



BY MARK TONER
mark@gendermatters.com.au

We need to come to terms with unconscious bias

WOMEN – NOW There is a general but superficial view that unconscious bias training removes or reduces our unconscious biases simply because we have become aware of them.

Let's take a common situation: one female candidate and three to four male candidates being interviewed for recruitment by an organisation. Let's assume there are three interviewers, with one female amongst them, although in male-dominated businesses the interviewers will often all be male.

The interviewers will try to be fair and treat all applicants equally, but they will probably be unaware of the following biases which can affect their interviewing behaviour and subsequent decision-making about the suitability of each applicant:

- in-group bias, which causes us to be more comfortable with and favour people like us, that is, of the same gender, background, experience, interests or personality type;
- the halo effect, which causes us to allow the physical characteristics of others to affect our judgement of their other qualities, for example, physically attractive people are more trustworthy;
- anchoring bias, which causes us to rely too much on an irrelevant piece of data or belief, for instance, one of the interviewers had previously hired a woman and it turned out badly;
- minority pool bias, which causes interviewers to evaluate more negatively applicants who comprise a minority of the applicant pool;
- confirmation bias, which causes us to notice data and information that conforms with our beliefs and to disregard any that doesn't; and
- availability bias, which causes us to grab readily available data to make decisions

rather than use all available and relevant data, which will take longer to analyse.

So the single female applicant starts out with an initial disadvantage of having the minority gender amongst the applicants. When interviewed, the male interviewers may see the male applicants as members of their in-group and favour them consciously or unconsciously, and they may see the female applicant as a member of their out-group with characteristics similar to the other women in business they know, which could be negative.

The other biases listed above can further confuse their judgement of the most appropriate applicant and, of course, there are many other types of cognitive bias which could also affect the interviewers' decisions.

These factors can also be present in performance appraisals, promotions and other decisions about people. So organisations need to examine at a detailed level not just their written policies and procedures but their current practices in the hiring, performance review and promotion of staff, and provide appropriate training.

Some definitions may help:

- cognitive bias is a systematic deviation from rational thinking when we make judgements and decisions, and has different causes. There are more than 150 known types of such bias;
- unconscious (or implicit) bias is a bias that happens automatically, is not under our control and is triggered by our unconscious mind making quick judgments and assessments of people and situations, influenced by our genetic make-up, background, past and present cultural environments and personal experiences; and

- gender bias is the general name given to any type of bias that occurs in a situation involving gender.

Almost every week in the national or business media there are articles about women in business, covering issues such as a lack of women in senior positions, pay gaps between men and women, the business case for gender diversity, and discussions about bullying, harassment and career discrimination.

There are fewer articles about how these issues affect women in academia and research institutes but these issues are just as relevant to them.

Given their importance, it is critical that these issues continue to be aired publicly. However, in many of these articles the cause of all these problems is generally attributed by both women and men to unconscious gender bias.

Perhaps this occurs for two reasons. First, it is an easy way out to attribute the cause of these problems to other people's unconscious beliefs because they are not aware of such beliefs and therefore can't be held accountable for them – so nobody is to blame. Second, the men and women who believe unconscious bias is the main or sole cause of poor treatment of women do not perhaps observe the degree of conscious sexism that does occur in business.

Men who are sexist have learned to be careful about what they say in front of women (and perhaps vice versa), which means that women do not observe the amounts of sexist behaviour that does occur in business and academia. Hence many of the authors of such articles, who are mostly women, underestimate the degree of

conscious sexism prevailing in our workplace and attribute sexist behaviour solely to unconscious bias.

Unconscious bias is reflected in our prejudices and stereotypes that are deeply seated within us as a result of our genetics and socialisation. In increasingly popular 'unconscious bias training', employees take tests which indicate where their biases are, the rationale being that, once we are aware of our previously unknown biases, we can train ourselves to think differently and make less biased judgements and decisions.

So the general but superficial view is that unconscious bias training removes or reduces our unconscious biases simply because we have become aware of them.

Some large publicly listed organisations have stated in recent annual reports that they have put their staff through unconscious bias training – and that is a good start – but the real question is: what are they then doing to assist their staff to deal with their unconscious biases and how are they addressing the conscious biases that we are all subject to?

TRAINING

Certainly, training which increases our awareness of our unconscious biases is useful but is insufficient on its own to bring about greatly improved employment practices.

Most organisations which have written policies and procedures for recruitment, performance appraisal and promotion of staff believe that they manage these key processes well and that their decisions are based on 'merit', which they regard as an objective concept but is actually very subjective.

Unfortunately, current data on the number of women in middle and senior positions in industry and academia in Australia indicate that these beliefs are ill-founded and that gender bias is prevalent in many such organisations. The problem is not only due to unconscious bias, as many commentators continue to claim, but to both conscious and unconscious bias and a lack of understanding of how bias can affect our decisions about people.

Modelling of an organisation ... which initially had an equal number of men and women at the bottom level, shows that a mere one per cent bias against women in all promotion decisions produced almost twice as many men than women in the second-top level reporting to the CEO.

Unfortunately, there is little evidence that consciously realising an unconscious belief or association is sufficient to mitigate it. It may do so in some cases. Some unconscious biases can be extremely deep-seated because they are genetically inherited – for example, in-group bias. In contrast, there is some evidence that unconscious bias training can reinforce cognitive biases and prejudice.

Bringing an unconscious belief or association to the conscious level does not necessarily remove it from the unconscious mind or change it. In fact, if the unconscious belief is aligned with a conscious belief, it will reinforce the unconscious belief, so that if someone who is consciously sexist discovers he/she is unconsciously sexist as well, his/her beliefs at each level are unlikely to change and could be strengthened.

It's also possible to have conscious and unconscious beliefs remaining unaligned with each other, which will cause confusion in the mind of the person when a relevant situation arises.

So it is a complex scene and different biases need different treatments to mitigate their different causes.

Modelling of an organisation with eight levels of management from the very bottom to the very top, which initially had an equal number of men and women at the bottom level, shows that a mere one per cent bias against women in all promotion decisions

produced almost twice as many men than women in the second-top level reporting to the CEO. A one per cent bias in decision-making is undetectable in practice, but this modelling showed the significant effect that a tiny amount of bias can have when management makes decisions about its staff.


Further refinement of the algorithm should allow organisations to model their own staff numbers and calculate the average level of bias in their promotion decisions. It will be interesting to see if Australian management is interested in such an analysis of their organisations' practices.

Best practice would be for the recruitment panel to discuss their own biases before interviewing candidates, to have at hand a description of biases relevant to recruitment, their causes and their mitigation, and after the interviews, to discuss how the panel mitigated their own biases in a very transparent process.

How long will it take for business and academia to adopt such practices? ☺

Dr Mark Toner FTSE is Chair of ATSE's Gender Equity Working Group. He is a consultant with Gender Matters, which advises organisations on gender equity issues. A former CEO of the engineering and construction company Kvaerner (now Jacobs) Australia, he is a board member (and a past Chair) of Australian Science Innovations (a non-profit organisation promoting science education to secondary school students) and Chair of Calsmelt Pty Ltd (an aluminium technology start-up). He has been a company director for more than 25 years in the STEM and IT sectors.

**CONTRIBUTIONS
ARE WELCOME**
FOCUS



Opinion pieces on technology related topics, preferably between 600 and 1400 words, will be considered for publication. They must list the full name of the author, if a Fellow of the Academy. Other contributors should provide their full name, title/role and organisation (if relevant) and email address. Please address to editor@atse.org.au