Episode 2 — Beyond the Hashtag

Sarah Kaplan: Welcome to another limited-edition series from GATE audio productions. In this four-part podcast, we're bringing to you four conversations with expert panelists from our 2018 Behavioral Approaches for Diversity conference, affectionately known as the (BAD) conference. In them, you'll hear new solutions from the behavioural sciences for making real progress on diversity and inclusion. The BAD conference was co-hosted with the Behavioural Economics in Action at Rotman research center (or BEAR) and we focused on the childhood roots of inequality, going beyond hashtags towards real change, bringing masculinity into the conversation, and how to move the needle on diversity.

GATE audio is produced by the Institute for Gender and the Economy at the University of Toronto's Rotman School of Management, or GATE as we call it, and I'm Sarah Kaplan, GATE's director. Our goal is to engage current and future leaders in rich conversations about inequalities in our society and how we might address them. And, this conference, and these conversations are part of that effort. Hundreds of people joined us at that conference and now we're super pleased to bring it to the GATE audio listening audience. As usual, if you want more information on GATE, go to gendereconomy.org. And, now on to the show.

Sonia Kang: So we're moving right along to our next panel, which is beyond the hashtag moving toward real change. We thought about this panel. Admittedly, it was a little bit reactionary. So we're thinking about all of the fads that come and go that we all see in the diversity world and really feeling a little bit frustrated about why none of those have really helped us to make long lasting change, we see little incremental change, but nothing really huge. And so the people who are on this panel up here are some of the best minds thinking about and working toward true progress. So we're very happy to have them up on stage today. So once again, I'll introduce our moderator, and our moderator will introduce the panel. So our moderator is Dr. Maydianne Andrade Andrade, Maydianne Andrade is a professor and Canada Research Chair in the Department of Biological Sciences at the University of Toronto, as well as Vice Dean Faculty Affairs and Equity, we thought that Maydianne Andrade would be a real natural to moderate this panel, because of all of the work that she's done as a champion for diversity and inclusion here at U of T. So she's worked for years, spreading the message of how bias can affect the assessment of women, people of color, other underrepresented groups in academia and leadership roles. And it's not even her research area, her real research areas like spider sex, like literally, like (in audible) and spiders. So she really believes deeply in this. So moving towards real change is something that she's enacted in her life. So I think this is she's really well suited to this panel. So thanks, Maydianne Andrade.

Maydianne Andrade: Thank you so much for joining us for this panel moving beyond the hash tag moving towards real change. We are here today to continue this conversation and to really engage you and challenge you to think seriously about how we, as individuals who understand these issues, can actually operationalize our understanding of behavioral change in the service of diversity. Now, I've been engaging people in these conversations for about the last eight years. So I did delve into the social science literature enough to act as a knowledge translator, and to try to convince people that bias is a thing. And that it can affect systematically, what our organizations look like, and how they function. So what I found is that when you talk about diversity and the need for systematic change, you often start by looking at the data, right, walking through representation data, and then talking about what we think might underlie some of the biases we see in representation. And this is under representation of women, of people of color of Indigenous people, of people with disabilities, of people from the LGBTQ communities. So and this isn't in just about every sector, right? politics, business, the academy. Everywhere we look, we see these under representations. And in most cases, when you look at data over time, you see a glacially slow change, and in some cases, stagnation, and in some cases, retrenchment, serious problem. And in fact, some of you who were around for the Anita Hill hearings may be feeling that even though we had a hashtag movement about harassment, and about violence, but we haven't actually gone all that far, because they've responses to what's going on right now. Some of them sound a lot like what we heard during the Anita Hill hearings. So the data. When you show people the data, they start out, you show them a mirror, and you say, Look at what I see. And they start out with disbelief. And gradually, as a data accumulates, that shifts into horror. And it shifts into outrage for at least a subset of the people, you're showing the data too. But that's not enough. And that's what we mean by beyond the hashtag. The outrage, the which now is often manifests as

