# **Notes**

#### Introduction

- 1. For a recent discussion of a related issue, see 20 C.F.R. 410.670 (c) and Pear 1997. In this latest development, SSA is suggesting that ALJs follow agency policy even when it conflicts with circuit precedent, unless an Acquiescence Ruling has been issued authorizing ALJs to follow the circuit court decision. Remedial training and disciplinary action has been threatened for noncompliance with agency policy (Pear 1997). Acting President ALJ Ronald Bernoski (1997) of the Association of Administrative Law Judges, expressed concern over this matter at a congressional hearing on issues related to OHA backlogs and decisional inconsistencies.
- 2. There is some evidence that the presence of an SSA attorney would relieve ALJs of this complex burden. See, for example, GAO 1997.
- 3. It has been suggested that because these cases have been appealed, they are not representative of typical hearings or decisions. I am not contending that my case sample is representative, only that it reveals some of the dynamics that occur between ALJs and claimants.
- 4. More recent statistics reveal similar trends. Approximately 88 percent of the ALJs are men and approximately 90 percent are white (Balkus 1998).

#### Chapter 1

1. *Hallex* is not binding on judges; it communicates guiding principles and serves as a reference source. However, its significance should not be underestimated. When SSA developed its data collection form to test ALJ compliance with the rules, *Hallex* figured prominently in its hearings review process (SSA 1995, 1997).

### Chapter 2

1. As part of its Disability Redesign Plan (see note 2), SSA is testing the use of a "predecision interview" with a claimant by a DDS examiner in an effort to increase consistency in decision making between DDS examiners and ALJs (GAO

- 1997). Apparently there is some evidence to suggest that a face-to-face interview positively affects ALJ award rates (GAO 1997).
- 2. For an overview of some of the incremental steps Social Security is or is proposing to take through its Redesign Plan, see Apfel (1998). For a critique of the Plan, see Mashaw 1996. For recent proposed or final rules relating to the hearings and appeals process, see 62 Fed. Reg. 48963 (18 September 1997); 62 Fed. Reg. 49598 (23 September 1997); and 62 Fed. Reg. 50266 (25 September 1997).
- 3. See *Cruz v. Califano*, Civ. No. 77-2234 (E.D. Pa. 1979), a class-action lawsuit, which required SSA to provide certain Social Security and SSI notices in Spanish to Spanish-speaking claimants to remedy the fact that they had received notices in English, which they were unable to read, and hence were unaware of their appeal rights and procedures. Notices are not available in languages other than English and Spanish, however, SSA personnel have suggested the need to develop strategies that address the particular needs of diverse communities with large numbers of non-English speaking applicants (NOSSCR 1995). Recent congressional action suggests that these special services, including Spanish-language notices may be eliminated in the near future (NOSSCR 1996).
- 4. ALJs have rendered increasingly higher percentages of favorable decisions over the years. In 1958, they granted 4.1 percent of the cases they heard. In 1967, they granted 13.9 percent. By 1965, they granted nearly 30 percent of the cases they heard. By 1970, they granted 44 percent (Dixon 1973, 40). In the 1980s, ALJs' favorable decisions rose to 50 percent (U.S. Senate 1982, 146–47). By 1993, ALJs on average granted 74 percent of the cases they heard (GAO 1997). More recently, ALJ allowance rates have decreased (NOSSCR 1998). For a discussion of this issue, see chapter 2.
- 5. The cases I rely on for support for this argument vary according to circuit. I have attempted to cite cases from as many jurisdictions as possible to ensure that my argument is derived from broad principles of law. Recently, Social Security has attempted to limit the application and relevance of federal court decisions by limiting ALJ reliance on circuit precedent. See 20 C.F.R. 410.670 (c); Pear 1997; see also Introduction, note 1.
- 6. The two cases cited are the most famous illustrations of this point. See also Miranda v. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare 514 F.2d 996 (1st Cir. 1975); Heggarty v. Sullivan 947 F.2d 990 (1st Cir. 1991); Cutler v. Weinberger 516 F.2d 1282 (2d Cir. 1975); DeChirico v. Callahan 134 F.3d 1177 (2d Cir. 1998); Jozefick v. Shalala 854 F. Supp 342 (M.D. Pa. 1994); Sims v. Harris 631 F.2d 26 (4th Cir. 1980); Craig v. Chater 76 F.3d 585 (4th Cir. 1996); Clark v. Schweiker 652 F.2d 399 (5th Cir. 1981); Lashley v. Secretary of Health and Human Services 708 F.2d 1048 (6th Cir. 1983); Born v. Secretary of Health and Human Services 923 F.2d 1168 (6th Cir. 1990); Smith v. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare 587 F. 2d 857 (7th Cir. 1978); Nelson v. Apfel 131 F.3d 1228 (7th Cir. 1997); Sellars v. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare 458 F.2d 984 (8th Cir. 1972); Shannon v. Chater 54 F.3d 484 (8th Cir. 1995); Cox v. Califano 587 F.2d 988 (9th Cir. 1978); Crane v. Shalala 76 F.3d 251 (9th Cir. 1995); Dixon v. Heckler 811 F.2d 506 (10th Cir. 1987); Hawkins v. Chater 113 F.3d 1162 (10th Cir. 1997); Cowart v. Schweiker 662 F.2d 731 (11th Cir. 1981); Graham v. Apfel 129 F.3d 1420 (11th Cir. 1997).

See also *Hess v. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare* 497 F.2d 837 (3d Cir. 1974); *Brock v. Chater* 84 F.3d 726 (5th Cir. 1996); and *Binion v. Shalala* 13 F.3d 243 (7th Cir. 1994) for relevant legal elaborations and distinctions.

- 7. For other relevant cases on this point, see *Cruz v. Schweiker*, 645 F.2d 812 (9th Cir. 1981); *DeLorme v. Sullivan* 924 F.2d 841 (9th Cir. 1991); *Thompson v. Sullivan*, 987 F.2d 1482 (10th Cir. 1993).
- 8. A legal mandate is not the only reason why judges should make a concerted effort to accommodate claimants with special needs; as officers of the court, it is judges' ethical and social obligation to enable claimants to tell their stories in an environment that does not stifle what often requires great effort for people with special needs to report (Durston and Mills 1996).
  - 9. See note 6 for relevant citations.

#### Chapter 3

- 1. See, for example, *Shore v. Callahan* 977 F. Supp. 1075 (D. Or. 1997) for the kinds of problems applicants encounter with Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. See also NOSSCR 1998 for a general discussion of the issues applicants face when they allege these impairments.
- 2. The GAO gender-bias study (1994) confirmed that 20 years later, the same problems could be detected in the disability decision-making process—namely, that "women had occupations that, among older applicants, had lower allowance rates regardless of gender" (4).
- 3. For other descriptions and interpretations of gender bias in the Social Security system, see *Williams v. Shalala* 997 F.2d 1494 (D.C. Cir. 1993); see also Becker 1989; Coughenour, et al. 1994; Dubin, 1993; Golin 1995; Jackson and Deller-Ross 1996; Lee, Porath, and Schaffner 1994; Masson 1995; Zelenske and Udell 1994.
- 4. Mashaw's (1995–96) more recent work on administrative adjudication seems more compassionate to claimants. He acknowledges that certain "immutable adversities" persist in mass justice systems that make it difficult to pursue the often conflicting values of accuracy, timeliness, and fairness (22). He makes several suggestions, including the implementation of quality assurance programs that identify problems and seek solutions and the adherence to program values and principles rather than technical rules. These ideas support my thesis that judges should be held accountable for their hearing and decision-making practices. In addition, these notions acknowledge that we need much more than rules to ensure that an engaged adjudicatory process is pursued.
- 5. SSA's decision to peer review these cases suggests that they may be reluctant to address the issue of bias directly.

# Chapter 4

1. In two of the fifty federal court cases, (Allen, 89-2788, IL and O'Connor, 89-4412, IL), claimants appealed their federal court decisions affirming the ALJ's denial of benefits to the Court of Appeals. The Court of Appeals' decisions were contained in the file folders with the federal court records.

- 2. It is interesting to note that the racial and ethnic backgrounds of the claimants were readily available in the record, either through identifiers in the medical records or through Social Security records documenting the need for a translator. There is therefore little doubt that adjudicators know the racial or ethnic make-up of the claimants' cases they are adjudicating.
- 3. The GAO (1989) compiled a statistical analysis of the national pool of disability applicants who had been denied benefits. I used these statistics to compare the national pool of denied applicants to my sample. These were the only statistics and characteristics available for comparison. The only other statistics SSA compiles and publishes are of the recipients and beneficiaries of Social Security benefits. Since my study is specifically designed to look at denied applicants, the most relevant comparison is with other denied applicants.
- 4. The term *other* is used by Social Security to designate all people of color except African Americans. I use this term only for the purposes of comparison.
- 5. I could find no current data on the variations of ALJ award rates. I base this conclusion on my own practice and on the experience of my colleagues who still represent disability applicants.
- 6. The GAO (1997) opines that one reason ALJs grant more cases than DDS examiners is that claimants are represented at hearings by attorneys who aggressively pursue new evidence that the judge considers. This finding suggests that claimants who are represented by counsel at the ALJ hearing level may have a higher likelihood of success on their claims. This would comport with my experience as an advocate.
- 7. ALJs seem particularly influenced by treating physician evidence. A study by the Social Security Administration (1995) reveals that a treating physician's report was one of five primary influences on the ALJ to award or deny benefits.
  - 8. For a discussion of this and related issues, see chapter 2, note 3.
- 9. Federal court cases that have addressed the issue of retaining an attorney directly, include *Yother v. Secretary of Health and Human Services* 705 F.2d 460 (6th Cir. 1982); and *Binion v. Shalala* 13 F.3d 243 (7th Cir. 1994). For cases on the right to representation more generally, see *Heggarty v. Sullivan* 947 F.2d 990 (1st Cir. 1991) (per curiam); *Robinson v. Secretary of Health and Human Services* 733 F.2d 255 (2d Cir. 1984); *Dobrowolsky v. Califano* 909 F.2d 403 (3d Cir. 1979); *Brock v. Chater* 84 F.3d 726 (5th Cir. 1996) (per curiam); *Yother v. Secretary of Health and Human Services* 705 F.2d 460 (6th Cir. 1982); *Binion v. Shalala* 13 F.3d 243 (7th Cir. 1994); *Carter v. Chater* 73 F.3d 1019 (10th Cir. 1996); *Graham v. Apfel* 129 F.3d 1420 (11th Cir. 1997) (per curiam).
- 10. For similar cases on this point see *Thompson v. Sullivan* 933 F.2d 581 (7th Cir. 1991); *DeLorme v. Sullivan* 924 F.2d 841 (9th Cir. 1991).
  - 11. See chapter 2, note 6 for support for this contention.
- 12. These materials are now disseminated to all ALJs through the Justice and Diversity Training Series, which gives ALJs sensitivity training on race and gender issues (Skoler 1994).
- 13. For a definitive work on the topic of the social and cultural significance of such terms, see Collins 1991, chap. 4, "Mammies, Matriarchs, and Other Control-

