7-3-2014

An Autoethnographic Perspective on the Messy Business of Change

Michael B. Elmes
Worcester Polytechnic Institute

Joy E. Beatty
University of Michigan-Dearborn

From Academics to Change Agents in a Gender Equity Initiative

Sonia M. Goltz[1] and Patty Sotirin[2]

[1]*School of Business and Economics, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, Michigan, USA*
[2]*Department of Humanities, College of Sciences and Arts, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, Michigan, USA*

Firsthand experience offers a valuable perspective on the lived complications of change initiatives. We describe how we suddenly found ourselves in charge of a university-wide gender equity initiative. Despite our experience with campus issues of gender bias and larger discussions about implicit bias, we were unprepared for the personal, community, and institutional implications of taking on such a widespread and very visible initiative. We reflect on the complexities of our struggles to reframe our own assumptions, to engage with the campus community, to respond to multiform resistances, and to ensure institutional accountability. Our reflections have implications both for equity initiatives in workplaces and for women's work as organizational change agents. *Organization Management Journal*, 11: 194–207, 2014. doi: 10.1080/15416518.2014.947531

Keywords   organizational change; gender equity; unconscious bias; academia; tempered radicals

I'm sitting in the campus café with the Principal Investigator on the university's National Science Foundation (NSF) ADVANCE grant. We're talking about the University of Michigan's well-known STRIDE workshops on research about gender bias in faculty hiring. The ADVANCE committee has been bringing a STRIDE member to our campus periodically to conduct faculty presentations. The PI is smiling at me, her eyes crinkling behind her glasses as she ruefully acknowledges that we need something more than an occasional visit. "You know," I venture, "we could create our own program here." "Really?" she sounds incredulous. (Sotirin, diary entry)

This exchange marks our inauspicious and unreflective entry into the experience of advancing bias literacy on a campus dominated by science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) programs where the 4:1 male to female ratio has remained stubbornly persistent over the past twenty years. The concept of "bias literacy" originated with the American Association for the Advancement of Science (Sevo & Chubin, 2008), and the underlying assumption is that change is not possible without

bringing processes that operate at the unconscious or implicit level to the conscious, explicit level (e.g., Nonaka, 1994). Thus, bias literacy efforts focus on getting people to recognize and counteract habitual perceptions based in social stereotypes that operate in implicit, persistent, and precognitive ways (Banaji & Greenwald, 2013; Carnes et al., 2012), rather than focusing on explicit bias, which is more overt, easily recognizable, and changeable. Given the traditional male dominance of STEM fields and of our institution in particular, our program addresses gender biases that hinder the hiring, retention, and promotion of women faculty.

We were well-positioned to assist with the bias literacy program on our campus. We are both senior academics from different areas of organization studies employed in two different academic units: Sonia Goltz is a professor of organizational behavior in the School of Business and Economics, while Patty Sotirin is a professor of communication in the Department of Humanities. However, one could say that in many ways we were also naive. In this article, we offer our stories of this program and reflect not only on our own assumptions, ambivalences, and responses to the multiform resistances to bias literacy but also on the larger contexts that came into play throughout our experience, including the complexities of university politics, the ongoing corporatization of the university, the erosion of faculty autonomy, and the persistence of gender inequities in the academy. While our program and experiences are academic and United States-based, our reflections have broad implications for equity initiatives elsewhere and for women's work as organizational change agents.

In reflecting on the complexities of our experiences, we identify with a classic statement about feminist academics as "tempered radicals" whose transformative visions must be tempered by the need to work from within the very organizational structures and relations they wish to change (Meyerson & Scully, 1995). This is an ambivalent stance motivated by deep feminist commitments and felt anger at injustices and inequities yet tempered by insider loyalty and a willingness to work with existing power holders. Other equity change programs are more ambitious; our directive was to instruct faculty about

unconscious bias that occurs during hiring and promotion decisions. In this, our vision was to initiate small changes in the way faculty think of gender bias, precipitating, as small changes sometimes do, more extensive conversations about creating a more equitable, inclusive campus culture. Our experience has been somewhat different than this. In particular, we have learned that equity initiatives are plagued by a minefield of complex sociopolitical dynamics. Yet we hold to the critical role of hope and pragmatic fortitude for those advocating equity and bias literacy programs. We have come to realize that such change is less a coherent and rational initiative than an intricate weaving of conflicting dynamics, at once tenuous and fragile, knotty and complex, enabling and disenabling (Spicer & Levay, 2012).

Our program at Michigan Technological University (hereafter Michigan Tech) was developed at the conclusion of an investigation into the university's faculty hiring and retention practices of women in the STEM fields. The investigation was based on a grant awarded by the NSF ADVANCE Program. This is the initiative that frames our experiences. Accordingly, we offer some background information on this national initiative to change universities.

WOMEN IN THE STEM FIELDS AND THE NSF ADVANCE GRANT PROGRAM

Although percentages of graduate women in the United States have risen substantially over several decades, this has not in turn translated into a substantial increase in the percentage of women faculty members (Mason & Goulden, 2004; Monroe et al., 2008). Women are overrepresented in part-time, untenured, and primarily teaching positions, and sexual harassment and lower salaries continue to plague women (e.g., Mason, 2011; Mason & Goulden, 2004; Nettles, Perna, Bradburn, & Zimbler, 2000; Rai, 2000; Curtis, 2005). When women do enter academia in tenure-track positions, they are tenured and promoted more slowly and less often (e.g., Bain & Cummings, 2000; Dugger, 2001; Mason, 2011). Organizational factors are important influences: a climate tolerant of discrimination perpetuates the problem (Gruber, 1998), as does the lack of family-friendly policies (e.g., Mason & Goulden, 2004). Additionally women who attempt to use overt routes to addressing issues are often punished (Monroe, Ozyurt, Wrigley, & Alexander, 2008). Our focus has been on inequity between academic men and women that is attributable to bias and discrimination, rather than to performance or structural factors (e.g., Lee, 2011; Umbach, 2008) or to gendered work/family conflicts and commitments (e.g., Bagger & Li, 2012; Buzzanell et al., 2005). The result of such biases is a tendency for women to be consistently underrated (Heilman, Wallen, Fuchs, & Tamkins, 2004) and for women's work to be devalued (Monroe, Ozyurt, Wrigley, & Alexander, 2008). These small biases accumulate over time, resulting in a large advantage for men (Eagly & Carli, 2007). This can especially be seen at the higher ranks: in recent years,

women have composed a little over one-third of associate professors and about one-quarter of full professors (e.g., Mason, 2011).

These issues are particularly problematic in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). Although the numbers of women earning degrees in these areas have increased dramatically, women are still underrepresented in all ranks of the academic hierarchy but particularly as professors, and employment of women in academia in these areas is often in untenured or part-time positions (Bellas, Ritchey, & Parmer, 2001; Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology, 2009; Hahm, 2006; Long, 2001; National Academy of Sciences, 2007; National Science Board, 2010). The research on women in the STEM fields indicates a number of underlying factors for these low numbers (e.g., Etzkowitz, Kemelgor, & Uzzi, 2000; Fox, 2001; National Academy of Sciences, 2007; Rosser, 2004; Xie & Shauman, 2003). The underrepresentation of senior women, particularly in the STEM fields, is also found internationally and results from similar factors, even though different countries have had different histories and policies regarding gender equality (e.g., van den Brink & Benschop, 2012).

Given these issues, in the United States, the NSF ADVANCE grant program, begun in 2001, is designed to promote systemic approaches to increase the representation and advancement of women in the STEM fields (e.g., Fox, Colatrella, McDowell, & Realff, 2007; Stewart, Malley, & LaVaque-Manty, 2007). As reported on the ADVANCE website, "Since 2001, the NSF has invested over $130M to support ADVANCE projects at more than one-hundred institutions of higher education and STEM-related not-for-profit organizations in forty-one states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico" (ADVANCE, 2014). The most well-known type of ADVANCE grant is called the Institutional Transformation (IT) grant, which generally focuses on (a) increasing the flow of women into the pipeline and helping them progress successfully through it, or (b) changing the climate through methods such as increasing awareness of diversity, equity, and inclusion issues (Bilimoria & Liang, 2012). The grant our university received was not an IT grant, but was the smaller scale PAID grant (Partnerships for Adaptation, Implementation, and Dissemination). However, the grant had many of the climate and pipeline elements that are found in an IT grant; indeed, our grant activities were modeled on the University of Michigan ADVANCE program's network of faculty committees and initiatives (see Sturm's 2006 analysis of the UM ADVANCE project). Our provost described the ADVANCE program as follows:

> The ADVANCE team consists of a diverse range of people from across the university, from graduate students, to faculty, chairs, deans, and the Provost. The team works to focus people and resources on building a body of best practices in recruitment, retention and promotion which can help Michigan Tech build a rich faculty pool, with particular attention to the advancement of women in the STEM fields of academia.

