

Modeling Discrimination with Causal Abstraction

Milan Mossé* Kara Schechtman* Frederick Eberhardt Thomas Icard
UC Berkeley *Princeton* *Caltech* *Stanford*

Draft of January 2025

Abstract

A person is directly racially discriminated against only if her race caused her worse treatment. This implies that race is an attribute sufficiently separable from other attributes to isolate its causal role. But race is embedded in a nexus of social factors that resist isolated treatment. If race is socially constructed, in what sense can it cause worse treatment? Some propose that the perception of race, rather than race itself, causes worse treatment. Others suggest that since causal models require *modularity*, i.e. the ability to isolate causal effects, attempts to causally model discrimination are misguided.

This paper addresses the problem differently. We introduce a framework for reasoning about discrimination, in which race is a high-level *abstraction* of lower-level features. In this framework, race can be modeled as itself causing worse treatment. Modularity is ensured by allowing assumptions about social construction to be precisely and explicitly stated, via an alignment between race and its constituents. Such assumptions can then be subjected to normative and empirical challenges, which lead to different views of when discrimination occurs. By distinguishing constitutive and causal relations, the abstraction framework pinpoints disagreements in the current literature on modeling discrimination, while preserving a precise causal account of discrimination.

*Joint first author.

1 Introduction

Direct racial discrimination against a person occurs only if she is treated worse than others in some respect, and this is explained by her race (Thomsen, 2018). When explanation is understood causally, we arrive at the notion of

Causal Discrimination: A person is directly racially discriminated against only if she is treated worse than others, and this is caused by her race.

This notion of discrimination makes sense of the widespread use of *audit studies*, in which experimenters detect institutional discrimination using techniques that resemble randomized controlled trials. Indeed, in a now-famous correspondence study, resumes were randomly assigned Black- or white-sounding names and sent out to prospective employers. White names received 50 percent more callbacks for interviews, and callbacks were more responsive to resume quality for white names than for Black ones (Bertrand and Mullainathan, 2004). In other words, the study found that intervening on race-coded names changed interview callbacks, irrespective of resume quality; in this sense, race caused worse treatment. The causal notion of discrimination then justifies the researchers’ conclusion that their study revealed racial discrimination in the labor market. This kind of audit study has become a gold standard for detecting discrimination, with social scientists undertaking increasingly larger-scaled, more ambitious, and more methodologically complex experimental designs (Gaddis, 2018).

The causal notion of discrimination popularized by audit studies applies equally to other protected attributes, like gender or religion, and is invoked across a wide variety of settings. For example, causal discrimination is invoked by algorithmic fairness criteria (Kilbertus et al., 2017; Kusner et al., 2017; Barocas et al., 2023)¹, and in the U.S. law (Kohler-Hausmann, 2018), as in a recent Supreme Court decision:

Title VII ...prohibits employers from taking certain actions “because of” sex. ... Title VII’s “because of” test incorporates the “simple” and “traditional” standard of but-for causation. ... That form of causation is established whenever a particular outcome would not have happened “but for” the purported cause. ... In other words, a but-for test directs us to change one thing at a time and see if the outcome changes. If it does, we have found a but-for cause. (SCOTUS, 2020)

Here, the Court explicitly invokes the causal notion of discrimination: discrimination occurs when were sex different, the outcome would have been different as well.

¹These causal criteria hold the promise of escaping some of the impossibility theorems (Kleinberg et al., 2017; Chouldechova, 2017; Barocas et al., 2023) that plague merely probabilistic or “correlational” notions of discrimination (Glymour and Herington, 2019; Beigang, 2023). More generally, it is suggested that causal criteria appropriately cash out the notion of explanation relevant to algorithmic fairness (Hedden, 2021). Of course, causal analysis requires substantive causal assumptions, but reasoning with such assumptions is no harder, from a computational complexity perspective, than probabilistic reasoning (Mossé et al., 2022; Van Der Zander et al., 2023), and theorists have developed methods for protecting against causal discrimination in the face of uncertainty about the underlying causal structure (Russell et al., 2017).

In sum, the commonsense idea that discrimination occurs only when a protected attribute causes worse treatment is invoked across the social sciences, computer science, and U.S. law. But even assuming we have settled on a theory of when and why attributes such as race and gender should be protected from discrimination (e.g. Hellman 2008; Kolodny 2023), the notion of causal discrimination is difficult to spell out in a precise and plausible way. Indeed, on the counterfactual understanding of causation (Lewis, 1973; Woodward and Hitchcock, 2003a,b; Woodward, 2005), to determine whether race caused worse treatment, we must consider whether an individual’s treatment would have been worse, had their race and *only* their race been different;² this is precisely the test suggested by audit studies, algorithmic fairness criteria, and the U.S. Supreme Court.

However, it is widely held that race, as well as other attributes protected from discrimination like gender, religion, and disability, are *socially constructed*: they help to sustain and are influenced by social norms concerning individuals’ appearance, wealth, location, education, criminal history, and more (Haslanger, 2000, 2012; Taylor, 2022; Mills, 1998). This raises the worry that there is no robust metaphysical boundary between what *constitutes race* (and thus should be varied, when testing racial discrimination) and what is *causally distinct from race* (and thus should be controlled for, when testing racial discrimination). For instance, in the resume audit study, why shouldn’t an auditor vary features of individuals like educational or employment history in addition to their names, if such features are bound up in the social construction of race?

An influential line of recent work argues that causal models of discrimination make it impossible to give a satisfactory answer to this question, because they force us to postulate an implausible metaphysical boundary between race and the context in which it is socially embedded (Kohler-Hausmann, 2018; Hu and Kohler-Hausmann, 2020; Hu, 2022, 2024b). Race can cause worse treatment in a causal model only if its effects are *modular*: one can perform an intervention *only* on race and trace the resulting effects to race. But if race is socially constructed, it seems to straightforwardly violate this requirement of modularity: in intervening on race, one inevitably intervenes on its constituents as well. For example, because race is partly constituted by norms surrounding people’s names, education, and employment history, interventions on these attributes and on race are bound up with each other. If we change someone’s race from Black to white while attempting to hold fixed “Jamal” as their name or “Howard University” as part of their educational history, the social resonance of these attributes changes; interventions on race, on names, and on education are intertwined. The modularity requirement then seems to forbid a causal model from including variables corresponding to race, names, education, and so on, when precisely such a model would be needed to explain how manipulations on names reveal effects of race in the resume audit study.

More generally, causal models of discrimination face a *modularity problem*:

²We focus on the framework of structural causal models rooted in the work of Pearl (2000), given that it is used in definitions of algorithmic fairness (Kilbertus et al., 2017; Kusner et al., 2017), and that its ability to accommodate racial discrimination has already been subject to criticism (Kohler-Hausmann, 2018; Hu and Kohler-Hausmann, 2020; Hu, 2022, 2024b) and defense (Weinberger, 2022). For discussion of analogous difficulties for the potential outcomes framework, see (Glymour and Glymour, 2014; Marcelllesi, 2013; Greiner and Rubin, 2011; Sen and Wasow, 2016). For an equivalence between structural causal models and potential outcomes frameworks, see Ibeling and Icard (2024).

1. *Causal discrimination*: A person is directly racially discriminated against only if she is treated worse than others, and this is caused by her race.
2. *Modularity assumption*: Race is a cause in a causal model only if its effects are modular.
3. *Social construction*: Race is socially constructed, so its effects violate modularity.
4. Therefore, causal models are incompatible with the social construction of race.

This worry has prompted many to defend causal models, typically by arguing that causal models of discrimination do not require modularity for race, but for some distinct feature associated with race. For example, Greiner and Rubin (2011) propose that racial discrimination occurs if others’ *perception* of race causes worse treatment (cf. Singh and Wodak 2023), Sen and Wasow (2016) propose that race has several constituents and that racial discrimination occurs if any *constituent* causes worse treatment, and Weinberger (2022) proposes that racial discrimination occurs if *signals* of race cause worse treatment. We argue that the modularity problem is not adequately addressed by these proposals.

Meanwhile, those who developed the modularity problem conclude from it that we must think of race as explanatory in some sense that cannot be represented by causal models (Kohler-Hausmann, 2018; Hu and Kohler-Hausmann, 2020; Dembroff et al., 2020; Hu, 2022, 2024b). Like the alternatives of skepticism (Holland, 1986) or agnosticism (Tolbert, 2024a) that race is a cause, this amounts to a rejection of the notion of causal discrimination apparently deployed by audit studies, algorithmic fairness criteria, U.S. law, and by those describing their lived experience of discrimination (Cherry and Bendick Jr., 2018, pp.45-46, 53-55). At points these authors suggest that discrimination claims are backed by constitutive explanation, rather than causal explanation (Hu and Kohler-Hausmann 2020, p.10; Dembroff et al. 2020, p.9).³ But we will argue that this proposal is best understood as pointing to a distinction between two kinds of causal discrimination, and that this distinction, as well as the relations between race and its constituents, are well-represented by causal models.⁴

Crucially, both of these responses to the modularity problem share what we can call

the Single-Level Assumption: When causally modeling some phenomenon, one must place all of the relevant variables in a single causal model, which describes the situation at a single level of abstraction.