- ling Images." My references to claimants as "Miss" and "Mrs." are consistent with their responses to questions regarding their marital status. When I am in doubt, I use "Ms."
- 14. This interpretation is based on my 10 years' experience as an attorney for Social Security disability claimants, during which time I supervised the processing of more than 500 cases.
- 15. For case law related to this point, see *Bosch v. Secretary of Health and Human Services* No. 85 CV 3536 (E.D.N.Y. 1988); *Holloway v. Heckler* 607 F. Supp. 71 (D. Kan. 1985).
- 16. For a sample of relevant cases supporting this contention, see *Ferraris v. Heckler* 728 F.2d 582 (2d Cir. 1984); *Murray v. Heckler* 722 F.2d 499 (9th Cir. 1983); *Brandon v. Bowen* 666 F. Supp 604 (S.D.N.Y. 1987); *Byron v. Heckler* 742 F.2d 1232 (10th Cir. 1984); *Reed v. Secretary of Health and Human Services* 804 F. Supp. 914 (E.D. Mich. 1992). See also *Allen v. Heckler* 749 F.2d 577 (9th Cir. 1984) for an argument limiting the application of *Murray v. Heckler*.
- 17. Deciding any case involves a dialectic between evidence and credibility: a claimant's credibility is inextricably intertwined in the evidence, and the evidence is influenced in the judge's mind by the claimant's credibility. This process is complex; however, for purposes of my analysis, it is important only to recognize that a give-and-take occurs between the two.
- 18. Several federal court cases address the issue of household chores. I am not arguing that daily activities are not relevant to the consideration of a claimant's ability to do paid work, but rather that the ability to do these chores does not necessarily translate to the ability to work. See for example, *Gold v. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare* 463 F.2d 38 (2d Cir. 1972); *Leggett v. Chater* 67 F.3d 558 (5th Cir. 1995), *Light v. Social Security Administration* 119 F.3d 789 (9th Cir. 1997); *Orteza v. Shalala* 50 F.3d 748 (9th Cir. 1995); *Cavitt v. Schweiker* 704 F.2d 1193 (10th Cir. 1983); *Ragland v. Shalala* 992 F.2d 1056 (10th Cir. 1993); *Mullen v. Gardner* 256 F. Supp. 588 (E.D.N.Y. 1966); *Kelley v. Callahan* 113 F.3d 583 (8th Cir. 1998).
- 19. For other cases analyzing the use of the "sit and squirm" test, see *Aubeuf v. Schweiker* 649 F.2d 107 (2d Cir. 1981); *Van Horn v. Schweiker* 717 F.2d 871 (3d Cir. 1983); *Jenkins v. Sullivan* 906 F.2d 107 (4th Cir. 1990); *Spencer v. Schweiker* 678 F.2d 42 (5th Cir. 1982); *Weaver v. Secretary of Health and Human Services* 722 F.2d 310 (6th Cir. 1983); *Bishop v. Sullivan* 900 F.2d 1259 (8th Cir. 1990); *Teter v. Heckler* 775 F.2d 1104 (10th Cir. 1985); *Gay v. Sullivan* 986 F.2d 1336 (10th Cir. 1993); *Johns v. Bowen* 821 F.2d 551 (11th Cir. 1987); *Tyler v. Weinberger* 409 F. Supp. 776 (E.D. Va. 1976).
- 20. The sample sizes shift because only certain cases invoke each rule. For example, in some cases, ALJs did not make a negative credibility determination, denying the claim on other grounds, such as a failure to comply with prescribed treatment. In these cases, the rule was not relevant. In other cases, there were no extramedical factors to substantiate or validate the determination, rendering this aspect of the credibility rules irrelevant.
  - 21. For a sample of relevant Social Security federal court cases, see note 19.

- 22. Mr. Tommie (89-4093, CA) served in Vietnam, and his alleged impairments stemmed from that military service. Based on my reading of the transcripts, no other service-related impairments were alleged.
- 23. The preference historically afforded ALJ applicants who are veterans has disproportionately filled the ALJ corps with men who previously served in the military (Verkuil et al. 1992). This factor could have some bearing on the proclivity of some judges to establish whether claimants have a history of military service. If military service influences judges' credibility determinations, there is little doubt that women are disadvantaged by this practice.

## Chapter 5

- 1. The only other studies that have examined these issues are the DHQRP Reviews (SSA 1995, 1997; chap. 3). However, the SSA's findings did not do a detailed text analysis of the hearing and decision-making process. Instead, RJs found, in general terms, that ALJs did or did not protect claimants' rights or did or did not inform claimants of their right to representation.
  - 2. For a sample of relevant cases on this issue, see chapter 4, note 10.
- 3. Based on my 10 years' experience representing disability claimants before the SSA, judges are reluctant to postpone hearings because of the pressure to process claims quickly. See also GAO 1997; SSA 1995, 1997, for recent discussions on OHA hearing and decision-making practices.
- 4. This contention is based on informal conversations with several ALJs regarding their objections to claimants who wished to postpone.
  - 5. For a full discussion of this issue see chapter 2, note 6.
- 6. For other relevant cases on unrepresented applicants, see chapter 4, note 10.

# Chapter 6

- 1. The 1994 amendments to the Social Security Act (P.L. 103–296) place a 36-month cap on disability benefits for people with addictions and require drug testing. The 1996 amendments to the Social Security Act (P.L. 104–121) eliminated benefits to people who allege drug or alcohol addictions unless claimants can prove an underlying or unrelated impairment (Mills and Arjo 1996).
- 2. Relevant cases on involuntariness and alcohol or drug addiction include Arroyo v. Secretary of Health and Human Services 932 F.2d 82 (1st Cir. 1991); Rutherford v. Schweiker 685 F.2d 60 (2d Cir. 1982); Jones v. Sullivan 954 F.2d 125 (3d Cir. 1991); Matullo v. Bowen 926 F.2d 240 (3d Cir. 1990) King v. Califano 599 F.2d 597 (4th Cir. 1979); Neal v. Bowen 829 F.2d 528 (5th Cir. 1987); Smith v. Secretary of Health and Human Services 893 F.2d 106 (6th Cir. 1989); O'Connor v. Sullivan 938 F.2d 70 (7th Cir. 1991); Thompson v. Sullivan 957 F.2d 611 (8th Cir. 1992); Hardy v. Chater 64 F.3d 405 (8th Cir. 1995); Tylitzki v. Shalala 999 F.2d 1411 (9th Cir. 1993); Andrews v. Shalala 53 F.3d 1035 (9th Cir. 1995); Saleem v. Chater 86 F.3d 176 (10th Cir. 1996).
- 3. See Rice 1992 for a discussion of codependency theory and its ramifications on people's lives.

- 4. In a similar case, another ALJ felt justified lecturing a claimant on her tobacco use (Moore, 89-6436, IL). Interestingly, at least one circuit court recognized the discrimination smokers encounter and reversed the decision of an ALJ who denied the claimant benefits due to her habit, on the grounds that her problems would not be relieved by quiting smoking (*Kelley v. Callahan* 133 F.3d 583 (8th Cir. 1998)).
- 5. See Link, Mirotznik, and Cullen 1991; Melton and Garrison 1987 for a discussion of the stigma people with mental disabilities experience and the stereotypical assumptions the larger culture holds. These attitudes are frighteningly consistent with Nagi's (1969) findings on the biases of judges in cases involving mental impairments. That these attitudes persist among judges thirty years later is disturbing.
- 6. A number of federal court cases recognize that educational levels achieved by claimants do not necessarily reflect their capacity to read and write. Toward this end, ALJs are encouraged to inquire into a claimant's literacy. See, for example, *Albrilton v. Sullivan* 889 F.2d 640 (5th Cir. 1989); *Wilcults v. Apfel* 143 F.3d 1134 (8th Cir. 1998); *Dollar v. Bowen* 821 F.2d 530 (10th Cir. 1987); *Wolfe v. Chater* 86 F.3d 1072 (11th Cir. 1996). For relevant definitions of literacy and related issues, see 20 C.F.R. 404.1564 (b) (1) and *Wolfe v. Chater* 86 F.3d 1072 (11th Cir. 1996).
- 7. See Schoultz 1986 for a discussion of the discrimination faced by people who are illiterate. The National Center for Education Statistics (1993) reported that adults who demonstrate limited reading skills describe themselves as reading or writing English well. Matthew Adams (1994) of the Student Coalition for Action in Literacy Education, confirmed the view that people who are illiterate will overestimate their ability rather than admit to their limitations.
- 8. See Mills 1993 for a more elaborate discussion of the issue of gender bias in Social Security decision making. See also U.S. Court of Appeals [Ninth Circuit] (1992, 1993); and chapter 3, notes 1–3, for other insight into the gender bias in the system.
- 9. For an insightful discussion of the social pressure, particularly on black women, to be attractive, see Collins 1991, chap. 4.
- 10. See chapter 4, note 19 for relevant case law prohibiting judges from basing their decisions on personal observations alone.

#### Chapter 7

- 1. Evidence of this dynamic was detected in the recent study of ALJ decision making (SSA 1995), which revealed that claimant credibility was one of five primary factors affecting ALJ award rates. Implicit in this finding is the assumption that credibility can also have a negative effect on ALJ decision making.
- 2. SSA could and should add to the DHQRP Data Collection Form explicit questions about the influence of bias on ALJ hearing and decision-making practices. See, for example, Mills 1993.
- 3. Some of these ideas come from the Justice and Diversity training I designed for OHA with Benchmark Institute, a continuing legal and leadership education training center in San Francisco, Calif.

# **Table of Claimants' Cases**

The cases listed below form the database of hearings and decisions from which the substantive analysis is derived.

Acevedo, Maria. 87-2767, CA.

Alexander, Elwood. 90-1220, CA.

Allen, Bervin. 89-2788, IL.

Alva, Maria Luisa. 84-0617, CA.

Bell, George. 90-5548, IL.

Brown-Blick, Marion. 89-2659, CA.

Burr, Glendine. 87-10636, IL.

Costello, Frank. 88-7350, IL.

Curran, Katherine S. 88-2459, MA.

Davenport, Renee R. 89-1268, MA.

Davidson, Gerald. 88-4892, IL.

DeAlmeida, Jose R. 87-3402, CA.

Degryse, Linda. 88-2082, MA.

DeMeo, A. Louise. 90-10131, MA.

Diaz, Lauro. 86-20473, CA.

Flynn, Lawrence H. 88-9370, IL.

Forsyth, Claire. 99-1887, MA.

Foster, Benjamin. 89-3214, IL.

Galasso, Beatrice. 88-0280, MA.

Garcia, Maria D. 87-5693, CA.

Harner, Ruth. 86-4185, CA.

Harold, Eugene. 89-5168, IL.

Harper, John. 89-4374, IL.

Hereford, James. 90-1115, CA.

Hilton, Amos. 89-2370, MA.

James, Arthur G. 88-1712, CA.

Karkar, Lourice. 89-3486, CA.

LaPensee, Kevin J. 89-2492, MA.

Lawton, G. Arnold. 87-5180, CA.

Marques, Maria Alice. 89-01257, MA.

McGee, Robert. 88-6320, IL.

McMahon, George. 89-1084, MA.

Mendoza, Josefa. 87-2376, CA.

Miller, Richard D. 89-4239, CA.

Moore, Barbara. 89-6436, IL.

Neri, Mary. 84-20289, CA.

O'Connor, Thomas. 89-4412, IL.

Petrie, Joan Marie. 87-9100, IL.

Plain, Bobbie L. 87-5258, IL.

Price, Gussie. 89-4298, IL.

Prince, Ralph. 87-9662, IL.

Redd, Selina. 87-3348, IL.

Reed, Seymour. 88-6170, IL.

Rodriguez, Virgilio. 87-878, IL.

Slevin, Terrence K. 84-3092, CA.

Smith, Gladys. 86-6054, IL.

Thompson, Darlene V. 88-6104, IL.

Tommie, Patrick. 89-4093, CA.

Vatistas, Savas. 88-6532, IL.

Ventura, Rafael. 88-9490, IL.