Current initiatives include 1) Increasing the diversity and quality of the faculty applicant pool, 2) Increasing the number of women hired into STEM tenure-track positions, and 3) Retaining our excellent faculty, once hired, by assisting them in the achievement of successful careers through mentoring and other practices which ensure a diverse, rich and welcoming campus community. (Michigan Technological University, 2011)

This description clearly puts the focus on numbers; it is not a cultural change program but a program aimed at improving the university's gender equity record. Nonetheless, initial indications from both IT and PAID ADVANCE grant institutions show that these grants have stimulated the creation of new positions and structures supporting diversity and equity, improved faculty recruitment, retention, and promotion practices, and are associated with the increased representation of women faculty in STEM fields (e.g., Bilimoria & Buch, 2010; Bilimoria, Joy, & Liang, 2008; Bilimoria & Liang, 2012). We were aware of and encouraged by these indications as we developed the bias literacy program for our campus.

THE PROGRAM

Our bias literacy program is called the Diversity Literacy Online Workshop (hereafter DLOW). It was an afterthought to our university's ADVANCE grant self-study and launched as a way to educate faculty about implicit gender bias without relying on outsourcing. Implicit or unconscious bias refers to an attitude that someone has—a preference for or against something—that is outside of awareness (cf. Dovidio, 2001; Greenwald, Uhlmann, Poehlman, & Banaji, 2009). Implicit attitudes are rooted in habitual responses and therefore are persistent and more difficult to alter than are explicit ones (Wilson, Lindsey, & Schooler, 2000). Furthermore, they have been found to be more predictive of behavior than self-reported attitudes for socially sensitive topics (Greenwald et al., 2009).

As indicated earlier, bias literacy programs are designed to bring these persistent responses to consciousness so they are more readily recognized and redressed (e.g., Carnes et al., 2012). Among these programs are Harvard's Project Implicit (Harvard University, 2011), the Gender Bias Learning Project (Center for Worklife Law, 2014), and the University of Michigan's admired and well-established STRIDE—Strategies and Tactics for Recruiting to Improve Diversity and Excellence (STRIDE, 2013). The STRIDE training program was contracted to give presentations on our campus and to consult with our ADVANCE Training subcommittee. Yet the presentations were infrequent, voluntarily attended, one-time PowerPoint sessions, which only served to encourage the idea that bias literacy was not critical on our campus and was of interest only to those already concerned about diversity issues. Instead, we designed an online program with 24/7 accessibility that would maximize flexibility for busy faculty and still facilitate cross-campus discussions about their experiences, assumptions, and practices. While we might have preferred to offer a series of face-to-face discussions, we knew based on experience with online courses

as well as familiarity with the research literature that online learning can be an effective format, particularly for reaching adult learners who have personal and professional responsibilities (e.g., Brewer & Headlee, 2007; Dell, Low, & Wilker, 2010; Fishman et al., 2013; Rasheed, 2007). The program is self-paced and module-based, with written, graphic, and video content, as well as a threaded discussion section. These features are consistent with principles of adult learning, such as those outlined by Knowles (1984), which include recognizing that adult learners are self-directed, have accumulated significant experience, and prefer learning that integrates with the demands of their everyday life. To facilitate bias literacy as the basis for social change (Brewer & Headlee, 2011), the emphasis is on transformative learning through critical reflection and posted discussion about how the material relates to real-life challenges (e.g., Mezirow, 1990). The teacher role is replaced by facilitators encouraging the flow of discussion that is especially critical to online co-learning (Brewer & Headlee, 2001; Brookfield, 1986).

Our workshop design was influenced by several already-established ADVANCE-based programs, including the Gender Equity Project at Hunter College directed by Virginia Valian and Vita Rabinowitz (Gender Equity Project, 2013); the Awareness of Decisions in Evaluating Promotion and Tenure (ADEPT) project at Georgia Tech University, headed by Carol Colatrella and David McDowell (ADEPT, 2013); the extensive programmatic work done by the Women in Science & Engineering Leadership Institute (WISELI, 2013), a research center at the University of Wisconsin–Madison; and of course the ADVANCE project at the University of Michigan, especially its STRIDE work (STRIDE, 2013). This work seemed to us to emphasize three elements for an initiative like ours: education, conversation, and best practices. As we show in the following, we incorporated two of these elements and resisted the third.

The DLOW program we developed is organized around research and discussion and structured as a 3-week online "course." Each year, we offer four to five online sessions. Each course can "seat" 25 faculty members and is cohort based. Given that faculty across campus often do not know each other, we ask participants to post a profile introducing themselves. The course is structured into three 1-week modules: Week 1 introduces the concepts of implicit bias and the accumulation of disadvantage; week 2 is on implicit bias in selection committees; and week 3 is on implicit bias post-tenure, promotion and mentoring. In each module, participants are given two to three brief research articles. In addition, each week offers a pertinent university report such as a summary of the most recent climate survey and women and minority hiring and retention rates for each department. The heart of each week's workshop is the discussion section. We offer a prompt to elicit participants' responses to and experiences with the issues discussed in the readings and university reports. These discussions generate considerable thought and interaction among participants. There are ongoing opportunities for feedback throughout the course and a closing survey about the participants' reactions and

suggestions. Two online facilitators participate in the discussion portion of the course and respond to questions or problems with the technical aspects of the program. A separate week-long course focusing on legal aspects of hiring is administered by the Institutional Equity office following participants' completion of our course. Together, these two courses constitute our university's certification for faculty service on hiring and promotion committees.

Shortly before we inaugurated the DLOW, our provost decided that not just faculty on search and advancement committees but all tenured and tenure-track faculty would be required to complete the two components of the certification. A list of which faculty are certified is posted on a university website. Clearly, this change initiative has been an encompassing, top-down, rapid, and intrusive effort to alter campus-wide perceptions and practices. As might be anticipated, our experience as the implementation change agents has been intense.

PERSONAL NARRATIVE: AN AUTOETHNOGRAPHIC APPROACH

We present our story here as an autoethnographic narrative in order to convey the dynamic tensions of this experience and offer a self-reflexive analysis. Autoethnography is a well-recognized form of personal narrative research in which the researcher highlights her own lived experiences contextualized within social and institutional relations. Narrative writing is in itself a mode of qualitative inquiry (Goodall, 2000; Richardson, 2000). At the same time, autoethnography explores the researcher's subjective investments, as well as the perspectives of others toward self, and self as other (Bochner & Ellis, 2000; Ellis, 2004). As a mode of writing, self-reflexivity queries the implicit assumptions and feelings embedded in a personal story; as Humphries (2005) observed, writers "expose their doubts, fears, and potential weaknesses in such accounts" (p. 852). We do so in order to engage the complexities of our own experiences and to critically reflect on the larger implications for similar change programs. As Ellis (2004) points out, autoethnographic self-scrutiny connects autobiographical accounts to the worlds of others and renders cultural politics personal.

Ours is a situation that represents the heart of the ADVANCE grant change initiative: a STEM university steeped in 100 years of near gender exclusivity. (The relatively low proportions of women in the educational, economic, and empowered spheres of the university have been documented in an article appearing in *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* [Goltz & Hietapelto, 2013].) On our campus, this national narrative about the need to promote inclusion and equal opportunity in the STEM fields meets with a local narrative about the continuing dominance of both STEM fields and male faculty and students. Organizations as storytelling systems are multidimensional; personal stories are informed by and contribute to larger narratives (Boje, 1995; Gabriel, 2000; Prusak, Groh, Denning,

& Brown, 2011). Yet these interweavings are complex and often contradictory, especially when the unquestioned value of change is part of the story (Zorn, Page, & Cheney, 2000). We call attention to how dominant social narratives have framed our own understanding of the program and our justifications and assumptions.

To construct our personal part of this narrative, we combed through reams of records that had accrued over the course of the program's development. Our data include formal ADVANCE grant committee documents and reports; memos from various university administrators; webpages, workshop handouts, and our own online materials; and most critically, an ongoing e-mail record consisting of 650 e-mail exchanges between the two of us over the period of December 2010, when we agreed to develop a bias literacy workshop for faculty, to June 2012, when the last workshop of our initial year of operation concluded. This e-mail record is in itself a personal narrative account focused not only on what was happening but on our feelings about events, people, directions, and concerns. In short, it is autoethnographic data. It serves to prompt our recollections of events, people, and emotions and to ground our critical self-reflections.

