

VOLUME 68 NUMBER 2 2012

Sheri R. Levy EDITOR

Discover this journal online at
wileyonlinelibrary.com/journal/sis
WILEY ONLINE LIBRARY

JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ISSUES

**The Reality of Contemporary Discrimination in
the United States: The Consequences of Hidden
Bias in Real World Contexts**

ISSUE EDITORS Jason A. Nier and Samuel L. Gaertner

EDITORIAL BOARD

Dominic Abrams
Manuela Barreto
Allan B.I. Bernardo
Jacquelynnne Eccles
Jennifer E. Graham
Carolyn Hagelskamp
Nick Haslam
Ying-yi Hong
Melanie Killen
Rodolfo Mendoza-Denton
Jason Plaks
Luisa Ramirez
Jennifer Richeson
Adam Rutland
Isis Settles
Beth Shinn
Maykel Verkuyten
Johanna Vollhardt



A Journal of the
Society for the
Psychological Study
of Social Issues

Issues in Progress

The Intersection of Psychology and Globalization

Jeannette Diaz-LaPlante and Sabrina Zirkel

Sustainability in Combining Career and Care

Marloes van Engen, Claartje Vinckenburg, and Josje Dijkers

The Aftermath of Genocide: Psychological Perspectives

Johanna Vollhardt and Michal Bilewicz

Editorial Advisory Board

Dominic Abrams, University of Kent at Canterbury, United Kingdom

Manuela Barreto, University of Exeter, United Kingdom

Allan B.I. Bernardo, De La Salle University, Philippines

Jacquelynne Eccles, University of Michigan, United States

Jennifer E. Graham, The Pennsylvania State University, United States

Carolin Hagelskamp, New York University, United States

Nick Haslam, University of Melbourne, Australia

Ying-yi Hong, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Melanie Killen, University of Maryland, College Park, United States

Rodolfo Mendoza-Denton, University of California at Berkeley, United States

Jason Plaks, University of Toronto, Canada

Luisa Ramirez, Universidad del Rosario, Colombia

Jennifer Richeson, Northwestern University, United States

Adam Rutland, University of Kent at Canterbury, United Kingdom

Isis Settles, Michigan State University, United States

Beth Shinn, Vanderbilt University, United States

Maykel Verkuyten, Utrecht University, The Netherlands

Johanna Vollhardt, Clark University, United States

Past JSI Editors

Rick H. Hoyle (2006–2009)

Irene Hanson Frieze (2001–2005)

Phyllis Katz (1997–2000)

Daniel Perlman (1993–1996)

Stuart Oskamp (1988–1992)

George Levinger (1984–1987)

Joseph E. McGrath (1979–1983)

Jacqueline D. Goodchilds (1974–1978)

Bertram H. Raven (1970–1973)

Joshua A. Fishman (1966–1969)

Leonard Solomon (1963)
Robert Chin (1960–1965)
John Harding (1956–1959)
M. Brewster Smith (1951–1955)
Harold H. Kelley (1949)
Ronald Lippitt (1944–1950)

**The Reality of Contemporary Discrimination in the
United States: The Consequences of Hidden Bias
in Real World Contexts**

Issue Editors: Jason A. Nier and Samuel L. Gaertner

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

- The Challenge of Detecting Contemporary Forms of Discrimination 207
Jason A. Nier and Samuel L. Gaertner

**SECTION II: DETECTING CONTEMPORARY DISCRIMINATION
IN EMPLOYMENT CONTEXTS**

- Identifying Discrimination at Work: The Use of Field Experiments 221
Devah Pager and Bruce Western
- Developing the Research Basis for Controlling Bias in Hiring 238
Marc Bendick, Jr. and Ana P. Nunes
- Death by a Thousand Cuts?: Accounting for Gender Differences
in Top-Ranked Publication Rates in Social Psychology 263
Mina Cikara, Laurie Rudman, and Susan Fiske

**SECTION III: DETECTING CONTEMPORARY DISCRIMINATION
IN LEGAL CONTEXTS**

- The World is Not Black and White: Racial Bias in the Decision
to Shoot in a Multiethnic Context 286
*Melody S. Sadler, Joshua Correll, Bernadette Park,
and Charles M. Judd*
- The Missing Quadrants of Antidiscrimination: Going Beyond the
“Prejudice Polygraph” 314
Jerry Kang

