

Algorithmic Fairness and Color-blind Racism: Navigating the Intersection

Jamelle Watson-Daniels
Harvard University
jwatsondaniels@g.harvard.edu

Abstract

Our focus lies at the intersection between two broader research perspectives: (1) the scientific study of algorithms and (2) the scholarship on race and racism. Many streams of research related to algorithmic fairness have been born out of interest at this intersection. We think about this intersection as the product of work derived from both sides. From (1) algorithms to (2) racism, the starting place might be an algorithmic question or method connected to a conceptualization of racism. On the other hand, from (2) racism to (1) algorithms, the starting place could be recognizing a setting where a legacy of racism is known to persist and drawing connections between that legacy and the introduction of algorithms into this setting. In either direction, meaningful disconnection can occur when conducting research at the intersection of racism and algorithms. What is lost in translation when algorithmic methods are applied in social contexts with ongoing problems related to systemic racism? What are opportunities for improvement when concepts from race theory are borrowed as a lens to interpret algorithmic advances? The present paper urges collective reflection on research directions at this intersection. Can we do better to engage more intentionally and thoughtfully in this space? Despite being primarily motivated by instances of racial bias, research in algorithmic fairness remains mostly disconnected from scholarship on racism. In particular, there has not been an examination connecting algorithmic fairness discussions directly to the ideology of color-blind racism; we aim to fill this gap.

We begin with a review of an essential account of color-blind racism as a tool to frame this discussion. We see

how ideological maneuvers can cloud and confuse how we reason about racial inequality. Functionally, color-blind racism shows up in the following ways: an unwillingness to engage in racial discourse, avoidance of racial language while communicating about social problems shaped by racial dynamics, oversimplifying racial justice to a search for outright “racists,” and more. In the context of algorithmic fairness, a better understanding of color-blind racism can help improve collective research practices. Namely, scholars can identify and challenge practices that ignore racial context or explanations, dedicate more attention to the lived experience and perspectives of minoritized people, and attend to harms related to a historical legacy of discrimination. Further, we review racial discourse within algorithmic fairness research and underline significant patterns, shifts and disconnects. Ultimately, we argue that researchers can improve the navigation of the landscape at the intersection by recognizing ideological shifts as such and iteratively re-orienting towards maintaining meaningful connections across interdisciplinary lines.

1 Introduction

Our focus lies at the intersection between two broader research perspectives¹: (1) the scientific study of algo-

¹We define this interdisciplinary split to represent two research areas comprising multiple disciplines. We acknowledge the limitations of the dichotomy. First, there has been a good deal of overlap between the two sides in previous algorithmic fairness research papers. Second, the examples of fields listed above on each side are non-exhaustive, and there are many other axes to determine a useful split. Even so, we see this as a useful conceptualization for our discussion.

rithms and (2) the scholarship on race and racism. We say that (1) includes previous work led by researchers trained in computer science, statistics, data science, etc., and (2) includes previous work led by researchers trained in race and racism, political science, investigative journalism, philosophy, etc. At the intersection, researchers primarily operating from the perspective of (1) often become interested in applying scientific methods to characterize, measure, or interpret racial disparity output by algorithms. Researchers primarily operating from the perspective of (2) often become interested in the socio-political implications of introducing algorithms into various social contexts.

Many streams of research have been born out of interest at this intersection. For instance, the realization that algorithms can perpetuate or exacerbate racial disparities in society has spurred significant research in the field of algorithmic fairness [2; 8; 21; 38; 4; 9; 17]. More specifically, racism in algorithmic outputs has been explored in healthcare applications [43; 11] and resume filtering and hiring applications [52]. Other researchers examine racial disparities in facial recognition performance [8; 48; 55], image captioning [54], visual question answering [25]. In natural language processing (NLP), researchers examine discrimination towards dialects from racialized minorities such as African American English and Chicano English [57], offensive speech classification [24; 24; 47], sentiment analysis [23; 30], misrepresentation of dialects in speech recognition [41], or question answering [57; 56], racial stereotypes in word-embeddings [39] and text generation [50].

We can think about this intersection as the product of work derived from both sides. From (1) algorithms to (2) racism, the starting place might be an algorithmic question or method that is then connected to a conceptualization of racism. On the other hand, from (2) racism to (1) algorithms, the starting place might be recognizing a setting where a legacy of racism is known to persist and drawing connections between that legacy and the introduction of algorithms into the setting. As an example, Buolamwini and Gebru [8] examined disparities in classification accuracy across subgroups revealing that benchmark facial analysis algorithms had better performance for individuals identified as being male and lighter skinned. In some way, the study connected algorithmic performance metrics (error rate, true positive rate,

false positive rate) to the social concepts of colorism and male privilege to highlight that the algorithm in question performed particularly poorly for dark-skinned females. Hence, this is an instance of work derived from (1) algorithms to (2) racism.

Another example, the 2016 study by ProPublica of the COMPAS criminal risk assessment algorithm [2] found that Black defendants were more likely to have received a false high risk score or a false violent recidivism score, while white defendants were more likely to have received a false low risk score or false violent low risk score. This work [36] raised awareness and interest in the intersections between racism and algorithms. These types of studies focused on racial bias in risk assessments have mainly been the result of anticipating the impact of introducing algorithms into the US criminal justice system. In the US carceral system, researchers have well-documented the racist origins of mass incarceration fueled by the fact that black and brown people are over-criminalized, over-policed, and incarcerated at inhumane rates [1]. Given this context, the study of racial disparities with respect to risk assessment algorithms can be understood as translating from (2) racism to (1) algorithms.

In either direction, meaningful disconnection can occur when conducting research at the intersection of racism and algorithms. What is lost in translation when algorithmic methods are applied in social contexts with ongoing problems related to systemic racism? What are opportunities for improvement when concepts from race theory are borrowed as a lens to interpret algorithmic advances? For algorithmic fairness in particular, essential disconnects noted in prior work are the disconnect from socio-political and historical context [26; 49], the disconnect between being motivated by disparate impact and developing anti-racist solutions [40], and the disconnect between developer goals and algorithmic social impact [34].