social media storms, is manifest as the metoo movement, for example, sometimes it can cross lines and have an effect, like we've seen recently. But quite often it doesn't. And that's because it's just not enough. So being outraged is not the same as taking action. And we need to take action to work on this problem, because it will be work. And the problem is how do we move from education and outrage to actually understanding how bias works, and leveraging our vast academic understanding of how to change behaviors in a positive way to make a systemic change. And that's what this panel is about. So in this panel, we focus on the critical importance of individuals not just recognizing understanding the issues, but thinking about ways to move from recognition to developing strategies for changing individual behaviors, and to produce those systematic shifts that we know we need if we want to shift those numbers and make the data a little less oppressive. So our panelists today will challenge us to move from understanding to action. This means considering the way in which you think about yourself, and whether you can accept that initial mirror, about whether or not bias might reside in your own behavior. This means considering how education just knowing that bias exists, may not be enough to change behavior. And this means thinking about how what we know about behavior and altering behavioral patterns can actually be harnessed to move things in the direction that would lead to positive change. So I'm pleased today to be joined by our panelists. I'm actually privileged to be on the same stage with these folks. Mr. Eric Singler, Professor Katy Milkman, and Professor Dolly Chugh, who will be our first speaker today. They'll start with about a five minute address each and then we'll be taking questions and discussion from the audience. So we'll start with Professor Chugh, who earned her MBA and PhD in organizational behavior and social psychology from Harvard, worked in the business world for a number of firms such as Morgan Stanley and Merrill Lynch prior to joining New York University's Stern School of Business, where she's now an associate professor in the management and organizations department. Professor Chugh teaches about leadership management and negotiations and Stern's full time MBA program and the NYU Prison Education Program. Her research focuses on the psychology of good people, particularly unintentional forms of unethical behavior, such as unconscious bias. She's published in the top managerial and academic journals, and her work is widely cited in the academic professional in popular press. In 2014, she was named one of the top 100 most influential people in business ethics by Ethisphere Magazine. Professor Chugh's first book entitled The Person You Mean to be How Good People Fight Bias was published this month by HarperCollins. And I believe is available in the bookstore. Professor Chugh,

Dolly Chugh: Thank you very much. I want to start with a story. So a friend of mine told me this story, she took a taxi to the airport. And she ended up striking up a conversation with a taxi driver. And at the end, when he dropped her off, he said to her, I can just tell you're a good person. And when she told me the story, she was blown away by his words, she said, I can't believe how good it made me feel that a total stranger thought I was a good person. And what struck me about that is it she's not alone. Those of us who study social science of people, I study the psychology of good people. The research is pretty clear in our field that most of us do care about our moral identity, we care about feeling like a good person, and being seen as a good person, even if, like my definition of a good person may be different than your definition and the taxi drivers. Definitely we may have different definitions, but we care about this particular identity that we hold. And so what I'm interested in is what is that commitment that attachment we have to that good person identity? Is that attachment actually holding us back from being better people? Is our attachment to being a good person, scientifically impossible to meet? Because it's a very, very tight corner. in that tight corner of being a good person, it's either or either you are a sexist, or you're not. Either you are a racist, or you're not. Either you are a homophobe, or you're not et cetera. And in that tight corner, where it's a choice, you either are or you're not about an identity, we care deeply about taxi driver, total stranger. We have no choice in the way the human mind works, but to cling to the this belief that I am a good person. And so when we have all sorts of data, from our experience, and from social scientists, that point to the fact that unconscious bias exists, that much of the mental processes of our mind take place outside of our awareness. within any given moment, that was a snap, do better with right hand, snap, within any given moment, 11 million bits of information are flowing into our mind right now. And only 40 of them are being processed by you consciously 11 million outside of awareness 40 within conscious awareness that the mind will take shortcuts that's the core of bounded rationality work many of you know, and it extends itself into this work on bounded ethicality. The same mind that can be irrational in what cereal it chooses, at the grocery store, what product it launches in the boardroom. It's the same mind deciding who to hire, whose advice to trust and what joke to tell. So my proposition is that we let go of our attachment to being good people, and that we instead embrace the idea of being good ish people. Good ish, people still make mistakes, but we own them when we do. We learn from them. When we do we raise the red flag when we do we get better at noticing it ourselves and not

just being called out on it by other people. We treat issues of diversity, inclusion, ethics bias, just like we treat other areas in our lives. If we want to be better at accounting, we take a course in accounting. When we become new parents, if we become new parents, we often read a book about how to be a parent in this as well, especially in a topic that's changing as quickly in the world as technology, ethics, diversity, inclusion bias, when our knowledge base is changing that quickly, can't we approach it in the same way is something that we can get better at? That is what good ish people do.