SECTION IV: CONTEMPORARY DISCRIMINATION AND WELLNESS

- Life-Threatening Disparities: Treatment of Black and White
Cancer Patients 328
*Louis A. Penner, Susan Eggly, Jennifer J. Griggs,
Willie Underwood, III, Heather Orom, and Terrance L. Albrecht*

Racism and Social Capital: The Implications for Social and Physical Well-Being	358
<i>Elizabeth Brondolo, Madeline Libretti, Luis Rivera, and Katrina M. Walsemann</i>	
SECTION V: CONCLUSIONS	
Intergroup Disparities and Implicit Bias: A Commentary	385
<i>Emily L. Fisher and Eugene Borgida</i>	
Contemporary Discrimination in the Lab and Field: Benefits and Obstacles of Full-Cycle Social Psychology	399
<i>Nilanjana Dasgupta and Jane G. Stout</i>	
SECTION VI: 2011 KURT LEWIN AWARD	
Introduction to Michelle Fine's SPSSI Kurt Lewin Award Address	413
<i>Susan Opotow</i>	
Resuscitating Critical Psychology for "Revolting" Times	416
<i>Michelle Fine</i>	

The Challenge of Detecting Contemporary Forms of Discrimination

Jason A. Nier*

Connecticut College

Samuel L. Gaertner

University of Delaware

While the persistent and widespread racial and gender inequalities that exist in the United States are almost certainly due to a combination of many different factors, one likely source of inequality is discrimination. As decades of research in social psychology suggest, this discrimination is often subtle and difficult to detect, and in some instances, may be unintentional. Although this type of discrimination is subtle, it is nonetheless damaging to those who are its victims and the cumulative effects of such discrimination may be substantial. In the domains of race and gender, in which individuals are presumably legally protected from discrimination, people are deprived of their civil rights when they face such behavior. Therefore, an important goal for research and practice in intergroup relations is to develop techniques that allow such discrimination to be reliably detected and to distinguish discriminatory conduct from behavior that is not influenced by subtle racial and gender biases.

From its earliest roots, the *Journal of Social Issues (JSI)* has been at the forefront of the study of discrimination. Prejudice, as a pressing societal issue to be addressed by social science, was the focus of the very first issue of *JSI*, which was titled “Racial and religious prejudice in everyday living” (Weltfish, 1945a). Indeed, with so much to say on the matter, the editorial board of *JSI* decided to devote much of the second issue of *JSI* to the topic as well (Weltfish, 1945b). Contributors to these first two volumes included some of the most influential social scientists of the era, such as Gordon Allport, Kenneth Clark, and Margaret

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jason A. Nier, Department of Psychology, Box 5305, Connecticut College, 270 Mohegan Avenue, New London, CT 06320. Tel: 860 439 5057 [e-mail: janie@conncoll.edu].

Mead. Kurt Lewin himself also offered a commentary on one of the articles. In reading their works, one is immediately struck by their timeliness. They dealt with some of the most significant forms of bigotry of their times, such as anti-Semitism, racism directed at Black Americans, and sexism against women.

They also saw that while discrimination could often be overt, as in the case of Jim Crow style racism directed at Black Americans, it also could be subtle. The editor of that first *JSI* issue, Gene Weltfish, wrote that “[t]he Negro has been selected as an illustration of [employment discrimination] because the situation applies most stringently to him. But Jews, Catholics, and Foreign-Born are in no sense immune to this type of discrimination. People are less open about the fact that they have a discriminatory policy toward these groups; the discrimination comes in more subtle forms, but it is there nevertheless. This means that a considerable part of our American people suffer one of the most serious kinds of discrimination that there is.” (Weltfish, 1945a, p. 11).

