

January/February 2015

Volume 24: Number 1

Breaking the Cycle: Implicit Bias, Racial Anxiety, and Stereotype Threat

Rachel D. Godsil

Our country is in the midst of a racial cataclysm. Deaths of black men and boys at the hands of police, combined with grand juries' failure to indict, have spurred grief, rage and protest across the country. The reactions to the events are not uniform, however. A deep polarization along racial lines has emerged that contributes to the feeling among many people of color that black lives don't matter.

Neither these tragedies nor the racial disconnect that followed occur in isolation. People of color experience

obstacles rooted in racial or ethnic difference with alarming frequency. And yet most Americans espouse values of racial fairness. How can we make sense of these seeming contradictions? And how can we work to change the conditions that set the stage for daily challenges and tragic endings that are linked to race?

In November 2014, the Perception Institute, along with the Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society, and the Center for Police Equity, issued the first in a series of reports entitled, *The Science of Equality: Addressing Implicit Bias, Racial Anxiety, and Stereotype Threat in Education and Health Care*, co-authored by Rachel Godsil, Linda Tropp, Phillip Atiba Goff and John Powell. The goal of this series of reports is to synthesize and make accessible the advances in neuroscience, social psychology and other "mind sciences" that have provided insight into otherwise confounding contradictions between our country's stated commitment to fairness and the behaviors that lead both to tragic outcomes and day-to-day indignities linked to race.

Our report includes a lengthy discussion of social psychological research focusing on "implicit bias"—the automatic association of stereotypes or attitudes with particular social groups. We place particular emphasis on new research on reducing bias or, as Patricia Devine and colleagues de-

scribe, "Breaking the Prejudice Habit" (Devine 2014) and research identifying best practices to prevent implicit bias from affecting decision-making and behavior.

Understanding implicit bias can help explain why a black criminal defendant charged with the same crime as a white defendant may receive a more draconian sentence, or why a resume from someone named Emily will receive more callbacks than an otherwise identical resume from someone named Lakeisha. This work confirms that people of color whose experiences of the world make abundantly clear that "race matters" are not simply oversensitive, while also explaining how whites who consider themselves non-racist may be sincere, even if their behavior sometimes suggests otherwise.

This is not meant to suggest that racialized outcomes are only a result of individual actions; cumulative racial advantages for whites as a group have been embedded into society's structures and institutions. However,

(Please turn to page 2)

Rachel D. Godsil (rachel.godsil@gmail.com) is the Eleanor Bontecou Professor of Law at Seton Hall Law School and Director of Research for the Perception Institute, a national consortium of social scientists, legal academics, lawyers and social justice advocates focusing on the implications of the mind sciences for policy, culture and institutions. She also chairs the New York City Rent Guidelines Board. This article is a précis of a longer Perception Inst./Haas Inst. for a Fair & Inclusive Society/Ctr. for Police Equity report by Rachel Godsil, Linda Tropp, Phillip Atiba Goff & John Powell, *The Science of Equality: Addressing Implicit Bias, Racial Anxiety, and Stereotype Threat in Education and Health Care*. The Perception Inst., <http://perception.org/our-publications>

CONTENTS:

Implicit Bias	1
§8 Landlords	3
Resources	10

as John Powell and I argued in these pages in 2011 ("Implicit Bias Insights as Preconditions to Structural Change," *P&R*, Sept./Oct. 2011), there are two key reasons why structural racism cannot be successfully challenged without an understanding of how race operates psychologically. First, public policy choices are often affected by implicit bias or other racialized phenomena that operate implicitly. As a result, the changes in policy necessary to address institutional structures are dependent upon successfully addressing implicit biases that can affect political choices. Second, institutional operations invariably involve human behavior and interaction: Any policies to address racial inequities in schools, workplaces, police departments, courthouses, government offices and the like will only be successful if the people implementing the policy changes comply with them (Crosby & Monin, 2007).

Although implicit phenomena have the potential to impede successful institutional change, implicit racial bias is not the only psychological phenomenon that blocks society from achieving racial equality. We risk being myopic if we focus only on people's cognitive processing, and we also risk unintended consequences if we focus our interventions only on addressing implicit bias. Our experiences, motivations and emotions are also integral to

how we navigate racial interactions. These can translate into racial anxiety and stereotype threat which, independent of bias, can create obstacles for institutions and individuals seeking to adhere to antiracist practices. Indeed, research suggests that some forms of anti-bias education may have detrimental effects, if they increase *bias awareness* without also providing skills for managing anxiety.

Racial anxiety refers to discomfort about the experience and potential consequences of inter-racial interactions. It is important to distinguish this definition of racial anxiety from what social scientists refer to as "racial threat," which includes the anger, frustration, uncertainty, feelings of deprivation and

Skills are needed for managing racial anxiety.

other emotions associated with concern over loss of resources or dominance. People of color may experience racial anxiety that they will be the target of discrimination and hostile treatment. White people tend to experience anxiety that they will be assumed to be racist and will be met with distrust or hostility. Whites experiencing racial anxiety can seem awkward and maintain less eye contact with people of color, and ultimately these interactions tend to be shorter than those without anxiety. If two people are both anxious that an interaction will be negative, it often is. So racial anxiety can result in a negative feedback loop in which both parties' fears seem to be confirmed by the behavior of the other.

Stereotype threat refers to the pressure people feel when they fear that their performance may confirm a negative stereotype about their group (Steele, 2010). This pressure is experienced as a distraction that interferes with intellectual functioning. Although stereotype threat can affect anyone, it has been most discussed in the context of academic achievement among students of color, and among girls in science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) fields. Less commonly

explored is the idea that whites can suffer stereotype threat when concerned that they may be perceived as racist. In the former context, the threat prevents students from performing as well as they ought, and so they themselves suffer the consequences of this phenomenon. Stereotype threat among whites, by contrast, often causes behavior that harms others—usually the very people they are worried about. Concern about being perceived as racist explains, for example, why some white teachers, professors and supervisors give less critical feedback to black students and employees than to white ones (Harber et al., 2012) and why white peer advisors may fail to warn a black student but will warn a white or Asian student that a certain course load is unmanageable (Crosby & Monin, 2007).

