

ROTARY CLUB OF HONOLULU
ZOOM MEETING MINUTES
DATE: JUNE 22, 2021
PRESIDING: PRESIDENT RICH PROCTOR

President Rich Proctor called to order the Rotary Club of Honolulu meeting at 12:00 noon.

Welcome one, welcome all to the June 22nd meeting of the Rotary Club of Honolulu. Thank you for joining us. My name is **Rich Proctor** and I am honored to be your Club President for this period of time. We have a great program today. Our guest speaker today is **Justin Levinson**, Professor of Law at the *UH Manoa, William S. Richardson School of Law*. He will discuss *Implicit Bias In Hawaii: What Does It Really Mean And Why Should We Care?* We will find out in about half an hour!

OPENING CEREMONIES

Inspiration by **Scotty Anderson**

My Fellow Rotarians:

A year ago March, the world as we knew it started to fall apart. Amid much confusion, finger pointing, and miscellaneous claims, many people, organizations, and business went into a tailspin.

We Rotarians of the *Rotary Club of Honolulu* however did not fail, did not deviate from the goals. Instead, we just figured out a path that would work.

In having to leave our Royal Hawaiian home, some of our group understandably bowed out. But the majority adjusted and doubled down to learn a new way to stay the course; that was Zoom. Many of us still are not Zoom fans but for the present it has worked for us.

All of this came with our leadership. First was the last few months of **Paul Saito's** term with his cool, levelheaded leadership. With the *Changing of the Guard* in comes the steady and unflappable **Rich Proctor**. No problem was unsolvable, and no voice had to be raised. Cool, calm, and collected. Soon we will be transferring leadership to **Gwen Yamamoto Lau**. She has paid attention and is ready to serve.

Our club, while some members have left, as they want what we all want, that is to be together for fellowship etc, and we hope they will return as we move to have in person club meetings in our near future. We must also thank the efforts of our membership chair, **Erin Auerbauch** and others who have brought in so many new members under these difficult times. We have also been fortunate to have **Brian Dunkel** to be our Zoom Champion. And then there is **Martha German** to sweep up the mess and keep us all under control.

Our club is extremely fortunate to have the right leadership at the right time.

Mahalo!

Linda Coble led the *Pledge of Allegiance* and **Al Linton** led singing of *America the Beautiful*.

Visitors: Carol Bintz (Rotarian from mainland), Dave Moss, Mark Spain, Prospective Member Maja Grajski, and Katherine Wellington.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- *Birthdays:* **Beth-Ann Kozlovich** (6/24), **Ron Tsukamaki** (6/27), **Reese Liggett** (6/28), and **Bub Wo** (6/28).
- *Anniversaries:* **Nancy Pace**, 19 years, sponsored by **Mel Kaneshige**; **Aaron Wallen**, 3 years, sponsored by **Don Anderson**.

Service Above Self update by Dawn Marie:

On behalf of your Rotary Club of Honolulu Foundation Trustees we shout out **mahalo nui loa** to the 71 members who have made their commitment to our 2021 *Service Above Self Campaign*, and a very special appreciation to those new members who have so generously given during their very first annual campaign.

With your generous gifts we are at 78% of our monetary goal of \$100,000: only \$22,000 to go! And now with more than half of our membership having committed, for an impressive average of \$1,100 each. We have done it before so we know we can do it again with your 100% involvement.

Please remember that your gift — of any amount suitable to your personal economy — has extraordinary impact on our local and global communities. To paraphrase my friend and fellow Rotarian, **Don Anderson**, “The good news is that you have promised generously; the bad news is that the money is still in your wallets.”

Your Foundation Trustees offer 3 super easy ways for you to pledge:

- Notice the link to the pledge form in the chat box to your right.
- Also find that same link in our Friday Tradewind e-news blast.
- And if you misplaced your original form mailed in April, ask Martha to post a new one your way.

When you have made your commitment, you may fulfill it now or anytime **before 30 November**.

If your personal goal is to become a *Paul Harris, John Warren* and/or *Maile Hale Fellow* you are welcome to ask **Martha** for your current level in order to get closer to your own goals.

And now **Carolann** will recognize the Club’s newest Fellows. Again, sincere gratitude for your participation!

