

BARBARA F. RESKIN: Most of the action is on--is over there. The panelists wisely decided to sit in the audience so they can see the projector more easily, so people will come up when they're going to speak. I'm feeling like I wish I had some kind of executive clout and I could get all the attendees who are out in the hall wasting time into this room because this is going to be a fabulous session. I--when I found out that I got to have some input, well I got to pick plenaries for the annual meetings this year, I knew right away that I wanted this plenary on profiling and I knew right away who I wanted to speak. And I'm extraordinarily pleased with the panel and I think you're going to be have your socks stuffed off by these presentations. So you can tell all your friends they made a bad decision if they didn't come. I'm Barbara Reskin. I'm welcoming you to a plenary session on Profiling across Social Institutions. I want to remind you that following this two-hour session, there are five followup sessions again that the program committee works very hard to pick great speakers for and my only trouble with these followup sessions is which of them I'm going to go to. I'm just torn because I want to go to all of them. We've got sessions on profiling in employment, profiling in education, profiling in healthcare, profiling in housing and consumption markets, and profiling on the criminal justice system. So, even if you're hungry, hang in there because we've got four hours following this session and they are going to be stupendous. Today, what we're going to do is have each speaker talk about 25 minutes. I'll introduce them. They'll come up and speak and then there will be time for discussion. And I really encourage you to ask questions. The panel is broad in their skills and their knowledge and it would be wonderful to take an advantage, for you to take an advantage of getting to talk to these people. I would like to sit down and talk to all of them for three hours. Our first speaker is Mahzarin Banaji who is currently at Harvard and indeed we overlapped at Harvard although it says on her name tag, she is from Yale. She taught at Yale before that. She is a cognitive psychologist and I first learned of her work several years ago on the web. She has a website. Now, I'm sure you're going to hear more about this in which you can have your students or your relatives. I've set all my relatives there. Friends, people, where you can look at your own implicit attitudes. Implicit, what I mean by that is may not be attitudes you're aware of. I think the research that she has done with her main collaborator in this, Greenwald, is truly paradigm changing. I've heard her present two or three times. She is a wonderful presenter. She has done an enormous amount of scholarly work and has scholarly titles but I'd rather take the time for you to listen to her. So it's my pleasure to introduce to you Mahzarin Banaji.

[Applause]

[Pause]

MAHZARIN BANAJI: This is going to be interesting for me. Control has been rested for me and there are wizards in the back who are going to run this show. So we will see how I'll deal without anything to do with my hands. Thank you, Barbara. I'm honored to be invited. My introduction to the social sciences was really through sociology, the Frankfurt School to be precise, and I studied Habermas for a while.

Didn't quite understand Habermas and thought it was the English translation. And I studied German in order to read Habermas. What was I thinking? I mean I--so here I am 24 years later back at a gathering of sociologists who talk about something actually associated with the Frankfurt School, unconscious mental processes even though the approach that I will take here is nothing like theirs. It's not at all psychodynamic. You can say it is somewhat hostile to that way of thinking. I'm gonna take it as a given that the issue that we will speak about here in this session and following sessions on profiling have a-- that that problem has a more general cognitive affect of phases in constructs that social scientists know and through the words stereotypes and even perhaps prejudice. And that the second given is that these processes can indeed be measured. There are three sciences now involved in this, three clusters of sciences, the social sciences obviously, the mind sciences where I'm more or less at, and these days even the brain sciences and it is my sense that an alliance between all of these would be extremely good if we are to assertively attempt to understand profiling, where it is born, how it is nourished both socially and cognitively and affectively, and where they reveal themselves in the real world. I'm going to only focus on the first part. I will focus really on the roots of stereotypes and the roots of prejudice by showing you that they exist. Not only that they exist in others but in ourselves and our own minds. And that they often sit outside the reach of conscious awareness so that we are not aware while we are indeed stereotyping or judging somebody in a prejudicial way. And when sometimes aware which is in some ways easier, still not being able to exert full control over it. And so much of this talk in the next 25 minutes or so is going to focus on the issue of an inability to be able to control the associations that we've learned to make based on experience. And from that we can go on to questions of then what the solutions need to be given the pervasiveness of them as a new book by Ian Ayres called "Pervasive Prejudice?" we'll tackle, and our own work in cognitive psychology and social psychology, certainly [inaudible]. If you will give me a moment, I'm just going to get some water. Let's go to the first slide. This is an odd-looking face. It's turned upside down. What I'd like you to do is to do a very simple exercise. Turn this face mentally in your heads right side up and just imagine what it would look like. And by your response I will know when I do that whether you actually got it right or not, okay. So ready, turn it up, straight side up. My own sense is that most of you did not imagine it looking this way. And the main point that I want to make using this illusion which was generated by a left wing labor psychologist in England who used Maggie Thatcher's face to first demonstrate this illusion is that not only do we even with familiar objects not recognize them. It is the orientation in which we see objects, the patterns or the arrangements in which society lays itself that preclude us from seeing things that are quite familiar. I'm just recovering from the flu and have a bad throat, so excuse me. Let's go to the next slide. I'm going to--this one is an interesting one and I use it to make multiple points. These two table tops are identical in shape and size, okay. How many of you believe that? If you do you should raise your hand if you've seen that illusion before, okay, one person. What we're going to do is switch the projector off so that we have a black screen. And can you take me off camera, okay. Thank you. Alright, what we need is greater light though. So let us, Bill, if you can just show them the tables first without any overlay. Yeah, okay, those are the tables, if we can move them as high up so that, yeah, people can see them. Alright, the same table. The reason I don't show you this in the projector is that the illusion is so powerful you would actually feel that the shape is changing as I'm moving it. So now for the skeptics, we'll just do it. Why don't we just put--this is the second overhead that will go on top of this one and you will see that as Bill turns it. Yeah, you can turn it off. That actually is the same shape and size. For the skeptics, one more

time. This illusion was generated by Roger Shepard, a cognitive psychologist who studies perception. I teach about what this says about the mind and the brain. The image on our retina is indeed equal but our mind imposes meaning on to this and makes them seem different to you for reasons that actually fit very well with why it is that under many conditions we need to elongate things that are parallel to the line of vision versus those that are perpendicular and so on. The point here is not of course about tables. The point here is that the very same thing can be seen in some more modern work to be true in the social domain. So I will argue that there are social illusions that are very similar to this particular perceptual one. Two people can perform the same action. But knowledge that we have about the social groups to which they belong will lead us to see those behaviors to be entirely different. And the illusion is no different from this and I hope I can persuade to some extent that if you buy this, if you believe that our minds can lead us astray in as dramatically as in this illusion that you will also be on board with me when I show you that there are ways and which there are biases in our minds of which we're not aware that can have approximately effects of similar magnitude. The next slide. So this is just a comment made by Roger Shepard about the illusion that you just saw in which he says any knowledge or understanding of the illusion we may gain at the intellectual level remains virtually powerless to diminish the magnitude of the illusion and that is seen by my showing you if I had the same tables again and you would see the illusion yet again. Not very different, a man walks out of a building, puts his hand into his pocket to pull out an identity card to show police officers that behavior is seen quite differently and a set of consequences are produced that I think coming from an illusion, that is roughly the same as what we've seen here with the table. This is an ACLU ad written after the Amadou Diallo event in which they pair each of these pictures of bullet holes with the Miranda Warning arguing at the bottom that indeed Amadou Diallo did have the right to remain silent. And in some ways what we are interested in are the roots, the beginnings of the thoughts and the feelings in the minds of those police officers and perhaps even in ourselves if we were in such a situation that would lead to that particular sequence of events. One of my very favorite poets Adrienne Rich said these words that I've taken seriously and even thinking about my research program. Lucky I am, she says, I hit nobody old or young, killed nobody left no trace, practiced in life as I am, and it is this that we study. We're practiced in life. We, our minds are ready to learn to make connections between things that go together. And when experience in real or in false ways has connected them, they are going to be there and they will have influence often independently of our intention to have them. The way in which social scientists tend to study attitudes is this. We assume that we can ask people to tell us what they believe and to take that report as a genuine indication of their thoughts and their feelings. That is correct. In many, many cases we can do that and we can make wonderful predictions to behavior as many social scientists including the group that I work with have shown that we can ask people about their feelings and they predict very well. For example, we can ask people about their attitudes towards African-Americans, it can predict lots of things including the attitudes to racial profiling and so on. So we know that that is true. But we have focused on a different type of attitude or different kind of stereotype, one that is not in this way accessible to conscious awareness and to change. So when Clinger said I used to be X and now I'm Y, that is very true of the conscious beliefs that we called. We can have attitudes to a variety of object that are under our direct and conscious control. We are interested in a very different family of thoughts and feelings. Ones that are not--do not rise above the level of conscious awareness and therefore are interested in looking at the roots of stereotypes and the roots of prejudice. This is a very simple task that may tell you a little