# References

- Adams, M. 1994. Interview by author. 30 March.
- Alfieri, A. 1994. The ethics of violence: Necessity, excess, and opposition. *Columbia Law Review* 94:1721–50.
- American Jurisprudence. 1962. 2d ed. Rochester, N.Y.: Lawyers Co-operative Publishing.
- American Psychiatric Association. 1994. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, 4th ed. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association.
- Apfel, K. 1998. Testimony. Social Security: Issues Facing the Social Security Commissioner. Washington, D.C.: House Ways and Means Committee, March 12.
- Ayanian, J., and A. Epstein. 1991. Differences in the use of procedures between women and men hospitalized for coronary artery disease. *New England Journal of Medicine* 325:221–25.
- Balkin, J. M. 1987. Deconstructive practice and legal theory. *Yale Law Journal* 96:743–86.
- Balkus, R. 1998. EEO profile. OHA, ALJ. Faxed Communication. Falls Church, Va.: OHA.
- Banks, T. L. 1990. Gender bias in the classroom. Southern Illinois University Law Journal 14:527–43.
- Becker, M. E. 1989. Obscuring the Struggle: Sex Discrimination, Social Security, and Stone, Seidman, Sunstein & Tushnet's Constitutional Law. *Columbia Law Review* 89:264–88.
- Bell, D. 1995. Racial realism. In *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement*, ed. K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, and K. Thomas, 302–12. New York: New Press.
- Bernoski, R. 1997. Testimony. *Social Security Oversight of the Disability Appeals Process*. Washington, D.C., House Ways and Means Committee, April 24.
- Blendon, R. J., A. C. Scheck, K. Donelan, C. A. Hill, M. Smith, D. Beatrice, and D. Altman. 1995. How white and African Americans view their health and social problems. *Journal of American Medical Association* 273 (4): 341–46.
- Brennan, W. 1988. Reason, passion, and "the progress of the law." *Cardozo Law Review* 10:3–23.

- Burns, R. B., E. P. McCarthy, K. M. Freund, S. L. Marwill, M. Shwartz, A. Ash, and M. A. Moskowitz. 1996. Black women receive less mammography even with similar use of primary care. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 125 (3): 173–81.
- Cardozo, B. 1921. *The Nature of the Judicial Process*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Colameco, S., L. A. Becker, and M. Simpson. 1983. Sex bias in the assessment of patient complaints. *Journal of Family Practice* 16:1117–21.
- Collins, P. H. 1991. Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment. New York: Routledge.
- Coughenour, J., P. Hug, M. Patel, T. Bird, and D. Hensler. 1994. The effects of gender in the federal courts; The final report of the ninth circuit gender bias task force. Southern California Law Review 67:745–1106.
- Cover, R. M. 1986. Violence and the word. Yale Law Journal 95:1601–29.
- Devine, P. 1989. Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 56:5–18.
- Dixon, R. 1973. Social Security Disability and Mass Justice: A Problem in Welfare Adjudication. New York: Praeger.
- Dorris, M. 1989. The Broken Cord. New York: Harper and Row.
- Dresser, R. 1992. Wanted: Single, white male for medical research. *Hastings Center Report* 22 (January–February): 24–29.
- Dubin, J. C. 1993. Poverty, pain, and precedent: The Fifth Circuit's Social Security Jurisprudence. *St. Mary's Law Journal* 25:81–141.
- Durston, L., and L. Mills. 1996. Toward a new dynamic in poverty client empowerment: The rhetoric, politics, and therapeutics of opening statements in Social Security disability hearings. *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism* 8:119–44.
- Eliot, G. 1871/1992. Middlemarch. New York: Bantam.
- Elliott, K., and D. Coker. 1991. Crack babies: Here they come, ready or not. *Journal of Instructional Psychology* 18:60–64.
- Frug, M. J. 1992. Postmodern Legal Feminism. New York: Routledge.
- GAO [U.S. General Accounting Office]. 1976. The Social Security Administration Should Provide More Management and Leadership in Determining Who Is Eligible for Disability Benefits. Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office.
- GAO. 1989. Denied Applicants' Health and Financial Status Compared with Beneficiaries'. Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office.
- GAO. 1992. Racial Difference in Disability Decisions Warrants Further Investigation. Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office.
- GAO. 1994. Most of Gender Difference Explained. Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office.
- GAO. 1997. Social Security Disability: SSA Must Hold Itself Accountable for Continued Improvement in Decision-Making. Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office.
- Golin, E. 1995. Solving the problem of gender and racial bias in administrative adjudication. *Columbia Law Review* 95:1532–67.
- Goodrich, P. 1986. Reading the Law: A Critical Introduction to Legal Method and Techniques. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Greene, L. 1997. Tokens, role models, and pedagogical politics: Lamentations of an African American Female Law Professor. In *Critical Race Feminism: A Reader*, ed. A. K. Wing, 88–95. New York: New York University Press.
- Guinier, L., M. Fine, and J. Balin. 1997. *Becoming Gentlemen: Women, Law School, and Institutional Change*. Boston: Beacon.
- Harrison, P., N. Hoffman, and G. Edwall. 1989. Sexual abuse correlates: Similarities between male and female adolescents in chemical dependency treatment. *Journal of Adolescent Research* 4:385–99.
- Hulewat, P. 1996. Resettlement: A cultural and psychological crisis. *Social Work* 41 (2): 129–35.
- Jackson, T. 1996. Lessons learned from a domestic violence prosecutor. In *Domestic Violence Law: A Comprehensive Overview of Cases and Sources*, by N. Lemon, 561–62. San Francisco: Austin and Winfield.
- Jackson, V. C., and S. Deller-Ross. 1996. Report of the special committee on gender to the D.C. circuit task force on gender, race, and ethnic bias. *Georgetown Law Journal* 84:1657–1893.
- Johnson, J., E. Whitestone, L. A. Jackson, and L. Gatto. 1995. Justice is still not colorblind: Differential racial effects of exposure to inadmissible evidence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 21:893–98.
- Jung, C. G. 1966. The Practice of Psychology: Essays on the Psychology of Transference and Other Subjects. Trans. R. F. C. Hull. New York: Pantheon.
- Kennedy, D. 1992. Legal education as training for hierarchy. In *The Politics of Law*, ed. D. Kairys, 38–58. New York: Pantheon.
- Kennedy, D. 1995. A cultural pluralist case for affirmative action in legal academia. In *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement*, ed. K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, and K. Thomas, 159–200. New York: New Press.
- King, G. 1992. Letter to Lawrence J. Thompson. In *Racial Difference in Disability Decisions Warrants Further Investigation*, by U.S. General Accounting Office. Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office, 1992.
- Kollmann, G. 1997. Social Security: Recommendations of the 1994–1996 Advisory Council on Social Security. Bethesda, Md.: Penny Hill Press.
- Kozol, J. 1985. Illiterate America. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press.
- Krauskopf, J. 1994. Touching the elephant: Perceptions of gender issues in nine law schools. *Journal of Legal Education* 44:311–40.
- Labaton, S. 1992. Benefits are refused more often to disabled blacks, study finds. *New York Times*, 11 May, A1.
- Lahey, K. A. 1991. Reasonable women and the law. In *At the Boundaries of Law: Feminism and Legal Theory*, ed. M. A. Fineman and N. S. Thomadson, 3–21. New York: Routledge.
- Lee, P. E., S. Porath, and J. E. Schaffner. 1994. Engendering Social Security disability determinations: The path of a woman claimant. *Tulane Law Review* 68:1477–1526.
- Link, B., J. Mirotznik, and F. Cullen. 1991. The effectiveness of stigma coping orientations: Can negative consequences of mental illness labeling be avoided? *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 32:302–20.

- Llewellyn, K. 1962. *Jurisprudence: Realism in Theory and Practice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Macare, C. N., G. V. Bodenhausen, A. B. Milne, and J. Jetten. 1994. Out of mind but back in sight: Stereotypes on the rebound. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 67:808–17.
- Malow, R., J. West, J. Pena, and C. Lott. 1990. Affective and adjustment problems in cocaine and opioid addicts: Second annual symposium of the Society of Psychologists in Addictive Behaviors. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors* 4:6–11.
- Mashaw, J. L. 1983. Bureaucratic Justice. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mashaw, J. L. 1995–1996. Unemployment compensation: Continuity, change, and the prospects for reform. *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 29: 1–24.
- Mashaw, J. L. 1996. Panel: The structure of government accountability: Reinventing government and regulatory reform. Studies in the neglect and abuse of administrative law. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review* 57:405–22.
- Mashaw, J. L., C. Goetz, F. Goodman, W. Schwartz, P. Verkuil, and M. Carrow. 1978. *Social Security Hearings and Appeals*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.
- Masson, E. M. 1995. Social Security Administration nonacquiescence on the standard for evaluating pain. *William and Mary Law Review* 36:1819–54.
- Melton, G., and E. Garrison. 1987. Fear, prejudice, and neglect: Discrimination against mentally disabled persons. *American Psychologist* 42:1007–26.
- Mills, L. 1988. The disability benefit applicant. Unpublished manuscript.
- Mills, L. 1993. A calculus for bias: How malingering females and dependent house-wives fare in the Social Security disability system. *Harvard Women's Law Journal* 16:211–32A.
- Mills, L. 1996. On the other side of silence: Affective lawyering for intimate abuse. *Cornell Law Review* 86:1225–63.
- Mills, L. 1997. Intuition and insight: A new job description for the battered woman's prosecutor and other more modest proposals. *UCLA Women's Law Journal* 7:183–99.
- Mills, L. 1998. The Heart of Intimate Abuse: New Interventions in Child Welfare, Criminal Justice, and Health Settings. New York: Springer.
- Mills, L., and A. Arjo. 1996. Slipping them a mickey: Disability benefits, substance addictions, and the (un)deserving poor. *Georgetown Journal on Fighting Poverty* 3:125–60.
- Minow, M. 1990. Making All the Difference: Inclusion, Exclusion, and American Law. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Minow, M. 1995. Stripped down like a runner or enriched by experience: Bias and impartiality of judges and jurors. In *Courts and Justice: A Reader*, ed. G. L. Mays and P. R. Gregware, 366–87. Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press.
- Minow, M., and E. Spelman. 1988. Passion for justice. *Cardozo Law Review* 10:37–76.
- Mirvis, D. M., R. Burns, L. Gaschen, F. T. Cloar, and M. Graney. 1994. Variation in utilization of cardiac procedures in the Department of Veteran Affairs