In other words, cognitive depletion or interference caused by stereotype threat can affect how one's own *capacity*, such as the ability to achieve academically, will be judged; this causes first-party harm to the individual whose performance suffers. However, as is explored in more detail below, stereotype threat about how one's *character* will be judged (i.e., being labeled a racist) can cause third-party harms when suffered by an individual in a position of power.

Implicit bias, racial anxiety and stereotype threat have effects in virtually every important area of our lives. In the first report, we illustrate the inter-related implications of the three phenomena in the domains of education and healthcare. Education and healthcare are of critical importance for obvious reasons, and an abundance of research has highlighted the role race plays in unequal outcomes in both domains.

The report also emphasizes the interventions that are emerging in the research that institutions can begin to use to prevent continuing racialized obstacles. Ideally, this work will happen at the structural and institutional level—but many of us don't want to wait, and the social science research

(Please turn to page 8)

Poverty & Race (ISSN 1075-3591) is published six times a year by the Poverty and Race Research Action Council, 1200 18th Street NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20036, 202/906-8023, fax: 202/842-2885, E-mail: info@prrac.org. Chester Hartman, Editor. Subscriptions are \$25/year, \$45/two years. Foreign postage extra. Articles, article suggestions, letters and general comments are welcome, as are notices of publications, conferences, job openings, etc. for our Resources Section. Articles generally may be reprinted, providing PRRAC gives advance permission.

© Copyright 2015 by the Poverty and Race Research Action Council. All rights reserved.

Reverse Selection: Landlords and the Sorting of HCV Renters

Eva Rosen

Scholars of poverty and residential mobility have long been interested in how the choices and preferences of low-income families interact with housing policy to create and reproduce high-poverty and racially segregated neighborhoods (Massey & Denton 1993; Mayer & Jencks 1989; Wilson 1987). However, both of these explanations ignore a critical intermediary force in distributing residents across urban space: the landlord. Recent research has revealed that landlords affect residential instability and the reproduction of poverty through eviction (Desmond 2012; Hartman & Robinson 2003). But how do landlord practices sort residents into homes across urban areas? Landlords function as gatekeepers, affecting where people end up living. In my work, I examine landlords as a missing piece of the puzzle, and find that landlord practices combine with structural forces and residential choices to unequally sort renters across urban space.

To show how policy, preferences and landlords meet, I consider the transformation in housing policy over the past two decades, which has brought about the demolition of large-scale public housing and the shift to tenant-based housing subsidies. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)'s Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program, formerly "Section 8," has been expanded to serve over 2.2 million low-income households nationwide (CBPP 2012), with the intent to provide opportuni-

ties for poor families to access new neighborhoods. Out of the five million households across the country that federal housing programs now assist, over half are now housed in privately owned properties (Schwartz 2010). But even though a voucher can be used in any neighborhood with an affordable unit (defined as 40-50% of Area Median Rent), voucher holders are concentrating in neighborhoods with moderate to high poverty rates (Galster 2005; Hartung and Henig 1997; Orr et al. 2003), and Black voucher holders live in poorer and more segregated

We must focus on those supplying housing.

neighborhoods than White voucher holders (Devine 2003; Galvez 2010; Pendall 2000). This raises an important puzzle: Why don't renters move to better neighborhoods when they are provided the financial assistance to do so?

A rich body of research has considered the myriad obstacles to successful lease-up with a voucher, including bureaucratic barriers with the HCV program and problems with landlords (Boyd et al. 2010; DeLuca, Garboden & Rosenblatt 2013; Edin, DeLuca & Owens 2012; Pashup et al. 2005); discrimination (Freeman & Li 2013; Tegeler, Cunningham & Turner 2005); and social ties (Boyd 2008; Boyd et al. 2010). However, in order to understand why voucher holders end up in the neighborhoods they do, I argue that we must also look beyond those who are seeking housing, to focus on those who are *supplying* housing. I find that landlord strategies are linked to residential sorting patterns through three steps: 1) selection, where landlords favor certain types of ten-

ants; 2) a matching process, where landlords cherry-pick certain types of tenants for certain types of units; and 3) the selective retention of tenants who do not have the means to leave. These decisions can have an important impact on which voucher holders end up in which properties and how long they stay.

The Baltimore Study

To explore this question, I lived in Baltimore for 15 months between 2011 and 2012, where I conducted ethnographic fieldwork and in-depth interviews with 20 landlords and 82 residents. All landlord respondents own one or more rental units, though some are also property managers (with whom tenants often interact as the landlord's proxy), and I observed them in this capacity as well. The sample spans the range of types of landlords who rent to voucher holders, and also represents a significant portion of the units rented through the HCV program in Baltimore at this time. Together, these individuals and the companies they represent own and manage over

(Please turn to page 4)

John Doar

We dedicate this issue of *P&R* to **John Doar**, who passed away in November, 2014 at the age of 92. Doar, Director of the US Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, took courageous and effective action in the 1960s to utilize the federal government's powers in the fight against racial discrimination and inequality in our nation's South.

Eva Rosen (rosen.eva@gmail.com) is a Postdoctoral Fellow in the Harvard College Fellows program, in the Dept of Sociology at Harvard University.

A complete version of this article appears in the December 2014 issue of City & Community.

(LANDLORDS: Continued from page 3)

3,000 units in Baltimore city, over 1,600 of which are rented to voucher holders, meaning that they control over 14% of the nearly 12,000 units rented through the HCV program at the time of the study (HUD 2009). Below I describe some of the key findings from a forthcoming paper in *City & Community*, entitled “Rigging the Rules of the Game: How Landlords Geographically Sort Low-Income Renters” (Rosen 2014).

