Land of Milk and 'Honey'
Confronting Gendered Experiences in Field Research

Katie Hinde, Associate Professor,
School of Human Evolution and Social Change, ASU
April 15, 2021

Unanswered Questions from post-lecture Q&A
Please note, included citations are starting points for reading more and are not intended to be comprehensive/exhaustive.

Q1 09:17 AM
In this figure, is "Sex assigned at birth" basically the state of a person's sexual anatomy at birth, and "Anatomical sex" is the current state of a person's sexual anatomy?

KH: Exactly. Best practices in a professional setting (or otherwise) are to not enquire about someone's genitals, past or present.

<Q2 answered in a subsequent, separate document>

Q3 09:37 AM
How were you defining "field sites?"

KH: "Field Site" typically refers to a location in which raw, primary samples or data are initially collected and/or the base from which individual researchers or teams of researchers make short-term forays during a field season (or other period of scientific research). Such sites are typically, but not always, off-site from a researcher's home or principle institution. Typical examples include an archaeological dig site, a research station for field observations of animals, conducting population transects, or collecting samples/specimens. The specifics of what constitutes a "field site" can vary across disciplines, and in consideration of this variation for the SAFE study, we let survey participants respond to questions using their own construct of "field site."

Q4 09:41 AM (submitted Anonymously)

Do you have any idea what is it about the culture of academia that allows this harassment to be so prevalent?

KH: I think there are many issues that converge exceptionally in academia. Some key elements are:

Underappreciation of the Issue: Many academics, like the general public, do not have an accurate understanding of gender harassment/sexual assault (and other forms of discrimination) as defined by the US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Rather, academics are trained to operationalize concepts in their own way, without interrogating how this can routinely reflect enculturated, biased, and/or retrograde attitudes. Established women scholars who experienced gender harassment, sexual

harassment/assault during their training, advanced out of the career stage most targeted harassment/assault (and into a different, but still insidious gendered experience in mid-career) and perhaps assumed that the prevalence of such misconduct had declined. Most concerning, "gender bias persists—perpetuated by those who think it is not happening" (Begeny et al. 2020) or contribute in other ways to organizational silencing (Fernando & Prasad 2019). BUT more and more people are recognizing the magnitude of these and other problems, obstacles, and deficits and working to address and correct them, but the work is never done, we must continuously defend any improvements accomplished even while working to implement more.

A Life of the Mind: Academia is too often essentialized by a deep adherence to dedicated scholarly activity, often to the neglect of the body (and mind). Academics are at risk of workaholism- deprioritizing exercise, nutrition, sleep, and personal relationships, while trying to manage corrosive amounts of stress- increasing risk of burnout and depression (Pace et al. 2019; De Paula and Boas 2017; Fowler 2015; Lackritz 2004). Such physiological and psychological circumstances increase a person's likelihood of 'falling back on' biases and not implementing their training (even when they explicitly are motivated to do so). "When stressed, individuals tend to make more habitual responses than goal-directed choices, be less likely to adjust their initial judgment, and rely more on gut feelings in social situations" (Yu 2016). Taken together we see scholars under-valuing the lived experiences and wellness of themselves and others. Recently many campuses have adopted "community of care" principles in consideration of the COVID-19 pandemic about the healthy decisions and support that we owe to each other. I want to see such platforms refined, expanded, and extended to improve wellness and equity throughout our scholarly communities.

Begeny, C. T., Ryan, M. K., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Ravetz, G. (2020). In some professions, women have become well represented, yet gender bias persists—Perpetuated by those who think it is not happening. Science Advances, 6(26), eaba7814.

De Paula, A. V., & Boas, A. A. V. (2017). Well-being and quality of working life of university professors in Brazil. Quality of life and quality of working life, 187-210.

Fernando, D., & Prasad, A. (2019). Sex-based harassment and organizational silencing: How women are led to reluctant acquiescence in academia. human relations, 72(10), 1565-1594.

Fowler, S. (2015). Burnout and depression in academia: A look at the discourse of the university. Empedocles: European Journal for the Philosophy of Communication, 6(2), 155-167.

Lackritz, J. R. (2004). Exploring burnout among university faculty: incidence, performance, and demographic issues. Teaching and teacher education, 20(7), 713-729.

Pace, F., D'Urso, G., Zappulla, C., & Pace, U. (2019). The relation between workload and personal well-being among university professors. *Current Psychology*, 1-8.

Yu, R. (2016). Stress potentiates decision biases: A stress induced deliberation-to-intuition (SIDI) model. Neurobiology of stress, 3, 83-95.