- health care system: Effect of race. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 24 (5): 1297–1304.
- Naffine, N. 1990. Law and the Sexes: Explorations in Feminist Jurisprudence. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Nagi, S. 1969. Disability and Rehabilitation: Legal, Clinical, and Self-Concepts and Measurements. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- National Center for Education Statistics. 1993. *Adult Literacy in America*. Washington, D.C.: Educational Testing Service.
- NOSSCR (National Organization of Social Security Claimant's Representatives). 1995. *Social Security Forum*. November. Midland Park, N.J.: NOSSCR.
- NOSSCR. 1996. Social Security Forum. April. Midland Park, N.J.: NOSSCR.
- NOSSCR. 1997. Social Security Forum. April. Midland Park, N.J.: NOSSCR.
- NOSSCR. 1998. Social Security Forum. April. Midland Park, N.J.: NOSSCR.
- Obiora, L. A. 1996. Neither here nor there: Of the female in American legal education. *Law and Social Inquiry* 21:355–432.
- Padilla, A., R. Cervantes, M. Maldonado, and R. Garcia. 1988. Coping responses to psychological stressors among Mexican and Central American immigrants. *Journal of Community Psychology* 16:418–27.
- Pear. R. 1997. U.S. challenges courts on disabilities. *New York Times*, 21 April, B9. Peller, G. 1985. The metaphysics of American law. *California Law Review* 73: 1151–1290.
- Redman, S., F. Webb, D. Hennrikus, J. Gordon, and R. Sanson-Fisher. 1991. The effects of gender on diagnosis of psychological disturbance. *Journal of Behav*ioral Medicine 14:527–40.
- Resnik, J. 1988. On the bias: Feminist reconsiderations of the aspirations for our judges. *Southern California Law Review* 61:1877–1944.
- Rice, J. 1992. Discursive formation, life stories, and the emergence of co-dependency: "Power/knowledge" and the search for identity. *Sociological Quarterly* 33:337–64.
- Rothblum, E., P. Brand, C. Miller, and H. Oetjen. 1990. The relationship between obesity, employment discrimination, and employment-related victimization. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 37:251–66.
- Saldena, D. H. 1995. Acculturative stress: Minority status and distress. In *Hispanic Psychology: Critical Issues in Theory and Research*, ed. A. M. Padilla, 43–54. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Scales, A. 1986. The emergence of feminist jurisprudence: An essay. *Yale Law Journal* 95:1373–1402.
- Schoultz, C. O. 1986. Reading between the lines: The high cost of ignorance. *Training and Development Journal* 40:44–47.
- Singer, J. 1988. Legal realism now. California Law Review 76:465-544.
- Skoler, D. 1994. Fighting racial bias: How one federal agency confronted the problem. *Human Rights* (September): 18–21.
- Smart, J. F., and D. W. Smart. 1995. Acculturative stress of Hispanics: Loss and challenge. *Journal of Counseling & Development* 73 (4): 390–96.
- Snow, J. T., and M. B. Harris. 1985. Maintenance of weight loss: Demographic,

- behavioral, and attitudinal correlates. *Journal of Obesity and Weight Regulation* 4:234–55.
- SSA (U.S. Social Security Administration). 1981. Office of Research and Statistics. *Consistency of Initial Disability Decisions among and within States.* Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Social Security Administration.
- SSA. 1992. Office of Hearings and Appeals. Office of Training. *Hallex: Hearings, Appeal and Litigation Law Manual for ALJs: Administrative Law Judge Hearings.* Vol. 1, div. 2. Baltimore, Md.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Social Security Administration.
- SSA. 1993. Office of Hearings and Appeals. Training materials.
- SSA. 1995. Office of Program and Integrity Reviews. *Findings of the Disability Hearings Quality Review Process.* Washington, D.C.: SSA Pub. No. 30–013.
- SSA. 1996–1997 (December 28–March 28). Office of Hearings and Appeals. *Case Control System. Summary of Involvement at Hearings.*
- SSA. 1997. Office of Program and Integrity Reviews. *Findings of the Disability Hearings Quality Review Process.* Washington, D.C.: SSA Pub. No. 30–013.
- SSA. 1998. Office of Hearings and Appeals. OHA Case Control System. Profile of Participant Involvement at Hearings Held. Highlights for Fiscal Year 1997.
- Steingart, R., M. Packer, P. Hamm, M. E. Coglianese, and B. Gersh. 1991. Sex differences in the management of coronary artery disease. *New England Journal of Medicine* 325:226–30.
- Stone, D. 1984. The Disabled State. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Swent, J. F. 1996. Gender bias at the heart of justice: An empirical study of state task forces. *Southern California Review of Law and Women's Studies* 6 (1): 1–87.
- Taibi, A. 1990. Frontier of legal thought III: Note: Politics and due process: The rhetoric of social security disability law. *Duke Law Journal*, 913–66.
- Thomas, T. N. 1995. Acculturative stress in the adjustment of immigrant families. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless* 4 (2): 131–42.
- Tolchin, M. 1989. Judges who decide Social Security claims say agency goads them to deny benefits. *New York Times*, 8 January, I, 16.
- Trope, Y., and E. Thompson. 1997. Looking for truth in all the wrong places? Asymmetric search for individuating information about stereotyped group members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 73:229–41.
- Unger, R. 1983. *The Critical Legal Studies Movement*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Unger, R., and M. Crawford. 1992. Women and Gender: A Feminist Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- U.S. Court of Appeals [Ninth Circuit]. 1992. *The Preliminary Report of the Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force*. Seattle, Wash.: U.S. Ninth Circuit Court.
- U.S. Court of Appeals [Ninth Circuit]. 1993. The Effects of Gender in the Federal Courts: The Final Report of the Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force. Seattle, Wash.: U.S. Ninth Circuit Court.
- U.S. House. 1994. Committee on Ways and Means. Green Book: Background

- Material and Data on Programs within the Jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Washington, D.C.: Committee on Ways and Means.
- U.S. Senate. 1978. Committee on Ways and Means. Subcommittee on Social Security. *Disability Adjudication Structure*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Senate. 1982. Committee on Finance. *Staff Data and Materials Related to the Social Security Disability Insurance Program.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Senate. 1992. Select Committee on Aging. *Insurmountable Barriers: Lack of Bilingual Services at Social Security Administration Offices.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Verkuil, P., D. Gifford, C. Koch, R. Pierce, and J. Lubbers. 1992. *The Federal Administrative Judiciary*. Washington, D.C.: Administrative Conference of the United States.
- von Hippel, W., D. Sekaquaptewa, and P. Vargas. 1995. On the role of encoding processes in stereotype maintenance. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, ed. M. P. Zanna, 177–254. New York: Academic Press.
- Wadden, T., and A. Stunkard. 1987. Psychopathology and obesity. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 499:55–65.
- Whittle, J., J. Conigliaro, C. B. Good, and R. Lofgren. 1993. Racial differences in the use of invasive cardiovascular procedures in the Department of Veterans' Affairs medical system. *New England Journal of Medicine* 329:621–27.
- Williams, P. 1995. *The Rooster's Egg: On the Persistence of Prejudice.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Wills, D. 1997. Domestic violence: The case for aggressive prosecution. *UCLA Women's Law Journal* 7:173–82.
- Zelenske, E., and D. Udell. 1994. Defining and addressing ALJ bias and unfitness in the Social Security system. *Clearinghouse Review* (April): 1460–1468. Los Angeles: National Senior Citizens Law Center.
- Zipursky, B. 1990. Deshaney and the jurisprudence of compassion. *New York Law Review* 65:1101–47.

# Table of Codes, Regulations, Rulings, and Rules

```
20 C.F.R. 404.913
                                              32
           404.944
                                              76, 141
           404.950 (d)
                                              39
           404.953
                                              36
           404.1517
                                              29
                                              28
           404, subpt. P, app. 1
                                              28
           404, subpt. P, app. 1, 12.05 B
           404, subpt. P, app. 1, 12.00
                                               139
                                               139
           404, subpt. P, app. 1, 9.09
           404, subpt. P, app. 1, 1.09 C
                                              28
           404, subpt. P, app. 2
                                              30
                                              30
           404, subpt. P, app. 2, 201.03
           404, subpt. P, app. 2, 201.00 (d)
                                              42
           404.1527 (f) (1)
                                              29, 31
                                              30
           404.1527 (f) (2)
           404.1530
                                              86, 87
                                               142
           404.1564
           404.1572 (a)
                                              31
                                              31
           404.1572 (b)
           410.670 (c)
                                               165n. 1 (intro.), 166n. 5
                                              39
           416.1450 (d)
53 Fed. Reg.
              29779 (8 August 1988)
                                               12
62 Fed. Reg.
              48963 (18 September 1997)
                                               166n. 2
                                               166n. 2
              49598 (23 September 1997)
               50266 (25 September 1997)
                                               166n. 2
                                               139
63 Fed. Reg.
              11854 (11 March 1998)
```

# 184 Codes, Regulations, Rulings, and Rules

Hallex SSA 1992,	I-2-514A.1	82	
	I-2-520	112	
	I-2-601	12, 90	
	I-2-650	34, 69	
	I-2-652	34, 69, 74, 101	
	I-2-654	35	
	I-2-658	35	
	I-2-660A	76	
	I-2-830	90, 93	
	I-2-835A1	36	
Social Security Act			
	P.L. 103-296	170n. 1 (chap. 6)	
	P.L. 104–121	170n. 1 (chap. 6)	
Social Security Rul	ings		
	1982, 82-59	86, 87	
	1982, 82-60	134, 135–36	
	1983, 83-10	32	
	1996, 96-2P	29, 81	
	1986, 86-8	31	
	1996, 96-7p	35	
42 U.S.C.	§ 405 (b) (1)	12, 33, 90	
	§ 423 (d)	2	
	§ 423 (d) (5) (A)	28, 29	
	§ 1382 (c) (3) (b)	2	
	§ 1383 (c) (1)	12, 90	

# **Table of Cases**

```
Albrilton v. Sullivan 889 F.2d 640 (5th Cir. 1989): 171n. 6
Allen v. Heckler 749 F.2d 577 (9th Cir. 1984): 169n. 16
Andrews v. Shalala 53 F.3d 1035 (9th Cir. 1995): 170n. 2 (chap. 6)
Arroyo v. Secretary of Health and Human Services 932 F.2d 82 (1st Cir.
    1991): 170n. 2 (chap. 6)
Association of Administrative Law Judges, Inc. v. Heckler 594 F.Supp.
    1132 (D.D.C. 1984): 3
Aubeuf v. Schweiker 649 F.2d 107 (2d Cir. 1981): 169n. 19
Berger v. U.S. 255 U.S. 22 (1921): 12
Binion v. Shalala 13 F.3d 243 (7th Cir. 1994): 167n. 6, 168n. 9
Bishop v. Sullivan 900 F.2d 1259 (8th Cir. 1990): 169n. 19
Born v. Secretary of Health and Human Services 923 F.2d 1168 (6th Cir.
    1990): 166n. 6
Bosch v. Secretary of Health and Human Services No. 85 CV 3536
    (E.D.N.Y. 1988): 169n. 15
Bradwell v. The State 83 U.S. 130 (1872): 18
Brandon v. Bowen 666 F.Supp. 604 (S.D.N.Y. 1987): 169n. 16
Brock v. Chater 84 F.3d 726 (5th Cir. 1996): 167n. 6, 168n. 9
Byron v. Heckler 742 F.2d 1232 (10th Cir. 1984): 169n. 16
Carter v. Chater 73 F.3d 1019 (10th Cir. 1996): 168n. 9
Cavitt v. Schweiker 704 F.2d 1193 (10th Cir. 1983): 169n. 18
Ceguerra v. Secretary 933 F.2d 735 (9th Cir. 1991): 90
Clark v. Schweiker 652 F.2d 399 (5th Cir. 1981): 166n. 6
Cooper v. Bowen 815 F.2d 557 (9th Cir. 1987): 134
Coria v. Heckler 750 F.2d 245 (3d Cir. 1984): 90
Cowart v. Schweiker 662 F.2d 731 (11th Cir. 1981): 166n. 6
Cox v. Califano 587 F.2d 988 (9th Cir. 1978): 166n. 6
```

