David R. Williams

Florence and Laura Norman Professor of Public Health, Professor of African & African American Studies and of Sociology, Harvard University

David R. Williams, Ph.D., M.P.H., is the Florence and Laura Norman Professor of Public Health and Professor of African & African American Studies and of Sociology at Harvard University. His prior academic appointments were at the University of Michigan and Yale University. He is an internationally recognized authority on social influences on health and has special expertise in socioeconomic and racial disparities in health, the effects of racism on health, and the ways in which religious involvement can affect health. He is the author of more than 300 scientific papers and was ranked as the Most Cited Black Scholar in the Social Sciences in 2008 by the *Journal of Black Issues in Higher Education*. He is an elected member of the Institute of Medicine and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Pathways to Promote Racial Healing and Equity in the American South: Opportunities for Community Philanthropy

This article will outline some of the critically important ways in which community philanthropy can promote racial healing in the American South and beyond. However, in order to identify the leverage points for intervention, we need to be clear about the complex nature of contemporary racism in the United States. Accordingly, the article highlights salient aspects of the current racial terrain before offering recommendations for moving forward.

In order to comply with Article 1, Section 2, and Paragraph 3 of the U.S. Constitution, the very first American Census in 1790 enumerated whites and only those Indians who paid taxes, with blacks enumerated as three-fifths of a person. Although this "three-fifths rule," as it came to be called, reflected a compromise between the North and the South in terms of the appropriate basis for taxation and political representation, it nonetheless captured the actual status of persons of African descent in the United States. As a social category, race has reflected differential access to status, power, and desirable resources in our society. For much of the history of the United States, African Americans (or blacks), American Indians, and many immigrant populations have—either by law or custom— received inferior treatment in major societal institutions.

Race in the United States: Progress and Challenges

At the same time, there have been important changes in the status of disadvantaged racial populations in the United States. In 2012, Barack Obama is the president of the United States and Sonia Sotomayor, a Hispanic female, is a Supreme Court justice. The racial attitudes of whites also have changed in vital ways, and new legislation prohibits discrimination. For example, let us consider the domains of housing and employment. In 1963, 60 percent of whites agreed with the statement that "White people have a right to keep Negroes out of their neighborhoods if they want to, and Negroes should respect that right." By 1996, only 13 percent of whites supported a similar statement, documenting a substantial shift within the white population in the endorsement of the principle of equal opportunity in terms of housing (Schuman, et al., 1997). In addition to changes in attitudes, the Fair Housing Act of 1968 (Title VIII) made it illegal to refuse to sell or rent to—or to otherwise make unavailable or deny a dwelling to—any person because of race.

A similar change is evident if we examine racial attitudes about equality in employment. In 1944, a majority of whites (55 percent) indicated that white people should have the first chance at any kind of job. By 1972, only 3 percent of whites agreed with that statement; 97 percent of whites indicated that blacks should have the same opportunity as white people to get any kind of job (Schuman, et al., 1997). Again, changing attitudes and federal law were at work: The Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VII) also prohibited an employer from firing, refusing to hire or promote, or in any way limiting an employee's compensation or job conditions because of his or her race.

The Principle-Implementation Gap

Despite overwhelming support for the principle of equality, there is less support for policies that would actually implement equal access to housing and employment. In 1973, 67 percent of a national sample of whites indicated that they would support a law that would guarantee a homeowner a right to decide to whom to sell his house—even if he preferred not to sell to blacks. By 1996, 33 percent of whites would still grant a homeowner that right. Similarly, in 1964, 38 percent of whites indicated that the federal government should ensure that black people get fair treatment in jobs, and 13 percent indicated that they lacked enough interest in the question to favor one side over another. By 1996, the percentage of whites supporting federal intervention to ensure fair treatment in jobs declined to 28 percent, while the percentage expressing no interest in the question increased to 36 percent (Schuman, et al., 1997). Thus, although there has been increasing support over time for the principle of equality and for laws that seek to implement equality in housing and employment, there is greater support for the principle of equality than for legislation upholding its implementation.

