Masters Theses & Specialist Projects   Graduate School

Spring 2021

The Dark Side of the Ivory Tower: Examining Incivility and Microaggressions Against Ethnic Minorities in Academia

Teresa San Hoang Nguyen
Western Kentucky University, teresasan.nguyen246@topper.wku.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses

Part of the Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons, Multicultural Psychology Commons, and the Social Psychology Commons

THE DARK SIDE OF THE IVORY TOWER: EXAMINING INCIVILITY AND
MICRO-AGGRESSIONS AGAINST ETHNIC MINORITIES IN ACADEMIA

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Psychological Sciences
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

By
Teresa San Nguyen

May 2021

THE DARK SIDE OF THE IVORY TOWER: EXAMINING INCIVILITY AND MICRO-AGGRESSIONS AGAINST ETHNIC MINORITIES IN ACADEMIA

Date recommended_____April 7, 2021_____

Katrina A. Burch Digitally signed by Katrina A. Burch
Date: 2021.04.07 16:08:04 -05'00'

Katrina Burch, Director of Thesis

Reagan D. Brown Digitally signed by Reagan D. Brown
Date: 2021.04.08 13:56:44 -05'00'

Reagan Brown

Andrew Mienaltowski Digitally signed by Andrew Mienaltowski
DN: cn=Andrew Mienaltowski, o=Western Kentucky University, ou=Psychological Sciences, email=drmski@wku.edu, c=US
Date: 2021.04.08 14:02:43 -05'00'

Andrew Mienaltowski

Associate Provost for Research and Graduate Education

I dedicate this thesis to my mom, my sister, and the rest of my family.

I also want to thank my cohort—Brewer Ayres, Eli Dickinson, Brandi Forgione, Faith

Rollins, and Ben Sammet—who became my friends and support. I wish you all nothing

but success in your future careers!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Author's Note:

As a woman of color, discrimination and its effects have always been a topic that I have been passionate about because it is thoroughly pervasive in everyday life. Though some people may say that racism and other forms of prejudicial behaviors "do not exist anymore", my own experiences and many others dispute this. Discrimination is not as overt as before, but it still lingers beneath society's consciousness. It is something that has impacted so many people and its effects have been internalized and remain within minorities for life. The summer of 2020 brought the struggles of Black and Brown people to the forefront of the societal consciousness and their fight to not be oppressed. The fight continues to this day, and I want to do my due diligence in reporting the incidences that so many were scared to bring up for fear of retaliation, of not being taken seriously, of being stripped of the achievements they have worked so hard for, and being ridiculed for speaking out. My own experiences are almost negligible in comparison to what my fellow POC have gone through and I was gutted reading some of these experiences. I want to stress that the data mining of the tweets were done without any identifiers of the tweeters and done so with my best intentions at heart. I do not want to profit from the discriminatory experiences of fellow Black scholars and academics. I hope that I am able to highlight these injustices experienced in a way that will bring more light to the issues at hand for the future of equality for all POC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

THE DARK SIDE OF THE IVORY TOWER: EXAMINING INCIVILITY AND MICRO-AGGRESSIONS AGAINST ETHNIC MINORITIES IN ACADEMIA

Teresa San Nguyen   May 2021   63 Pages

Directed by: Katrina Burch, Reagan Brown, and Andrew Mienaltowski

Department of Psychological Sciences   Western Kentucky University

Discrimination is still prevalent and pervasive in society, though there have been many attempts to mitigate its impact. Though often not as overt, "modern" discrimination is more subtle in nature, often slipping through as passable social interactions because of its ambiguity. However, the negative impact that ethnic and racial minorities experience because of this subtle discrimination cannot be ignored. In academia, as with many other workplaces, ethnic and racial minorities are impacted by subtle discrimination. During the Black Lives Matter movement that has surged in 2020 in the wake of social injustices against Black and Brown people, this issue has been brought to the forefront. Though academia is often held to a higher standard, discrimination still permeates throughout the institution. The present study investigated the incidences of subtle discrimination via workplace incivility and microaggressions experienced by ethnic and racial minorities in academia by utilizing Twitter as a data source and data-mining experiences through #BlackintheIvory that promote the sharing of said experiences. Specifically, I analyzed self-reported discriminatory (incivility and microaggressions) experiences reported through the use of #BlackintheIvory between the dates of June 7, 2020 – June 17, 2020. Frequencies of reported experiences, narrative descriptions, and analyses of intersectionalities are reported. Future research directions and practical implications are discussed.

Introduction

Discrimination against ethnic minorities is a pervasive issue that can occur within all levels of the system, and the workplace is no exception. However, while overt discrimination against ethnic minorities used to be considered commonplace, the past few decades have seen an upheaval of social reform that has penalized discrimination in the workplace, from federal laws that prohibit discrimination (e.g., Title VII of the Civil Rights Act; 1964), to a culture that has largely admonished flagrant discrimination in the workplace. Yet, ethnic minorities still face discriminatory experiences, particularly through experiences of workplace incivility and micro-aggressions.

Workplace discrimination via incivility and micro-aggressions may more appropriately describe covert discrimination experiences, also known as "modern discrimination." Implicit bias is associated with these modern discrimination experiences within the workplace as "old-fashioned" racism and sexism have been outlawed and/or became taboo (Cortina et al., 2013). The continued racial and gender gap between white and ethnic minority groups within the workplace can perhaps be attributed to the impact of modern discrimination as females and ethnic minorities continue to receive fewer opportunities than their white majority counterparts. Furthermore, implicit biases held by upper management culminating in modern discriminatory practices may inhibit ethnic minorities and women in the workplace from progressing in their careers.

Workplace incivility is a reflection of the social interactions employees may have with one another or with superiors, and it can lead to increased turnover, increased job stress, lower job satisfaction, lower organizational citizenship behaviors, negative affect and physical health, among other negative outcomes (e.g., Abid et al., 2015). Workplace

1

incivility is not exclusive to ethnic minorities, all employees may be subject to incivility at work (Abid, et al., 2015); however, the impact on ethnic minorities may be exacerbated due to increased incivility experiences or rumination (Jones et al., 2017). Like work incivility, microaggressions are not unique to race, however, racial microaggressions impact ethnic minorities in the workplace to a larger extent.

Recently the Black Lives Matter movement and critique of the societal pervasiveness of racism have led to renewed discussions on how to effectively address discrimination in the workplace. With workplace incivility and microaggressions having such an impact on ethnic minority employees, understanding ethnic minority experiences and the pervasiveness of racial-based workplace incivility and microaggression are needed. However, reported cases of workplace incivility and microaggressions are likely to be underreported as they tend to be rather ambiguous in form. Rough estimates regarding the prevalence of incivility in the workplace suggest that at least 50% of employees experience uncivil behaviors on a weekly basis (Porath & Pearson, 2013).

Due to the potential for underreported discriminatory experiences of ethnic minorities, for many reasons (e.g., fear of retribution; voluntary turnover), alternative data sources in the form of "big data" may be more appropriate for understanding the experiences of ethnic minorities. Specifically, I addressed the following research question: what discriminatory experiences do ethnic minorities encounter in academia? I examined the reported instances of incivility and microaggressions by minorities in academia in an effort to understand these experiences.

Uniquely, Twitter has become a source of reported experiences, both good and bad, of employees in the United States, as well as globally. Twitter allows for the mining

of their platform for specific and approved research purposes. Specifically, my thesis project utilized the mining of Twitter data to understand and answer the above research questions. As a response to the renewed attention on systemic race issues in the United States and abroad, minority employees and students in academia have utilized the twitter hashtag #BlackintheIvory to share their experiences with racial discrimination in the workplace. To date, this Twitter hashtag has more than 100,000 Tweets from minority graduate students, faculty, and staff in Academia. Twitter posts will be analyzed using conceptual content analysis methodology.

Literature Review

Critical Race Theory (CRT)

Central to the social reform that has gripped the United States currently with its perspective and ideology on the construct of racism is critical race theory (CRT). CRT denotes that racism exists in society and that to acknowledge the struggle of those who have to experience inequality while attempting to correct it is the method for social justice (Howard & Navarro, 2016). CRT focuses on the intersection of race, laws, and power (Bergman, 2019). Key to the perspectives of CRT are the views of race as a social construct, white privilege, intersectionality, and the challenge of meritocracy (Gillborn, 2015). It states that the current society is not as egalitarian as we claim or that we want it to be, there is systematic and pervasive wall that divides the privileged and the non-privileged, in which the non-privileged have to climb in order to obtain an iota of success.

CRT also explores the perspective of "color-blindness", in which individuals suggest an incognizance of race and of the implications of the experiences of

a person of a different race (DeCuir-Gunby & Gunby, 2016). CRT suggests that by denying the existence of race, these individuals are denying the impact that race has on the sociocultural spectrum (DeCuir-Gunby & Gunby, 2016). By doing this, these individuals are negating any negative realities that those from a different race may have had to struggle through. This perspective is especially damaging, as it proclaims egalitarian values, yet ignores the detrimental impacts that prejudice has created and continues to perpetuate to this day by manifesting itself in a different form of discrimination. CRT calls for the acknowledgement of racism and its affiliate effects so that as a society, we can work towards equality with the recognition of differences in experience.

As the United States remains under turmoil over current social justice and reform, keeping in mind the ideology of CRT, reminds us that the system is broken. However, an attempt to repair it can be taken by acknowledging the differences in experience that every individual has throughout life because of their race, ethnicity, gender, religion, age, etc. By learning to be empathetic, recognizing implicit bias, and reconstructing the barriers that have been placed based on race, a future towards a more egalitarian society can be paved. This extends to the workplace as well. If organizations want to remain competitive, increase productivity, and increase job satisfaction, they need to support diversity in the workplace (Hatipoglu & Inelmen, 2018). Employers and organizations need to acknowledge the impact of discrimination that minority employees face and set policies that create a culture that discourages discrimination.

Subtle Discrimination

Discrimination is no longer as overt as before due to changes in societal

standards, however it still permeates through all aspects of life. Blatant racism or sexism

such as unconcealed contempt, offensive stereotyping, or the intolerance of women and

people of color have been termed "old-fashioned" or "overt" discrimination (Jones et al.,

2017). It is far less socially acceptable for this type of discrimination to occur and it is

illegal within the workplace, therefore organizations have many policies and practices

preventing such incidences. Yet, there are still gender and racial inequalities in the

workplace, in which minority groups and women are still disadvantaged when it comes

to opportunities for advancement and promotions (Cortina, et al., 2013). Thus, the

discrimination that continues to be perpetuated has conformed to current egalitarian

values and proclaimed its intolerance of prejudice, while still harboring implicit bias has

manifested as "modern discrimination" or "subtle discrimination" (Cortina et al., 2013;

Jones et al., 2017).