The present paper urges collective reflection on research directions at this intersection. Can we do better to engage more intentionally and thoughtfully in this space? One problem when translating between (2) and (1) is that reconnecting back to either side is non-trivial. Consider, for instance, how Benjamin [3] applies a design perspective to outline a “New Jim Code”²: technological design

²The term references *The New Jim Crow* [1] which frames US mass incarceration as a transformation of Jim Crow Laws. Recall, Jim Crow

choices that encode modern racism. The work outlines instances where technology increases and intensifies existing racial hierarchies, ignores ongoing racial inequality throughout society, or stakes claim to decrease disparities while functionally enhancing racial inequality. While influential to sociology, it is non-trivial how to translate the central ideas of this work into concrete scientific inquiries. The difficulty is partially due to the book’s breadth as it covers examples from various technological disciplines, i.e., robotics, search algorithms, risk assessment algorithms, classification algorithms, etc. On the other hand, it is also non-trivial how to connect many algorithmic methods and streams of research to questions related to race and racism. For instance, scholars need more tools to connect questions in theoretical algorithmic fairness to applied machine learning research let alone to design and sociology perspectives. Given that conducting research at intersections between subfields within computer science presents its own challenges, it is to be expected that intersections between entirely separate disciplines require particular tools. Though the intersection between algorithms and racism has proven to be meaningful in terms of socio-political relevance, it is indeed quite challenging in practice.

Despite being primarily motivated by racism, research in algorithmic fairness remains mostly disconnected from scholarship on racism. In particular, to the best of our knowledge, there has not been an examination connecting algorithmic fairness discussions directly to the ideology of colorblind racism; we aim to fill this gap. Our focus is related to previous work on the legal ramifications of algorithmic discrimination [31]. For instance, scholars have underlined problematic assumptions involved in treating any “race-aware” algorithm as discriminatory and engaged anti-discrimination law to challenge these assumptions from a legal perspective [29]. Our work is complementary to these ongoing discussions about the ways racism might be misunderstood or misinterpreted in the context of algorithms, though we do not contend with the legal view directly.

In this paper, we revisit concepts from colorblind racism and apply them to interpret research discussions in algorithmic fairness. Colorblind racism as it relates to

Laws enforced an anti-black racial caste system in the US during the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

algorithmic fairness research has been understudied, and this is a first step toward drawing more explicit connections. In what follows, we review the ideology of colorblind racism to offer a more nuanced understanding of how racism functions today. Then, we discuss how work in the field of algorithmic fairness has been informed by this context, reinterpreting meaningful discussions and outlining misunderstandings that can be avoided when equipped with a better understanding of racial discourse.

2 Color-blind Racism

In this section, we discuss concepts that highlight the complex nature of modern racial discourse. As a starting place, we outline terms for the collective discussion at the intersection. Understanding patterns within racial ideology can help guide our navigation of the interdisciplinary landscape we occupy. Modern racism is particularly difficult to identify and address given that it is often concealed by seemingly “race-neutral” methods and rhetoric. How do we begin to solve a problem that we cannot see?

Among other sources that might be used to help frame this problem with a view toward trying to solve it, Bonilla-Silva [6]’s account of colorblind racism is an especially useful resource. Bonilla-Silva [6] examines the ideology of color-blind racism: a powerful ideology that justifies racial inequities under the guise of neutrality³. Colorblind racism manifests in several ways on an individual and societal level: The tendency to avoid directly engaging with racial discourse. The avoidance of racial language while communicating about social problems that racial dynamics have historically shaped. The invisibility of mechanisms that reproduce racially disparate outcomes. And the oversimplification of the pursuit of racial justice to the search for outright “racist” actors who have an intent to cause harm.

The central frames of color-blind racism are (1) abstract liberalism, (2) naturalization, (3) cultural racism and (4)

³We do not claim to cover the full breadth of the ideology or the book *Racism Without Racists*. Our summary focuses primarily on chapters 1 and 3. We encourage readers to read the book in full. Also, the book demonstrates that the frames of color-blind racism are endorsed chiefly by white Americans and that black Americans are much less likely to use the frames directly. Even so, the book argues that color-blind racism is the dominant ideology shaping racial discourse in the US. And is, therefore, in our view, still worth considering widely.

minimization of racism. When engaging in racial discourse, people often employ these frames to make racial inequality appear reasonable. Notice how the frames can be leveraged individually or together to influence how people reason and think about racism. We consider each of the frames individually.

2.1 Abstract Liberalism

Abstract liberalism is an abstraction of liberal ideals to explain racial matters, enabling one to appear logical and moral while actively opposing attempts to address racial inequality. In practice, it is the combination of political liberalism (i.e., notions of equal opportunity, etc.) and economic liberalism (notions of individualism, choice, etc.) in an abstract way to explain race-related issues. For example, a common abstraction of “equal opportunity” tends to remove the socio-political context of who has been excluded from opportunities historically. Removing this context allows the pivot to focus blindly on applying the same policies to all individuals regardless of context. Further, this abstraction is often weaponized against progress by shifting the question to whether historically disenfranchised and excluded groups are receiving “preferential” treatment. Notice this abstraction has ignored patterns of under-representation, limited access to opportunities, etc. In doing so, it has diverted the conversation away from progress altogether, all while appearing to be race-neutral. This diversion illustrates the power of abstract liberalism as a function of color-blind racism.

Meritocracy and individualism are also elements of liberalism used to justify racial inequality while appearing reasonable. Abstract liberalism is also related to the idea that things will balance into a state of equilibrium over time without intervention, letting progress happen slowly. In essence, the abstraction of liberalism can function to allow people with power to evade the responsibility of correcting the wrongs of racism.

2.2 Naturalization

Naturalization involves positioning instances of racial inequality as natural occurrences. For instance, a naturalization view on racial residential segregation might question whether people naturally tend to group amongst others like themselves. Notice how historical context has been

removed to create the illusion of race neutrality. Expanding on the example of US racial residential segregation, the naturalization reasoning requires we completely ignore the well-documented history of discriminatory housing policies that have informed neighborhood composition. By ignoring this context, one can arrive at the explanation that maybe something like racial segregation in schools or neighborhoods is just the way things are. This frame posits racial inequities as the norm rather than the result of structural racism and historic inequities. Naturalization functions to question whether anything can be done to change the status quo meaningfully. Without aligning with explicit racism, naturalization allows for the rationale that things are just fine the way they are while racial inequality persists.

