**Session Title**: A Roundtable for Women Educators in Organizational Behavior

**Abstract:** Many women in academia share a common set of challenges, in the lecture theatre, in research and across their careers. This roundtable is an opportunity for women in organizational behavior and adjacent disciplines (including, but not limited to, organizational theory, leadership, entrepreneurship, strategy, and I/O psychology) to gather for the purpose of sharing their concerns, lessons learned, and best practices. Participants will address topics such as classroom/course management, teaching best practices, research productivity and mentorship in a safe space. Through a semi-structured discussion forum, participants will collectively reflect on their experiences and discuss pressing topics in contemporary higher education, all while building their academic support networks.

**Keywords**: Women in Academia, Affinity Group, Mentorship

**Session Format:** 60- minute Roundtable

**Resources Needed**: Movable chairs to sit in a circle or move to circles.

**Unique Contribution:** The “Women in Organizational Behavior Facebook Group” has also submitted a proposal for a roundtable session at the domestic MOBTS conference, 2022.

**Introduction:**

The Women of Organizational Behavior (WOB) is a closed Facebook Group open to interested women, including those who identify as women and non-binary, who hold academic positions in Organizational Behavior or related fields. The group is internationally focused with representation of women educators from the Americas, Europe, Middle East, United Kingdom, Asia, Africa, and Oceania. This group was founded in early 2018 as part of a growing trend highlighting the importance of affinity groups similar to the inaugural 2018 Academy of Management session entitled “And Yet She Persisted: Tools for Succeeding as a Woman Academic” (Farkas & Soderstrom, 2020). The group is a vehicle for sharing resources, knowledge, and support on how to overcome challenges that are unique to female academics. Women in academia navigate a wide array of challenges, including slower turnaround times on manuscripts (Hengel, 2019), relatively less credit for research contributions when working in a team (Sarsons, 2017), biased student evaluations (Mengel et al., 2019, Boring et al., 2016), and cultural issues that disregard or undervalue the professionalism of women (Kossek et al., 2017; Rivera, 2017). There are currently over 1,100 members of the WOB group with an average of 1 post on the site per day, on topics ranging from teaching to career advancement.

This roundtable will provide an opportunity for individuals interested in women’s affairs in higher education to connect and share. While the virtual space has helped many to navigate barriers, advance their careers, and find support especially during the last two years, getting a chance to expand internationally and meet in person would help to create stronger, and more internationally diverse, relationships and discuss issues that may not be comfortable or safe to discuss online. Getting a chance to share stories and reflect on previous experiences together can help women educators to feel connected to MOBTS and to other women in academia. The session is open to anyone interested in being part of and helping to build a supportive community of women academics in organizational behavior.

**Theoretical Foundation/Teaching Implications**:

For female academics, career progression is often more tumultuous than for their male counterparts (David, 2015). In European countries, women are a minority among senior academics, including the Netherlands (18.7%), Germany (19.4%), France (21.9%), Switzerland (23.3%), Sweden (25.4%) and the United Kingdom (26.4%) (European Commission, 2018). Additionally, amongst the EU-28 countries only 21.8% of leadership roles in academia were held by women – a statistic that is mirrored internationally (Catalyst, 2020; Debede, 2011; Knipfer et al., 2017), even in fields where they earn the vast majority of doctoral degrees (e.g., psychology; Gruber et al., 2021). These inequalities were once assumed to be consequences of differential research productivity; however, recent evidence suggests that female scholars exhibit comparable or even higher productivity and impact than men (Huang et al., 2020; Nielsen, 2017). Further, reducing the conversation to research productivity neglects other key factors. For example, women are more likely to carry the burden of non-promotable tasks (Babcock et al., 2018). Within the academic context, female academics are more likely to conduct emotionally taxing activities, including service roles that are critical to institutional functioning but not explicitly valued (Bellas, 1999). As well, female academics are less likely to secure the mentoring and support needed to be promoted to the rank of Professor (Geisler et al., 2007). Combined with problematic evaluation structures within academia (e.g., student evaluations; Mengel et al., 2019), women face significant obstacles. Support networks and affinity groups help women to discuss such issues and may also contribute to positive mental wellbeing in educators (Edwards et al., 2021).