1983): 109, 166n. 6

Leggett v. Chater 67 F.3d 558 (5th Cir. 1995): 169n. 18

```
Craig v. Chater 76 F.3d 585 (4th Cir. 1996): 166n. 6
Crane v. Shalala 76 F.3d 251 (9th Cir. 1995): 166n. 6
Cruz v. Califano No. 77-2234 (E.D. Pa. 1979): 166n. 3
Cruz v. Schweiker 645 F.2d 812 (9th Cir. 1981): 101-2, 103, 104, 105, 108,
    109, 128, 167n. 7
Cutler v. Weinberger 516 F.2d 1282 (2d Cir. 1975): 166n. 6
Davis v. Callahan 125 F.3d 670 (8th Cir. 1997): 90
DeChirico v. Callahan 134 F.3d 1177 (2d Cir. 1998): 166n. 6
DeLorme v. Sullivan 924 F.2d 841 (9th Cir. 1991): 168n. 10
Desrosiers v. Secretary 846 F.2d 573 (9th Cir. 1988): 90, 145
Dixon v. Heckler 811 F.2d 506 (10th Cir. 1987): 166n. 6
Dobrowolsky v. Califano 909 F.2d 403 (3d Cir. 1979): 168n. 9
Dollar v. Bowen 821 F.2d 530 (10th Cir. 1987): 171n. 6
Ferraris v. Heckler 728 F.2d 582 (2d Cir. 1984): 169n. 16
Gallant v. Heckler 753 F.2d 1450 (9th Cir. 1984): 73
Gay v. Sullivan 986 F.2d 1336 (10th Cir. 1993): 169n. 19
Ghant v. Bowen 930 F.2d 633 (8th Cir. 1991): 90, 95, 98
Gold v. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare 463 F.2d 38 (2d Cir.
    1972): 38, 169n. 18
Graham v. Apfel 129 F.3d 1420 (11th Cir. 1997): 166n. 6, 168n. 9
Hardy v. Chater 64 F.3d 405 (8th Cir. 1995): 170n. 2 (chap. 6)
Hawkins v. Chater 113 F.3d 1162 (10th Cir. 1997): 166n. 6
Heggarty v. Sullivan 947 F.2d 990 (1st Cir. 1991): 166n. 6, 168n. 9
Hennig v. Gardner 276 F.Supp. 622 (N.D. Tex. 1967): 38
Hess v. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare 497 F.2d 837 (3d Cir.
    1974): 167n. 6
Holloway v. Heckler 607 F.Supp. 71 (D. Kan. 1985): 169n. 15
Hummel v. Heckler 736 F.2d 91 (3d Cir. 1980): 11
In re Murchison 349 U.S. 133 (1955): 12
Jenkins v. Sullivan 906 F.2d 107 (4th Cir. 1990): 169n. 19
Johns v. Bowen 821 F.2d 551 (11th Cir. 1987): 169n. 19
Jones v. Sullivan 954 F.2d 125 (3d Cir. 1991): 170n. 2 (chap. 6)
Jozefick v. Shalala 854 F.Supp. 342 (M.D. Pa. 1994): 166n. 6
Kelley v. Callahan 133 F.3d 583 (8th Cir. 1998): 169n. 18, 171n. 4
King v. Califano 599 F.2d 597 (4th Cir. 1979): 170n. 2 (chap. 6)
Lashley v. Secretary of Health and Human Services 708 F.2d 1048 (6th Cir.
```

Light v. Social Security Administration 119 F.3d 789 (9th Cir. 1997): 169n. 18

Liteky et al. v. U.S. 510 U.S. 540 (1994): 12

Macri v. Chater 93 F.3d 540 (9th Cir. 1996): 90

Marsh v. Harris 632 F.2d 296 (4th Cir. 1980): 82

Matullo v. Bowen 926 F.2d 240 (3d Cir. 1990): 170n. 2 (chap. 6)

McGhee v. Harris 683 F.2d 256 (8th Cir. 1982): 77

*Miranda v. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare* 514 F.2d 996 (1st Cir. 1975): 166n. 6

Mullen v. Gardner 256 F.Supp. 588 (E.D.N.Y. 1966): 169n. 18

Murray v. Heckler 722 F.2d 499 (9th Cir. 1983): 169n. 16

Neal v. Bowen 829 F.2d 528 (5th Cir. 1987): 170n. 2 (chap. 6)

Nelson v. Apfel 131 F.3d 1228 (7th Cir. 1997): 166n. 6

Novotny v. Chater 72 F.3d 669 (8th Cir. 1995): 90

O'Connor v. Sullivan 938 F.2d 70 (7th Cir. 1991): 170n. 2 (chap. 6)

Orteza v. Shalala 50 F.3d 748 (9th Cir. 1995): 169n. 18

Perminter v. Heckler 765 F.2d 870 (9th Cir. 1985): 90

Ragland v. Shalala 992 F.2d 1056 (10th Cir. 1993): 169n. 18

Reed v. Secretary of Health and Human Services 804 F.Supp. 914 (E.D. Mich. 1992): 169n. 16

Regents of the University of California v. Bakke 438 U.S. 265 (1978): 20

Richardson v. Perales 402 U.S. 389 (1971): 38

Robinson v. Secretary of Health and Human Services 733 F.2d 255 (2d Cir. 1984): 168n. 9

Rutherford v. Schweiker 685 F.2d 60 (2d Cir. 1982): 170n. 2 (chap. 6)

Saleem v. Chater 86 F.3d 176 (10th Cir. 1996): 170n. 2 (chap. 6)

Sellars v. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare 458 F.2d 984 (8th Cir. 1972): 166n. 6

Shannon v. Chater 54 F.3d 484 (8th Cir. 1995): 166n. 6

Shore v. Callahan 977 F.Supp. 1075 (D. Or. 1997): 167n. 1 (chap. 3)

Sims v. Harris 631 F.2d 26 (4th Cir. 1980): 166n. 6

Smith v. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare 587 F.2d 857 (7th Cir. 1978): 166n. 6

Smith v. Secretary of Health and Human Services 893 F.2d 106 (6th Cir. 1989): 170n. 2 (chap. 6)

Spencer v. Schweiker 678 F.2d 42 (5th Cir. 1982): 169n. 19

Teter v. Heckler 775 F.2d 1104 (10th Cir. 1985): 169n. 19

Thompson v. Sullivan 987 F.2d 1482 (10th Cir. 1993): 167n. 7

Thompson v. Sullivan 957 F.2d 611 (8th Cir. 1992): 170n. 2 (chap. 6)

Thompson v. Sullivan 933 F.2d 581 (7th Cir. 1991): 168n. 10

Tyler v. Weinberger 409 F.Supp. 776 (E.D. Va. 1976): 169n. 19

Tylitzki v. Shalala 999 F.2d 1411 (9th Cir. 1993): 170n. 2 (chap. 6)

United States v. Grinnel Corp. 382 U.S. 563 (1966): 12

University of California v. Bakke 438 U.S. 265 (1978): 20

Van Horn v. Schweiker 717 F.2d 871 (3d Cir. 1983): 169n. 19

Ventura v. Shalala 55 F.3d 900 (3d Cir. 1995): 77

Vidal v. Harris 637 F.2d 710 (9th Cir. 1981): 74, 102, 105, 108, 109, 128

Ward v. Village of Monroeville 409 U.S. 57 (1972): 11

Weaver v. Secretary of Health and Human Services 722 F.2d 310 (6th Cir. 1983): 169n. 19

Wilcults v. Apfel 143 F.3d 1134 (8th Cir. 1998): 171n. 6

Williams v. Shalala 997 F.2d 1494 (D.C. Cir. 1993): 167n. 3

Wolfe v. Chater 86 F. 3d 1072 (11th Cir. 1996): 171n. 6

*Yother v. Secretary of Health and Human Services* 705 F.2d 460 (6th Cir. 1982): 168n. 9

# Index

accommodation, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 22,	and Caucasian applicants, 4, 63, 85,
26, 28, 37–38, 62, 64, 68, 71, 80,	86, 135, 138, 141, 146
101–31, 147, 148, 151, 153, 154,	characteristics of, 4, 80, 137, 141,
155, 162, 163, 164, 167n. 8	154, 160, 165n. 4
Adams, M., 143, 171n. 7	and collecting records, 82-83
addictions (in general), 134–37, 170n. 3	and credibility determinations, 5,
(chap. 6), 171n. 4	35, 43, 54–55, 57, 67, 68, 88–100,
Administrative Law Judges (ALJs)	128, 145, 146, 150, 169nn. 17, 20,
and abuse of discretion, 56, 57	171n. 1
and adequate time to obtain evi-	as defense counsel, 33, 109, 113, 152
dence, 82–83	and duty to develop records, 38-39,
and administer the oath, 35, 58	76, 105, 112, 113, 132, 142,
and African-American claimants, 3,	166–67n. 6
4, 63, 75, 78–79, 84, 85, 86, 93, 98,	and duty to obtain records, 39, 57,
106, 109, 112, 114, 116, 122, 123,	62, 81–86, 112, 150
135, 136, 137, 140, 143, 149, 151,	and duty to protect rights, 57,
152	74–76, 101, 105, 108, 114,
and age, 4, 28, 30, 32, 59, 135	120–21, 122, 124, 129, 131, 132,
and appearance, 97, 143, 145,	133, 137, 141, 142–43, 148, 149,
171n. 9	170n. 1 (chap. 5)
and appropriate titles, 76, 77, 78–79,	and education, 28, 30, 32, 38, 39, 75,
80, 115, 140, 149, 168–69n. 13	152
and award rates, 33, 36, 66, 166n. 4,	and eliciting evidence, 5, 67, 76, 78,
168n. 5	132, 151
and biography, 156–57, 160–61, 163	and eliciting testimony, 5, 6, 57, 58,
and borderline intelligence, 74, 83,	60, 62, 64, 67, 76–81, 114–31, 132,
102, 152	149, 151, 152
and burden of proof, 69, 73, 149	and emotionally charged words, 36,
and caretaking, 90, 91, 94, 95–96,	90, 93, 94, 99–100, 150
143, 144–45	and errors of law, 56
and caseloads, 2-3	and failing to follow up, 114, 127–31

Administrative Law Judges (continued) and family background/history, 90, 91, 92, 94, 98-99, 150 and gender, 15, 54-55, 59, 60, 61, 68, 90, 91, 92, 94, 96–98, 99, 132, 133, 143–45, 148, 150, 151, 152, 154 and hindering, 76–77, 79–80, 100, 112, 122, 130, 149 and housekeeping, 90, 91, 94, 95–96, 143, 144–45, 150, 169n. 18 and ignoring claimants, 6 and infantalizing claimants, 109, 114, 115–17, 130–31 and interrupting, 76–77, 79–80, 100, 149 and introductions at hearing, 5, 34, 58, 62, 67, 69–74, 100, 152 and irritation with claimants, 81 and leading the claimant, 5–6, 114–15, 130–31, 151 and military history, 90, 91, 92, 94, 98-99, 150 and obesity, 4, 6, 133, 139–40, 151, and opening statements, 34, 35, 49, 56, 58, 62, 67, 69–74, 112, 132, 148–49, 153 and pejorative terms/statements, 36, 90, 93, 94, 99–100, 150–51 and personal judgments or opinions, 5, 36, 60, 90, 92, 93, 94, 99–100, 119, 120, 121, 136, 151 and personal observations (see Administrative Law Judges, and 'sit and squirm' test) and perspective was wrong, 114, 130-31, 151 and playing three roles, 2, 3, 53, 109, 113, 152–53, 165n. 2 and poverty, 2, 4, 38, 146, 154 and pressure to deny claims, 3, 53, 81, 88, 152, 165n. 1 (intro.) and pressure to follow agency policy, 165n. 1 (intro.) and pressure to process claims, 2–3,

