The Psychology of Bias:
Understanding and Eliminating Bias in Investigations

By Amy Oppenheimer, Attorney at Law[1]

Our experiences instantly become part of the lens through which we view our entire past, present, and future, and like any lens, they shape and distort what we see.

—Daniel Gilbert, *Stumbling on Happiness*

Actors do not always have conscious, intentional control over the processes of social perception, impression formation and judgment that motivate their actions.

—Anthony G. Greenwald & Linda Hamilton Krieger, *Implicit Bias: Scientific Foundations*

Bias – Some Basics

Bias may be defined as: a strong inclination of the mind; a preconceived opinion or irrational preference or prejudice; an inclination, especially one that prevents an unprejudiced consideration of a question; prejudice.

Although we may associate the term "bias" with prejudice against a disadvantaged group, the term is broader and applies to all types of preferences and prejudices. Some of these are idiosyncratic and reflect personal tastes or experiences. Others are impacted by societal images and norms. The types of biases about which an investigator should be concerned are those that may lead the investigator to faulty conclusions.

Cognitive bias may be defined as: the human tendency to make systematic errors in certain circumstances based on cognitive factors rather than evidence. Such biases can result from information-processing shortcuts called heuristics.[2] They include errors in judgment, social attribution, and memory. Cognitive biases are

---

[1] Information about the author is available on her website, www.amyopp.com. The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Stephen P. Angelides in the analysis and editing process.

[2] Heuristic is a term for experience-based techniques that help in problem solving, learning and discovery. A heuristic method is used to come to a solution rapidly that is hoped to be close to the best possible answer, or "optimal solution". A heuristic is a "rule of thumb", an educated guess, an intuitive judgment or simply common sense. A heuristic is a general way of solving a problem.

Copyright ©2010 Amy Oppenheimer, Attorney at Law, www.amyopp.com. All rights reserved.

a common outcome of human thought, and often drastically skew the reliability of anecdotal and legal evidence. It is a phenomenon studied in cognitive science and social psychology.

As employment investigators we promise to come to an "unbiased" conclusion of what occurred in the workplace. But if we ourselves are impacted by biases of which we are unaware, how can we be sure that we are delivering on this? This paper, which is provided to augment the author's presentation at the first annual conference of the California Association of Workplace Investigators, Inc., is intended to educate investigators about different types of bias and provide information on various studies that have shown the impact of bias on investigators and others.[3]

Bias Against Disadvantaged Groups

Although individuals may have an "implicit" bias about many different types of things, researchers have developed a test called the Implicit Association Test (IAT) that focuses on discovering unconscious bias towards or against certain groups of people. These biases may be based on social stereotypes that have led to an association between a group and a trait. The test measures relative speeds in key stroking when responding to four categories – images of members of groups that have been traditionally disadvantaged (e.g. African Americans, overweight people, gays and lesbians, older people), images of members of groups that have been traditionally advantaged (European Americans, thin people, straight people, young people), images or words with positive associations (happiness, goodness) and images or words with negative associations (depression, war). A longer delay in key stroking when asked to associate positive words with a disadvantaged group, as compared with an advantaged group, shows a bias against that group. Individuals can take the test on a computer and the tests are available online.[4]

Prior to taking the test, individuals are asked to rate themselves on bias, and that rating is compared with their scores on implicit bias tests. There is a significant difference between the ratings. The test has been taken by thousands of individuals. Scoring shows that across 12 topics, 42% of respondents rated themselves as at or near neutral, yet only 18% of respondents demonstrated sufficiently small implicit bias to be judged as implicitly neutral. About 70% showed an implicit bias in favor of the advantaged group (European Americans) whereas 12% showed a bias in favor of the disadvantaged group (African

[3] This is a draft of a paper that is not yet final.

[4] More information about the IAT, along with the tests themselves, is at https://implicit.harvard.edu

Copyright ©2010 Amy Oppenheimer, Attorney at Law, www.amyopp.com. All rights reserved.

Americans). Further, IAT results consistently revealed greater bias in favor of the advantaged group than did the explicit measures.[5]

Numerous studies have demonstrated that certain traditionally disadvantaged groups are treated differently, to their detriment. No doubt many (if not most) of the people treating others differently are unaware of doing so. This is unconscious bias playing itself out in everyday life. A summary of some of these studies follows.