³Alternatively, it might be thought that race functions as a *structuring* rather than *triggering* cause, which operates by constraining agents’ choices (Ross, 2023).

⁴A third line of response would be to claim that protected attributes like race and gender are not socially constructed, and instead adopt *skepticism* that race exists (Appiah, 1995; Zack, 1993) or *racial population naturalism*, which holds that “it is possible that genetically significant biological groupings could exist that would merit the term races . . . [though] there is no set of genetic or other biological traits that all and only all members of a racial group share that would then provide a natural biological boundary between racial groups.” (James and Burgos, 2024) To address the modularity problem, one would need to adopt such views regarding *every* attribute which is a potential basis for wrongful discrimination, e.g. gender, gender identity (Stoljar, 1995; Jenkins, 2016), racial identity (Appiah, 1998), and race as it is commonly perceived and conceptualized. The abstraction model can be used to model (social or natural) constituents of any of these attributes. Since the modularity problem openly assumes that protected attributes are socially constructed, we prefer a reply to it which is consistent with social constructionism.

In this paper, we propose a simple model of discrimination which jettisons the Single-Level Assumption, by modeling race as a high-level abstraction of lower-level attributes. We introduce

the Abstraction Model for Discrimination: A person’s race is constituted by low-level natural and social attributes and relations. Race causes an outcome if a change in race, instantiated by a change in the low-level attributes constitutively aligned with race, causes a change in outcome. This is the sense in which race causes worse treatment, when racial discrimination occurs.

While we develop the model by applying it to racial discrimination in audit studies, it applies equally to other protected attributes, like gender, and in other settings, including algorithmic fairness and the U.S. law. We show that this model dissolves the modularity problem: in our model, the relationship between race and its constituents remains non-modular, in the sense that one cannot intervene on race without intervening on its constituents. But as we explain, this is a benign (indeed intended) feature of abstraction, not an obstacle to causal modeling: when one attribute is simply a higher-level abstraction of other, lower-level attributes, one should expect changes at one level to correspond to changes at the other.

The abstraction model addresses the modularity problem, but the use of abstraction does not obviate the need to make normative judgments about the relevant counterfactual contrasts in testing the effects of social kinds. Instead, the abstraction model provides a framework for making these judgments precise and explicit, primarily via an alignment between higher-level protected attributes and their lower-level constituents. In this way, the abstraction model offers the flexibility to encode different assumptions about how discrimination should be measured, which lead to different verdicts about whether discrimination has occurred. Made precise and explicit, these assumptions can then be subjected to further normative and empirical challenges.

Indeed, after introducing the abstraction model of discrimination (Section 2) and addressing the modularity problem (Section 3), we use the abstraction model to distinguish further challenges for causal models of discrimination (Sections 4, 5). In particular, we address the worry that interventions which purport to test the discriminatory effects of race in fact reveal quantities which are in some sense irrelevant to discrimination (Hu and Kohler-Hausmann, 2020). We then turn to the worry that causal models cannot capture discrimination claims, because discrimination involves constitutive, rather than causal, explanation (Dembroff et al., 2020). Stated precisely, these further challenges provide reasons for objecting to particular causal models of discrimination. However, we argue that these are not objections to causal models of discrimination as such, because they can be stated within the framework of causal abstraction.

2 Abstraction and discrimination

The social construction of protected attributes like race implies that an individual’s race is not a feature on par with other natural or social attributes and relations, but rather defined in terms of such lower-level attributes and relations. While such multi-level representation is not part of a standard causal model, causal abstractions can represent causal systems at

multiple levels of granularity. This section will introduce the framework of causal abstraction and then show how it can be used to model discrimination, using the example of audit studies to illustrate.

2.1 Introducing abstraction

Consider an experiment in which a bird is trained to peck at objects of any shade of red (Yablo, 1992; Woodward, 2021). When the bird pecks at some red object, say a crimson one, we can make two causal claims about it, at different levels of abstraction: that it pecks at the object because it is *crimson*, or that it pecks at an object because it is *red*. Each of these causal claims suggests an associated causal model, one in which perception of a fine-grained color (e.g., crimson, scarlet, cyan, turquoise) causes pecking behavior, and another in which perception of a coarse-grained color (e.g., red, blue) causes pecking behavior. Intuitively, the coarse-grained model is an abstraction of the lower-level, fine-grained one, because (a) the coarse-grained model is *simpler*, and (b) the models are *causally equivalent*: changing the color from red to blue in the coarse-grained model has the same effect as changing the color from crimson to cyan in the low-level model. As we now explain, in the framework of causal abstraction, the notion of “simplifying a model” is provided by a relationship between them, called an *alignment*, while the notion of causal equivalence is provided by a feature of alignments, called *causal consistency*.




Figure 1: Color as an abstraction. Dotted arrows represent an alignment τ_{color} between causal models, which maps values of the Fine Color variable (crimson, scarlet) to values of the Coarse Color variable (red). Solid arrows express causal relationships, e.g. that intervening on the value of the coarse color variable **Coarse** can change the value of the pecking variable **Pecking**.

The fine-grained and coarse-grained models are depicted in Figure 1. The high-level model contains two variables: **Coarse**, which represents the bird’s perception of a coarse-grained color, and **Pecking**, which represents whether the bird pecks. The causal arrow implies that **Pecking** is an effect of **Coarse**, and thus is some function f_{coarse} of **Coarse**, perhaps together with random noise (included to capture variation among birds’ pecking behavior not explained by object color). The low-level model is almost exactly the same, except it models pecking behavior as a function of fine-grained color **Fine** rather than coarse color.

These simple models already contain all of the essential features of a causal model. Indeed, recall that in a *structural causal model*, there are variables $V_1, V_2, V_3 \dots$, where the value of each variable V is defined by a function f_V of the values of other variables. (See, e.g., Pearl 1995; Peters et al. 2017; Bareinboim et al. 2022.)

The relationship between the variables of the high-level and low-level causal models is captured by an *alignment* τ_{color} , which provides a way of transforming variable settings in the lower-level model to variable settings in the high-level model. In this case, crimson and scarlet settings map to red settings, while cyan and turquoise settings map to blue settings. In other words, the alignment τ_{color} is a function which maps values of the low-level variable *Fine* to the values of the high-level variable *Coarse*.

More generally, consider two models \mathcal{M}_{low} and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{high}}$. An *alignment* τ is a function which maps values of variables in the low-level model to values of variables in the high-level model. Intuitively, an alignment may be thought of as a *simplification* of the low-level model: it merges different values of low-level variables into individual values of high-level variables, and may ignore some low-level variables entirely (Chalupka et al., 2017; Rubenstein et al., 2017; Beckers et al., 2019; Geiger et al., 2024). So-defined, alignments are highly permissive: strictly speaking, any model can be aligned with any other. As we now explain, to define an abstraction, an alignment must also ensure that “manipulations” in the low-level model and “manipulations” in the high-level one are “causally equivalent.” We can now make the relevant notions of manipulation and causal equivalence more precise.

Formally, the effects of manipulations are evaluated with *interventions*. An intervention (sometimes called a *hard* intervention) $\text{do}(V = v)$ on a variable V replaces its function f_V with a constant function, that is a fixed value v . Because other variables may be defined as functions of V , the intervention $\text{do}(V = v)$ can percolate through the model, changing the likelihood that other variables take various values; this is the effect of the intervention.⁵

An alignment establishes “causal equivalence” between two models when it is *causally consistent*. To check whether τ_{color} is causally consistent, we first perform an intervention on color at the low level, and then transform the effect it has on pecking to the high level via the alignment. We then check that this has the same result as first transforming the intervention via the alignment, and then intervening at the high level. This condition is in fact met by the alignment τ_{color} , because intervening on fine-grained color by changing it from crimson to cyan and then checking whether the bird pecks has the same result as intervening on coarse-grained color by changing it from red to blue and then checking whether the bird pecks. By mapping more general colors to corresponding more specific shades, τ_{color} tracks a real metaphysical relationship between a color and its many shades, to which pecking behavior is insensitive. More generally, an alignment τ between two models is causally consistent if intervening on variables in the low-level model \mathcal{M}_{low} and then aligning into the high-level model $\mathcal{M}_{\text{high}}$ is the same as first aligning into the high-level model and intervening there. Given such an alignment, we say that $\mathcal{M}_{\text{high}}$ is an *abstraction* of \mathcal{M}_{low} . (See e.g. Def. 3 of Rubenstein et al. 2017 or Def. 16 of Geiger et al. 2024.)

Causal consistency is a stringent requirement, requiring perfect correspondence between

⁵In the setting of probabilistic structural causal models, causal consistency for interventions – what happens when we force a variable to take a particular value – and counterfactuals – what would have happened had a variable been different in a particular instance – will come apart (cf. Bareinboim et al. (2022) pp.526-530). However, here and in the rest of the paper, we discuss just interventions for simplicity.

low-level and high-level interventions. We introduce it for simplicity, but it can be relaxed in various ways (cf. Beckers et al. 2019; Rischel and Weichwald 2021; Geiger et al. 2024). Most simply, where the values of several lower-level variables V_1, \dots, V_n are aligned via τ with the values of a single high-level variable V , we can say that τ is *approximately* causally consistent if *average* of the effects of V_1, \dots, V_n on some outcome is very close to almost all of the effects of V_1, \dots, V_n on that outcome, taken individually.