While evidence suggests that female scholars traditionally exhibit comparable or even higher productivity and impact than men (Huang et al., 2020; Nielsen, 2017), the COVID-19 pandemic did differentially impact working mothers in academia (Kasymova et al., 2021; Mandeville et al., 2022). Indeed, when academics had boundary violations due to working in the home domain with children, the mothers seemed to absorb most of the childcare related duties (Mandeville et al., 2022). Several studies find support that women published fewer papers as first/corresponding authors and co-authors than men (King & Frederickson, 2021; Barber et al., 2021; Kasymova et al., 2021) and that their voices have been heard less in the scientific response to the pandemic (Rosa & Clavero, 2022). Thus, having a platform for women in academia to connect, is more important than ever.

Affinity groups like WOB can provide mentoring resources and valuable social capital that may benefit female academics. Research has shown that high-quality mentoring relationships, whether formal or informal, positively affect proteges' attitudes, including increasing career commitment and lessening their desire to quit (Ragins et al., 2000). Extensive mentoring relationships have been associated with higher salaries and more promotions (Dreher & Ash, 1990). Research indicates that female mentors may provide a particularly valuable resource to female proteges as role models (Ragins & McFarland, 1989). While some colleges and universities have their own mentorship programs, many do not and thus there may be even more value in informal, external mentoring resources. In fact, Ragins and colleagues (2000) found that formal mentoring programs may be less effective for women and may lessen career commitment for them. Their findings suggest that mentors from the same department as their protege are less effective than cross-departmental relationships. Joshi and colleagues (2015) further suggest that industry-wide mentoring groups may be particularly beneficial, as within-organization groups do not necessarily benefit women’s career advancement (Ibarra et al., 2010). Thus, access to and interaction with faculty from a wide variety of institutions may be particularly beneficial for women. Peripheral interactions with an affinity group like WOB may provide the kind of “weak ties” that are beneficial in finding a job ([Granovetter, 1982](https://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/20159624#B84)), whereas more involvement may help build stronger connections to well-connected women in the field, helping gain access to important networks for career advancement (Brass et. al, 2004). Affinity groups can also help women’s search for voice in academia and offer a community to strengthen their voice and encourage others to find theirs (Gallos, 2017).

Furthermore, mentorship groups like WOB help female academics to develop as educators and advocates for their students. They provide a safe environment to explore, assess, and assist instructors in developing teaching skills. Specifically in the last years, members were developing tools and exercises suitable for virtual experiential learning and have shared those with the group. Members have found that applying what they have learned from others in this group to enhance their students’ engagement and learning. Additionally, these developments have led to publications on synchronous virtual experiential learning (Hearn et al., 2021). Advice shared during synchronous online WOB writing retreats have helped members to address inequities in how teaching research and service awards were allocated (Schneider & Radhakrishnan, 2018). In this way, the WOB was a source of continued professional support and encouragement for women of color who face both racial and gender inequities in academia (Radhakrishnan et al., 2021) which helps to make management education a more equitable place for all faculty and students. Such groups help women academics handle the unique obstacles they face in becoming leaders in their fields (Sugiyama et al., 2016) and becoming role models for their students.

In terms of communication, research has pointed to the benefits of combining in-person meetings with distance communication. Peer-to-peer connections over social media platforms can have significant positive impact on well-being, providing people multiple opportunities to share resources and experiences (Rothkrantz, 2015). In-person meetings can further enhance this sense of connection and enhance trust, group identification and engagement by reducing feelings of interpersonal distance experienced in virtual groups (Gibson & Cohen, 2003; Watkins, 2013). The in-person setting at the conference will also provide an avenue for new members to form proximal connections and build new networks. Finally, this roundtable would answer a call from recent research indicating that during Covid women sought more mentorship in general (van Esch, Luse, & Bonner, 2021).

**Session Description:**

The session will begin with short introductions of all facilitators and participants. We will give everyone a chance to share who they are, what aspects of their job they are most excited about, and why they decided to attend the roundtable. We will allow the participants to choose if they would like to break off into smaller groups or to have one large discussion. The following questions will be provided as a conversation starter.