bit about what it is that we try to measure. I can ask you to name the color in which this words are written and you should be able to do that column by column pretty rapidly. So let's just see if we can try to do this. I don't know if we--you'll get a feel for what the task is. Alright, so is that a green up there? Yeah, okay. So why don't you just say as quickly as you can the name of the color in which the word appears and will just go down and do two columns. Ready, go. Green, red, purple--

Okay, alright, next slide. Alright, we're going to do the same thing now. Name the color in which the word appears. Okay? Just ignore what the word says. Ready? Green--

>> Red, blue--

Okay, this is a tough test. Can you see exactly why it's hard? There are two parts to each word, at least two. One is the color in which it's printed, the other is its meaning. I'm asking you to do something very simple, ignore the meaning. Okay. Just name the color, don't pay attention to the meaning. And the reason you're having trouble doing this is that it is impossible not to pay attention to the meaning of the word. Meaning is going to come in there and do something and our work looks at social categories, race, gender, sexual orientation, disability, you name it we've done it to show that those aspects of who we are, are like the meaning of information. Choose as we may to ignore it, it takes enormous practice and really, a very different world in which we would have to live for us to be able to ignore. It's gonna impinge on the judgments that we have to make very much in this way and so the dialog then about what those processes tell us about what solutions might be proposed, change the playing field in significant ways. Let's look at. So that is--actually captures a very critical piece of the kind of technique that we use which I unfortunately will not have the time to describe. My two main collaborators on this work are Anthony Greenwald at University of Washington, Brian Nosek who just finished his PhD and has started a position at University of Virginia. And then graduate students at Yale and Harvard except Elizabeth Phelps who's a professor at NYU. I'm going to make a connection between the kind of work that is happening and it is eons away from producing anything of a real technique or a technology like the spyglass for the telescope. But the wheels of science grind slowly. It was in the 13th century that Roger Bacon first ground a piece of glass down and produced an eye glass so that people could see things they had never seen. It was several centuries later in the 17th century that the son of a Dutch artisan put two lenses together and discovered that you could see much further and Galileo used that to produce the first telescope and if you look at that telescope and the Hubble telescope this century, those are vastly different. So the time it takes to get from the development of something like the piece of glass or the Hubble telescope is many, many centuries. And what I think we're coming to in this--in the sciences that are trying to look inside the mind and with the hope that some future generation hundreds of years from now will actually build a tool that will gives us a much more precise recording of it. I think the issue that we confront as this description says about the telescope is something to keep in mind because the results from these experiments seem to be very easily challenged, not so much on the basis of evidence that comes from the outside as much as from our own gut. So when I first took the test

that I'm going to tell you about I thought that the test was that there's something simply wrong with it. Okay. It could not absolutely, it could not produce the data that it had and now I humbly will produce my own data. I often show my own scores in an effort to tell you not to be as close minded as I was when I first took the test myself. The question is going to be one of not just what the data are saying but whether to even interpret them. Because I think that in many ways they are nothing short of frightening. Next slide. Alright, and actually let's do--why don't you hit the button twice more so we can. In this task which I'm not going to be able to demonstrate to you, you're asked and if you go to the website you will see it and I'll give you the address in a second. You're asked to pair things together. You're asked to pair faces. These are morphed phases so that morphed faces, they're not faces of real people. The task requires you to rapidly classify faces that come from one of two groups, white or black in this case, along with words that we know to be meaning things that are either good, and wonderful, and nice, and pleasant or things that mean things that are awful and not so nice where it's like hatred, failure, war, awful, et cetera. Or words like friend, love, joy, peace, and so on. And what we do and if you can--it's in one set we will have people make the connection between African-American faces and good words, white faces and bad words, measure the reaction time that it takes to make that sorting. So imagine in your mind you have a set of playing cards and you were asked to rapidly sort anything that was white and good on one side and anything that was black and bad on the other side. I could just measure how quickly you can do that then shuffle the cards, give them back to you, and have you make the opposite pairing, this time saying try to put black and good together, white and bad together, and measure the speed it takes you to do that.

>> The difference in those two conditions gives us a score that we use as a rough indication of the ease with which you as a person wherever this information may have come from but now it's your hands doing the shuffling so it's telling us something about the strength of association in your mind, how quick--that difference in score is what we use, a difference in reaction time at the level of milliseconds. I should say that this task produces statistically very large effects on the order of a hundred milliseconds or so, that's very, very large. Even a difference in the past using very different tools of 17 milliseconds produces a statistically significant difference. So 100 and 150 millisecond difference is huge. As a friend of ours said, we don't need a computer to measure this. A sundial will do. And I think that is among its impressive properties. Just showing you the race task, the website. So about four years ago, we put this task at a website to which people come and take any one of many different tasks that will give them some insight into the strength of their biases. And what you just saw, if we can just go back to that slide please, yeah. What you're seeing here is how quickly they're able to pair black with bad and in that same cell are included the data for white and good, okay. And then the other cell, the taller bar where you're pairing black--oh sorry, white with bad. And in that cell is also are included the data for black and good. And what you're seeing is the difference in speed that it takes to make one kind of pairing over the other. I'm not gonna show it you for all tasks but this is over and over again what we get and what is interesting of course is that this is in people who report having no conscious bias one way or another, okay. They tell us that they prefer the group black and white equally or and very close to neutral is the score. Teachers who came to the website because there's a second website that we have that the