We focus on our first year, particularly the development period. During that time, we engaged in a torrent of activity. We designed the online course in March and April and had it online by May; held meetings in May with the ADVANCE Steering Committee, our invited course facilitators, as well as chairs and deans across campus; ran a pilot session in June largely populated by chairs and our workshop facilitators; made significant modifications to the course in July based on feedback from the pilot; ran our first workshop in August and held three more during the 2011–2012 academic year. The pace of our efforts distracted us from reflecting on the implications of this initiative and our role in it. We intended the course as a place for faculty from across campus to meet and reflect on their assumptions and practices through inclusive, respectful conversations and personal reflections about implicit gender bias. Here we consider whether our efforts were complicit with managerial interests; whether we were responsive to the differing perspectives and interests of faculty themselves; and how well we were able to integrate feminist-inspired changes into the ways faculty think about their own biases. We offer vignettes of our experiences in order to reflect on these concerns.

Scrutinizing Beginnings: Suddenly We're Change Agents

Our work on the implicit bias program was grounded in a decade of efforts among women faculty on campus, including self-advocacy work in ongoing formal and informal groups and committees; an institutionalized advocate position with budgetary allocation authority reporting directly to the university president (this position has recently been eliminated); a Women and Minority internal grant program annually funding visiting scholars and public lectures; periodic climate surveys and focus groups resulting in considerable data about faculty perceptions;

a student-focused Center for Diversity and Inclusion established in 2009; and successful faculty petitions for a child care center, lactation rooms, and, in 2012, a maternity leave policy. Our involvement in these ongoing efforts provided the backdrop for our work on the bias literacy program. Specifically, our own experiences of bias, disadvantage, and inequity along with our awareness of colleagues' experiences and the shared complaints of female faculty around campus were powerful motivators. For example, comments by women faculty on the most recent climate survey identified a common perception that Caucasian men are entrenched in power positions (Anderson, 2011). Further, in response to the statement "Recruitment of women is taken seriously on campus," 74% of men responded in agreement while only 45% of women agreed. We unreflectively assumed a great deal of common knowledge, history, and commitment between ourselves and other women faculty, while we assumed critical differences and even antithetical orientations between ourselves and male faculty. Our decisions about how to design and manage the bias literacy course were based on these assumptions.

Notably, given our histories and identities as academic feminists, we bought into the ideology of change (Spicer & Levay, 2012; Zorn et al., 2000). This unreflective stance was based on a larger narrative: that universities are mired in policies, practices, and ideologies that perpetuate gender-based biases and privileges and that the call for change is justified as socially, morally, and organizationally progressive and beneficial (Fine, 2010; Townsley & Broadfoot, 2008). Additionally, feminist perspectives are themselves inherently change-focused and motivated by social justice commitments (Morley & Walsh, 1995). We did not question our commitments to these larger narratives; our viewpoint that the university must change seemed self-evident as we considered the history and conditions of our campus culture (cf. Sotirin, 2008).

Epistemic Struggles: Meeting With Facilitators

Early in the process of implementing the course, we encountered but did not recognize an epistemic sticking point that posed a primary site of resistance to the idea of implicit bias: an empirical-analytic mind-set. Our introduction to this form of cognitive resistance happened as we were meeting for the first time with the faculty facilitators. These facilitators were tenured faculty members who had responded to our e-mail invitation; they were selected based upon recommendations by the ADVANCE Committee and their personal and professional support for diversity measures. We had invited four faculty members to facilitate the actual online courses: two women and two men, all tenured, and three of the four working in STEM fields. After a brief explanation of the course and the facilitator's role, we asked if they had any initial questions before we discussed the details of the course. One of the women answered:

> I'm all on board with this but when I talked to my husband about it [he was also a tenured professor in a STEM area], he wanted to

know what happened to provoke this response by the administration. Was there some incident or lawsuit about gender discrimination? What's the problem?

The idea that there must be an incident illustrates three aspects of a mind-set that for many faculty framed the rationale for the course and that we encountered again and again in various forms of resistance. The first aspect is a cause–effect approach—some negative incident precipitated the provost's mandate for a bias literacy course. Distrust between faculty and administration had historic roots on our campus, but the point here is that by approaching our program as the effect of an administrative coverup, the value of the program for understanding and addressing gender inequities became overshadowed by suspicion about administrative motives and manipulations and, as we elaborate later, entangled the DLOW in ongoing campus politics.

A related issue was a problem-solution approach, and this aspect dominated even the ADVANCE Committee's support for our course. Simply put, if gender bias is a problem, we need "best practices" to ensure that our hiring and promotion processes are bias-free. This view implies that bias is an undesirable habit of mind that can be replaced by implementing objective, socially neutral practices. Indeed, the provost and ADVANCE Committee initially named our course "Best Practices in Faculty Hiring and Promotion." Throughout the course, various faculty would insist that "I used to be biased but now I'm not" or "My department uses a criteria ranking system for selection and promotion decisions that eliminates any bias." Yet the point of the workshop is that implicit bias is part of our social being—there is no "bias-free" position that a social subject can occupy. Instead, the point of bias literacy is to recognize and counteract our partial, partisan, and problematic perceptions and interpretations (Goodall, 2000, p. 55). There is an epistemological divergence inherent to this issue, sometimes marked as the "two cultures" of scientistic and humanistic ways of knowing (Snow, 1959). Our response sought to acknowledge the problem approach while suggesting that there could be no definitive solution and attempting to shift the frame of understanding from problem-solution to proactive vigilance. As Patty explained in a meeting:

> We think of this as both a problem-solving strategy and a proactive approach to implicit bias. The sheer number of women and minority faculty at Tech suggest that we need to do something to increase diversity. So there's a problem. Anecdotal evidence suggests that women on campus perceive subtle biases. So there's a problem. But just as importantly, we see this course as a proactive strategy for promoting vigilance against implicit bias among Tech's faculty and for creating a campus climate of fairness and equity. (meeting notes, May 27, 2011)

Additionally, we actively resisted the widespread expectation that the course would supply "best practices." While all of the ADVANCE programs we consulted offered recommendations for bias-reducing practices in faculty selection and promotion committees, we felt strongly that participants in the course

would identify practices in use that had particular resonance on our campus. Accordingly, while some of the readings ended with recommendations (Hill, Corbett, & St. Rose, 2010; Isaac, Lee, & Carner, 2009; Valian, 2010), we compiled ideas from each week's module in a weekly summary to document campus practices that helped detect and minimize bias. These ideas have been compiled in a list of our own inductively derived "vigilance practices" that we periodically revise based on discussions among participants. The list is open-ended, not a definitive set of "best practices."

A final epistemic issue that we encountered early in the implementation of the course had to do with what counted as evidence of implicit bias both in the research studies and experientially. We encountered the research issue in an early debriefing meeting with one of our facilitators who admitted that he had a hard time reading the research studies provided in the course because he was getting "stuck on the tables" in the articles. What he meant was that for him, the convincing evidence for implicit bias had to be in the measures and calculations reported in data tables rather than in the arguments advanced by the authors. His faith in the methods of analysis as a basis for what can be known countered our own epistemological convictions that experience is open to interpretation and what can be known is subject to argument (Bernstein, 1983; Feldman, 2002). Our choice of readings was based on (a) a focus on faculty rather than students or on organizational gender bias more generally and (b) well-supported arguments about implicit bias and the accumulation of disadvantage. Our assumption was that faculty would be convinced by quality of argument rather than by numbers per se. Instead, as we discuss again later, STEM-based faculty in particular criticized the procedures and statistical methods in the research, in effect dismissing evidence of gender bias. Notably, most faculty professed to believing that bias matters but the stance was, "There may be bias but you haven't convinced me with this study." Discussion was thus diverted to research protocols rather than to reflections on gender bias (cf. Block's note on this form of resistance, 2011, p. 126).

Similarly, evidence through experience encountered resistance among participants. Initially, we included the Implicit Association Test (IAT) designed to demonstrate subtle biases (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998). The reactions to this test among participants in our pilot were vehemently negative and defensive. In addition, women faculty members' stories of experienced bias were sometimes disciplined by other participants as "getting us off track" or "water under the bridge." While at times experiences of bias proved quite telling and were granted evidential status, experience as evidence was not accorded the authority granted to numerical data.

As we came to realize from these examples, differences in ways of knowing may generate resistance even among those willing to address issues of gender bias. We remain committed to promoting vigilance and focusing attention on campus experiences and practices. Nonetheless, the dominance of

an empirical-analytic mind set valuing cause–effect, problem-solution, and quantifiable evidence was a major force of resistance that was both antithetical to our own ways of thinking and resistant to the premises of the course. Further, the resistance we encountered was very consistent with the politics of "chilly climate" controversies as described by Prentice (2000). She discussed how the claims of equity seekers at universities are regularly disputed in four key areas, including disagreements over the definition of equality, attributions of responsibility for inequities, questioning proof of discrimination, and debating remedies. Further, the epistemic issues we encountered were complicated by the politics of change on our campus, politics that began occurring as soon as we introduced the course in a meeting for chairs and deans.