Since that time, much has changed and, yet, much also remains the same. Some of these social and cultural changes, many of which were wrought by the civil rights movement, were foreseen by the editor of that first issue of *JSI*. She wrote, “[i]f we take no practical steps to clear away prejudice [against Black Americans], and if jobs are hard to get after the war, the previous situation will recur. All jobs will be difficult for Negroes to get, not on the basis of inability to do the work or lack of need, but on the basis of race prejudice. The Negro will then demand his rights in no uncertain terms.” (Weltfish, 1945a, p. 11). African Americans and other groups did, of course, demand their rights in the ensuing decades, and with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1965, many of those rights became legally protected. Yet, over 65 years after the first *JSI* issue dealing with discrimination, subtle prejudice remains. Just as religious minorities were sometimes a target of subtle, rather than overt, discrimination in the United States in 1945, racial minorities and women (and other groups as well) must still sometimes face subtle bias in the present day.

Since contemporary forms of discrimination can often times appear, ironically, to be nondiscriminatory, detecting the subtle manifestations of discrimination, and understanding the true consequences of these behaviors, has proven difficult. In an attempt to better understand the tangible impact of these subtle biases, the objective of this issue is to examine the consequences of contemporary forms of race and gender discrimination in several different naturalistic domains—the workplace, law enforcement, academia, and well-being. Toward that end, this issue will focus on the procedures that may be employed to detect the operation of subtle biases in these contexts, including the use of experimental field studies of discrimination, in which adverse decisions toward members of legally protected classes (e.g., deciding not to hire a particular individual because of his/her race or gender) are observed in the actual contexts in which they normally occur (Bendick, Jackson,

& Reinoso, 1994; Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Pager, 2007). The practical significance of identifying everyday discrimination will also be addressed, including a discussion of the different ways in which research examining contemporary forms of discrimination can be integrated into the litigation of discrimination cases (e.g., Borgida, Hunt, & Kim, 2005).

Racial and Gender Disparities

Racial and gender disparities are widespread in many different countries, including the United States. For example, according to the U.S. Department of Labor (2012), rates of unemployment are over twice as high for Black Americans relative to Whites, and unemployment rates are also significantly higher for Latinos compared to Whites. Similar disparities also exist in income as well; on average Black households earn about \$22,500 less per year than White households, and Latino households earn about \$16,500 less than do Whites (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, & Smith, 2011). Income inequities also persist in the domain of gender. While unemployment rates are similar for women and men, according to Census Bureau statistics (DeNavas-Walt et al., 2011), women workers averaged \$33,900 per year whereas male workers averaged \$47,700 per year. Alarming disparities exist in the realm of law enforcement practices. For example, Black males are six times more likely to be incarcerated than White males, and Latinos are twice as likely to be in prison than are White males (U.S. Department of Justice, 2007). And although reliable data on police shootings are difficult to obtain, by one estimate Blacks are about five times more likely to be killed by police officers than are Whites (Sadler, Correll, Park, & Judd, 2012), and a growing body of research has begun to indicate that individuals, including law enforcement professionals, are likely to react more swiftly to non-Whites in the application of deadly force (Correll, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2002; Correll et al., 2007; Payne, 2006).

Perhaps the most disconcerting inequities are the disparities in the health and well-being of various racial and ethnic groups in the United States. These racial disparities often times remain sizable even after controlling for other variables for which race may serve as a proxy, such as insurance status and income. This finding led the Institute of Medicine to conclude that the subtle biases of White health care providers against Black patients may be partially responsible for many health care disparities (Smedley, Stith, & Nelson, 2002).

Subtle Forms of Contemporary Discrimination

Although most racial and gender disparities are likely due to a combination of many factors, one potential source, both in the United States and in other countries as well, is discrimination. Following the passage of Title VII of the

1965 Civil Rights Act discrimination based on race and gender was outlawed in the United States. During and after this period, overtly racist and sexist attitudes and discrimination decreased significantly. So how can research reconcile the persistent racial and gender inequalities with the decline in overtly racist and sexist behavior? One possible explanation is that prejudice and discrimination continue to exist in a form that is more subtle and difficult to detect. Consistent with this interpretation, a number of different forms of subtle race and gender bias have been identified by social psychologists, including Symbolic Racism (Sears & Henry, 2005), Aversive Racism (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986), Modern Sexism (Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995), and Ambivalent Sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996, 2001). Although these forms of subtle bias differ in important ways, they also share some features in common. Perhaps most significantly, many theories of subtle bias focus on the idea that different kinds of attitudes and beliefs sometime conflict with one another, which in turn results in subtle (rather than overt) discrimination. In short, subtle bias is often the product of ambivalence.