2.2 Audit studies and abstraction

Because any metaphysical relationship between two attributes that necessarily co-vary can be captured by an alignment, causal abstraction is a flexible framework. For example, it can be used to express logical relations, determinate-determinable relations, and constitutive relations. In this section, we explain how to use abstraction to capture the constitutive relations posited by a social constructionist theory of race, and then provide a formal interpretation of the causal discrimination claims tested by audit studies.⁶

On a social constructionist theory of race, race is not a natural kind. Instead, it is a social kind. To belong to a certain race is to possess a collection of attributes, which may themselves be natural or social, and are fixed by a set of social norms, historical developments, identities, and other social factors associated with the race in question. In the terminology of abstraction, social constructionist theories of race posit an alignment τ_{SC} which specifies how an individual’s race is socially constructed from all of their other attributes (Figure 2).




Figure 2: Race and resumes as abstractions. The alignment τ_{SC} is posited by social constructionist theories of race, and the alignment τ_{audit} is used by audit studies. The dotted “Resume” box represents a collection of variables, including work history, education, name, and so on. The variables in the “Resume” box are a proper subset of those appearing in the “All attributes” box. The latter includes all attributes of an individual, some of which are abstracted into race (e.g., family history, the hierarchical relations they stand in to others, skin color, education, and location), and others of which are not (e.g. favorite color, number of hairs on their head).

⁶Our view does not depend on accepting the metaphysical relations at play in social construction as constitutive; abstraction is well-suited to capture other grounding relationships that may be viewed as important to construction, such as realization (cf. Griffith (2018)).

This is already a substantive modeling assumption. One might hold that it is impossible, even in principle and in a particular context, to specify how exactly race is constructed from lower-level social and natural attributes of individuals, which may include their relations to others. For example, one might claim that race, socioeconomic class, and gender are all mutually constituted by each other, rather than by a more fine-grained basis of lower-level attributes.⁷ However, we will set this possible worry aside, because (1) this claim is potentially consistent with the abstraction model, insofar as we may model race as abstracting socioeconomic status and gender in one context, and model gender as abstracting socioeconomic status and race in another; and (2) we assume that social constructionist concerns regarding the possibility of causal models of discrimination do not rest on thorough-going skepticism that a social construction of race in terms of lower-level attributes could ever be articulated in principle.⁸

Suppose then that a social constructionist has provided an alignment τ_{SC} between race and the attributes from which it is socially constructed. Because, as the social constructionist suggests, this alignment tracks a genuine metaphysical relationship, we should expect the alignment to be (at least largely) causally consistent: if the effects of race diverged greatly from those of its constituents, this would suggest that τ_{SC} had been misspecified. Thus the alignment τ_{SC} specifies an abstraction.

The simple assumption that race abstracts lower-level attributes in this way already licenses answers to counterfactual questions about race. For instance, it makes sense to ask what would happen were one to intervene on a person’s race in a specific way. This is just to ask what would happen, were one to intervene on the lower-level attributes of an individual in such a way that their race—according to the social construction of race—would now be different. That is, what would happen if an individual’s attributes were different, such that their alignment via τ_{SC} to a racial category is itself different?

Audit studies select a strict subset of an individual’s features, namely those appearing on their resume, purportedly “screening off” the effects of all other attributes of the individual on the outcome. In the terminology of abstraction, this defines a second alignment τ_{audit} , which discards any attributes not appearing on the resume and trivially aligns all attributes appearing on the resume with themselves (Figure 2). The resume is assumed to include all attributes (that is, all variables in “All attributes”) that exert a causal effect on interview status. In this way, τ_{audit} is by construction a “lossless” abstraction of “All attributes” when it comes to interview status.

We can use the alignments τ_{SC} and τ_{audit} to state precisely the quantity of interest in audit studies. An audit study fixes two resumes, Resume_1 and Resume_2 , which differ only in their names. Because resumes only contain a few pieces of information about an individual,

⁷For arguments that would make room for this possibility, e.g., by rejecting the traditional view that constitutive relations are asymmetric and irreflexive, see Barnes (2018) and Jenkins (2016), respectively.

⁸The assumption that there exists an alignment between race and lower-level constituents is consistent with *thin constructionist* views, on which social norms, treatment by others, and so on determine the constituents of race, which then consists entirely of a few superficial features like appearances and ancestry (Outlaw, 1990; Mills, 1998; Gooding-Williams, 1998; Mallon, 2006). But this assumption is also compatible with *thick constructionist* views, on which the constituents of race include social factors and relations, e.g. relations of subordination Haslanger (2019); Taylor (2022); Hu (2024b). In this paper, we focus strictly on modularity. We discuss other possible barriers to modeling social kinds, e.g. relating to cycles of causation (Hacking, 1995; Bongers et al., 2021; Diana et al., 2024), in other work.

many different people with different attributes could possess the same resume. Where a “person” refers to a maximally descriptive set of attributes, let \mathcal{A}_1 be the set of people with resume Resume_1 , and let \mathcal{A}_2 be the set of people with resume Resume_2 . (In other words, \mathcal{A}_1 is the set of people that τ_{audit} aligns with Resume_1 , and \mathcal{A}_2 is the set of people that τ_{audit} aligns with Resume_2 .)

The racial compositions of \mathcal{A}_1 and in \mathcal{A}_2 will tend to differ, especially given that the different names appearing on the resumes Resume_1 and Resume_2 , like Greg and Jamal, are highly correlated with race. Let Race_1 indicate the race most common in \mathcal{A}_1 and let Race_2 indicate the race most common in \mathcal{A}_2 .⁹ Then it follows from the assumption that τ_{SC} and τ_{audit} are causally consistent that audit studies successfully test the causal effect of race on interview outcomes, in the following sense: the difference in interview status that results from changing Race_1 to Race_2 is the same as the difference that results from changing \mathcal{A}_1 to \mathcal{A}_2 , which is in turn the same as changing Resume_1 and Resume_2 . The necessary assumptions of causal consistency are licensed by the social constructionist theory of race that defined τ_{SC} , and by the construction of audit studies, which screen out all attributes not on the resume via τ_{audit} (Figure 3).




Figure 3: The abstraction model of audit studies. The alignment τ_{SC} is posited by social constructionist theories of race, and the alignment τ_{audit} is used by audit studies. Because these alignments are causally consistent, the effect of all attributes on interview status is the same as the effect of resume on interview status (and the same as the effect of race on interview status). It follows that audit studies correctly test the effect of race on interview status.

Formally, audit studies purport to test the effect of race on interview status via the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}[\text{Interview Callback} \mid \text{do}(\text{Race}_1)] - \mathbb{P}[\text{Interview Callback} \mid \text{do}(\text{Race}_2)] \\ = & \mathbb{P}[\text{Interview Callback} \mid \text{do}(\text{Resume}_1)] - \mathbb{P}[\text{Interview Callback} \mid \text{do}(\text{Resume}_2)]. \end{aligned}$$

Admittedly, this picture is an over-simplification. There are multiple interventions on all of an individual’s attributes which could correspond to a change from Race_1 to Race_2 , so

⁹We align resumes to the most common race in the population for simplicity, but other ways of aligning resumes to races are certainly possible, such as probabilistically aligning Resume_1 to Race_1 and Resume_2 according to the frequencies of each in the population \mathcal{A}_1 (and handling Resume_2 alignments analogously).

there is significant under-determination and ambiguity in finding a lower-level intervention to test the effect of this change. But this is ambiguity is common feature of causal inference (Spirtes and Scheines, 2004): in saying that we changed a stimulus for the bird from red to blue, it is ambiguous whether we changed it from crimson to cyan, or from scarlet to turquoise. Causal consistency guarantees that all such changes produce the same pattern of changes in outcome. Thus, to the extent that we have causal consistency in a diagram like Figure 3, there is a clear and principled sense in which audit studies can be modeled as testing the effect of interventions on race. More generally, one can model claims about causal discrimination as claims about the effects of race, understood as an abstraction of lower-level, in-principle manipulable attributes.¹⁰

It is sometimes objected that structural causal models cannot accommodate constitutive relations, because constitutive relations lack the directionality characteristic of causal relationships (Hu and Kohler-Hausmann, 2020, p.5). As the above diagram illustrates, this objection can be overcome using abstraction. One might argue that the specified alignments do not commute with the intervention performed by audit studies, and thus that the crucial assumption of causal consistency fails to hold even approximately; we return to this worry below, in Section 4.1. However, we show in the next section that given this assumption, the abstraction model straightforwardly addresses the modularity problem.

3 The modularity problem

In this section, we explain the modularity requirement and the modularity problem for causal models of discrimination. We then explain how the abstraction model of discrimination addresses this problem and compare this model to some alternatives.