2.3 Cultural racism

Cultural racism is a framing that positions persistent racial inequality as a result of cultural differences of racial groups. This positioning assumes racial inequality to be the result of the cultural inferiority of racial minorities. Cultural racism can be thought of as an evolved version of the biological inferiority frame well-known for older forms of racism. The extension moves away from the assertion that racial minorities are inherently inferior due to their biology and instead towards explaining inherent inferiority through the cultural differences between different racial groups.

2.4 Minimization of Racism

Minimization of racism reduces the weight assigned to the historical context of racial inequality. Instead of completely ignoring or discounting the context of racial inequality, a slight concession is made. The idea is that racial discrimination is no longer a primary factor materially impacting people’s lives but that it plays some less significant role. This minimization allows one to align with support for racial minorities by acknowledging the existence of racism while simultaneously arguing that race does not play a significant role in practical lived experience. The power is in the subtlety. Minimization enables one to accept or live with racially imbalanced outcomes without a sense of responsibility or accountability. Further, questioning the significance of race as a factor

leads us to question the importance of focusing on racism as a topic. It can also contribute to devaluing scholars who examine racism as being overly sensitive or even unreasonable.

2.5 Discussion

The four frames add to our collective vocabulary as well as our understanding of racial discourse. We see how they function as ideological maneuvers that can cloud and confuse the way we reason about racial inequality. When employed, the frames of color-blind racism can make scholars hesitant and avoidant when navigating the intersection of race and algorithms. And even when engaging in racial discourse, we will see the influence of color-blind racism in making connections difficult to restore across disciplinary lines.

Unfortunately, these are powerful maneuvers that researchers need to be aware of and actively responding to. They play a critical role in how we think about racial matters. For instance, it is difficult to respond when someone invokes the principles of liberalism to advocate against progress partially because the historical context of the problem has been removed. If one cannot recognize that this abstraction has occurred, it is much harder to reconnect to the original problem of racial inequality. We end up in cyclic streams of logic where we might find ourselves unsure how to respond to seemingly neutral attempts to justify various types of unfairness. And the maneuvers seem so reasonable and logical that one cannot trivially correct it. These maneuvers effectively hinder the detection of racism.

Fundamentally, the maneuvers can distort how we define and discuss racial discrimination. Racism becomes legitimate or relevant only in its “all-out” explicit form. Similar to procedural notions of colorblindness, we can become consumed by the outdated task of finding instances of outright easily exposed racist actors. The reasoning follows then that there must be evidence that every racial minority has been discriminated against in the same way at the same point in time for racism to be a relevant factor. Anything other than this is unreasonable. And if there exists a few outliers or exceptions (racial minorities) who do not experience the particular racial discrimination in question, then race must not be a significant factor by this logic.

Notice that this understanding of racism resembles that seen in the Jim Crow era, where racist policies were applied unilaterally to all black people in the Jim Crow South. One problem with this view of racial discrimination is that the post-civil rights shift towards more institutionalized and systemic racism is more nuanced and complicated than the “all-out” racial discrimination of previous eras. Hence, once the logic of color-blind racism is invoked, our focus pivots to either searching for outright racist agents (demonstrated racist intent) or defending the value of addressing racism altogether. Neither of which directly supports the development of solutions to address systemic racism meaningfully.

3 Color-blind racism and Algorithms

At the intersection between racism and algorithms, understanding the frames of color-blind racism helps outline simple guiding principles for ongoing research practices. First, scholars should identify and challenge practices that disregard racialized context or racial issues. Second, scholars might consider dedicating more attention to lived experience and perspectives of minoritized people. Third, scholars should be attentive to harms related to a historical legacy of discrimination. To illustrate the value in each of these guides, consider each more closely:

1. **Identify and challenge the disregard for racial context or explanations:** Scholars might unconsciously dismiss racial disparities or deny the existence of racism. This could take the form of inattention or unwillingness to reflect on racial issues compared to other axes of oppression. Scholars might internalize a view that race is not a significant societal factor or that racial progress has been achieved. This lack of concern tends to be a default response rather than a conscious cognitive belief.
2. **Avoid the misvaluation of lived experience and perspectives of minoritized people:** Scholars fall somewhere on the spectrum between under-valuing and over-valuing lived experience. Undervaluing in the sense of dismissing perspectives of racial minorities as irrelevant and over-valuing when neglecting

to account for disciplinary positioning. We need a balance. Storytelling and lived experience can play a role in research perspective. For instance, Ogbonnaya-Ogburu et al. [42] highlights how storytelling and valuing the perspectives of racial minorities is critical for making the scientific community more inclusive. Leveraging lived experience and storytelling can serve as a powerful methodology in improving anti-racist efforts in our field. However, we also note that lived experience of individuals researchers should not be conflated with disciplinary expertise; When forming interdisciplinary collaborations, we should not naively assume all racial minorities are able to provide extensive perspective on race and racism scholarship. Many researchers racialized as minorities have received training only from the algorithmic perspective. In terms of the intersection between racism and algorithms, scholars need to consider this evaluation carefully.

- 3. Attend to de-prioritization of ongoing harms caused by a legacy of racial discrimination:** A more subtle form of ignoring context, scholars might acknowledge racial context but dismiss it as irrelevant to more recent occurrences. For instance, the belief that race is not a priority or less valuable to consider because of social progress is related to the minimization of racism. It can be a failure to recognize or engage with the existence of racial disparities and the need for ongoing efforts to address them.

The concealed nature of color-blind racism complicates the role of intent. There can be disparate impact even without intention. Further, there can be racial inequality that arises even out of neutral or good intention. In essence, one can subscribe to a color-blind racist ideology without racist intent. This is one of the most important aspects of understanding color-blind racism. It requires scholar to have a more nuanced understanding of what it means to be neutral. In contrast, consider more simplistic notions of racism where one might say that any mention of race is racist. One reason for the confusion is that people often interpret the mere mention of race as suggestive of an intention. Similarly, admitting or advocating for being aware of race might be misinterpreted as suggestive of having discriminatory intentions [29]. Color-blind

racism offers an ideological framework that does not require racist intent; it is the real world impact that matters separate from intention.