Southern Poverty Law Center hosts, teachers who go to that website said to us that they were somewhat perturbed about their race bias but they weren't terribly perturbed because they would certainly not show that bias towards children. They were only showing that towards adult blacks and whites. And so this test was created same measures but with faces again morphed, not real kids, of African-American and European-American faces. And you'll get an effect that is in fact the same magnitude as the one that I showed you with adult data, adult stimuli I should say. Alright, next. Alright so here are the websites. The first one is still active and will be active and is going to be active until the end of September. The second one will be active only at the end of September. And you can go to www.tolerance.org which is the Southern Poverty Law Center's website and they do a bunch of other things there but our tests are a prominent part of that website. And it just, I was pleased to see it just won the Webby Award in the activism category. My social scientists in the audience who will say to me, how can you interpret those data from the 400,000 tests taking on race, this is a slide to tell you yes, I am aware of the difficulties of what we do. I am currently sitting because of this kind of work on a taskforce of the American Psychological Association on using the internet for research paying attention to two questions mostly, the ethics of running human subjects by the web and the veracity of the data. So I am happy to answer questions. We've done a lot of work with this. We have a couple of papers now on how to interpret those web data but I can't go into that here. This is just to show you that this is a pretty general effect although we're supposed to be working on profiling which I wanna get to if I can in about 5 minutes. This is just a few of the difference kinds of tests and what you're seeing there is not-- you're not seeing both bars, you're seeing the subtraction and you're seeing really an effect size that's being computed and these are very--these are under estimates of anything because we're very cautious with the web data. And these are decent-sized effect sizes. Most of the ones in the laboratory run under much more controlled conditions are [inaudible] of 1.5 and around there. This test sits at the SPLC website in which we are looking at the connection between races. So people see faces that are like the ones that you saw before, morphed faces of African-Americans, European-Americans, and they're asked to now pair either one type of face with the objects on the left which I will simply refer to as harmless objects and then objects on the right which are harmful objects. Although I should note that a police officer who took this test told me that Maglite torch there is not, flashlight there is not one that is a harmless object. He has used it both at home and on the job. So what--but what we're looking at is the speed with which people will classify or associate white faces with these weapons on the right as well as with harmless objects, same with black faces, and look at the speed, okay. The reason for picking these odd weapons is that we wanted to undermine our own hypothesis that we'd find a relationship. So we picked weapons that were explicitly not connected with the group African-American to show that in spite of doing that, you're going to see an association. On the explicit measure when we asked them, so do you think that weapons for some reason are more associated with people who are black or white, what we see is a score very close to the neutral. When we asked them the same about harmless objects, again very close to the neutral. So, and at least on self-report measures they're telling us that they think both of these are more or less equally associated with the group black and white. On the implicit association test, what we see is very rapid, much more rapid association between weapons and black than weapons and white. The Frankfurt School had taught me about ethnocentrism. It's not something that psychologists these days pay much attention to, but a student Will Cunningham and I have been interested in it and one of the things that we see, I'm not going to spend much time on this graph is that

not only is there a--everything in blue represents in that histogram all of the people who are to the right of the no bias point. So what you're seeing there is that something like 83 percent or 86 percent or 79 percent are showing each of those biases and we picked out six groups to capture race and class and nationality and ethnicity, religion, and sexual orientation. And what you see is just a magnitude of the bias on those scores. This is among college students at William and Mary and Yale. I'm going to skip over these because it is going to take me a little time to explain the brain data. But we have some very interesting brain data showing a correlation between the magnitude of the behavioral data on this particular task and brain activation in a region that is known to be responsible for emotional learning. And so the work in that area is being taken by us to show, really show how the social world impinges not only on behavior but if it does on behavior, it has to have a representation somewhere in the brain and the brain is quite plastic, quite malleable, responsive to social input and our goal in those studies is to look at how simple changes in the situation mimicking the work that people like [inaudible] have done having black or white experimenters do the study is to see if those even get reflected in changes in the brain data. In this study, Yale undergraduates were asked to think about their most favorite white-- sorry, their most favorite black athletes and their most despised white politicians. And these are examples of the ones that were listed most frequently by Yale students. And in this experiment, they do exactly the same task with the same names but with one small difference. In one case, they're classifying names like Michael Jordan and Jackie Robinson and so on as names of athletes while they're classifying Strom Thurmond and Jessie Helms and so on as politicians, okay. And when they do that, you see that their conscious and their unconscious data show roughly the same pattern. I'm not showing you the conscious data but on the left toolbars, you see that they're pairing Michael Jordan with positive things a lot faster than they're pairing Jessie Helms with positive things. So the implicit is showing that effect. But then we have them do exactly the same task, this time pair--this time classifying the name Michael Jordan or Jessie--Jackie Robinson as black and classifying Strom Thurmond and Jessie Helms as white. The lens through which they look at those people, race versus occupation, makes quite substantial difference so that that benefit that Jordan has both implicitly and explicitly, when you think about him as an athlete goes away when looked at when he's viewed through a race lens. I am not going to have-- how much time do I have Barbara? Down to three minutes? Okay, so I'm going to--let's skip over the next well, eight slides, I'm sorry. This is a project to look at with--that I'm calling the who's American and showing and I'll just mention the bottom line here. People tell us that Asian-Americans are not as American as white Americans culturally and so on, even though they ought to have the same rights as citizens.

But they tell us that African-Americans are just as American as white Americans are. Contrary to that statement, they're unable to make the connection between African-American and American using things like the American flag and so on to represent the country as they are with white American. The harder tests were to look at the pairing of African-American athletes and the category American and white athletes. The bias remains as robust even there and the most odd one shows up in the inability to associate well known Asian-Americans people like Connie Chung and so on with the category American compared with white foreigners, people like Hugh Grant and so on. So that might tell you about how strong the bias is. So I'm going to move, not do that particular set of studies and just get us down to closure. John Rawls' work always was appealing to me and I wonder if the work on implicit stereotypes

and implicit prejudice now gives stronger and new meaning to his words all social primary goods and liberty an opportunity, income and wealth and the basis of self-respect are to be distributed equally unless an unequal distribution of any or all of these goods is to the advantage of the least favored. I think that in thinking about how we might correct and how we might balance things out the data of the kind that I have spoken about, I hope we'll go into some discussion about the extent to which correction is needed. I'm going to just say a few more words to those fellow travelers in this room who do work on the pervasiveness of attitudes of prejudice and beliefs that reveals stereotypes. I would say that the remarkable feature of our joint effort is the ability to demonstrate that we ourselves are susceptible to the biases we've traditionally shown in others. Now, more so than ever, the case can be made that solutions need to take in to account this knowledge because of the meaning it gives to the term demonstrable. I who admit to showing many of these biases and in quite robust ways see them as saying something about my own mind and what has come to be in it. In part because of the time and culture in which I live, in part because of the settings I have willingly chosen because they benefit me or assure my safety. However imperceptible they are and however resistant I might be to acknowledge their presence, I conclude that this do reflect who I am. And each unmasking reminds me that if I am to be a participant in the democratic process and if I am to pay more than lip service to anything like a duty to justice that I have as a scholar, that eternal vigilance about the threats to the dignity of the individual is an ever greater need. Attorney General John Ashcroft has had a new and unprecedented set of powers PO10756 passed on October 26, 2001 is called Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism producing the convenient acronym USA PATRIOT. The goal is safety for Americans, a worthwhile goal in our minds as we travel and do our business. But the context in which the act was framed and the explicit powers that it renders raised troubling questions about the potential effects on the civil rights of citizens and non-citizens. I'll mention only a few here. Indefinite detention without right to counsel, detention and deportation of innocent people who have unknowingly associated with the potential terrorists, returning the rights to the CIA to spy on US citizens, a right that had been revoked in the aftermath of Vietnam. And the requirement that universities comply in providing information about foreign students, courses taken, library books read, etcetera, etcetera. Given what we know about the threats to mental due process, long before due process in the courts is even an issue, there is a need even an urgency to ask about implications of that act. To make the connection between what I'm talking about which is implicit social cognition, single events that take place on the order of 500 milliseconds and large scale social systems not only seems but is an unimaginable distance. But I will remind us that science has been there before. In the 1930s, the astrophysicist, Subrahmanyan Chandrasekhar, used the orbital mechanics of a single electron about as microscopic a phenomenon as one can imagine to predict the existence of black holes about as macroscopic a phenomenon as one can imagine. The notion that the mechanics of the tiniest of structures could serve not only as a metaphor to understand the other but rather to describe the very mechanism of the other was an outrageous idea, outrageous enough that it was a full 50 years later that it served as the basis of his Nobel Prize. I will admit to harboring the belief that even in matters of connection between mind and society that we imagine a bridge between the micromechanics of the mind, the work of psychologists largely in the macro social universe, the work of sociologists largely that they shape and they reflect in just that way. And I thank you for listening.