In the domain of race, the Aversive Racism perspective proposes that ambivalent attitudes sometimes result in subtle discrimination (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). According to this perspective, the explicit racial attitudes of many White Americans are presumed to be positive and egalitarian, whereas their implicit attitudes are often negative. As a result of these negative implicit attitudes and their seemingly contradictory egalitarian values, Whites may discriminate against African Americans in some situations, but not in others. In situations where their explicit egalitarian values are salient, they will not discriminate. However, when their egalitarian values are not salient, their negative implicit attitudes toward African Americans may guide their behavior and often result in discrimination.

According to the research examining Ambivalent Sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996), prejudicial attitudes toward women may, at times, simply reflect hostility, but perhaps more commonly, sexism likely reflects a mix of positive and negative beliefs about women. These conflicting positive and negative beliefs are referred to as Hostile Sexism, on the one hand, and Benevolent Sexism, on the other. According to this perspective, Women who conform to traditional gender roles will typically evoke a positive reaction associated with Benevolent Sexism, whereas those who do not conform to tradition are likely to evoke the negative reactions associated with Hostile Sexism. Thus, both racial attitudes and gender attitudes are often characterized by ambivalence, which suggests that beliefs about race and gender may manifest themselves in subtle and complex ways during the course of everyday interactions (i.e., in “the real world”). The manner in which race and gender may influence behavior may be so subtle, in fact, that it precludes actors from recognizing their differential behavior toward the targets of such beliefs, such as African Americans and women.

Detecting Contemporary Discrimination: Challenges and Critiques

Despite its subtle and often unintentional nature, contemporary forms of discrimination can nonetheless have a significant impact on the lives of those who are presumably legally protected from such behavior. But how may such discrimination, which may even be hidden from the individual who is actually discriminating, be detected outside the laboratory, where investigators do not have such tight control over different variables that may be responsible for disparate outcomes? This is a significant challenge indeed, because in addition to reliably detecting the presence of discriminatory behavior, it is equally important to detect nondiscriminatory behavior as well. Many adverse decisions made toward members of legally protected classes may be relatively free from the influence of racial and gender biases, and whatever approach is employed to detect discriminatory conduct must also be able to detect these negative, but nonetheless nondiscriminatory decisions, and distinguish them from adverse decision that are based on discriminatory factors.

In order to distinguish discriminatory behavior from nondiscriminatory behavior, a growing number of researchers are turning to field experiments, conducted outside of the laboratory, which are sometimes referred to as “audit” or “testing” studies of contemporary discrimination. For example, Pager & Western (2006) conducted an audit study of workplace discrimination in New York City. In this study, members of a research team, some of whom were White, some of whom were Latino, and some Black, applied for entry level positions at 252 different companies. All members of the research team (referred to as “testers”) who applied for one of these positions had undergone training in order to standardize the manner in which they presented themselves to prospective employers. After applying for these positions, the results were examined to see whether the race of the tester had an impact on the likelihood of receiving a job offer or a “callback.” The employers’ responses to the testers demonstrated a consistent pattern of discrimination; overall 23% of White testers received either a job offer or a callback, whereas only 19% of Latino and 13% of Blacks testers received an offer or a callback. Also, these negative outcomes faced by Latino and Black testers were typically veiled by racially neutral explanations. This is precisely the type of discrimination that would be expected to occur, according to the subtle bias perspective; discriminatory employment decisions were rationalized on the basis of ostensibly fair criteria. Moreover, this discriminatory conduct would likely have gone undetected if employment decisions were only examined on a case-by-case basis.

Although audit studies of real-world discrimination do indeed document the type of discrimination that is predicted by the subtle bias perspective, such studies do have weaknesses and limitations. For example, despite the training that testers of different races receive to present themselves in a uniform manner to employers,

testers may subtly and perhaps unintentionally respond in a manner that elicits a negative response from prospective employers. In other words, Latino and Black testers may anticipate receiving a cooler reception than their White counterparts, and may interact with prospective employers in a manner that is less warm and friendly, and the employers may then respond more negatively toward this behavior. If racially disparate outcomes were produced by this process, a form of self-fulfilling prophecy, then no actual discrimination would have occurred.