Maydianne Andrade: Thank you so much. I'll be hearing next from Professor Katy Milkman. Professor Milkman earned her PhD from Harvard University's joint program in computer science and business and currently holds the Evans C. Thompson endowed term chair for excellence in teaching at the University of Pennsylvania, where she also co directs the behavioral change for good initiative and award winning behavioral economist and expert on behavior change. She's a professor of operations information and decisions at the Wharton School at UPenn. With a secondary appointment at the Perelman School of Medicine. Professor Milkman has won numerous publications in leading journals, and was named one of the world's top 40 Business School professors under 40. By poets and quants, Professor Milkman has advised the Department of Defense, Google and the American Red Cross and writes about behavioral economics regularly for The Washington Post, Professor Milkman.

Katy Milkman: Thank you. I'm inspired by Dolly to start with a story though instead of giving you something as concrete as a philosophy, I'll use it to talk about some research she and I have done together and with actually led by my amazing doctoral student, Edward Chang, will you wave Edward, he should really be up here, but I have all the degrees and he'll have them soon. So the story is actually that my husband is a professor too. He's in physics where there are even fewer women and minorities than in business schools, believe it or not, and he made an observation to me a few years ago, he said, I've noticed this funny thing that physics departments do when they don't have any women or minorities. They frantically search to hire one, maybe two. And once they get one or two on their faculty rolls, they sit back, relax, breathe a sigh of relief and never think about it again. And he said, I bet that is something you could study and I said I bet it is. Actually I called Dolly. And I said let's study that and and then Edward was actually starting his PhD about a week later and I called him and I said let's study this. And Edward quickly collected a data set of the board the Boards of Directors of publicly held companies in the US. And what he did was, I think, really a neat simulation, he took all of the people sitting on boards. And he said, Let's ignore where they're sitting. Let's play musical chairs and see what the distribution should look like, how many boards should have zero women on them, 1234, and so on, if we just assigned seats at random, the people who are already on board, so we're taking the pool as given, and you get a nice normal curve. And then he said, let's look at how that compares to what actually happens. And two really astounding things jump out of this data. One, there should be some boards without any women. That's how normal distributions work. We don't really see that there's an enormous under representation of boards with zero women, no one wants to have zero women. What are they doing though, they're gaming it. So there's a huge over representation of boards with exactly two women. Two is the social norm. That's the average number of women. And you see 45% More boards with exactly two women on them and fortune 500 companies than you'd expect by chance that's whoppingly statistically significant words are aiming to hit the social norm, and then they quit. So I guess the question I'll pose is, how do we move beyond that kind of diversity? Why is it that we are so fixated on making sure we don't stand out, we don't look bad. But then when we feel comfortable, we just step back from it instead of continuing to pursue those goals. So so that's the question I'll pose.

Maydianne Andrade: That's a great way to segue, I think into our next speaker. And actually, I have to clap for that one too. And my excuses, I study spiders so I'm not from the business culture. Maybe you don't clap all the time we do. So I'm really happy to introduce Mr. Eric Singler, our third speaker, Mr. Singler holds an MBA in marketing research and marketing strategy from the Paris Institute of Political Studies. He's a managing director of BVA a market research and consultancy group, as well as a managing director of PR s invivo, which focuses on consumer goods market research. Mr. Singler is a pioneer on achieving behavioral change by utilizing behavioral economics and nudges which I did look up to make sure I knew what it was environmental changes that we can use to trigger shifts in cognition and decisions. Mr. Singler has successfully applied this technique to public policy, fortune 500 companies, NGOs and international organizations. In addition to which he was a founder of the BVA Nudge Unit, which successfully guided Emmanuel Macron presidential campaign with the application of nudge. Mr. Singler is the author of three books specializing in the application of nudge, nudge

marketing, green nudge focusing on sustainability and nudge management focused on creating a better work environment. Presently he is working with the United Nations with the He for She campaign for global gender equality. Mr. Singler.