> Despite overwhelming support for the principle of equality, there is less support for policies that would actually implement equal access to housing and employment.
> In 1973, 67 percent of a national sample of whites indicated that they would support a law that would guarantee a homeowner a right to decide to whom to sell his house—even if he preferred not to sell to blacks. By 1996, 33 percent of whites would still grant a homeowner that right.

Discrimination Persists

Despite the positive changes in racial attitudes, overwhelming evidence demonstrates the persistence of discrimination in contemporary America. In 2001, sociologist Devah Pager sent pairs of young, well-groomed, well-spoken college men with identical resumes to apply for 350 advertised entry-level jobs in Milwaukee, Wisconsin (Pager, 2003). Two of the males were black and two were white. In each team, one man said that he had served an 18-month prison sentence for cocaine possession. For both blacks and whites, a criminal record led to fewer callbacks for a job (17 percent versus 34 percent for whites and 5 percent versus 14 percent for blacks). Stunningly, the study found that it was easier for a white male with a felony conviction to get a callback for a job than a black male whose record was clean. When this study was replicated in New York City in 2004, 17 percent of the applications from the white felons received a positive response, compared to 15 percent from the Hispanics with a clean record and 13 percent from the African Americans with a clean record (Pager, Western, and Bonikowski, 2009).

Another study conducted in 2001 and 2002 documented that African Americans can face discrimination in employment if their name is perceived to be black Researchers Marianne Bertrand and Sendhil Mullainathan (2004) studied the most common names that white parents gave their children and the most common names that black parents gave their children. They identified distinctively white names, such as Allison, Emily, Brad, and Greg, and distinctively black names, such as Latisha, Aisha, Jamal, and Darnell. They then mailed 5,000 fictitious applications to 1,300 ads for white-collar job openings in Boston and Chicago with black names and white names. There was no explicit identification of race in these applications. Bertrand and Mullainathan found that applicants with white first names received 50 percent more callbacks for interviews than identical resumes with black first names.

Discrimination Harms Health

Research has also documented that subjective experiences of discrimination are stressors that have direct negative consequences for health. In recent studies, discrimination contributes to a broad range of health problems, ranging from violence, sexual dysfunction, and poor sleep quality to increased abdominal fat, high hemoglobin A1c, coronary artery calcification, fibroids, breast cancer, high blood pressure, and mental health problems (Williams and Mohammed, 2009). Studies have also found that discrimination is adversely related to health care seeking and adherence behaviors, and to increased risk of using multiple substances, such as tobacco, alcohol, and illicit drugs.

A striking example of the negative effects of discrimination comes from a study of Arab Americans. After September 11, 2001, a well-documented increase in discrimination and harassment of Arab Americans was at a very intense level for six months. Diane Lauderdale (2006) found that Arab American women in California had an increased risk of having low birth weight babies and preterm births in the six months after September 11, compared to the six months before. Women of other racial and ethnic groups in California had no change in birth outcome risk during the same time period.

A 2003 report published by the prestigious Institute of Medicine summarized hundreds of studies that indicate that across virtually every therapeutic intervention, ranging from high technology procedures to the most basic forms of diagnostic and treatment interventions, minorities receive fewer procedures and poorer quality medical care than whites (Smedley, Stith, and Nelson, 2003). These differences persist even after differences in health insurance, socioeconomic status, stage and severity of disease, co-morbidity, and the type of medical facility are taken into account. Moreover, they exist in contexts such as patients with Medicare and among persons in the Veterans Health Administration, where differences in economic status and insurance coverage are minimized.

One example of bias in medical care is evident in research done by Dr. Knox Todd. As an emergency room physician at UCLA's emergency department (ED), he did a chart review of 139 patients with isolated long-bone fracture (a broken bone in the arm or leg) who had been treated in the ED. Todd found that 55 percent of Hispanic patients received no pain medication, compared to 26 percent of non-Hispanic whites (Todd, Samaroo, and Hoffman, 1993). As a good researcher, he considered other factors that could have caused this, including sex, primary language, insurance status, occupational injury, time of arrival at the ED, total time in the ED, and hospital admission. After examining all of these factors, a patient being Hispanic was the strongest predictor of receiving no pain medication. When Todd repeated the same study in Atlanta, he found that black patients

with a broken bone in the leg or arm were less likely to get pain medication than white patients (Todd, et al., 2000).