However, other audit procedures have addressed this limitation and provide further evidence that the disparate treatment generally found in audit studies does reflect discrimination. For example, one variation of audit studies relies upon resumes rather than face-to-face interviews. In studies such as these, resumes of fictitious individuals with equivalent (although not identical) qualifications are sent to prospective employers. The race of the hypothetical job applicants is varied through the use of race typed names. An employer may receive similar resumes from Greg and Jamal, or from Lakisha and Emily. The results of studies employing such resume methodologies are similar to those obtained while using the face-to-face techniques. For example, Bertrand and Mullainathan (2004) found that resumes with White-sounding names were about 50% more likely to receive callbacks for interviews than were resumes with Black-sounding names. However, studies employing this resume procedure are imperfect as well and have their own limitations (for a review, see Pager, 2007). But when one simultaneously considers the results of audit studies using face-to-face interviews and resume procedures, discrimination is clearly the most parsimonious explanation for the results that are typically observed. Although it is possible that some audit studies may overestimate the impact of race and gender on employment decisions (Pager, 2007), it seems quite unlikely that all of the disparate treatment observed in such audit studies is simply a consequence of these methodological concerns.

While the idea that subtle bias persists in the face of declining overt biases is well accepted within the social psychological literature, there are some who are critical of the subtle bias perspective. Many of these critics have come from outside the discipline of social psychology (e.g., Wax, 1999; Zuriff, 2002), but some have also come from within the field of social psychology (Mitchell & Tetlock, 2006; Tetlock & Mitchell, 2008, 2009). These critics argue that subtle bias has not been convincingly demonstrated to result in discriminatory behavior. However, reviews of the implicit bias literature indicate that discriminatory behavior has indeed been linked to different forms of subtle bias. For example, Dasgupta (2004) examined the relationship between implicit bias and behavior in a number of previous studies. She concluded that while implicit bias does not invariably lead to discriminatory behavior, the link between implicit beliefs and discriminatory behavior has been empirically demonstrated and replicated in numerous studies. More recently, Greenwald, Poehlman, Uhlmann, and Banaji (2009) examined the relationship between one particular measure of subtle bias (the Implicit

Association Test or IAT) and a variety of different criterion variables, such as nonverbal behavior. When combining the results of over 50 different empirical studies, they found that scores on the IAT did tend to be associated with criterion variables. Taken together these results strongly suggest that there is indeed a predictable relationship between implicit measures of subtle bias and discriminatory conduct.

Despite this substantial evidence, critics of the subtle bias perspective (Mitchell & Tetlock, 2006) argue that there is no evidence linking implicit bias to “real-world” discriminatory conduct, since the studies that have examined this link are typically conducted in laboratory contexts. That is, no study has linked implicit bias to discrimination in a truly naturalistic setting (e.g., an actual, rather than simulated, employment setting). While such a study has not been conducted in the United States, a study recently conducted in Sweden has indeed examined the link between implicit bias and actual employment decisions (Rooth, 2010, Experiment 1). This study employed a resume methodology in which two resumes with similar qualifications were sent in response actual employment advertisements, which had been placed by job recruiters. One of these resumes ostensibly belonged to an individual with a native Swedish surname and another resume was ostensibly from an individual with an Arab/Muslim surname. Researchers then recorded whether the resume received a callback for an interview from each of the job recruiters. In the bulk of the cases, neither resume received a callback from the job recruiter; however, in 522 cases at least one of the resumes received a callback. In 239 of these cases, both hypothetical applicants received a callback. Of those cases in which only one of the applicants received a callback, 217 calls were returned for the native Swedish applicant, whereas only 66 calls were returned for the Arab/Muslim applicant. Thus, consistent with previous studies conducted in the United States that have employed a similar methodology, a pattern of discrimination did emerge such that native Swedish applicants were significantly more likely to receive a callback than the Arab/Muslim applicants.