Subtle discrimination is "interpersonal discrimination that is enacted

unconsciously or unintentionally and that is entrenched in common everyday

interactions, taking the shape of harassment, joke, incivility, avoidance, and other types

of disrespectful treatment" (Van Laer & Janssens, 2011). Subtle discrimination

encompasses many different aggressions based on minority group status, however,

because of its subtle nature, it is difficult to discern at times and its perpetrators are more

likely to evade consequences, leaving the targets to suffer (Jones et al., 2016). This

subtle discrimination has been found to be as debilitating to its targets as overt

discrimination. Subtle discrimination has been associated with negative psychological

health (e.g. increased anxiety, depression, lowered self-esteem, and negative affect),

negative physical health outcomes (e.g. increased cardiovascular problems), and

negative work-related outcomes (e.g. decreased job satisfaction, lowered productivity,

decreased organizational commitment, etc.; Jones et al., 2016). Due to its ambivalent

nature, subtle discrimination can include workplace incivility (when it is selective) and

microaggressions as it is more covert.

Subtle discrimination has many forms, and its effects have detrimental outcomes

for its targets and their organizations. It is clear that this modern form of discrimination

needs to be addressed, especially in light of current social reform. However, subtle

discrimination encompasses a multitude of behaviors that could be measured. For the

purposes of this thesis, I will focus on workplace incivility and microaggressions as the

forms of subtle discrimination to investigate.

Attributional Ambiguity

In response to discrimination, those who experience it may use attributional

ambiguity to cope in order to prevent negative associations with self-esteem (Hoyt et al.,

2007). Attributional ambiguity is "a strategy used to avoid having to attribute potentially

negative performance on a task to ability" (Hormuth, 1986). When evaluating an

individual's performance, the attribution of the outcome of the behavior enacted by the

individual is association with the individual's abilities (Hormuth, 1986). However, if an

observable outcome is attributable to an external cause, an evaluation of the individual is

not possible. To prevent negative performance from being attributed to the individual,

and thereby affecting the individual's self-esteem, the individual may then attribute the

negative outcome to something else. There are three such strategies of attributional

ambiguity: (a) an external cause that can explain an outcome, i.e. weather, bad tools,

illness; (b) the specificity of one attribution to ability is reduced by offering several, plausible, alternative, sometimes external causes; (c) avoid producing any attributable outcome at all (Hormuth, 1986).

In the case of ethnic and racial minorities, as they are stigmatized by virtue of a devalued social identity, discrimination has often impacted the accurate evaluation of their performance (Hoyt et al., 2007). As a self-protective measure, attributional ambiguity has been found to be utilized by ethnic minorities for both negative and positive feedback (Hoyt et al., 2007). Studies have found that those who attribute negative feedback to discrimination, reported higher well-being, as they do not attribute the negative evaluation as due to personal abilities, thereby affecting self-esteem (Hoyt et al., 2007). Though this is a protective mechanism, attributional ambiguity limits the ability for ethnic and racial minorities to accurately assess their abilities (Aronson & Inzlicht, 2004).

A study found that minorities who are high in stereotype vulnerability, which is the tendency to expect, perceive, and be influenced by stereotypes about one's social category, have impaired self-knowledge through heightened mistrust of performance feedback in stereotype-relevant domains and stereotype threat, which is the apprehension in performing in a domain in which the individual's group is stereotyped to lack ability (Aronson & Inzlicht, 2004). Those who are high in stereotype vulnerability utilize attributional ambiguity to protect themselves, however, this leaves room for uncertainty about the individual's actual ability. This is especially relevant in academia as minority students, faculty, and staff may be unable to ascertain their abilities and either overestimate or underestimate their capabilities. Aronson & Inzlicht (2004) found that

those high stereotype vulnerability foster an "unstable efficacy", academic self-confidence that fluctuates more readily and extremely than the average person. This could be a factor in the lack of representation of ethnic and racial minorities in academia, as they are not able to foster a stable academic efficacy due to the consistent use of attributional ambiguity.

For ethnic and racial minorities in academia, attributional ambiguity may be used to deflect from the negative consequences of discrimination via workplace incivility and microaggressions. However, this may limit the potential of ethnic and racial minorities to continue on in academia as they are not able to assess themselves accurately.

Workplace Incivility

At its core, workplace incivility is not targeted towards any group of people. As the lowest level of aggressive behavior within the workplace, workplace incivility occurs more frequently and may impact every employee at one time or another, whether it is experienced incivility, witnessed incivility, or instigated incivility (Schilpzand et al., 2016). Workplace incivility is defined as "low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect" (Anderson & Pearson, 1999). The key difference from workplace incivility from other forms of mal-intent within the workplace is its ambiguous nature.

Workplace incivility can be viewed as a social interaction between two or more parties at work, an interaction that can be interpreted differently due to its ambiguous nature (Pearson, Andersson, & Porath, 2000). Unlike the higher levels of aggressive behavior within the workplace (e.g., harassment, violence, vandalism, etc.), the intent to harm as perceived by the instigator, the target, or observers, is difficult to discern

(Pearson et al., 2000). Because of this, workplace incivility has been categorized as a counterproductive work behavior (CWB) as incidences of incivility can hinder work performance (Cortina et al., 2013).

Workplace incivility can also be seen as breeching of the psychological contract that exists between an employee with fellow employees or the organization (Estes, & Wang, 2008). A psychological contract is "the implied set of unwritten expectations in a relationship" (Estes, & Wang, 2008). A civil environment for social interactions is expected within the confines of a workplace and when incivility occurs, this is a breech in the target's expectations of the organization and the social interactions which should occur in said organization.

Research has indicated that incivility can be experienced in almost every occupation by almost every individual in a workplace (Abid et al., 2015). This is why it is important for all organizations to consider the outcomes of workplace incivility. Incivility has been associated with psychological distress (Cortina et al., 2013), lower job satisfaction, negative affect, and lower task performance for employees (Schilpzand et al., 2016), and higher turnover intentions (Abid et al., 2015). Moreover, research has suggested that when ethnic minorities experience incivility, their experience is more detrimental to their psychosocial health and can lead to increased costs due to potential health issues and loss of productivity (Schilpzand et al., 2016). Incivility is characterized as "rude" behavior, and when directed towards minority groups such as those of gender or race and can be interpreted by the target as discrimination (Cortina et al., 2013).

There is research that asserts that the uncivil behavior experienced by minority groups are done so selectively due to prejudice, linking workplace incivility with

9

discrimination to create selective incivility (Cortina et al., 2013). Selective incivility is the mechanism in which modern gender and racial discrimination takes form, through the means of workplace incivility as a guise (Cortina et al., 2013). Selective incivility is the result of the overlap of workplace incivility with racism and sexism.

Selective incivility proposes that cognitive, situational, and affective factors cause women and ethnic minorities to be targeted at disproportionate levels due to the prejudice of the instigator (Kabat-Farr & Cortina, 2012). Ethnic minorities and women have been found to encounter more instances of incivility due to the nature of selective incivility (Krings, Johnston, Binggeli, & Maggiori, 2014). Minority women, particularly African American women, have been found to experience an increased level of incivility than their white male and minority male counterparts (Krings et al., 2014).

Incivility in Academia.

Though academia is not considered a conventional workplace, academic institutions are organizations that have employees, i.e. faculty, staff, even student workers. Therefore, workplace incivility can occur in academia, like any other workplace. While academia has an idealized portrayal of the noble pursuit of knowledge and espouses egalitarian views, interpersonal relationships that occur within the hallowed halls of academic institutions are not as simple. Indeed, incivility may be more prevalent in academic institutions over more conventional workplaces, as academia tends to have a more liberal view in promoting free speech. While freedom of speech and expression are typically considered as positive, the errant use of free speech may encroach into uncivil territory, especially when it may be used in covertly discriminatory ways (Cortina et al., 2019).

Furthermore, the perpetrators of incivility are not limited to the traditional 'coworker' and 'supervisor' in academia, rather perpetrators of uncivil behavior may consist of fellow faculty, department chairs, students, and those in administrative roles. Indeed, research in nursing academics has found that both nursing faculty and students are guilty of instigating incivility, and that both faculty- and student- instigated incivility was associated with detriments in faculty and student performance (Muliira et al., 2017). Research also suggests that when incivility is ignored by administration, faculty become frustrated and have an increased risk of depression, cardiac problems, high blood pressure, and increased attrition of students and faculty from the academic program (LaSala et al., 2016).

Microaggressions

Microaggressions are a form of modern discrimination and are defined as "everyday exchanges, in the form of seemingly innocuous comments and subtle or dismissive gestures and tones that send denigrating messages to people because they belong to a minority group" (Williams, 2019). Microaggressions can be categorized as subtle discrimination due to their more covert and ambiguous nature. However, microaggressions are not as generalizable as incivility and are not necessarily limited to the workplace. Moreover, microaggression occurrences are almost exclusively gendered and racialized. Subtle disses, dismissive looks, tones, and back-handed compliments are examples of microaggressions. For the purposes of my thesis, I will focus on racial microaggressions, though it should be acknowledged that women face microaggressions as well and the intersectionality of minority women may have an aggregated negative impact.

Microaggressions can be categorized into three types of transgressions: microassaults, microinsults, and microinvalidations (DeCuir-Gunby & Gunby, 2016). Microassaults are the most explicit attacks that are intended to hurt or offend someone and typically do not attempt to veil the discrimination that fueled it (e.g., using a racial slur; DeCuir-Gunby & Gunby, 2016). Microinsults are behavioral and verbal expressions that express insensitivity and rudeness towards an individual's heritage and racial identity (e.g., telling a Black person they are well-spoken and articulate; Sue et al., 2009). Microinvalidations are entrenched in the colorblindness belief and invalidate or negate an individual's psychosocial reality of being a minority and the experiences that come with it by assuming "everyone has the same experiences" (e.g., telling an Asian person they must be a good student; Sue et al., 2009). Microinsults and microinvalidations are more covert and therefore more difficult for the victim to analyze. Though these microaggressive slights appear trivial and inconsequential to perpetrators, they can have detrimental effects on the victim as they accumulate stress, anger, and feelings of being marginalized (Sue et al., 2009).

Research had identified five sequential domains, in which victims of microaggressions may categorize their reactions, and this may impact the severity of how the microaggressions have affected them (Sue et al., 2009). The five domains are: incident, perception, reaction, interpretation, and consequence (Sue et al., 2009). If victims identify negative intentions through all domains, the consequences are dire as they feel powerless, invisible, and forced to comply with predominately white norms (Sue et al., 2009). As such, it should not come as a surprise that microaggressions have been associated with negative outcomes such as psychological distress (e.g. stress,

depression, anxiety), decreased job satisfaction, and increased turnover (Williams, 2019). Moreover, microaggressions have been associated with feelings of inferiority, psychological and career-related costs, and affective responses such as anger, frustration, and invalidation (Pitcan et al., 2018). Though racial and ethnic minorities have learned to cope with such experiences, they should not have to. It is clear the impact that microaggressions have on racial and ethnic minorities, and organizations should attempt to limit microaggressive incidences, if not for the sake of social justice, then for the negative outcomes that can occur with such experiences.