[Applause]

BARBARA RESKIN: I am going to be really quick in the introductions because I don't want you guys need to hear these speakers rather than me. The second speaker is Larry Bobo. Oops, [whispering]. Larry is going to speak on ideas that matter stereotypes and social inequality. He is another sterling scholar who's done very important work on understanding race attitudes, race politics, race profiling in America. Thank you.

[Applause]

LAWRENCE D. BOBO: Good afternoon, thanks very much for that warm introduction. It's a pleasure to be a part of this thought-provoking and important session. When my good friend and now ASA president Barbara Reskin asked me to be a part of a session on racial profiling, I did not hesitate to say yes. As time passed, however, I began to fret a bit about exactly what I might have to contribute to a discussion on profiling having done little in the way of direct research on the phenomenon of police profiling of African-Americans and Latinos let's say, or even the new scourge of Flying While Arab with airline pilots now kicking some dark complected secret service agents off of planes or an F15 being called out to escort a commercial airliner back to an airport because one passenger saw people who appear to be Arab having a suspicious amount of fan. Then it occurred to me that I do a great deal of work in thinking about the role of racial stereotypes and other ethno-racial attitudes, and especially how these social psychological factors and processes contribute to the maintenance and reproduction of systematic descriptive social inequality. And so that is where I have chosen to focus my remarks today. As a sociologist, what I say here may represent a slightly different emphasis in the framing of the problem and methods of inquiry. I rely primarily on social surveys, experiments embedded within surveys, and a thick material of open-ended replies to survey questions. I do so in the service of an analysis of how studies of ethno-racial attitudes and beliefs may illuminate the micro social processes that help create and sustain the macro social patterns and conditions that constitute the observable structure of ethno racial inequality and hierarchy, of what my colleague political scientist Michael Dawson calls the racial order. My talk will first be about stereotyping and comparatively recent data on the extent of racial stereotyping at least to the degree one can measure with explicit items. Second, I will discuss data on how these stereotypes may figure into the process of racial residential segregation. Third, I will discuss how stereotypes may influence labor market dynamics and lastly, I will talk about the larger sociopolitical effects of stereotypes and then quickly sketch some strategies of ameliorative response. That's a lot to do so let's go. I hope this little green things work. Profiling in many ways is a catchy new term for the process of acting on stereotypes. Social psychologists have long thought of stereotypes as a set of beliefs about the personal attributes of members of a particular social category, a set of cognitions that specify the personal qualities, especially personality traits of members of an ethnic group, ethno-racial category. Cognitive social psychologists have done extensive works suggesting that

we must employ some simplifying categories in order to deal with the great flood of stimuli coming to us or impinging on us in any given moment. Such ways of organizing information in our environment even when about members of other ethno-racial groups need not be extreme and categorical uniformly of negative tilt totally unresponsive to new information or therefore, inherently bad. The problem arises is when we take ideas about members of an ethno-racial group even if now more qualified new and sophisticated and apply them to individuals irrespective of important relevant individuating information.

It is useful to recognize the distinction as Patricia Devine notes between cultural or broadly recognized effectively conceptual stereotypes. And those things that are personal beliefs. Each of us are now well aware of the talk of using profiling, say, of people from the Middle East, from the Arab world as a way of combating terrorism. Behind this notion is now a sort of cultural stereotype that these are the people despite the Timothy McVeigh's of the world and friends that pose a risk to our safety. Fortunately, even though that stereotype is out there, many of us hold personal beliefs that reject such a simplistic organization of our thinking and public policy. The trouble is as I think is the implication of much of the [inaudible] work is that even those of us who know better may come to be influenced or affected by the repeated reinforcement of the common cultural stereotype. Stereotypes have three principal sources and in many ways come to reflect the distribution of groups in the social structure, an issue I will return to at the end. Stereotypes may be learned. They may be instrumental and useful to us. They certainly have a basis in the fundamental processes of perception that encourage certain systematic biases in the ideas we come to hold. Having quickly sketched a few ideas about what stereotypes involve, I want to shift gears to talk about some results from a large research project called the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality for which I was one of the principal investigators. The study involved the four metropolitan area examination of the interplay of the labor market and economic inequality issues, the housing market and residential segregation issues, and ethno-racial relations, attitudes and beliefs. I will heavily emphasize data from the Los Angeles portion of the study, but at various points would draw on results from the other sites that are pulled together. One of my main concerns in the study was racial stereotypes. At the time that Howard Schuman, Charlotte Steeh, and I wrote the first edition of the book *Racial Attitudes in America*, we discovered that survey researchers have largely forsaken focus work on stereotypes. There was indeed only one question on which we could find extensive trend data. Subsequently, Mary Jackman and her important work published in the book *the Velvet Glove: Paternalism and Conflict in Gender, Class, and Race Relations*, became the first major reintroduction into the survey tradition of a concern with stereotyping. This was followed by a major module in the general social survey in 1990 that I have led along with Jim Kluegel from Illinois, and from there there's been a widespread return to an interest in stereotyping and surveys. For the MCSUI, that is multi-city project. Pardon me for that painful acronym. We use a variation of the bipolar trait rating skills used in the GSS which called for respondents to rate ethno-racial groups on such trait dimensions as intelligence or unintelligent, hardworking or lazy, speaking standard English well or speaking standard English poorly, prefer to live off of welfare, prefer to be self-supporting, are involved with drugs and gangs, not involved with drugs and gangs, and so on. In this next figure, we show results where high scores indicate more negative stereotypical ratings across the set of six such traits. To focus briefly on the results for our

white respondents, we can see that the lowest, that is the most favorable rating, goes to white and that both blacks and Latinos are given the more negative higher ratings. The data immediately underscores that despite considerable sensitivity on racial topics, people still certainly express important perceptions of ethno-racial differences in basic personality and behavioral traits. And with the exception of how they rate themselves, blacks and Latinos tend to end up at the unfavorable or most negatively stereotyped end of the continuum. It is also helpful to look at the different score ratings which would be the next slide. Thanks guys. A comparison of ratings of how people rated members of their own group relative to that of each of the possible other groups. Bars above the zero point mean that the in-group is rated as superior to an out-group and bars below the zero point mean that the in-group is rated as inferior to an out-group. Thus, our white respondents on average clearly rated themselves as substantially superior to blacks and to Latinos and is less clearly distinct from Asians. Black respondents rated themselves as only trivially different from whites, but superior to Latinos and Asians. Our Asian respondents a little difference on the set of traits between themselves and whites, but rated themselves as substantially superior to blacks and especially Latinos. And ironically, Latinos were the only group to rate themselves as substantially behind whites. This tended to occur even among those of Mexican ancestry as well as those from other parts of Latin America and that this is not merely a function of length of residence or an activity to the native born or less--show less pronounced effect. I will quickly note that given the set of traits we used, we had expected to find average ratings of African-Americans to be the most negative, but instead found that white's ratings of blacks and Latinos were about equivalent. This proved to be attributable really to one key item among the set and that was the ability to speak Standard English well. When we remove that item from the scale and examine the different scores again, we see white's rating of blacks are more clearly distinct from those of Latinos on average across the remaining five traits, and that white's perceptions of Asians then diminished to almost virtually indistinguishable difference. In some, we found reasonably clear evidence of widespread perceptions of differences across groups with the two most economically and socially disadvantaged groups, African-Americans and Latinos, subject to the most negative stereotype perceptions. The next question then is whether any of these stereotypes of perceptions of differences across groups of behavioral tendencies, capacities, and personality characteristics matters for other social processes and outcomes. There was strong warrant to believe that they should given what cognitive social psychologists have shown regarding the influence of stereotypes on what we perceive, how we interpret information, how we make sense of the world, and how we develop lines of behavioral response to people and issues in our environment. I will begin by thinking about the housing market. Thanks. The pioneering work of demographers Douglas Massey and Nancy Denton recorded in their book *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*, compelled a reconsideration of how racial bias in the housing market contributed to larger patterns of group differences and the chances of experiencing unemployment, poverty, and long-term economic hardship. Key among Massey and Denton's result was the findings that African-Americans in the US were hypersegregated in most major metropolitan areas. Why? The short answer was prejudice and discrimination. A more complete and empirically validated answer requires fuller evidence on attitudes and beliefs and on how they may figure into housing search and selection decisions. The MCSUI replicated a pioneering set of measures of neighborhood racial composition preferences developed by my friend and distinguished demographer Reynolds, Farley and my mentor Howard Schuman for the 1976 Detroit area study. The show card approach presented respondents by five

