

Does “Implicit Bias Training” work?

Molly Carnes, MD, MS

Virginia Valian Professor

Departments of Medicine, Psychiatry, and Industrial &
Systems Engineering

University of Wisconsin-Madison

One of few strategies proven effective in helping change *behavior* in response to stereotype-based bias

- “Motivated self-regulation” – social psychology
- “Intuitive override” – judicial reasoning
- “Forward-looking tuneability by reasons” - philosophy
- “Breaking the bias habit” – our research team

Two cluster randomized controlled studies of bias habit-breaking workshops with STEMM faculty (R01 GM088477, R35 GM122557)

Study 1: 92 STEMM departments at UW-Madison

Departments receiving a 2.5 hour workshop vs. controls:

- Greater awareness of personal bias; and motivation and self-efficacy to engage in bias-reducing activities at 3 months
- Perception of a more inclusive department climate on a faculty worklife survey 1-24 months after the workshop
- Increase from 32% to 46% women among new faculty hires and greater retention of male faculty 2-3 years after vs. 2-3 years before the intervention

Study 2: 19 departments of medicine in U.S.

Divisions receiving a 3.0 hour workshop vs. controls:

- Greater self-efficacy and action to engage in a number of bias-reducing activities at 3 months

6 elements of successful bias habit-reducing workshops delivered to an entire department/division of STEMM faculty in which participation was voluntary

1. Establish credibility of presenters
2. Appreciative inquiry-type exercise
 - “What would be the benefits of diversity and inclusion in your specific area?”
3. Implicit bias as a habit: How simply knowing cultural stereotypes can distort perceptions
 - Stoop Color Naming Task
 - Experimental study demonstrating perceptual distortion from stereotypic assumptions
4. Bias literacy
 - Introduce, label, and illustrate with studies 4-5 bias concepts
 - Apply bias concepts to case studies
5. Provide 5-6 evidence-based strategies to practice (and note strategies that do not work)
6. Written implementation intention exercise (personal if/then scenarios)

Why do we think this approach worked?

- Engaged those responsible for organizational norms
- Incorporated strategies shown to be effective in fostering sustained intentional behavioral change
- Participation was voluntary
- Enabled social diffusion by targeting the entire dept/division

2 strategies to practice to break your own bias habits

- Growth mindset: e.g., “with *hard work* I can overcome the influence of stereotypes on my judgment and decision-making” *(based on studies in Carr et al., 2012)*
- Perceiving variability: Whenever you hear someone say [members of some group] are...., respond with “some are ____, some are ____, some others are ____...”
(based on studies in Er-rafiy & Brauer, 2012)

Why focus on individual faculty rather than on policy?

- Behavioral norms can be more powerful than policy in perpetuating bias; for example
 - Equal pay for equal work has been law for almost 50 years *Equal Pay Act, 1963; Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, 1964*
 - Multiple studies affirm gender pay inequity in academic science and medicine including chairs *ACP position statement 2018; Menash et al.2020*
- For organizational culture to change, the individuals who create the culture and make policy must intentionally change their behavior *Rogers 1962; Noneka 1994; Simpson 2002*
 - Requirements by some deans to attend WISELI search committee training before release of position
 - Value added for DEI work in tenure criteria