In a study involving tipping cab drivers, the following findings were made:

- White cab drivers were tipped 61% more than black drivers and 64% more than other non-white drivers in the sample.
- Black passengers tipped white drivers 48% more than black drivers.
- White passengers tipped white drivers 49% more than black drivers.
- Latino passengers tipped white drivers 146% more than black drivers.
- Black drivers were 88% more likely to be stiffed than white drivers and white passengers were nearly twice as likely to stiff black drivers than white drivers.
- Passengers of all races tended to round up for white drivers and round down for black drivers.[6]

A study of restaurant tipping showed that customers of both races discriminated against black service providers by tipping them less than white service providers.[7]

In another study with implications in the employment arena, identical resumes were submitted in response to help wanted ads. The only differences were the names on the resumes. Some were submitted with traditionally African American names (e.g. Tamika Jones) while others were sent with traditionally white names (e.g. Emily Ryan). The white names received 50 percent more responses across the board.[8]

---

[5] For further discussion, see Greenwald, Anthony G. & Krieger, Linda Hamilton, *Implicit Bias: Scientific Foundations,* 94 California Law Review 945 (2006).

[6] Ayres, Ian, Vars, Frederick E., and Zakariya, Nasser, *To Insure Prejudice: Racial Disparities in Taxicab Tipping*, The Yale Law Journal, Vol. 114, no. 7 (May), pp. 1613-1674 (2005).

[7] Lynn, Michael, *Consumer Racial Discrimination in Tipping: A Replication and Extension*, Journal of Applied Social Psychology, Volume 38, Issue 4, pgs 1045–1060, April 2008.

[8] Bertrand, M. and Mullainathan, Sendhil, *Are Emily and Greg More Employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination,* The American Economic Review, 94(4), 1-31 (2004).

Copyright ©2010 Amy Oppenheimer, Attorney at Law, www.amyopp.com. All rights reserved.

In a study examining gender bias identical scripts were rated, some with the name of a female playwright and others with the name of a male playwright. The twist in these results was that it was the female reviewers that revealed a bias. The female reviewers rated the script with the female name significantly lower than the script with the male name whereas male raters rated them the same.[9]

Two studies conducted in the 1970s examined how nonverbal behavior impacts interracial interactions. In the first study interviewers who did not know the purpose of the study were videotaped while interviewing both black and white job applicants. The applicants were aware of the study and had been trained to interact a set way, so that there would be consistency in the manner in which the applicants presented themselves. The results showed that interviewers demonstrated greater indications of nonverbal discomfort when interviewing the black applicants. For example, there was less nonverbal immediacy,[10] less time spent in the interview, and higher rates of speech errors.

In the second, follow up study, white interviewers were trained to conduct interviews of whites applicants in the manner that the previous white interviewers had with the black applicants. That is, they were trained to interact with less immediacy, spend less time, and make more speech errors. In this study the white interviewees did not know the purpose of the study. The result was that the white interviewees performed worse in the interview and were more nervous and distant in their interaction style. The interviewees also judged the interviewer to be less friendly.[11]

In a more recent study, white undergraduates were videotaped while being interviewed separately by white and black experimenters. The subjects also completed a race attitude IAT. Those subjects whose race IAT scores indicated strong implicit preference for whites relative to blacks hesitated less and made fewer speech errors when speaking to the white experimenter than to the black

---

[9] Glassberg Sands, Emily unpublished thesis available at: http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/theater/Openingthecurtain.pdf and *Rethinking Gender Bias in Theater,* New York Times, June 23, 2009.

[10] Nonverbal Immediacy is a term used among communication researchers to describe nonverbal behaviors that communicate liking, a positive evaluation of others, or positive affect to others. These behaviors typically include looking toward someone, leaning toward someone, touching someone in a non-threatening manner, sitting near someone, smiling, and speaking in an animated way. Research demonstrates that the more a communicator employs immediate behavior, the more others will like, evaluate highly, and prefer that communicator. Nonverbal immediacy is also positively correlated with perceptions of communicator competence, goodwill, and trustworthiness (all components of credibility).