Questions of objectivity arise naturally in the context of a scientific discipline [44; 35]. The computer science perspective is thus influenced by this tendency to strive for more objectivity [27; 45]. It is possible that race neutrality could be thought to align with scientific objectivity. Therefore, it can be confusing to think about color-blind racism as a scientific researcher. One might wonder: how can striving towards neutrality be problematic? We urge researchers against assuming that race neutrality is in alignment with scientific objectivity.⁴ Recall how color-blind racism functions to render racial inequality neutral and reasonable. For this reason, color-blind racism might be more prominent amongst scientists and therefore more difficult to address.

Race neutrality or color-blindness can range between passive and active. Active color-blindness involves actively blinding oneself to race. Passive color-blindness involves unconsciously disregarding or ignoring race. This range presents a challenge to the idea of color-blind racism: what do we make of instances where active color-blindness might in fact be the goal (procedural color-blindness [20; 29])? We revisit this discussion more in depth in the next section.

4 Algorithmic Fairness

The four frames of color-blind racism typically function as ideological tools that influence the way we reason and discuss racism in the United States. It is not as simple as identifying each frame in isolation. In fact, the frames can be interwoven to form a protective boundary around racism. Notice the power in using liberal ideals to abstract away racial explanations and then pivoting to questions around racial privilege. The effectiveness of using minimization of racism as a starting point and therefore placing the burden on scholars to dedicate time to the task of defending the relevance of racism altogether. We see these shifts in research discourse. For instance, the move from the question “how do we measure the racial dispar-

⁴We briefly acknowledge possible relationship between scientific objectivity and discussions of race neutrality in the context of algorithms. A more detailed discussion is outside the scope of the present paper.

ities of algorithms?” to the question “are race considerations legal or fair in the first place?”. How did we start at a conversation about correcting historical trends of racism and end up in a defensive position clarifying that correction is not equivalent to preferential treatment? The ideology of color-blind racism helps understand these pivots and disconnects. And further helps to anticipate shifts based on patterns in existing racial discourse. For instance, we might expect that the question “how do we ensure a healthcare algorithm does not discriminate against black patients?” will shift to the question “are race-aware healthcare algorithms unfair to white patients?”.

Consider the following analogy where we envision the landscape at the intersection between algorithms and racism like researchers as agents navigating various paths. If we think about a researcher as an agent navigating the disciplinary space between algorithms and racism, imagine dropping an agent onto the board and observing. Some of the agents begin squarely within the disciplinary lines of computer science but their destination is located across the other side in the land of race and racism. When we observe their trajectory, we notice a problem. They can orient themselves towards the other side. They can even begin walking in that direction, getting closer and closer. But for some reason, their plight gets disrupted. It is as if someone is intervening in the game. At times, it seems as though the agent is literally picked up and turned around by some outside force. At other times, we find the agent in some circular pattern far away from the destination. Or they are on a path of infinite internal spiral with not much connection to either side. It seems that they have lost sight of the original plan altogether. We can start some agents nearer to the middle of the intersection and observe how they navigate the space. Many times they end up helping to correct the paths of those around them and essentially building bridges and roads. They are sometimes trying to identify where the spirals and disconnects occur and urge the community to avoid those areas. And still other agents begin squarely with disciplinary training focused on race and racism. We might see these agents also struggle to find entry points of connection to the other side.

In this imaginary view, there are some hidden forces at play. If the agent paths represent research discourse, then color-blind racism is acting as an invisible force influencing these paths. And the frames of color-blind racism function embedded in racial discourse continue to influ-

ence pivots, disconnects and diversions. This is partially because the agents operate without an awareness of color-blind racism to begin with. If there was a general understanding of the complicated nature of modern racial discourse then agents would have a lens through which to interpret and adjust ongoing discourse accordingly.

Equipped with an awareness of color-blind racism, we can improve the navigation of the landscape at the intersection between algorithms and racism by recognizing ideological shifts as such and re-orienting towards remaining meaningfully connected across disciplinary lines. Perhaps, we gain insight into the roles different researchers play in the discussion. Without being able to identify color-blind racism, these disconnects mimic the distortion and concealing of racism prevalent in racial discourse more broadly. Let us examine these disconnects more closely in the context of algorithmic fairness.

4.1 Disconnection between Racialized Concepts and Oppression

In algorithmic fairness, racialized concepts often become disconnected from their original relationship to oppression and power. One example is the misinterpretation of the term “intersectionality”. Intersectionality is the unique combination of social and political identities resulting in distinct discrimination or privilege. The term has roots in black feminism and legal scholarship where black women needed to establish a unique form of discrimination not quite captured by previous precedents for black men or white women independently [15; 12]. When this concept entered the landscape of algorithmic fairness, the dominant interpretation partially reduced the term to simply mean combining identity categories; abstracting away the function of systems of oppression [33]. Kong [33] describes the dominant interpretation of intersectionality within algorithmic fairness as aiming for demographic parity across subgroups of race and gender. They present three weaknesses of this approach, one of which we will emphasize here: the concept of intersectionality addresses the compounding impact of overlapping systems of oppression, and the dominant interpretation in algorithmic fairness does not meaningfully address or challenge the unique nature of oppression that those at the intersections of identities face. Rather, the misinter-

pretation abstracts away how systems of oppression function at all, and reduces this term to mean combining identity categories. While the term, intersectionality, has been misinterpreted in other fields, the setting of algorithmic fairness is particularly interesting.

The same way instances of racial inequality become detached from racism in the ideology of color-blind racism, racial concepts are being detached from meaningful origins in discourse within algorithmic fairness. There is a type of filtering effect. You take a concept like intersectionality, run it through racial discourse in algorithmic fairness and come away somehow having dropped the considerations of power and oppression. How does this happen? Bringing in the lens of color-blind racism is one way to pay closer attention to the filter itself.

And ultimately, the discussion shifts towards resolving the very problem the filter created. Kong [33] points out the research dilemma that arises post-filter between a focus on (i) splitting into smaller and smaller subgroups or (ii) prioritizing subgroups arbitrarily. The question “does some unique combination of social and political identities result in distinct algorithmic discrimination?” turned into the question “is it computationally feasible to consider all possible subgroup combinations?” or the question “how should a particular combination of subgroups be prioritized?”. What role is work like Kong [33] playing here? When the fundamental research questions have become disconnected from the conceptual framework they were born out of, the work is to highlight the disconnect and suggest paths towards re-connection. This is the role of this type of work. At such a complicated intersection, the importance of work that essentially re-orient and re-connects cannot be overstated. Comparable to the role of signage and guides at physical intersections.