FINDINGS

The Appeal of the Voucher Program

The city now has one of the highest voucher rates in the country (HUD 2009; U.S. Census Bureau 2010). Baltimore landlords face a common set of challenges in the local housing landscape: vacancies, high turnover and rent collection. Evolving HCV policies, coupled with the financial crisis of 2008 and subsequent changes to Baltimore’s housing landscape, mean that the HCV program now offers a set of potential solutions to these problems. In particular, the burden of rent collection is eased with voucher tenants since the majority of their payments are issues directly and dependably to the landlord by the housing authority.

Matching: “A Tenant for Every House”

What constitutes an ideal tenant? As

Are you a federal employee?
Please consider contributing to PRRAC through the Combined Federal Campaign (CFC).
Our CFC designation code is 11710.
We appreciate your support!

I observed landlords interact with prospective tenants and carefully select which properties to show them and in what order, I learned that there is no universally “good” tenant. As one landlord pointed out, it depends on the property: “The thing is, you don’t need a lot of help when it’s a good area. But in the bad area, that’s when it’s hard. The key is you got to understand that everyone needs somewhere to live. There’s a tenant for every house. You’ve just got to find the right tenant.”

Landlords have an array of properties located in different neighborhoods, and a list of prospective tenants with varying traits and preferences. We might think about landlords responding to tenant demand by finding them a home that meets their needs.

Landlords strategically orient their businesses toward the voucher market.

But landlords have another, perhaps more pressing concern, which is to fill as many of their units as possible with tenants who are likely to stay over the long term. In a city with a high vacancy rate like Baltimore’s, near 16 percent of unit are vacant (U.S. Census Bureau 2010, includes available and abandoned properties). Landlords engage in a matching game: they sort residents into optimal units in order to minimize vacancies and turnover, while they maximize profit. Finding the right tenant for a property means matching tenant characteristics—such as age, family size, race, voucher status and financial risk—to property characteristics—such as size, condition and neighborhood location.

The most important criteria upon which landlords match are voucher status and geography. In disadvantaged neighborhoods, it can be hard to find and attract market tenants who pay their rent reliably. This provides an incentive for landlords to find voucher tenants to occupy units in these areas.

Not only does renting through the voucher program provide a rent that is paid reliably, there is also evidence that in some neighborhoods landlords can charge more than they would be able to obtain on the open market. In many poor neighborhoods landlords are obliged to lower their asking rents for market-rate tenants in order to fill units and accommodate the incomes of the local population. The voucher rent ceilings are based on Fair Market Rent (FMR) for a much larger geographic area, and may indeed be higher than other similar houses on the block or in the neighborhood.

Landlords also match on race, but since Baltimore’s voucher holder population is over 90% African-American (HUD 2009), landlords cannot practically use race as a criterion for selection if they want to have voucher tenants. However, landlords do use race as a criterion for determining *which* property, and *where*, they are likely to show homes to a prospective tenant. One tenant placement agent admits to this type of steering based on race:

Now, I know—this may be discrimination and I must openly admit that I may discriminate, but I won’t take a White client and put her right down in the middle of Park Heights... When we place Whites, it’s Whites on Section 8, and we [do] get Whites, but I’ll try to place them in a more safer type neighborhood ... I won’t try to place a White down in the middle of the war zone. You can call it discrimination, but to me, it just wouldn’t be right.

What this agent describes as a “war zone” is a predominantly Black, moderately poor neighborhood in Northwest Baltimore. If landlords and agents like this one are prioritizing the placement of White voucher holders in the limited units they have in White neighborhoods, they are *de facto* unable to place Black tenants in such neighborhoods. This may be one explanation for the disparate locational outcomes we see for Black and White voucher holders in the quantitative research.

Reverse Selection: Building a Better Mousetrap

In some neighborhoods—particularly in disadvantaged or high-crime neighborhoods—landlords have difficulty attracting tenants with or without a voucher. Therefore, it is common to actively recruit and target desired tenants. For example, many landlords stand outside the Baltimore Housing Authority office, recruiting voucher tenants for their hard-to-rent properties in disadvantaged neighborhoods. Thus, voucher holders with fewer resources to conduct independent housing searches will be more likely to end up viewing these types of units. This is an important way in which voucher holders are internally sorted within the voucher market.

Another way to target desired tenants is to compensate for the neighborhood by offering enticements to the tenant. For example, a young Black landlord says he can capitalize on a property that is still under renovation in order to “lock down” the tenant:

You can ... put the tenant in a position where they are in control. So you come into a room and say, “What color do you want this room?” And they feel like now it belongs to them, so it makes them want the property even more. It makes them do the things they need to do to qualify for the property and then we rent it a lot faster.

Landlords have an arsenal of strategies to fill hard-to-rent properties. Another landlord takes the idea of “locking down” a tenant a step further. When showing voucher holders properties, he picks up families at their homes and personally drives them to see available units. He shuttles them directly in the door of the newly renovated home, emphasizing the quality of the unit over its surroundings, and effectively preventing prospective tenants from exploring the neighborhood. Once the tenant gets in the door, it is much easier to negotiate because the home is beautifully renovated with lots of amenities. “The house looks like anything that you might walk in in the suburbs on the inside of the house, so

it’s beautiful... It’s like, if you build a better mousetrap, you know how they say that...” In other words, the landlord lures the tenant into the home, dazzles them with sparkling new renovations, and proposes a rental contract on the spot. The landlord’s financial investment in the home is rewarded by the ability to attract a voucher tenant.

This same placement agent often advises landlords that offering tenants enticements or “promotions,” on an apartment in an unattractive neighborhood can help it to rent more quickly, and makes it easier to attract the coveted voucher tenant: “I tell owners ... look, you want to get your place

Landlords play a role in selective retention of tenants.

rented. Okay. All right, now, this girl is on Section 8, okay? Her annual income is \$6,000 a year. For real. You want a \$1,000 security deposit? You want one sixth of her annual income.” The security deposit is not usually covered by the housing voucher, so waiving the deposit is a particular enticement to voucher tenants and others on fixed incomes for whom it would be very difficult to come up with a large lump sum of money. An understanding of voucher holders’ financial circumstances allows landlords to make offers that are so good, they are hard to refuse. Fifteen out of the twenty landlords selectively used some form of “move-in special” or security deposit waiver to entice desired tenants.