Making Frenemies: The Chairs' Meeting and Pilot Workshop

Designing the workshop itself was only part of our responsibilities. What we didn't recognize early on was that we were the "public face" of this initiative, responsible for garnering administrators' support, faculty cooperation, and campus visibility. Once we had designed the workshop, we realized that we needed support from chairs and deans who would ultimately be responsible for getting faculty to enroll in the workshop. So in May 2012, we asked to present plans at a scheduled chairs meeting. We knew chairs were resistant. They questioned the need for an all-faculty training dictum ("Has there been an incident to prompt all this?"); they questioned the time commitment necessary for a workshop as compared with a PowerPoint presentation (faculty should be researching, "not wasting time in training"); and they were reluctant to stand in front of dismissive faculty defending what some of them held to be a mandate that lacked institutional support and would likely be eliminated after a year or two (the inevitable fate of such an "unfunded mandate"). What we didn't realize was that some of this resistance arose from considerable resentment over the perception that the deans and chairs had been left out of the decision process to implement such a program. Not surprisingly, our meeting with the chairs was palpably tense. Even those in the room we thought were supportive offered little explicit encouragement as we were grilled by others about the 3-week length of the course and the reasons for requiring all faculty to complete it. (As a note of interest, out of the 20-some people in attendance, four—including the two of us—were women.)

Our case for the course design tapped in contradictory ways into narratives about the corporatization of the public university and the erosion of faculty autonomy (Donohue, 2008; Ginsberg, 2011; Neufield, 2011; Readings, 1997). First, we made a case that learning about unconscious bias would yield more enduring changes and be more worthwhile than attending a 1-hour PowerPoint and ticking off a required training checkbox. To facilitate faculty participation across an extended period (3 weeks) in the midst of their ongoing responsibilities,

we offered an online format to maximize flexibility and we designed this format in accord with current understandings of online learning. This argument cast faculty as self-governing learners rather than subject to mandated training. Yet we also marshaled an argument drawn on the encroaching corporatization of the university. We argued that academe in general and our campus in particular had no tradition of mandatory training, yet this was an entirely reasonable and well-accepted practice outside academe, including in postsecondary education. We return to this point in our discussion about change initiatives in the following section. Our own position as "tempered radicals" thus tapped into the ambiguities of change and situated us in an uncomfortable alignment with administrative practices.

We also defended the 3-week, 3-hours-a-week time commitment as a minimal investment for fostering bias awareness and vigilance. Our rationale drew on a mix of supporting arguments: a long-established cognitive change model about unfreezing established habits of mind (Lewin, 1951); the implicit association patterns (Greenwald et al., 1998,; 2009; Jost et al., 2009) that undergird bias awareness programs; and feminist arguments for the critical importance of vigilance as resistance against entrenched but subtle biases (McRobbie, 1985; Thomas & Davies, 2006). For these reasons, we felt strongly that a week per topic was the minimal period for allowing participants time to engage readings and reflect on their own and each other's experiences, interpretations, and assumptions. Admittedly, our analogy of faculty as "eager learners" failed to acknowledge the practical burden of our program on our colleagues' time and energies. Yet the time commitment was also a subtle bid to increase the perceived value of bias literacy.

By the end of the meeting, several chairs signed up to do our upcoming pilot workshop and most seemed willing to consider our arguments. One chair came over to us after the meeting and told us that it was about time that Michigan Tech did something like this. Our post-meeting relief was palpable; Sonia's first e-mail exclaimed: "Whew! We navigated that one—give yourself a pat on the back!" In retrospect, our excitement was premature. In the next few days, we heard that some chairs had gone to the provost shortly after the meeting to complain about the initiative. The workshop was viewed as another of the administration's top-down projects foisted on the faculty and soon to be abandoned. While there was little criticism of us directly—indeed, most remarks were prefaced by some version of "This isn't directed at Sonia and Patty"—we were also not included in the discussion. Instead, arguments were carried on around and without us. We wondered: Were we ignored as minions of the provost with no authority or presence beyond him? Were we disregarded as women faculty in a debate carried on by more powerful male administrators? Eventually, the provost prevailed and we were told to carry on with our planned pilot session.

Even though we were aware of the resistance to the course, the intensity of the pilot session was daunting. During the first week, it became clear that some of the chairs were merely collecting data to mount a petition against having such a workshop.

The tenor of the discussion posts during that first week was hostile and dismissive. One STEM chair attacked the workshop readings ("this would never be published in my discipline") and posted an article stating that diversity workshops such as ours are not effective. Another began posting the hours spent on each activity to demonstrate that our estimate of 2–3 hours per week was misleading. Rather than 2–3 hours per week, he claimed the workshop took 5–6 hours a week and that in the 16+ hours he spent on the workshop, he "could have written a grant proposal," a high-priority/high-reward activity on our campus. In addition to negative discussion posts, there were other issues, early warnings about the challenge and import of minor mechanics in delivering such a course. We worried that these small tribulations would negatively affect the perceptions and evaluations of our participants. The pilot workshop was a trial not only for our design but for our resolve.

In a diary excerpt from that first week of the pilot course, Patty admitted, "I've been taken aback by the vehemence of some of the posts and the general tenor of antagonism. . . . People I thought would be supportive have been very negative." The surprise was that not only the STEM chairs but feminist colleagues and even our own facilitators were attacking workshop materials, structure, and assumptions. Being on campus began to feel emotionally unsafe; walking across campus one day, Patty saw one of the STEM chairs approaching and felt overwhelming anxiety. We were unprepared for the emotional demand of our change roles. As the pilot proceeded, we reassured each other in private e-mails and met frequently at a coffee shop on campus that we dubbed the "motivation station." Along with reinforcing our commitment to women's advancement and campus change, we found that our mutual support and camaraderie were critical personal resources.

Based on feedback from the pilot, we cut out one-third of the required materials and activities to focus on more accessible readings and shorten the time required to complete the workshop. What we didn't know was that at a chairs' retreat during the week following the pilot, some of those who participated wrote a three-page single-spaced memo to the provost denouncing the workshop and proposing a much shorter, one-time alternative. We were called to the provost's office and told him that we had already made substantial changes and remained committed to a learning experience rather than a one-time presentation. To our relief, the provost issued a memo supporting our workshop and reiterating the requirement that all faculty earn certification. We began enrolling faculty in upcoming workshops, cognizant that this had been a battle fought above our heads with little impact on the multiform resistances we had encountered.

Staying Alive: The DLOW 2 Years Later

Over the past 2 years, the majority of comments we have received from workshop participants have been positive, most acknowledging the experience as "eye-opening." Yet we

continue to face resistance even from those who subscribe to the goals of equity and inclusivity. Among them are those for whom the program itself is a rehearsal of empty platitudes—one male faculty member noted that the message of the workshop was akin to apple pie and "Boy Scout principles." Others dismiss the course as blatant cooptation and suspect us of selling out our feminist commitments, a challenge that "tempered radicals" often face (Meyerson & Scully, 1995, p. 590). Still others chafe against the circumscribed focus on women's advancement rather than on larger goals of diversity per se. (This has been a criticism of the NSF ADVANCE program, which now includes a broader focus including race and ethnicity as well as gender; see Sturm [2006].) Even colleagues in our own departments have been slow to participate and have been quite dismissive, often ridiculing the workshop as "trivializing" and "inadequate." At one of Patty's department meetings when the chair commended a faculty member for completing the workshop, the faculty member made a face and everyone shared derisive laughter.

Of course, it is the negative criticism that feels most acute. For example, a common observation, often from male STEM participants, is that the social science research we include "would not pass the standards for peer reviewed publication" in a STEM field; such comments can provoke a flurry of discussion posts that critique research assumptions, methods, and analyses. We continue to encounter blatant sexism and incivility in the discussion posts of participating faculty; one faculty member dismissed the scenarios illustrating gender discrimination with the platitude "women like to complain." The validity of the workshop itself continues to be challenged by faculty who want pre- and post-tests to verify bias mitigation. And the time commitment required for the workshop continues to rankle. As one male faculty member told us in an e-mail, "This seems a ridiculously inefficient use of time for busy faculty." He refused to take the course because,

> While I am a very loyal supporter of the cause and the message, I still question the efficiency of your delivery method. I do not know a single colleague (even among the women) who looks forward to this inconvenient & time-consuming course. If you make it too difficult, you run the risk of creating hostility that spills over from method to message. Then you end up doing more harm than good.

