Being Explicit about Implicit Bias Education for the Judiciary

Shawn C. Marsh & Diane C. Marsh

Implicit bias has been a popular topic in judicial education for well over a decade, and for good reason: evidence from fields such as social and cognitive psychology suggests people can and do make decisions about others via cognitive mechanisms operating outside of their awareness. Because a primary role of a judge is to make decisions impacting others while maintaining objectivity, it is not surprising that implicit bias has blossomed as a topic in judicial education. Although education on implicit bias is often framed in the context of race, it is important to note that there are other implications for justice when considering the range of stereotype domains one can hold about various "other" groups (e.g., gender, body type, age). Ultimately and regardless of the categorical focus, the core feature of implicit bias at issue in this work is that human beings are often not aware of how stereotypes and other cognitive mechanisms are potentially influencing their decisions.

Judges and allied court professionals are not the only groups that have introduced training on nonconcious bias and how to reduce its unintended influence on decision making. Indeed, fields such as medicine, business, education, law enforcement, and entertainment/media have recommended or implemented implicit bias education to address issues of discrimination, disparity, disproportionality, and diversity in myriad contexts.[1] Courts at all levels also are following this trend internally, as well as in cases heard, including a recent U.S. District Court decision noting that the Harvard academic admission process "would likely benefit from conducting implicit bias trainings for admissions officers" (p. 127).[2] As interest grows in educational interventions to help limit the influence of implicit bias, there appears to be a corresponding increase in critiques about the validity or applicability of the construct, as well as the effectiveness of related educational interventions.

Given our experience designing and providing implicit bias education programs for judges and court stakeholders, and in light of the attention implicit bias training is receiving in the media, we believe the time is ripe to reflect on the status of these efforts to help guide the next steps of this work in a judicial and court context. In doing so, we are explicit that we do not directly address here the form and function of implicit bias, the debates about the validity of the implicit bias construct, the ability of implicit bias measures to predict discriminatory behavior, or the methods to assess implicit bias.[3] Rather, we enter into our present effort with the assumption that implicit bias and social cognition *writ large* will likely remain important topics in judicial education for the foreseeable future,[4] and focus instead on basic pedagogical issues and perspectives.

We begin by briefly reviewing the general status of implicit bias education across sectors, including the courts and the judiciary. Second, using data from a 2018-2019 survey of judicial educators in the United States and Canada, we explore their perspectives on implicit bias education in general, and elucidate feedback received on promising and not-so-promising pedagogical approaches. Finally, we propose in the form of considerations for policy and practice what might be next for the field of judicial education—and for judges often reponsible for spearheading court education—on the topic of implicit bias and related research.

BACKGROUND

Implicit bias education, in various forms, is a popular approach in attempts to reduce bias in decision making or interpersonal interactions in organizations and systems, including business,[5] law enforcement,[6] healthcare,[7] and education.[8] Even though educational approaches to addressing implicit bias tend to be implemented in response to high-profile incidents (e.g., police shootings, videos of public arrests), the underpinnings of implicit bias as a psychological construct have been reasonably well understood for decades and based on a

Footnotes

1. For example, see C. STAATS, K. CAPATOSTO, L. TENNEY & S. MAMO, STATE OF THE SCIENCE: IMPLICIT BIAS REVIEW (Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity at The Ohio State University 2017).

2. Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President & Fellows of Harvard College, 14- cv -14176 -ADB. (U.S. District Court, MA; September 30, 2019).

3. For an overview, see J. T. Jost, *The IAT Is Dead, Long Live the IAT: Context-sensitive Measures of Implicit Attitudes Are Indispensable to Social and Political Psychology,* 28 CURRENT DIRECTIONS PSYCHOL. SCI. 10-19 (2019); and A. G. Greenwald, M. R. Banaji & B. A. Nosek, *Statistically Small Effects of the Implicit Association Test Can Have Societally Large Effects,* 108 J. PERSONALITY & SOC. PSYCH. 553-61 (2015).