Pledge form online: <https://forms.gle/vE1sT7CcyUxAei5QZ>

Recognition of First Time Fellows (with slides) by Carolann:

Thank you **Dawn**. In my role as President of the Foundation, I'm thrilled to recognize our Club's newest *Paul Harris, John Warren and Maile Hale Fellows*.

January 2020 was the last time we were able to honor Fellows in person. For now, our ceremony remains virtual, so on-screen applause is welcome. First, I'd like to describe the Paul Harris Fund, established by Rotary International.
(Visual: *Paul Harris Fellow* medallion)

Rotary International has one Fund:

The Rotary Foundation was established in 1917 as a nonprofit organization. It's *Paul Harris* endowment fund enables Rotarians to advance world understanding, goodwill and peace through visionary projects that advance health, education, equity, alleviate poverty, and more, like *Polio Plus*.

Those who contribute an outright or cumulative gift of \$1,000 or more become *Paul Harris Fellows* (named after the Founder of Rotary International). Some call this the *Paul Harris Fund*, but it's correctly - recognition. And multiple Fellowships are awarded with every subsequent \$1,000 contributed.

(Slide picture of **Len Rossoff**)

It's my pleasure to recognize new member **Len Rossoff** as our newest *Paul Harris Fellow*. Our deepest appreciation and congratulations go to you, **Len**. There will be a pin and certificate to come.

Our Club Foundation has three Funds, two of which have Fellows recognitions.

(Slide of the *John Warren Fellow* medallion)

The *John Warren Fund*, founded in 1977, is named for the Club president during whose tenure the Foundation came into being. *John Warren* contributions are considered unrestricted and can be used for funding current projects and on-going expenses.

An outright or cumulative gift of \$1,000 designated to the *John Warren Fund* of the Foundation is the criteria for this Fellowship.

(Slide pictures of **Scotty Anderson, Gigi Davidson and Ann Miller**)

I'd like to recognize **Scotty Anderson, Gigi Davidson and Ann Miller** as our newest *John Warren Fellows*.

Please accept our congratulations and sincere thanks, for your commitment to our common goals of community and global service.

(Slide of *Maile Hale* medallion)

The *Maile Hale Fund* is our Club's endowment fund, and contributions are permanently restricted. By policy, a portion of earnings can be used for Club projects, calculated on a conservative annual calculation, approximately \$70,000 +

15 years ago the endowment's goal was to reach a corpus of \$500,000, at which time a portion of the earnings began to be available for projects. As of May 31 the endowment value has reached more than \$2,300,000 (\$2,321,263). Your contributions to the current *Service Above Self* fundraising campaign will make this fund grow ever stronger.

This Fund is named in honor of **Maile Hale**, the daughter of Centennial Park Committee Chair and Past President **Rob Hale** and his late wife **Carol Ann**. While **Maile** died tragically in the 9/11 World Trade Center attack, her memory lives on in our Club's community service projects, which are supported by the fund that bears her name.

Individuals who donate \$1,000 or more to the *Maile Hale Fund* are recognized as *Maile Hale Fellows*.

(Slide picture of **Len Rossoff**)

It's my pleasure to recognize **Len Rossoff** for his first *Maile Hale Fellowship*. Congratulations **Len**! Your two Fellowships in one day – attest to your commitment to Rotary.

Before I step away, I'd like to acknowledge all of the Foundation Trustees, and especially **Don Anderson** and **Nancy Pace**, who will complete their terms on the Foundation Board at the end of the month. I couldn't ask for better partners during my tenure as President. Mahalo nui loa, **Don** and **Nancy**, **Hiroko**, **Joanna**, **Nancy White**, **Tracey**, **Rick**, and **Carol** for your *Service Above Self*. And to **Martha German**, our club Administrator, who supports all of our volunteer efforts.

Club members and guests, **mahalo** for your passionate engagement in Rotary, and please remember, if you haven't already pledged, that your financial contributions support our Club's local and global impact projects — changing our world for the better, every day.

Back to you, **President Rich**.

President Rich: "Thank YOU so much, **Carolann**. We should give you a big hand! You have done so much this year to make the Foundation work well, even through the audit and all the things you had to put up with or through – Oh My Goodness, **Carolann**, you are a testament of fortitude - I've got to say – and leadership as well!"