3.1 The modularity requirement

In structural causal models, X causes Y when changes in X lead to changes in Y . For instance, to determine if there is a causal relationship between object color and pecking behavior, we could try intervening on each independently, and seeing which intervention

¹⁰Interventions on race are practically impossible, since to change someone’s race would arguably make them a different person. (One might imagine intervening on a fetus’s genes to change its phenotype and assigning the fetus to a mother of a race associated with that phenotype (Marcellesi (2013), p. 655), but this is clearly not the kind of intervention that social scientists, U.S. courts, and theoretical computer scientists have in mind when discussing causal discrimination (Weinberger (2022), p. 1269).) This impossibility can seem to threaten the intelligibility of modeling race as a cause, and thus of the notion of causal discrimination (cf. Holland (1986), p. 946; Greiner and Rubin (2011), pp. 1-2; Glymour and Glymour (2014); Sen and Wasow (2016), p. 504). However, the impossibility of intervening on race is not an insurmountable problem (Pearl, 2018). As Weinberger (2022) observes (p. 1268), while it is impossible (due to regulations) to intervene on people’s smoking habits, we can still estimate causal effects of smoking: upon observing different health outcomes for relevantly similar populations that differ in their smoking habits, we can often reasonably infer that smoking caused these outcomes. We can even make this inference when a person would have been very different, had they not been a smoker. Similarly, upon observing different outcomes for relevantly similar individuals of different races, we can often reasonably infer that race caused this difference in outcomes (cf. (Marcellesi, 2013), p. 656)—though of course one must specify what counts as relevant similarity, which we propose to do using the theory of causal abstraction.

leads to a change in the other variable. In this case, we would observe that changing the color of an object (for instance, by painting it) leads to a change in bird’s pecking behavior, but that changing the bird’s pecking behavior (for instance, by bribing the bird with a treat) does not magically change the object’s color. We thus conclude that the object’s color causes pecking behavior and not the other way around.

To allow for these kinds of interventions on individual variables, structural causal models must satisfy a modularity requirement (see, e.g., Pearl (2000), p. 63; Woodward (2005), p.327; Peters et al. (2017), pp.17-20, point 1). A variable in a causal model is *modular* when it can be intervened upon independently from intervening on the others, and a causal model is *modular* when all its variables are modular.

For example, a causal model which implies that object color causes bird pecking behavior is modular because it is possible to conceive of interventions on each of the two variables that do not act on the other. If we paint an object blue, we perform an intervention that directly changes just that object’s color, not whether the bird is wont to peck at blue objects.¹¹ As a result, any effects of this intervention demonstrate the causal relationship between object color and bird pecking behavior.

Without modularity, the causal effects of an intervention on a variable are hopelessly conflated with the intervention itself. Consider, for instance, a causal model claiming that the coarse color of an object causes its particular fine shade. This model is non-modular because it is conceptually impossible to manipulate the color of an object separately from intervening on its particular shade (and often, vice versa). How could we change the color of an object from red to blue, without changing it from some shade of red to some shade of blue? Since actions on fine shades and coarse colors are muddled together, we cannot isolate a causal effect of the intervention.

3.2 The modularity problem

Return to the resume audit study, in which experimenters aim to establish a causal effect of race on interview decisions by performing manipulations on race-coded names. To support reasoning about whether race (via manipulations on names) causes interview callbacks, we should be able to represent the audit study using a causal model with variables corresponding to race, name, and interview callback status. This causal model must include names and interview callbacks to represent the causal effect of name interventions on interview callbacks performed by the audit study, and it must include race to explain (by reference to some property of the causal model) how this name manipulation reveals an effect of race.

The modularity problem, developed by Lily Hu and Issa Kohler-Hausmann (Kohler-Hausmann (2018); Hu and Kohler-Hausmann (2020); Hu (2022)), is that protected attributes like race, gender, and religion cannot be placed in a single causal model with the attributes from which they are socially constructed, because their constitutive relations violate the mod-

¹¹Of course, since variables often causally influence other variables, modularity allows for an intervention on some variable to affect other variables through *causal* relations. Interventions on the color of the object plainly affect the bird’s actual pecking causally, but color and pecking behavior are still modular. Instead, when a variable X is modular with respect to Y , this means that interventions on X can be conceptually separated from interventions on Y . While this distinction between causal and non-causal relations is an intuitive one, Janzing and Meija (2022) discuss a number of puzzles about how to make it fully precise.

ularity requirement. In the case of audit studies, the problem is that race, names, and interview callback status cannot be placed in a single structural causal model without violating the modularity assumption crucial to causal modeling and inference. The worry is that these three variables interact more like colors and their more specific shades than like bird pecking behavior and object colors; models including all three variables inevitably end up non-modular.

The problem is easiest to see if we accept that race is a social construction, and thus stands in *constitutive* rather than *causal* relations to many of its correlates. For then certain names constitute part of the social meaning of race, and thus race itself. For instance, Black-sounding names like ‘Jamal’ form part of the social meaning of what it is to be Black. As a result, an intervention setting a name of an applicant on a resume to Jamal cannot, in principle, be separated from an intervention to their race, and vice versa. Thus, placing race and names in a causal model together — as formalizations of audit studies do, to justify using an intervention on names to reveal an effect of race — requires making a false modularity assumption that names do not partially constitute race. This problem arises for any attributes that appear on a resume, like education or employment history, which partly constitute race.¹²

3.3 Abstraction as a solution to the modularity problem

The abstraction model of discrimination straightforwardly addresses the modularity problem. Because protected attributes and their constituents are placed in *separate causal models*, and modularity need only hold within each model taken separately, there is no non-modularity within either the high-level model containing race or the low-level model containing its constituents. Audit studies can be understood as testing the causal effects of race, by testing the effects of its constituents, as defined by a causally consistent alignment. The relationship specified by this alignment is non-modular, in the sense that changes to names correspond to changes in race, but this is a benign (indeed intended and necessary) feature of causally consistent alignments, not an obstacle to causal modeling: when one attribute is simply a higher-level abstraction of other, lower-level attributes, one should expect changes at either level to correspond to changes at the other.¹³

¹²Attempting to solve the modularity problem by modeling differing effects of constitutive elements of race across different races using interactions simply opens a further modularity problem. Suppose we included an interactive effect variable meant to capture people’s impressions of the typicality of a name given someone’s race, with $T = 1$ capturing a “typical” name for the race and $T = 0$ an “atypical” one. Then our causal graph is $R \rightarrow T \leftarrow N$. If we have an individual named Jamal, who is Black, and for whom $T = 1$, we cannot intervene to set $T = 0$ while leaving his name as Jamal and his race as Black, as modularity would demand. This is because the social resonance of Jamal remains that it is a Black-coded name.

¹³The abstraction model does leave the outcome variable—in this case, interview status—out of the alignment. It may be objected that interview status is constitutive of race, and thus that the modularity problem persists. However, in the resume audit study, the outcome variable does not represent the interview status of the applicant for all jobs, but is specific to the decision audited in the study. Since that decision has not happened yet at the point of the audit, it cannot yet be constitutive of race, and thus poses no modularity problem. We agree that on a functional understanding of race as a social kind that sustains social stratification, the causal capacity of race to reinforce the hierarchical social positions that constitute it may be thought of as part of what defines race. But this capacity is better represented by a causal relation between race and future social positions, rather than by inclusion of those social positions in the constitutive basis

By dissolving the modularity problem, the abstraction model immediately dissipates the concern that the audit studies fail to demonstrate any intelligible causal effect of race at all. This in turn shows that the modularity requirement does not in itself force causal models to posit an especially implausible metaphysical boundary between race and the context in which it is socially embedded (Kohler-Hausmann, 2018; Hu and Kohler-Hausmann, 2020; Hu, 2022, 2024b). Instead, this relationship is modeled within the framework, via the causally consistent alignment τ_{SC} that specifies how race is socially constructed. This alignment may include all the attributes that are included in a particular social constructionist theory of race—for instance, names, education history, and employment history.

Of course, the use of abstraction does not obviate the need to make substantive normative judgments in causal modeling about how race and its effects are abstracted from low-level attributes. Nor does it tell us, once we have an abstraction, how to choose the relevant counterfactual contrasts in testing for the causal effects of race or other social kinds. These are further modeling choices, which are subject to empirical and normative challenges. We discuss these issues in Section 4.

3.4 Comparison to other approaches

Our proposal formalizes and further develops Sen and Wasow (2016)’s suggestion to treat race as a “bundle of sticks,” such that manipulations on race are manipulations on some of the sticks. Kohler-Hausmann (2018) raises a modularity-like worry for this proposal: causal manipulations on constituents of race might alter the constitutive organization and causal profile of race, making the constitutive graph unstable. For instance, suppose that an audit study on names floods a city’s job market with so many resumes for Jamal that it changes perceptions of how common the name Jamal is among Black people, in turn changing how names constitute the social kind of race in that city.¹⁴

Fortunately, these kinds of distribution-dependencies are compatible with causal abstraction. For example, one can represent virtual memory in a computer as an abstraction of physical memory in that computer, even though the alignment between virtual and physical memory itself depends on the distribution of physical memory.¹⁵ Analogously, the abstraction of race from names attributes may itself depend on the distribution of names. For example, the ability of names like “Jamal” to count as race-coded plausibly depends on how this name is perceived by recruiters, and thus on its distribution in the population. When these distributional dependencies are idealized away (as they may be in small-scale experimental manipulations, like those of most audit studies, as opposed to sweeping interventions like policy changes), abstraction can provide a formalism to state assumptions about their absence, thereby exposing them to empirical challenges.

from which race is abstracted.