Making Sense of Contemporary Discrimination

How is it possible that highly trained medical professionals who go to work with good intentions can nevertheless produce a pattern of care that is riddled with discrimination? How can we explain discrimination in employment, housing, and other sectors of society? Research suggests that a phenomenon known as unconscious (or unthinking) discrimination based on negative stereotypes is likely to be a major contributor to this pattern (van Ryn, et al., 2011). This research indicates that negative stereotypes can be activated automatically (without intent) and without any awareness of their activation or of their impact on one's perceptions, emotions, and behavior. These stereotypes are typically activated more quickly and easily than conscious cognition, and these processes can occur even in persons who do not endorse racist beliefs. So although individuals may consciously and sincerely believe that they are not prejudiced, their automatically activated biases can lead to discriminatory behavior that they would personally oppose. Thus, one cannot rely on the stated racial attitudes of whites or the mere existence of laws prohibiting discrimination to ensure that discrimination does not occur.

Negative Stereotypes Persist

Considerable evidence indicates that high levels of negative stereotypes persist, which is an ominous indicator of the likelihood of discrimination in society. In 1990, the *General Social Survey,* a respected national social indicators study, asked several questions about racial stereotypes. It found that 29 percent of whites viewed blacks as unintelligent, 44 percent viewed them as lazy, 56 percent believed that blacks prefer to live off welfare, and 51 percent believed that blacks are prone to violence. Comparatively, 6 percent of whites viewed whites as unintelligent and 5 percent viewed them as lazy, and just 4 percent believed that whites prefer to live off welfare and only 16 percent believed that whites are prone to violence. These questions were asked on a seven-point scale from a positive to a negative stereotype, with 4 on the scale representing agreeing with neither side. Strikingly, very few whites endorsed positive stereotypes of African Americans. Only 20 percent of whites viewed blacks as intelligent, 17 percent viewed them as hard-working, 13 percent as preferring to be self-supporting, and 15 percent as not prone to violence. In contrast, 55 percent of whites viewed whites as intelligent and 55 percent viewed whites as hard-working (Davis and Smith, 1990; Williams, 2001).

These national data on stereotypes also indicated that whites tended to view blacks, Hispanics, and Asians more negatively than themselves. Blacks were

> How is it possible that highly trained medical professionals who go to work with good intentions can nevertheless produce a pattern of care that is riddled with discrimination? How can we explain discrimination in employment, housing, and other sectors of society? Research suggests that a phenomenon known as unconscious (or unthinking) discrimination based on negative stereotypes is likely to be a major contributor to this pattern.

viewed more negatively than other groups, however, and Hispanics were viewed twice as negatively as Asians. Jews were viewed more positively than whites in general and Southern whites were viewed more negatively than whites in general. These data were collected in 1990. Have these views changed over time? Data are available on two of the stereotypes since 1990. In 2006, 33 percent of whites agreed that blacks were lazy, down from 44 percent in 1990. However, the percentage of whites endorsing the view that blacks were hard-working changed from 17 percent in 1990 to 16 percent in 2006, indicating that there had been no increase in positive perceptions, only a higher proportion of whites sitting on the fence by endorsing the "neither" category. Some progress was evident on the intelligence stereotype, with whites endorsing the view that blacks were unintelligent declining from 29 percent in 1990 to 15 percent in 2006. Similarly, whites agreeing that blacks were intelligent increased from 20 percent in 1990 to 27 percent in 2006 (Smith, Marsden, and Hout, 2011).