4. Although data for this article were collected before the death of George Floyd and others in 2020, those high-profile events certainly launched, in part, a renewed critical discussion around how/the degree to which we educate justice professionals about implicit bias, how to better evaluate the efficacy of bias education interventions, and how to better fit ongoing bias education into the constellation of responses to reduce racism and improve justice.

5. M. Foley & S. Williamson, *Managerial Perspectives on Implicit Bias, Affirmative Action, and Merit,* 79 PUB. ADMIN. REV. 35-45 (2019).

6. R. J. Smith, *Reducing Racially Disparate Policing Outcomes: Is Implicit Bias Training the Answer?,* 37 U. HAW. L. REV. 295-312 (2015).

7. C. R. Teal, A. C. Gill, A. R. Green & S. Crandall, *Helping Medical Learners Recognise and Manage Unconscious Bias toward Certain Patient Groups*, 46 MED. EDUC. 80-88 (2012).

8. D. K. Whitford & A. M. Emerson, *Empathy Intervention to Reduce Implicit Bias in Pre-Service Teachers,* 122 PSYCHOL. REP. 670-88 (2019).

robust foundation of theory and research on attitudes.[9]

Moving from the laboratory to the field has been a major effort by those involved in this bias work, particularly in the area of developing and testing interventions to reduce the influence of implicit bias in decision making. These intervention efforts, at least initially, sought to expand understanding of implicit bias under the theory that awareness or knowledge could help reduce bias in decision making.[10] Leading court and judicial organizations, including the National Center for State Courts, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, The National Judicial College, and American Judges Association, have engaged in educational programming (e.g., conference sessions, workshops) and/or projects focused on addressing issues of implicit bias.[11] Other resources to educate judges and allied justice professionals about implicit bias include articles,[12] books,[13] and subject/technical assistance reviews.[14]

Regardless of format (i.e., written, video, face-to-face), approaches to implicit bias education are varied, including strategies that focus on information processing, social cognition, data-driven arguments, evolutionary theory, and blended appeals (e.g., history coupled with neuroscience). Common activities to demonstrate how concepts related to implicit bias (e.g., automaticity, interference) in the training environment include the Stroop Task, the "knee tap" exercise, the Implicit Association Test (IAT), and generating examples of potentially misleading stereotypes found in the media. Although there is only limited research on the effectiveness of strategies to reduce the influence of bias in applied settings, some educational programming also includes suggestions on how to counteract implicit bias (e.g., reduce cognitive load, outgroup exemplars). As interest in implicit bias education has grown, persons providing such training has expanded noticeably as well, with trainer expertise ranging substantially from paraprofessionals to legal experts and scientists.

Arguably, implicit bias education alone was never intended to eliminate bias/discrimination; rather, it was at least initially viewed as adding to a larger discussion surrounding race in a justice context, as well as providing a common ground of understanding for future interventions and subsequent impact evaluations. As noted previously, proponents of implicit bias training suggest building this foundation is a critical step in the process to ultimately change behavior. Further, these types of training are heralded by educators and participants alike as helping not only to increase awareness of the issue, but also to stimulate serious individual and system reflection as to how experiences, environment, culture, and system design can lead to biased decision making.

Of course, there are criticisms of this kind of educational intervention, including limited evidence of its efficacy, inaccurate information being provided to participants, and a "one and done" mentality toward training. Some of these critiques have started to come to light in the media, for example, with observations by stakeholders suggesting that the process could inadvertently worsen biased behavior, can sour participants to the value of diversity, or could even make jobs more challenging/dangerous.[15] Further, participant criticism of training on this topic across professions tends to include some resentment about shaming approaches or the information presented being perceived as giving people a potential excuse for discriminatory behavior (i.e., it is universal thus cannot be avoided). In light of the contrasts between advocates and critics of implicit bias education, there does appear to be a disconnect between the popularity of this type of training, the state of the science at the intersect of policy, the intended purpose of educational interventions, and the actual outcomes of the interventions.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

But what do we know about educators charged with selecting, designing, or providing this type of educational experience specifically for judicial officers? Within the context of a rise in implicit bias training being advised for myriad professions—including the judiciary—as a strategy to improve fairness, equality, and diversity, we proposed several research questions to guide the present study focused on judicial education. Specifically, to what degree do judicial educators think teaching judges about implicit bias is important? What controversies or criticisms might exist in regards to including implicit bias in judicial education or how the topic is approached? Are there preferred teaching models best suited to approaching this potentially controversial topic and judicial education in general? Finally, is there a sense that education on bias is actually changing practice in courts? The survey research and findings presented in the following sections seek to answer these and related questions and to provide a "current snapshot" of perspectives of judicial educators in regards to current bias education.