Q5 09:41 AM (submitted Anonymously)

These survey results are so interesting, and I really appreciate this summary of the research - thank you! Were you or other researchers able to address the potential (possibly unsubstantiated) concern that survey respondents are more likely to respond if they have experienced sexual harassment, which one could argue as potentially biasing the results? (Asking in case others ask me that same question!)

KH: Thank you for your question, and I am delighted to provide you with ample counterpoints should you encounter such questions from others. We recognized this limitation of the SAFE study and addressed it in the publication in both the methods section in a Study Limitations subsection (excerpted below) and revisited in the discussion:

> "Study Limitations
> The data presented here represent the first systematic investigation of field site work environment and experiences, particularly as they relate to sexual harassment and assault. These data are limited in several important ways. First, incivility, chilly climate, sexual harassment, and sexual assault are biopsychologically intense experiences for the targets, witnesses/bystanders, and perpetrators. Recall of these experiences has the potential to precipitate emotional distress. The sample was potentially biased by ethical, pre-participation disclosure that questions regarding these topics were in the survey. Some people may have been more likely to participate in the survey if they had negative experiences, some people may have been more likely to forward the survey link to individuals who had previously disclosed negative experiences in private conversation (snowball sampling), and some people may have been less inclined to participate in this survey to avoid emotional stress of sharing their experiences. Several colleagues directly informed the study authors that they would not participate because revisiting their experiences was too traumatic. Thus, it is unclear if the self-selection of this sample produces over- or under-reporting of negative field experiences.
>
> One potential concern one could have was that individuals with negative experiences could take the survey multiple times, becoming disproportionately represented in the dataset of their experiences. However, nearly all respondents provided a unique identifier in the form of an e-mail address (N=628, 94.3%). Comparison between the group that provided a unique identifier and those that did not (N=38) revealed that the two groups did not significantly differ in the composition of their gender, sexual orientations, race/ethnicity, ages, countries of origin, or career stages (all $p>0.4$). We combined the two groups for subsequent analyses, but did evaluate for differences in harassment and assault (see results)."

Importantly, hundreds of studies of workplace environments for decades have yielded results documenting widespread gender harassment, many comparable to the findings we reported in the SAFE study. More recent reports by the National Academy of Sciences are an excellent review of the magnitude of the issue within academia, particularly the 300-page report "National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2018. Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi: https:// doi.org/10.17226/24994."

Additionally, the research methodology into workplace harassment is complex. For example, the Rand Corporation was contracted by the US Department of Defense to independently survey sexual harassment and sexual assault within the US armed forces (a bounded population). The first of the two volume report was entirely dedicated to methodological consideration, constraint, and study design and is >200 pages (Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment in the U.S. Military)

In my experience, this concern about over-representation of respondents with bad experiences is intentional derailment of the discussion. The predicating assumption of this question seems to be that the proportion of researchers experiencing

harassment/assault MUST be lower. Is the implication that there is an acceptable non-zero number? Or that we should be hesitant to implement new policies until we super-duper for sure know the exact prevalence? How does someone look at the hundreds of individuals represented in Figure 3, dismiss them as an inflation, and pivot the conversation to the precise prevalence? And if the argument is in good faith, how come no one has ever returned from my suggestion to read the Rand report on methodology having done so to continue the conversation? SAFE and other studies substantiate that these are problems within our academic communities, highlight the deficits in codes of conduct, sexual harassment policies, and principles of community, and motivate correcting these obstacles to equal opportunity in academia.

Q6 09:42 AM
This is perhaps more of a comment, but my lab put together a code of conduct for us and our collaborators this past year, and something we struggled with is that institutions have no mechanism by which to deal with harrassment/assault that occurs between lab groups across institutions. Often, it is up to the PI to end the collaboration if something happens, but there really is no structure to report these situations. It's really disheartening for trainees!

KH: This is indeed a challenge. Importantly, sexual misconduct in the context of research, at field sites or campuses, is increasingly recognized as scholarly, scientific, and professional misconduct. If a collaborator engaged in data falsification, unpermitted data collection, or extensive plagiarism, PIs would be expected to repudiate the misconduct, dissolve the collaboration, and make efforts to protect colleagues impacted by the misconduct. I think institutions should increase expertise within their faculty development offices or sponsored programs to help provide guidance and support for navigating these occurrences (that are not contingent on victims/targets cooperation). Additionally, tenure & promotion committees should have mechanisms for explaining disruptions in productivity in the wake of pivoting from research collaborations due to the misconduct of collaborators.

Q7 09:46 AM (Submitted Anonymously)
Have you ever come across a study that assessed sexual harassment reporting before and after training within a workplace?