Some landlords market properties specifically toward the “lower end” of the voucher market. This less advantaged segment is more susceptible to landlord tactics: tenants who have bad credit histories, unfavorable residential references, or criminal records have fewer rental options, and are more likely to accept the first unit a landlord offers them. Voucher holders who have little money saved up for a security deposit are more likely to accept a unit if the landlord offers to waive it. Those who have only lived

in rental units with rodent infestations, dysfunctional kitchens or persistent water leaks might be more susceptible to the allure of a newly renovated kitchen or the landlord’s offer of a dishwasher. Those with few resources for learning about new and different neighborhoods are more likely to be swayed by the physical features of the unit than by the less tangible characteristics of the neighborhood. Landlords capitalize on these vulnerabilities, attracting the tenants they want by “building a better mousetrap,” in one landlord’s words. I call this process “reverse selection,” where, rather than tenants selecting homes and neighborhoods, *landlords* are *selecting* tenants. This has important implications for where voucher holders end up.

Selective Retention: Leveraging the Voucher

Previous research has demonstrated that eviction is a means through which landlords selectively purge residents (Desmond 2012; Edin, DeLuca & Owens 2012; Hartman & Robinson 2003; Stegman 1972). I find evidence that landlords also play a role in the selective *retention* of renters. In a majority of cases, landlords have a strong financial incentive *not* to evict tenants (especially voucher tenants, whose rent is paid mostly by the government). Eviction is costly to the landlord, and most go out of their way to avoid it unless absolutely necessary. In fact, much of the time, landlords are scheming of ways not to rid themselves of tenants, but to *hold on* to tenants, taking measures to discourage and prevent them from leaving. Landlords have at their disposal a number of strategies to get desirable tenants to stay in hard-to-rent units, ranging from enticements and incentives, to strategic implementation of the HCV rules surrounding inspections and the terms of the lease, to threats of voucher loss and financial entrapment.

In this study, one of the biggest challenges landlords face is tenant turnover. In one landlord’s perception:

(Please turn to page 6)

(LANDLORDS: Continued from page 5)

“Every tenant wants to move all the time. That is the one bad thing about Section 8 ... They all want to move, all the time.” Turnover incurs significant costs. Every time a tenant moves, expenses include repainting, re-carpeting, and the loss of valuable time and money looking for a new tenant.

The so-called “teeth” of the HCV program can help landlords to combat this challenge. Landlords exploit the intricacies of the voucher rules to attenuate the movement of voucher holders out of their properties. The HCV program does not allow a tenant to be issued a new voucher to move if the landlord is owed any money, as explained by one landlord: “If they owe money for damages, they can’t move until they make good on it. The old way, they used to be able to just pack up, move, and be irresponsible... Essentially, it’s not really that you’re holding them... [it’s] that they’re accountable.” Furthermore, by permitting small, unpaid rental portions to accrue over time, landlords can facilitate a situation where the tenant owes more money he or she can repay, and therefore cannot leave the home without losing the voucher. A landlord explains how this works:

[Certain landlords] game the Section 8 system back to the tenant... If some-

one owes them money or if someone doesn’t pay their \$100 portion... [they] would let them not pay, and then hold that over their head. So when they say, “I want to leave,” “No, you owe me \$1500.” And they are never coming up with \$1500.

This practice may serve as a broader mechanism that keeps tenants “stuck in place” (Sharkey), preventing them from moving on to newer homes and neighborhoods.

Landlords imagine the rental process as a game between landlord and tenant, in which the voucher is in jeopardy and can be used to manipulate behavior. But the rules are rigged. Landlords have superior access to information and resources, they know the rules of the game and how to use them. In contrast, many voucher holders are not aware of their own bargain-

The set of landlord practices described here form a powerful sorting instrument.

ing power and do not have the resources to employ it effectively. Landlord retention tactics effectively hold the most disadvantaged voucher holders—those behind on their rent—into some

of the worst quality units in the poorest neighborhoods.

IMPLICATIONS & CONCLUSION

There are several ways to improve current policy and to address these problems within the voucher system. Better information and housing counseling for families, transportation for housing searches, and security deposit assistance would all minimize the effect of the landlord’s targeted recruitment tactics that attract and retain vulnerable voucher holders. It is essential for families to be informed of their rights as tenants so they can report necessary repairs or request to move without fear of losing their voucher.

Another potential area of intervention is in the calculation of Fair Market Rent and the perverse incentives that are created its definition. New research finds that when the FMR is defined at the zip-code level rather than at the metropolitan level, voucher holders move to better neighborhoods with no additional costs (Collinson & Ganong 2013). This has important implications for the cost effectiveness of voucher administration. If housing authorities spend less on rent, they could help a larger number of families, which is key, since only one in four qualified families currently receives housing aid (Turner & Kingsley 2008).