A 2004 study by Maria Krysan, Reynolds Farley, and Mick Couper (2008) found that negative stereotypes play an important role in undergirding discrimination. As part of this study, white residents in the Detroit and Chicago areas viewed a 35-second video of five different neighborhood social class levels: 1) lower working class; 2) upper working class; 3) blemished middle class; 4) unblemished middle class; and 5) upper middle class. The neighborhoods had actors representing the residents. All of the actors were dressed similarly and doing exactly the same thing, but they were all white, all black, or a mix of white and black residents. The study found that whites in the study rated racially mixed and black neighborhoods more negatively on the cost of housing, safety, future property values, and the quality of schools. Whites who more frequently endorsed negative racial stereotypes about blacks rated neighborhoods with blacks more poorly. The study indicated that whites' perceptions of the desirability of these neighborhoods were based not on observable features; instead, their perceptions of neighborhood quality were shaped by negative racial stereotypes.

Thinking with our Hearts

Recent research underscores that our emotions play a much larger role in decision-making in general, and in inter-racial interactions and attitudes in particular, than we usually give them credit for. The absence of positive emotions toward racial minorities is a key contributor to beliefs and behavior with regards to race. Thomas Pettigrew has identified the absence of positive emotions as a powerful component of subtle prejudice (Pettigrew and Meertens, 1995). A study of Detroit-area whites by David Williams and colleagues (1999) found that the absence of positive emotions about blacks was the strongest predictor of opposition to affirmative action in employment and opposition to an active role of government in reducing racial inequalities. The lack of positive emotions was measured by two items that captured the absence of feelings of sympathy and admiration for blacks. Importantly, a low level of positive emotions about blacks was a stronger predictor of opposition to affirmative action and government than age, gender, income, education, individual and group self-interests, political party preference, beliefs about individualism, social dominance, conservatism, traditional prejudice, and modern prejudice.

Similarly, Pettigrew and Meertens found that across four countries in Europe, the absence of positive emotions was a strong predictor of opposition to policies regarding stigmatized immigrant groups. This measure of subtle contemporary prejudice was a stronger predictor than measures of traditional prejudice. A recent meta-analysis concluded that feelings are

a good covert indicator of prejudice and a predictor of discriminatory behavior (Talaska, Fiske, and Chaiken, 2008). They found that emotional prejudices toward minority groups are more closely related to actual discriminatory behavior than are beliefs and stereotypes. Thus, an individual's emotions regarding a stigmatized group are one of the strongest predictors of their actual behavior toward that group.

Racism in Culture

Negative racial stereotypes do not come out of a vacuum, but rather are deeply embedded in the culture of American society. A study by Weisbuch, Pauker, and Ambady (2009) documents how deeply embedded racism is in our culture and how profoundly we are affected by it. Because racial biases are often communicated subtly via facial expressions and body language, they studied the characters in 11 popular television shows. The study found that characters on these shows exhibited more negative nonverbal behavior (facial expressions and body language) toward black characters than toward status-matched white characters. The study found that exposure to nonverbal bias increased viewers' bias—even though patterns of nonverbal behavior could not be consciously reported. Thus, hidden bias in televised nonverbal behavior accounts, in part, for white viewers' own bias.

Similarly, a study by Phillip Goff and colleagues (2008) found that despite widespread opposition to racism, a dehumanizing bias that associates blacks with apes persists. In this study, black or white male faces were subliminally flashed on a screen for a fraction of a second to "prime" the student participants. Researchers found that subjects could identify blurry ape drawings much faster after they were primed with black faces than with white faces. Furthermore, subjects' ability to identify apes was facilitated by black male faces but inhibited by white male faces. In a second study detailed in the same scientific article, the researchers show that this dehumanization matters. An examination of the media coverage of 153 defendants convicted of capital crime in Pennsylvania between 1979 and 1999 found that newspaper stories described black convicts (8.3 mentions) with more ape-like words than white convicts (2.2 mentions). Apelike words used in the articles included: animal, barbaric, beast, brute, clan, crouch, hairy, howl, hunt, jungle, monster, pounce, predator, prowl, and savage. Moreover, blacks implicitly portrayed as more apelike were more likely to be executed (12.7 mentions) than those whose lives were spared (6.2 mentions). There was also a similar trend for whites. These relationships remained after statistical adjustment for number of articles, defendant socioeconomic status, victim socioeconomic status, crime severity, aggravating circumstances, and mitigating circumstances.