KH: The efficacy of this training is… mosaic (for review see Roehling & Huang 2018). Part of the variance is likely due, in part, to differences in training approach and context, but a substantial component is likely to be individual learners' motivations and pre-training attitudes (Walsh and Magley 2020). Pre- and post-training institutional structures and processes, especially mechanisms for employee accountability, may play a role in motivating people to apply training info to work contexts (Sachdev et al. 2019). Training is most effective when 1) embedded in an institution's multifactorial approach to shaping the workplace climate, 2) is evidence-based an nuanced, 3) takes into account the myriad identities and backgrounds of stakeholders for shaping internal motivation to adopt better practices and disrupt biased behaviors (Icekson et al. 2020).

Icekson, T., Tziner, A., & Bareket-Bojmel, L. (2020). One size does not fit all: Taking trainees' personal characteristics into consideration in sexual harassment and racial discrimination training. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 13(2), 191-195.
Roehling, M. V., & Huang, J. (2018). Sexual harassment training effectiveness: An interdisciplinary review and call for research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *39*(2), 134-150.
Sachdev, A. R., Grossman, R., & Burke-Smalley, L. A. (2019). Beyond "checking the box": Using accountability to promote the effectiveness of sexual misconduct training. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *12*(1), 100-105.
Walsh, B. M., & Magley, V. J. (2020). Workplace civility training: Understanding drivers of motivation to learn. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 31(17), 2165-2187.

Q8 09:48 AM (submitted anonymously)
Regarding the finding that field labor assignments fell along traditional gender roles, could it be possible that these assignments are due to differential preferences and abilities? (I am thinking about the example where "Alice" often felt too unwell to complete the physical field duties, and other types of duties needed to be found for her)

Gendered asymmetry of fieldwork tasks, shaped by expectations of traditional gender roles, contribute to unequal opportunity for career advancement for women. If women are doing more maintenance of the household, more emotional nurturance of staff and trainees, more grading, or lower-level research activities that are essential to the function of the field site, then women are asymmetrically deprived of access and opportunities to develop more complex research skills in the cutting-edge intellectual spaces that are the criteria by which post-doctoral and tenure-track positions are predicated. By relaxing the expectations that men contribute to these tasks that are free-riding on collective action exploiting the contributions of their women colleagues. Also, they are neglecting the development of key skills and equity values to the detriment of their future students, trainees, and employees. Additionally, such sexist disparities contribute to feelings of alienation and exploitation for women and are counterproductive to cultures of respect, dignity, and equity of field sites. Lastly, such disparities may contribute to a climate underlying more egregious abuses of women, such as sexual harassment and assault (Meyers et al. 2018; Nelson et al. 2017). Despite what too many people think Neil Young told them, a man does not need a maid.

Meyers, M. S., Horton, E. T., Boudreaux, E. A., Carmody, S. B., Wright, A. P., & Dekle, V. G. (2018). The context and consequences of sexual harassment in Southeastern archaeology. *Advances in archaeological practice*, *6*(4), 275-287.
Nelson RG, Rutherford JN, Hinde K, & Clancy KB. 2017. *Signaling safety: Characterizing fieldwork experiences and their implications for career trajectories.* American Anthropologist. 119:710-722.

Q9 09:48 AM (submitted anonymously)
What is the most effective way to to get people to understand & interrogate their own biases? It seems research shows that implicit bias trainings don't really seem to result in any long-lasting change.

KH: Pre-training attitudes, motivation, and whether trainings are part of a broader suite of institutional, team, and individual approaches are likely important for improving people's understanding of their own biases and encouraging changes in biased behavior (see Q7). Frustratingly, individuals with explicitly sexist biases tend to be most

skeptical of social science research demonstrating gender bias (Kim and Tidwell 2014) and men view research demonstrating gender bias as less valid than do women (Handler et al. 2015). Analyses of >4 million implicit association tests between 2004-2016, however, indicate that for many dimensions of identity, implicit and explicit biases are sustainably moving toward neutrality, especially among millennials (Charlesworth and Banaji 2019). As expected, implicit biases lag behind explicit biases. Unfortunately some biases have remained unchanged (implicit body-weight attitudes) and even those implicit and explicit attitudes moving toward neutrality still indicated many years (even decades) before achieving neutrality.

Trainings/Workshops that showcase evidence of bias, involve active learning (participants engage in writing or speaking exercises, problem-solving and group discussion), inclusivity as a shared goal & responsibility (among other elements) have been shown to be most useful (Moss-Racusin et al. 2014; 2016). Moving forward, new video and immersive virtual reality technologies are also expected to be important tools for innovative perspective-taking and reducing biases (Moss-Racusin et al. 2018; Barbot and Kaufman 2020). Changing cultural attitudes and practices requires sustained, collaborative, long-term effort by many stakeholders.