METHOD

An online survey for judicial educators was administered using the Qualtrics survey software and platform. The survey consisted of 24 questions about various judicial education topics, preferred teaching models, and respondent demographics and

> "Moving from the laboratory to the field has been a major effort by those involved in bias work."

9. G. W. ALLPORT, THE NATURE OF PREJUDICE (Addison-Wesley 1954).

10. There is some allied research support for an "education as intervention" approach; for example, see J. Katz & J. Moore, *Bystander Education Training for Campus Sexual Assault Prevention: An Initial Meta-Analysis,* 28 VIOLENCE & VICTIMS. 1054-67 (2013); and C. Lee, *Awareness as a First Step Toward Overcoming, in* ENHANCING JUSTICE: REDUCING BIAS 289-302 (S. E. Redfield ed., 2017).

11. For examples, see the National Center for State Courts' resources for implicit bias education at https://www.ncsc.org/ibeducation.

12. J. Rachlinski, S. Johnson, A. Wistrich & C. Guthrie, *Does Unconscious Racial Bias Affect Trial Judges?,* 84 NOTRE DAME L. REV. 1195-246 (2009).

13. S. E. REDFIELD, ed., ENHANCING JUSTICE: REDUCING BIAS (American Bar Association 2017).

14. J. Kang et al., *Implicit Bias in the Courtroom,* 59 UCLA L. REV. 1124-86 (2012).

15. For example, see https://news.northwestern.edu/stories/2016/03/opinion-huffpo-police-bias/.

"Respondents were also asked to indicate their opinion as to the single most important training topic ...

background.[16] A snowball-sample approach was used to help maximize reach and subsequent responses, and recruitment targeted individuals and organizations engaged in providing or evaluating judicial education in the United States and Canada (e.g., faculty, funder, coordinator, researcher, etc.).[17] The survey was open for approximately one month and closed mid-January 2019, with the principal investigator performing three formal follow up requests to participate via phone or email. To help improve response rates, a technique suggested by Porter and Whitcomb[18] was employed whereby the survey was incentivized by donating a modest amount to a judicial scholarship fund for each complete survey up to 250 surveys. The research was conducted consistent with ethical research standards of the American Psychological Association and was reviewed and approved as exempt by the University of Nevada, Reno Institutional Review Board (protocol # 1355229-1 dated November 28, 2018).

RESULTS

There were 264 responses to the request to take the survey, with 26 respondents indicating they were not actually involved in judicial education or did not identify their type of involvement, resulting in $N = 238$ valid responses. Response rates cannot be calculated given the snowball-sampling methodology.[19] Respondents identified their current position as judicial officers (42.6%), judicial educators (18.3%), other (e.g., retired judge, service provider, etc. (13.5%), academics/researchers (9.1%), attorneys (7.0%), independent consultants (6.5%), and court administrators (3.0%). Respondents indicated they had been in their current position for 14.4 years on average, and had been in judicial education for 15.0 years on average, with no significant difference on either measure across profession or judicial education role. With the possibility of multiple roles reported, 73.5% of respondents indicated they directly provide education

(i.e., faculty); 58.0% coordinate or evaluate judicial training; 45.4% design curricula; and 27.7% conduct pedagogical research, fund judicial education, or hold another allied role (e.g., administrative support, discussion facilitator, etc.).