The shift in American housing policy in the last two decades towards individual subsidies has been touted as a way to let the private market solve the problem of concentrated poverty—in which federal housing policy has been historically complicit—by providing opportunities for poor families to move to neighborhoods of their choosing. However, without studying how landlords mediate market forces, we miss an important mechanism shaping residential inequality. Rather than providing low-income families with the opportunity to make informed decisions about which neighborhood would be best for them, the system has

New on PRRAC’s website

Amicus Curiae briefs in U.S. Supreme Court case of *Inclusive Communities Project v. Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs* (raising question of availability of “disparate impact” liability under the Fair Housing Act)

Civil rights coalition comments on HUD’s “Moving to Work” program for Public Housing Agency flexibility

Housing Justice Network comments on HUD’s proposed rule on public housing demolition and disposition

PRRAC comments on the Department of Transportation’s metropolitan transportation planning guidance

National Coalition on School Diversity suggestions to the Department of Education for stricter civil rights standards for renewals of state “waivers” of “No Child Left Behind” requirements

been turned on its head. Instead of tenants selecting neighborhoods, landlords are recruiting, selecting, and then sorting tenants into the units and neighborhoods where the greatest profit can be made. Despite its potential to facilitate the mobility of low-income households, the HCV program has in some cases done the opposite. In this process of reverse selection, supply ac-

tually creates demand, landlords' actions shape and constrain residents' choices. This reversal illuminates an important mechanism in processes of residential sorting and selection. The voucher case demonstrates the ways in which landlord practices intervene to pervert the process of residential choice, revealing the limits of a market-based solution to a complicated and

entrenched social problem. The set of landlord practices described here form a powerful sorting instrument that channels the most disadvantaged voucher holders into some of the worst neighborhoods, thus reproducing spatial inequality and concentrated poverty. □

Works Cited

- Boyd, Melody. 2008. "The Role of Social Networks in Making Housing Choices: The Experience of the Gautreaux Two Residential Mobility Program." *Cityscape* 10(1): 41–63.
- Boyd, Melody, Kathryn Edin, Susan Clampet-Lundquist & Greg Duncan. 2010. "The Durability of Gains from the Gautreaux Two Residential Mobility Program." *Housing Policy Debate* 20(1): 119–46.
- CBPP. 2012. *Fact Sheet: The Housing Choice Voucher Program*. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. <http://www.cbpp.org/files/3-10-14hous-factsheets/US.pdf>.
- Collinson, Rob & Peter Ganong. 2013. "Incidence and Price Discrimination: Evidence from Housing Vouchers." Working Paper. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2255799.
- DeLuca, Stefanie, Philip M.E. Garboden & Peter Rosenblatt. 2013. "Segregating Shelter: How Housing Policies Shape the Residential Locations of Low-Income Minority Families." *Annals* 647: 268–99.
- Desmond, Matthew. 2012. "Eviction and the Reproduction of Urban Poverty." *American Journal of Sociology* 118(1): 88–133.
- Devine, Deborah J. 2003. *Housing Choice Voucher Location Patterns: Implications for Participant and Neighborhood Welfare*. U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development PD&R.
- Edin, Kathryn, Stefanie DeLuca & Ann Owens. 2012. "Constrained Compliance: Solving the Puzzle of MTO's Lease-Up Rates and Why Mobility Matters." *Cityscape* 14(2): 163–78.
- Freeman, Lance & Yunjing Li. 2013. "Do Source of Income Anti-Discrimination Laws Facilitate Access to Less Disadvantaged Neighborhoods?" *Housing Studies* 29(1): 88–107.
- Galster, George C. 2005. "Consequences From the Redistribution of Urban Poverty During the 1990s: A Cautionary Tale." *Economic Development Quarterly* 19(2): 119–25.
- Galvez, Martha. 2010. *What Do We Know About Housing Choice Voucher Program Location Outcomes?*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Hartman, Chester & David Robinson. 2003. "Evictions: The Hidden Housing Problem." *Housing Policy Debate* 14(4): 461–501.
- Hartung, John M. & Jeffrey R. Henig. 1997. "Housing Vouchers and Certificates as a Vehicle for Deconcentrating the Poor: Evidence from the Washington, D.C., Metropolitan Area." *Urban Affairs Review* 32(3): 403–19.
- HUD. 2009. *A Picture of Subsidized Households*. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. <http://www.huduser.org/portal/picture2000/index.html>.
- Jacobson, Joan. 2007. *The Dismantling of Baltimore's Public Housing*. Baltimore: The Abell Foundation. <http://www.abell.org/sites/default/files/publications/arn907.pdf>.
- Massey, Douglas S. & Nancy A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Mayer, Susan E. & Christopher Jencks. 1989. "Growing Up in Poor Neighborhoods: How Much Does It Matter?" *Science* 243(4897): 1441–45.
- Orr, Larry et al. 2003. *Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing Demonstration: Interim Impacts Evaluation*. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research.
- Pashup, Jennifer, Kathryn Edin, Greg J. Duncan & Karen Burke. 2005. "Participation in a Residential Mobility Program from the Client's Perspective: Findings from Gautreaux Two." *Housing Policy Debate* 16(3-4): 361–92.
- Pendall, Rolf. 2000. "Why Voucher and Certificate Users Live in Distressed Neighborhoods." *Housing Policy Debate* 11(4): 881–910.
- Rosen, Eva. 2014. "Rigging the Rules of the Game: How Landlords Geographically Sort Low-Income Renters." *City & Community* 13(4).
- Schwartz, Alex F. 2010. *Housing Policy in the United States*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Sharkey, Patrick. 2013. *Stuck in Place: Urban Neighborhoods and the End of Progress toward Racial Equality*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
- Stegman, Michael A. 1972. *Housing Investment in the Inner City*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Tegeer, Philip D., Mary Cunningham & Margery Austin Turner. 2005. *Keeping the Promise: Preserving and Enhancing Housing Mobility in the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program*. Poverty and Race Research Action Council.
- Turner, Margery Austin & G. Thomas Kingsley. 2008. *Federal Programs for Addressing Low-Income Housing Needs: A Policy Primer*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/411798_low-income_housing.pdf.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2010. *American Community Survey, 2006-2010*. U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey Office. <http://factfinder2.census.gov>.
- Wilson, William Julius. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

(IMPLICIT BIAS: from page 2)

shows that we are not wholly without agency or tools. The interventions described below can, even in absence of wide-scale institutional change, help individual teachers or medical providers begin at least to ameliorate implicit bias, racial anxiety and stereotype threat.