Microaggressions in Academia.

Microaggressions occur in everyday life, however, their prevalence within the workplace creates a more hostile work environment that signals that the workplace may not be as supportive of its ethnic or racial minority employees. This may be especially evident in academia. Post-secondary education has been, and remains, predominately white with minimal minority representation, comparatively. For example, there is a 50% attrition rate for graduate students of all disciplines in the U.S., however, the attrition rate for minority graduate students is 70% (Brunsma et al., 2017). The high rate of attrition of minority graduate students from graduate education has been found to be associated with lack of adequate mentorship, limited support of minority students, and insufficient encouragement to promote continuing on within academia. This may be in part because there is a lack of ethnic minority faculty members who could relate to and provide more guidance to minority graduate students. In addition to this, the microaggressions that both students and faculty face often lead to the perception of hostile climates that facilitate their departure from academia.

13

In the U.S., only 6% of higher education faculty are Black and 5% are Hispanic, while Black Americans represent 13% of the total population and Hispanic Americans represent 18% of the total population (Williams, 2019). Not only do these numbers indicate the prevalence of racism and its impact on the academic system, but they also show the severe discrepancy in the representation of minorities in academia. This is made worse as minority faculty are subject to microaggressions and racial discrimination. Research supports that minority faculty experience racial microaggressions and that these experiences negatively affect job satisfaction (DeCuir-Gunby & Gunby, 2016). Moreover, oppressive academic climates for racial minority faculty have been associated with psychological distress, grievances, lawsuits, and turnover (Williams, 2019). Therefore, while academic institutions are thought of as egalitarian institutes of knowledge, they may be particularly detrimental to ethnic minority faculty and students.

Twitter

Twitter (http://twitter.com) – is a social media giant and a "micro-blogging" service where users share and receive messages or "Tweets" of up to 280 characters. Twitter is used for friends, family, and coworkers to communicate and stay connected through the exchange of these Tweets. Tweets may contain photos, videos, links, and text. Account holders use these messages to post to their profile, send to followers, and are searchable on Twitter using hashtags (#). Twitter was the fourth most popular social networking app in the U.S. in 2019 (Clement, 2020). In 2019, it boasted 145 million daily users, 30 million of which were in the U.S. (21%; Iqbal, 2020). Twitter also

supports over 45 languages in total (with translated widget text available in 34 of these). While 80% of Twitter usage happens on mobile devices, it is still accessible on the web.

In the U.S., 21% of women overall use Twitter, compared to 24% of men in 2019 (Iqbal, 2020). By age, the greatest concentration of Twitter users in the 18-24 and 25-34 age brackets (Iqbal, 2020). Notably, Twitter is also more popular with 35-49 year old and 50+ year old users than it is with teenagers. The median age of adult U.S. Twitter users is 40, while the median U.S. is 47 years old (Wojcik & Hughes, 2019). Though Twitter is used by many Americans, the demographics of its users are slanted from the average American. It is more popular for younger adults, and Twitter users are more likely than the general population to have a college degree and live in urban cities (Iqbal, 2020). This may make Twitter the best data source for collecting information about ethnic minorities' experience with discrimination in academia, as many of those who use Twitter are more likely to be in an educated position. As Twitter is used as a free speaking platform, individuals are more likely to be able to voice their experiences as they happen in real time. This could be a huge source of untouched data, as many individuals may not feel comfortable expressing their discriminatory experiences to other faculty or reporting it in surveys. As Twitter is often used as a source for one to express their thoughts freely and sometimes with anonymity, the individuals who are exposed to discriminatory practices may be able to record these experiences and have them available as soon as they happen by using hashtags (#).

Present Study

For this study, I examined the incivility and microaggressions experienced by ethnic minorities in the workplace, specifically, academic institutions. Subtle

discrimination has persistently prevailed in the workplace and it is embedded in academia as well. Though incivility and microaggressions are occurrences that racial and ethnic minorities are all too familiar with, underreporting of these experiences are common. Employees (and students) may fear retaliation or are hesitant to report each instance to proper channels, which may limit the actual representation of the discrimination that racial and ethnic minority faculty and students may face. However, in light of the state of social justice unrest that is currently occurring throughout the United States (and globally) with public outcry against the discriminatory practices that racial minorities face, it is no surprise that this would invoke those who were previously silent about the subtle discrimination they experience(d) in academia to speak out. The #BlackintheIvory Twitter hashtag was created in response to the untimely deaths of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery, and many more. On June 6, 2020, Dr. Shardé Davis and Joy Melody Woods created the hashtag in order to bring light to how pervasive racism is, even in academia (Enright, 2020). Examination of reported experiences under this hashtag may enable researchers to better understand ethnic minority experiences in academia.

Specifically, I address the following research question: what discriminatory experiences do ethnic minorities encounter in academia? I examined reported instances of incivility and microaggressions by minorities in academia in an effort to understand these experiences. I utilized conceptual content analysis of the experiences reported under the #BlackintheIvory Twitter hashtag to examine such experiences.

Method

Sample

As this study prioritized the privacy of the personal data that was gathered, the data mined from Twitter using the #BlackintheIvory hashtag removed the names or personal identifiers of the tweeters. The study focused on the self-reported contents of the tweets that were extracted from June 7, 2020 – June 17, 2020. During this timeframe, 13,656 tweets were extracted. During the data mining process, the tweeter's name and Twitter handle were removed. After this, the tweet contents were coded if they were relevant to the study, i.e., containing instances of subtle discrimination, if the tweets contained such instances, the tweets were coded as microaggressions or incivility. From the data collected, 29.05% (3,965) of the 13,656 tweets were classified as microaggressions or incivility.

Procedure and Data Collection

Content analysis is a qualitative method used to analyze the complex multi-faceted human experience into concepts that can be interpreted for research (Erlingsson & Brysiewicz, 2017). Content analysis is typically used to analyze textual data such as interviews, focus groups, documents, or documented participant observation (Erlingsson & Brysiewicz, 2017). This study utilized the conceptual content analysis method to quantify the amount of times a concept appears in the Twitter data collected and analyze the instances to make inferences on the incidences of workplace incivility and microaggressions experienced within academia. Content analysis was used to analyze

twitter posts under the #BlackintheIvory hashtag. The #BlackintheIvory hashtag documents incidences of discrimination experienced in academia by racial minorities.

Conceptual content analysis is "a research tool that helps quantify the number of times a word/phrase or text appears in a document" (Sabharwal et al., 2018). The theme of subtle discrimination via microaggressions and workplace incivility was chosen from the text data to help ascertain what the researcher is looking for and the categories will be chosen from the theme to shorten the summary of key results (Erlingsson & Brysiewicz, 2017). The categories used for this study are: incivility, microassaults, microinsults, microinvalidations, microaggression; unspecified. In order to enhance the content validity of the coding scheme, we developed examples from each construct derived from pre-established measurement scales (see Table 1 for definitions). From there, the coders classified the contents of the tweet data into the categories. By using conceptual content analysis, I was able to aggregate the twitter text data to condensed units that still convey any experience of workplace incivility or microaggressions under the #BlackintheIvory hashtag, while calculating the incidences of workplace incivility or microaggressions through Kappa statistics.

Twitter data was extracted using SearchTweets, which is a program for the Python library which accesses the Twitter Application Programming Interface (API), and allows for full-archive access (i.e., tweets that can access beyond a 30-day limit). The Twitter API allows one to compose tweets, read profiles, and access a high volume of tweets on particular subjects in specific locations (i.e., hashtags). Furthermore, Python libraries such as json, pandas, time and datetime were utilized to transfer extracted Twitter data into usable formats for coders. With Premium access (i.e., paying for access

to the Twitter API), users have the capacity to extract or "web-scrape" up to 1.25 million tweets as well as access the full archive of tweets (dating back to 2006, if needed). Premium Twitter API access with special academic research track permissions were obtained in order to web-scrape the data of interest.

Undergraduate and first-year graduate students were utilized as coders and trained in the coding process. Coders were informed to not disclose any personal information they may come across in the process of coding to ensure anonymity of the personal data that was gathered. After undergoing training, coders began coding the 13,656 tweets if the tweet was relevant, i.e., it contained experiences of subtle discrimination, coders classified the tweets into incivility, microassaults, microinvalidations, microinsults, and microaggressions; unspecified. Coders also reported the following information if it was available within the tweet text: source of microaggression, source of incivility, location of incident, academic position of tweeter, if the tweets were sharing information about resources or articles to amplify #BlackintheIvory, and lastly if the tweet was available. There were 30 or 0.22% of the total tweets that were not available. This is likely because the tweet was deleted or the account was deleted.

Results

Table 2 contains the descriptive statistics of the 13,656 tweets. From the 13,656, 3,697 (27.09%) of the tweets were classified as relevant to the study. Though there was discrepancy between the coders classifying the tweets into whether or not tweets were relevant to this study. The majority of the nonrelevant tweets were in support of #BlackintheIvory as they were retweeting the hashtag or amplifying the voices that used

the hashtag to share their experiences. Many of these tweets shared articles or resources that may help others understand discrimination in academia, as well as calling for others to read the stories under the #BlackintheIvory to learn. From the 13,656 total tweets collected, 280 (2.05%) were classified as microassaults, 431 (3.15%) were classified as microinvalidations, 978 (7.16%) were classified as microinsults, 658 (5.31%) were classified as microaggression-unspecified, and 1,285 (9.41%) were classified as incivility. Additionally, 1,299 (9.51%) tweets were classified as sharing information about #BlackintheIvory, 563 (4.12%) tweets were classified as being a part of a thread, and lastly 65 (0.48%) were not available to analyze as they may have been deleted or the accounts may have been deleted. It should be noted that there were tweets that showcased overtly discriminatory experiences or commented on the systemic and structural racism that is embedded in society, however, these tweets did not fit within the criteria of this study's confines of subtle discrimination via microaggressions or incivilities. Thus, these instances were unable to be measured as they were classified into the "not relevant" to this study category.

However, the discrimination that was measured in this study still depict a rather bleak picture of how academia allows minorities to be treated. Within the confines of the categories that were chosen to represent subtle discrimination, the tweets that were coded as within the six categories reveal how extensive the experiences are. The following section showcases the tweets that were coded into the categories chosen for this study. The following are examples of tweets that were coded as *microassaults*:

> "#BlackintheIvory When the Dean that you worked for is let go and another colleague tells you 'don't worry, you'll be fine without your master'."