The majority (55.2%) of respondents were female. The sample was primarily White (87.7%), followed by Black (6.2%), other (3.8%), American Indian/Alaska Native (1.4%), and Asian (.9 %). In terms of education, the majority (58.5%) of respondents indicated holding a JD or equivalent, with 14.8% holding a PhD or equivalent, 12.2% with a Masters or equivalent, 9.2% with a Bachelors, 3.9% with less than a four-year degree (e.g., Associates), and 1.3% with an MD or equivalent. Most respondents (31.3%) came from SAMHSA U.S. Region 9, followed by SAMHSA U.S. Region 5 (14.8%).[20] The remainder of U.S. participants were relatively evenly distributed across regions (ranging from 2.6% to 10.0% of respondents), and there was only a small representation (1.3%) from Canadian Provinces/Territories.

Respondents were also asked to indicate their opinion as to the single most important training topic in 2018, and what they perceive will be the single most important training topic in 2019. Qualitative responses were analyzed using case x topic keyword counts coupled with *post hoc* verification of context. In terms of the immediate past (2018), the topic of *judicial independence* was identified most frequently (12.2%), followed by *trauma/vicarious trauma* (10.9%) and *ethics* (9.6%). This pattern of reported topic importance remained the same when only considering judge respondents.

For 2019, the three most important topics were identified as *judicial independence* (10.4%), *ethics* (8.7%), and *implicit bias* (8.3%). When considering only judge respondents, the order of topic importance shifted to *judicial independence* and *trauma/vicarious trauma* as being equally the most important for 2019, followed distantly by the topic of *ethics*.[21]

Specific to implicit bias, most respondents (63.3%) have been involved in some way in providing education on the topic to judges in the last 5 years. Nearly one-half of respondents (47.9%) noted being aware of controversy or criticism around bias education for judicial officers. Themes emerging from qualitative analysis[22] of responses from this later group centered, in no

16. For further detail on survey questions, see S. C. Marsh, *Judicial Educators' Perspectives on Trauma Education for the Judiciary,* 70 Juv. & Fam. Ct. J. 55-67 (2019).

17. Recruitment avenues included the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, National Judicial College, Association for Family and Conciliatory Courts, National Association of State Judicial Educators, state judicial education agencies/administrative office of the courts, allied justice partners (e.g., NCTSN), social-media networks (e.g., Twitter), and personal contacts of the authors. The authors thank all involved responding organizations and individuals for their assistance provided in distributing and participating in the survey.

18. S. R. Porter & M. E. Whitcomb, *The Impact of Lottery Incentives on Student Survey Response Rates,* 44 Res. Higher Educ. 389-407 (2003).

19. The total possible population of judicial educators in the U.S. and Canada also is unknown; however, as a rough reference point, the National Association of State Judicial Educators reported 239 members as of January 2019.

20. Region 9 includes Arizona, California, Hawaii, Guam, Nevada, American Samoa, CNMI, FSM, Marshall Islands, and Palau; Region 5 includes Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin; a full list of SAMHSA regions is available at https://www.samhsa.gov/about-us.

21. Other less-endorsed important topics included mental health, substance abuse, judicial demeanor, evidence, domestic violence, bail reform, and immigration.

22. The authors used an *a priori* coding scheme that initially categorized comments as either student-centric, educator-centric, pedagogical-centric, or topic-centric. This categorization was conducted independently, and coding had high levels of agreement (.85). Comments that were not rated similarly were discussed until consensus was reached. From these categorized comments, the authors then jointly identified the six major themes presented based on frequency—with the "additional" themes beyond the initial four categories a result of overlap within comments or clearly emergent sentiment that warranted inclusion.

particular order, on awareness that (a) there is some sentiment that bias education for judges is primarily about being politically correct and it has been overdone, (b) some people question the very concept of implicit bias and the science behind the construct and how it is assessed, (c) some doubt the effectiveness of how the science/psychology of bias is taught, (d) some believe certain judicial officers are in "denial" about their own personal bias and thus are resistant to education efforts, (e) some expressed concern bias education actually makes things worse (e.g., comes across as accusatory, actually increases disproportionality and disparate treatment), or (f) there is some belief education on this topic lacks practical and meaningful approaches to reducing bias in the courts. These general trends in awareness of controversy or criticism on this topic remained similar when only considering judges as judicial educators.