Eric Singler: Hello, everybody, I have a very bad news for you as a bad conference. As you have already understood. I am not an English native speaker. And even if I come from the same continent as (inaudible) we could have a very different accent. So sorry for this accent, I will try to do my best to be clear. If not, don't hesitate to ask me to say Oh, I don't understand anything about what you share. But I hope I will be clear. I was two days ago at he for she meeting in New York, to share some ideas about applying behavioral economics for gender equality. Why I start with this because one year and a half ago, I have been contacted by He for She. The lady in charge of in prompt of He for She telling me oh, we have heard about something which is called nudge. And we would like to know more about this. First, I was very surprised that He for She organization knows quite nothing so they asked me to come to London with he for she impact lab group with a lot of big people maybe you know that he for she is 10 heads of state 10 President global CEO of big companies McKinsey (inaudible) so on, and then presumed a few universities. And I was again amazed to hear it that nobody knows something about behavioral science. They told me, they asked me, could you give us one advice? I told them, yes, it's very easy. I had a book, What Works. And I told them read this book, it will be a good start. Because you have the level, which is zero, if you even don't know what is behavioral science and how it could be effective to change your behavior. So my message is really about promoting behavioral science, we think we have done a lot to promote to communicate about nudge. And in a lot of countries, outside of the academic world, I am always surprised to see how few people know about it. And Sugandha how few people use really concretely this knowledge to change behavior. So my work at UBV Energinet is mainly to work with big companies, I come from a background in marketing research, or what I try to do is to steal what you do, to learn about what you do to combine this with (inaudible) in marketing, no research in creativity, technique in construction with consumer to create knowledge to change our environment in very different sector and areas. I have worked, for example, with (inaudible)I think you don't know (inaudible) longer, but he's a head of the Paris 2024 Olympics committee to nudge our candidacy. I have worked with green priests with WWF I am accompanied Emmanuel Macron, during all his campaign, we can nurture campaign, out to encourage people to donate for you how to encourage people to become a member of our march. you can work also with L'Oreal to try to say what could we do to help our employee if they see something about sexual harassment to act? We could do you know here that we can do a lot. But again, there is a big gap to me, between the academic world all what we do, and the lack of use of this to make every day a better world. So I think we have a lot to do this generation to change things to promote learning from great researcher, and to make it applied in a lot of sectors for a better world, especially in gender equality.

Maydianne Andrade: Thank you so much. There's a lot to think about across the board. And maybe should we actually start unusually with with Katy's question, do you want to repeat your question, Katy? And then we'll open it up for quite other questions.

Katy Milkman: So let's be using sorry, it feels so natural to be up here, just having a conversation. So my question is, how do we move beyond a focus on diversity that's really about keeping up with the Joneses just sort of checking the box, making sure that we won't stand out from our peers as looking particularly inept to actually investing in diversity and caring about it for its own sake and trying to achieve as much as we can to be better organizations. So how do we get there? Would someone like to take that one first and then we'll open it up?

Eric Singler: Okay. Well, I can share is what we try to do for example, for He to She to change behavior, very small idea but I like small ideas with big effect is for example, could we if you are an organization or if you are university, each time you have a new student or each time you have a new employee per default, suggesting them to become He for She member in this case, The objective maybe you know for He to She is to reach 1 billion men supporting gender equality and first step could be having this men with us and so gone to motivate them to help them to take action. And I think the onboarding process in a university or in a company, it would be very easy to add something per default to suggest Okay, we are He for She champions. We are proud of this, maybe with a 30 second video because we are emotional, a 30 second video by your great messenger, for example, your CEO, mentioning okay, maybe you could become like me like our company He for She ambassador and per default, I am quite sure you need a verse For example, a company which is He for She

champion, which is supposed to be because even if Paul Polman, the CEO is telling every day we are He for She only 1% of Unilever employees, men are He for She members, because there is a lack of salience. So small ideas like during the onboarding process, good. We suggest per default, if you want. So I like very much all these type of small things which could change behavior. Paul, in this case, gender equality.

Katy Milkman: Thank you, Professor Chugh.

Dolly Chugh: Absolutely. So one of the one of the ideas I talked about in my book is something I'm calling ordinary privilege. And I think Jeevan earlier today talked about the discomfort with the word privilege. And some people feel what I mean by ordinary privilege is if you think about that part of your identity that you have to think least about. So for example, I'm straight. I go months, without thinking about the fact that I'm straight like it. I just don't have to think and people say what do you do this weekend? I tell my husband, bla bla bla the kids and bla bla bla. And I have pictures and I put them up on Facebook. And I don't worry about who's going to see them and what their what their sort of homophobia is going to be in reaction to my pictures. I can go through my life knowing that the headwinds and tailwinds that we heard about earlier to use Debbie Irving's metaphor. I know that the world has tailwinds that support my straight identity. The world that I try I travel in that part of my identity where I have tail winds that I have to think least about it is also where I most likely have blind spots. I don't feel the tail winds, right? Because when you know when I go running, occasionally, I go running very slowly. He would speed walk past me but but but every now and then if I have a good tailwind, I think I'm kind of rocking out there. And like those eggs, they really got me going this morning. And then when you like make the loop to come back home, the U turn and now the wind is in your face, you feel what you didn't feel in the other direction. So your ordinary privilege part of your identity that you think least about where you have the tail winds is where someone else has headwinds, and you're least likely to see it, it is your blind spot. It also the what research shows from David Hackman Stephanie Johnson and many others is that in those areas, the identity you have to think least about your ordinary privilege is also where you have surprising influence. If somebody tells a racist joke, and a black person speaks up versus a white person speaking up, the black person is not viewed as having as legitimate a right to speak up, they're being entitled they're being whiny, as opposed to the white person. In a career context. If a manager hires if a white manager hires a white person, they take no hit for that if a white person hires a black person, they take no hit for it, the black person hires a black person, they take a hit for it. And we can extrapolate this to different groups and different social categories. So ordinary privileged part of my identity, I think least about where I most likely have blind spots, because I only feel to tailwinds. And not the headwinds is also where I have surprising influence. This is where I can do more, if I choose to notice those blind spots. So I think what we can each do is whatever the part of our identity is, and we heard some great, great examples this morning, it could be that you are a native speaker of the language spoken in your environment, it could be that you're straight in an environment where that is the norm. It could be that you are physically able to do things that someone else might not be able to do whatever the part of your identity is that you think least about, in my case, I can list off like a dozen things off the top of my head that I never have to think about. Those are the places where I most likely can have influence.