At times, this type of work might seem overly self-critical. We wonder why it seems scholars in algorithmic fairness tend towards internal critique where many papers take the tone of “here is what we did wrong” or “here is another misinterpretation” or “here is something all these papers missed”. Though it may seem like research in algorithmic fairness critiques simply for the sake of critiquing, there is something more important going on. Returning to the analogy where agents navigate a landscape, we see this work as a form of course correction and road building particularly at the intersection of race and algorithms. For every step we take towards algorithmic

advances in this landscape, we need to re-evaluate the connection to racism. Not to disrupt the progression of research but to enhance it via re-orientation and re-connection as research progresses.

Scholars navigating the overlapping landscape ought to anticipate an iterative process that could take the following form. Step 1: translate between racism and algorithms. Step 2: identify what has been gained and what has been filtered out. Step 3: return to step 1 to meaningfully re-establish connection and repeat. We may find that the abundance of self critique is necessary precisely because of the intersection we navigate.

When translating a concept from racism to algorithms, connections get filtered out. When engaging in racial discourse, we encounter all the things that make racial discourse difficult in general. And color-blind racism is a helpful framework for understanding racial discourse from an ideological perspective offering many clues about how the disconnects occur and the types of ideological maneuvers to look out for.

4.2 Implications of Fairness Metric Choice

In algorithmic fairness research, scholars have developed metrics that capture notions of fairness from both the individual and group perspective for classification problems. This has led to debates around metric choice and ethical differences between different options. Corbett-Davies and Goel [13] underline important statistical limitations of fairness definitions while suggesting a useful categorization for types of fairness metrics. In one view, researchers require equal performance over protected groups via metrics that satisfy “classification parity”. In the other view, researchers examine how protected attributes impact decisions (related to the legal concept of disparate treatment [19]). Interestingly, researchers have shown that it is impossible to satisfy certain fairness metrics simultaneously (demographic parity, equalized odds and calibration when base rates differ across subgroups) [10; 32]. The limitations of different fairness metrics has garnered lots of discussion. For instance, Kasy and Abebe [28] argue that some fairness definitions legitimize inequality by encoding a notion of merit in algorithmic design decisions; they suggest researchers refocus on the causal impact and challenge assumptions around choosing the objective function of the algorithm.

One topic in algorithmic fairness discourse is whether researchers should frame fairness from the perspective of equity or equality. Equality typically involves treating all individuals the same in some sense without considering protected attributes. Whereas equity might include considerations of existing racial hierarchies and the possibility that different individuals might require different treatment to correct for historical inequalities. For instance, Davis et al. [17] see fairness metrics as flawed underlining their failure to address systemic issues and ultimately advocate for more “reparative” algorithms based on an equity framing.

Elements of abstract liberalism offer interesting insights into this conversation. Scholars often assume classification parity is a reasonable notion of equality partially in alignment with abstractions of equal opportunity. Countering the logic of color-blind racism would caveat that the existence of racial hierarchies in a given domain ought to inform the notion of equality defined. This is a point that is largely accepted within fairness discourse where researchers understand that deciding between fairness metrics must be guided by the downstream decision making process or social policy goals for a particular problem [13]. Color-blind racism supports this idea and further clarifies that researchers should challenge assumptions around whether a notion of fairness might constitute neutrality or colorblindness. And ultimately whether that ought to be the goal.

Scholars examining the legality of various fairness metrics point out that a useful dichotomy to consider is whether metrics are bias preserving or bias transforming [53]. The idea is that there may be a need for more transformational fairness metrics and methods that do not reinforce the status quo and reflect the biases prevalent in a social domain. Though it is not immediately clear what exactly bias transforming means from a technical perspective. And scholars have even argued that existing fairness metrics will not suffice in this shift towards fairness that incorporates equity and justice [22].

Underlying this discussion about fairness metrics is discourse around the ultimate goal of fairness research. Researchers grapple with how, when and why to specify fairness. Not all of this is directly tied to racism. But the discussions of equity and justice are largely motivated by instances of racism. And the scholars re-orienting and challenging the discussion are often leaning heavily on con-

cepts from scholars in racism. Regardless of intentions or explicit rhetoric, many scholars are engaging in racial discourse. Hence, we see familiar themes of disconnect, disorientation and confusion arise; further underlining the importance of improving our collective understanding of modern racism.

4.3 Building Models that Reflect the Racism of the World

In one line of discussion at the intersection of race and algorithms, researchers consider that when algorithms are introduced in a particular social domain, the model output may simply reflect persistent inequality. For instance, in a standard classification task where training data is fundamentally flawed, model performance is prone to the same flaws. One of the most meaningful examples has been the use of re-arrest data as a proxy for recidivism [51]. Without considering the greater context of how racism connects to the criminal justice system, especially the system of policing in the United States, a model trained on re-arrest data is likely to reflect the over policing of black and brown communities. Essentially, begging the question: what are our goals when introducing algorithms into social domains? On the one hand, racial bias output by algorithms could be a useful indicator that racial bias persists in that domain. This is interesting in light of what we know about the concealed and hidden nature of color-blind racism. As racism becomes more complex and more difficult “to see”, might the role of algorithms be related to helping make visible that which has been hidden? There are policy considerations for what it means to preserve bias as an indicator in this way [53].

On the other hand, some scholars see an opportunity for algorithms to go further than humans have been able to. Green [20] point out that the adoption of risk assessments has been motivated by two assumptions: i) the idea that assumed objectivity of algorithms could decrease human bias and (ii) the idea that algorithms could have potential to promote a new type of reform. Ultimately, they demonstrate the failures of these assumptions and challenge underlying ideas of color-blindness i.e. aiming to be race neutral in an unequal society will inevitably result in disparate outcomes [20]. Hence, scholars have pointed out the issues that occur when color-blind racism

is ignored or when algorithmic fairness methods progress without deeper interdisciplinary insight. Would scholars more familiar with systemic racism have anticipated this happening? In fact, some did. Richardson et al. [46] detail potential civil rights violations that occur from building algorithms on top of data that captures “dirty policing”. In both these examples, the research supports connecting algorithmic fairness discussions to concepts from color-blind racism in an effort to clarify and re-direct.