Opportunities for Community Philanthropy

There is clearly a need for concerted efforts to confront and eliminate racial prejudice, stereotypes, and discrimination in all areas of society. That is, effectively addressing prejudice and discrimination will require concerted efforts by multiple sectors of society to address larger racial healing in major societal institutions. Community philanthropy can be a leader, initiator, convener, and catalyst for this change. Several priorities are outlined below.

Raise Awareness Levels

First, community philanthropy needs to play a leadership role in raising awareness levels of the deeply embedded, subtle forms of prejudice that are pervasive and unrecognized. Currently, we don't even know we have a problem. Visitors to the Museum of Tolerance in Los Angeles

are presented with two doors. One of the doors is labeled "prejudiced." The other door is marked "unprejudiced." If a visitor tries to enter the door marked "unprejudiced," the visitor finds that the door is locked and it is not possible to enter the museum through that door. The following message is then projected on the "unprejudiced" door: THINK… NOW USE THE OTHER DOOR. This reflects the museum's attempt to communicate in dramatic fashion that we are all prejudiced to a greater degree than we normally acknowledge. We have all been affected by the culture in which we were raised, and to some degree, we have been affected by the larger stereotypes of our culture.

One of the failures of much of our approach to prejudice and discrimination currently is that we tend to focus on discriminatory intent. Given that the vast majority of white Americans favor non-discrimination in principle, it is often difficult to identify discriminatory intent. Therefore, racism appears to be commonplace in society, but few individuals believe that they engage in discriminatory behavior. Much contemporary discrimination may be due to careless and negligent behavior, rather than deliberately hateful behavior. Community philanthropy should lead to place this issue on the national agenda and should call on other leaders in society to use the "bully pulpit" to focus on racism. President Clinton explicitly called attention to the problem of racism and in June 1997, he established "One America in the 21st Century: The President's Initiative on Race."

Intensive and systematic educational campaigns about the nature of contemporary prejudice and discrimination are needed. The awareness levels of the public and the professional community must be raised. Although information alone has its limits, educational campaigns can accomplish much. For example, Ken Warner shows that in the case of tobacco, per capita consumption in the United States has declined over the course of the past century whenever there was a major media campaign on the negative effects of cigarette smoking (2000). We must raise public awareness to ensure the needed sensitivity toward these issues exists and to secure a new commitment to addressing the lingering effects of racism.

Enable Individuals to Address Racism

Second, and relatedly, community philanthropy needs to create opportunities that enable well-intentioned individuals to respond to and confront instances of racially prejudiced beliefs and discriminatory behavior. A 2006 CNN poll found that large pluralities of American adults think that racism is a serious problem in the United States (66 percent of whites and 84 percent of blacks), with half of blacks and a quarter of whites saying that they had personally been a victim of racial discrimination. Although very few people (12 percent of blacks and 13 percent of whites) believe that they have racial biases, more than four out of ten (43 percent) blacks and 48 percent of whites indicate that they personally know someone who they believe is racist. Given the familiarity of American adults with racism (presumably racism of the traditional type), individuals can have enormous potential to respond to and address racism that emerges in their daily lives. Much of this potential likely remains unrealized because individuals may lack the skills and/or motivation to confront racism in an effective, but non-threatening, manner.

A study by Kawakami and colleagues (2009) suggests that confronting racism may be an exceeding difficult challenge. It documented that in striking contrast to how people think that they would act, when actually faced with real instances of racism, most individuals do not confront racists or become upset by racist behavior. In this experiment, researchers

divided 120 non-black students into three groups. One group watched a video of a racist incident—in which a black actor slightly bumps into a white actor's knee while leaving the room—while another read about it. The white actor responds with one of three scenarios, saying either, "Typical, I hate it when black people do that," or "Clumsy N-----," or nothing. The students were then asked to choose one of the two actors for a teamwork assignment. These two groups of students were upset by the racist behavior: 75 percent who read about the incident and 83 percent who watched the video of the incident said they would choose the black actor for the assignment.