This is a concern that we take seriously. Is the time required to do the workshop undermining the goal to encourage vigilance? And how should we respond to ongoing complaints about the amount of time the workshop takes? To date, we have maintained the DLOW as it is. Yet we are sensitive to three implications of this complaint. First, responses to an evaluative survey at the end of the course consistently are more positive than negative. Faculty who have not taken the course may have very different perceptions than those who have finished it. Indeed, after 2 years, the course has become an accepted requirement for service on search committees. Second, the complaint that the readings and discussions in the course are too

time-consuming is inherently value-laden. Given that most faculty members spend an inordinate amount of time reading what arguably are esoteric academic materials, the issue is not necessarily that the course places too much burden on faculty but that the burden is one that is not of value. It may be the case that denigrating the course masks the ready devaluation of bias literacy on campus despite lip service to the contrary. In this regard, we wonder if these complaints are defensive routines that appear to articulate concerns while masking underlying issues. In a classic elaboration of defensive routines, Argyris (1986) noted that such self-reinforcing loops make underlying issues undiscussable. The comment shown earlier warns about "doing more harm than good" yet enforces the idea that a demanding course on bias literacy is harmful because faculty members don't want to spend the time and are not rewarded for such efforts. This argument deflects focus from the underlying issues of campus culture and prevailing priorities. The complaint makes these issues undiscussable since the problem is not in the culture but in the design of the course! Further, making the DLOW a target deflects discussion of a critical question: the prerogative of top administrators to dictate organizational mandates. On our campus, faculty members have railed against this prerogative as an issue of faculty governance and the chairs' initial resistance seems to be a move against the provost's right to dictate "unfunded mandates." Yet as we noted, once the provost stood by his decision to require the DLOW, there was no further discussion. Critically, the prerogative of top administrators was treated once again as an "undiscussable." Finally, this raises a third implication about changes to the professoriate. Specifically, the DLOW is one more requisite faculty training requirement at Michigan Tech; others include Internet security, research ethics, federal security regulations, safe work practices, and sexual harassment, not to mention a myriad of "optional" training sessions on everything from benefits selections (the university has changed providers every year for the past three years), course delivery software (necessitated by a switch from one system to another), and faculty productivity reporting (the implementation of Digital Measures). These new training requirements were implemented on our campus within a 1- to 2-year period. During this time, faculty workloads increased even though salaries remained stagnant. Further, our own campus mandates are part of a larger change in the professoriate toward more entrepreneurial and corporate models. Accordingly, the resentment among faculty about such changes was already felt and our own change effort became a ready target for venting. It is clear that change initiatives are not experienced in a vacuum but in the context of ongoing changes and demands on campus and beyond.

REFLECTING ON OUR EXPERIENCES: WHAT DO CHANGE MODELS TELL US?

Turning to change management models, we offer several lessons learned as we reflect on our experiences. First,

instituting change is a negotiation process. Responding to criticism is important, but not losing the focus or impact of the change is also critical—both need to be done simultaneously. Ely and Meyerson (2000) refer to this as "maintaining the gender narrative," meaning that participants in equity initiatives need to generate stories about change that keep gendered relations central to the narrative. Narrative in this sense is a form of sensemaking; the resistances we encountered can be thought of as interpretative responses to what was deemed a disruptive requirement (e.g., Ford, Ford, & D'Amelio, 2008; Gioia, Thomas, Clark, & Chittipeddi, 1994). We wondered whether the anger faculty expressed over the length of the workshop had to do with a sense that a psychological contract granting faculty autonomy over their time and accountability had been breached (e.g., Shapiro & Kirkman, 1999). Unfortunately, preoccupation with the demands of the workshop can overshadowed the value of bias literacy and vigilance beyond the workshop. Such conversations are especially critical in the case of gender biases and inequities because practices that sustain such disparities are specific to the ways gender dynamics play out in particular disciplinary fields, departmental settings, and campuses (van den Brink & Benschop, 2012).

Second, we have come to hold an ambivalent stance about the importance of staunch and visible top management support (Fernandez & Rainey, 2006). This is a mainstay in mainstream change management models, such as Kotter's (1995) discussion of forming a powerful guiding coalition, and in our own experience, the provost's support was clearly critical. As one of the ADVANCE PIs put it, "If you have a strong Provost, changes can be made overnight" (e-mail, September 26, 2011). Yet this support might also have cast the workshop and us as instruments of the administration. Further, top university administrator participation in the DLOW has been minimal, indicating a preference to lead by mandate rather than example. Thus, top management support is a double-edged sword; we realize that a program foisted upon faculty from above has lasting implications beyond the survival of the program itself.

Third, both change management and feminist scholars urge change agents to facilitate communication and to empower stakeholders as participants throughout the process (e.g., Ford et al., 2008; Giangreco & Peccei, 2005; Lines, 2004; Msweli-Mbanga & Potwana, 2006). According to communication scholars Deetz, Tracy, and Simpson (2000), this is especially important when (a) the extent of change requires diverse insights and forms of knowledge; (b) the nature of the change requires creative and innovative programs; and (c) high levels of commitment by those affected by change are important (p. 92). In her case study of the University of Michigan's ADVANCE initiative, Sturm (2006, 2007) applauds the participative and collaborative nature of that program as innovative and effective. Ironically, the ADVANCE program at our university was modeled on the Michigan program and included diverse faculty members working on committees to study issues derived from the climate surveys: training, mentoring, recruiting, and human resources (HR) processes. Yet the decision to create a workshop and its design were not widely shared.

These lessons learned point to a new agenda for us as change agents: to develop responsive changes to the DLOW in order to affect a more participative and collaborative program. The challenge is daunting at this point and introduces another lesson learned: the toll on "tempered radicals." While change efforts rely on the strong beliefs and commitment of these individuals, there are costs. First, given the individuals' commitments to feminist causes, the change effort can more easily be dismissed as servicing narrow interests and benefiting only certain groups who endorse similar beliefs. An interesting example of this was reported in an article titled "Bad News from the Trenches"—senior faculty women tapped as ADVANCE "Equity Advisors" to review search committee processes were described as "lightning rods for all the frustration on campus that women are getting special treatment" (Monroe et al., 2008, p. 229). Both the equity effort and the individual women were disadvantaged, although in the long run there may be benefits to the university overall. Second, the strong commitments of "tempered radicals" along with the effort to work within given power relations can eventually lead to frustration, self-doubt, and burnout (Meyerson & Scully, 1995). Despite long hours and the willingness to deal with ongoing difficulties, the pressures of cooptation, lack of external recognition, and heavy emotional burdens lead us to wonder whether the struggle is worthwhile or whether we should step aside. As implementers rather than leaders, we find that the hard work of change is isolating and leaves us feeling professionally and personally vulnerable. As one feminist commentary put it, feminist academics who work as agents of change become very aware of the "points at which our visibility most ensures our vulnerability" (Morley & Walsh, 1995, p. 3). A more participative and collaborative approach from the beginning not only might have made the change more palatable for participants, but also might have left us feeling less isolated, with participants gaining a sense of greater shared responsibility for the program.

While our focus has been on our experiences as individual change agents, we cannot ignore the agency of the DLOW itself. Sturm (2006) argues that the NSF ADVANCE initiative constitutes an innovative change process entailing a cast of agents that include institutions and programs. One of these agentic roles is what she calls "organizational catalysts" who are central to ADVANCE implementation strategies; catalysts "leverage knowledge, ongoing strategic relationships, and accountability across systems" (p. 287). Sturm's examples are individuals, but as we reflect on the DLOW, we realize that the program itself plays a catalyst role, challenging dominant ways of knowing and prevailing prescriptions for eliminating gender disparities and discrimination; recrafting strategic relationships among both internal and external stakeholders including faculty, disciplines, administrators, legal requirements, other universities, and NSF; and changing the level and visibility of equity accountability among all participants. The lesson learned for us

is that this is not our program but a catalyst of change that is part of a larger network of transformative forces. Whether we continue to manage it or not, the program will remain part of a changing academic landscape.

A move to gender equity and the institutionalization of what Sturm (2006, 2007) calls an "architecture of inclusion" in the academy is evident in the work of NSF ADVANCE, as well as in other initiatives to reconstitute the traditional power structures of the university. Our own efforts are set within signs of change regarding the advancement of women faculty. Notably, there are more women faculty than in the past, and while the numbers seem to concentrate in the human sciences rather than the STEM fields, even those areas have seen an increase. On our campus, the percentage of women faculty members (tenured and tenure track) has increased from 15% in 1995 to 33% in 2012. Of most relevance, the mandate that all faculty members serving on search or promotion committees must be certified through the Diversity Literacy Workshop and the Legal Aspects workshop remains in effect. As of July 2014, 294 faculty are certified and 189 are not. That we have certified over half of all faculty sets the university's program apart from similar ADVANCE initiatives and evidences a concrete effort to change the pattern of unconscious gender discrimination. There is of yet no measure of the effects of the workshop on campus culture. However, as we mentioned, the survey of participants indicates that most find the workshop worthwhile and illuminating. Further, the university conducts an extensive climate survey every 10 years and the next survey is about to be done. We look forward to evidence of the workshop's impact in the results of that survey.