"Walking back from lunch, white colleagues & one wants to make the eXplicit point that there's a qualitative difference b/w 'Nigger' & 'Nigga'. Yes, they used those words out loud & seemed to think it was necessary to eXplain this in my presence. #BlackintheIvory"

"#BlackintheIvory is having a young Black man come into office hours, full of apology, bc was late: he was threatened & detained by undercovers w/ guns on his walk to uni—he 'fit the description.' Y'all never get to school shit bc you have to process this mad violence & trauma."

The following are examples of tweets that were coded as *microinsults*:

"During residency on my Consult & Liason rotation, asked my attending for a book to brush up on neuroscience. She pulls out a book, then says this is too complicated for you and then gives me another book. #BlackintheIvory"

"Or how about the time I won an NSF graduate research fellowship, and my white lab mate told me he wasn't eligible for those fellowships because he's white and middle class. #BlackintheIvory"

"My friend shared that he was asked on an interview for a top undergraduate program if his favorite movie was The Lion King because he was from Africa... #BlackintheIvory"

"Being #BlackintheIvory is two WM professorS telling me I won't get into a Ph.D. program and that I should consider getting an industry job instead... I got into 6 Ph.D. programs and I'm now a 3rd year Ph.D. student. TAKE THAT!"

The following are examples of tweets that were coded as *microinvalidations*:

"Doctoral program discussing inequities in schools. I speak to funding due to property taXes and racism. Prof tells the class, "look at her, and look at her bias."#BlackintheIvory

#BlackintheIvory calling out a racist statement and then being ostracized by your cohort. People see you in the hall to tell you (silently) they are on your side."

"The leader of a pedagogy seminar once told me "You should think less about race when thinking about pedagogy." Again, I teach c19 US literature, especially C19 African American literature. #BlackInTheIvory"

"Told by HR office that being paid half of what other colleagues were remunerated for the same work was not discrimination #BlackintheIvory"

"When I started my PhD, I was told my by my head of school that race theory/feminist theory was useless so why bother. With "well intentioned" sincerity because he, a white man, was "worried" about my future employability. #blackintheivory"

The following are examples of tweets that were coded as *microaggressions; unspecified*:

"#BlackintheIvory When you are the only Black faculty and you have several colleagues who constant call you 'boy.' And then when you complain people say 'you don't know what you're talking about, even if someone had called you a 'boy', it deals more with your age than your race'."

"#BlackintheIvory When you get called into the Dean's office to eXplain why you embedded issues of diversity into a course on ethics. And then when the Dean says to you, 'I just want to make sure that I don't have a Reverend Wright on my hands'"

"Our 3rd year rotations were at an inner city hospital

classmate: I don't wanna live in the ghetto.

Me: what do you mean?

C: you know what I mean

Me: no I don't. Before you answer that, remember I'm black

C: that's not what I meant. And you're not like them #BlackintheIvory"

The following are examples of tweets that were coded as *incivility*:

"#BlackintheIvory is being refered to by your colleagues as "troublemaker.""

"#BlackintheIvory When a group of White faculty walk up to you and ask whether you are a drug dealer because you are always on your phone. And then start laughing at you as if you are the butt of a joke"

"3rd year uni wanting to write about MarXism and class reductionism. The seminar leaders advised that I could be more 'fiesty' and 'sassy' and asked why I didn't chose to write on the question about race. 🙃 #BlackintheIvory"

"Some of my #BlackintheIvory eXperiences:

1. To get the highest GPA during post-grad and an admin in the dep. comes to me saying: that doesn't mean anything afterall I am black and come from Sudan. I cried my eyes off that day!!"

"Some of my #BlackInTheIvory eXperiences: In a small waiting area to meet a PI in another department, my name is called, I say 'yes' & wave to indicate it's me, but person goes to white women sitting near me to introduce themselves… I then stand up and I met with an 'oh'."

These tweets reveal that the academia is rife with discriminatory experiences that minorities face. Though the literature does indicate that subtle discrimination exists and is ubiquitous in every workplace, the actual incidences and frequencies of discrimination have not been actually measured because of the fear of reporting to official avenues. The premise of this study was to have an alternative means of gauging prevalence of the discrimination that ethnic and racial minorities may face in academia outside of organization specific data. The following are examples of tweets that attest to the discriminatory experience of minorities:

"I created a twitter account just to post this thread. I'm seeing a lot of ppl talking about not being able to speak up using #BlackintheIvory bc of the very real fear of retribution in academia (1/11)"

"'despite popular stereotypes of the Ivory Tower as a bastion of liberal ideology, academia operates as an institution with white supremacist rot at its core. ' A Personal Response to #BlackInTheIvory by (name redacted for privacy)"

"Exactly this. This is how microaggressions work. It eats away at you, & yet, the aggressor is free from consequences, free from culpability, & is none the wiser, & will do this, & worse, again and again. The incidents can be so fleeting, & damaging all at once. #BlackintheIvory"

According to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC; 2021a), in 2020, there were 22,064 cases of racial discrimination filed with the EEOC, meaning racial discrimination comprised of 32.7% of the charges filed. Though there were cases in which discrimination of multiple forms were filed together, this is still a substantial amount considering the amount of racial discrimination that may have been unreported. While EEOC claims are usually from typical workplaces, and academia is not a typical workplace, parallels can still be made. Given that the frequencies of microaggressions and incivilities coded were lower than even the amount of reported racial discrimination, this may be because the tweeter's still feared repercussions from their institutions or colleagues for speaking about their specific experiences. The following highlights some of the tweets that speak to fear of retaliation:

"THIS IS THE SAD TRUTH! At the end of the day, these academic streets are too small and we fear that this will get traced back to us. These #BlackInTheIvory tweets are NOTHING compared to our worst racism-related experiences. #BlackLivesMatter #BlackInSTEM #BlackandSTEM"

"When you're too scared to like or retweet some #BlackintheIvory stories because they reflect your EXACT experiences but you know it's not safe and so you just bookmark them to remind yourself that you're not the only one."

"#BlackintheIvory means not really being able to participate in this amazing hashtag and thread for fear of all the emails, calls, and texts you will receive from various members of your institution(s). ✊🏿"

"Knowing that you have stories to tell but you remain silent because of the fear of retaliation... I've been racially profiled and dealt with micro & macro aggressions. #BlackintheIvory"

In fact, some tweets indicated that the tweeter had reported or confronted the behavior that was experienced by them, but had no justice done for them:

"#BlackintheIvory is being called a terrorist and the N-word by patients and being told it's unprofessional to report that. It's being told 'you're here to serve patients and learn, stop complaining.'"

"#BlackintheIvory is when you complain about racial slurs during research fieldwork (locals at your site calling you a monkey, for example) & your PI tells you it's a 'learning experience' and that it's up to you to show them Black people are human just like them. #BlackInSTEM"

"I had a professor use the term 'tar baby' to refer to a research project nobody wanted to work on, then he spent the rest of the afternoon trying to convince me why I shouldn't be offended 🙃 #BlackintheIvory"

Moreover, several experiences detailed the explicit instances of racism that perpetuates in what should be a safe haven of knowledge. For example:

"#BlackintheIvory Attending a PWI in the 2000s and having to see nooses hung on the Quad while walking pass buildings with the N word sprayed on them is one of the hardest lessons to learn when pursuing higher education. #Racismisnotdead"

"#BlackintheIvory Having a professor say to the class, 'if you don't turn in your papers, I'll... idk... I'll have to call the KKK on ya or somethin' and immediately feel all eyes turn to you, the only black person in the room."

25

"Having a white male student bring a fully formed noose 2campus 2threaten me

because he didn't like learning about race (said it was racist of me to teach it... in

a Sociology course.

1/ #SocInTheIvory #BlackintheIvory"

"That time I presented my dissertation at a prestigious conference at a prestigious

school and someone in the front row asked, 'Isn't it appropriate for White

liberals to talk down to Black people, since they're less intelligent?' Crickets

from the audience. #BlackintheIvory"

During the coding of the data, several testaments showed that the discrimination

that racial and ethnic minorities experienced negative effects from the treatment that they

endured in academia. These are a few examples:

"I've experienced more racial inferiority in academia than in other walks of life.

The black academic is like a drop of oil in the ocean. To survive in this

environment, his 'blackness' must be stripped away for 'whiteness'

('whiteness'=social construct-not race) #BlackintheIvory"

"Pre-ABD, I took on a project coding open-ended survey responses abt

department/campus climate. I read story after story from Black faculty enduring

hostile environments. It was emotionally exhausting. I quit the project before I

quit grad school. #BlackintheIvory"

"being #BlackintheIvory #BlackinIvory is the inability to authentically disclose

your experiences due to the deep fears, traumas, and insecurities that stem from

compounding anti-black/painful experiences at the hands of white, nonblack poc,

and black faculty, admin, staff etc."

In the collection of the data, there were instances that highlighted the

intersectionality of being a minority female and the discrimination that they face. These

are a few examples:

26

"#BlackInTheIvory is being told by a senior academic during my undergrad that as a black woman, I just need to add "disabled and gay" to "my list" get further in STEM 🤢"

"That as a black women we stay quiet because we don't want to be viewed as the 'angry black woman'. We hold on to our thoughts and ideas Bc we're still struggling with imposter syndrome #BlackintheIvory"

"I've been seeing a lot of "I think they just did/said that because you're a woman" replies on Black women's #BlackintheIvory posts, and let me tell you- not only is that horribly disrespectful, that is also simply not the conversation we're having right now."

"Yes, @(redacted), let's gender this. #BlackInTheIvory is being propositioned in a glass hotel elevator by an older white male conference attendee at a major national conference with the line, 'What would Thomas Jefferson say about all of this?'"

These are just a fraction of the reported experiences of ethnic and racial minorities in academia. It is clear that subtle discrimination, and at times, overt discrimination, still runs rampant in the gilded halls of academia.

Agreement Analyses

For studies that use nominal or ordinal scales, ratings are typically used to interpret the data. The reliability of these ratings is imperative to the research involved. Kappa statistics are used to measure the interrater reliability (agreement between ratings made by 2 or more raters) and intrarater reliability (agreement between ratings made by the same rater across 2 or more occasions (Sim & Wright, 2005). Cohen's Kappa is used to gauge the agreement between 2 raters by calculating the overall percentage of agreement, which is calculated over all paired ratings, or effective percentage of agreement, which is calculated over those paired ratings where at least one rater

diagnoses presence of the variable (Sim & Wright, 2005). If raters agree by chance, they are not actually "agreeing", this agreement is the result of random error; only agreement that is because of actual agreement, free from chance is considered "true" agreement (Sim & Wright, 2005). Kappa is a measure of "true" agreement. Kappa "indicates the proportion of agreement beyond that expected by chance, the achieved beyond chance agreement as a proportion of the possible beyond-chance agreement" (Sim & Wright, 2005). The equation for kappa is as follows:

$$K = \frac{\text{observed agreement} - \text{chance agreement}}{1 - \text{chance agreement}}$$

In terms of symbols:

$$K = \frac{Po - Pc}{1 - Pc}$$

where *Po* is the proportion of observed agreements and *Pc* is the proportion of agreements expected by chance (Sim & Wright, 2005).