We see that this discussion has been enhanced by the studies dedicated to revealing hidden assumptions and re-interpreting technical results. Reiterating the importance of actively forging interdisciplinary connections between research at the intersection of algorithms and racism. And we can see how discourse about the goals and promises of algorithmic fairness resemble some of the trends in racial discourse more broadly.

4.4 Race-Neutral Rhetoric

Within the field of algorithmic fairness, there has been a shift towards race-neutral language despite work being largely motivated by racism. For instance, scholars often generalize by moving from the word “racism” to “bias”⁵. Consistent with the guiding principles for ongoing research practices, we advocate for more specific language when studying at the intersection of race and algorithms. The tendency towards race-neutral language in the field of algorithmic fairness, particularly when engaging in racial discourse, is partially due to the fact that notions of fairness are applicable to various axes of identity. And of course, algorithmic fairness is not only focused on algorithms and racism. In instances where the research focus is more broad, the term “bias” is often appropriate. We are more interested in scenarios where the only type of bias articulated as motivating a study is racism. Where the shift to a more general term has advanced a socio-technical disconnect that will need correcting in the future. Where the appeal of a more general term is naively to be race-neutral. Plainly, scholars in algorithmic fairness discussing racism ought to state this more directly resisting the urge to avoid racial rhetoric. Per our discus-

⁵To be sure, there are streams of research in algorithmic fairness where this move is warranted. Our goal is simply to urge awareness around rhetorical shifts and encourage researchers to be more specific when possible.

sion of color-blind racism, concealing racism ultimately makes it more difficult to contend with. Instead of shifting to race-neutral language, we advocate for being explicit about the motivation of the work and the intended impact of the work moving forward.

5 Limitations and Future Work

We have discussed racism primarily from the perspective of research motivated by addressing anti-black racism in the United States. In doing so, we have not incorporated wider ethnic studies perspectives focused on racism as it relates to non-Black racial minorities. We acknowledge this as a limitation, however we also justify this choice. Grounding in anti-black racism in discourse around racism can lead to advancements not only for black people but for other minority groups i.e. the benefits of desegregation [7], affirmative action [14] and other advancements in the U.S. designed to benefit black people that ultimately benefit many others.

We have discussed racism as an ideology, which has its limitations. Garcia [18] outlines several considerations with accounts of racism as an ideology. While racism as an ideology can be helpful, it is important to examine non-ideological accounts in future work. Further, there are ongoing philosophical and sociological debates over the ongoing causes of racial disparities that should be considered. For instance, Darby [16] argues for stronger normative arguments that stand regardless of how racial inequalities are explained. In future work, these types of perspectives can strengthen the discussion of discourse at the intersection of race and algorithms.

The theory underlying the account of color-blind racism builds on work that is mostly based on American racism. This focus on the US context means this paper does not fully contend with racism outside the US that can have similarities but deserves independent consideration. We have also limited our discussion to racism as the axis of oppression; other types of harms and biases are outside the scope of this work. And lastly, we understand that race is socially constructed and still has a meaningful impact on our lives throughout society. As mentioned, part of our motivation is to ensure our understanding of racism is moving forward as technology influences and transforms racial inequality.

This work is related to the conceptualization of racism in scientific research. For instance, Lett et al. [37] outline the failure modes associated with the intersection between race and quantitative health sciences research. Also, Birhane et al. [5] detail a value system within machine learning research showing that the dominant values in applied machine learning disproportionately neglect historically marginalized people. Our work is complementary to this stream of research. But much more work is needed to fully examine the dynamics between researchers at the intersection of race and algorithms.

We have discussed racism while mostly assuming unintentional or unconscious racism. Yet the possibility of racism existing without racists⁶ explains that institutional structures tinged with their creators' or designers' racism can persist and perpetuate racial disparities even after the originators have passed away. In essence, there can be no racism at any time without there having been racists earlier, and the harm caused by institutional, structural, and systemic racism can be widespread and significant. Bonilla-Silva [6]'s influential trope of "racism without racists" helps remind us that when racism is translated into institutions, it must be translated from something. Future discussions might contend more deeply with the role of intent.

6 Concluding Remarks

To strengthen the intersection between algorithms and racism, we have reviewed the frames of color-blind racism and connected them to research in algorithmic fairness. Color-blind racism is an ideology used to explain away racial inequalities under the guise of neutrality. Functionally, color-blind racism shows up as an unwillingness to engage in racial discourse, avoidance of racial language while communicating about social problems shaped by racial dynamics, oversimplifying racial justice to a search for outright "racists" and more. In the context of algorithms, a better understanding of color-blind racism can inform collective research practices. Namely, scholars can identify and challenge practices that ignore racial context or explanations, dedicate more attention to the lived

experience and perspectives of minoritized people and attend to harms related to a historical legacy of discrimination.

We discuss points of confusion that arise particularly when race neutrality might be conflated with scientific objectivity. And the important distinction between passive and active notions of color-blind racism that may arise in the context of algorithms. Finally, we offer perspective on algorithmic fairness discussions through the lens of color-blind racism. We see color-blind racism as a useful tool in understanding how racialized concepts become disconnected and misinterpreted in the context of algorithmic fairness, how color-blind racism surfaces in discourse around fairness metrics and the overall goals of algorithmic fairness research, and how the shift toward race-neutral language deserves thought and attention as research progresses.

Overall, we advocate for drawing connections between algorithms and racism more deeply. A kind of call to action to more thoughtful engagement at the intersection. This is not a call for abandoning disciplinary lines altogether; there is immense value in continuing to develop research on both algorithms and racism separately. This is simply a recognition that this particular intersection is deserving of more attention and more creative engagement; That we should state clearly our attempts to do this translational work between fields including the challenges as well as the limitations; That we will need unique curriculum development dedicated to this particular intersection (it is not as simple as say training scholars in computer science or African American studies, separately). There is a growing need for training people directly at the intersection which may require new courses, internships, job titles, etc. There may be untapped institutional potential associated with dedicating time and resources specifically to the examination of algorithms and racism.

Understanding colorblind racism is crucial for addressing the racial disparities that have motivated much of the algorithmic fairness research agenda. Furthermore, recognizing the invisibility of color-blind racism is essential in developing effective solutions to combat racial bias in algorithms. Ultimately, these simple guiding principles are meant to help identify occurrences of color-blind racism to promote racial regard by attending to racism more directly at the intersection of algorithms and racism.