Maydianne Andrade: So this is interesting a combination of involved ally ship conscious ally ship, and then institutionalization of that ally ship in the form of the onboarding procedures that make it clear that that is acceptable and even expected. So this is from the personal to the professional. And maybe these are some of the avenues. I don't, Katy, if you wanted to comment,

Katy Milkman: Right, solve my own problem. Well, we're trying so I'm going to point at Edward again until he turns red and runs out runs away. But we had, we had one attempt that I'll say was a partial success was a little bit of a failure, but a partial success, we convinced a big international organization to let us run a 3000 person field experiment with an intervention that we hoped might improve behaviors towards women and minorities. It was a an unconscious bias training, but also it talked about conscious bias and stereotypes and women don't ask and all the best social science research that might make someone think differently about how they treat members of underrepresented groups in their organization. And we were able to measure both attitudes after the training, and also a number of behaviors up to three or four months post intervention, including who you volunteer, who you invite to a mentoring lunch, who you nominate for awards for excellence and how you behave. When you receive an audit experiment email asking you to spend time with women in the organization. What we found was a little bit

of good news and a little bit of bad news. So the training did change attitudes robustly, and particularly the attitudes of groups that in the absence of intervention showed the least support for women and minorities. So that's good news. Here's the bad news. It didn't move behavior very much. And when it did, it was actually only for the groups who you would have already expected to be aligned. So women change their behavior a little bit and minorities changed their behavior a little bit. And largely, it caused them to lean in, if you will. So women actually started seeking out more mentoring from other women, when they participated in the training, the same thing happened when we looked at minorities, so it seemed to alert people that they needed to seek help. And by the way, I think that's actually a great outcome. It wasn't what we were aiming for. We were aiming more for debiasing. And instead, what we got was making people more proactive. But that was our best attempt, I think we have to keep working trying to get organizations as you mentioned, it's really hard to convince the lawyers to let you to collect, let you collect this kind of data do these kinds of randomized controlled trials, we've fought for a month with the lawyers over changing what, two paragraphs when we're sending this to a journal. So as many organizations as we'll open the doors, it's going to give us an opportunity to do more of this kind of work so that we can figure out what really moves the needle.

Maydianne Andrade: Thank you. I think we should open it up to questions or comments from any of you, then, oh, it's gonna pop up on the screen entirely. Okay. So that means that we can talk some more. Okay. Can I Can I just say that one of the things that we found helpful, so I do new Academic Director training, I also do onboarding, basically new faculty orientation, and particularly for the academic administrators, and this is something that would that would factor into just about every sector, concrete, what they call potentially bias, interrupter, mindsets, tools and phrases have found to be we found that to be incredibly helpful. Chairs had the will to change things after seeing the data. And after thinking about how bias could trickle into, for example, hiring decisions or assessment of yearly merit increases. They didn't have the tools in the context of a discussion with often senior faculty who have a lot of gravitas in their department, how to redirect the conversation without calling out racism, sexism, homophobia. And so we actually started to use some of those tools that are available online, from again, this excellent social science research about how you redirect conversations. And I know I'm in a management school where there's entire schools of thought of that. But the thing is, there's so many people who don't study that. And again, the idea that there are really good data on how we could do this, but we need to distill it into useful packages that we can then distribute to administrators of goodwill, who we've shown the data and who are convinced there's an issue and want to change it, because in the heat of the moment, if they haven't modeled it, if they haven't read it, if they haven't maybe done a workshop on it, where they actually thought about what to say. They are going to be caught flat footed, and the process will continue as it always has. So that would be my suggestion. Oh, Well, I don't know if anyone else has had that experience of actually, I think Eric has from his description of actually talking about this in terms of toolkits, ah, that you make it easy for people who actually are convinced and want to do something.