¹⁴Just like non-modularity, this distribution-dependence of the relations between variables threatens the intelligibility of causal models. The so-called principle of independent mechanisms that motivates modularity can be interpreted to imply that for all variables V in a causal model, the mechanism f_V by which it depends on its causal parents and exogenous noise does not contain information about the distribution of any other variable X (see Janzing and Schölkopf (2008); Peters et al. (2017) pp.17-21, point 2 and pp.58-62). This requirement is sometimes also referred to as “modularity” but is distinct from the notion of modularity we present in §3.1.

¹⁵Thanks to Atticus Geiger for the example.

Concerns about race’s manipulability lead Greiner and Rubin (2011) to propose that we use the perception of race, rather than race itself, as a treatment in causal studies of race. Weinberger (2022) suggests, more generally, that we can model audit studies as manipulating a signal of race that is causally downstream of race. Audit studies vary names “as if” they were varying race, thereby revealing an effect of race along this path.¹⁶ To include race and names in the same causal graph without violating modularity, Weinberger argues it does not follow from the assumption that race is socially constructed that race is constituted by its signals, such as names. If race is not constituted by its signals, then it is possible to manipulate those signals separately from race.

However, even if we grant that names are not part of the constitutive basis of race, this does not license manipulations on names but not race, because non-modularity can arise among variables that do not share a constitutive relation. Indeed, suppose we adopt a “thin constructionist” view of race, which says race is constituted just by a few superficial features of people’s appearances and ancestry (Mallon, 2006). Then it is still the case that the name Jamal has a different social resonance when a white person and Black person have it, and that attempting to model these changes in social resonance will result in modularity violations; denying the constitutive relation between names and race just makes it puzzling why that is.¹⁷ By contrast, the abstraction model does not require us to reject the social constructionist views that motivate the modularity problem: it allows that race may be partly constituted by its signals, such as names (cf. fn. 6).

4 Intervention identification

We have argued that the framework of causal abstraction provides a natural way of capturing the constitutive relations between race and the attributes from which it is socially constructed (Section 2) and that this framework straightforwardly addresses the modularity problem raised for causal models of discrimination (Section 3).

However, there remains the *intervention identification problem* of explaining when and why interventions reveal causal effects of a social kind normatively relevant to discrimination. To illustrate, consider the following examples:

¹⁶VanderWeele and Robinson (2014) propose a model of race as a cause which is very similar to Weinberger’s, in which socioeconomic status, physical phenotype, parental physical phenotype, genetic background, cultural context, family, and neighborhood function as signals of race (in Weinberger’s sense). This proposal faces the same worries we raise for Weinberger’s view. We focus on the latter because it is framed as a response to the modularity problem.

¹⁷Weinberger acknowledges this worry in his discussion of the modularity problem for other potential racial signals of audit studies, like university or socioeconomic status; even if these signals do not constitute race, we will have to contend with the possibility that they have different attendant norms across races and thus are further sources of non-modularity. In reply, Weinberger proposes that in many narrow experimental contexts, such as that of a resume audit study, these attributes of people will not be racialized, licensing the assumption of modularity. This stipulative solution to the modularity problem can seem overly optimistic, given the empirical literature on race perception summarized by Hu and Kohler-Hausmann (2024); racial perception, even if induced just by one attribute (like a name), starts a cascade of racialized interpretation of individuals’ other attributes. Our formalism instead provides a way to model the manner in which the constitutive features of race on a resume are racialized by changes to names.

- *U.S. law.* In *Bostock vs. Clayton*, the plaintiff, a gay male employee, was fired for his sexual orientation. The majority decided that this amounted to sexual discrimination, since had the male employee been a female employee attracted to men, she would not have been fired. Dissenters replied that had the male employee been a female employee with same-sex attraction, she would have still been fired (Dembroff et al., 2020; Kohler-Hausmann and Dembroff, 2022). Should we keep sexual orientation fixed, when testing the effect of sex on firing decisions?
- *In-person audit studies.* “Two actors, one taken to be male and the other female, present identical resumes, answer interviewer questions identically, and affect the same tone, mannerisms, and general personality traits (as best as they can). The male actor also dons the same dress and wears the same facial makeup as the female actor; both actors wear skirts and facial makeup to their interviews” (Hu 2022, p. 16, Hu 2024a p. 8; cf. Kohler-Hausmann 2018, p. 1216). Should we keep appearance and mannerisms fixed when intervening on gender to test its effect on hiring decisions?

In each case, we face an intervention identification problem: when and why should attributes be varied with a protected attribute, such that worse treatment on their basis constitutes discrimination? This is not a purely metaphysical question, but also a normative one; it arises because there is no non-normative, purely metaphysical boundary between social kinds like race or gender and the context in which they are socially embedded.

In this section, we use the abstraction framework to distinguish a number of further worries for causal models of discrimination, showing that these are ultimately objections to particular models of discrimination, rather than challenges to causal models of discrimination as such (Section 4.1). We then discuss how these debates about modeling assumptions bear on experimental design (Section 4.2).

4.1 Two challenges of intervention identification

We can now use the framework of causal abstraction to distinguish two challenges to the claim that by intervening on names, audit studies reveal an effect that is normatively significant and a sign of discrimination.

Consider, first, a set of challenges associated with defining the alignment and high-level model. Of course, there is the question of how to decide what features belong in the constitutive basis of race. But there are further challenges in defining the effect of race in the high level model. For example, how should one define the equation that underlies the arrow $\text{Race} \rightarrow \text{Interview}$ in figure 3, given that interventions on race are ambiguous between lower-level interventions on its many constituents (Hu, 2022, pp. 102-103)? Even if the changes to the names on resumes performed in audit studies correspond, via the relevant alignments, to change in races, there are many such changes. Changing university from “Harvard” to “Howard,” for example, would typically also change the race most likely associated with a given resume (Figure 4; Hu (2022), pp. 91-93).



Figure 4: Measuring how an outcome could be different when moving from one category to another may depend on how precisely one picks exemplars of the two categories. Given a two-dimensional feature space (given by x and y coordinates), suppose settings of those features are clustered into categories, as boxes in Subfigure (a). Shade of teal denotes likelihood of an outcome (say, interview status) for a given category. Subfigure (b) reveals a finer-grained picture of the space of individuals, at which level outcome status is binary (yes or no). Taking an individual from one category to another can be done in any number of different ways, and these different possibilities may also differ with respect to the outcome. To the extent that the alignment is causally consistent, this type of ambiguity will be absent.

As suggested in Section 2.1, once we relax the stringent requirement of causal consistency, and allow that the effect of race on interview status is some complex function of the varying effects of many different lower-level changes, interventions at the high-level become ambiguous (cf. Tolbert 2024a, pp. 1103-5). We thus face the difficult task of aggregating those low-level contrasts into one higher-level effect. Because we are essentially asking to what extent differential treatment on the basis of race-coded names fully captures discrimination on the basis of race, this function, like the social constructionist alignment τ_{SC} , will need to be informed by our understanding of the normative significance of discrimination. Similarly, even once we determine how to define the high-level functional equations, whether an alignment is causally consistent “enough” is partly a normative question. For instance, to have a theory of race that is explanatory across a wider variety of contexts, or one that employs fewer high-level categories, we might have to relax causal consistency further. It is an open question whether a metaphysically plausible alignment between race and its constituents can deliver cross-contextual causal consistency, even approximately.¹⁸

Suppose, however, that the problem of ambiguity is addressed, and that we have defined the effects of race as some complex function of the effects of its lower-level constituents. Then to the extent that alignment is causally consistent, we could rest assured that audit studies revealed an effect of race, i.e. that we acquire information about (1) via (2):

$$\mathbb{P}[\text{Interview Callback} \mid \text{do}(\text{Race}_1)] - \mathbb{P}[\text{Interview Callback} \mid \text{do}(\text{Race}_2)] \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbb{P}[\text{Interview Callback} \mid \text{do}(\text{Resume}_1)] - \mathbb{P}[\text{Interview Callback} \mid \text{do}(\text{Resume}_2)]. \quad (2)$$

In other words, audit studies would then provide information about the result of intervening on race, by intervening on resumes.

¹⁸See Tolbert (2024a, p. 1105) and Tolbert (2024b) for related skepticism that the effects of race are homogenous enough to lend racial categories explanatory power; in the framework of abstraction, this could lead to skepticism that there exists a cross-contextual, causally consistent alignment between race and its constituents.