different neighborhoods moving from an all-white neighborhood to one with one black neighbor, to one with about 20 percent black neighbors, to one with one third black neighbors, to one that was a slight majority black. In the MCSUI, what we did was create a three-way survey-based experiment in which randomly selected subsets of respondents received show cards referring either to integration with blacks or with Latinos, or with Asians. Thus, we have a direct experimental test of whether the specific racial out-group matters. Along with Professor Camille Z. Charles of the University of Pennsylvania, Sociology Department, I have analyzed these data. Respondents were asked to express two judgments whether or not they would feel comfortable and whether they would personally be willing to move in to such a neighborhood. This figure shows several key patterns. First, there is generally substantial openness to residential integration especially in so far as small numbers of minorities reside in the area. Second, numbers matter, however, with a significant decline in the level of openness with each increased in proportioned minority. Third, and perhaps most important for the argument I'm making today, there is always a stair step pattern result whether we are talking about one minority group member in the neighborhood or over 50 percent minority. African-Americans always encounter expression of the least comfort and the least willingness on the part of whites to move in. It is worth noting here that the question wording tells respondents to think in terms of a neighborhood "that they can afford", thus largely equating or taking out the social class distinction. A different array of show cards was used with black, Latino, and Asian respondents, asking them to pick up preferred neighborhood and to indicate whether or not they were willing to move into a neighborhood with varying percentages of members of other groups. For the moment, what I will stress here is that blacks and Latinos expressed a willingness to live in substantially integrated areas. The limitation of the old DIS show card methodology, however, is that it relies on two group comparisons. Of course, real social environments are not composed only of two groups, but rather as I like to put it, are prismatic, composed of a great mixture of colors, hues, and cultures. To respond to this situation, the MCSUI project deployed what we called the multiethnic group card where respondents could indicate any racial composition they might prefer. Results for this measure have been reported in a major social problems article by Camille Charles and in her chapter in the volume *Urban Inequality: Evidence from Four Cities*. The results show in this slightly-complicated to read table, for example, in the first column, that fully 11 percent of the white respondents in L.A. County in 1994, that is a majority-minority county in 1994, fully 11 percent of white respondents created an all-white neighborhood which ought to raise immediate questions about the potential for creating stable integrated communities. 19 percent or 1 out of 5 created a neighborhood that was integrated, but had no African-Americans on it. In contrast, only 3 percent of blacks created an all-black neighborhood and, in general, blacks created neighborhoods that were majority other groups, that is at least 63 percent non-black. Part of what I want to underscore is that stereotypes help drive how people think about the neighborhoods they'd be willing to live in. As this next slide shows and this pulls data across the four multi-city sites, 22 percent of white respondents created neighborhoods that had no blacks in it, but that number leaps to nearly 40 percent if the anti-black stereotyping score was even moderately negative among our respondents. And here, it should be stressed that the impact of negative stereotypes tends to hold for all groups though it is most consistent among the white respondents. There were some encouraging news in the MEC results and I don't want to skip pass those, most respondents of all groups creates some degree of integration. However, it is an interesting sidelight of that particular methodological innovation that you can also look at who people

put adjacent to them in that little your home box. And it's interesting the way in which racial hierarchy plays out even here in that whites were the most likely to have made all of the immediately-adjacent houses in the show card, people of the same race, and blacks were the least likely to do so and the most likely to have made all of the adjacent homes, members of other groups. If this story is true, if it helps spells out some of the micro social processes that undergird discrimination in the housing market and that helped perpetuate the segregation of groups and communities, well then, that's an important thing. And we should be clear. There is strong evidence on the persistence of discrimination in access to housing. Audit studies summarized by economist John Yinger are very clear on this point. In roughly half their efforts to buy a home, blacks and Latinos encountered differential negative treatment compared to an otherwise identical white home seeker. Furthermore, residential segregation remains an extensive and here I draw on data tabulated by the Lewis Mumford Center at SUNY, and even the census data, I think, show us very clearly about the extremity of racial segregation of at least black-white parents. With a number of major studies still showing dissimilarity scores in the '80s indicating that 80 percent of blacks and whites would have to change their places of residence to accomplish a random distribution in residential space. There are strong reasons as well to believe that stereotypes play a powerful role in the labor market. My colleague, William Julius Wilson's Urban Poverty and Family Life Study, gave powerful evidence first reported by Kirschenman and Neckerman that many urban employers not only hold racial stereotypes, but routinely act on them. Kirschenman and Neckerman's in-depth interviews showed employers characterizing inner city blacks as "illiterate, dishonest, unmotivated, involved with drugs and gangs, et cetera." Wilson's own summary emphasized the overall negative tilt of employer assessments based on these in-depth interviews, though both he and Kirschenman and Neckerman treat the processes involved as principally statistical discriminations, sort of basing on inference. Similarly, telephone interviews with employers conducted as part of the MCSUI project by economist Harry Holzer pointed in the same direction of negative employer perceptions limiting the attainments of blacks and Latinos. Part of what I want to stress here today is that people with power in the workplace, however, are unlikely to derive their attitudes and beliefs strictly from workplace experiences as is often the implication of the studies based on looking just at employers. Like everyone else, like all of us, like you and me, they are embedding the set of institutions and social arrangements, a culture and a social fabric that exposes us all to certain cultural-racial stereotypes. Thus, in analyzing MCSUI data, I have shown that business owners do not respond to our stereotype questions very differently from non-business owners or workers. Likewise, those with supervisory authority in the workplace are no more or less likely to respond substantively to our stereotype questions than those who were mere line workers. Owners and supervisors showed no important systematic differences in how they responded to racial attitude questions according to our interviewer debriefing assessments as well. We had the interviewers monitor respondent's behavior, and if they felt they were particularly sensitive, acute or hesitant, or like they were to make a record of it. That is, these supervisors and business owners completed the test and expressed similar views to those who were just average Joes, not in the position to hire or fire or direct the work of other individuals. We also asked people directly about their own experiences with discrimination in the workplace using a limited number of items quite admittedly. We found that blacks and Latinos were the most likely to report workplace experiences of discrimination. Indeed, on a cumulative basis, 60 percent of African-Americans reported at least one such encounter across four items as did 31 percent of our Latino respondents. Our analyses of open-ended replies make it clear to