Eric Singler: Yes, thank you for your observation. In your question, It is a mantra of Richard Taylor, if you want to change behavior, make it easy. So you could create psychological environment or a physical environment which facilitate and encourages the new design behavior you want people to adopt. And there is a big limitation to nudge but to me, which is also a big strengths. If you don't have the intent to adopt the new behavior, you will be not successful to encourage people to adopt this new behavior. So education is really about creating the intention to adopt the behavior. And with nudge and behavioral economics, you could create a choice architecture, which facilitates to on salience with a lot of mechanism, you know, by hurt to change behavior, and it is feasible. It is what we observe, we have created for the first time the nurture building in Paris, with Annie Dalgo, which is about how we could encourage people to adopt eco friendly behavior. Oh, we could create some friendliness within a building we are (inaudible) out to big company for it's headquarters to create an office space, which encourage cooperation innovation, I think we can work on a lot of different areas with behavioral science in mind.

Dolly Chugh: I was so captivated by what you were talking about with the bias interrupters that I sort of missed the question, but I do understand now. And I think so it's so interesting in what May Deanna described, it gives us a sense of what to do. And the tool, one of the tools that I have gotten a lot of value out of using, I didn't invent this tool, but I'd love to share it with you is when to do those things. And it's something called the 2060 20 rule. Susan Nunzio, who's a change consultant I worked with in my pre academic years, she uses the 20 60 20 rule to think about any cultural change. And it can be like a new accounting system or a new way of, you know, building your

business 20% of your people are like onboard ready to go just stay out of their way. 20% of the people are never coming with you. They are comfortably miserable. They are not adopting the new system. 60% of the people are in the middle there, the movable middle, and they're not super engaged in the topic, they don't have strong opinions, they're not paying close attention and they're not vocal on it. What we tend to do in our change efforts is pay a lot of attention to the 20. That's vocal and resistance, and very little attention to the 60 in the middle. Now keep in mind on different issues, I might be in the 20 on one issue and the 60 on the other end, and on the other 20 on another week, we can all sort of float depending on the issue. But when it comes to issues like diversity and inclusion, interrupting bias, we are spending a lot of time on this 20. and not enough time noticing the 60 in the middle, that 60 In the middle are the ones that are most swayed by our norms, interventions. And what research also says is when people don't have deeply held views on a topic, they are most swayed by stories versus data. So the what to do, and then the when to do it is don't waste too much time on the 20 or bring in your HR folks if we're doing real harm to people, but spend a lot of time on the 60 and using stories to move them towards the other 60.

Katy Milkman: Katy, I was thinking about this and I had the most time to think it's nice to go third. No, you didn't take my time was great. It's great, because I actually had no answer whatsoever initially. But now I do. So here's what I've been thinking about. I've been thinking actually about something that Juris brought up, which is and also this is triggered by Eric's comments on how do we take nudges that work in one context and bring them to diversity. So one nudge that we know that's very effective is accountability. Feeling visible and feeling like your actions are are being scrutinized by others because we don't want to look bad and again, this comes back to the theme of the work we did on corporate boards. Nobody wanted to be the board with zero women. How can we use that as a tool to fight inequality and to promote diversity? Well, Juris you talked about in the UK now, it's required that companies report the pay gap. In my university a few years ago, the Deans instituted a new rule, which was that we had to report on the demographics of every speaker we brought to a speaker brought to Speaker Series, and all of the faculty candidates we interviewed and hired. So now we're accountable to the Dean every department chair has to send this list at the end of the year. And it's not just the names, you're literally meant to count how many of them were women? How many of them were underrepresented minorities, and how many were Caucasian men. And, of course, when this call went out at the beginning of the year, it meant everybody was scrambling to rethink, wait, did we actually think about these numbers at all, when we were inviting candidates? That year, when that new policy went into place, my department doubled the number of women we hired three women previously, we'd had three women in the whole department, and now we have six. So you know, whatever, that's an n of one. I'm an academic. But there's lots of evidence that countability interventions work. And I like my my single piece of evidence from my department as well, I think that's the kind of thing that brings this top of mind and makes it hard to hide from our mistakes.