The majority of the sample (89.7%) reported they think that judicial education on bias is *very important* or *extremely important*. Yet, most of the sample (51.9%) indicated that training has only been *moderately effective* in changing practice, and approximately one-quarter (26.4%) felt training was *not effective* or *slightly effective* in changing practice. Thus, even in light of a general consensus regarding the importance of educating judges on this topic, a relative minority of respondents (21.7%) felt it has been *very effective* or *extremely effective* in changing practice. On average, there was no significant difference between judge and non-judge judicial educators on perceived importance or effectiveness of bias training.[23]

For approaches to judicial education specific to the topic of bias, respondents indicated that self-study (63.4%) and webinars (60.2%) were *not effective at all* or *slightly effective*. In contrast, 63.3% felt that small group discussions (50-90 minute interactive breakouts) were *very effective* or *extremely effective*— a sentiment reflected in qualitative responses further detailing effective features of educational programming (i.e., interaction, regularly scheduled small group discussions, etc.). A substantial minority of respondents also indicated that 1+ day institutes, 50-90-minute small group lectures, or one-half day seminars are *very effective* or *extremely effective* (46.5%, 48.8%, and 46.3%, respectively). There was no significant difference between judge and non-judge judicial educators on perceived effectiveness across educational program approaches, except that non-judges ($M = 3.09$, $SD = 1.06$) in comparison to judges ($M = 2.79$, $SD = 1.03$) were significantly more likely to view 1+ day educational programs as effective with this topic [$t(197) = 2.04$, $p = .043$].

In regards to preferences around general judicial education models, the vast majority (70.8%) of respondents endorsed an approach whereby a judge is teamed with a technical-subject-matter expert.[24] The typical rationale offered for support of this model centered on the team approach providing a balance between judicial experience and technical expertise on extralegal topics while maintaining the credibility offered by teaching "judge-to-judge." There was no significant difference between judge and non-judge judicial educators on preferred general education models. Other judicial education model preferences included the judge-only model (12.0%), and technical-expert-only model (non-judge; 6.9%). The remaining 10.2% of respondents indicated no preference or preference for some "other" model—typically a blended approach or one dependent on the content being addressed.

> **"Despite this attention on the topic of implicit bias, concerns remain about the agenda, approach, and efficacy of education."**

DISCUSSION

Results suggest that implicit bias in legal decision making remains a substantial yet controversial topic of importance to the judiciary, courts, and allied justice professionals. The interest in implicit bias in the justice system is reflected in the sheer attention it has received in judicial education over the last decade as well as it being rated as one of the most important judicial education topics that was expected in 2019, albeit somewhat less endorsed when considering only judicial officers as judicial educators. Despite this attention on the topic of implicit bias, concerns remain about the agenda, approach, and efficacy of education related to this topic. These criticisms, many reported here, are generally consistent with the experience of the authors and others in the field who are active in judicial education on this topic.

These insights give some hint as to why there seems to be a disconnect, in some circumstances, between education and behavior change in courts (e.g., "implicit bias is a fad"). Because of these types of beliefs or other misconceptions about intervention strategies, inadequate or poorly designed curricula, lags in implementation strategies, or some yet-to-be-identified factor, there also seems to be a sense that existing education is not as effective as it should/could be in changing awareness and practice. Although not explicitly explored in relation to behavior change in courts, results do indicate that across all judicial educators surveyed there is a theme that a judge/technical expert team education model and interactive discussion seems most effective in addressing this topic.

LIMITATIONS

Limitations to this study include the standard cautions regarding representativeness, generalizability, and biased responses due to the methodology employed—particularly in light of the large majority of respondents being White. Further, teasing out how combinations of roles within judicial education might impact findings is beyond the scope of the present study.

---

23. The potential group comparisons possible within these data are substantial, so only conceptually meaningful differences or similarities are reported. Specifically, in this context, judges versus non-judge judicial educators are the focus of the sub-analyses as judges are uniquely positioned as both the providers and consumers of judicial education—and also see the fruits of these educational

efforts in day-to-day practice.
24. Judicial officers certainly can be content/technical experts outside of the law; this team model simply suggests that certain topics (e.g., medicine, psychology, statistics, etc.) are highly specialized/nuanced and could benefit from inclusion of specifically trained experts to help ensure complete and accurate information.