[11] Word, Carl O., Zanna, Mark P. and Cooper, Joel, *The Nonverbal Mediation of Self-Fulfilling Prophecies in Interracial Interaction*, 10 J. Experimental Soc. Psychol. 109 (1974).

Copyright ©2010 Amy Oppenheimer, Attorney at Law, www.amyopp.com. All rights reserved.

experimenter. They also spoke to and smiled more at the white experimenter than the black experimenter. These subtle and spontaneous behaviors suggested a higher level of comfort interacting with the white experimenter.[12]

These studies have significant implications for investigators. If an investigator is less comfortable with an individual of a different race or background, and therefore less able to establish rapport, the ability of the investigator to obtain information and assess credibility may be compromised.

The studies above focus on bias regarding characteristics that are protected under the law. However many biases go beyond these categories. In *Blink*, Malcolm Gladwell discusses his own research on the impact of height. In an interview about this, Gladwell states:

> *I have a chapter where I talk a lot about what it means for a man to be tall. I called up several hundred of the Fortune 500 companies in the U.S. and asked them how tall their CEOs were. And the answer is that they are almost all tall. Now that's weird. There is no correlation between height and intelligence, or height and judgment, or height and the ability to motivate and lead people. But for some reason corporations overwhelmingly choose tall people for leadership roles. I think that's an example of bad rapid cognition: there is something going on in the first few seconds of meeting a tall person which makes us predisposed toward thinking of that person as an effective leader.*

Bias in the Legal System

Studies have also shown the impact on bias in civil rights cases and in criminal sentencing. One study found that African American judges, as a group, and white judges, as a group, perceive racial harassment differently (regardless of political affiliation). The statistics showed:

- Racial harassment plaintiffs are successful, on average, 22% of the time.
- With an African American judge presiding, they were successful 45.8% of the time.
- With a judge appointed by a Democratic 29.3%; Republican 17%.
- Female judges found for the plaintiff 25.6%; male 21.3%.[13]

---

[12] McConnell, A. R., & Leibold, J. M. (2001). *Relations Between the Implicit Association Test, Explicit Racial Attitudes, and Discriminatory Behavior*, Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37, 435–442.

[13] Chew, Pat K. and Kelley, Robert E., *The Myth of the Color-Blind Judge: An Empirical Analysis of Racial Harassment Cases*, Washington University Law Review, 2009.

Copyright ©2010 Amy Oppenheimer, Attorney at Law, www.amyopp.com. All rights reserved.

Another study that involved violent felons in Detroit found that both black and white judges imposed harsher sentences on black defendants than white ones.[14]

Other studies have revealed that judges set bail 25% higher for black defendants than similarly situated white defendants and gave sentences that were 12% longer for blacks than comparable whites. Killers of white victims are more likely to be sentenced to death that killers of black victims.[15]

In a study that looked at whether the gender of the judge made any difference in outcome in Title VII sex discrimination and harassment cases, the researchers found that female judges were significantly more likely than male judges to find for plaintiffs (when their cases were appealed to the appellate level). Furthermore, panels with a female judge were significantly more likely to find for the plaintiff than panels with no female judge, implying that the female judge's perspective had an influence on her male colleagues.[16]

A recent study examined whether explicit and implicit biases in favor of whites and against Asian Americans would alter mock jurors' evaluations of a litigator's deposition. The authors found evidence of both explicit bias (as measured by self-reports), and implicit bias (as measured by two Implicit Association Tests.) In particular, explicit stereotypes that the ideal litigator was white predicted worse evaluation of the Asian American litigator. By contrast, implicit stereotypes predicted preferential evaluation of the white litigator. The study concluded that individuals were not "colorblind" towards even a "model minority," and that these biases produced racial discrimination.[17]

Bias in Educational Settings

Many studies have shown that when teachers are randomly given the expectation that some children will excel whereas others will not, it impacts how well those children perform. In one study, school teachers were asked to score exams of children tested for academic readiness. The test booklets included "background" information on the child, including IQ score. The scorers gave different grades to identical performances – the differences correlated with the

---

[14] Spohn, Cassia, *How do Judges Decide? The Search for Fairness and Justice in Punishment* (2009) See also Spohn, Gruhl and Welch, *The Effect of Race on Sentencing: A Re-Examination of an Unsettled Question*, 16 Law & Society Review 71 (1981-1982).