Later these job recruiters, who either called back the hypothetical applicant or failed to call the hypothetical applicant, were contacted and asked to complete implicit and explicit measures of their stereotypes of native Swedes and of Arab/Muslims, over the internet. Then the implicit and explicit beliefs of these individuals were examined to determine whether these beliefs were significant predictors of the call-back decision. The results revealed that implicit stereotypes were indeed a significant predictor of the callback decision, even after controlling for a number of other variables, including explicit attitudes and stereotypes. Rooth also conducted a second, similar study and was able to replicate this finding; he again found that IAT scores were able to predict discriminatory employment behavior. These studies demonstrate that there is indeed a link between implicit bias and discriminatory conduct in actual employment settings. Thus the consequences of implicit bias should no longer be viewed as a laboratory artifact, but as

a phenomenon that has been linked to actual discriminatory employment-related decisions. Furthermore, this line of research suggests, as do a number of other studies, that subtle bias may be an international phenomenon that extends beyond the United States, and that similar forms of prejudice and discrimination may exist in a number of different countries (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2007; Hodson, Dovidio, & Gaertner, 2002; Nosek et al., 2007).

But since Rooth's research (2010) was conducted outside of the United States, does it tell us anything about subtle discrimination in the United States? While similar research has yet to be conducted in the United States, we would point out that there is a significant amount of literature that documents precisely the type of discrimination that would be expected based on the subtle bias perspective. For example, audit studies indicate that the pattern of discrimination that exists in the United States often conforms to the pattern that would be predicted by the subtle bias perspective (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Pager & Western, 2006). Thus, even though the link between measures of subtle bias and "real-world" employment discrimination has not yet been directly observed in the United States, research does nonetheless indicate that discrimination in the United States often follows the pattern predicted by the subtle bias perspective.

Despite evidence such as this, critics of the subtle bias perspective argue that there is good reason to expect that discrimination will be less likely to occur in "real-world" contexts, relative to laboratory contexts in which the bulk of research has been conducted. Specifically, Mitchell and Tetlock (2006) reason that many real-world contexts have institutionalized safeguards, such as equal employment opportunity policies, which greatly reduce the likelihood that discriminatory conduct will occur. Since laboratory contexts typically lack such safeguards, the link between implicit bias and discrimination, which occurs in lab, does not accurately reflect the dynamics of real-world decision making. For example, in employment settings many organizations have official policies and procedures in place that strongly discourage discriminatory conduct, and as a result, the subtle forms of prejudice that may express themselves in laboratory contexts may not express themselves in such employment contexts. Whether this is actually the case remains an empirical question that has not been directly tested. However, audit studies of discrimination strongly suggest that discrimination still occurs, despite such safeguards; recall that audit studies reveal a consistent pattern of differential treatment in the contexts in which these institutional safeguards are presumably in place. If such safeguards actually prevented the expression of discriminatory conduct in actual employment contexts, then one would expect to see little evidence of disparate treatment in audit studies. Thus, while the hypothesis that institutional safeguards prevent the expression of subtle discriminatory conduct has not been rigorously tested, the available evidence does not seem to support such an interpretation and suggests that discrimination does commonly occur in naturalistic settings.

Burden of Proof in Applied Settings

Since the purpose of this issue is to examine the consequences of contemporary discrimination in everyday contexts, we should point out that the existence of race and gender disparities alone do not convincingly demonstrate that such disparities are due to subtle discrimination. At the very least, any procedure used to draw an inference of discrimination must provide evidence that other plausible explanations for disparate outcomes cannot fully account for such disparities. Therefore in this volume, the authors will address the evidence that suggests that group disparities are manifestations of discrimination, rather than factors unrelated to race or gender. Authors will also address how alternative explanations for disparate outcomes can (or cannot) be ruled out.