TAKING A SKEPTICAL VIEW

Given that transformative change is central to both the ADVANCE initiative and feminist agendas, it may seem untoward for us to critique the ideology of change itself. We certainly do not mean to endorse the status quo but we question whether improving the DLOW in order to more effectively enact change, collaborative or not, is ultimately desirable. In this more skeptical view, we are guided by Spicer and Levay (2012) when they suggest developing performative accounts of change that focus on change as enacted discourses. The framework they propose involves an affirmative stance, an ethic of care, a sense of pragmatism, and assessment of the normative bases of change efforts (p. 282). We next discuss some of these aspects with respect to our own experiences.

Affirmative stance refers to not being theoretically or analytically distanced but instead being grounded in our own stories and affirming the "complexities, ambiguities, and contradictions" of the change process (Spicer & Levay, 2012, p. 282). One example Spicer and Levay offer is change programs that promise grand results but deliver largely symbolic content, diverting people from the hard work of actual change. We find ourselves struggling against upper management's use of our program as a symbolic activity, a public relations (PR)

resource that both diverts faculty attention and energies and that defers any serious cultural changes. As we have noted, the advancement of women is a widely applauded value in academe these days. The ideological value of increasing equity for women in STEM fields becomes cultural capital for the university administration when diversity measures are touted as "points of pride" that garner support from internal and external stakeholders alike. While we do not mean to devalue faculty time expended on workshop readings and discussions, it is the case that the Diversity Literacy Workshop is an inexpensive program that may be valued only for the opportunity to win an award or deflect criticisms that the university has not addressed gender inequities. Indeed, in 2012 Michigan Tech was an inaugural recipient of the Higher Education Excellence in Diversity (HEED) award from the magazine *Insight into Diversity* (Rainey, 2012) and received the award in 2013 as well. The judges of this award praised, among other things, the university's NSF-funded ADVANCE program and the mandatory training that included modules on diversity and inclusion. We cannot help but feel skeptical about our contribution to this award.

Other contradictions arise when gender equity practices are countered by the persistence of old practices (van den Brink & Benschop, 2012). For example, while there is finally a paid maternity leave at our university, anecdotal evidence suggests that women faculty may be reluctant to use it, afraid that promotion committees may expect more or question a woman's professional priorities (Kirby & Krone, 2002). Another example is that while there are now women candidates for the university's top STEM administrative positions, questions about a candidate's diversity record and explicit public position regarding women's advancement are not always seriously considered when filling those positions.

Finally, we have encountered reluctance about institutionalizing the DLOW. The workshop remains very much an ad hoc program. Each year we have had to ascertain how payments would be made or whether software or documentation support would be provided or whether certain policies could be enacted. This is in part because of changes in administrators—both of the PIs on our ADVANCE grant have retired—but also because the workshop has not been made a formal part of the budget and operations of the university. On one hand, the workshop is no longer a "front-burner" initiative so we have disappeared into the bureaucratic woodwork. On the other hand, we face ongoing challenges that require institutional resources and support. While we continue to think of ourselves as change agents, the tasks that consume us often leave us feeling like we are pursuing bureaucratic nagging rather than worthwhile initiatives. We find this both dispiriting and necessary, ironically repositioning us in the housekeeping roles that stereotype women (Valian, 2005). In fact, we have become so discouraged with the lack of sufficient integration of the program into the structure of the university that we have discussed stepping aside as a way to stimulate that integration. By bringing together these

contradictions, we affirm a skeptical view of the change initiative and our own part in it, while at the same time reaffirming our commitment to the spirit of the initiative itself.

This brings us to the ethic of care element of Spicer and Levay's (2012) performative framework. An ethic of care entails recovering "the silent and sometimes painful struggles" that attend change processes and seeking out "mysteries" or events that do not fit or that call into question change models. Care may involve listening empathetically and empowering those subject to marginalizing forces. This is a difficult assignment for us, given our investment in the DLOW, bias literacy and vigilance, and gender equity on campus. Have we adequately "cared" about the views of all involved in our bias literacy change program? Because we identify with women faculty long rendered invisible and/or patronized on a traditionally male-dominated campus, we have had difficulties adopting an ethic of care toward the vociferous critiques of our male colleagues. The more we accepted a defensive role, the less open we became to hearing and understanding these critiques. We are well aware that taking the other's perspective has created strategic disadvantages for feminist change agents because in a competitive, win–lose change scenario, empathy is too often construed as vacillation or a tentative position. However, we have come to question the ready polarizations we developed. Given our personal and professional histories, we cast ourselves on the side of the marginalized in a dichotomized battle against traditional misogyny and academic patriarchy. In addition, as one reviewer pointed out, our self-reflections have unwittingly adopted unconscious biases about women as change agents, advancing expectations about more collaborative, empathic, and emotional performances distinct from those expected of male change agents. Clearly, such simplistic dichotomies are insufficient, given the political and cultural complexities we have documented here.

On the other hand, we did not adequately care for the interests of female faculty even though we aligned ourselves with them. While we interviewed some women as we designed the workshop, in our flurry of activity to get the workshop up and running, we did not get very far in this effort. In addition, underlying differences and tensions among women faculty came into play. As we have noted, those who might have endorsed our efforts were chagrined by what they felt were "baby steps" toward a more inclusive equity program. Some felt anger and resentment at being left out of the ADVANCE decision-making process despite their track records of diversity and feminist research and campus involvement. These resentments were especially pronounced in tensions we were initially unaware of between a "good old girls" network associated with senior women faculty and administrators and a STEM-based faculty group that had long operated to effect institutional, professional, and social support and material change.

More insidiously, our identification with the ongoing efforts among women faculty members to address campus conditions of inequity and disadvantage framed our own identities as change agents. We positioned ourselves as participating in a larger social movement toward academic gender equality, a movement we understood as emerging with more visibility and force on our own campus thanks to the scattered efforts of various individual faculty members, administrators, and faculty groups. Yet this very identification effected a position of defensiveness and vulnerability that shut off collaborations and coalitions. Once we had created our program, we felt blindsided by opposition from women faculty members, and instead of recognizing and embracing the tensions, we often simply reinforced a "with us or against us" perspective. We made the classic feminist mistake: an assumption of solidarity that collapsed differences and took shared experiences and concerns for granted. At this juncture, we would like to temper our assumption by adopting what some feminists have called "strategic essentialism" as a political strategy for creating alliances and collaborative projects (Ashcraft, 2013). Such an ambivalent strategy requires both skepticism and hope for more productive alliances across campus.

Indeed, this is the third element of a skeptical view: the enactment of a pragmatic approach and an ethos of hope. In this vein, Meyerson and Kolb (2000) advise tempered radicals to aim for "small wins," while Spicer and Levay (2012) advise engaging change programs not as monolithic but as incremental, uneven, and fragile (p. 284). Habituating faculty to a practice of vigilance against unconscious bias is the focus and challenge of our workshop. For most participants, this is quite a new concept. One asked, "How can you be biased if you're unconscious?" By the second and third weeks of the workshop, discussion drifts from implicit to explicit bias, which refers to the more overt, obvious forms of bias. It would be a small but powerful change if vigilance toward implicit biases were to infuse the everyday work of faculty committees. The evidence for such an incremental change is hard to come by, for our hope is that examples occur without fanfare in the course of routine interactions. For example, Sonia was recently at a tenure and promotions committee meeting where one of the faculty members, who had been through the workshop, must have forgotten the power of visual cues for invoking implicit associations. Referring to a set of possible outside reviewers for a tenure case, he said proudly, "Look, I even have pictures of them." Credit for vigilance goes to the committee chair who commented, "Look, Sonia is covering her face!" when he noticed her horrified response. A small win indeed, but enough to give us hope.

The final element of a performative engagement with change processes is articulating normative criteria for evaluating the need and progress of change initiatives. Certainly the moral justification for an equity change program is quite obvious. Yet we find that this moral appeal is readily hijacked in the service of the university's competitive ambitions. Recently, we were encouraged by an administrator to gather together the "positive reviews" from participants in the workshop for "distribution." Here we identify a major contradiction between the justifications for the bias literacy program espoused by the

upper administration and those that we ourselves argued as we presented and defended the program. While the university's administration has argued for this program based on "utilization" figures (how well department hiring statistics match availability rates in relevant scholarly fields) and on the value of diversity in attracting students, grants, employers, financial donors, and awards, we argued that this program would enhance the campus culture for everyone, not only women and minorities. That is, a culture of equity would benefit all of us. To assess the ADVANCE goals and our own initiative on the basis of this moral appeal might involve alternative criteria than those of utilization or faculty retention and promotion rates. For example, feminist criteria might include changes in reward structures to equalize the value of teaching, service, and research; alternative career paths beyond the publish-or-perish model; and the effectiveness of mentoring programs that focus not on "fixing" women but on validating differences in academic work (cf. Monroe et al., 2008).