[15] Rachlinski, Jeffrey J., Johnson, Sheri Lynn, Wistrich, Andrew J. & Guthrie, Chris, *Does Unconscious Racial Bias Affect Trial Judges?* Notre Dame Law Review, March 2009.

[16] Peresie, Jennifer L., *Female Judges Matter: Gender and Collegial Decision-Making in the Federal Appellate Courts*, Yale Law Journal (2005).

[17] Kang, Jerry, Dasgupta, Nilanjana, Yogeeswaran, Kumar & Blasi, Gary, *Are Ideal Litigators White? Measuring the Myth of Colorblindness*, 7 J. Empirical Leg. Studies (forthcoming Dec. 2010).

Copyright ©2010 Amy Oppenheimer, Attorney at Law, www.amyopp.com. All rights reserved.

IQ scores. Thus the IQ scores gave the scorers expectations that influenced the results.[18]

Another study showed that if teachers were randomly told that some students were superstars and others were not going to make it, then that was how the students performed. Yet another study showed that racial differences in the outcome of a standardized test disappeared if the participants were told they were doing a puzzle, rather than a test.[19] One of the implications for this is that individuals who are members of a disadvantaged group perform worse in situations (like school) that invoke a stereotypical expectation of poor performance. This phenomenon is known as stereotype threat.[20]

Confirmation Bias, Observer Effects and Other Forms of Cognitive Bias

It is difficult to avoid the subconscious tendency to reject for good reason data which weaken a hypothesis while uncritically accepting those data which strengthen it.

—Seymour Kety

As discussed above, many of our biases are not based on race, sex or some other "protected" category, but are due to the manner in which we process information and other factors. It may be that a complainant reminds us of someone we know who tends to exaggerate. This may lead us to assume, without even realizing it, that this individual is exaggerating and then to look for evidence to support this theory while rejecting the evidence that does not. A number of these other types of biases are discussed here.

Confirmation Bias

Confirmation Bias is the tendency to bolster a hypothesis by seeking consistent evidence while minimizing inconsistent evidence. It involves unconscious information processing rather than deliberate case building.[21] As in the example above, once a hypothesis is formed, people tend to search for information that supports it. For investigators this means that by attending primarily to the favored hypotheses, investigators may fail to generate alternatives and thus do not see the relevance of information supporting another explanation.

---

[18] Rosenthal, Robert and Jacobson, Lenore, *Teacher's Expectancies: Determinations of Pupils' IQ Gains,* Psychological Reports (1966).

[19] Cahen, L.S., *An Experimental Manipulation of the "Halo Effect": A Study of Teacher Bias,* unpublished (1965).

[20] Additional information about stereotype threat is available at the website www.reducingstereotypethreat.org

[21] O'Brien, Barbara, *Prime Suspect: An Examination of Factors that Aggravate and Counteract Confirmation Bias in Criminal Investigations*, Psychology, Public Policy and Law, Vol. 15, No 4, 315-334, 2009.

Copyright ©2010 Amy Oppenheimer, Attorney at Law, www.amyopp.com. All rights reserved.

Anything that causes one to accept the truth of a hypothesis, even temporarily, makes the hypothesis become a conditional reference frame. A decision maker evaluates and organizes relevant information within this frame, which affects how he or she perceives the problem, interprets relevant data, and searches for new information.[22] It is an unwitting selection and interpretation of evidence to support a previously held belief. To attain coherence between evidence and the hypothesis, data that are incompatible may need to be reconciled. An investigator may reconcile ambiguous or hypothesis-inconsistent evidence with his or her theory of the case and the hypothesis may also influence the search for new evidence. As investigators piece together information, what they perceive as missing depends on the picture already in mind. [23] People are often reluctant to revise initial expectations that arise from early perceptions of a situation.[24]

Studies have shown that people assigned to interrogate suspects in a mock theft pushed harder for confessions and interpreted suspects' behavior as more consistent with guilt when they approached the task with higher levels of suspicion.[25] Fingerprint experts were less likely to find a match when facts provided about the case made a match seem less probable.[26] Experienced investigators rated witnesses who exonerated a favored suspect as less credible than those who confirmed guilt.[27]