53, 81, 88, 109, 152, 165n. 1 (intro.), 170n. 3 (chap. 5) and previous work experience, 28, 30, 31-32, 57, 110 and prison history, 90, 91, 92, 94, 98-99, 150 and promise to help/protect rights, 106, 108–9, 113, 132 as prosecutor, 33, 109, 113, 152 and race, xii, 4, 7, 12, 15, 54, 59, 60, 61, 90, 91, 92, 94, 96–98, 99, 137, 148, 155 and racial and ethnic minorities, 4, 6, 54, 72, 73, 80, 88, 96–98, 101–2, 122, 124, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 140–41, 142, 144, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 154, 155, 157, 166n. 3, 167n. 7, 168n. 4 (see also Administrative Law Judges, and race; bias) and racism (see Administrative Law Judges, and race; Administrative Law Judges, and racial and ethnic minorities; bias) and recovering history, 157 and responsibility at hearing, 38–39, 55-60 and robes, 34 and rudeness, 5, 114, 121–27 and rule violations, 3, 4, 5, 10, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 72–73, 74–76, 78–80, 81, 83–86, 87–88, 89, 93–100, 102, 134, 136, 148–53 and salaries, 137 and sexism (see Administrative Law Judges, and gender; Administrative Law Judges, and women) and shame, 157, 160 and 'sit and squirm' test, 90, 92, 94, 99, 145, 150, 169n. 19, 171n. 10 and smoking, 116–17, 120, 171n. 4 and socioeconomic status, 90, 91, 92, 94, 96–98, 99, 137, 148, 150, and stereotyping, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 62, 64, 68, 79, 131, 132–47,

148–53, 154, 155, 156, 159, 161, 162, 163–64 and subjective factors, 48, 49, 53, 60, 68, 89, 94, 152 and substantial evidence, 56, 58, 59 and testifying in own way, 76–77, 80 and training (see training) and unnecessarily judgmental, 114, 117–21, 130–31, 151 and unrepresented claimants, 5, 7, 33, 34–35, 38, 39, 49, 56, 57, 58, 59, 62, 67, 73, 74–76, 82, 83, 100, 101–14, 128, 131, 149, 151, 152, 153, 168nn. 9, 10 (see also right to representation) and welfare benefits, 6, 90, 97–98, 99, 133, 145–47, 151, 152 and women, 2, 6, 7, 54–55, 75, 78–79, 131, 144, 149, 150, 151, 152, 157 and workers' compensation benefits, 6, 90, 133, 145–47, 151, 152 Affective Advocacy, 23 Affective Lawyering, 23 affectivity, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22–23, 25, 26, 35, 37–39, 52, 61, 62, 100, 132, 154, 155–64 Alanon, 117, 118, 137 Alfieri, A., 143 Altman, D., 41, 83 American Jurisprudence, 12, 15 American Psychiatric Association, 134, 137, 139	Balin, J., 19 Balkin, J., 18 Balkus, R., 2 Beatrice, D., 41, 83 Becker, L. A., 41, 83 Becker, M. E., 167n. 3 Benchmark Institute, xii, 171n. 3 benefits amounts, 2 Bernoski, R., 152, 165n. 1 bias (generally), 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 19–20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 30, 37, 46, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60, 63, 64, 68, 81, 82, 91, 96–98, 99, 100, 117, 119, 131, 132–47, 148, 148–53, 156, 159, 163–64, 167nn. 2, 3, 171nn. 5, 8 (chap. 6), 171n. 2 ALJ's views of, 3, 55 checklists to monitor, 162–63 defined, 12–13 detected in physicians, 5 detected in the rules, 5, 8, 10, 27, 37, 39, 42–43, 142, 148, 156 as disqualifying, 12 in elementary education, 21 exposing, 6, 155 expunging, 13 mechanics of, 23–24 in medical profession, 40 (see also physicians) repressing, 6, 8, 9, 22, 24–25, 43, 147, 154, 155, 157, 161, 162, 163 self reflection/reflexivity on, 6, 7, 8,
American Psychiatric Association, 134,	
amputation, 28	9, 10, 21, 23, 25, 153, 154, 155–64
anorexia, 71	(see also Administrative Law
Antabuse, 136	Judges, and race; —, and racial
Apfel, K., 166	and ethnic minorities)
appeals process. <i>See</i> Social Security Administration, and procedure	Bird, T., 167n. 3 Blendon, R., 41, 83
for appeal; Social Security disabil-	Bodenhausen, G. V., 25, 154
ity claims	Boston, 4, 54, 63
appearance and disability (generally),	Brand, P., 139
145	Brennan, W., 16, 22, 52, 156
Arjo, A., 134	'bureaucratic rationality,' 50
Ash, A., 41, 83	Burns, Risa B., 41, 83
Ayanian, J., 40, 83	Burns, Robert, 41, 83

Cardozo, B., 16, 156	Collins, P. H., 78, 168–69n. 13, 171n. 9
Carrow, M., 48–50, 51, 62, 153	color-blind meritocracy, 21
Cervantes, R., 140	Committee on Ways and Means, 46
Chicago, 4, 54, 63	Conigliaro, J., 41, 84
Chief Administrative Law Judge,	Constitution, U.S., 11
Office of, 4	Consultative Examiners/Evaluators
chronic fatigue syndrome, 42-43, 167n.	(CEs), 29, 82, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89,
1 (chap. 3)	152
claimants	Contreras, M., xii
and ability to pay for medical evi-	Corde creditur ad iustitiam, xii, 164
dence, 82, 84, 85, 86	Coughenour, J., 167n. 3
with addictions, 4, 38, 93, 105,	countertransference, 157–58, 161–62,
117–20, 121, 128, 133, 134–37,	163
138, 139, 151, 152, 157, 170n. 2	Cover, R., 19
(chap. 6)	Crawford, M., 41, 84, 139
of color (see Administrative Law	credibility determinations (generally),
Judges, and African-American	68
claimants; Administrative Law	critical legal scholars/studies, 6, 9, 11,
Judges, and race; Administrative	17, 19, 21, 163
Law Judges, and racial and ethnic	critical race scholarship/theory, 11, 17,
minorities; bias)	18, 20–21, 155, 156
denied benefits (generally), 65	Cullen, F., 171n. 5
as foreign-born (see Administrative	
Law Judges, and race; Adminis-	Deller-Ross, S., 167n. 3
trative Law Judges, and racial and	Devine, P., 23–24, 154, 162
ethnic minorities; bias)	Disability Determination Services
as homemakers, 13–14, 79, 96–97	(DDS) (generally), 29, 31, 32, 34,
as hypothetical person, 110–12	45–46
as illiterate, 4, 5, 7, 8, 13–14, 15, 38,	and Administrative Law Judges,
39, 64–65, 74–75, 82, 83, 93, 102,	59–60, 165n. 1 (intro.), 168n. 6
104, 105, 106, 108, 114–15, 120,	and gender differences in decision
121, 129, 132, 133, 142–43, 149,	making, 44–45, 47–48, 167n. 2,
151, 152, 155, 156, 162, 171n. 6	171n. 8
with linguistic limitations, 6, 7, 38,	and racial differences in decision
39, 72, 80, 102–3, 115, 130, 131,	making, 44–45, 53–54
141, 151	physicians/evaluators, 29, 31, 32, 36,
with mental illness/impairments, 4,	43–47
5, 6, 7, 32, 35, 38, 39, 57, 58, 93,	Disability Insurance (DI), 2, 34, 46, 53,
117, 119, 123, 127, 128, 129, 130,	54, 63, 69, 70, 72–73
131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137–39,	distribution of disability benefits,
145, 151, 152, 154, 157, 171n. 5	52–53
Cloar, F. T., 41, 82	Dixon, R., 48, 49, 51, 53, 60, 66,
Coglianese, M. E., 40, 84	166n. 4
Cohen, W., 134	domestic violence, 158–59, 161
Coker, D., 134, 135	Donelan, K., 41, 83
Colameco, S., 41, 83	Dorris, M., 135

Dresser, R., 42 Goodman, F., 48-50, 51, 62, 153 Dubin, J. C., 167n. 3 Goodrich, P., xiv, 16, 71 Durston, L., xiii, 67, 70, 72, 167n. 8 Goodrich, R., xiv Gordon, J., 41, 84 Edwall, G., 134, 135 Graney, J., 41, 83 Eliot, G., 161 Greene, L., 21 'Grid,' 27, 30, 33, 60, 156 Elliott, K., 134, 135 emotion. See affectivity as biased, 42 'empty formalities,' 5, 49, 62, 73, 132, Guinier, L., 19 153 engage. See accommodation Hallex: Hearings, Appeals and Litigation Law Manual (generally), Epstein, A., 40 equal treatment/equality, 12, 20 33–34, 165n. 1 (chap. 1) equity, 27, 39, 51 Hamm, P., 40, 84 exhibit file, 34, 35, 39, 75, 103, 107, 113 Harris, M. B., 139 harmful language rules, 93, 99-100 fairness (generally), 27, 29, 33, 37, 39, Harrison, P., 134, 135 43, 49, 51, 55, 60, 67, 72, 89, 94, Harvard Law School, 19 113, 130, 148, 149, 152, 153, 164 Hawkins, Versie, xi, xiv legal definition of, 11–12 Hawkins Center, xi feelings. See affectivity Health, Education and Welfare feminist legal scholars/jurisprudence, (HEW), 43, 46, 47 6, 9, 11, 17, 18–19, 20, 21, 155, hearing process (generally), 32 156, 163 length of, 35–36, 105, 108 and notification, 33-34 Fine, M., 19 five-step sequential evaluation process, and studies of, 48–50, 55–61 27, 30, 33, 60, 69, 73, 88, 120 Helewat, P., 140 French, R., xii Hennrikus, D., 41, 84 Freund, K. M., 41, 83 Hensler, D., 167n. 3 Frug, M. J., 20 Hill, C. A., 41, 83 Hoffman, N., 134, 135 Garcia, R., 140 homosociality, 18, 19 Garrison, E., 171n. 5 Hug, M., 167n. 3 Gaschen, L., 41, 83 Gatto, L., 91 identity politics, 160 General Accounting Office (GAO) (in illiteracy general), xii, 2, 3, 4, 12, 33, 45, 46, definition of, 64, 171n. 6 47, 51, 53, 54, 55, 59–60, 63, 140, and stereotypes, 142–43, 171n. 7 165n. 2, 165–66n. 1, 166n. 4, 167n. immigrants (generally), 140-41 2, 168nn. 3, 6, 170n. 3 (chap. 5) impartiality ideal of, 8, 12, 16, 22, 42, 60, 147, 148 gender stereotypes (in general), 143–45 Gersh, B., 40, 84 judicial, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 22, 25–26, 27, Gifford, D., 170n. 23 Goetz, C., 48-50, 51, 62, 153 33, 36, 49, 60, 67, 71, 76, 132, 133, Golin, E., 167n. 3 148, 149, 152, 154, 163 Good, C. B., 41, 84 veil of judicial, 3

impotence, xi, 71, 128 inadmissible evidence, 92	legislators, 156, 157, 158, 159–63 Link, B., 171n. 5
interpreters, 65, 69, 72, 96, 102, 115, 149	listings of impairments, 27, 28, 31, 33, 60, 79, 140, 156
Jackson, C., 167n. 3	as biased, 42–43
Jackson, L. A., 91	literacy (in general), 142–43
Jackson, T., 158, 159	Llewellyn, K., 17
Jetten, J., 25	Lofgren, R., 41, 84
Johnson, J., 91	London, xi
judges as lawyers. See lawyers as	Los Angeles City Attorney's Office,
judges	158
judicial culture	Los Angeles District Attorney's Office,
organizational, 161	158
professional, 161	Lott, C., 134, 135
judicial independence, 3	Lubbers, J., 170n. 23
Justice and Diversity training, xii, 3,	
73, 168n. 12, 171n. 3	Macare, C. N., 25, 154
	Maldonado, M., 140
Kansas City, 63	Malow, R., 134, 135
Kennedy, D., 17, 21	Marwill, S. L., 41, 83
Kennedy, S., 4	Mashaw, J. L., 48–52, 53, 60, 62, 153,
King, G., 12, 140, 141	166n. 2, 167n. 4
Koch, C., 170n. 23	Masson, E. M., 167n. 3
Kollmann, G., 3	McCarthy, E. P., 41, 83
Kozol, J., 142, 143	Medical Experts (MEs), 29, 30, 35, 36,
Krauskopf, J., 20	57, 58, 69, 70, 88
Kuehl, S., 158	Medical-vocational Guidelines. See 'Grid'
Lahey, K. A., 20	Melton, G., 171n. 5
Langdell, C., 15	mental illness (in general), 137–39,
law	171n. 5
as neutral, 20, 26	mental retardation, 28
as relational, 19	metaphysics of law, 18
as science, 16, 17, 19	Miller, C., 139
as violence, 19, 20	Milne, A. B., 25
lawyers as judges, 9	Minow, M., xii, 13, 18, 22, 23
Lee, P. E., 167n. 3	Mirotznik, J., 171n. 5
legal education (generally), 16, 17,	Mirvis, D. M., 41, 83
19–20, 21, 26, 154, 159, 162	modernist, 6, 163
and faculty of color, 20, 21	'moral judgment,' 50, 51
and impartiality, 17	Moskowitz, M. A., 41, 83
and students of color, 20, 21	multiple chemical sensitivities, 42–
and women, 19–20	43
legal realists, 6, 16–17, 26, 156	
Legal Services/Legal Aid, 34, 74, 102,	Naffine, N., 18
106	Nagi, S., 43–44, 47, 60, 171n. 5
	<u> </u>