CONCLUSION

An important contribution of our analysis is to make visible the complex, contrary, tenuous, yet often painful nature of change (Spicer & Levay, 2012, p. 284). As our experiences unfolded, we became more and more aware of the complexities and fragilities of our assumptions, efforts, alliances, and effectivities. Certainly, our reliance on the strong position taken by the provost can be viewed as both a program-sustaining strategy and a point of cooptation. As we reflect on the recent past, we have come to appreciate the micropolitical moves of others on our campus to counter, alter, or mobilize our change efforts. We have come to appreciate the fragility of shared commitments to larger social justice goals and the internal contradictions of large-scale change programs like NSF ADVANCE.

Along with such appreciations, we have come to appreciate the modesty of our own vision of campus change: to inspire vigilance focused on bias as a feature of human response rather than as a distortion or fallacy. But there is the hope that this small change in how faculty members think will inspire more significant campus culture changes. We cast this as an epistemological initiative, an intervention in dominant ways of thinking that are both male and STEM identified. At the same time, we remain committed to the ADVANCE goals: to redress implicit biases against women and minorities in hiring and retention decisions, to create more equitable campus cultures, to realize opportunities for women in STEM and across academic fields, to transform the existing academic culture. Our commitments to these goals both directed and obscured our understanding of a pragmatic change program.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

ADEPT. (2013). *ADEPT*. Georgia Tech Institute of Technology. Retrieved from http://www.advance.gatech.edu

ADVANCE. (2014). *2014* ADVANCE *program workshop*. Retrieved from https://www.etouches.com/ehome/2014nsfadvanceprogramworkshop/about/?eb=90376

Anderson, C. (2011). *Presentation on 2010 climate survey*. Office for Institutional Diversity. Houghton, MI: Michigan Technological University.

Argyris, C. (1986). Reinforcing organizational defensive routines: An unintended human resources activity. *Human Resources Management*, *25*, 541–555.

Ashcraft, K. L. (2013). Feminist theory. In L. L. Putnam & D. A. Mumby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (pp. 127–150). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bagger, J., & Li, A. (2012). Being important matters: The impact of work and family centralities on the family-to-work conflict-satisfaction relationship. *Human Relations*, *65*, 473–500.

Banaji, M. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (2013). *Blind spot: Hidden biases of good people*. New York, NY: Delacorte Press.

Bain, O., & Cummings, W. (2000). Institutional barriers to the career advancement of academic women. *Comparative Education*, *44*, 493–514.

Bellas, M., Ritchey, N., & Parmer, P. (2001). Gender differences in the salaries and salary growth of university faculty. *Sociological Perspectives*, *44*, 163–188.

Bernstein, R. J. (1983). *Beyond objectivism and relativism: Science, hermeneutics, and praxis*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bilimoria, D., & Buch, K. K. (2010, July/August). The search is on: Engendering faculty diversity through more effective search and recruitment. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 42*(4), 27–32.

Bilimoria, D., Joy, S., & Liang, X. (2008). Breaking barriers and creating inclusiveness: Lessons of organizational transformation to advance women faculty in academic science and engineering. *Human Resources Management*, *47*, 423–441.

Bilimoria, D., & Liang, X. (2012). *Gender equity in science and engineering: Advancing change in higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Block, P. (2011). *Flawless consulting: A guide to getting your expertise used*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Bochner, A. P., & Ellis, C. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Sage handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 773–768). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Boje, D. M. (1995). Stories of the story-telling organization: A postmodern analysis of Disney as 'Tamaraland.' *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*, 997–1035.

Brewer, E. W., & Headlee, N. S. (2011). Adapting adult learning theories for online learning. In V. C. X. Wang (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of information communication technologies and adult education integration* (pp. 135–153). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Brookfield, S. (1986). *Understanding and facilitating adult learning: A comprehensive analysis of principles and effective practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Buzzanell, P. M., Meisenbach, R., Remke, R., Bowers, V., Liu, M., & Conn, C. (2005). The good working mother: Managerial women's sensemaking and feelings about work-family issues. *Communication Studies*, *56*, 261–285.

Carnes, M., Devine, P. G., Isaac, C., Manwell, L. B., Ford, C. E., Byars-Winston, A., . . . Sheridan, J. (2012). Promoting institutional change through bias literacy. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *5*, 63–77.

Center for Worklife Law, UC College of the Law. (2014). *Gender bias learning project*. Retrieved from http://www.genderbiasbingo.com/index.html

Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology. (2009). *Professional women and minorities* (16th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Curtis, J. W. (2005, January). Women faculty: Still trailing after all these years. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 14.

Deetz, S. A., Tracy, S. J., & Simpson, J. L. (2000). *Leading organizations through transition: Communication and cultural change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dell, C. A., Low, C., & Wilker, J. F. (2010). Comparing student achievement in online and face-to-face class formats. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 6*. Retrieved from http://jolt.merlot.org/vol6no1/dell_0310.htm

Donohue, F. (2008). *The last professors: The corporate university and the fate of the humanities*. Bronx, NY: Fordham University Press.

Dovidio, J. F. (2001). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The third wave. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(4), 829–849.

Dugger, K. (2001). Women in higher education in the United States: I: Statistics. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, *21*, 131–142.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Ely, R. J., & Meyerson, D. E. (2000). Advancing gender equity in organizations: The challenge and importance of maintaining a gender narrative. *Organization*, *7*(4), 589–608.

Etzkowitz, H., Kemelgor, C., & Uzzi, B. (2000). *Athena unbound: The advancement of women in science and technology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Feldman, R. (2002). *Epistemology*. New York, NY: Pearson.

Fernandez, S., & Rainey, H. G. (2006, March/April). Managing successful organizational change in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*, 168–176.

Fine, C. (2010). *Delusions of gender: How our minds, society, and neurosexism create difference*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Fishman, B., Konstantopoulos, S., Kubitskey, B. W., Vath, R., Park, G., Johnson, H., & Edelson, D. C. (2013). Comparing the impact of online and face-to-face professional development in the context of curriculum implementation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *64*, 426–438.

Ford, J. D., Ford, L. W., & D'Amelio, A. (2008). Resistance to change: The rest of the story. *Academy of Management Review*, *33*, 362–377.

Fox, F. M. (2001). Women, science, and academia. *Gender and Society*, *15*, 654–666.

Fox, M. F., Colatrella, C., McDowell, D., & Realff, M. L. (2007). Equity in tenure and promotion: An integrated institutional approach. In A. J. Stewart, J. E. Malley, & D. LaVaque-Manty (Eds.), *Transforming science and engineering: Advancing academic women* (pp. 170–186). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Gabriel, Y. (2000). *Storytelling in organizations: Facts, fictions, and fantasies*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Gender Equity Project. (2013). *The gender equity project*. Hunter College. Retrieved from http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/genderequity

Giangreco, A., & Peccei, R. (2005). The nature and antecedents of middle manager resistance to change: Evidence from an Italian context. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *16*, 1812–1829.

Ginsberg, B. (2011). T*he fall of the faculty: The rise of the all-administrative university and why it matters* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Gioia, D. A., Thomas, J. B., Clark, S. M., & Chittipeddi, K. (1994). Symbolism and strategic change in academia: The dynamics of sensemaking and influence. *Organization Science*, *5*, 363–383.

Goltz, S. M., & Hietapelto, A. B. (2013). Translating the Social Watch Gender Equity Index for university use. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *45*(3), 66–73. doi:10.1080/00091383.2013.787310

Goodall, H. L., Jr. (2000). The ethics of writing ethnography. In *Writing the new ethnography* (pp. 153–174). Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Greenwald, A. G., Uhlmann, E. L., Poehlman, T. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2009). Understanding and using the implicit association test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*(1), 17–41.

Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 1464–1480.

Gruber, J. E. (1998). The impact of male work environment and organizational policies on women's experiences of sexual harassment. *Gender & Society*, *12*, 301–320.

Hahm, J. (Ed.). (2006). *To recruit and advance: Women scientists and engineers in academia*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Harvard University. (2011). *Project implicit*. Retrieved from https://www.projectimplicit.net/about.html

Heilman, M. E., Wallen, A. S., Fuchs, D., & Tamkins, M. M. (2004). Penalties for success: Reactions to women who succeed at male gender-type tasks. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 416–427.