Although each selection will discuss the evidence that points to subtle bias as a cause of disparate outcomes, the burden of proof required in order to draw an inference of discrimination should not be set unrealistically high either. Although it is more difficult to isolate subtle bias as a cause of discrimination in real-world contexts, it is important to note that antidiscrimination laws typically involve a different burden of proof than that which is commonly required in the social sciences. For example, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act does not require absolute proof of discrimination or even proof “beyond a reasonable doubt” in order for an inference of discriminatory conduct to be drawn. As in other types of civil court procedures, only a preponderance of evidence is required to demonstrate discrimination. In other words, only more evidence supporting an inference of discrimination than that which refutes an inference of discrimination is required. Thus while social scientific evidence alone may not prove discriminatory conduct in applied settings with 100% confidence, such strong evidence is not required in order to draw a legally actionable inference of discrimination. Indeed such a high burden of proof is not required in any area of law, and in many instances there is likely to be at least some ambiguity in the motives that underlay the bulk of real-world discriminatory behavior. Despite this ambiguity, in some domains the available social scientific data strongly suggest that discrimination is at least partially responsible for the disparate outcomes faced by those who belong to groups that are legally protected under Title VII. And in many cases, evidence from social psychology may be of value to demonstrate the presence or absence of legally actionable discrimination.

Organization of the Issue

The first section of the issue will examine workplace discrimination. A significant and growing number of social psychologists, sociologists, and legal scholars have focused specifically on workplace discrimination as perhaps the most damaging form of subtle discrimination. This section will begin with a chapter by Devah

Pager and Bruce Western who will discuss the need for experimental research conducted outside of the laboratory. Since lab research documenting implicit bias and discrimination is typically conducted in artificial settings, its applicability to hiring decisions made in actual organizations, is open to debate. Pager and Western report that field studies of racial discrimination indicate that Blacks are significantly less likely to be hired than similarly qualified Whites. Moreover, they present qualitative data that point to subtle, rather than overt, discrimination as the source of this differential treatment. For example, Black testers, who are less likely to receive callbacks from prospective White employers, do not typically report that they have been treated more negatively by their prospective employers. In other words, the process by which discriminatory treatment occurred is so subtle, that the targets of the discriminatory conduct cannot accurately detect it.

In the same spirit as Pager and Western, Marc Bendick and Ana Nunes will discuss the use of paired comparison techniques to detect discrimination in the workplace. These procedures, in which pairs of research assistants with equivalent credentials apply for an actual position in a real workplace, have demonstrated that somewhere between 20% and 40% of employers discriminate against members of a legally protected class. Although a significant number of paired comparison studies have been conducted in the past decade, there has not been a concerted effort to systematically employ such techniques on a broader scale. Bendick and Nunes also believe that the use of such techniques can enhance social scientists' understanding of the psychological mechanisms that are responsible for subtle bias.

Mina Cikara, Susan Fiske, and Laurie Rudman describe how subtle gender bias may be present in academia and within the field of social psychology. They point out that despite the preponderance of women in the field, women are underrepresented at the highest levels of the professional hierarchy. This disparity is perhaps most evident in the publications appearing in social psychology's flagship journal, *The Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Cikara and her colleagues test a number of nondiscriminatory explanations for the existence of the gender gap in publications in this journal, and find that these gender neutral explanations cannot fully account for the disparity. They therefore conclude that the disparity may be due, at least in part, to a subtle form of gender discrimination.

The second section of this issue will address the implications of subtle bias in legal contexts. Melody Sadler, Joshua Correll, Bernadette Park, and Charles Judd explore the role that subtle bias may play in law enforcement contexts. They specifically examine whether the "shooter bias" (i.e., the tendency for Whites to more quickly shoot Black targets, relative to White targets) extends to a multiethnic context. They report data that suggest that the shooter bias is not unique to Black-White relations. For example, they observe that many Whites, including police officers, are quicker to shoot at Latino targets, relative to White targets. They also observe that Asian targets show a reverse shooter bias; Whites were more quick

to fire on other Whites relative to Asian targets. These results have potentially significant consequences for the some of the split second decisions that those in the law enforcement community must make in the application of deadly force.

Jerry Kang will examine the different ways in which evidence of implicit bias may facilitate the enforcement of antidiscrimination law. He argues that some have been alarmist in presuming that measures of implicit bias will be used to “read the minds” of individuals who are accused of discrimination; some fear that individual acts discrimination will be proven in the future by requiring individuals to complete measures of implicit bias. Despite this fear, no psychologists have suggested that measures of implicit bias be used in this way. He points out that implicit bias can still nonetheless improve compliance with antidiscrimination law by focusing on the prevention of such biases, rather than focusing on litigation that occurs after discrimination has already taken place.