BREAKOUT ROOMS – A space to allow members to engage more personally – Question(s) of the day from **President Rich:** "What was the highlight for you this year? What stood out for you in Rotary this year? If you are a guest, what was the highlight of your year from June to June?" **Martha** sent us to our rooms!

GUEST SPEAKER INTRODUCTION by Beth-Ann Kozlovich:

Justin Levinson, Professor of Law, William S. Richardson School of Law, University of Hawaii and Manoa, is a leader in the field of implicit bias and the law and an expert in psychological decision-making in the legal system. His scholarship, which regularly employs experimental social science methodology, has appeared in the NYU Law Review, UCLA Law Review, Yale Law Journal Forum, and Duke Law

Journal, among others, and has been cited by the United States Supreme Court. Professor Levinson served as lead editor of *Implicit Racial Bias Across the Law*, a volume that was published by Cambridge University Press in 2012 (co-edited by Robert J. Smith). He has lectured, taught courses, and trained audiences globally, including in Eastern and Western Europe, East and Southeast Asia, Australia, and the Middle East. In 2008, Professor Levinson founded the Culture and Jury Project, an interdisciplinary and international research collaboration devoted to facilitating the study of human decision-making in the law. He is currently collaborating with scholars in China, Japan, and Korea, as well as domestically in the United States. He has served as Visiting Assistant Professor at Beijing University, a Visiting Scholar at Nagoya University, and as a Fellow at the Culture and Cognition Lab at UC Berkeley. He regularly teaches Criminal Law, Business Associations, and Law and Psychology, and has offered a seminar on *Implicit Bias and the Law*. Professor Levinson received his JD from University of California, Los Angeles, and his LLM from Harvard Law School. He received his undergraduate degree from University of Michigan.

Please, let's give him a warm, Rotary welcome!

GUEST SPEAKER: Justin Levinson – *Implicit Bias In Hawai'i: What Does It Really Mean And Why Should We Care?*

Thank you so much, Beth-Ann that was very kind. I'm not used to such short speaking. I think 25 minutes used to seem like a long time, and then you become a Professor and you stand up and talk for hours! (laughter) Time just flies by! So I am going to really work on conciseness today. I do have some slides because I think talking about *Implicit Bias* requires some experiential components and also grounding people in some social science basics, so I will share some slides. . . and I really want to have a chance for discuss because this group has so many experiences and you are all coming together for service and I think that the Rotarian service commitment is something that really should be considered in the context of *Implicit Bias*. I think Rotary probably has worked to combat *Implicit Bias* naturally, but also can probably do better by informing itself with understanding of *Implicit Bias*.

Justin shared as a side that in his house from the East Honolulu Rotary he has a Rotary Jug and many surf boards from 1958 when his grandfather was a member. So Rotary is in his house and he was happy to be in our meeting!

Justin began his presentation with what he calls "framing questions."

Trivia Time: "Do Hawaii resident eat more than 10 million pounds of SPAM every year (in a normal year, not COVID)? How many pounds do they eat?" Members guessed by typing into the chat box.

Anchoring Effect: If he had rephrased the questions to "Do Hawaii residents eat more than 4 million pounds of SPAM annually? How much do they eat?" He notes that the second question is identical but gives the lower number of 4 million. What researchers found is when they ask a question and frame it in a certain way, is that our minds will anchor, even on an irrelevant numbers and pulls on answers.

So essentially, looking at the chat, quite a bit of you guessed over the 10 million.

Those who guess under the 10 million may have been pulled up by it. If I had

started with 4 million pounds, the average answer probably would have been closer to 5 or 6. With 10 million, the average answer is probably somewhere around 8 or 9. The true answer is right in the middle.

So why does this work and how does it affect us? It works because our minds take shortcuts. The reason the mind takes shortcuts is because life would be really hard if we had to wake up every day with a blank slate of information and navigate the world; figuring out how things work; can I sit in this chair? Will it hold my body weight? What is this thing that is supposed to toast my bread? Why is the refrigerator cold? All of these things we just know because we do them day after day. Fortunately, I don't have to know how my espresso machine works, I just go turn it on and make a double shot of espresso. These are shortcuts that we humans have learned to navigate the world without trying to understand every little thing. Sit on the chair – you don't fall. Sitting in front of a computer on Zoom, we no longer have to think about the technology underlying this call – we just get on and we see our friends and colleagues.