National Center for Education Statistics, 143, 171n. 7  National Organization of Social Security Claimants' Representatives (NOSSCR), xiii, 3, 33, 36, 43, 166nn. 3, 4, 167n. 1 (chap. 3)  National Science Foundation, xii  Nazi Germany, xi  Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force, 41–42, 54–55, 61, 68, 171n. 8  obesity (in general), 139–40  Obiora, L. A., 19  objective medical evidence, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 35, 52–53, 68  objectivity, 3, 9–10, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 26, 30, 37, 40, 43, 47, 52–53  Oetjen, J., 139  Office of Chief Administrative Law Judge, 4  Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA), 1, 12, 34, 60, 69, 109, 170n. 3, 171n. 3  opening statements (in general), 68	prescribed treatment, 5, 58, 67–68, 86–88, 100, 117, 150 privilege, 156–57, 160 'professional treatment,' 50–51 psychoanalysis, 9, 155, 156, 157, 163 psychoanalysts. See therapists  race bias in medical profession. See physicians, as biased racism. See Administrative Law Judges, and race; Administrative Law Judges, and racial and ethnic minorities; bias Redman, S., 41, 83–84 Reinharz, S., xii representation (generally), 34 residual functional capacity, 30, 32 Resnik, J., 23 Reviewing Judges (RJs), 55–59, 170n. 1 (chap. 5) right to representation, 5, 34, 56, 58, 62, 67, 68, 74–76, 101–14, 131, 132, 149, 152, 153, 168n. 9, 170n. 1 (chap. 5) Rothblum, E., 139
Packer, M., 40, 84 Padilla, A., 140 passion. <i>See</i> affectivity Patel, M., 167n. 3 Pear, R., 3, 152, 165n. 1 (intro.), 166n. 5 Peller, G., 18 Pena, J., 134, 135 Philadelphia, 63 physicians as biased, 5, 39, 40–42, 83 in disability decision-making process, 29, 50 treating, 29, 57, 60, 67, 68, 81–86, 88, 89, 107, 138, 145–46, 150, 152, 168 Pierce, R., 170n. 23 Porath, S., 167n. 3 postmodernism, 20, 155, 163 prejudice. <i>See</i> bias	Saldena, D., 140 San Francisco, 4, 54, 63, 171n. 3 San Quentin, 98 Sanson-Fisher, R., 41, 84 Scales, A., 18, 19 Schoultz, C. O., 171n. 7 Sekaquaptewa, D., 23, 79 sexism. See Administrative Law Judges, and gender; Administrative Law Judges, and women; bias sexual abuse, xi Schaffner, J. E., 167n. 3 Scheck, A. C., 41, 83 Schwartz, W., 48–50, 51, 62, 153 sequential evaluation process. See five- step sequential evaluation process Shwartz, J., 41, 83 Simpson, M., 41, 83 Singer, J., 16, 17 slavery, 21