* Teaching best practices
  + How do we handle some of the unique challenges of women in the classroom?
  + What successful strategies have you employed to overcome the double bind?
  + What mistakes have you made in the classroom or in class administration and what have you learned from them?
  + What metrics does your institution use to measure teaching effectiveness? What are best practices here? How can we sell this issue effectively to upper administration? How should we frame teaching success in tenure and promotion materials?
  + What can we do to minimize the impact of negative comments in teaching evaluations for ourselves and our T&P decisions? How have you been able to process qualitative evaluations in an emotionally healthy and helpful way?
* Mentorship
  + How can you find helpful mentors? What are best practices for managing the mentorship relationship?
  + How can we better support colleagues in their teaching? What approaches to observation, mentoring, and coaching have you seen employed effectively?
  + How can we leverage the expertise within MOBTS to develop mentoring within WOB?
  + What resources (books, professional development seminars, etc.) have helped in navigating an academic career?
* Productivity and wellbeing
  + What instrumental resources have been helpful to you during the pandemic and other stressful points of your career?
  + How can you cultivate social support during difficult times?
  + What tools and systems do you have in place to be productive with your research?
* Navigating family-life and academic-life
  + How can we navigate flexible work schedules to attend to childcare?
  + How can we approach senior administration in requesting help with family-related needs (such as time off, teaching schedules, etc.)?
  + Is there a healthy balance between family life and academic life? What does that look like?

Humility in reflecting on our own experiences will allow the participants to become better educators and reflexive practitioners (Cunliffe, 2016; Edelson et al., 2019) and give everyone a chance to build a community with others who share similar aspirations as well as barriers. In the last ten minutes, the facilitators will help to wrap up actionable take-aways for the group and see if there are any actions (such as developing ongoing roundtables or setting up a mentorship program) that groups of facilitators or participants would like to take charge on.

**References**

Babcock, L., Recalde, M. P., & Vesterlund, L. (2018). Why women volunteer for tasks that don’t lead to promotions. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2018/07/why-women-volunteer-for-tasks-that-dont-lead-to-promotions>.

Barber, B. M., Jiang, W., Morse, A., Puri, M., Tookes, H., & Werner, I. M. (2021). What Explains Differences in Finance Research Productivity During the Pandemic?. *The Journal of Finance.* *VOL. 76, (4)*

Bellas, M. L. (1999). Emotional labor in academia: The case of professors. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 561(1), 96–110.

Boring, A., Ottoboni, K., & Stark, P. B. (2016). Student evaluations of teaching are not only unreliable, they are significantly biased against female instructors. *Impact of Social Sciences Blog*.

Brass, D. J., Galaskiewicz, J., Greve, H.R., & Tsai, W. (2004). Taking stock of networks and organizations: A multilevel perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(6), 795-817.

Catalyst. (2020). *Women in academia (Quick take).* https://www.catalyst.org/research/women-in-academia.

Cunliffe, A. L. (2016). “On becoming a critically reflexive practitioner”. *Journal of Management Educatio*n, 40(6), 747-768.

David, M. E. (2015). Women and gender equality in higher education? *Education Sciences*, 5, 10-25.

Debede, G. (2011). Creating a safe environment for women’s leadership transformation. *Journal of Management Education*, 35, 679-712.

Dreher, G. F., & Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(5), 539.

Edelson, S.A., Lo, K.D., Nelson, T., Stark, G., Stratton, M.T., & van Esch, C. (2019). From the shadow of overconfidence into the light of humility: Reflections on experiential learning activities gone awry. *Journal of Management Education*, 43(2), 200-211.

Edwards, M. S., Martin, A. J., & Ashkanasky, N. M. (2021). Mental health and psychological well-being among management students and educators. *Journal of Management Education*, 45(1), 3-18.

European Commission, (2018). Proportion (%) of Women Among Academic Staff, by Grade and Total, 2016 (Table 6.1). She Figures: p. 118.

van Esch, C., Luse, W. and Bonner, R.L. (2021), The impact of COVID-19 pandemic concerns and gender on mentor seeking behavior and self-efficacy, *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-09-2020-0279.

Farkas, M., & Soderstrom, S. (2020, August 10). *Nevertheless she persisted: Succeeding as a woman academic* [Conference Session]. Academy of Management National Conference, Chicago, IL.

Gallos, J. V. (2017). Women’s experiences and new ways of knowing: Implications for an inclusive and equitable world. *Journal of Management Education*, 41(5), 643-648.

Geisler, C., Kaminski, D., & Berkley, R. A. (2007). The 13+ Club: An index for understanding, documenting, and resisting patterns of non-promotion to full professor. *National Women's Studies Association Journal*, 19(3), 145-162.

Gibson, C. B. & Cohen, S. G. (Eds). (2003). *Virtual teams that work: Creating conditions for virtual team effectiveness*, Jossey Bass, San Francisco.