The idea of the Anchoring Effect has been long documented, along with a number of other things known as *Cognitive Biases*.

- **Extremeness Aversion:** the principle where if you go to a restaurant and want to get something nice, you don't pick the most expensive item, you pick the next most expensive. Every restaurant knows that the most expensive thing on the item, almost no one orders it, but a lot of people order the next most expensive thing. So they actually construct their menus around this. That is Extremeness Aversion.
- **Endowment Effect:** this principle, whereby we believe that things we possess and we own, are worth more than they really are. Have you ever had someone offer you money for something you own, something where it is hard to know a market value like if you wanted my water bottle and you said, Justin this used water bottle is maybe worth a dollar. If you offer me a dollar for my purple, insulated water bottle, I would tell you to get lost. No way would I sell you this water bottle – it would cost you like \$12 bucks. Even though new, I could probably find it for \$13. So why? Because we have irrational automatic attachment to things we own; it makes us feel better in the world; it's automatic. This inhibits transactions in economic activity sometimes.
- **Hindsight Bias:** Once something has happened, we look back and think “that was bound to happen.”

Justin then gave a visual and auditory exercise. He used words like blue, grey, green, yellow, etc. We looked at the colored word and said aloud the word (which was colored the same). Next we did the same thing, by identifying the word, but not what it's font color. Ex: the word **blue**, may have been colored green. After that, we had to name the color of the word and not the word! So if the word **blue** was yellow, we had to say yellow!

Why was the last one harder? [this was a Stroop test] Because we have learned to automatically read language in a certain way and it has become automatic and ingrained. When I ask you to override your automatic response, it's hard. It requires

a lot of focus and attention, and many of us get tripped up. I have taken this test many times and I still mess it up! (Justin says this with a smile)

Sometimes, the cognitive shortcuts we take, called (heuristics) are helpful. They speed up our life. They make the world make sense. We don't get stuck trying to figure out how to make coffee in the morning and end up *never* leaving the house! So, shortcuts help. The problem is that sometimes the mind can get us into trouble. The Anchoring Effect, all the Cognitive Biases I mentioned, are all inefficient, can get us into trouble, and we can be manipulated by commercial enterprises, or if we are commercial enterprises, we can use them to manipulate others. The bottom line is to recognize that because the human mind is allow to do shortcuts which helps us, it also creates space where we can make mistakes.

The human mind makes errors and this is where *Implicit Biases & Stereotypes* comes in. It comes into the picture where our minds have learned things are related to the group membership. And when we learn things through our culture and our experience, we take shortcuts, and sometimes those shortcuts can get us into trouble and they can be predicted and that is what *the Ottoman Biases* is about.

So, what does *Implicit Biases* mean? *Implicit Biases* are automatic and often, non-conscious, attitudes and stereotypes we hold towards members of certain groups.

What are attitudes versus stereotypes? Attitudes are how we feel towards a group. But what's your attitude towards flowers? Well, we love flowers; we have a positive energy towards flowers. An attitude towards bugs – "UGH!" – that's attitude. Stereotypes are actually attributes. Where we attribute certain qualities or characteristics to certain people. So that's the difference between attitudes and stereotypes. *Implicit Biases* apply to both, and the vast majority of Americans hold these biases; a very high percentage!

A limited list of groupings; race, gender and disability – there's all kinds of groups memberships and stereotypes where we have to think about *Implicit Biases* and it causes inefficiency, which is connected to the cognitive area of biases. These are problems. They are incorrect errors that can lead to trouble.

Justin then gave us a real research study about how we perform when we are stereotyped. When we are a member of a stereotyped group we can perform in a manner that is consistent with those stereotypes. In this study there are two stereotypes.

The way this study works: two groups of participants are on a golf putting green, and half the participants, right before they putt are told, "putting is a measure of sport intelligence." The other half is told, "putting is a measure of athletic ability." It turns out that if your group is stereotypes as having higher levels of intelligence that you putt better when told this is a measure of sports intelligence. If you are stereotyped a member of a group that is not particularly good at sports, and you are told this is a measure of sports ability, you will actually putt worse.