“Debiasing” and Preventing Effects of Implicit Bias

While the research on debiasing is fairly new, recent studies by Patricia Devine and colleagues have found success in reducing implicit racial bias, increasing concern about discrimination and awareness of personal bias by combining multiple interventions to “break the prejudice habit.” The strategies quoted below (thoughtfully utilizing findings from research by Nilanjana Dasgupta and others) included:

- *Stereotype replacement*: Recognizing that a response is based on stereotypes, labeling the response as stereotypical and reflecting on why the response occurred creates a process to consider how the biased response could be avoided in the future and replaces it with an unbiased response.
- *Counter-stereotypic imaging*: Imagining counter-stereotypic others in detail makes positive exemplars salient and accessible when challenging a stereotype's validity.
- *Individuation*: Obtaining specific information about group members prevents stereotypic inferences.
- *Perspective-taking*: Imagining oneself to be a member of a stereotyped group increases psychological closeness to the stereotyped group, which ameliorates automatic group-based evaluations.
- *Increasing opportunities for con-*

tact: Increased contact between groups can ameliorate implicit bias through a wide variety of mechanisms, including altering their images of the group or by directly improving evaluations of the group.

The data showing reduced bias from Devine and colleagues “provide the first evidence that a controlled, randomized intervention can produce enduring reductions in implicit bias” (Devine et al. 2012). The findings have been replicated by Devine and colleagues, and further studies will be in print in 2015.

Whites can also suffer stereotype threat.

Preventing Implicit Bias from Affecting Behavior

To the extent that debiasing is an uphill challenge in light of the tenacity of negative stereotypes and attitudes

about race, institutions can also establish practices to prevent these biases from seeping into decision-making. Jerry Kang and a group of researchers (Kang et al. 2012) developed the following list of interventions that have been found to be constructive:

Doubt Objectivity: Presuming oneself to be objective actually tends to increase the role of implicit bias; teaching people about non-conscious thought processes will lead people to be skeptical of their own objectivity and better able to guard against biased evaluations.

Increase Motivation to be Fair: Internal motivations to be fair rather than fear of external judgments tend to decrease biased actions.

Improve Conditions of Decision-making: Implicit biases are a function of automaticity (Daniel Kahneman's “thinking fast”—Kahneman, 2013). Thinking slow by engaging in mindful, deliberate processing and not in the throes of emotions prevents our implicit biases from kicking in and determining our behaviors.

Count: Implicitly biased behavior is best detected by using data to deter-

Works Cited

- Crosby, J. R. & Monin, B. (2007). Failure to warn: How student race affects warnings of potential academic difficulty. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 663-670.
- Dasgupta, Nilanjana, 2013 “Implicit Attitudes and Beliefs Adapt to Situations: A Decade of Research on the Malleability of Implicit Prejudice, Stereotypes, and the Self-Concept,” in P.G. Devine & E.A. Plant (eds.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 47, pp.233-79).
- Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Austin, A. J., & Cox, W. T. L. (2012). Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 1267–1278
- Devine, Patricia, et al. *Breaking the Prejudice Habit* (Guilford Publications, 2014)
- Erman, S. & Walton, G. M. (in press). Stereotype threat and anti-discrimination law: Affirmative steps to promote meritocracy and racial equality. *Southern California Law Review*.
- Harber, K. D., Gorman, J. L., Gengaro, F. P., Butisingh, S., William, T., & Ouellette, R. (2012). Students' race and teachers' social support affect the positive feedback bias in public schools. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(4), 1149-1161.
- Kahneman, Daniel, *Thinking Fast and Slow* (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2013)
- Kang, J., Bennett, M., Carbado, D., Casey, P., Dasgupta, N., Faigman, D., Godsil, R. D., Greenwald, A. G., Levinson, J. D. & Mnookin, J. (2012). Implicit bias in the courtroom. *UCLA Law Review*, 59(5), 1124-1186.
- Steele, C. M. (2010). *Whistling Vivaldi: And other clues to how stereotypes affect us*. New York, NY: Norton.

mine whether patterns of behavior are leading to racially disparate outcomes. Once one is aware that decisions or behavior are having disparate outcomes, it is then possible to consider whether the outcomes are linked to bias.

Interventions to Reduce Racial Anxiety

The mechanisms to reduce racial anxiety are related to the reduction of implicit bias—but are not identical. In our view, combining interventions that target both implicit bias and racial anxiety will be vastly more successful than either in isolation.

Direct Inter-group Contact: Direct interaction between members of different racial and ethnic groups can alleviate inter-group anxiety, reduce bias, and promote more positive inter-group attitudes and expectations for future contact.

Indirect Forms of Inter-group Contact: When people observe positive interactions between members of their own group and another group (vicarious contact) or become aware that members of their group have friends in another group (extended contact), they report lower bias and anxiety, and more positive inter-group attitudes.

Stereotype Threat Interventions

Most of these interventions were developed in the context of the threat experienced by people of color and women linked to stereotypes of academic capacity and performance, but may also be translatable to whites (Erman & Walton, in press) who fear confirming the stereotype that they are racist.

Social Belonging Intervention: Providing students with survey results showing that upper-year students of all races felt out of place when they began but that the feeling abated over time has the effect of protecting students of color from assuming that they

Thanks for your contributions to PRRAC!

Thomas Arcury & Sara Quandt
Michelle Aronowitz
Susan Bennett
Paul Birnberg
Joel Blau
Rachel Bratt
Rob Breymaier
Tino Calabia
Harry Carey
Amy Eppler-Epstein
Paul Fischer
Henry Freedman
William & Zeldia Gamson
Daniel Goldstein
Alice Henkin
Helen Hershkoff
Betsy Julian
Henry Kahn & Mickey Gillmor
Ken Kimerling
Maria Krysan
Judith Liben

James Liebman
Douglas Massey
Roslyn Mickelson & Stephen Smith
Nancy McArdle
S.M. Miller
John & Sandra O'Donnell
Michael Paris
Larry Pearl
Allan Rodgers
Camille Rodriguez
Rev. Henry Schriever
Tony Schuman
Susan Silverstein
Maddie Sloan
Girardeau Spann
David & Nancy Tegeler
James Wilkinson
Howard Winant
Jody Yetzer

You can also donate online at www.prrac.org

do not belong on campus due to their race and helped them develop resilience in the face of adversity.