Kappa allows a numerical rating of the degree in which raters agree by chance (Viera & Garrett, 2005). To measure how different the observed agreement is from the expected agreement, kappa is used. A kappa coefficient of 1 indicates perfect agreement, whereas a kappa of 0 indicates agreement equivalent to chance and negative values indicate agreement less than chance (Viera & Garrett, 2005). Due to the nature of this study, Kappa statistics were used to calculate intercoder reliability on all coded dimensions. The proposed standards for strength of agreement for the kappa coefficient are that values of less than 0.40 are poor, values of 0.40 to 0.60 suggest fair agreement, values of 0.60 to 0.75 represent good agreement, and values greater than 0.75 indicate excellent agreement (Watkins & Pacheco, 2001). Because of its ability to account for

chance, a kappa coefficient of +1.00 can correctly be interpreted as perfect agreement between observers (Watkins & Pacheco, 2001).

In this study, two undergraduate and three graduate students acted as coders and coded the 13,656 data points. The coders were given the codebook for this study (see Appendix A) to familiarize themselves with the concepts and examples of the relevant categories. The codebook was developed using established scales and the definitions were developed from established articles to increase the construct validity of the categories for this study. After coders were knowledgeable about the concepts, they were given the study procedures (see Appendix B) to study and begin the coding process. The coders classified tweets into one category of microaggressions (microassault, microinsult, microinvalidation, microaggression – unspecified) and if the tweet met the definition of incivility, the tweet could be classified into incivility.

The coders were paired into four sets: rater 1 & rater 2, rater 3 & rater 4, rater 3 & rater 5, and lastly rater 4 & rater 5. The sets of coders each coded the same data files and a kappa was calculated for each set of coders. The interrater agreement was measured on all categories, wherein the kappa was calculated based on the coder's agreement on coding a tweet into the following categories: not relevant, microassault, microinvalidation, microinsult, microaggression; unspecified, and incivility. The interrater agreement and kappa of these are reported in Tables 3, 5, 7, and 9. A kappa was also calculated based on whether the coders had coded a tweet into any of the microaggression categories (microassault, microinsult, microinvalidation, microaggression; unspecified) to ascertain whether or not there truly was a microaggressive event, in the case that coders may have misclassified a microaggression.

The interrater agreement and kappa of these categories are reported in Tables 4, 6, 8, and 10. Rater 1 and rater 2 were in agreement on all categories 82.78% ($\kappa = 0.606$) of the time. On coding just microaggressions, rater 1 and 2 were in agreement 91.53% ($\kappa = 0.759$) of the time. Rater 3 and rater 4 were in agreement on all categories 83.23% ($\kappa = 0.463$) of the time. On coding just microaggressions, rater 3 and 4 were in agreement 89.17% ($\kappa = 0.638$). Rater 3 and rater 5 were in agreement on all categories 82.45% ($\kappa = 0.502$) of the time. On coding just microaggressions, rater 3 and 5 were in agreement 88.25% ($\kappa = 0.638$) of the time. Rater 4 and rater 5 were in agreement on all categories 88.77% ($\kappa = 0.581$) of the time. On coding just microaggressions, rater 4 and 5 were in agreement 92.33% ($\kappa = 0.696$) of the time.

Following the standards for kappa coefficient values, all of the kappas that were calculated in the "all categories" section were between the values of 0.40 – 0.60, which suggest fair agreement on the part of the coders to classify the tweets into the categories for the theme of this study. When just the interrater agreement on classifying a tweet into at least one category of a microaggression was calculated, the kappa value increased to good agreement, as expected.

As the study was done within a time constraint, the disagreements between raters were not resolved. The reported agreements are simply the sets of coders' initial classification of tweets. There were no adjustments made to calculate disagreements between raters.

Discussion

This study is among the first to utilize a "big data" source, such as Twitter, to conduct a large-scale content analysis of the self-reported discrimination ethnic and

30

racial minorities face in the workplace, specifically, academia, across employees from different organizations and positions. When tweets were coded, 27.09% of the tweets were found to be relevant to the study. However, as human coders were used to determine whether a tweet was relevant to this study, there is error to be expected in classifying the tweets. This is evident by the interrater agreement and kappa values. While the sets of coders were in agreement over 80% of the time and the Kappa coefficients for each set indicated fair agreement, there is no denying the variability of the tweets' classification by coders.

As this study sought to define abstract concepts such as discrimination, using content analysis in order to classify the tweets, the coding used was interpretative rather than topical coding. Coders had to interpret each tweet based on the tweet contents to categorize the tweets into the defined categories, rather than code using topical sorting such as when computer assisted data analysis (Podolefsku & McCarty, 1983). Importantly, coders reported some difficulty in the coding task as some tweets were "subjective" or "vague". The variability of interrater agreement between raters may be the result of individual differences, such as personal backgrounds, different social networks, cultures, knowledge prior to the study, and a plethora of other factors.

However, definitions of the constructs of interest (microaggressions, microassaults, microinvalidations, microinsults, and incivility were drawn from the literature and are well established. In addition, examples of the constructs provided for training purposes were drawn from well-established, valid and reliable scales, thus enhancing the construct validity of the study. It should be noted that coding using Twitter data runs into the essential issue of understanding the intent and message based

31

on only the content of the tweet. Context of the tweet matters, as some of the text may have been broken up or written in response to another tweeter. Though Twitter may provide a wealth of information, contextualizing this information on just 280 characters is difficult.

Nevertheless, this study was able to use content analysis of the tweets to depict the discrimination of minorities in academia. The premise of this study was that by accessing personal accounts from the individuals who experience subtle discrimination, we would be able to utilize an alternative source of information ascertain the frequency of which they occur and what type of discrimination was experienced. Too often subtle discriminatory behavior occurs and is left unreported because while organizations have policies against overt discrimination, subtle discriminatory behaviors have less clear avenues to pursue justice and those who are impacted by prejudicial actions are left to deal with the consequences (Jones et al., 2013). Employees may fear retaliation, fear alienation from peers, or the organizational climate stifles the reporting of discriminatory acts (Williams, 2019). This is corroborated by many accounts from the tweets. Moreover, at times when the discriminatory behaviors were confronted, minorities were invalidated and shut down. It is highly likely that the frequency that the subtle discrimination that ethnic and racial minorities face in academia are still underreported from this method of data collection. However, this study may bring about a new method to portraying the depth and prevalence of discrimination ethnic and racial minorities face by using a public "big data" source.

The main objective of my thesis was to identify and categorize subtle discrimination shared by ethnic and racial minority employees, focusing on tweet

content. Thereby, this study advances our understanding of how pervasive prejudicial

behavior is, even within the confines of the gilded halls of knowledge. Despite attention

to dissemination of knowledge and skills in institutions of higher education, non-

discrimination rules guided by EEO law are ignored, not understood, and violated as

evidenced by the behavior documented in tweets. Universities and colleges may not be

the typical workplace, but it has employees and customers alike from its students, staff,

and faculty. As with any organization, for there to be efficient and effective productivity

for its employees, the employees must be supported. While there are laws within the

U.S. that prevent the discrimination of an applicant or employee based on their race

through any employment decision (hiring, firing, promotions, benefits, training, layoffs,

or any other condition of employment), as well as preventing harassment of employees

based on the individual's race/color, these laws do not prohibit the simple "teasing" or

off-handed comments that are not "very serious" (EEOC, 2021b). Racial harassment is

only illegal when "it is so frequent or severe that it creates a hostile or offensive work

environment or when it results in an adverse employment decision (such as the victim

being fired or demoted)" (EEOC, 2021b). Thus, overt discrimination may fall in this

realm, however, whether or not subtle discrimination such as incivility and

microaggressions falls under this purview may not be as clear. Individual institutions

may have policies regarding this, but there is no common standard when dealing with

these subtle discriminatory experiences.

It is no surprise that racism and discrimination still exist, it is embedded within

society's unconscious and permeates throughout all aspects of life. However, this study

reveals that despite all of the comprehensive data on the value to supporting minorities

within organizations (e.g., productivity, health, well-being, etc.), members of the academy display discriminatory behaviors and academia is lacking in its implementation of effective strategies to combat discrimination. Universities, colleges, and other institutions of learning need to support and elevate its minority students, staff, faculty, and professors so that they are able to contribute their own knowledge and experience. Though some may argue that affirmative action is the method used to propel ethnic and racial minorities within the workplace, affirmative action is typically a legal remedy for past discriminatory practices or it may be a voluntary action in response to noncompliance to nondiscrimination and "it does not require preference for minorities or women in actual selection decisions, rather the emphasis is on recruitment and outreach" (Gutman et al., 2010). Thus, unless an institution has discriminated against protected classes in the past, affirmative action may not be utilized. Moreover, if it is implemented, there is no guarantee that the organization would be able to support minorities in full.

Limitations and Future Research

As this study prioritized the anonymity of the personal data that was gathered, demographic information was not available to collect. The age, gender, academic position, specific location, or affiliated workplaces were not tracked, unless the contents of a tweet specified such information. Future studies should gather willing participants in order to gain access to such information, so that research can be more predictive. Moreover, this study did not track the frequencies of the tweeter's tweets. As the study did not identify each tweeter, it is more than likely that a single tweeter may have multiple data points wherein they shared their various discriminatory experiences under

the #BlackintheIvory. A design flaw in this study was that the amount of social media use cannot be detected in a content analysis. That is, this study did not track the frequencies of the tweets by the day or time within the timeframe of June 7, 2020 – June 17, 2020. However, it should be noted that the majority of the relevant tweets (i.e., those containing subtle discrimination) were extracted from earlier on in the timeframe, while sharing information tweets were more frequent towards the end of the timeframe. This is likely because the hashtag went "viral" at the beginning of the selected timeframe. Future studies should track the frequencies and time that the tweeter tweets something as this may reveal more information.

Further, this study was unable to differentiate between the ethnic and racial minorities that utilized the #BlackintheIvory to shed light onto their own discriminatory experiences. Specifically, there were Aboriginal academics, Asian academics, Muslim academics, and academics from African descendant that were found in the data extracted, but we were unable to differentiate their experiences. During the coding process, several tweets detailed the experiences of academics in other countries, Australia, Canada, the UK, the Netherlands, Germany, and others as they utilized the #BlackintheIvory hashtag to shed light onto their discriminatory experiences. Future research should utilize more hashtags that may be able to specify specific ethnic and racial minorities in order to accurately measure their experiences in academia.

