



**Matt Blackwell** @matt\_blackwell

7h

Maybe a simple point about the Fryer use of force paper: looking at bias in force conditional on stops complicates interpretation (1/n)

↩️ ↻️ 4 ❤️ 6



**Matt Blackwell** @matt\_blackwell

7h

If black ppl are more likely to be stopped regardless of criminality, then criminality and race will be correlated cond. on stops (2/n)

↩️ ↻️ 3 ❤️ 2



**Matt Blackwell** @matt\_blackwell

7h

The logic is that many noncriminal black ppl are stopped but only criminal whites are stopped. Could be very diff than the overall pop (3/n)

↩️ ↻️ 3 ❤️ 3



**Matt Blackwell** @matt\_blackwell

7h

And if criminality and force are related, this is classic selection/collider bias. (4/n)

↩️ ↻️ 3 ❤️ 3



**Matt Blackwell** @matt\_blackwell

7h

Thus it's possible for racial use of force gap to emerge with no racial bias in use of that force, only bias in who is stopped. (5/n)

↩️ ↻️ 3 ❤️ 3



**Matt Blackwell**  
@matt\_blackwell

This selection bias would make white ppl more "dangerous" than black ppl among those stopped. Could imply more force against whites (6/n)

Jul 12, 2016, 4:25 AM

4 RETWEETS 5 LIKES





← 2 2



**Matt Blackwell** @matt\_blackwell 7h

counterintuitive that anti-black bias in stops could lead to anti-white bias in force among those stopped, but collider bias is crazy! (8/n)

← 2 2



**Matt Blackwell** @matt\_blackwell 7h

All of this is speculative, but a real potential issue with this type of analysis. As usual, there's more work to be done. (9/n)

← 1 2



**Matt Blackwell** @matt\_blackwell 7h

Anyway it's a very interesting paper with tough post-treatment bias issues. If this stuff was easy, it would have already been settled (fin)

← 2 2