The third group of students was placed in a room with a black actor and a white actor and actually witnessed the incident. Their reactions were completely different: *none* of them were upset by it, *none* of them intervened to correct or disparage the white actor for his remarks, and 71 percent chose the white actor as their partner for the assignment. That is, the people who witnessed the event in person were less offended than those who watched or read about it. Failing to feel outrage, they appeared to rationalize the racist comment as acceptable. Importantly, the study shows that how people think they would feel and act in response to a racial slur is drastically different from their actual reaction. When faced with actual racism, people's spontaneous feelings and behavior may reflect a latent bias toward blacks that prevents them from having a negative emotional reaction and confronting racist behavior.

Promote Interracial Contact

Third, community philanthropy needs to take a leadership role in creating a psychosocial environment that promotes interracial contact and creates the conditions and "safe contexts" where interracial contact will flourish. In the United States, interracial contact continues to be uncomfortable—and even stressful—for many (Richeson and Shelton, 2007). Too often for both whites and racial minorities, interracial contact is a source of stress. Whites are often worried about not appearing to be prejudiced, while minorities are frequently concerned about being a target of prejudice or discrimination, or about being viewed in a stereotypical manner. These concerns can produce anxiety for individuals from both groups. This discomfort highlights the need to promote interracial interactions early and often, whenever and wherever possible. Efforts should be made to create contexts where minorities feel that their group is valued, and where the focus for whites is not on avoiding the risk of appearing prejudiced but on developing friendships, learning across cultures, and creating a new dialogue that promotes better understanding.

Gordon Allport's classic volume, *The Nature of Prejudice,* describes his contact hypothesis, which argues that intergroup contact is an important strategy to reduce prejudice. He describes several key conditions that must be met for intergroup contact to be effective:

- First, the different groups must be equal in status
- Second, they must have a commitment to a common goal or goals
- Third, there must be cooperation among members of both groups to promote their shared goals, and
- Fourth, there must be support and encouragement from persons in positions of authority.

The conditions Allport outlines clearly suggest that simple contact is not enough. Some evidence suggests that intergroup contact that fails to meet these stringent criteria can

promote exceptionalist thinking: a group member sees their friend from the other group as different from the other members of his/her group, but retains the categorical negative beliefs about that individual's group. Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) recently reviewed studies that evaluated the contact theory of prejudice. They concluded that intergroup contact works to reduce prejudice based on race, as well as other prejudices, such as those based on ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, and mental illness.

Reduce Racism in the Larger Culture

Fourth, community philanthropy must play a leadership role in convening relevant stakeholders and experts to establish a coordinated and sustained mass media campaign to redefine race in American culture. A concerted effort to address discrimination requires efforts to change the larger cultural values and images that undergird it. As a society, we should make it a priority to address and eradicate racial prejudice that is deeply embedded in our culture. These prejudices give rise to racial inequalities that fly in the face of cherished American principles of equal treatment in society.

The media can influence our worldviews, normative expectations, attitudes, and stereotypes. The media can also affect our emotions and the degree of empathy we feel toward particular groups. Societal-wide reductions in prejudice, stereotypes, and discrimination will require large-scale adoption and implementation to alter deeply embedded cultural beliefs about race.

Deeply ingrained cultural ideas persist, such as the notions interpreting things that are light as good and positive and things that are dark as bad and negative. Taking an example of the role of skin tone and political behavior from recent history, photos of presidential candidate Barack Obama were digitally altered to be darker or lighter in skin tone. Undergraduate students were shown the altered and unaltered photos. Liberals were more likely to view the lightened photo of Obama as most representative. Conservatives were more likely to view the darkened photo as most representative. How this played out: viewing a lightened photo as more representative predicted both the student's intention to vote for Obama and an actual vote for him (even after the study was adjusted for political views and measures of prejudice). However, political affiliation did not affect digitally lightened or darkened photos of John McCain (Caruso, Mead, and Balcetis, 2009).