Wise Criticism: Giving feedback that communicates both high expectations and a confidence that an individual can meet those expectations minimizes uncertainty about whether criticism is a result of racial bias or favor (attributional ambiguity). If the feedback is merely critical, it may be the product of bias; if feedback is merely positive, it may be the product of racial condescension.

Behavioral Scripts: Setting set forth clear norms of behavior and terms of discussion can reduce racial anxiety and prevent stereotype threat from being triggered.

Growth Mindset: Teaching people that abilities, including the ability to be racially sensitive, are learnable/incremental rather than fixed has been useful in the stereotype threat context because it can prevent any particular performance from serving as “stereotype confirming evidence.”

Value-Affirmation: Encouraging

students to recall their values and reasons for engaging in a task helps students maintain or increase their resilience in the face of threat.

Remove Triggers of Stereotype Threat on Standardized Tests: Removing questions about race or gender before a test, and moving them to after a test, has been shown to decrease threat and increase test scores for members of stereotyped groups.

Interventions in Context

The fundamental premise of this report is that institutions seeking to alter racially disparate outcomes must be aware of the array of psychological phenomena that may be contributing to those outcomes. We seek to contribute to that work by summarizing important research on implicit bias that employs strategies of debiasing and preventing bias from affecting behavior. We also seek to encourage institutions to look beyond *implicit bias*

(Please turn to page 10)

(IMPLICIT BIAS: from page 9)

alone, and recognize that *racial anxiety* and *stereotype threat* are also often obstacles to racially equal outcomes. We recommend that institutions work with social scientists to evaluate and determine where in the institution's operations race may be coming into play.

The empirically documented effects

of implicit bias and race as an emotional trigger allow us to talk about race without accusing people of "being racist," when they genuinely believe they are egalitarian. The social science described in this report helps people understand why inter-racial dynamics can be so complicated and challenging for people despite their best intentions. The interventions suggested by the research can be of value

to institutions and individuals seeking to align their behavior with their ideals. Yet for lasting change to occur, the broader culture and ultimately our opportunity structures also need to change for our society to meet its aspirations of fairness and equal opportunity regardless of race and ethnicity. □

Resources

Most Resources are available directly from the issuing organization, either on their website (if given) or via other contact information listed. Materials published by PRRAC are available through our website: www.prrac.org

Prices include a shipping/handling (s/h) charge when this information is provided to PRRAC. "No price listed" items often are free.

When ordering items from PRRAC: SASE = self-addressed stamped envelope (49¢ unless otherwise indicated). Orders may not be placed by telephone or fax. Please indicate from which issue of P&R you are ordering.

Race/Racism

- "Ferguson In Focus" (October 2014, 8 pp.), NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, available at http://www.naacpldf.org/files/publications/Ferguson%20in%20Focus_2.pdf
- *The Colorization of America*, by Jeff Chang (2014, 416 pp.), has been published by St. Martin's Press.
- "A Concise History of U.S. Divestment in Black Men" is a 2014 video; inf. from colorlines@colorlines.com.

Poverty/Welfare

- "Building Local Momentum for National Change: Half in Ten Annual Poverty and Inequality Indicators Report," by Melissa Boteach, Shawn Fremstad, Erik Stegman, Sarah Baron & Rebecca Vallas (November 2014, 142 pp.), Half in Ten Annual Poverty and Inequality Indicators Report, available at <https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/HiT2014-final.pdf>
- "Sometimes the Poor Want to be Apart," by Emily Badger, appeared in the August 3, 2014 *Washington Post*.

Civil Rights History

- *Angels by the River*, James Speth (October 2014, 224 pp.), Chelsea Green Publishing Company, available for purchase at <http://www.indiebound.org/book/9781603585859>

Community Organizing

- "The Problem of African American Underrepresentation on Local Councils," by Karen Shanton (October 2014, 10 pp.), Demos, available at <http://www.demos.org/sites/default/files/publications/Underrepresentation.pdf>

Criminal Justice

- "DEATH ROW U.S.A.: Fall 2014," by Deborah Fins (October 2014, 64 pp.), NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, available at http://www.naacpldf.org/files/publications/DRUSA_Fall_2014.pdf
- "One Strike and You're Out: How We Can Eliminate Barriers to Economic Security and Mobility for People with Criminal Records," by Rebecca Vallas and Sharon Dietrich (December 2014, 79 pp.), Center for American Progress, available at <https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/VallasCriminalRecordsReport.pdf>
- "Skewed Justice": *Citizens United*, Television Advertising and State Supreme Justices," by Joanna Shepherd & Michael S. Kang (2014), is available from jshpherd@law.emory.edu

Economic/Community Development

- "Credit Card Debt in the Latino Community," by Amy Traub (October 2014, 30 pp.), Demos, National Council of La Raza, available at <http://www.demos.org/>

sites/default/files/publications/inos&CreditCardDebt_0.pdf

- ***Losing Our Way: An Intimate Portrait of a Troubled America***, by Bob Herbert (October 2014, 304 pp.), Random House, available for purchase at <http://www.randomhouse.com/book/78802/losing-our-way-by-bob-herbert>

- **“The Wealth of Households: An Analysis of the 2013 Survey of Consumer Finances,”** by David Rosnick & Dean Baker (November 2014, 19 pp.), Center for Economic and Policy Research, available at <http://www.cepr.net/documents/wealth-scf-2014-10.pdf>

Education

- **The White House Summit on Early Education** was held Dec. 10, 2014. Inf. from anya@fcd-us.org

- **“High-quality Kindergarten - What It Should Look Like”** is a 3-part series from Foundation for Child Development. Inf. from anya@fcd-us.org