> **"Bias education should routinely address how to apply such knowledge in practice ..."**

Although analyses explored for potential differences between judge judicial educators and non-judge judicial educators, additional analyses could reveal other important perspectives, contrasts, and nuances. With these limitations in mind, however, the results do suggest several considerations for at least the immediate future of judicial education in regards to the topic of bias.

CONSIDERATIONS

Reflecting on our findings and in no particular order, we offer the following considerations:[25]

Continue to educate the judiciary on implicit bias as well as social cognition in general. There is little evidence to suggest the popularity of implicit bias in judicial education circles will change soon or substantively, particularly given it provides a framework for understanding information processing and decision making based on social cognitive factors (e.g., stereotypes). As courts continue to evolve as part of the larger healing community dealing with important issues of race, gender, sexuality, and other stereotype domains, maintaining and refining a routine emphasis on bias education and interventions will be important for keeping step with other institutions and for improving outcomes for consumers of justice.

Engage judicial voice in assessing how bias education is designed and delivered. Education theory recognizes that no one approach to teaching is most effective in all circumstances; however, results reported here do suggest judicial education coordinators should consider teaming judges with technical-subject-matter experts, when appropriate. Equally important for educators to consider is the expressed preference for interactive learning with colleagues on a regularly scheduled basis, which might be accomplished even locally with informal events such as monthly judicial brown bags or quarterly facilitated discussion groups.

Review and revise bias education for judges to address common misconceptions. Although there is clearly a general awareness of the importance for judges and courts to consider implicit bias in decision making, evidence also suggests there is some criticism of the topic and its application in the justice system. Further research will be needed to tease out the exact underlying reasons for these attitudes, but it seems many are rooted in misconceptions that bias education justifies or normalizes biased decisions or that the topic reflects an "agenda" and is not rooted in science. Addressing these and other common misconceptions and attitudes about implicit bias effectively and assertively in judicial education curricula will be critical for developing shared meaning, understanding, and purpose moving forward.

Redouble efforts to include guidance on how to incorporate what we know about implicit bias in day-to-day court practice.

Results suggest there still exists a disconnect for many between knowledge of implicit bias and its impacts on decision making—and how to apply this understanding meaningfully in court practice. Bias education should routinely address how to apply such knowledge in practice, and should include concrete, precise, and realistic suggestions/examples of practice change that encourage a culture of objective decision making (e.g., reducing cognitive load). To this end, implementation science can help guide this effort and also provide a framework to assess for actual change in policy and practice.

Continue to engage judicial leadership to advance the discussion on race (and gender, sexual preference, etc.). Judicial officers hold a powerful position in our society. Given their status, judges can not only bring communities together to have these sensitive and important discussions about bias, but also serve as role models through their participation and leadership to show that these dialogues are foundational to the effective administration of justice and societal change.

Expand the discussion of implicit bias beyond race. Implicit bias is not limited to issues of race; education efforts in this area should also acknowledge and draw connections to the experiences of victims, those identifying as LGBTQ, variance in body type (e.g., weight), gender expression, and those with different political or religious affiliations, among other groups.

Engage businesses and other stakeholders in this effort. Courts are not alone in their interest in the topic of implicit bias and approaches to reducing its impact in decision making. Working to collaborate with and draw upon the experience of other sectors (e.g., healthcare, business), justice/legal groups (e.g., American Bar Association), and judicial education organizations (e.g., National Association of State Judicial Educators) could help leverage limited resources and help avoid unnecessary duplication of intervention development/materials.

Engage academia in this effort. The psychological science behind implicit bias is complex and nuanced. Working with judicial educators and judges, academics can help guide the selection and assess the efficacy of educational approaches and other interventions (e.g., challenging community/system norms). Local universities can make strong partners in applied court research and program evaluation, and often are happy to help advise or evaluate programs for no/low cost.