⁶The title of Bonilla-Silva [6] is "Racism Without Racists: Color-blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America"

Acknowledgements

We thank colleagues at Harvard and University of Pennsylvania for feedback and helpful discussions. We thank anonymous reviewers to useful engagement. We thank Camille Harris and Alexander Tolbert for editing support on previous versions of the paper. We thank Jennifer Chien, A. Feder Cooper, Hailey James, Shannon Whittaker and Harvard EconCS friends for feedback and helpful discussions. JWD is supported by a Ford Foundation Pre-doctoral Fellowship and the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. DGE1745303. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF.

References

- [1] Michelle Alexander. *The new Jim Crow: mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. The New Press, 2010. ISBN 1595581030.
- [2] Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Lauren Kirchner, and Surya Mattu. Machine bias, May 2016. URL <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing>
- [3] Ruha Benjamin. Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code. *Social Forces*, 98(4):1–3, 12 2019. ISSN 0037-7732. doi: 10.1093/sf/soz162. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soz162>.
- [4] Ruha Benjamin. *Captivating Technology: Race, Carceral Technoscience, and Liberatory Imagination in Everyday Life*. Duke University Press, 06 2019. ISBN 978-1-4780-0449-3. doi: 10.1215/9781478004493. URL <https://doi.org/10.1215/9781478004493>.
- [5] Abeba Birhane, Pratyusha Kalluri, Dallas Card, William Agnew, Ravit Dotan, and Michelle Bao. The values encoded in machine learning research. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '22, page 173–184, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450393522. doi: 10.1145/3531146.3533083. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533083>.
- [6] Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Rowman & Littlefield, 5 edition, 2017.
- [7] Charlotte Brooks. *Alien neighbors, foreign friends: Asian Americans, housing, and the transformation of urban California*. University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- [8] Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru. Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. In *Conference on fairness, accountability and transparency*, pages 77–91. PMLR, 2018.
- [9] Alexandra Chouldechova. Fair prediction with disparate impact: A study of bias in recidivism prediction instruments. *Big Data*, 5, 10 2016. doi: 10.1089/big.2016.0047.
- [10] Alexandra Chouldechova. Fair prediction with disparate impact: A study of bias in recidivism prediction instruments. *Big Data*, 5(2): 153–163, 2017. doi: 10.1089/big.2016.0047. URL <https://doi.org/10.1089/big.2016.0047>. PMID: 28632438.
- [11] Davide Cirillo, Silvina Catuara-Solarz, Czuec Morey, Emre Guney, Laia Subirats, Simona Mellino, Annalisa Gigante, Alfonso Valencia, María José Rementeria, Antonella Santucciono Chadha, et al. Sex and gender differences and biases in artificial intelligence for biomedicine and healthcare. *NPJ digital medicine*, 3(1):81, 2020.
- [12] Combahee River Collective et al. 'A Black Feminist Statement'. na, 1977.
- [13] Sam Corbett-Davies and Sharad Goel. The measure and mismeasure of fairness: A critical review of fair machine learning. *CoRR*, abs/1808.00023, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1808.00023>.
- [14] Anthony J Cortese. Affirmative action: Are white women gaining at the expense of black men? *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 25(2-4):77–89, 1991.
- [15] Kimberle Crenshaw. Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics, 1989.
- [16] Derrick Darby. Reparations and racial inequality. *Philosophy Compass*, 5(1):55–66, 2010. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-9991.2009.00268.x>. URL <https://compass.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1747-9991.2009.00268.x>
- [17] Jenny L. Davis, Apryl Williams, and Michael W. Yang. Algorithmic reparation. *Big Data & Society*, 8(2):20539517211044808, 2021. doi: 10.1177/20539517211044808. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517211044808>.

- [18] J.L.A. Garcia. Is racism an ideology? an outline, 2021. doi: 10.1145/3531146.3533144. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533144>.
- [19] Sharad Goel et al. Combatting police discrimination in the age of big data. *New Criminal Law Review: An International and Interdisciplinary Journal*, 20(2):181–232, 2017. URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26417658>. Accessed 16 Jan. 2024.
- [20] Ben Green. The false promise of risk assessments: epistemic reform and the limits of fairness. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAT* '20, page 594–606, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450369367. doi: 10.1145/3351095.3372869. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372869>.
- [21] Ben Green and Yiling Chen. Disparate interactions: An algorithm-in-the-loop analysis of fairness in risk assessments. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAT* '19, page 90–99, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450361255. doi: 10.1145/3287560.3287563. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287563>.
- [22] Ben Green and Lily Hu. The myth in the methodology: Towards a recontextualization of fairness in machine learning, 2018.
- [23] Sophie Groenwold, Lily Ou, Aesha Parekh, Samhita Honnavalli, Sharon Levy, Diba Mirza, and William Yang Wang. Investigating african-american vernacular english in transformer-based text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02510*, 2020.
- [24] Camille Harris, Matan Halevy, Ayanna Howard, Amy Bruckman, and Diyi Yang. Exploring the role of grammar and word choice in bias toward african american english (aae) in hate speech classification. In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '22, page 789–798, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450393522. doi: 10.1145/3531146.3533144. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533144>.
- [25] Yusuke Hirota, Yuta Nakashima, and Noa Garcia. Gender and racial bias in visual question answering datasets. In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '22, page 1280–1292, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450393522. doi: 10.1145/3531146.3533184. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533184>.
- [26] Anna Lauren Hoffmann. Where fairness fails: data, algorithms, and the limits of antidiscrimination discourse. *Information, Communication & Society*, 22(7):900–915, 2019. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2019.1573912. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1573912>.
- [27] Saleha Javed, Tosin P. Adewumi, Foteini Simistira Liwicki, and Marcus Liwicki. Understanding the role of objectivity in machine learning and research evaluation. *Philosophies*, 6(1), 2021. ISSN 2409-9287. doi: 10.3390/philosophies6010022. URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2409-9287/6/1/22>.
- [28] Maximilian Kasy and Rediet Abebe. Fairness, equality, and power in algorithmic decision-making. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 576–586, 2021.
- [29] Pauline T Kim. Race-aware algorithms: Fairness, nondiscrimination and affirmative action. *California law review*, 2022. URL <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract>
- [30] Svetlana Kiritchenko and Saif M Mohammad. Examining gender and race bias in two hundred sentiment analysis systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.04508*, 2018.
- [31] Jon Kleinberg, Jens Ludwig, Sendhil Mullainathan, and Cass R Sunstein. Discrimination in the Age of Algorithms. *Journal of Legal Analysis*, 10:113–174, 04 2019. ISSN 2161-7201. doi: 10.1093/jla/laz001. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/jla/laz001>.