Hill, C., Corbett, C., & St. Rose, A. (2010). *Why so few? Women in science, technology, engineering and math*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Women.

Hunter College. (2005). *The gender equity project*. Retrieved from http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/genderequity

Humphries, M. (2005). Getting personal: Reflexivity and autoethnographic vignettes. *Qualitative Inquiry 11*(6), 840–860. doi: 10.1177/1077800404269425

Isaac, C., Lee, B., & Carnes, M. (2009). Interventions that affect gender bias in hiring: A systematic review. *Academic Medicine*, *84*, 1440–1446.

Jost, J. T., Rudman, L. A., Blair, I. V., Carney, D. R., Dasgupta, N., Glaser, J., & Hardin, C. D. (2009). The existence of implicit bias is beyond reasonable doubt: A refutation of ideological and methodological objections and an executive summary of ten studies that no manager should ignore. *Research in Organizational Behavior 29*, 39–69.

Kirby, E. L., & Krone, K. K. (2002). "The policy exists, but you can't use it": Negotiating tensions in work-family policy. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *30*, 50–77.

Knowles, M. S., & Associates (1984). *Andragogy in action: Applying modern principles for adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kotter, J. (1995). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review*, *73*(2), 59–67.

Lee, J. (2011). Does universalism hold in academia?: Focusing on women and racial minority faculty. *Journal of the Professoriate*. Retrieved from http://jotp.icbche.org/2012/6_1_Lee_48_finalBBJ.pdf

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Lines, R. (2004). Influence of participation in a strategic change: Resistance, organizational commitment, and change goal achievement. *Journal of Change Management*, *4*, 193–215.

Long, J. S. (Ed.). (2001). *From scarcity to visibility: Gender differences in the careers of doctoral scientists and engineers*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Mason, M.A. (2011, March). The pyramid problem. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/The-Pyramid-Problem/126614

Mason, M. A., & Goulden, M. (2004). Do babies matter (Part II)? Closing the baby gap. *Academe*, *90*, 10–15.

McRobbie, A. (1985). Strategies of vigilance: An interview with Gayatri Chakravorti Spivak. *Block*, *10*, 5–9.

Meyerson D. E., & Kolb, D. M. (2000). Moving out of the 'armchair': Developing a framework to bridge the gap between feminist theory and practice. *Organization*, *7*(4), 553–571.

Meyerson, D. E., & Scully, M. (1995). Tempered radicalism and the politics of ambivalence and change. *Organization Science*, *6*(5), 585–600.

Michigan Tech. (2011). *ADVANCE: Changing the face of Michigan Tech—Provost's message*. Retrieved from http://www.mtu.edu/advance/advance/message

Mezirow, J. (1990). *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Monroe, K., Ozyurt, S., Wrigley, T., & Alexander, A. (2008). Gender equality in academia: Bad news from the trenches, and some possible solutions. *Perspectives on Politics*, *6*(2), 215–233.

Morley, L., & Walsh, V. (Eds.). (1995). *Feminist academics: Creative agents for change*. London, UK: Taylor & Francis.

Msweli-Mbanga, P., & Potwana, N. (2006). Modeling participation, resistance to change, and organizational citizenship behavior: A South African case. *South African Journal of Business Management*, *37*, 21–29.

National Academy of Sciences (2007). *Beyond bias and barriers: Fulfilling the potential of women in academic science and engineering*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Science Board. (2010). *Science and engineering indicators 2010*. NSB 10-01. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation.

Nettles, M., Perna, L., Bradburn, E., & Zimbler, L. (2000). *Salary, promotion, and tenure status of minority and women faculty in U.S. colleges and universities*. National Center for Education Statistics Statistical Analysis Report 173. Retrieved from http://www.immagic.com/eLibrary/ARCHIVES/GENERAL/US_ED/NCES0606.pdf#page=95

Neufield, C. (2011). *Unmaking the public university: The forty-year assault on the middle class* (reprint ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, *5*, 14–37.

Prentice, S. (2000). The conceptual politics of chilly climate controversies. *Gender and Education*, *12*, 195–207.

Prusak, L., Groh, K., Denning S., & Brown, J. S. (2011). *Storytelling in organizations: Why storytelling is transforming 21st century organizations and management*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

Rai, K. (2000). *Affirmative action and the university: Race, ethnicity and gender in higher education employment*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Rainey, M. (2012, December). The first annual higher education excellence in diversity award. *Insight into Diversity*, 21–26.

Rasheed, F. (2007). Factors impeding implementation of Web-based distance learning. *Association for the Advancement of Computing Education (AACE) Journal*, *15*, 315–338.

Readings, W. (1997). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Richardson, L. (2000). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative methods* (2nd ed., pp. 923–948). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rosser, S. V., & Taylor, M. Z. (2009). Why are we still worried about women in science? *Academe*, *95*(3), 7–10.

Sevo, R., & Chubin, D. E. (2008). *Bias literacy: A review of concepts in research on discrimination*. AAAS Center for Science and Engineering Capacity. Retrieved from http://www.case.edu/provost/ideal/doc/BiasLiteracy.pdf

Shapiro, D. L., & Kirkman, B. L. (1999). Employees' reaction to the change to work teams: The influence of "anticipatory" injustice. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *12*, 51–66.

Snow, C. P. (1959). *The two cultures. The Rede lecture*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sotirin, P. (2008). Academic momhood: In for the long haul. *Women's Studies in Communication*, *31*(2), 258–267.

Spicer, A., & Levay, C. (2012). Critical theories of organizational change. In D. Boje, B. Burnes, & J. Hassard (Eds.), *The Routledge companion of organizational change* (pp. 276–290). New York, NY: Routledge.

Stewart, A. J., Malley, J. R., & LaVaque-Manty, D. (2007). Faculty recruitment: Mobilizing science and engineering faculty. In A. J. Stewart, J. E. Malley, & D. LaVaque-Manty (Eds.), *Transforming science and engineering: Advancing academic women* (pp. 133–151). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

STRIDE. (2013). *STRIDE*. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI. Retrieved from http://sitemaker.umich.edu/advance/STRIDE_Committee

Sturm, S. (2007). The architecture of inclusion: Interdisciplinary insights on pursuing institutional citizenship. *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender*, *30*, 409–424.

Sturm, S. (2006) The architecture of inclusion: Advancing workplace equity in higher education. *Harvard Journal of Law & Gender*, *29*, 248–334.

Thomas, R., & Davies, A. (2006). What have the feminists done for us? Feminist theory and organizational resistance. *Organization*, *12*(5), 711–740.

Townsley, N., & Broadfoot, K. (2008). Care, career, and academe: Heeding the calls of a new professoriate. *Women's Studies in Communication*, *31*(2), 133–142.

Umbach, P. D. (2008, March). *Gender equity in college faculty pay: A cross-classified random effects model examining the impact of human capital, academic disciplines, and institutions*. Paper presented at the 2008 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Valian, V. (2005). Beyond gender schemas: Improving the advancement of women in academia. *Hypatia*, *20*, 198–213.

Valian, V. (2010). What works and what doesn't: How to increase the representation of women in academia and business. In B. Riegraf, B. Aulenbacher, E. Auwarter, & U. Muller (Eds.), *Gender change in academia: Mapping the fields of work, knowledge, and politics* (pp. 317–328). Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer.

van den Brink, M., & Benschop, Y. (2012). Slaying the seven-headed dragon: The quest for gender change in academia. *Gender, Work, and Organization*, *19*(1), 71–92.

Wilson, T. D., Lindsey, S., & Schooler, T. Y. (2000). A model of dual attitudes. *Psychological Review*, *107*, 101–126.

WISELI. (2013). *The Women in Science & Engineering Leadership Institute*. University of Wisconsin–Madison. Retrieved from http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/about.php

Xie, Y., & Shauman, K. (2003). *Women in science: Career processes and outcomes*. *Cambridge*, *MA:* Harvard University Press.

Zorn, T. E., Page, D. J., & Cheney, G. (2000). Nuts about change: Multiple perspectives on change-oriented communication in a public sector organization. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *13*, 515–566.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Dr. Sonia Goltz is Professor of Organizational Behavior in the School of Business and Economics at Michigan Tech. She received her PhD in Industrial/Organizational Psychology from Purdue University. Her research in organizational behavior focuses on gender equity, social power, escalation of commitment, and workplace spirituality. She may be reached at smgoltz@mtu.edu.

Dr. Patty Sotirin is Professor of Organizational Communication in the Humanities Department of the College of Sciences and Arts at Michigan Tech. She received her PhD in Organizational Communication from Purdue University. Her research focuses on communication and gender in a variety of guises, including secretarial bitching, the process of aunting, and autoethnographic mother-writing. She may be reached at pjsotiri@mtu.edu.