Maydianne Andrade: Excellent. And actually, that figures quite well into our first question, or, well, one of our questions. What's, what's the line between nudging? So nudging is slightly different, but this is also an incentives or negative incentives for for better behavior, right? What's the difference between those kinds of things incentives, negative incentives, nudging and manipulation? And did people worry about that?

Eric Singler: Do you think it is a classical question? You maybe know the books from (inaudible) The Ethics of Influence. And during the last behavioral exchange conference in Sydney, the keynote from Cass was about this, talking about what are the criteria we need to respect to be nudging for good and not what they call now sludge. So, it is about transparency, it is about being true, or that the new desired behavior we want to encourage is a behavior which is good for the individual for the community on or for the planet. So to be sure of this, we have also to take care about who is in charge to decide what is a good behavior, we have also to be transparent about what we do why we do it to the Nudge. And so we who respect a certain number of rules, I think it is a difference between manipulation and nudging, but for sure, with the same understanding the same knowledge, you can nudge for good or you can nudge for bad and here there is also regulations, there is also I think responsibility from for the society to take care of this.

Maydianne Andrade: Thank you. Other responses to that?

Katy Milkman: I think one of the things that the leaders of the nudge movement have helpfully talked about is the importance of transparency, as a means of making sure that we are nudging and not manipulating. It feels much more like manipulation, when nudges are sort of stealthily inserted into our lives and with a goal of promoting a certain behavior. And there's no mention made, but when for instance, a dean very explicitly says we are trying to promote more diversity and our faculty. And one of the things we recognized is that a way to do that is to hold you accountable for the diversity of the candidates you look at for jobs and the diversity of the people you bring in for your seminar speakers. That doesn't feel like manipulation, it's pretty transparent what they're doing. So I think transparency is a big part of the answer. And, and it's hard to feel manipulated. When you know exactly what the purpose of the nudges, you still have free choice. And so that transparency, I think, really guards against this issue.

Maydianne Andrade: I might also argue that I think people have been using nudging for quite a long time. There's people who intuitively understand how to nudge we might call them our leaders, for example. There's people who intuitively understand these things and have leveraged it over time. It's just now that it's available to more people if they actually read the literature. So what are the most effective behavioral interventions that will help us move past just changing people's minds?

Eric Singler: Anyone I think know from BIT for example, there are so many interventions we know are very effective. I think it is important each time not to apply systematically the same idea but to understand the context to understand why people are not in the desired behavior and based on this activate some driver of influence we know from science are powerful with specific ideas and default options, once again from (inaudible) is a gold medal of the effectiveness of what we can do. When we have changed on the Emmanuel Macron website during the campaign, just the way we asked we request people to become a member we change one sentence saying, Okay, it's in 3 minutes it, it is free and it is simple. From one day to the other day, plus 55% of transformation rate among visitors to member just because rather than reading a long text explaining why you should become a member of Amash, very short sentence, an image with Emmanuel Macron, like this, and yes, super of themand according to simple, three minutes, and it's free. So easiness is something for me, which is very effective

Dolly Chugh: This just builds on what Eric said. But changing defaults is an incredibly powerful intervention. So simply changing, you know, if in the case of Katie's department and their their speaker series, if the default was we're going to only invite women and minorities and I recognize that's fraught with all sorts of problems, that statement, but imagine if they said that unless there's a compelling reason to invite someone else, versus there's an unspoken default, nobody's intending it, but that the speakers are going to be white male, because they're the ones that come for this to mind quickest to mind. They're the ones that are most associated with brilliance. According to the studies, we know that that equate men and brilliance. They're the ones that are cited the most, they're the ones that are more tenured the most, and therefore, they are going to be the ones that are most salient in our mind. So changing the default is a powerful intervention. And then we've heard a lot of compelling evidence today about the power of changing norms. It is not easy to change norms, but it is easier to change norms than it is to change minds. And a surprisingly, it's amazing. If you picture you know, the wedding where the band starts playing, and nobody goes on the dance floor until one person goes on the dance floor, and then everybody's on the dance floor. It just took that one person to like bogey out there and kind of get laughed out a little bit, that that first mover effect of norm changing is really important. Simply having the first is is powerful.