A study by Elizabeth Levy Paluck provided evidence that creative use of the media can reduce intergroup prejudice and conflict. The study evaluated the impact of a year-long field experiment in Rwanda: a radio soap opera employed humor, drama, popular proverbs, and traditional songs to influence listeners' beliefs about the roots and prevention of prejudice and violence. Compared to a control group who listened to a radio soap opera about health, the perceptions of social norms and behaviors for listeners in the intervention group changed with respect to intermarriage trust, open dissent, and empathy. Behavioral changes were observed that were consistent with increased willingness to speak up and dissent if appropriate, and to cooperate with each other. Interestingly, there was no change in personal beliefs about prejudice and violence. The magnitude of change, even though significant, was modest. For example, the likelihood of a person advising in-group marriage decreased from 50 percent to 40 percent (Paluck, 2009).

Research is needed to identify the most effective strategies to reduce negative stereotypes, racial prejudice, and discrimination in the general public and within

specific societal institutions. Current approaches to cultural sensitivity may not address the systemic problem of discrimination, but may instead enhance and accentuate negative stereotypes. Some cultural sensitivity training focuses on the distinctive behavioral patterns of subgroups in the population and, therefore, appears to focus primarily on the "strange" behavior of clients of a different background, which can lead to increased stereotyping. More research is also needed to identify the most effective strategies for raising awareness of, increasing sensitivity to, and effectively addressing unconscious discrimination.

As a society, we lack data on effective strategies to reduce racism at both the individual and institutional levels. While many books have been published on the topic and many programs address cultural diversity and tolerance, little systematic data is available about the conditions under which particular strategies are more or less effective. Given the growing body of evidence that indicates that racism adversely affects health in multiple ways, more systematic efforts to evaluate and assess the impact of various strategies to reduce racism are warranted. Strong incentives need to be put in place to encourage leaders to make improvements in tolerance central to their various organizational missions.

> Given the growing body of evidence that indicates that racism adversely affects health in multiple ways, more systematic efforts to evaluate and assess the impact of various strategies to reduce racism are warranted. Strong incentives need to be put in place to encourage leaders to make improvements in tolerance central to their various organizational missions.

Address Institutional Racism

Fifth, community philanthropy needs to take a leadership role in working with the public, private, and voluntary sectors to identify feasible and optimal strategies to create the political will and support to dismantle institutional racism. Residential segregation is an enduring institutional legacy of racism that has multiple effects that perpetuate racial inequality in society (Williams and Collins, 2001). Segregation restricts socioeconomic mobility by limiting access to quality elementary and high school education, preparation for higher education, and employment opportunities. Segregation is also associated with residence in poorer quality housing and in neighborhood environments that are deficient in a broad range of resources that enhance health and well-being, including medical care. The concentration of poverty in segregated environments can lead to exposure to elevated levels of chronic and acute stressors at the individual, household, and neighborhood level, including economic hardship and criminal victimization.

Concluding Thoughts

On the evening of Dr. Martin Luther King's assassination, Senator Robert Kennedy challenged the nation: "What we need in the United States is not division; what we need in the United States is not hatred; what we need in the United States is not violence and lawlessness, but is love, and wisdom, and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our country, whether they be white or whether they be black." Community philanthropy can work to make this dream come true!

References

Bertrand, Marianne, and Sendhil Mullainathan. "Are Emily and Greg More Employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination." *American Economic Review*, September 2004.

Caruso, Eugene M., Nicole L. Mead, and Emily Balcetis. "Political Partisanship Influences Perception of Biracial Candidates' Skin Tone." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, December 1, 2009.

Davis, James A. and Tom W. Smith. *General Social Surveys*, 1972-1990, NORC ed. National Opinion Research Center, 1990.

Goff, Phillip Atiba, Jennifer L. Eberhardt, Melissa J. Williams, and Matthew Christian Jackson. "Not Yet Human: Implicit Knowledge, Historical Dehumanization, and Contemporary Consequences." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, February 2008.