us at least that these encounters were usually described in clear detail and compelling terms. Since my time is short, let me rush to my final area of concern and that is with the sociopolitical effects of negative stereotyping. Major work based on National Survey Data by myself, Jim Sidanius and colleagues, Jim Kluegel, by Donald Kinder and colleagues, have all shown that anti-minority attitudes and beliefs are major underpinnings of opposition to affirmative action, and to other race targeted social policies. Martin Gilens has shown that anti-black stereotypes are a powerful influence on thinking about social welfare expenditures producing powerful evidence also in the sort of cultural sociology in-depth interviews of Michele Lemont, pointing in much the same direction. It is increasingly clear that support for the death penalty and other punitive criminal justice policies shown by recent Ph.D. David Johnson, is consistently linked to anti-minority attitudes and beliefs. Likewise, work by social psychologists like Victoria Esses and survey researchers like David Sears have shown that anti-minority attitudes and beliefs undergird popular support for nativist immigration policies as well. Indeed, it is not difficult to list many different circumstances where we are likely to absorb the operation of racial stereotypes. A cab driver who refuses to pick up Danny Glover, the white homeowner who thinks that a Latino architect should necessarily come in with a lower bid for construction work than a white contractor, the owner of a high-tech software manufacturer who becomes suspicious of proprietary theft by Asian employees, the teacher who expects and demands little of Latino or Latina 9th graders who he or she believes are just going to drop out anyway, television news editor who sends a reporter out again to get new film footage with blacks and Latinos in it because all of the people pictured in the story about welfare were white and no one will believe this was a real welfare office. All of these are real instances, by the way. And as I said earlier, how do we begin to break down this sort of process? First and foremost, we need to change institutional, structural arrangements and conditions that breathe new life in to stereotypes by creating social context that give them a kernel of truth. Stereotypes, as I said earlier, reflect the distribution of social groups in the social structure. The best way to undo this stereotype is to break down the conditions that give them a kernel of truth. As others have stressed, this should mean an outcome-focused response to problems of segregation, of workplace discrimination, and other forms of bias. Exhortation to change is simply not enough. There must be measures of changing results and outcomes, but it is still important to work on changing the normative environment as well. Otherwise, the stereotype and the biased expectancies and actions they encourage are likely to find new avenues of expression even as pressure for behavioral change continues. As we all know, attitudes and beliefs change. Indeed, the tragic events of September 11th, at least temporarily, seem to alter the ethno-racial hierarchy of dislike here in the US as pointed out by cartoonist Aaron McGruder, as blacks temporarily move from being number one on the most disliked list to number three, being replaced by Arabs and Midwestern, wherein you see the child in the comic strip celebrating being number three. But, temporarily replacing the profiling scourge of driving while black with the new scourge of flying while Arab is not social progress. Stereotypes matter, they are ideas to take shape and response to social conditions, and develop over long stretches of historical time. At the same time, they are all a social product. Stereotypes are at the same moment social forces. Once developed and widely shared, these ideas--they become ideas that guide perception, understanding, and action.

As a result, they become critical factors in the maintenance and recreation of ethno-racial hierarchy, inequality, and pressure. It is therefore urgently important that we continue to research to theorize and to challenge the ways the stereotyping that is profiling impact society. As Walter Lippman put it a century ago, the subtlest and most pervasive of all influences are those which create and maintain the repertory of stereotypes. We are told about the world before we see it. We imagine most things before we experience them, and those perceptions, unless education has made us acutely aware deeply govern the whole process of perception. They mark out certain objects as familiar or strange emphasizing the difference so that the slightly familiar is seen as very familiar and the somewhat strange as sharply alien. Negative stereotypes that have historically stigmatized and disadvantaged racial minority groups may not be as extreme or uniformed as they once were. But, whether now as omnipresent cultural backdrop whereas the individual's toolkit of ideas for engaging a variety of social interactions, racial stereotypes envelope the relations and dynamics that define modern social inequality. Researchers and policymakers concerned with ameliorating these conditions as I believe we all are must now attend to these facts as well. Thank you all very much.

[Applause]

BARBARA RESKIN: Okay, our third speaker is Troy Duster. Troy is a Professor of Sociology in New York University. He is the Chair of the Board of Directors for the Association of American Colleges and Universities. He is the American Association for Advancement of Sciences Committee on Germ-Line Intervention. He is on the human genome project and particularly important for us, he has chaired a taskforce on an ASA policy on the importance of continuing to collect racial data that we're releasing tomorrow morning at our press conference. He has made profound contributions to our discipline and represented us in public spheres only to our extraordinary credit and I am delighted that he will be able to speak to us.

[Applause]

His topic is social profiling and political marginalization--marginalism, the authority behind "the gaze," g-a-z-e, the gaze. Do you have slide? Okay.

TROY DUSTER: Thank you and good afternoon. George Will, the columnist, back in March of 2001 published a column in which he defended vigorously racial profiling by the police. He argued that since the data showed that Latinos and African-Americans are committing more crimes than whites, the police are rationally on the lookout. Three months ago, Sally Satel in the New York Times published a piece arguing that she was a proud racial profiler as a physician. That it was--that just a good medical practice can profile our race, one can deliver pharmaceuticals, other kinds of treatment if one new the

racial condition or the racial phenotype. Now I'm going to return to this proud to be profilers in a moment. But before I do, I want to make some largely theoretical points about profiling. As any good social analyst would do, I want to begin with the elementary distinction between the individual who does profiling as she or he navigates through the world and institutions that engage in profiling namely systematic routine ways of doing business. It's one thing for individuals to sort and relate to each other in a situation that's personal, a socialist, and other for a school, a police department, a bank, a hospital, or a large international cooperation, or a food chain to do it. So it sets the stage. There are many instances across human history in which groups are so much alike in appearance that institutions or governments have to mark them, to literally put a mark on them as a profile. Burakumin of Japan come to mind, a pariah caste that's been around for about a thousand years but they are so "Japanese" in appearance that you can't tell them by looking at them, you can't tell them by their linguistic differentiation, nothing about their physiognomy, nothing about them, and so the Japanese who were Burakumin decided to have them wear in the Tokugawa Period leather patches on their kimonos or other piece on their hair. More recently, of course, we have the Star of David and yellow patches were produced. Now, here's the theoretical question, the Burakumin could be profiled but could the other Japanese. Jews in Poland and Germany could be profiled but could Gentile German and Poles be profiled. Well, theoretically, the answer of course is yes, in theory but it's worth emphasizing that in practice, such profiling almost never occurs. That's because of the latent and hidden dimension of power and a decision to profile a group. It's not about the numbers by the way. It's about power relationships. Let me give you an example which is quite contemporary. About 10 years ago, actually 12 years ago, University of Virginia Campus, there was a drug raid. The police came on the campus, they made several arrests, cocaine dealers, cocaine users and it was a big story and the police expected applause and affirmation but it backfired because the next few days, there was a reaction where press excoriated the police. They said, what are you doing going onto a college campus arresting college students for drug sales and use when there are real criminals on the streets. Now to my knowledge, since that drug bust in Virginia, there's not been a campus raid by the police department on college campus in America since. I could be wrong. If I am I'll be delighted to be told at the end of the session by those of you who know about this but I followed this situation relatively carefully. I think what happened is that the subject matter, the notion of a drug bust on a college campus just isn't attractive. Now, I want to read to you what happened 5 years later. This is from a September 1996 campus newspaper in Virginia and here is what it says. While the operations leaders hope that the raid 5 years ago would decrease drug use among students, a survey conducted by universities institute for substance abuse last spring showed illegal drug use has doubled during the last 4 years. Twenty-two percent of the university students claimed to have used marijuana within the last month. That's March 21st, 1996 Cavalier Daily, University of Virginia. I want to return to George Will, his argument. Remember I was able to say that racial profiling by the police of Latinos and blacks is expeditious, parsimonious, and rational. Because he says these are the groups that are committing most of the drug crimes. If the police are only doing their business correctly to rightly target them, put that in the juxtaposition of the idea that there is some evidence that there are drugs on American college campuses. I've heard rumors that those drugs are on the campus and yet the police are not doing their bust there. They're doing buy and bust operations in particular communities. In 1986, the then Reagan administration, Drug Enforcement Administration, the DEA, initiated a national program called Operation Pipeline. Now, it was not to increase the pipeline of

