field
Gender in the Global Research Landscape Report
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Is there evidence for gender disparities in publishing?

NATURE | COMMENT

Bibliometrics: Global gender disparities in science

Vincent Larivière, Chaoqun Ni, Yves Gingras, Blaise Cronin & Cassidy R. Sugimoto

11 December 2013

Cassidy R. Sugimoto and colleagues present a bibliometric analysis confirming that gender imbalances persist in research output worldwide.

‘in the most productive countries, all articles with women in dominant author positions receive fewer citations than those with men in the same positions.’

‘women's publication portfolios are more domestic than their male colleagues — they profit less from the extra citations that international collaborations accrue.’
Papers with female first authors are less likely to be published

Double-blind review favours increased representation of female authors

Amber E. Budden¹,², Tom Tregenza³, Lonnie W. Aarssen⁴, Julia Koricheva⁵, Roosa Leimu⁶ and Christopher J. Lortie⁷

Papers published in Behavioral Ecology by first-author gender. (a) Total number of papers published in BE in the four years before and after the implementation of a double-blind review policy in 2001. (b) Percentage change in author representation.
Bias in reviewer invitations

**Female reviewers suggested by authors**

Both male and female authors suggest fewer female reviewers than expected on the basis of publication rates.

**Female reviewers invited by editors**

Editors, especially male ones, are inviting too few women to review.

Lerback & Hanson 2017, Nature
How can publishers help?

Elsevier is committed to ensuring that publishing is fair and equitable for all. Some examples of actions we are taking:

• Examining our processes and policies to ensure that our journals publish leading research in the most equitable and inclusive manner

• Establishing best practises for editorial policies and processes, board recruitment, etc. that engender inclusive researcher opportunities.

• Reviewing and addressing the gender diversity of editors, editorial boards, and reviewers

• Reviewing editor and reviewer training to look at the inclusion of unconscious bias

• Stimulating analytics and studies on gender in research and science, technical and medical publishing
Addressing gender bias in a leading reviews journal
Trends in Biochemical Sciences

$IF_{2015} = 12.81$, Ranked 8th in Category

$CiteScore_{2015} = 11.49$, Ranked 7th in Category
Combating Gender Bias at TiBS

- What are the potential sources of gender bias at TiBS?
- Where do we have biases?
- What can we do to correct the biases?

But first:
What gender balance should we be aiming for?
Looking to the community

• What percentage of your community is women?
• What is the “community”?
  ▪ All researchers including trainees?
  ▪ Just the tenured professors?
  ▪ What field(s)?

Life Science PhDs employed by Academia*

- 38% Men
- 62% Women

Tenured Life Sciences Faculty*

- 25% Men
- 75% Women

Best estimate

- American Society of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
- Survey of 1780 members in biochemistry departments

28:72 Women:Men ratio for Tenured or Tenure-track
Examining internal sources of bias

- Choosing and inviting peer reviewers
  - 21% Women
- Editorial Board members
  - 27% Women
- Inviting authors to write (e.g., Reviews)
  - 26% Women
- Choosing which uninvited submissions to consider
  - 13% Women (senior authors)
Examining external sources of bias

- Authors decide where to submit
  - 13% women
- Authors suggest peer reviewers
  - 22% women
- Peer reviewers self-select
  - 21% women
Main findings

• All measures were lower than minimum benchmark (28% women)
• Worst bias in author-initiated article suggestions

• Women accept referee invitations at the same rate as men
• The least bias was found in the editorial board (27% women) and in published authors (26% women), which are both editor-driven.
What to improve, and how to improve it?

• Continue to collect and monitor data
• Consider what barriers may decrease self-promotion for women researchers
• Move past the “usual suspects” when inviting authors and reviewers
• Ask ourselves if we have considered all equally qualified women before inviting authors and reviewers
• Consider making composition aspirational
Thank you