In this particular study, white golfers putted better when they were told that golf was a measure of sports intelligence and worse when they were told that putting measured athletic ability, and black golfers were the opposite! They putted worse when they were told golf was a measure of sports intelligence and better when they were told it was a measure of athletic ability.

So this is about how stereotypes or about how groups can affect our performance, even when we DON'T believe the stereotypes, as long as we know it is real. We can act in ways that conform with stereotypes.

There is an old study, that I like, that was done by priming people. Study participants just read a story. Half of them read a story that had words like 'wise', 'worried', and 'bingo' embedded in the story. The purpose of that story was to make participants think of elderly people. The other half read a story that didn't have those words. Then the researchers measured something very simple – how long it took people to walk down the hall to drop off their packet of paper after completing their assignment. The words 'wise', 'worried', 'bingo' and other words that triggered stereotypes of elderly where in the paragraph, people actually walked slower. So, the human mind is very susceptible of all kinds of cues related to group membership.

This is a study done, starting in the 1990's:

When people use the word *implicit bias* it actually means something in social science. In today's world, the words *implicit bias* are thrown around a lot and I think a lot of people don't realize what it means from a social science perspective.

Slides were shown. In the slides where someone was holding a gun, we had to say "boom" as quickly as we can and when someone was holding a cellphone or non-weapon object, we had to say "no" as fast as possible. This was to test how quickly we could recognize if there was a threat or not.

This is the social science behind *implicit biases*. This is one study called the Shooter Biases Study. There are many things you can measure when you run studies like this. The first thing you can measure is response time in milliseconds if you are using appropriate software. If you measure how fast people can act you have a pretty good gauge of whether they have associations in there or not.

Graphs were shown in Reaction Time of milliseconds. Justin shared the following:

The average response time to recognize an unarmed person was between 540 and 640 milliseconds. Well, does our response time mean something? The answer is, if people are showing trends based upon the racial categorization or racial membership of the person holding the gun or the phone, and that is a result that happens over and over and over, then you've measured something really interesting.

Looking at the graph, you see that people are faster to shoot armed people than they are to hit the safety for unarmed people, which is really interesting. It is easier to recognize a threat. This might be evolutionary. We might be trained to recognize

threats immediately, but then to realize something is not a threat takes slightly more cognitive processing. Then if you zoom in and you looked at the categories for armed men, you notice that study participants (and this has been done on many thousands of people), study participants are faster to shoot armed black men than armed white men, in this simple slide version. There are virtual reality versions that have been created since, and the results are similar. For some reason, people are faster to identify weapons when black men hold them than when white men hold them. Conversely, they are faster to identify non-threatening objects, such as cell phones, when held by a white man compared to a black man.

You can measure reaction time and mistakes. There is a high error rate in this study, which is 10-11. When it is a white man, the errors are about 12%. When it is a black man, there are much fewer errors when he is armed. And unfortunately, there are about 17% errors when it is an unarmed black man.

This is how I [Justin] try and explain how *implicit bias* can be measured: milliseconds, reaction time, and errors. If this chart out over large groups of participants we have to wonder what is going on; why are we associating black men with guns and why does that affect our response, even when we are given clear rules. Shoot in this situation or don't you – why can't we do this equally across groups.

Another way to measure *implicit bias*; known as the *Implicit Association Test*. [<https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/takeatest.html>] If you are interested in taking a demonstration test, there is a website at Harvard that is called "Project Implicit" – you can take a demonstration test and get feedback. I am working in Hawaii to launch one that is Hawaii specific because a lot of their studies are national focus and don't have local stereotype measures. But for not, use the Harvard test. The study looks something like this –

It measures reaction time like the last study. The idea is the speed of how fast you can group together words and photos, is a proxy for how strongly you associate the concept. EX: at top of screen there are positive and negative words. Negative and positive words and pictures are shown and you sort them into the negative or positive category. This is done 20 times. After practicing, then the participants reactions and choices are measured. This is done 40 times. Then the categories switch sides of the screen. Positive that was on the right is now on the left, and Negative that was on the left is now on the right side of the screen.