blacks and Latinos going to medical school. It was a program to train 27,000 police officers over the last 16 years in 48 participating states and what was the training all about. This is the DEA training over the 27,000 police officers to train them to do what are called pretext stops on the road for drivers. Let's see how this works. Okay, technology. Operation pipeline, I can't read that from here and I thought I would have access to it but I don't, so you'll have to bear with me while I go through this. This is a program where the police come to Washington or sometimes they're visited by these DEA people and they're told, here's the way you're supposed to be engaging in this procedure. CHP in California has already indicated that, you know, what they're doing is stopping over 80 percent of those who are "minorities," only about 10 percent white. And here are some of the data, the way in which the police themselves under oath and their testimony in hearings are describing what they're doing. Now, who is being stopped? Well, people who have a profile, who do things like, don't sit down for long dinners in restaurants but they have fast food. The testimony goes on and on and it gives you a picture of the social profile of the marginal, at least in the point of view the way that much police are making their decisions. Now, what I want to show you next is a graphic material from the I-95 corridor and here's the way police behavior actually occurs here, not here but on the east coast. That this is the data from a 6-month period--8 months, '95 September '96 January and these were data coming from the police departments themselves, most of the police I-95 corridor. Now what you notice in this graphic is on the left side, there are the number of people who actually are driving and are observed, about 4300 or so on that far left bar for whites pulled up, 4000 re actually doing something which could violate the law, namely either changing lanes without signaling or they're some--so many violations that you could be stopped for, that 4000 o f 4300 could be stopped and the same is true for every other category for blacks and Latinos, for others. You can see that the number of people who are observed and those who could be stopped are almost identical. If you're having, for example, a sticker on your rearview mirror in California, you can be stopped, on your rearview mirror, you can be stopped for that. If you're driving too slowly, you could be stopped; driving too fast, you can be stopped; driving too close, you can be stopped. There are so many violations that are "minor" which could be stopped and again almost everyone. Now, the drama comes when we look to the next slide and here is who actually got stopped. So this data indicate that while everybody could be stopped, in the same short period of about 7 or 8 months in Maryland corridor, what we're seeing here is that about 80 percent of those who are stopped are Latino or black. Is this just Maryland? No, New Jersey's governor then Whitman said in 1999, she recanted reporting that she confessed that profiling was occurring in New Jersey. In California, we have similar reports. We've had about 6 states reporting now that this is a profiling phenomenon. Now, I've been looking very closely at profiling data but not so much from the point of view of these particular stops but what's going to happen I think in the future, we moved to DNA and forensics. What's happening now is that when there is a serial rapist or a murderer in an area and we have a profile of him, usually, what then happens is that people start talking about let's have a DNA dragnet. Now what happened in 1995 in Florida is I think a harbinger of things to come in which we need to be quite alert to. Here's what a DNA dragnet looks like. The police were looking for a black male in his early 20s and so they took in the scene of the crime saliva samples from 2300 persons "who fit the possible profile." This was done in a 1-mile radius of the scene of one of the crimes. When some of those young men were stopped they were asked to voluntarily provide samples, almost all did so voluntarily but those who were reluctant or refused became immediately prime suspects. Now, the most [inaudible] thing about

racial profiling and DNA dragnet in Florida is that once the samples were collected, they remained stored in databanks, not returned or destroyed. This has been a subject of law suits around the country but only those persons who sue know enough about these issues to pursue it. For example, Ann Arbor, Michigan, a case reported in the new book by [inaudible]. They opened with a notorious case of racial profiling in the DNA dragnet. A few years ago, there was a rape in this--in Ann Arbor and the Ann Arbor Police stopped over 720 black men. They took DNA samples from 160 of them and again, those who did not cooperate were further harassed that they could not--they could prove that they "has submitted" DNA samples, and I want to give you the texture of one case to show you the human side of this. One of those men was a man named Blair Shelton. The police came to his workplace. He was a janitor at two different spots, one was T.J. Maxx and they questioned his manager about him. They told his manager that a rape had occurred by a black male and the height was between 5'7" and 6 feet 2. Shelton had two jobs. Both, again, as a janitor. The first was at a local school and when the police had questioned the previous week, his boss there, just the questioning, got him fired. The second job at T.J. Maxx, next week, he submitted to the request for DNA testing having his blood drawn. There was no match. He was therefore declared innocent and later, the rapist was found and convicted. However, in the period between this is happening, between the conviction of the rapist, Shelton was stopped 6 more times by the Ann Arbor police, request that he submit to a DNA test. Waiting in line outside of a movie theater, boarding a bus, buying bagels, jogging around the baseball field, and two other instances in which he was stopped by the police and asked to submit to a DNA test. Each time, he haply had a receipt on him showing he had already gone through the DNA test. This had become his passport 'til the next time he was stopped. Now, let us consider here the conjunction of powerlessness and profiling in the context of drug work. A couple of years ago, Governor Pataki of New York proposed to include white-colored criminals in the state DNA criminal database. The proposal met with hostility in the legislature and it died. It never reached the committee. Yet we actually have profiles of executives at places like Enron, Global Crossing, Worldcom, Johnson and Johnson, Xerox, the list could go on and on and Arthur Anderson and so forth and so on, who are these people who are engaged in these behaviors. But where is the impetus to collect their DNA samples? Are they stemming from the theaters? Jogging around the park? We obtain DNA samples easily now, not from blood test. We can now get them from these, from buccal swabs. You used to get those swabs inside your cheek, you've got DNA sample and the Taskforce on Criminal Justice in DNA which Janet Reno put together about 2 years ago came back with a recommendation and a ruling which said that this strategy, this saliva swab for DNA is non-intrusive. Therefore, will meet constitutional requirements, it will pass constitutional muster, it is coming to a neighborhood near you soon. If you're in New York, you may actually know this. There is a test case. There is a pilot study now going on in New York where those who are stopped by the police can be requested to have this buccal swab and so [inaudible] to put on this little device about--as big as a compact disc player and the police can go back to the police car and submit these materials to a computer and is registered in about 12 minutes to see if they have what's called a cold hit. Now cold hit is when you actually are able to match up the DNA sample which you have on this little device with what is happening in the national CODIS, FBI DNA criminal database. But it turns out if the police are only collecting those data for a certain part of the population, the cold hit is going have in it remarkable bias that comes from the strategy of certain kinds of either dragnet profiling or stopping of the police which I showed you to the Maryland Corridor. How much time do I have?