Katy Milkman: I would go, you know, I think era's spoke about some of the most powerful strategies, I would go with blind evaluation as an incredibly powerful when the orchestra evidence, of course, I was dismayed by your results eras of the study where you show that even with the blind evaluation of an algorithm, a person still makes a bias judgment. But that even speaks more strongly in some sense for the truly blind evaluation, right? You, you never unblind that the algorithm maybe is even the one that's making the judgment and the human isn't allowed to tweak it more than a tiny bit. There's some research by colleagues of mine, Berkeley (inaudible), who was a PhD student at Wharton and is now a professor at Chicago Booth, Kate Massey, and Joe Simmons on people's aversion to using algorithms for judgment, which is a challenge if you wanted to do something like blind evaluation or evaluation by algorithm, but one of the things they found is if you let people tweak the judgement of the algorithm, even a tiny bit, just fractionally, all of a sudden the algorithm is palatable. So whether you let them adjust an algorithm that's giving you a forecast of this person's performance, 10% 5% or 2%, any of those

amounts, still, all of a sudden people adopt an algorithm. And so if we maybe just let people tweak it only a tiny bit, not enough to induce too much bias, maybe we could combine your algorithmic scoring of code quality with humans and make it palatable and unbiased.

Dolly Chugh: And one thing to that and I had sort of been so sold by the research that Katie's described and the algorithms and you know, we were letting such an opportunity go by not being more receptive to algorithms. And then I read a book called weapons of MATH destructions by Cathy O'Neil, in which case, she has a PhD, I think in math and has been, like the chief quant person at hedge funds. And then she moved over to support social justice movements. And so what she did was analyze the algorithms, the key algorithms that drive a lot of key sectors, everything from hiring, to admissions, to mortgage applications, to education to teacher assessment, so she each chapter is like a different domain. And let's say there's eight chapters. And in every single chapter in domain, she shows how the algorithm which was written by human beings, who are biased, however, consciously or unconsciously, and how those assumptions that are built into the algorithm are actually creating bias algorithmic outcomes. So while the algorithms may be a resource for us, we cannot trust them to be bias free without being super vigilant about what assumptions fed them.

Maydianne Andrade: And of course, the story on that one is there's several years ago where AI is wouldn't recognize this is a female face.

Dolly Chugh: That's right, right. That's right. We're when I go to wash my hands it never that thing never drawn from my hands. I like to dance. It does not recognize me on the motion detector.

Maydianne Andrade: To Dolly's point about using your ordinary privilege? How does this apply to addressing workplace harassment issues? Sexual harassment and workplace bullying? Who has that privilege? And who can use it? And how do you use it? That's a huge question for our last three minutes.

Dolly Chugh: I mean, I hate to point fingers at the men that they could help. It really would help to hear more men talking about this issue. I mean, it's I think, as women, every text, every email, every social media feed I have right now is somehow tied to this issue. That's not true with every man in my life.

Maydianne Andrade: You know, we won't put you on the spot. I would say also as a leader, being open to the conversations even when the person doesn't want to report. I've found repeatedly that women have come into my office and just felt relieved to unburden themselves of this information, and to be told that it wasn't their fault. It's all sounds trivial and hackneyed. And it's just like a textbook. But in fact, it does help people to hear the words from someone who's made it through some of those situations that, in fact, it is not your fault. In fact, if I can help, I will, in fact, you can always come and talk to me about it if you need to. And I will try to help you get out of those situations.

Dolly Chugh: One challenge we have in American universities is we are obligated to report it once they tell us. I don't know if that's true here

Maydianne Andrade: At U of T we have a distinction between disclosure and reporting. So unless there's a risk of imminent violence, so I'm talking about not violence, but harassment or bullying it unless there's a risk of violence or risk or to individuals who are under age say, we can take a disclosure and give them the options for reporting, but they don't have to report and we don't have to report

Dolly Chugh: I'm going to check the nuance on ours. Thank you.

Maydianne Andrade: I think we're nearing the end of our time. And I just wanted to say thank you so much. I feel really do feel privileged to be on this stage with you and your work is so important. So thank you very much.

Sarah Kaplan: Thanks for listening to another GATE audio production podcast. To continue these conversations, GATE will collaborate with Rotman's TD Management and Data Analytics Lab to host a new conference called Gender Analytics: Possibilities or the (GA:P) conference on April 27, 2023. At the GA:P conference, you'll join

more than 25 speakers and hundreds of participants to explore how to use inclusive analytics to generate innovative products, services, and policies. We'll be talking about topics such as decolonizing data and design, inclusive product and service design, new trends in financial services, creating inclusive contracts in legal practice, and revolutionizing sports analytics. Check out thegapconference.com for more information. That's the gap conference dot com. Stay tuned for more GATE audio episodes!