This study utilized the hashtag function to collect relevant data, however, Twitter has three tools to facilitate interactivity that this study neglected to measure: mentions, retweets, and the favorite feature. While this study did measure the amount of tweets that were a part of a thread, we were unable to specify which tweets were a part of a thread

detailing a single tweeter's experiences. Future studies should put in place a design that would be able to differentiate between all of the interactive function of the social media platform used.

Lastly, this study was unable to account for the intersectionality of female minorities because of its research design. There was not a reliable method to account for gender differences when content coding. Future research designs should gather willing participants who are able to consent to giving that information or utilize Twitter's API to gain access to that information, with consent, to be able to account for how female minorities or transgender minorities may face discrimination in academia. This study provides empirical support for knowledge sharing on social technologies such as social media platforms that can be used to convey information about their work. Social media users are growing exponentially by the day as such technologies are more accessible. These are a wealth of big data that may be strategically to share knowledge for future research about the workplace, the organization, and work behaviors.

Practical Implications

As this study utilized content analysis to determine the instances of subtle discrimination via microaggressions and workplace incivility, in order to improve future research using this design, a more developed construct of microassaults, microinsults, microinvalidations, and incivility is needed. Though this study utilized preexisting scales in order to increase the content validity to define the constructs of the categories, there was still difficulty in determining the discriminate validity of the constructs. Further, this study emphasizes the importance of training when dealing with human coders for content analysis. Another point to note is the limitations of using content analysis on

Twitter data for future research, as Twitter data can be vague and limited in the information it provides. Further, this study may build a foundation for future computer assisted data analysis. Machine learning has grown to insurmountable heights and providing the basis for identifying classifiers of terms within text to categorize them may help researchers more accurately and quickly analyze data such as in O'Dea et al.'s (2015) study utilizing human coders and machine learning to identify suicidality on Twitter.

This study demonstrates that discrimination is a serious problem in academia, as any workplace. Though there is not a way to measure all discriminatory experiences that minorities face, the data from this study highlights the need for change. These organizations may adhere to EEO laws in nondiscrimination practices; however, subtle discriminatory behaviors may still slip through the cracks. Academia and all forms of higher education need to be held to a higher standard to support minority students, staff, and faculty. Perhaps these institutions need to restructure their design to resemble a more typical workplace so that reporting instances of discrimination may be more accessible.

Most workplaces and these learning institutions comply with EEOC rules, such that claimants of noncompliance may, in deferral states (states with EEO laws), have 300 days to file with the EEOC, but the first 60 days belong to the state (Gutman et al., 2010). In non-deferral states (states without EEO laws), the statute of limitations for filing with the EEOC is 180 days. However, because of the tenure system within academia, there may be a fear of reporting and nothing being done because the instigator is "tenured". As universities and institutions of higher education often sweep reports of discrimination under the rug, especially when pertaining to those who have tenure,

unless there is a public outcry that denounces the faculty who commit atrocities, there is often no other avenue for justice of those who are discriminated against. At the very least, universities and other institutions need to be held accountable for allowing such practices.

Moreover, there are a plethora of organizations that do not know the importance of diversity, equity, and inclusion; thus, they are stuck on just increasing diversity. An increasing number of HR professionals are realizing this by following this analogy: "diversity is inviting different kinds of people to a party; inclusion is asking everyone to dance; equity is asking everyone to help to plan the party and then valuing and utilizing their input" (Falcone, 2020). Rather than institutions focusing on increasing diversity, academia needs to improve equity and inclusion of minority populations. Additionally, creating networks of support groups, such as the Black Student Union (BSU) or International Student Union (ISU) depending on the institution, for minority populations could help retention as social support often buffers against negative psychological health for minorities (Bagci et al., 2018; DeCuir-Gunby & Gunby, 2016).

Though there are laws to protect protected groups, such as Title VII, these laws do not prevent discrimination, nor do they ensure employee compliance. These laws simply act as a method to restore justice to those discriminated against and enforce nondiscriminatory policies in organizations that allowed the discrimination to happen (Gutman et al., 2010). Therefore, it is incumbent of the organization to do better for its minority population. Establishing clear policies and procedures on how to report discrimination, being transparent in this process, allowing anonymous reporting to prevent retaliation, these are just some things that organizations should do to support its

minority employees. Lastly, though it may be redundant as academia is the supposed

pinnacle of knowledge, educating those within academia about the discrimination

minorities face is imperative, as there are too many who do not know or do not

acknowledge the differences in reality of others' experiences.

Conclusion

This study was able to collect and analyze data from Twitter to better ascertain the

ethnic and racial minority experience within academia. Overall, the study suggests

promising results for future research utilizing social media. While this study was created

in the hopes to give voice to the rise in racial awakening as more and more Black, Brown,

and other people of color have told their stories within the past year, it cannot describe

the trauma and hurt that was caused. Racism exists and though discrimination is not as

overt as it once was, its new form, subtle discrimination, penetrates the subconscious of

society. It exists within the workplace and it exists within academia. There can only be a

call to be cognizant of this fact and a call for change to happen.

References

Abid, G., Khan, B., Rafiq, Z., & Ahmed, A. (2015). Workplace incivility: Uncivil activities, antecedents, consequences, and level of incivility. *Science International, 27*(6), 6307-6312.

Aharoni-Goldenberg, S., Tziner, A., & Barnett, D. (2019). Repercussions of incivility and hostile expressions in academia: A legal perspective. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *12*, 385-390.

Aronson, J., & Inzlicht, M. (2004). The ups and downs of attributional ambiguity. *Psychological Science (0956-7976)*, *15*(12), 829–836.

Bagci, S. C., Turnuklu, A., & Bekmezci, E. (2018). The buffering role of in-group identification and intergroup contact on the association between perceived discrimination and mental health. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *28*(5), 293–305. https://doi-org.libsrv.wku.edu/10.1002/casp.2357

Bergman, M. E. (2019). Civility, anti-racism, and inclusion. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *12*(4), 412-418.

Brough, P., Muller, W., & Westman, M. (2018). Work, stress, and relationships: The crossover process model. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *70*(4), 341–349. https://doi-org.libsrv.wku.edu/10.1111/ajpy.12208

Brunsma, D. L., Embrick, D. G., & Shin, J. H. (2017). Graduate students of color: Race, racism, and mentoring in the white waters of academia. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, *3*(1), 1-13.

Capasso, R., Zurlo, M. C., & Smith, A. P. (2018). Ethnicity, work-related stress and subjective reports of health by migrant workers: A multi-dimensional

model. *Ethnicity & Health*, *23*(2), 174–193. https://doi-

org.libsrv.wku.edu/10.1080/13557858.2016.1258041

Clement, J. (2020, September 25). Most popular social media apps in the U.S. 2019, by

audience. Statistica. https://www.statista.com/statistics/248074/most-popular-us-

social-networking-apps-ranked-by-audience/

Cortina, L. M., Cortina, M. G., & Cortina, J. M. (2019). Regulating rude: Tensions

between free speech and civility in academic employment. *Industrial and

Organizational Psychology*, *12*(4), 357-375.

Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Leskinen, E. A., Huerta, M., & Magley, V. J. (2013).

Selective incivility as modern discrimination in organizations: Evidence and

impact. *Journal of Management*, *39*(6), 1579–

1605. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311418835

Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the

workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,

6*(1), 64–80. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.6.1.64

DeCuir-Gunby, J. T., & Gunby, N. W. (2016). Racial microaggressions in the workplace:

A critical race analysis of the experiences of African American educators. *Urban

Education*, *51*(4), 390–414. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916628610

Dhanani, L. Y., Beus, J. M., & Joseph, D. L. (2018). Workplace discrimination: A meta-

analytic extension, critique, and future research agenda. *Personnel

Psychology*, *71*(2), 147–179. https://doi-org.libsrv.wku.edu/10.1111/peps.12254

Enright, M. (2020). UConn Professor's Hashtag Goes Viral In Fight Against Racism. *UCONN Today.* Retrieved from https://today.uconn.edu/2020/06/uconn-professors-hashtag-goes-viral-fight-racism/

Erlingsson, C., & Brysiewicz, P. (2017). A hands-on guide to doing content analysis. *African Journal of Emergency Medicine*, *7*(3), 93-99.

Estes, B., & Wang, J. (2008). Integrative literature review: Workplace incivility: Impacts on individual and organizational performance. *Human Resource Development Review*, *7*(2), 218–240. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484308315565

Falcone, P. (2020). Viewpoint: Make this checklist your DE&I launching point. SHRM. Retrieved from https://www.shrm.org/ResourcesAndTools/hr-topics/behavioral-competencies/global-and-cultural-effectiveness/Pages/Viewpoint-Make-This-Checklist-Your-DEI-Launching-Point.aspx

Gillborn, D. (2015). Intersectionality, critical race theory, and the primacy of racism: Race, class, gender, and disability in education. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *21*(3), 277-287.

Gutman, A., Koppes, L. & Vondanovich, S. (2010). *EEO Law and Personnel Practices (3rd Edition)*. New York, NY: Psychology Press/Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Hatipoglu, B., & Inelmen, K. (2018). Demographic diversity in the workplace and its impact on employee voice: The role of trust in the employer. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 29*(5), 970-994.

Holder, A., Jackson, M. A., & Ponterotto, J. G. (2015). Racial microaggression

    experiences and coping strategies of Black women in corporate

    leadership. *Qualitative Psychology*, *2*(2), 164.

Hormuth, S. E. (1986). *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *16*(2), 181–192.

Howard, T. C., & Navarro, O. (2016). Critical race theory 20 years later: Where do we go

    from here?. *Urban Education*, *51*(3), 253-273.

Hoyt, C. L., Aguilar, L., Kaiser, C. R., Blascovich, J., & Lee, K. (2007). The self-

    protective and undermining effects of attributional ambiguity. *Journal of*

    Experimental Social Psychology, *43*(6), 884-893.

Iqbal, M. (2020, July 30). Twitter Revenue and Usage Statistics (2020). Business of

    Apps. https://www.businessofapps.com/data/twitter-statistics/#1

Johnson-Bailey, J. (2015). Academic incivility and bullying as a gendered and racialized

    phenomena. *Adult Learning*, *26*(1), 42-47.

Jones, K. P., Arena, D. F., Nittrouer, C. L., Alonso, N. M., & Lindsey, A. P. (2017).

    Subtle discrimination in the workplace: A vicious cycle. *Industrial and*

    Organizational Psychology, *10*(1), 51-76.

Jones, K. P., Peddie, C. I., Gilrane, V. L., King, E. B., & Gray, A. L. (2016). Not so

    subtle: A meta-analytic investigation of the correlates of subtle and overt

    discrimination. *Journal of management*, *42*(6), 1588-1613.