Kawakami, Kerry, Elizabeth Dunn, Francine Karmali, and John F. Dovidio. "Mispredicting Affective and Behavioral Responses to Racism." *Science,* January 2009.

Krysan, Maria, Reynolds Farley, and Mick P. Couper. "In the Eye of the Beholder: Racial Beliefs and Residential Segregation." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, March 2008.

Lauderdale, Diane S. "Birth Outcomes for Arabic-Named Women in California Before and After September 11." *Demography*, February 2006.

Pager, Devah. "The Mark of a Criminal Record." *American Journal of Sociology*, March 2003.

Pager, Devah, Bruce Western, and Bart Bonikowski. "Discrimination in a Low-Wage Labor Market: A Field Experiment." *American Sociological Review*, October 2009.

Paluck, Elizabeth Levy. "Reducing Intergroup Prejudice and Conflict Using the Media: A Field Experiment in Rwanda." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, March 2009.

Pettigrew, Thomas F., and Roel W. Meertens. "Subtle and Blatant Prejudice in Western Europe." European *Journal of Social Psychology*, January/February 1995.

Pettigrew, Thomas F., and Linda R. Tropp. "A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, May 2006.

Richeson, Jennifer A., and J. Nicole Shelton. "Negotiating Interracial Interactions: Costs, Consequences, and Possibilities." *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, December 2007.

Schuman, Howard, Charlotte Steeh, Lawrence Bobo, and Maria Krysan. *Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations*. Revised ed. Harvard University Press, 1997.

Smedley, Brian D., Adrienne Y. Stith, and Alan R. Nelson. *Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care*. National Academy Press, 2003.

Smith, Tom W., Peter V. Marsden, and Michael Hout. *General Social Survey*, 1972-2010. Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, 2011.

Talaska, Cara, Susan Fiske, and Shelly Chaiken. "Legitimating Racial Discrimination: Emotions, Not Beliefs, Best Predict Discrimination in a Meta-Analysis." *Social Justice Research*, September 2008.

Todd, Knox H., Christi Deaton, Anne P. D'Adamo, and Leon Goe. "Ethnicity and Analgesic Practice." *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, January 2000.

Todd, Knox H., Nigel Samaroo, and Jerome R. Hoffman. "Ethnicity as a Risk Factor for Inadequate Emergency Department Analgesia." *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, March 24, 1993.

van Ryn, Michelle, Diana J. Burgess, John F. Dovidio, Sean M. Phelan, Somnath Saha, Jennifer Malat, Joan M. Griffin, Steven S. Fu, and Sylvia Perry. "The Impact of Racism on Clinician Cognition, Behavior, and Clinical Decision Making." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, April 2011.

Warner, Kenneth E. "The Need for, and Value of, a Multi-Level Approach to Disease Prevention: The Case of Tobacco Control." *Promoting Health*. Eds. B. D. Smedley and S. L. Syme. National Academy Press, 2000.

Weisbuch, Max, Kristin Pauker, and Nalini Ambady. "The Subtle Transmission of Race Bias via Televised Nonverbal Behavior." *Science*, 18 December 2009.

Williams, David R. "Racial Variations in Adult Health Status: Patterns, Paradoxes and Prospects." *America Becoming: Racial Trends and Their Consequences*. Eds. N. J. Smelser, W. J. Wilson, and F. Mitchell. National Academy of Sciences Press, 2011.

Williams, David R., and Chiquita Collins. "Racial Residential Segregation: A Fundamental Cause of Racial Disparities in Health." *Public Health Reports*, September/October 2001.

Williams, David R., James S. Jackson, Tony N. Brown, Myriam Torres, Tyrone A. Forman, and Kendrick Brown. "Traditional and Contemporary Prejudice and Urban Whites' Support for Affirmative Action and Government Help." *Social Problems*, November 1999.

Williams, David R. and Selina A. Mohammed. "Discrimination and Racial Disparities in Health: Evidence and Needed Research." *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, February 2009.