- [32] Jon M. Kleinberg, Sendhil Mullainathan, and Manish Raghavan. Inherent trade-offs in the fair determination of risk scores. *CoRR*, abs/1609.05807, 2016. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1609.05807>.
- [33] Youjin Kong. Are “intersectionally fair” ai algorithms really fair to women of color? a philosophical analysis. In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 485–494, 2022.
- [34] Joshua A. Kroll, Joanna Huey, Solon Barocas, Edward W. Felten, Joel R. Reidenberg, David G. Robinson, and Harlan Yu. Accountable algorithms. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 165(3): 633–705, February 2017. ISSN 0041-9907.
- [35] Thomas S Kuhn. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- [36] Jeff Larson, Julia Angwin, Lauren Kirchner, and Surya Mattu. How we analyzed the compas recidivism algorithm, May 2016. URL <https://www.propublica.org/article/how-we-analyzed-the-compas-recidivism-algorithm>.
- [37] Edd Lett, Ehimare Asabor, Samuel Beltrán, Abby M Cannon, and Onyebuchi A Arah. Conceptualizing, contextualizing, and operationalizing race in quantitative health sciences research. *Annals of Family Medicine*, 20(2): 157–163, 2022. doi: 10.1370/afm.2792. URL <https://www.annfamned.org/content/20/2/157>. PMID: 35045967; PMCID: PMC8959750.
- [38] Kristian Lum and William Isaac. To predict and serve? *Significance*, 13(5):14–19, 2016. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-9713.2016.00960.x>. URL <https://rss.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1740-9713.2016.00960.x>.
- [39] Thomas Manzini, Yao Chong Lim, Yulia Tsvetkov, and Alan W Black. Black is to criminal as caucasian is to police: Detecting and removing multiclass bias in word embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.04047*, 2019.
- [40] Shira Mitchell, Eric Potash, Solon Barocas, Alexander D’Amour, and Kristian Lum. Algorithmic fairness: Choices, assumptions, and definitions. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 8(1):141–163, 2021. doi: 10.1146/annurev-statistics-042720-125902. URL <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-statistics-042720-125902>.
- [41] Mikel K Ngueajio and Gloria Washington. Hey asr system! why aren’t you more inclusive? automatic speech recognition systems’ bias and proposed bias mitigation techniques. a literature review. In *HCI International 2022–Late Breaking Papers: Interacting with eXtended Reality and Artificial Intelligence: 24th International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction, HCII 2022, Virtual Event, June 26–July 1, 2022, Proceedings*, pages 421–440. Springer, 2022.
- [42] Ihudiya Finda Ogbonnaya-Ogburu, Angela D.R. Smith, Alexandra To, and Kentaro Toyama. Critical race theory for hci. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI ’20, page 1–16, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450367080. doi: 10.1145/3313831.3376392. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376392>.
- [43] Trishan Panch, Heather Mattie, and Rifat Atun. Artificial intelligence and algorithmic bias: implications for health systems. *Journal of global health*, 9(2), 2019.
- [44] Karl R Popper. *Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach*. Oxford University Press, 1972.
- [45] Julian Reiss and Jan Sprenger. Scientific Objectivity. In Edward N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Winter 2020 edition, 2020.
- [46] Rashida Richardson, Jason Schultz, and Kate Crawford. Dirty data, bad predictions: How civil rights violations impact police data, predictive policing systems, and justice. In *New York University Law Review*, 2019.
- [47] Maarten Sap, Dallas Card, Saadia Gabriel, Yejin Choi, and Noah A Smith. The risk of racial bias in hate speech detection. In *Proceedings of the 57th*

- annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 1668–1678, 2019.
- [48] Morgan Klaus Scheuerman, Alex Hanna, and Emily Denton. Do datasets have politics? disciplinary values in computer vision dataset development. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, 5 (CSCW2), oct 2021. doi: 10.1145/3476058. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3476058>.
- [49] Andrew D. Selbst, Danah Boyd, Sorelle A. Friedler, Suresh Venkatasubramanian, and Janet Vertesi. Fairness and abstraction in sociotechnical systems. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAT* ’19, page 59–68, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450361255. doi: 10.1145/3287560.3287598. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287598>.
- [50] Emily Sheng, Kai-Wei Chang, Premkumar Natarajan, and Nanyun Peng. The woman worked as a babysitter: On biases in language generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.01326*, 2019.
- [51] Michael Carl Tschantz. What is proxy discrimination? In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 1993–2003, 2022.
- [52] Elmira van den Broek, Anastasia Sergeeva, and Marleen Huysman. Hiring algorithms: An ethnography of fairness in practice. *International Conference on Information Systems*, 2019.
- [53] Sandra Wachter, Brent Mittelstadt, and Chris Russell. Bias preservation in machine learning: The legality of fairness metrics under eu non-discrimination law. *West Virginia Law Review*, 123(3), 2021. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3792772> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533099>.
- [54] Angelina Wang, Solon Barocas, Kristen Laird, and Hanna Wallach. Measuring representational harms in image captioning. In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT ’22, page 324–335, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450393522. doi: 10.1145/3531146.3533099. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533099>.
- [55] Yu Yang, Aayush Gupta, Jianwei Feng, Prateek Singhal, Vivek Yadav, Yue Wu, Pradeep Natarajan, Varsha Hedau, and Jungseock Joo. Enhancing fairness in face detection in computer vision systems by demographic bias mitigation. In *Proceedings of the 2022 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, AIES ’22, page 813–822, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450392471. doi: 10.1145/3514094.3534153. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3514094.3534153>.
- [56] Caleb Ziems, Jiaao Chen, Camille Harris, Jessica Anderson, and Diyi Yang. Value: Understanding dialect disparity in nlu. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.03031*, 2022.
- [57] Caleb Ziems, William Held, Jingfeng Yang, and Diyi Yang. Multi-value: A framework for cross-dialectal english nlp. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08011*, 2022.