Kabat-Farr, D. & Cortina, L. M. (2012). Selective incivility: Gender, race, and the

    discriminatory workplace. In S. Fox & T. R. Lituchy (Eds.). Gender and the

    dysfunctional workplace. (pp. 107-119). Monograph Book.

LaSala, K. B., Wilson, V., & Sprunk, E. (2016). Nursing academic administrators' lived

experiences with incivility and bullying from faculty: consequences and outcomes

demanding action. *Nurse educator*, *41*(3), 120-124.

Louis, D. A., Rawls, G. J., Jackson-Smith, D., Chambers, G. A., Phillips, L. L., & Louis,

S. L. (2016). Listening to our voices: Experiences of Black faculty at

predominantly White research universities with microaggression. *Journal of*

Black Studies, *47*(5), 454-474.

Marchiondo, L. A., Cortina, L. M., & Kabat, F. D. (2018). Attributions and appraisals of

workplace incivility: Finding light on the dark side? *Applied Psychology: An*

International Review, *67*(3), 369–400. https://doi-

org.libsrv.wku.edu/10.1111/apps.12127

Muliira, J. K., Natarajan, J., & Van Der Colff, J. (2017). Nursing faculty academic

incivility: perceptions of nursing students and faculty. *BMC medical*

education, *17*(1), 253.

O'Dea, B., Wan, S., Batterham, P.J., Calear, A.L., Paris, C., & Christensen, H. (2015).

Detecting suicidality on Twitter. *Internet Interventions, 2*(2), 183-188.

Patton, T. O. (2004). Reflections of a Black woman professor: Racism and sexism in

academia. *Howard Journal of Communications*, *15*(3), 185-200.

Podolefsku, A. & McCarty, C. (1983). Topical sorting: A technique for computer assisted

qualitative data analysis. *American Anthropologist. 85*(4). 886-890.

Pitcan, M., Park-Taylor, J. and Hayslett, J. (2018), Black men and racial

microaggressions at work. *The Career Development Quarterly, 66*: 300-314.

Sabharwal, M., Levine, H., & D'Agostino, M. (2018). A conceptual content analysis of
75 years of diversity research in public administration. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *38*(2), 248-267.

Schilpzand, P., de Pater, I.E., & Erez, A. (2016). Workplace incivility: A review of the
literature and agenda for future research. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37, S57-S88.

Sim, J. & Wright, C. C. (2005). The kappa statistic in reliability studies: Use,
interpretation, and sample size requirements. *Physical Therapy, 85*(3), 257–268.

Sue, D. W., Lin, A. I., & Rivera, D. P. (2009). Racial microaggressions in the workplace:
Manifestation and impact.

Tinline, G., & Cooper, C. (2019). Work-related stress: The solution is management not
mindfulness. *Organizational Dynamics*, *48*(3), 93–97. https://doi-org.libsrv.wku.edu/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2019.03.004

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (2021a). *Charge statistics (charges
filed with EEOC) FY 1997 through FY 2020*. Retrieved from https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/enforcement/charges.cfm

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission F(2021b). *Race/Color discrimination.*
Retrieved from https://www.eeoc.gov/racecolor-discrimination

Vahle-Hinz, T., Baethge, A., & Van Dick, R. (2019). Beyond one work day? A daily
diary study on causal and reverse effects between experienced workplace incivility and behaving rude towards others. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 28(2), 272-285.

Van Laer, K., & Janssens, M. 2011. Ethnic minority professionals' experiences with subtle discrimination in the workplace. *Human Relations*, 64: 1203-1227.

Viera, A. J., & Garrett, J. M. (2005). Understanding interobserver agreement: The kappa statistic. *Fam med*, *37*(5), 360-363.

Walsh, B. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Matthews, R. A., & Schulte, B. D. (2019). Can we select for respect in academe?. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *12*(4), 405-407.

Watkins, M.W. & Pacheco, M. (2001). Interobserver agreement in behavioral research: importance and calculation. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 10*(4), 205-212.

Welbourne, J. L., Gangadharan, A., & Sariol, A. M. (2015). Ethnicity and cultural values as predictors of the occurrence and impact of experienced workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 20*(2), 205–217. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038277

Wojcik, S. & Hughes, A. (2019, April 24). *Sizing up Twitter users*. Pew Research Center Internet & Technology. Retreived from https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2019/04/24/sizing-up-twitter-users/

Williams, M. T. (2019). Adverse racial climates in academia: Conceptualization, interventions, and call to action. *New ideas in Psychology*, *55*, 58-67.

Zurbrügg, L., & Miner, K. N. (2016). Gender, sexual orientation, and workplace incivility: Who is most targeted and who is most harmed? *Frontiers in psychology*, *7*, 565.

Tables

Table 1

Coding Categories.

Categories	Definition	Example
Microaggression	Everyday exchanges, in the form of seemingly innocuous comments and subtle or dismissive gestures and tones that send denigrating messages to people because they belong to a minority group (Williams, 2019).	Overlooking a person's opinion in a group discussion because of the person's race.
Microassault	Explicit attacks that are intended to hurt or offend someone and typically do not attempt to veil the discrimination that fueled it (DeCuir-Gunby & Gunby, 2016).	Using a racial slur.
Microinsult	Behavioral and verbal expressions that express insensitivity and rudeness towards an individual's heritage and racial identity (Sue et al., 2009).	Telling a Black person they are well-spoken and articulate.
Microinvalidation	Comments entrenched in the colorblindness belief and invalidate or negate an individual's psychosocial reality of being a minority and the experiences that come with it by assuming "everyone has the same experiences" (Sue et al., 2009).	Telling an Asian person they must be a good student.
Workplace Incivility	Low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect (Anderson & Pearson, 1999).	Making demeaning or derogatory remarks about a person.

Table 2

Breakdown of Percentages for Twitter Variables

Variable	% out of total	% out of relevant
Microaggression		
Microassault	2.0507	7.5196
Microinsult	7.1617	26.4538
Microinvalidation	3.1561	11.6581
Microaggression; unspecified	5.3163	19.6375
Workplace Incivility		
Incivility	9.4097	34.7579
Other Conditions		
Sharing Information	9.5137	
Not available	0.4761	
Tweet Thread	4.1233	

Note. This data was gathered from the agreed upon tweets from coders.
13,656 tweets were the total number of extracted tweets.
3,697 tweets were identified as relevant to this study (i.e., containing instances of microaggressions and incivility within the tweet contents).

Table 3

Interrater Agreement

		Rater 2						
		N/R	MA	MINV	MINS	MUN	INCIV	Total
	N/R	4079	32	24	26	50	21	4232
Rater 1	MA	10	73	9	1	2	0	95
	MINV	6	21	118	40	3	2	190
	MINS	19	20	67	213	16	0	335
	MUN	33	82	19	180	157	9	480
	INCIV	15	52	13	7	190	46	323
	Total	4162	280	250	467	418	78	5655

Note: N/R: is not relevant, MA is microassault, MINV is microinvalidation, MINS is microinsult, MUN is microaggression unspecified, INCIV is incivility.

$\kappa = 0.606$

Table 4

Interrater Agreement on Microaggressions

	Rater 2			
		Not Microaggression	Microaggression	Total
	Not Microaggression	4161	394	4555
Rater 1	Microaggression	70	1021	1100
	Total	4240	1415	5655

$\kappa = 0.759$

Table 5

Interrater Agreement

| | | Rater 4 | | | | | | |
		N/R	MA	MINV	MINS	MUN	INCIV	Total
Rater 3	N/R	2310	9	3	19	16	0	2357
	MA	29	21	1	28	23	0	102
	MINV	98	6	6	18	19	0	147
	MINS	88	9	6	151	47	0	301
	MUN	60	4	1	7	11	0	83
	INCIV	9	0	0	1	0	0	10
	Total	2594	49	17	224	116	0	3000

Note: N/R: is not relevant, MA is microassault, MINV is microinvalidation, MINS is microinsult, MUN is microaggression unspecified, INCIV is incivility.
$\kappa = 0.463$

Table 6

Interrater Agreement on Microaggressions

| | Rater 4 | | | |
		Not Microaggression	Microaggression	Total
	Not Microaggression	2319	48	2367
	Microaggression	275	358	633
Rater 3	Total	2594	406	3000

$\kappa = 0.638$

Table 7

Interrater Agreement

		Rater 5						
		N/R	MA	MINV	MINS	MUN	INCIV	Total
	N/R	1476	3	2	15	7	1	1504
Rater 3	MA	22	16	0	6	7	0	51
	MINV	72	3	21	12	22	0	130
	MINS	63	11	5	123	40	0	242
	MUN	51	1	2	1	13	0	68
	INCIV	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
	Total	1689	34	30	157	89	1	2000

Note: N/R: is not relevant, MA is microassault, MINV is microinvalidation, MINS is microinsult, MUN is microaggression unspecified, INCIV is incivility.
$\kappa = 0.502$

Table 8

Interrater Agreement on Microaggressions

	Rater 5			
		Not Microaggression	Microaggression	Total
	Not Microaggression	1482	27	1509
	Microaggression	208	283	491
Rater 3	Total	1690	310	2000

$\kappa = 0.638$

Table 9

Interrater Agreement

		Rater 5						
		N/R	MA	MINV	MINS	MUN	INCIV	Total
	N/R	2439	11	16	36	67	2	2571
Rater 4	MA	23	31	1	7	1	0	63
	MINV	9	4	5	10	8	0	36
	MINS	27	13	1	136	28	1	206
	MUN	38	8	8	16	52	2	124
	INCIV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	2536	67	31	205	156	5	3000

Note: N/R: is not relevant, MA is microassault, MINV is microinvalidation, MINS is microinsult, MUN is microaggression unspecified, INCIV is incivility.

$\kappa = 0.581$

Table 10

Interrater Agreement on Microaggressions

	Rater 5			
		Not Microaggression	Microaggression	Total
	Not Microaggression	2441	130	2571
	Microaggression	100	329	429
Rater 4	Total	2541	459	3000

$\kappa = 0.696$

APPENDIX A

Microaggressions and Workplace Incivility Codebook

Variable	
Subtle Discrimination Interpersonal discrimination that is enacted unconsciously or unintentionally and that is entrenched in common everyday interactions, taking the shape of harassment, joke, incivility, avoidance, and other types of disrespectful treatment (Van Laer & Janssens, 2011).	
Variables Measuring Subtle Discrimination	
Microaggression Everyday exchanges, in the form of seemingly innocuous comments and subtle or dismissive gestures and tones that send denigrating messages to people because they belong to a minority group (Williams, 2019).	**Workplace Incivility** Low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect (Anderson & Pearson, 1999).