Even when this assumption is granted, there remains a second question about why the interventional difference (2) is normatively relevant. For instance, in the resume audit study, the populations corresponding to the resumes used in the study may be *atypical*, insofar as there is no guarantee that when one changes “Greg” to “Jamal” on a resume, one moves from a representative population of white people to a representative population of Black people (Figure 5). In fact, either of these populations could be completely empty.¹⁹ If the resumes created by audit studies are highly atypical, it is unclear how they could shed light on a normatively salient population; the interventions performed by audit studies would simply be “strange” (Hu and Kohler-Hausmann (2020), p. 10).²⁰




Figure 5: Atypicality in the resume audit study. The resumes for Greg and Jamal differ only in their names, but the resume for Greg corresponds to a large population of individuals (the red oval), who are representative of the larger group of people named Greg (the leftmost dotted oval), whereas the resume for Jamal corresponds to a small, atypical population of individuals (the blue splotch), rather than the larger group of people named Jamal (the rightmost dotted oval).

Short of a requirement that we do not compare completely empty populations, normative relevance does not always require typicality. For instance, in the resume audit study, an auditor who believes Black students who attended majority-white schools should receive

¹⁹Tolbert (2024a, pp. 1100-3) argues that because race and socioeconomic status are highly correlated (and indeed race may be defined partly in terms of the social stratification it sustains), race will violate the so-called “positivity” requirement, potentially undermining its status as a cause. In the framework of abstraction and applied to the audit study, this suggests the related worry that because race is correlated with socioeconomic status, and socioeconomic status is highly correlated with the information appearing on a resume, it will be difficult to find pairs of resumes which differ only in their race-coded names and correspond to sufficiently large and representative populations.

²⁰Thus Hu (2022) writes: “When an intervention is made to break from [regularities associated with social norms], the situation is abnormal both in the statistical sense and in the sense of deviating from some social expectation or standard, thus pulling the comparison and observed effect away from the causal regularities that sex typically figures in in the actual world.” (p. 110)

similar job opportunities as compared to white students who attended those schools might decide that the causal contrast between these populations is relevant, even if the former population is “atypical.” However, this choice of a causal contrast is based on a normative assumption that these populations deserve similar treatment, and the ability of an audit study to demonstrate discrimination depends on the strength of the argument for that assumption. Likewise, concluding from the *absence* of such an interventional difference that there is not discrimination requires a normative assumption that there are not other contrasts that are normatively relevant—for instance, contrasts corresponding to populations reflective of differences in the schools typically attended by Black and white students.

There are thus at least two basic assumptions needed for audit studies to reveal the presence of a discriminatory causal effect of race:

- (i) There must exist an alignment between race and lower-level constituents, which is approximately causally consistent, such that testing effects of race-coded names provides information about the effects of race.
- (ii) The interventional quantities revealed by audit studies must correspond to race subpopulations which are normatively relevant. For instance, a racial subpopulation might be relevant because they are in some sense “typical” for that race; or they may be “atypical” but have features of normative relevance to expectations of similar treatment.

Stated explicitly and precisely, these assumptions can be subjected to further normative and empirical challenges, and we make no claim to have defended them. However, we propose that these further debates target particular modeling assumptions, which can be stated within the framework of causal abstraction; they are not objections to causal models of discrimination as such.

4.2 Intervention identification and experimental design

We now illustrate how different responses to the above challenges lead to differences in experimental design. Recall the in-person audit study, in which trained actors of different genders attend a job interview, presenting identical resumes and answering interview questions identically. An experimenter must determine whether to match or experimentally vary the appearances and mannerisms of actors of different genders—for instance, whether they are wearing a dress or a suit, whether or not they wear makeup, or how assertive they are.

When audit studies are modeled using the Single-Level Assumption, experimental designs must always be licensed by different modularity assumptions. Any features of individuals that experimenters vary are treated as “part of” gender, while any feature they keep constant is treated as “separate from” gender, and placed in the causal diagram subject to a modularity assumption. When a variable is modular with respect to gender, it cannot be partially constitutive of it. Thus, different interventions correspond to different assumptions about how gender is socially constructed (Hu, 2022, pp. 103-104).

However, this tight connection between assumptions about the social construction of gender and an audit study’s choice of an intervention can lead to implausible and normatively undesirable assumptions about the constitution of gender by the auditor’s own lights (Hu,

2022, pp. 104-106). Suppose an auditor designs a causal test of gender discrimination looking at differences in treatment between gender-nonconforming men and gender-conforming women. To vary gender-conformity across applicants, both applicants wear skirts. This implies, on the Single-level Assumption, that dress is modular with respect to gender. But this modularity assumption is strange in light of an underlying motivation of the experiment, namely that there are highly gendered standards about dress (which would suggest that dress partially constitutes gender).

On the abstraction picture, by contrast, we can interpret the auditor’s choice of intervention as coming down not just to (i) assumptions about the constitution of gender, but (ii) which choices of intervention select normatively relevant populations for similar treatment. The auditor running a study about gender-nonconforming job applicants can include dress in their abstraction, corresponding to their understanding that standards of dress are gendered. They then select an intervention that compares women wearing skirts and men wearing skirts, corresponding to the normatively relevant comparison of treatment for gender-conforming women and gender-nonconforming men. Their choice of intervention, then, is made *in light* of how dress constitutes gender, rather than by excluding dress from the constitution of gender.

Of course, on the abstraction model, it is still possible for the crux of an intervention identification to rest on (i) what attributes constitute gender. *Bostock vs. Clayton* provides one example. Should we vary the individual’s sexual orientation to test for gender discrimination, or just vary biological sex and hold orientation fixed?²¹

The former approach, which varies the individual’s sex but not that of their partner, does not require a distinction between gender conformity and non-conformity in the model of gender, and indeed the dissents in SCOTUS (2020) are motivated by the view that effects of sexual orientation do not constitute effects of gender.²² By contrast, on the latter approach, the high-level model in the abstraction might possess a single variable with four possible values: gender-conforming man, gender-conforming woman, gender-nonconforming man, and gender-nonconforming woman. The lower-level attribute of possessing a same-sex partner would then be aligned with gender-nonconformity, so varying sexual orientation is a way of intervening on gender (from gender-conforming man to gender-nonconforming man). Many social constructionist theories of gender indeed intend to highlight norms punishing non-conformity (cf. Kohler-Hausmann and Dembroff (2022), pp.88-89). Such modeling

²¹We put aside the question of whether discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation can be understood as a category additionally meriting protection from discrimination apart from sex. Our more limited aim is to articulate what distinguishes two proposals for counterfactual tests of gender discrimination in the abstraction framework, one similar to that of Dembroff et al. (2020), and animating the majority opinion of SCOTUS (2020), and another one given in the dissenting opinion of SCOTUS (2020). We do not analyze the majority decision of *Bostock* precisely on its own terms – the opinion takes sex as biological, and consequentially, as Dembroff et al. (2020), pp. 7-8, and Kohler-Hausmann and Dembroff (2022), pp.84-86, point out, commits a modularity violation just like the dissent. Instead, we aim to analyze the normative commitments that lie behind the majority opinion. For further discussion of how to formally model intersectionality, see for example (Bright et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2022).

²²For instance: “The Court tries to convince readers that it is merely enforcing the terms of the statute [prohibiting sex discrimination], but that is preposterous. Even as understood today, the concept of discrimination because of ‘sex’ is different from discrimination because of ‘sexual orientation.’” (SCOTUS (2020), dissent of Alito p.3).

choices might be further justified, in part, by considerations of causal consistency; if gender-conforming and gender non-conforming men are in fact treated very differently, then without such a high-level distinction, the abstraction will not be very causally consistent, combining groups that are treated very differently together.

In summary, the causal abstraction framework distinguishes a number of assumptions pivotal to the identification of an intervention. While the choice *to* vary a certain attribute commits us to including it in the constitutive basis of a social kind (as with sexual orientation in Bostock vs. Clayton), the choice *not to* experimentally vary an attribute need not be motivated by its exclusion from the constitutive basis of the social kind (as with attire in the in-person audit study). In other words, being included in the constitutive basis for the relevant social kind is a necessary condition for being varied in an experimental design, but not a sufficient one; a feature may be held fixed, in order to ensure that the test corresponds to normatively relevant subpopulations.

5 Two notions of causal discrimination

In the preceding sections, we have argued that the abstraction model of discrimination straightforwardly addresses the modularity problem, and that it provides the precision needed to distinguish several obstacles to intervention identification. Some critics of causal approaches to discrimination have used both the modularity problem and challenges of intervention identification to motivate the suggestion that because race is socially constructed, discrimination claims are backed by constitutive explanation, rather than causal explanation (Hu and Kohler-Hausmann 2020, p.10; Dembroff et al. 2020, p.9). In this section, we show that this suggestion can be made precise using causal abstraction; the appeal to constitutive explanation provides another interpretation of the causal notion of discrimination, not a non-causal alternative to it. We conclude that none of the worries we discuss are obstacles to causal models of discrimination as such.

To begin, suppose someone explains why a child, Oona, is not allowed to watch Game of Thrones by appealing to her membership in that social category—“because she is a child” (Dembroff et al. 2020, p.9). Dembroff et al. (2020) point out that this sort of explanation operates “at the level of social meanings and norms attached to the category *child*, rather than at the individual level of Oona’s age.” There is an ambiguity in this observation, because there are two different causal contrasts by which social norms can perform explanatory work.

