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Purpose
To test the effectiveness of WAGES-Academic with faculty and administrators who make hiring and promotion decisions on knowledge of gender inequity; the effectiveness of case-by-case, masked, and standardized evaluations; and system accountability.

What is WAGES?
WAGES is an intervention that demonstrates how subtle, unconscious bias accumulates over one’s career and results in gender inequity.
The goal of the game is to advance across the board from postdoc to Distinguished Professor. In two teams, players individually draw cards that describe scenarios of academic life.

Method – Immediate Follow-Up
Faculty and administrators (n = 69) from three institutions:

- Played WAGES and rated on a scale of 1-7 their knowledge of gender inequity and the effectiveness of evaluation procedures for hiring (see below for all items), pre and post playing WAGES.

- Qualitatively indicated whether they would recommend the activity to others and described what they found to be most and least effective.

Results – Immediate Follow-Up
Significant increase in agreement with the following items (see graph):

- Gender Inequity: Discrepancy between women and men in career success can be explained by the cumulative effect of many small incidents of gender inequity (F(1, 63) = 5.20, p < .05, η² = .08).

- Case-by-case: Case-by-case comparisons of individual applicants are difficult to do objectively (F(1, 62) = 14.99, p < .001, η² = .20).

- Masked Evaluation: The effectiveness of masked evaluation (F(1, 59) = 26.88, p < .001, η² = .31).

No significant change in agreement with the following items:

- Standard Evaluation: Effectiveness of standardized evaluation forms (F(1, 59) = 2.74, p = .10, η² = .04).

- Accountable: Systems where people are held accountable for fairness of their decisions (F(1, 58) = 1.66, p = .20, η² = .02).

Results – Long-term Follow-Up

Influence on work and everyday life
Since participating, have you noticed issues raised by the activity occurring at work or in everyday life?
55% responded “yes” and described how WAGES:
- Led to changes in their behavior
- Led to policy change at their institutions
- Described how WAGES provided them with new insights into gender biases at play in their institutions’ policies and practices
20% responded “no”
- Some responded this was due to policies already being in place
25% left blank

Influence on decision-making
30% cited WAGES’ influence on:
- Their professional behavior
- Their examination of their own and others’ biases
45% N/A
- 35% not in a position where they make hiring decisions
- 10% did not answer
25% answered “no”
- About half stated this was because they already have policies in place for equity in hiring

Summary

- WAGES–Academic has both immediate and long-lasting effects on faculty and administrators’ knowledge of: gender inequity and the effectiveness of case-by-case and masked evaluations.
- Follow-up with participants years later provides some evidence of WAGES’ long-term effectiveness, and demonstrates the activity’s impact on belief and behavioral changes on the individual and departmental levels.
- Future directions will include: better measuring WAGES’ long-term impact, working to make the intervention more available to people, and fine tuning the intervention based on participant feedback.

Questions and Comments please email Kaitlin McCormick at ktm149@psu.edu. For more information about WAGES please go to http://wages.la.psu.edu/.