Microassaults Explicit attacks that are intended to hurt or offend someone and typically do not attempt to veil the discrimination that fueled it (e.g., using a racial slur; DeCuir-Gunby & Gunby, 2016).	**Microinsults** Behavioral and verbal expressions that express insensitivity and rudeness towards an individual's heritage and racial identity (e.g., telling a Black person they are well-spoken and articulate; Sue et al., 2009).	**Microinvalidations** Comments entrenched in the colorblindness belief and invalidate or negate an individual's psychosocial reality of being a minority and the experiences that come with it by assuming "everyone has the same experiences" (e.g., telling an Asian person they must be a good student; Sue et al., 2009).

In order to enhance the construct validity of the coding scheme, the following examples were developed from each construct derived from preestablished measurement scales.

Workplace Incivility	
REFERENCE: Cortina, L.M., Magley, V.J., Williams, J.H., & Langhout, R.D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6(1), 64-80.	
*Examples of behaviors and actions that are indicative of incivility were drawn from items on the above scale	
Examples	Text mentions colleagues/students/supervisors behaving in a condescending manner or putting down focal individual
	Text refers to colleagues/students/supervisors paying little attention to focal individual or showing little interest in their opinion
	Text refers to colleagues/students/supervisors making demeaning or derogatory remarks to focal individual
	Text refers to colleague/students/supervisor addressing focal individual in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately
	Text refers to colleagues/students/supervisors ignoring or excluding focal individual from professional camaraderie
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor doubting judgment of focal individual on matters that they are knowledgeable on

Microaggressions	
REFERENCE: Nadal, K.L. (2011). The racial and ethnic microaggressions scale (REMS): Construction, reliability, and validity. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 58 (4) 470-480.**	
**Examples of behaviors and actions that are indicative of microaggressions were drawn from items on the above scale	
Examples	Text refers to colleague/student/supervisor behaving in unfriendly and unwelcoming ways because of focal individuals' race
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor overlooking focal individual's opinion was overlooked in a group discussion because of their race.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor ignoring focal individual at school or at work because of their race.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor addressing focal individual in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor assuming that focal individual's work would be inferior to people of other racial groups.

	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor treating focal individual differently than White co-workers.

Microinvalidations

REFERENCE: Nadal, K.L. (2011). The racial and ethnic microaggressions scale (REMS): Construction, reliability, and validity. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 58 (4) 470-480.***

***Examples of behaviors and actions that are indicative of microinvalidations were drawn from items on the above scale

Examples	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor telling the focal individual that they "don't see color."
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor telling the focal individual that they do not see race.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor telling the focal individual that people should not think about race anymore.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor telling the focal individual that she or he was color-blind.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor telling the focal individual that people of color do not experience racism anymore.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor of a different racial group has stated that there is no difference between the two of us.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor telling the focal individual that they should not complain about race.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor telling the focal individual that people of all racial groups experience the same obstacles.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor telling the focal individual that they complain about race too much.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor using stereotypes about the focal individual's race (e.g. hypersexualization of black women).

Microinsults

REFERENCE: Nadal, K.L. (2011). The racial and ethnic microaggressions scale (REMS): Construction, reliability, and validity. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 58 (4) 470-480.****

****Examples of behaviors and actions were adapted from Component 1 items from the above scale to indicate microinsults

	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor assuming that the focal individual would have had a lower education because of their race.

Examples	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor assuming that the focal individual was poor because of their race.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor assuming that the focal individual would not be educated because of my race.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor acting surprised at the focal individual's scholastic or professional success because of their race.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor assuming that the focal individual would not be intelligent because of their race.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor assuming that the focal individual held a lower paying job because of their race.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor assuming that the focal individual grew up in a particular neighborhood because of their race.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor telling the focal individual that they are "articulate" after she/he assumed they wouldn't be.

Microassaults	
REFERENCE: Torres-Harding, S.R., Andrade, A.L., & Romero Diaz, C.E. (2012). The racial microaggressions scale (RMAS): A new scale to measure experiences of racial microaggressions in people of color. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*. 18(2). 153-164.[1]	
DeCuir-Gunby, J. T., & Gunby, N. W. (2016). Racial Microaggressions in the Workplace: A Critical Race Analysis of the Experiences of African American Educators. *Urban Education*, *51*(4), 390–414.[2]	
Alabi, J. (2015). Racial microaggressions in academic libraries: Results of a survey of minority and non-minority librarians. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. 41 (*1*). 47-53.[3]	
Nadal, K.L. (2011). The racial and ethnic microaggressions scale (REMS): Construction, reliability, and validity. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 58 (4) 470-480.*****	
*****Examples of behaviors and actions were adapted from Component 2 items from the above scale to indicate microassaults	
Examples	[1] Hostile or overt racial incidents such as racial name-calling
	[2] Using racial slurs or displaying a racially charged symbol such as noose.
	[3] Explicit racial derogation characterized primarily by a verbal or nonverbal attack meant to hurt the indented victim through name-calling, avoidant behavior, or purposeful discriminatory actions
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor avoiding walking near focal individual on the street because of their race.

	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor clenching her/his purse or wallet upon seeing the focal individual because of their race.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor avoiding sitting next to focal individual in a public space (e.g., restaurants, movie theaters, subways, buses) because of their race.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor avoiding eye contact with the focal individual because of their race.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor's body language showing that they were scared of the focal individual, because of their race.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor assuming that the focal individual would physically hurt them because of the focal individual's race.
	Text refers to a colleague/student/supervisor receiving substandard service in stores compared to customers of other racial groups.

Study Procedures

Workplace Incivility and Microaggression Coding Procedure

Notes: Raw data will be mined from Twitter and will need to be cleaned and properly coded (refer to Workplace Incivility and Microaggression Codebook to categorize items). The coded data will be in a separate excel file from the raw data.

All data from the study will be extracted from June 7-June 17 2020.

Study Procedure:

1. Code the contents of the tweets.

   a. Open cleaned data excel file and **save the file as your initials in front of the file name**.

   b. Add the categories within the "Microaggression Data Categorization" excel file (the E-R columns) to the cleaned data excel file to categorize data.

   c. Coding will only be focused on the content of the tweet (i.e. column C).

   d. The substantive coding of data will be divided into 5 categories: *MICROASSAULT, MICROINSULT, MICROINVALIDATION, MICROAGGRESSION: UNSPECIFIED*, and *INCIVILITY*.
      ➢ If the tweet cannot be categorized as including a microassault, microinsult, microinvalidation, unspecified microaggression, or involving an instance of workplace incivility, then mark an **X i**n the category labeled "Not Relevant".
      ➢ If the tweet can be classified as both a microaggression and incivility, mark both the microaggression and incivility with an **X**.
      ➢ If the tweet is in another language, translate the tweet via google translate and input both versions.

   e. Mark an **X** for the tweet if:
      ➢ The tweet is sharing a source of information (e.g., video, article, etc.), mark an X in the category labeled "Sharing Information".
      ➢ The tweet cannot be viewed and is seen in the cell as "Not Available", this is because the tweeter is private or the tweet has been deleted, if so, mark an X in the column labeled "Not Available".
      ➢ The tweet is a part of a thread, mark an X in the column labeled "Tweet thread".

❖ If the tweet content indicates that the tweet is a part
of a thread, open URL to read full thread and code
content of the tweet.

    f. Mark an **X** under the category to code each tweet.
- ➢   Only 1 category for Microaggression
- ➢   Tweet can be both a microaggression and incivility if it fits
both definitions.
- ➢   Highlight the row if unsure about categorization of tweet.

2. Inputting relevant information.

    a. Source of Microaggression
- ➢   Identify the perpetrator of microaggression experienced, if
stated within tweet.
  - ➢ Professor, faculty, coworker, superior, institution, student,
passerby
- ➢   If no source identifiable, Input **N/A**.

    b. Source of Incivility
- ➢   Identify the perpetrator of incivility experienced, if stated
within tweet.
  - ➢ Professor, faculty, coworker, superior, institution, student,
passerby
- ➢   If no source identifiable, Input **N/A**.

    c. Location of Incident
- ➢   Identify the location of incident experienced, if stated
within tweet.
  - ➢ State, city, university
- ➢   If no source identifiable, Input **N/A**.

    d. Resolution if any
- ➢   Identify if a resolution of incident was reached, if any, if
stated within tweet.
  - ➢ Keep to 5 word maximum.
- ➢   If no source identifiable, Input **N/A**.

    e. Academic Position of Tweeter
- ➢   Identify the position of tweeter in the context of the
discrimination experienced, if stated within tweet.

- ➢ Professor, faculty, staff, administrator, student, parent of student
- ➢   If no source identifiable, Input **N/A**.

APPENDIX C
Python Code for Twitter Data Extraction

```python
API_KEY = 'XXXX'

API_SECRET_KEY = 'XXXX'

DEV_ENVIRONMENT_LABEL = 'XXXX'

API_SCOPE = 'fullarchive'  # 'fullarchive' for full archive, '30day' for last 31 days

********************************************************************************

********

SEARCH_QUERY = '#BlackintheIvory -is:retweet'

RESULTS_PER_CALL = 500  # 100 for sandbox, 500 for paid tiers

TO_DATE = '2020-06-07 02:06' # format YYYY-MM-DD HH:MM (hour and minutes optional)

FROM_DATE = '2020-06-07'  # format YYYY-MM-DD HH:MM (hour and minutes optional)


MAX_RESULTS = 1000  # Number of Tweets you want to collect


FILENAME = 'XXXX.jsonl'  # Where the Tweets should be saved


# Script prints an update to the CLI every time it collected another X Tweets

PRINT_AFTER_X = 1000


#-------------------------- STOP -----------------------------#
```

```python
# Don't edit anything below, if you don't know what you are doing.

#--------------------------- STOP -------------------------------#


import yaml

config = dict(

    search_tweets_api=dict(

        account_type='premium',


endpoint=f"https://api.twitter.com/1.1/tweets/search/{API_SCOPE}/{DEV_ENVIRONM

ENT_LABEL}.json",

        consumer_key=API_KEY,

        consumer_secret=API_SECRET_KEY

    )
)


with open('twitter_keys.yaml', 'w') as config_file:

    yaml.dump(config, config_file, default_flow_style=False)



import json

from searchtweets import load_credentials, gen_rule_payload, ResultStream


premium_search_args = load_credentials("twitter_keys.yaml",
```

```
                yaml_key="search_tweets_api",

                env_overwrite=False)


rule = gen_rule_payload(SEARCH_QUERY,

            results_per_call=RESULTS_PER_CALL,

            from_date=FROM_DATE,

            to_date=TO_DATE

            )


rs = ResultStream(rule_payload=rule,

        max_results=MAX_RESULTS,

        **premium_search_args)


with open(FILENAME, 'a', encoding='utf-8') as f:

    n = 0

    for tweet in rs.stream():

        n += 1

        if n % PRINT_AFTER_X == 0:

            print('{0}: {1}'.format(str(n), tweet['created_at']))

        json.dump(tweet, f)

        f.write('\n')

print('done')
```