Smart, D., 140 Smith, M., 41, 83 Snow, J. T., 139 social problems as disability, 138–39 social psychology, 7, 9, 14, 15, 23, 81, 92, 153, 156 Social Security. See Disability Insurance; Social Security Administration; Supplemental Security Income Social Security Administration (SSA) (generally), 2, 3, 12, 34, 46, 50, 55–60, 61, 66, 67, 68, 69, 76, 82, 89, 140, 154, 165n. 1, 166n. 3, 167n. 5, 168n. 7, 170nn. 1, 3 (chap. 5), 171n. 1 and bankruptcy, 3 and Disability Hearings Quality Review Process (DHQRP), 55–60, 61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5), 171nn. 1, 2 and Disability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Porgram and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47 Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Stunkard, A., 139 suicidal, xi superbureau, '51 Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 2, 34, 46, 50, 970, 72–73 Supreme Court, U.S., 12 Taibi, A., 33, 77 testimony (generally), 68 throw the methodology, 4, 8–9 and origin and history of cases, 62 Stunkard, A., 139 suicidal, xi superbureau, '51 Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 2, 34, 46, 50, 90, 70, 72–73 Supreme Court, U.S., 12 Thomas, T., 140 Thompson, E., 14, 81 tokenism, 21 Tolchin, M., 3, 152 training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81  UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Roberto, 164 and characteristics of claimants and judges, 64–66, 48n. 2 and methodology, 4, 8–9 and origin and history of cases, 62 Stunkard, A., 139 suicidal, xi superbureau, '51 Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supre	Smart, A., 140	156. See also Administrative Law
Snow, J. T., 139 social problems as disability, 138–39 social psychology, 7, 9, 14, 15, 23, 81, 92, 153, 156  Social Security. See Disability Insurance; Social Security Administration; Supplemental Security Income  Social Security Administration (SSA) (generally), 2, 3, 12, 34, 46, 50, 55–60, 61, 66, 67, 68, 69, 76, 82, 89, 140, 154, 165n. 1, 166n. 3, 167n. 5, 168n. 7, 170nn. 1, 3 (chap. 5), 171n. 1 and bankruptcy, 3 and Disability Hearings Quality Review Process (DHQRP), 55–60, 61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5), 171nn. 1, 2 and Disability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47  Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22  Steingart, R., 40, 84  Study design (generally), 62–69 and boundaries, 63–64 and boundaries, 63–64 and boundaries, 63–64 and deharacteristics of claimants and judges, 64–66, 168n. 2 and methodology, 4, 8–9 and origin and history of cases, 62 Stunkard, A., 139 suicidal, xi 'superbureau,' 51 Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supreme Court, U.S., 12  Taibi, A., 33, 77 testimody (generally), 68 therapists, 9, 155, 157, 162 Thomas, T., 140 Thompson, E., 14, 81 tokenism, 21 Tolchin, M., 3, 152 tranining, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81  UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153  U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. Hou		Judges, and stereotyping; bias
social problems as disability, 138–39 social psychology, 7, 9, 14, 15, 23, 81, 92, 153, 156  Social Security. See Disability Insurance; Social Security Administration; Supplemental Security Income  Social Security Administration (SSA) (generally), 2, 3, 12, 34, 46, 50, 55–60, 61, 66, 67, 68, 69, 76, 82, 89, 140, 154, 165n. 1, 166n. 3, 167n. 5, 168n. 7, 170nn. 1, 3 (chap. 5), 171n. 1 and bankruptcy, 3 and Disability Hearings Quality Review Process (DHQRP), 55–60, 61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5), 171nn. 1, 2 and Disability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47  Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  and characteristics of claimants and judges, 64–66, 168n. 2 and methodology, 4, 8–9 and origin and history of cases, 62 Stunkard, A., 139 suicidal, xi 'superbureau,' 51 Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supreme Court, U.S., 12  Taibi, A., 33, 77 testimony (generally), 68 therapists, 9, 155, 157, 162 Thomas, T., 140 Thompson, E., 14, 81 tokenism, 21 Tolchin, M., 3, 152 training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81 UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth C	Smith, M., 41, 83	Stone, D., xii, 52–53, 60, 68, 89
social psychology, 7, 9, 14, 15, 23, 81, 92, 153, 156  Social Security. See Disability Insurance; Social Security Administration; Supplemental Security Income  Social Security Administration (SSA) (generally), 2, 3, 12, 34, 46, 50, 55–60, 61, 66, 67, 68, 69, 76, 82, 89, 140, 154, 165n. 1, 166n. 3, 167n. 5, 168n. 7, 170nn. 1, 3 (chap. 5), 171n. 1 and bankruptcy, 3 and Disability Hearings Quality Review Process (DHQRP), 55–60, 61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5), 171nn. 1, 2 and Disability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  and characteristics of claimants and judges, 64–66, 168n. 2 and methodology, 4, 8–9 and origin and history of cases, 62 Stunkard, A., 139 suicidal, xi 'superbureau,' 51 Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supreme Court, U.S., 12  Taibi, A., 33, 77 testimony (generally), 68 therapists, 9, 155, 157, 162 Thomas, T., 140 Thompson, E., 14, 81 tokenism, 21 Tolchin, M., 3, 152 training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81 UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force	Snow, J. T., 139	Study design (generally), 62–69
92, 153, 156  Social Security. See Disability Insurance; Social Security Administration; Supplemental Security Income  Social Security Administration (SSA) (generally), 2, 3, 12, 34, 46, 50, 55–60, 61, 66, 67, 68, 69, 76, 82, 89, 140, 154, 165n. 1, 166n. 3, 167n. 5, 168n. 7, 170nn. 1, 3 (chap. 5), 171n. 1 and bankruptcy, 3 and Disability Hearings Quality Review Process (DHQRP), 55–60, 61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5), 171nn. 1, 2 and Disability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47  Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  Judges, 64–66, 168n. 2 and methodology, 4, 8–9 and origin and history of cases, 62 Stunkard, A., 139 suicidal, xi 'superbureau,' 51 Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supplemental Security Income (SII), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supplemental Security Income (SII), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supplemental Security Income (SII), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supplemental Security Income (SII), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supplemental Security Income (SII), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supplemental Security Income (SII), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supplemental Security Supplemental Security Income (SII), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Suppl	social problems as disability, 138–39	and boundaries, 63-64
Social Security. See Disability Insurance; Social Security Administration; Supplemental Security Income  Social Security Administration (SSA) (generally), 2, 3, 12, 34, 46, 50, 55–60, 61, 66, 67, 68, 69, 76, 82, 89, 140, 154, 165n. 1, 166n. 3, 167n. 5, 168n. 7, 170nn. 1, 3 (chap. 5), 171n. 1 and bankruptcy, 3 and Disability Hearings Quality Review Process (DHQRP), 55–60, 61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5), 171nn. 1, 2 and Disability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Porgram and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47  Social Security Administration (SSA) (generally), 2, 3, 12, 34, 46, 54, 50, 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22  Steingart, R., 40, 84  and methodology, 4, 8–9 and origin and history of cases, 62  Stunkard, A., 139 suicidal, xi  'superbureau,' 51  Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73  Supreme Court, U.S., 12  Taibi, A., 33, 77  testimony (generally), 68 therapists, 9, 155, 157, 162  Thomas, T., 140  Thompson, E., 14, 81  tokenism, 21  Tolchin, M., 3, 152  training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63  Trope, Y., 14, 81  UCLA, 158  US ed, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163  Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139  Unger, Roberto, 17  uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153  US. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force  U.S. House, 2, 33, 36  U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4	social psychology, 7, 9, 14, 15, 23, 81,	and characteristics of claimants and
ance; Social Security Administration; Supplemental Security Income  Social Security Administration (SSA)  (generally), 2, 3, 12, 34, 46, 50, 55–60, 61, 66, 67, 68, 69, 76, 82, 89, 140, 154, 165n. 1, 166n. 3, 167n. 5, 168n. 7, 170nn. 1, 3 (chap. 5), 171n. 1 and bankruptcy, 3 and Disability Hearings Quality Review Process (DHQRP), 55–60, 61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5), 171nn. 1, 2 and Disability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Porgam and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47 Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  and origin and history of cases, 62 Stunkard, A., 139 suucidal, xi Stuperbureau,' 51 Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supreme Court, U.S., 12 Taibi, A., 33, 77 testimony (generally), 68 therapists, 9, 155, 157, 162 Thomas, T., 140 Thompson, E., 14, 81 tokenism, 21 Tolchin, M., 3, 152 training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81  UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4	92, 153, 156	judges, 64–66, 168n. 2
tion; Supplemental Security Income  Social Security Administration (SSA)   (generally), 2, 3, 12, 34, 46, 50,   55-60, 61, 66, 67, 68, 69, 76, 82,   89, 140, 154, 165n. 1, 166n. 3,   167n. 5, 168n. 7, 170nn. 1, 3   (chap. 5), 171n. 1   and bankruptcy, 3   and Disability Hearings Quality   Review Process (DHQRP), 55-60,   61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5),   171nn. 1, 2   and Disability Redesign Plan (see   Social Security Administration,   and Reengineering Plan)   and Office of Policy, 4   and Office of Policy, 4   and Office of Porgram and Integrity   Reviews, 56-60   and procedure for appeal, 4, 27,   32–37   and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60,   165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2   and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47  Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3   and numbers of applicants, 2   initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48   success at appeal, 32–33, 36   social workers, 155   stand in the shoes, 157   Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12   Spelman, E., 22   Steingart, R., 40, 84  Stunkard, A., 139   suicidal, xi   'superbureau, '51   Supplemental Security Income (SSI),   2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73   Supreme Court, U.S., 12  Taibi, A., 33, 77   testimony (generally), 68   therapists, 9, 155, 157, 162   Thomas, T., 140   Thomas, T., 140   Thompson, E., 14, 81   tokenism, 21   Tolchin, M., 3, 152   training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147,   159–63   Trope, Y., 14, 81  UCLA, 158   Udell, D., 167n. 3   unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16,   24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155,   156, 157, 161, 162, 163   Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139   Unger, Roberto, 17   uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47,   62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132,   153   U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit).   See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias   Task Force   U.S. House, 2, 33, 36   U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4    Vargas, P., 23, 79   Verkuil, P., 48–50, 51, 62, 153,	Social Security. See Disability Insur-	and methodology, 4, 8–9
Social Security Administration (SSA)	•	
Social Security Administration (SSA)	tion; Supplemental Security	
(generally), 2, 3, 12, 34, 46, 50, 55–60, 61, 66, 67, 68, 69, 76, 82, 89, 140, 154, 165n. 1, 166n. 3, 167n. 5, 168n. 7, 170nn. 1, 3 (chap. 5), 171n. 1 and bankruptcy, 3 and Disability Hearings Quality Review Process (DHQRP), 55–60, 61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5), 171nn. 1, 2 and bisability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47 Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84 Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 2, 34, 46, 54, 69, 70, 72–73 Supreme Court, U.S., 12 Taibi, A., 33, 77 testimony (generally), 68 therapists, 9, 155, 157, 162 Thomas, T., 140 Thompson, E., 14, 81 tokenism, 21 Tolchin, M., 3, 152 training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81 UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		
55–60, 61, 66, 67, 68, 69, 76, 82, 89, 140, 154, 165n. 1, 166n. 3, 167n. 5, 168n. 7, 170nn. 1, 3 (chap. 5), 171n. 1 and bankruptcy, 3 and Disability Hearings Quality Review Process (DHQRP), 55–60, 61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5), 171nn. 1, 2 and Disability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47  Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36  Supreme Court, U.S., 12  Taibi, A., 33, 77 testimony (generally), 68 therapists, 9, 155, 157, 162 Thomas, T., 140 Thompson, E., 14, 81 tokenism, 21 Tolchin, M., 3, 152 training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81  UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4  Vargas, P., 23, 79 Verkuil, P., 48–50, 51, 62, 153,		•
89, 140, 154, 165n. 1, 166n. 3, 167n. 5, 168n. 7, 170nn. 1, 3 (chap. 5), 171n. 1 and bankruptcy, 3 and Disability Hearings Quality Review Process (DHQRP), 55–60, 61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5), 171nn. 1, 2 and Disability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47 Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 Social workers, 155 Stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84 Supreme Court, U.S., 12  Supreme Court, U.S., 12  Taibi, A., 33, 77 testimony (generally), 68 therapists, 9, 155, 157, 162  Thomas, T., 140 Thompson, E., 14, 81 tokenism, 21 Tolchin, M., 3, 152 training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81  UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		
167n. 5, 168n. 7, 170nn. 1, 3 (chap. 5), 171n. 1 and bankruptcy, 3 and Disability Hearings Quality Review Process (DHQRP), 55–60, 61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5), 171nn. 1, 2 and Disability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47 Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  Taibi, A., 33, 77 testimony (generally), 68 therapists, 9, 155, 157, 162 Thomas, T., 140 Thompson, E., 14, 81 tokenism, 21 Tolchin, M., 3, 152 training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81  UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		
(chap. 5), 171n. 1 and bankruptcy, 3 and Disability Hearings Quality Review Process (DHQRP), 55–60, 61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5), 171nn. 1, 2 and Disability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47 Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  Taibi, A., 33, 77 testimony (generally), 68 therapists, 9, 155, 157, 162 Thomas, T., 140 Thompson, E., 14, 81 tokenism, 21 Tolchin, M., 3, 152 training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81 UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		Supreme Court, U.S., 12
and bankruptcy, 3 and Disability Hearings Quality Review Process (DHQRP), 55–60, 61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5), 171nn. 1, 2 and Disability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47 Social Security disability claims (generally), 68 therapists, 9, 155, 157, 162 Thomas, T., 140 Thompson, E., 14, 81 tokenism, 21 Tolchin, M., 3, 152 training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81 UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4 Vargas, P., 23, 79 Verkuil, P., 48–50, 51, 62, 153,		T ''
and Disability Hearings Quality Review Process (DHQRP), 55–60, 61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5), 171nn. 1, 2 and Disability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47 Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  therapists, 9, 155, 157, 162 Thomas, T., 140 Thompson, E., 14, 81 tokenism, 21 Tolchin, M., 3, 152 training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81  UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		
Review Process (DHQRP), 55–60, 61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5), 171nn. 1, 2 and Disability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84 Tokenism, 21 Tolchin, M., 3, 152 training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81 UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		
61, 153, 170n. 1 (chap. 5), 171nn. 1, 2  and Disability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan)  and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47  Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  Thompson, E., 14, 81 tokenism, 21 Tolchin, M., 3, 152 training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81  UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		
tokenism, 21  and Disability Redesign Plan (see Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan)  and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47  Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  tokenism, 21 Tolchin, M., 3, 152 training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81  UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		
and Disability Redesign Plan ( <i>see</i> Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47 Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  Tolchin, M., 3, 152 training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81  UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		
Social Security Administration, and Reengineering Plan)  and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47  Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  training, xii, 3, 8, 10, 25, 78, 147, 159–63 Trope, Y., 14, 81  UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		
and Reengineering Plan) and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47  Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  Integrity  LUCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		
and Office of Policy, 4 and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47  Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  Trope, Y., 14, 81  UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		
and Office of Program and Integrity Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47 Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		
Reviews, 56–60 and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47  Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  UCLA, 158 Udell, D., 167n. 3 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		Порс, 1., 14, 61
and procedure for appeal, 4, 27, 32–37 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47 Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force u.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4 Vargas, P., 23, 79 Verkuil, P., 48–50, 51, 62, 153,		UCLA 158
32–37 and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47  Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  unconscious, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 24–25, 26, 92, 100, 133, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		
and Reengineering Plan, 33, 36, 60, 165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47 Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84 24 156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4 Vargas, P., 23, 79 Verkuil, P., 48–50, 51, 62, 153,		
165n. 1 (chap. 2), 166n. 2 and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47  Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  156, 157, 161, 162, 163 Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		
and response to disparities in decision making, 45, 46, 47  Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  Unger, Rhoda, 41, 83, 139 Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4		
sion making, 45, 46, 47  Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  Unger, Roberto, 17 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4  Vargas, P., 23, 79 Verkuil, P., 48–50, 51, 62, 153,		
Social Security disability claims (generally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84 uniformity, 27, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4 Vargas, P., 23, 79 Verkuil, P., 48–50, 51, 62, 153,		
ally), 2–3 and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  62, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 100, 132, 153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4 Vargas, P., 23, 79 Verkuil, P., 48–50, 51, 62, 153,		
and numbers of applicants, 2 initial and reconsideration stages, 43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Steingart, R., 40, 84  153 U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit). See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4 Vargas, P., 23, 79 Verkuil, P., 48–50, 51, 62, 153,		
43–48 success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Vargas, P., 23, 79 Steingart, R., 40, 84  See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4 Vargas, P., 23, 79 Verkuil, P., 48–50, 51, 62, 153,	and numbers of applicants, 2	
success at appeal, 32–33, 36 social workers, 155 stand in the shoes, 157 Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22 Vargas, P., 23, 79 Steingart, R., 40, 84  Task Force U.S. House, 2, 33, 36 U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4  Vargas, P., 23, 79 Verkuil, P., 48–50, 51, 62, 153,	initial and reconsideration stages,	U.S. Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit).
social workers, 155	43–48	See Ninth Circuit Gender Bias
stand in the shoes, 157  Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12  Spelman, E., 22  Steingart, R., 40, 84  U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4  Vargas, P., 23, 79  Verkuil, P., 48–50, 51, 62, 153,	success at appeal, 32–33, 36	Task Force
Skoler, D., 55, 59, 168n. 12 Spelman, E., 22	social workers, 155	U.S. House, 2, 33, 36
Spelman, E., 22       Vargas, P., 23, 79         Steingart, R., 40, 84       Verkuil, P., 48–50, 51, 62, 153,		U.S. Senate, 46, 72, 166n. 4
Steingart, R., 40, 84 Verkuil, P., 48–50, 51, 62, 153,		
stereotyping, studies in, 14, 81, 153–54, 170n. 23		
	stereotyping, studies in, 14, 81, 153–54,	170n. 23

veteran, 84, 170n. 23 Vietnam, 84, 170n. 22 Vocational Experts (VEs), 35, 36, 50, 57, 58, 69, 70, 88, 102, 110–11, 144 vocational rehabilitation, 50 von Hippel, W., 23, 79

Wadden, T., 139 Webb, F., 41, 84 West, J., 134, 135 Whitestone, E., 91 Whittle, J., 41, 83 Williams, P., 21
Wills, D., 158, 159
work, definition of, 31
workers' compensation
CEs (see Consultative
Examiners/Evaluators)
and stereotypes, 145–47
welfare benefits and stereotypes,
145–47

Zelenske, E., 167n. 3 Zipursky, B., 22