In a study conducted by Barbara O'Brien, college students were given facts of a criminal investigation. Some were asked after reviewing half the file for an initial hypothesis of who was guilty and some were not. Those asked to develop a hypothesis remembered facts as more consistent with guilt of and focused more on the initial suspect than those who were not. They interpreted ambiguous or inconsistent evidence as more consistent with guilt. There was a subtle shift of opinion in matters relevant to determining guilt in a way that supported initial suspicions. Thus, the simple act of naming a suspect and generating reasons for suspicion worsened bias on several measures.

---

[22] Klayman & Ha, *Confirmation, Disconfirmation, and Information in Hypotheses Testing*, 94 Psychol. Review 211 (1987)

[23] Holyoak, K. S. & Simon, D., *Bidirectional Reasoning in Decision Making by Constraint Satisfaction*, 128 Journal of Experimental Psychology: General 3 (1999)

[24] Darley J. M. & Gross, P. H., *A Hypothesis Confirming Bias in Labeling Effects*, 44 J. of Personality and Social Psychology 20 (1983)

[25] Kassin, S. M., Goldstein, C. C., & Savistsky, K. *Behavioral Confirmation in the Interrogation Room: On the Dangers of Presuming Guilt,* Law and Human Behavior (2003).

[26] Dror, I. E., Charlton, D., & Person, A. E., *Contextual Information Renders Experts Vulnerable to Making Erroneous Identifications*, Forensic Science International (2006).

[27] Ask, K., Rebelius, A., & Granhag, P. A., *The 'Elasticity' of Criminal Evidence: A Moderator of Investigator Bias*, Applied Cognitive Psychology (2008).

Copyright ©2010 Amy Oppenheimer, Attorney at Law, www.amyopp.com. All rights reserved.

The same study then tested two ways to reduce bias. Some participants were asked to explain why an initial hypothesis might be wrong and others were asked to generate additional suspects. Those who named a suspect and considered why he might be innocent showed no less bias than those not asked to name a suspect. Those asked to name two additional suspects showed about as much bias as those asked to name their primary suspect without considering the possibility of innocence. Those who were asked early in the case to name a suspect and state why he might be guilty showed a greater tendency to confirm that hypothesis. However this was counteracted by explaining why this might be wrong. Forming a hypothesis early made them adjust their opinions about evidentiary propositions and affected the course of action they advocated.[28]

O'Brien cautions that confirmation bias can occur in the absence of overconfidence. Investigators need not be especially sure that they have the right person to sway their investigation toward an early suspect. However, as demonstrated in the study above, making people consider alternatives reduces judgmental biases. Investigators cannot always delay focusing on a suspect, but taking the extra step of actively considering evidence that points away from that suspect shows promise as a simple way to counteract bias.

Observer Effects, Experimenter Effects, Priming

These terms refers to how a "neutral" observer is impacted by extraneous information and the attitudes of others. While confirmation bias is something formed internally, these biases are impacted by an outside influence. For example, studies show the impact of giving an investigator pre-interview reasons to believe or doubt the person interviewed. These expectations affect the interview structure, questions, and other aspects of the behavior of the investigator.[29] Researchers' expectancies change their behavior toward different research participants and the participants in turn pick up the cues and respond to them with their own changed behavior.

One study had observers record the head turns and body contractions of flatworms. Half the group was led to expect a high incidence of turning and contracting and the other half was led to expect a low incidence. The observers

---

[28] O'Brien, Barbara, Prime Suspect: *An Examination of Factors That Aggravate and Counteract Confirmation Bias in Criminal Investigations*, Psychology, Public Policy, and Law (2009).

[29] Risinger, Saks, Thompson & Rosenthal, *The Daubert/Kumho Implications of Observer Effects in Forensic Science: Hidden Problems of Expectation and Suggestions,* California Law Review, Vol. 90, 2002.