One kind of causal contrast is between two states of a socially embedded category. For instance, we might ask: Would Oona have been allowed to watch Game of Thrones were she an adult, rather than a child? To pose this counterfactual, we cannot just vary Oona’s age—leaving all else constant—but also have to vary features about Oona’s social relations that would tend to change with her age, like the way Oona’s parents interact with her. In the abstraction framework, this corresponds to selecting a low-level intervention on Oona’s features, including her natural features and features about her social relations, that corresponds to a high-level intervention bringing her from “child,” to “adult,” and then measuring the causal effect of that intervention. Call this *explanation by a socially constructed attribute*.

However, a second, relevant causal contrast is about what the effect on the outcome would have been if the socially constructed category *itself* had been constructed differently.

For instance, we might ask: Would Oona have been allowed to watch Game of Thrones, if the social norms attending to childhood were different? On the abstraction framework, this causal contrast can be represented by actually changing the abstraction of the social category itself, so that, for instance, parental supervision of media consumption is *not* partially constitutive of childhood; then, we measure the causal effect of this *constitutive counterfactual* on the outcome of interest, in this case Oona’s ability to watch Game of Thrones. Call this *explanation by a social kind’s constitutive norms*.

These two contrasts answer to different types of causal questions. The first is an assessment of the effect of a social kind *as it is currently defined in our social structure*, while the second is about what sort of effect of a social kind would be possible *if we reformed the social norms defining that kind*. These causal questions correspond to different ways of spelling out the notion of causal discrimination:

Attribute Discrimination: A person is directly racially discriminated against only if she is treated worse than others, and this is caused by her race, in the sense that were her race, and only her race, different, she would not have been treated worse than others.

Norm Discrimination: A person is directly racially discriminated against only if she is treated worse than others, and this is caused by her race, in the sense that were race itself differently constituted, she would not have been treated worse than others.

These should both be seen as live options. On the one hand, attribute discrimination is not a purely academic invention, gerrymandered to satisfy the demands of the causal inference framework or fit the constraints of modern antidiscrimination caselaw; audit studies originated in activist-led antidiscrimination efforts spanning back to the 1950s (Cherry and Bendick Jr., 2018). On the other hand, the notion of norm discrimination is not unprecedented. For example, Barocas et al. (2023) propose that an individual is discriminated against if they would have had different opportunities absent structural inequality (cf. Liu and Cohen (2024)). And as Kohler-Hausmann (2018) notes (p.1226), multiple legal theorists have proposed interpretations of antidiscrimination law as regulating against the pernicious impact of the social norms that constitute protected categories, suggesting the relevance of causal-constitutive counterfactuals to discrimination law.

It lies beyond the scope of this paper to adjudicate between these two notions of discrimination. However, we underscore that both are *causal* notions of discrimination, both are amenable to social construction, and both can be formalized using causal abstraction. Indeed, in the abstraction framework, attribute discrimination measures an effect of a shift across the boundaries of the partition of lower-level attributes defined by the alignment. Meanwhile, norm discrimination requires that we first change the constitutive basis itself—the alignment of the high-level social kind to low-level attribute space—and then determine the causal profiles of the variables in the model, were that counterfactual alignment real (Figure 6).




Figure 6: Norm explanation in the abstraction model. While race is in fact constituted by V_2 and V_3 via τ_{actual} , and thus has a certain effect, we can ask whether race would have the same effect, were it instead constituted by V_1 and V_2 via τ_{ideal} . Above, a dotted arrow without a label specifies an abstraction relation common to both τ_{actual} and τ_{ideal} . In general, τ_{ideal} and τ_{actual} can agree or disagree on the variables that belong to the constitutive basis of race, so long as they differentially align race with the values of these low-level variables.

In the abstraction model, these two kinds of explanation are closely related. Norm explanation is a generalization of attribute explanation; in the first case, we measure an effect of a social kind while holding its constitution fixed, while in the second, we measure an effect of a kind while varying its composition. Moreover, correctly evaluating the causal effects of attributes will sometimes require escalating to norms, if the interventions intended to change social category membership is at sufficient scale to change the norms as well.²³

6 Conclusion

While pervasive, the notion of causal discrimination is difficult to spell out in a precise and plausible way. For this notion implies that race is an attribute of an individual sufficiently separable from their other attributes to isolate its causal role. But if race is socially constructed, in what sense could it be separable in this way? In response, many have proposed that we give up on modeling race as causing worse treatment, either arguing that a distinct attribute (e.g. perception of race) causes worse treatment, or that because causal models require modularity, attempts to causally model racial discrimination are fundamentally misguided.

This paper has addressed the problem differently. We introduced a framework for reasoning about discrimination, in which race is a high-level abstraction of lower-level, in-principle manipulable features. In this framework, race can be modeled as itself causing worse treatment. The essential condition of modularity is ensured by allowing assumptions about social construction to be precisely and explicitly stated, via an alignment between race and its

²³For instance, recall the example in which changes to the distribution of names in a population occasion a change in how names constitute the social kind of race. There are many other connections and midway points between causal and constitutive explanation that abstraction could help formalize; see Ylikoski (2013); Schaffer (2016); Wilson (2018) for relevant discussion.

lower-level constituents. Such assumptions can then be subjected to further challenges. How do we define social kinds and their effects? Which population contrasts are normatively relevant to discrimination? More fundamentally: Are discrimination claims backed by causal explanations that contrast socially constructed *attributes*, or by causal explanations that contrast *the norms* by which these attributes are constructed? These questions have an empirical aspect and a normative one: they recommend different experimental designs, and their answers will depend in part on what makes discrimination wrongful. While answers to these questions lie beyond the scope of this paper, we have used the abstraction model of discrimination to state them precisely, and to explore some of their potential implications. We conclude that these questions point to important avenues for further work at the intersection between ethics and philosophy of science, but not to any in-principle objections to causal models of discrimination as such.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Hannah DeBrine, Myra Deng, Johann Frick, Elek Lane, Russell McIntosh, Christian Nakazawa, Naftali Weinberger, and Eliza Wells for comments and discussion, and to Caltech’s Linde Center for Science, Society, and Policy (LCSSP) for supporting a research incubator to develop this paper. Kara Schechtman was supported by a graduate fellowship award from Knight-Hennessy Scholars at Stanford University during initial work on this paper.

References

- Appiah, K. A. (1995). The uncompleted argument: Dubois and the illusion of race. In Bell, L. and Blumenfeld, D., editors, *Overcoming Racism and Sexism*. Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD.
- Appiah, K. A. (1998). Race, culture, identity: Misunderstood connections. In Appiah, K. A. and Gutmann, A., editors, *Color Conscious: The Political Morality of Race*. Princeton University Press.
- Bareinboim, E., Correa, J., Ibeling, D., and Icard, T. (2022). On Pearl’s hierarchy and the foundations of causal inference. In Geffner, H., Dechter, R., and Halpern, J., editors, *Probabilistic and Causal Inference: the Works of Judea Pearl*, pages 507–556. ACM Books.
- Barnes, E. (2018). Symmetric dependence. In Bliss, R. and Priest, G., editors, *Reality and Its Structure: Essays in Fundamentality*, pages 50–69. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Barocas, S., Hardt, M., and Narayanan, A. (2023). *Fairness and Machine Learning: Limitations and Opportunities*. MIT Press.
- Beckers, S., Eberhardt, F., and Halpern, J. Y. (2019). Approximate Causal Abstraction.
- Beigang, F. (2023). Reconciling algorithmic fairness criteria. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*.
- Bertrand, M. and Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are emily and greg more employable than lakisha and jamal? a field experiment on labor market discrimination. Working Paper 9873, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Bongers, S., Forré, P., Peters, J., and Mooij, J. M. (2021). Foundations of structural causal models with cycles and latent variables. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(5):2885–2915.
- Bright, L. K., Malinsky, D., and Thompson, M. (2016). Causally interpreting intersectionality theory. *Philosophy of Science*, 83(1):60–81.
- Chalupka, K., Eberhardt, F., and Perona, P. (2017). Causal feature learning: an overview. *Behaviormetrika*, 44:137–164.