Two of the chapters in this volume will examine the role of subtle bias in health and well-being. Louis Penner, Susan Eggly, Jennifer Griggs, Willie Underwood, Heather Orom, and Terrance Albrecht will discuss the implications of subtle racial discrimination in the treatment of cancer. They discuss the evidence that indicates that racial disparities in survival rates for cancer are significant, even after controlling for a number of nonracial variables. They argue that physician’s biases and stereotypes about Black patients play a key role in the different outcomes faced by Black and White cancer patients. They also discuss how these biases may influence the quality of physician–patient interactions, such that Black patients typically have lower quality interactions with their physicians than do White patients, and how the nature of these interactions may contribute to disparate outcomes.

Elizabeth Brondolo, Madeline Libretti, Luis Rivera, and Katrina Walsemann will discuss the role that implicit and subtle bias may play in social and physical well-being. They review the literature that suggests that different forms of subtle bias may serve to undermine the social capital of people of color. They argue that this diminished social capital is associated with a host of negative outcomes, and that it may therefore contribute to a number of economic, social, and health-related inequalities.

Emily Fisher and Eugene Borgida will contribute one of two concluding chapters by focusing on the most widely used measure of implicit prejudice, the Implicit Association Test, and its role in the litigation of employment discrimination cases. The IAT has faced on a number of critics who have focused on the presumed methodological shortcomings of the test (e.g., Blanton & Jaccard, 2006), as well as those who have questioned its application to the specific domain of employment litigation (e.g., Mitchell & Tetlock, 2006). Fisher and Borgida contend that while the IAT does have a number of shortcomings, the IAT and other measures of implicit bias still have relevance for understanding discrimination that occurs outside of the laboratory.

Nilanas Dasgupta and Jane Stout will offer a concluding chapter that summarizes the findings contained in our issue. They point out that questions about the external validity of laboratory research are indeed legitimate; at the same time however, the authors discuss how research has now begun to move from the laboratory into the field. They will also describe how the other selections in this issue illustrate the significance of implicit bias for “real-world” behavior, and call for greater collaboration between researchers and practitioners. They conclude by discussing the possible remedies for implicit bias, and argue that both perceivers and targets must take action in order to minimize the impact of the implicit bias.

Conclusion

While the consistent and widespread racial and gender inequalities that exist in many different domains are likely due to a combination of many different factors, one likely source of these inequalities is discrimination. In many cases, this discrimination is likely to be subtle and difficult to detect, and in some instances, may be unintentional. Although this type of discrimination is subtle, it is nonetheless damaging to those who are the targets of discriminatory conduct, and the cumulative effects of such discrimination may be substantial. In the domains of race and gender, in which individuals are presumably legally protected from discrimination, people are deprived of the civil rights when they face such behavior. Therefore, an important goal for research and practice in intergroup relations is the development of techniques that allow such discrimination to be reliably detected, and to distinguish discriminatory conduct from behavior that is not influenced by subtle racial and gender biases.

References

- Bendick, M., Jackson, C. W., & Reinoso, V. A. (1994). Measuring employment discrimination through controlled experiments. *Review of Black Political Economy*, 23, 25–48. doi:10.1007/BF02895739.
- Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *American Economic Review*, 94, 991–1013. doi:10.1257/0002828042002561.
- Blanton, H., & Jaccard, J. (2006). Arbitrary metrics in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 61, 27–41. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.61.1.27.
- Borgida, E., Hunt, C., & Kim, A. (2005). On the use of gender stereotyping research in sex discrimination litigation. *Journal of Law and Policy*, 13, 613–628.
- Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2002). The police officer’s dilemma: Using ethnicity to disambiguate potentially hostile individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 1314–1329. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.83.6.1314.
- Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., Wittenbrink, B., Sadler, M. S., & Keesee, T. (2007). Across the thin blue line: Police officers and racial bias in the decision to shoot. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 1006–1023. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.6.1006.