Copyright ©2010 Amy Oppenheimer, Attorney at Law, www.amyopp.com. All rights reserved.

led to expect a high rate recorded almost five times as many head turns and twenty times as many body contractions.[30]

Malcolm Gladwell, in *Blink,* cites a classic priming study in which two groups of students were asked to read a long list of unrelated words. Laced through one list were words associated with politeness; laced through the others were words associated with rudeness. The students were then asked to return to an academic office down the hall to report they had completed the task. For both groups, a confederate was blocking the door to the office with instructions to continue a conversation with the secretary until asked to move. The rude-word students were more likely to interrupt (and even barge in on) the conversation; the polite-word students were more likely to wait patiently -- some for minutes on end.

In another priming study, students were told negative things about one of the teaching assistants involved in the study. In rating the teaching assistants, those not told the negative things rated the assistant as a mean score of 9.33 on a "niceness" scale. Those who heard the negative information gave her a mean score of 6.58. Those who were told the information and then told to disregard it, because it was actually someone else they were thinking about, gave the assistant a mean score of 8.09.[31] Thus the students could not completely "un-ring the bell". Once told the negative information they were influenced by it, even though they had been told it was false.

Belief Perseverance

Similar to priming, in a belief perseverance study students were asked to review ten suicide notes and determine which were "real". They were told 5 were real and 5 were created for the experiment (all were actually created.) Some subjects were told they performed well and others were told they performed poorly. Later they were told all the letters were fakes. Nonetheless, when asked how they would perform if they evaluated real letters, the group told they performed well thought they would do well and the group told they had performed poorly predicted a poor future performance.[32]

---

[30] Lucien Cordaro and James R. Ison, *The Psychology of the Scientist: X. Observer Bias in Classical Conditioning of the Planarian*, 13 Psychol. Rep. 787 (1963).
[31] Golding & Hauselt, *When Instruction to Forget Become Instructions to Remember*, 20 Personality & Soc. Psychol. Bull. 178 (1994).
[32] Ross, Lepper & Hubbard, *Perseverance in Self-Perception and Social Perception: Biased Attributional Processes in the Debriefing Paradigm*, 32 J. Personality & Soc. Psychol. 880 (1975).

Copyright ©2010 Amy Oppenheimer, Attorney at Law, www.amyopp.com. All rights reserved.

Anchoring

Anchoring refers to the fact that judgments are influenced by positions asserted by outside influences. In one study, test subjects were given a random percentage number and then asked whether the percentage of African nations in the U.N. was higher or lower than that number. Then they were asked to give their best estimate of the actual percentage of African nations in the U.N. Those given a higher random number gave substantially higher estimates than those given the lower number.[33]

In *Blinking on the Bench: How Judges Decide Cases*[34] the authors examine how judges decide case, postulating (and then showing evidence for) judges using a combination of intuition and deliberation. In another article these same authors discuss a series of studies they conducted with judges that demonstrate how judges are influenced by cognitive biases.[35]

One study focused on how anchoring can impact a judge's assessments of damages. Each group was given the same facts about damages and was then asked to determine the monetary award. The control group was told the plaintiff's lawyer "was intent upon collecting a significant monetary payment" whereas the anchor group of judges was told the plaintiff's lawyer demanded $10 million. The control group awarded a mean of 808K and median of 700K, whereas the anchor group awarded a mean of 2.2 million and median of 1 million. A second study used same information and also told the anchor group that the defendant moved for dismissal, arguing that the case didn't meet the jurisdictional limit of 75K. Judges who were told about the motion to dismiss awarded an average of 350K less than the judges not told about it. Thus judges were strongly influenced by anchoring.

Conformity Effects, Halo Effect and Role Effects

There are a number of other forms of unconscious bias that might impact investigators' work. For example conformity effects refer to the manner in which individuals are influenced by people with greater stature than those with a lower social ranking. Research studies of perceptions with people from differing social status or authority show that people's perceptions were influenced by the perceptions of others based on their relative social ranks (those of a lower rank were more influenced by those of perceived higher rank). Thus an investigator

---

[33] Tversky, Amos & Kahneman, Daneil, *Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*, 185 Science 1124, 1128 (1974).

[34] Wistrich, Guthrie & Rachlinski, 93 Cornell L. Rev 101 (2007)

[35] Wistrich, Guthrie & Rachlinski, *Can Judges Ignore Inadmissible Information? The Difficulty of Deliberately Disregarding*, U. of Penn Law Review (2005).