- **“One City”** is the name of a San Francisco program that places techy volunteers into public schools. The *San Francisco Chronicle* (9/30/14) has a good cover story on it, by Joe Garfoli. More inf. at OneCitySF.org

- **“Skills for Success: Supporting and Assessing Key Habits, Mindsets, and Skills in PreK-12,”** by Melissa Tooley & Laura Bornfreund (November 2014, 50 pp.), New America Foundation, available at http://www.edcentral.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/11212014_Skills-for-Success_Tooley_Bornfreund.pdf

- **“The Need to Address Noncognitive Skills in the Education Policy Agenda,”** by Emma García (December 2014, 36 pp.), Economic Policy Institute, available at <http://s3.epi.org/files/2014/the-need-to-address-noncognitive-skills-12-02-2014.pdf>

- **“A School Reform Initiative: A Community of Learners,”** a Winter Meeting, will be held **June 15-17, 2015** in Chicago. Inf. at schoolreforminitiative.org/winter-meeting/

Employment/Labor/Jobs Policy

- **“Monthly Latino Employment Report: Elections Expose Anxiety about Wages,”** by Catherine Harvey (November 2014, 3 pp.), National Council of La Raza, available at http://www.nclr.org/images/uploads/publications/mler_election_11714b.pdf

Families/Women/Children

- **“Worthy Work, STILL Unlivable Wages: The Early Childhood Workforce 25 Years after the National Child Care Staffing Study,”** by Marcy Whitebook,

Deborah Phillips & Carollee Howes (November 2014, 124 pp.). Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, available at <http://www.irl.berkeley.edu/cscce/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/ReportFINAL.pdf>

Housing

- **“Farmworker Housing Quality and Health: A Transdisciplinary Conference”** was held Nov. 11, 2014. Inf. from Calif. Rural Legal Assistance (one of 3 conf. co-sponsors—Farmworker Justice & Wake Forest School of Medicine the other 2). Inf. from PRRAC Vice-Chair José Padilla, jpadilla@crla.org

- **“Homeowners Tap the Income in Their Homes: Sites Like Airbnb Turn Ordinary People into Landlords, Altering Economics of Real Estate,”** by Steven Rosenbush, is a good long article that appeared in the Sept. 22, 2014 *Wall St. Journal*, p. R1 in the Wealth Management section.

Immigration

- **“The Latino Electorate: Latino Voters Want Action on Immigration”** (November 2014, 4 pp.), National Council of La Raza, available at http://www.nclr.org/images/uploads/publications/thelatinoelectorate_11414.pdf

Miscellaneous

- **“Retail Politics,”** by Catherine Ruetschlin & Sean McElwee (November 2014, 18 pp.), Demos, available at <http://www.demos.org/sites/default/files/publications/RetailPolitics.pdf>

- **“What Counts: Harnessing Data for America’s Communities,”** Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco and the Urban Institute (December 2014, 459 pp.), available at <http://www.whatcountsforamerica.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/What-Counts-11.25.14.pdf>

- ***How Human Rights Can Build Haiti Activists, Lawyers & Grassroots Campaigns***, by Fran Quigley, has been published (2014) by Vanderbilt Univ. Press.

To subscribe to
Poverty & Race,
go to
[www.prrac.org/
order.php](http://www.prrac.org/order.php)

Poverty and Race Research Action Council

1200 18th Street NW • Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036
202/906-8023 FAX: 202/842-2885
E-mail: info@prrac.org
Website: www.prrac.org

Address Service Requested

1-2/15

Nonprofit
U.S. Postage
PAID
Jefferson City, MO
Permit No. 210

POVERTY and RACE RESEARCH ACTION COUNCIL Board of Directors/Staff

CHAIR

John Charles Boger
*University of North Carolina
School of Law
Chapel Hill, NC*

VICE-CHAIR

José Padilla
*California Rural Legal
Assistance
San Francisco, CA*

SECRETARY

john a. powell
*Haas Institute for a
Fair and Inclusive Society
University of California-
Berkeley
Berkeley, CA*

TREASURER

Spence Limbocker
*Neighborhood Funders
Group
Annandale, VA*

[Organizations listed for
identification purposes only]

John Brittain

*University of the District of
Columbia School of
Law
Washington, DC*

Sheryll Cashin

*Georgetown University
Law Center
Washington, DC*

Craig Flournoy

*University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH*

Rachel Godsil

*Seton Hall Law School
Newark, NJ*

Damon Hewitt

*Open Society
Foundations
New York, NY*

David Hinojosa

*Mexican American Legal
Defense and Educational
Fund
San Antonio, TX*

Camille Holmes

*National Legal Aid &
Defender Assn.
Washington, DC*

Olati Johnson

*Columbia Law School
New York, NY*

Elizabeth Julian

*Inclusive Communities
Project
Dallas, TX*

Demetria McCain

*Inclusive Communities
Project
Dallas, TX*

S.M. Miller

*The Commonwealth Institute
Cambridge, MA*

ReNika Moore

*NAACP Legal Defense Fund
and Educational Fund
New York, NY*

Don Nakanishi

*University of California
Los Angeles, CA*

Dennis Parker

*American Civil Liberties
Union
New York, NY*

Gabriela Sandoval

*Insight Center for
Community Economic
Development
Oakland, CA*

Anthony Sarmiento

*Senior Service America
Silver Spring, MD*

Theodore M. Shaw

*University of North Carolina
School of Law
Chapel Hill, NC*

Brian Smedley

*National Collaborative
for Health Equity
Washington, DC*

Philip Tegeler

President/Executive Director

Chester Hartman

Director of Research

Megan Haberle

Policy Counsel

Gina Chirichigno

*Co-Director
One Nation Indivisible*

Michael Hilton

Policy Analyst

Etienne Toussaint

Law & Policy Fellow

Sarah Clayman

Administrative Assistant

David Loesberg

Law & Policy Intern

Kamisha Cassidy

Policy Intern