Okay, okay. Let me--I'm not going to get the chance to get to the medical part of this but let me just give you something that's happened last Sunday. If you happened to see the New York Times, there was something called Pressuring Analyst: Hard Habit to Break, article by Gretchen Morgenson. It was talking about Kenneth Boss, a junior analyst at Salomon Smith Barney. In late June 2002, Mr. Boss has spent several days analyzing three different office furniture companies. He was not supportive about the stocks' prospect and assigned them a neutral and high-risk rating. When his supervisors saw the report they insisted that he revise it to be more upbeat to encourage more stockholders to invest or to get the stockholders to invest. Mr. Boss refused. He was fired on June 27th and offered 24,234 dollars in severance pay. He refused. Notice the kind of contrast here in the ways in which we now conceptualize the problem with profiling. There was--I'm indebted to Sharon Lee for this. She told me that there was a joke going around in the American community in the last year or so about agents having this after--in the wake of the Wen Ho Lee case was imprisoned by the way for his "activity" of taking home materials onto his computer. The joke was downloading while Asian. Once again, to show you how the power dimension is involved here. John Deutch, director of the CIA, white male, had taken home formal government data, had it on his home computer, government secrets, was never arrested, never spent a day in custody. Well, in closing, some brief remarks about profiling and medicine, interesting parallels to criminal justice, first ever ethnic drug. Let's see if I can do this quickly. First ever ethnic drug is about to be marketed for black people. It will be marketed because there are high risks of hypertension in the black community, high rates of heart disease but these rates are exactly that, their rates. There are competing explanations for high rates of hypertension. Ten years ago, Michael Klag and his associates produced the following data. He showed that the darker the skin color in the black community controlling in part of a class, tensions--hypertension rates were higher thus invoking interaction that's rendering of a biological condition so that one becomes more tense if one is for example followed around in stores, stopped by the police, getting a higher--at a bank loan being red lined, you know, that might produce you of some hypertension but the contrast of course is when you have the notion that there is molecular basis for this. So we move more into the revolution in genetics and move to pharmaceuticals in the field called pharmacogenomics, pharmacotoxicology, we're going to find more and more information about how--what is happening inside the body is the real science, the biology, the neurochemistry, the neurophysiology. We're going to find more and more of these data indicating that there will be "racially distinctive patterns" in how we respond to pharmaceuticals. You can see from these short images where I think we're headed with pharmacotoxicology and pharmacogenomics into a world in which we're talking about the warfarin dosage being much higher or lower whether you are Asian or white and racial profiling is going occur in medicine. Now, let me end then with this major point about racial profiling in medicine. It is known to make some substantial mistakes where the very simple reason that when you're talking about rates, you're talking about not so much individualized medicine which is the whole purpose at least of the etiology of pharmacogenomics. You're talking about marketing a drug to "different kinds of people" and yet, now that we've seen with the hormone replacement studies, rate analysis gets you into trouble. Individualized medicine will of course be a different issue. So, the hysteria over rates, marginal increases of 4 or 5 percent is I think going to be an issue here in the next few years as we move to racialized profiling in medicine. I'll say more about that perhaps tomorrow morning when I talk about the race issue, the race statement, the tight rope we have

to walk between looking closely at race as a social phenomenon and not falling into the backwaters of biological essentialism. So with that, let me close. Thank you.

[Applause]

BARBARA RESKIN: What I'd like to do is we have 15 minutes that I'd like to have--because there's only a mic up here, maybe the first couple of questions directed toward Troy, and then we'll direct a couple of questions toward Mahzarin, and then toward Larry. So the people wanting to ask questions to Troy and if you want, you could come up and ask him with this microphone or if you speak loudly, you can shout them from wherever you sit or stand. Any questions or comments?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have one.

BARBARA RESKIN: Yeah great.

[Inaudible Remark]

TROY DUSTER: There is an increasing amount of literature now spawned by the Innocence Project where we're now getting DNA evidence showing that people who are on death row are actually innocent. Now, we've known for a long time that these lineups where you bring someone up and you show five people and you ask the victim to identify, we know that that's problematic. We've had remarkably good studies showing how problematic that is but now that we have the DNA evidence, we have another weapon to argue that we should rethink the whole notion of the victim's perception about what they're seeing and at least one of the good things I can say about the DNA evidence material coming out now is that many police departments are trying to rethink the whole notion of the lineup and the victim's perception of what they're saying. I'm not sure that's responsive but at least that's where I think we're heading.

BARBARA RESKIN: Other questions? Oh yes, go please.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Inaudible Remark]

TROY DUSTER: Let me repeat the question that isn't it better to have DNA identification, DNA profiling of this kind as opposed to the kind of junk science that's been going on for a long time. Actually, you know, there's a new book by Simon, I forget his last--Cole, right, in which he is describing that fingerprinting itself, you know now a century old, was far--it was much more exaggerated for its definitiveness that actually upon closer inspection the fingerprint is problematic. We'll find that also about DNA as we go along over the next 30 or 40 years. I think everything within criminal system has to be on the context, so the DNA fingerprint is only useful if you got other supporting evidence around that fingerprint. It's like you know, [inaudible] they've gotten their--you got the fingerprint on the gun, that doesn't mean that you pulled the trigger. Well, someone could frame you by putting your DNA at a crime scene. So I think the larger answer I have to is about the social framing in which we talk about criminal justice as opposed to whether the DNA is definitive. It is if you've got the right person.

BARBARA RESKIN: Yes, okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Inaudible Remark]

TROY DUSTER: Yes, that's a very good point, indeed. I think what's going to happen next period, people will say, and we've already heard this argument, let's get everybody's DNA on the database. Let's start with your date of birth, we'll put it in the database. That never will get rid of bias. But it would not get rid of bias if the police were looking over at the buy and bust operation in the local community and they're looking on a college camps.

BARBARA RESKIN: I'd like to have an opportunity for people to direct a couple of questions to Mahzarin and to Larry and there is a mic back here and maybe, it would be easier Mahzarin if you just went to the mic, it's right kind of next to you. Questions?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: [Inaudible Remarks]

TROY DUSTER: Okay, the question is this. If we are seeing in this next--last period and the next few years increasing numbers of DNA collected in the national database but there is bias in the selection process, can we be seeing a reinscribing of the of the official categories. Two weeks ago, there was an article published in Genome Biology by Neil Risch and associates in Stanford and if you read the article even superficially, what you see is a kind of reinscription of the Linnaeus Taxonomy of 1735. He is going to the DNA to say that there are patterns which can be re-revealed by using 16, 18 points of the DNA, you can

now predict with certain accuracy ethnic estimation. So I think, you are perfectly right. Now, if that's been neutral it's one thing but if you add to the social dimension of this, namely, extent to which people are either being apprehended by criminal justice systems or being denied access to resources based upon this and you have the recreation, definitely.

[Inaudible Remarks]

MAHZARIN BANAJI: So the question is a very good one about just the data are there and why is there a selective rendering of them. I can't answer that question directly but what I can say is that in our own work. I don't know if Curtis Hardin is here or not but if he is he knows the data better than I do. The very interesting data that we've seen is this. I was under the mistaken notion that if implicit attitudes of the kind that we're discovering are indeed this primitive, revealing these primitive aspects of the mind that they are not to be malleable, that they are not to be easily changed as a result of some intervention that may have to do with the kinds of things that you're speaking about. Fortunately, it turns out I'm completely wrong because three students have done really nice experiments amongst now many others to show that the local immediate situation is quite powerful going back to the early social psychological evidence about the power of the immediate situation. In these studies, something like a black experiment or a white experiment might conduct this race-biased test. Something as simple as that or somebody who's female or male gives a math test or whatever and what this data show is that having that experience does lead to a shift not just on explicit attitudes but even on the seemingly rigid and inflexible implicit attitudes, so I think the data speak now quite strongly in favor of the way in which our, you know, what sits on--what hangs on those walls may matter, what sits on your screensaver might matter. It raises very interesting questions of what an attitude really is, because if we have the notion that attitudes are stable, a thing that lasts of over a lifetime and goes through slow change, then these data are very hard to reconcile. Instead, I think the data should lead us to ask the question of what an attitude even is, what a stereo type is, and how flexible it is which is why again, the previous question about the science part of it, the brain work I think is going to be quite important if the right people are involved in doing it, and I'm not willing to let neuroscientists be the only people who'd do these race brain studies.