Granovetter M.. 1982. The strength of weak ties: A network theory revisited. In Marsden P. V., Lin N. (Eds.), *Social structure and network analysis*, 105–130. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Gruber, J., Mendle, J., Lindquist, K. A., Schmader, T., Clark, L. A., Bliss-Moreau, E., Akinola, M., Atlas, L., Barch, D. M., Barrett, L. F., Borelli, J. L., Brannon, T. N., Bunge, S. A., Campos, B., Cantlon, J., Carter, R., Carter-Sowell, A. R., Chen, S., Craske, M. G., … Williams, L. A. (2021). The future of women in psychological science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 16(3), 483–516.

Hearn, A., Joordens, S., Radhakrishnan, P., Lewandowska, O. & Visan, L., (2021) A Case Study of Four Remote WIL Courses: Teaching in the Virtual Environment, Learning Outcomes and Possibilities for Future Teaching. In A. Stirling & J. Pretti, (Eds.) The Practice of Co-op and Work Integrated Learning in the Canadian Context. Co-operative Education and Work-Integrated Learning Canada. (CEWIL Canada), and The World Association for Cooperative and Work-Integrated Education (WACE).

Hengel, E (2019), “Publishing while Female. Are Women Held to Higher Standards? Evidence from Peer Review”, Mimeo.

Huang, J., Gates, A. J., Sinatra, R., & Barabási, A. L. (2020). Historical comparison of gender inequality in scientific careers across countries and disciplines. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(9), 4609–4616.

Ibarra, H., Carter, N., & Silva, C. (2010). Why men still get more promotions than women. *Harvard Business Review*, 88, 80-85.

Joshi, A., Son, J., & Roh, H. (2015). When can women close the gap? A meta-analytic test of sex differences in performance and rewards. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(5), 1516-1545.

Kasymova, S., Place, J. M. S., Billings, D. L., & Aldape, J. D. (2021). Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the productivity of academics who mother. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 28 (S2), 419– 433. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12699

King, M. M., & Frederickson, M. E. (2021). The Pandemic Penalty: The gendered effects of COVID-19 on scientific productivity. *Socius*, 7, 23780231211006977.

Knipfer, K., Shaughnessy, B., Hentschel, T., & Schmid, E. (2017). Unlocking Women’s leadership potential: A curricular example for developing female leaders in academia. *Journal of Management Education*, 41(2), 272-302.

Kossek, E. E., Su, R., & Wu, L. (2017). “Opting out” or “pushed out”? Integrating perspectives on women’s career equality for gender inclusion and interventions. *Journal of Management*, *43*(1), 228-254.

Mandeville, A., Manegold, J., Matthews, R., & Whitman, M. V. (2022). When all COVID breaks loose: Examining determinants of working parents’ job performance during a crisis. *Applied Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12372

Mengel, F., Sauermann, J., & Zölitz, U. (2019). Gender bias in teaching evaluations. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 17(2), 535-566.

Nielsen, M. W. (2017). Gender and citation impact in management research. *Journal of Informetrics*, 11(4), 1213–1228.

Radhakrishnan, P., Frederickson, M. & Toh, S. (2021). Why Student Evaluations are Biased against Women and Ethnic Minority Professors. Unpublished manuscript. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.24753.61288

Ragins, B. R., Cotton, J. L., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of Management journal*, 43(6), 1177-1194.

Ragins, B. R., & McFarlin, D. B. (1989, August). Mentor Roles: An Investigation of Cross-Gender Mentoring Relationships. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 1989, No. 1, pp. 58-62). Briarcliff Manor, NY: Academy of Management.

Rivera, L. A. (2017). When two bodies are (not) a problem: Gender and relationship status discrimination in academic hiring. *American Sociological Review*, *82*(6), 1111-1138.

Rosa, R., & Clavero, S. (2022). Gender equality in higher education and research. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 31(1), 1-7.

Sarsons, Heather. 2017. "Recognition for Group Work: Gender Differences in Academia." *American Economic Review*, 107 (5): 141-45. DOI: 10.1257/aer.p20171126

Schneider, K. T. & Radhakrishnan, P. (2018). Three dilemmas for academics: Gender disparities in scholarship, teaching, and service. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice,* 11, 428-433.

Sugiyama, K., Cavanagh, K. V., van Esch, C., Bilimoria, D., & Brown, C. (2016). Inclusive leadership development: Drawing from pedagogies of women’s and general leadership development programs. *Journal of Management Education*, 40(3), 253-292.

Rothkrantz, L. (2015). How social media facilitate learning communities and peer groups around MOOCS. *International Journal of Human Capital and Information Technology Professionals (IJHCITP)*, 6(1), 1-13.

Watkins, M. D. (2013). Making virtual teams work. *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2013/06/making-virtual-teams-work-ten.