Barbot, B., & Kaufman, J. C. (2020). What makes immersive virtual reality the ultimate empathy machine? Discerning the underlying mechanisms of change. Computers in Human Behavior, 111, 106431.

Charlesworth, T. E., & Banaji, M. R. (2019). Patterns of implicit and explicit attitudes: I. Long-term change and stability from 2007 to 2016. Psychological science, 30(2), 174-192.

Handley, I. M., Brown, E. R., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Smith, J. L. (2015). Quality of evidence revealing subtle gender biases in science is in the eye of the beholder. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 112(43), 13201-13206.

Kim, A., & Tidwell, N. (2014). Examining the impact of sexism on evaluations of social scientific evidence in discrimination litigation. Law and human behavior, 38(6), 520.

Moss-Racusin, C. A., van der Toorn, J., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2014). Scientific diversity interventions. *Science*, *343*(6171), 615-616.

Moss-Racusin, C. A., van der Toorn, J., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2016). A “scientific diversity” intervention to reduce gender bias in a sample of life scientists. CBE—Life Sciences Education, 15(3), ar29.

Moss-Racusin, C. A., Pietri, E. S., Hennes, E. P., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Roussos, G., & Handelsman, J. (2018). Reducing STEM gender bias with VIDS (video interventions for diversity in STEM). Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 24(2), 236.

Q10 09:52 AM

Joyfully taking the bait: Cultural Relativism- how to we disrupt this (in selves, in others)?

KH: The first step is understanding that the guiding “logics” of a culture are learned from early in development and can become so embedded in our thinking we don’t recognize that they are enculturated attitudes and can limit our thinking, understanding, and respect for other cultural logics. I need to do more research on systematic approaches to training how our enculturation guides our “logics” and “it must be the case”s, but I think that for those of us unfamiliar to such constructs, we could avail ourselves of MOOCs that tackle introductions to cultural anthropology, philosophy of science, and/or epistemology to enhance our familiarity with the diversity of ideas in these intellectural spaces.

It can take substantial grappling to recognize how our enculturated logics may come in conflict with other cultural logics. A few years ago I was leading a study abroad program on ONE HEALTH in Australia. This study abroad program directly contrasted the extractive attitudes of settler-colonialism with Aboriginal Australian constructs of sustainable environmental stewardship and the divergent impact on environmental and human health. At the end of the program we visited a museum exhibit of the bark paintings of sacred origin stories of the Yolŋu people of Northeast Arnhem Land. These paintings were instrumental in the Blue Mud Bay case that recognized Indigenous sea rights in 2008 (for land rights see *Mabo* Ruling 1992).

At the entrance to the exhibit guests were asked to not take pictures of the exhibit and students were alerted… but anticipating that the US cultural attitude of "take only pictures, leave only footprints" may manifest I was vigilant for any students taking photographs. And indeed I had an "opportunity" to remind a life sciences student to not take pictures. Ten minutes later I found the same student again taking photos- not of the art this time, but of the sacred story of the artwork.

I asked the student to accompany me to the exhibit entrance this time and pointed to the "no photos" icon. I explained that the community whose sacred art and stories these are has asked that no photos be taken and that culturally they deserve respect for their wishes for their own works and sacred knowledge. The student grappling with their cultural bias argued "but it's only pictures of the story description." I explained to the student that in the US the dominant cultural & philosophical attitudes are that everyone is equally entitled to knowledge, that knowledge is abstract and therefore moveable, that knowledge should be freely available, and that taking pictures to carry other's knowledge away with us as our own is considered a neutral act (or even good because it is about learning). I pointed out that these cultural values are not universal, that for some cultures, knowledge is embedded in place and can only be learned or known in context, that access to certain knowledge must be earned, and that taking a picture is literally TAKING. I watched the student cognitively process the existence of worldviews radically different from their own, and it clicked. Notably, we had covered these topics in a group setting a few days before, during a visit to the base of Uluru, suggesting that sometimes repeated explanations, experiences, and one-on-one conversation can be important for such understanding.

Q11 09:56 AM
Are there exiting written resources for Principles of Community process? Ty!

KH: See attached step-by-step guide.

Q12 09:57 AM
Very good presentation! How to combine it with a real life?

KH: Please see above and attached resources.

C1 09:58 AM
That was awesome! (not a Q, I know!)

KH: Thank you!

Q13 09:59
Resources for building the Principles of Community? - I furiously wrote notes but would love more documentation or a template. THANKS!

KH: See attached step-by-step guide.