What they found with these studies – being done on millions and millions of people – that people associate positive stereotypes with white – meaning they are faster to group together. When grouped with African-American faces they are slower to respond. The research shows that these studies predict human behavior; how we act, how we made decisions, and how we treat people. It affects how money and resources are allocated. It affects medical decision-making. It affects education. It affects jobs and hiring. Psychologists have done meta-analysis of these studies. It doesn't mean that we walk around only acting on our implicit biases, but it shows that implicit biases are one force that affects our actions.

People who show implicit biases are often not the same people who are willing to admit their biases. Those are explicit biases that people are willing to self-report; like, 'yeah, I have to admit that I might not be so fair when it comes to thinking about members of that group.' That is an explicit bias. Implicit bias measurements are only slightly correlated so just asking somebody that questions do not reveal the full depth of answers. It is important to ask, because if someone is willing to tell you have those biases, then maybe they shouldn't be making decisions in relevant context where those biases might manifest. But your job isn't over at that point.

Framing that conversation Q&A, I am curious what people think on this. How and what implicit biases might manifest here. [On a slide related to Hawaii; education, housing, healthcare, criminal justice, where else?] I'd love to hear from people.

Q&A/conversation with Justin:

Robyn: When we did the bad guy with a gun or a cellphone, why did you do the area first?

Justin: That was from the original study when it was a low-tech environment. The idea behind the slides was, they had like 20 or 30 setting slides. Then they had 20 or 30 slides of men in positions where they could be holding fake guns or cellphones. Then they randomized the setting, then randomized the man and randomized what he was holding so that over a large group of studies you would know that it wasn't the setting driving it or it wasn't the man. You can figure out what is driving it and what they found out was, it wasn't the setting, it was whether he was a white man or black man and what he is holding. That was the original, low-tech design.

Brian: I've only lived in Hawaii about five years now and I found I had to learn what the biases were for groups of people in Hawaii. For example, I didn't know that we were supposed to hate Micronesians. I still don't get that. But apparently that is a thing *here* that's not something I'm familiar with in Michigan. And there are other groups, like the homeless – people who are homeless, who are lots of different colors and shapes – people have particular thoughts about them as opposed to other people. So I think it is interesting that you are looking at the Hawaii specific contexts of biases, I think that is interesting. Can you say a little about that?

Justin: A lot of my studies in the early years I did here because we were limited in national technology and I was really interested in national criminal justice in implicit biases. What jumped out during those studies was that even though I was running the studies here on measuring anti-black implicit biases, the biases were super strong. It became clear, very quickly, that at least with regard to anti-black negative stereotypes, Hawaii was in a very similar place to the rest of the country. In more recent years, I have started looking at more nuanced local biases. I did run a study looking at implicit biases related to Micronesians, Japanese Americans, Native Hawaiians, and European Americans. The strongest results there were when I did a study of anti-Micronesian biases. People held strong anti-Micronesian biases. I ran the same study on the mainland, but people don't really know what Micronesians is on the mainland. So they hold some small negative out-group base like 'we don't know who you are but we don't really like you' biases. And our Hawaii biases were much stronger, negative anti-Micronesian biases, and people were very willing to self report them when we asked explicitly, which does not happen with a lot of group membership these days – people don't come forward and regularly self report negative

biases, but with Micronesians, people were willing to and I think that reflects your experience, Brian – probably explicit biases which is very unique. You don't find that too often.

CLOSING

President Rich: Thank you, Justin for joining us. It was one of the most fascinating and interesting presentations we have had all year. The subject is certain on and under everyone's radar and is something we should be aware of.

Next week is the *Change of Command* and we are sold out at the *Oahu Country Club*. If you have not told Martha you are coming, it is too late. They have arranged the dining room to accommodate us and now we are really sold out. Please join us on Zoom if you can. I think it will be a fun meeting and I am looking forward to it! **Brian**, can you take us out with some music?

Brian begins video of *Hawaii Aloha* for all members to sing along with.

President Rich adjourned the Rotary Club of Honolulu meeting at 1:00 pm with his bell after singing *Hawaii Aloha!*

Have a fabulous week.
Humble Scribe,
Lee LaBrash