Expand both basic and applied research regarding implicit bias and the judiciary. Researchers should continue to seek to understand the linkages between bias (cognitive domain), prejudice (affective domain), and discrimination/disparity (behavior domain) in a legal/court/judicial context. Further, although applied research in courts can be difficult to conduct due to access and human-subject constraints, it will be important to include judges to continue developing our fund of knowledge regarding judicial decision making. Applied research efforts should also include a pedagogical focus to refine how implicit bias education is provided, and the conditions under which it is most effective.

---

25. For additional suggestions see B. K. Payne & H. A. Vuletich, *Policy Insights from Advances in Implicit Bias Research,* 5 Pol'y Insights from Behav. & Brain Sci. 49-56 (2018); and Redfield, *supra* note 13.

Develop a roadmap for not only research (basic, applied, pedagogical), but centralizing information on promising practices, myths, experts to contact, effective interventions, etc. A comprehensive, centralized, and routinely updated electronic clearinghouse for courts and judges on the topic of implicit bias and related education, such as the one by the National Center for State Courts noted previously (i.e., www.ncsc.org/ibeducation), that includes well-reviewed resources *and* connections to others actively engaged in this work would likely be welcomed by justice practitioners and academics alike.

CONCLUSION

Implicit bias has been a major focus of judicial education and court reform efforts for over a decade. Even in the face of some skepticism about the value of bias education for judges and how effective it is in actually changing practice in courts, the focus on the topic is not likely to diminish any time soon. Although transitioning science from the "laboratory" to the "court" is and always will remain a challenge for academics and practitioners alike, continuing efforts to address critical disparities and disproportionalities based on race and other domains is important for our systems of justice and stated goals of access and fairness. The potential benefits of these efforts are substantial, and the role of the judicial educator in the process is critical and deserves ongoing attention by researchers and practitioners alike.

Shawn C. Marsh, Ph.D. is the Director of the Judicial Studies Graduate Degree Program and Associate Professor of Judicial Studies, Communication Studies, and Social Psychology at the University of Nevada, Reno. Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to: shawnm@unr.edu.

Diane C. Marsh (retired) is the former Chief Advancement Officer for the The National Judicial College headquartered at the University of Nevada, Reno.

Court Review Author Submission Guidelines

Court Review, the quarterly journal of the American Judges Association, invites the submission of unsolicited, original articles, essays, and book reviews. *Court Review* seeks to provide practical, useful information to the working judges of the United States and Canada. In each issue, we hope to provide information that will be of use to judges in their everyday work, whether in highlighting new procedures or methods of trial, court, or case management, providing substantive information regarding an area of law likely to encountered by many judges, or by providing background information (such as psychology or other social science research) that can be used by judges in their work.

Court Review is received by the 2,000 members of the American Judges Association (AJA), as well as many law libraries. About 40 percent of the members of the AJA are general-jurisdiction, state trial judges. Another 40 percent are limited-jurisdiction judges, including municipal court and other specialized court judges. The remainder include federal trial judges, state and federal appellate judges, and administrative-law judges.

Articles: Articles should be submitted in double-spaced text with footnotes in Microsoft Word format. The suggested article length for *Court Review* is between 18 and 36 pages of double-spaced text (including the footnotes). Footnotes should conform to the current edition of *The Bluebook: A Uniform System of Citation*. Articles should be of a quality consistent with better state-bar-association law journals and/or other law reviews.

Essays: Essays should be submitted in the same format as articles. Suggested length is between 6 and 12 pages of double-spaced text (including any footnotes).

Book Reviews: Book reviews should be submitted in the same format as articles. Suggested length is between 3 and 9 pages of double-spaced text (including any footnotes).

Pre-commitment: For previously published authors, we will consider making a tentative publication commitment based upon an article outline. In addition to the outline, a comment about the specific ways in which the submission will be useful to judges and/or advance scholarly discourse on the subject matter would be appreciated. Final acceptance for publication cannot be given until a completed article, essay, or book review has been received and reviewed by the *Court Review* editor or board of editors.

Editing: *Court Review* reserves the right to edit all manuscripts.

Submission: Submissions should be made by email. Please send them to Editors@CourtReview.org. Submissions will be acknowledged by email. Notice of acceptance, rejection, or requests for changes will be sent following review.