Copyright ©2010 Amy Oppenheimer, Attorney at Law, www.amyopp.com. All rights reserved.

might credit a witness with a higher rank over a witness with a lower rank without realizing that their relative ranks had an influence.

The halo effect, a documented social phenomenon, might also lead to unconscious bias. This refers to the tendency to assume that like goes with like and thus "beautiful people" are nice, smart and capable, while "ugly" and "short" people are mean, dumb and incapable.

Role effects refer to the fact that the perspective adopted by the viewer can affect the information sought as well as how the person perceives that information. In one study some participants assumed the role of a homebuyer and others of a burglar. They then read a description of a house and grounds. Later recollections of the details of the house differed, based on the assigned role.[36] Attorney investigators are certainly familiar with how representing the plaintiff or the defense impacts how the facts are viewed. Thus investigators should look at what impact their role has on how they view the information gathered in the course of the investigation. This question is especially germane to an investigator who is acting as an expert witness for the plaintiff or defense.

Suggestions to Counteract Bias

Some of the authors of the studies and articles cited above make suggestions about how investigators and judges can counteract their own biases. These include actively considering alternative hypothesis or why a favored hypothesis is wrong, expanding the time judges have to make decisions, issuing written opinions—because the process of writing might challenge the judge or investigator to assess a decision more carefully—and peer-review.

There is also some evidence that biases are malleable. Students who, prior to taking the IAT, viewed prominent African American leaders and artists showed a reduction in bias on a race IAT. Implicit gender stereotypes of feminine weakness were reduced by imagining examples of counter-stereotypic (i.e. "strong") women[37] and implicit anti-black bias was reduced by having an African American administer the research procedure.[38] Further, as an individual's life experience changes and expands, there is evidence that implicit biases change as well.

---

[36] Pichert, James W. & Anderson, Richard C., *Taking Different Perspectives on a Story*, 69 J. Educ. Psychol. 309, 310 (1977).
[37] Blair, Irene V., et al, *Imagining Stereotypes Away: The Moderation of Implicit Stereotypes Through Mental Imagery*, 81 J. Personality & Soc. Psychol. 828 (2001).
[38] Lowery, Brian S. et al, *Social Influence Effects on Automatic Racial Prejudice*, 81 J. Personality & Soc. Psychol 842 (2001).

Copyright ©2010 Amy Oppenheimer, Attorney at Law, www.amyopp.com. All rights reserved.

The more we understand our own biases, and the vulnerability we all have to be influenced by cognitive biases, the more we can do to prevent these biases from impacting our decision making.

Further Reading

Banaji, Mahzarin R. & Greenwald, Anthony G., *Implicit Gender Stereotyping in Judgments of Fame,* 68 Personality & Soc. Psychol. 181 (1995).

Gladwell, Malcolm, *Blink*, Little, Brown and Company, 2005.

Krieger, Linda Hamilton, *The Intuitive Psychologist behind the Bench, Models of Gender Bias in Social Psychology and Employment Discrimination Law*, 60 J. Soc. Issues 835 (2004).

Kulik, Carol T. et al, *Here Comes the Judge: The Influence of Judges Personal Characteristics on Federal Sexual Harassment Case Outcomes*, 27 Hum Behavior 69 (2003).

Lane, Kristin A. et al., *Implicit Social Cognition and Law*, 3 Ann. Rev. L. Soc. Sci. 427, 431 (2007) (describing the IAT).

Manning, Kenneth et al, *Does Age Matter? Judicial Decision Making in Age Discrimination Cases*, 85 Soc. Sci. Q 1 749 (2001).

Tucker, John C., *May God Have Mercy: A True Story of Crime and Punishment*, Dell Publishing, 1997.

Williams, Joan C., *The Social Psychology of Stereotyping: Using Social Science To Litigate Gender Discrimination Cases and Defang the "Cluelessness" Defense*, 7 Employee Rts. & Emp. Policy J. 401, 407 (2003).

Wilson, Timothy D., *Strangers to Ourselves: Discovering the Adaptive Unconscious*, The Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press (2002).

Copyright ©2010 Amy Oppenheimer, Attorney at Law, www.amyopp.com. All rights reserved.