- Cherry, F. and Bendick Jr., M. (2018). Making it Count: Discrimination Auditing and the Activist Scholar Tradition. In Gaddis, S. M., editor, *Audit Studies: Behind the Scenes with Theory, Method and Nuance*, volume 14 of *Methodos*, pages 45–62. Springer.
- Chouldechova, A. (2017). Fair prediction with disparate impact: A study of bias in recidivism prediction instruments. *Big Data*, 5(2):153–163.
- Dembroff, R., Kohler-Hausmann, I., and Sugarman, E. (2020). What taylor swift and beyoncé teach us about sex and causes. *U. Pa. L. Rev. Online*, 169:1.
- Diana, E., Tolbert, A. W., Ravichandran, K., and Blum, A. (2024). Adaptive algorithmic interventions for escaping pessimism traps in dynamic sequential decisions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04462*.
- Gaddis, S. M. (2018). *An introduction to audit studies in the social sciences*. Springer.
- Geiger, A., Ibeling, D., Zur, A., Chaudhary, M., Chauhan, S., Huang, J., Arora, A., Wu, Z., Goodman, N., Potts, C., and Icard, T. (2024). Causal abstraction: A theoretical foundation for mechanistic interpretability. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*. Forthcoming.
- Glymour, B. and Herington, J. (2019). Measuring the biases that matter: The ethical and casual foundations for measures of fairness in algorithms. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 269–278.
- Glymour, C. and Glymour, M. R. (2014). Commentary: Race and sex are causes. *Epidemiology*, 25(4):488–490.
- Gooding-Williams, R. (1998). Race, multiculturalism and democracy. *Constellations*, 5(1):18–41.
- Greiner, D. J. and Rubin, D. B. (2011). Causal effects of perceived immutable characteristics. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 93(3):775–85.
- Griffith, A. M. (2018). Social Construction and Grounding. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 97(2):393–409.
- Hacking, I. (1995). The looping effects of human kinds. In Sperber, D., Premack, D., and Premack, A. J., editors, *Causal Cognition: A Multidisciplinary Debate*, pages 351–394. Clarendon Press/Oxford University Press.
- Haslanger, S. (2000). Gender and race: (what) are they? (what) do we want them to be? *Noûs*, 34(1):31–55.
- Haslanger, S. (2012). *Resisting Reality: Social Construction and Social Critique*. Oxford University Press.
- Haslanger, S. (2019). Tracing the sociopolitical reality of race. In Glasgow, J., Haslanger, S., Jeffers, C., and Spencer, Q., editors, *What is Race? Four Philosophical Views*, pages 4–37. Oxford University Press.

- Hedden, B. (2021). On statistical criteria of algorithmic fairness. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 49:209.
- Hellman, D. (2008). *When is discrimination wrong?* Harvard University Press.
- Holland, P. W. (1986). Statistics and causal inference. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 81(396):945–960.
- Hu, L. (2022). *Causation in the Social World*. PhD thesis, Harvard University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.
- Hu, L. (2024a). Normative Facts and Causal Structure. *The Journal of Philosophy*, forthcoming.
- Hu, L. (2024b). What is “race” in algorithmic discrimination on the basis of race? *Journal of Moral Philosophy*, pages 1–26.
- Hu, L. and Kohler-Hausmann, I. (2020). What’s sex got to do with machine learning? In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*.
- Hu, L. and Kohler-Hausmann, I. (2024). What is Perceived When Race is Perceived and Why It Matters for Causal Inference and Discrimination Studies. *Law & Society Review*, forthcoming.
- Ibeling, D. and Icard, T. (2024). Comparing causal frameworks: Potential outcomes, structural models, graphs, and abstractions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- James, M. and Burgos, A. (2024). Race. In Zalta, E. N. and Nodelman, U., editors, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Spring 2024 edition.
- Janzing, D. and Meija, S. H. G. (2022). Phenomenological causality.
- Janzing, D. and Schölkopf, B. (2008). Causal inference using the algorithmic Markov condition. arXiv:0804.3678 [math].
- Jenkins, K. (2016). Amelioration and inclusion: Gender identity and the concept of woman. *Ethics*, 126(2):394–421.
- Kilbertus, N., Rojas Carulla, M., Parascandolo, G., Hardt, M., Janzing, D., and Schölkopf, B. (2017). Avoiding discrimination through causal reasoning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 30.
- Kleinberg, J., Mullainathan, S., and Raghavan, M. (2017). Inherent trade-offs in the fair determination of risk scores. In *Proceedings of the 8th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2017)*.

- Kohler-Hausmann, I. (2018). Eddie murphy and the dangers of counterfactual causal thinking about detecting racial discrimination. *Northwestern University Law Review*, 113(5):1163–1228.
- Kohler-Hausmann, I. and Dembroff, R. (2022). Supreme Confusion About Causality at the Supreme Court. *City University of New York Law Review*, 25(1).
- Kolodny, N. (2023). *The Pecking Order: Social Hierarchy as a Philosophical Problem*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Kusner, M., Russell, C., Loftus, J., and Silva, R. (2017). Counterfactual fairness. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*.
- Lewis, D. (1973). Causation. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 70(17):556–567. Seventieth Annual Meeting of the American Philosophical Association Eastern Division.
- Liu, L. and Cohen, J. (2024). The Reach of Fairness. Manuscript.
- Mallon, R. (2006). ‘Race’: Normative, Not Metaphysical or Semantic. *Ethics*, 116(3):525–551.
- Marcellesi, A. (2013). Is race a cause? *Philosophy of Science*, 80(5):650–659.
- Mills, C. (1998). *Blackness Visible: Essays on Philosophy and Race*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.
- Mossé, M., Ibeling, D., and Icard, T. (2022). Is causal reasoning harder than probabilistic reasoning? *The Review of Symbolic Logic*, pages 1–26.
- Outlaw, L. (1990). Toward a critical theory of race. In Goldberg, D. T., editor, *Anatomy of Racism*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Pearl, J. (1995). Causal diagrams for empirical research. *Biometrika*, 82(4):669–710.
- Pearl, J. (2000). *Causality*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Pearl, J. (2018). Does obesity shorten life? or is it the soda? on non-manipulable causes. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 6(2):20182001.
- Peters, J., Janzing, D., and Schölkopf, B. (2017). *Elements of Causal Inference: Foundations and Learning Algorithms*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Rischel, E. F. and Weichwald, S. (2021). Compositional abstraction error and a category of causal models. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1013–1023. PMLR. ISSN: 2640-3498.
- Ross, L. N. (2023). What is social structural explanation? a causal account. *Noûs*, 1.
- Rubenstein, P. K., Weichwald, S., Bongers, S., Mooij, J. M., Janzing, D., Grosse-Wentrup, M., and Schölkopf, B. (2017). Causal consistency of structural equation models. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI)*.

- Russell, C., Kusner, M. J., Loftus, J., and Silva, R. (2017). When worlds collide: integrating different counterfactual assumptions in fairness. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Schaffer, J. (2016). Grounding in the image of causation. *Philosophical Studies*, 173(1):49–100.
- SCOTUS (2020). *Bostock v. Clayton County*. Supreme Court of the United States. Docket No. 17-1618.
- Sen, M. and Wasow, O. (2016). Race as a bundle of sticks: Designs that estimate effects of seemingly immutable characteristics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 19:499–522.
- Singh, K. and Wodak, D. (2023). Does race best explain racial discrimination? *Philosophers’ Imprint*, 23.
- Spirtes, P. and Scheines, R. (2004). Causal inference of ambiguous manipulations. *Philosophy of Science*, 71(5):833–845.
- Stoljar, N. (1995). Essence, identity, and the concept of woman. *Philosophical Topics*, 23(2):261–293. *Feminist Perspectives on Language, Knowledge, and Reality*.
- Taylor, P. C. (2022). *Race: a philosophical introduction*. Polity Press, Cambridge, UK ; Medford, MA, third edition edition.
- Thomsen, F. K. (2018). Direct discrimination. In Lippert-Rasmussen, K., editor, *Routledge Handbook of Discrimination*, pages 19–29. Routledge.
- Tolbert, A. (2024a). Causal agnosticism about race: Variable selection problems in causal inference. *Philosophy of Science*, pages 1–11.
- Tolbert, A. W. (2024b). Restricted racial realism: Heterogeneous effects and the instability of race. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*.
- Van Der Zander, B., Bläser, M., and Liškiewicz, M. (2023). The hardness of reasoning about probabilities and causality. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI ’23*.
- VanderWeele, T. J. and Robinson, W. R. (2014). On the causal interpretation of race in regressions adjusting for confounding and mediating variables. *Epidemiology*, 25(4):473–484.
- Wang, A., Ramaswamy, V. V., and Russakovsky, O. (2022). Towards intersectionality in machine learning: Including more identities, handling underrepresentation, and performing evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 336–349.
- Weinberger, N. (2022). Signal manipulation and the causal analysis of racial discrimination. *Ergo*.

- Wilson, A. (2018). Metaphysical causation. *Noûs*, 52:723–751.
- Woodward, J. (2005). *Making things happen: A theory of causal explanation*. Oxford university press.
- Woodward, J. (2021). Explanatory autonomy: the role of proportionality, stability, and conditional irrelevance. *Synthese*, 198(1):237–265.
- Woodward, J. and Hitchcock, C. (2003a). Explanatory generalizations, part i: A counterfactual account. *Nous*, 37:1–24.
- Woodward, J. and Hitchcock, C. (2003b). Explanatory generalizations, part ii: Plumbing explanatory depth. *Nous*, 37:181–199.
- Yablo, S. (1992). Mental causation. *The Philosophical Review*, 101(2):245–280.
- Ylikoski, P. (2013). Causal and constitutive explanation compared. *Erkenntnis*, 78(2):277–297.
- Zack, N. (1993). *Race and Mixed Race*. Temple University Press, Philadelphia.