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SPECIAL SECTION INTRODUCTION
Bertha G. Holliday, PhD

My father was a World War II veteran. With his inherent brilliance and his college degree, he took the Army’s aptitude tests and was deemed a commissioned officer in the U.S. Army. He headed a segregated African American engineering unit that built a lot of bridges and roads. He said one of the hardest things he ever had to do was to pick up a rifle and engage the enemy during the bloody Battle of the Bulge, in which over 80,000 Americans were casualties.

After France was liberated, and U.S. soldiers had filled its streets, a Black soldier was sentenced by the military to death by hanging for consorting with a French woman. My father was ordered to bring his (Black) troops to witness the hanging. He refused and his men were not present to witness the noose around a Black man’s throat. For my father, in contrast to participating in the Battle of the Bulge, this was an easy thing to do, even though his defiance and insubordination resulted in his immediate demotion.

Nooses, as symbols of both power and vulnerability, are a continuing legacy of American slavery – the archetype of systems of human domination by other human beings. When a noose reportedly was placed on the office door of an African American Professor of Psychology at Columbia University, the OEMA staff was upset. What can we do in response to this most hateful and misguided act? And then we recalled: A little over 10 years ago, OEMA had sponsored a Miniconvention on Psychology and Racism at the 1997 APA convention in Chicago. This Miniconvention sought to promote greater visibility for psychological research and intervention on racism by “distilling, building, and broadly disseminating information about the dynamics and costs of racism and anti-racism, their effects upon science and society, and the mechanisms for perpetuation of both racism and anti-racism”. The Miniconvention was successful beyond our hopes — involving over 400 presenters and 150 programs including a major presentation by historian John Hope Franklin, PhD, in his role as Chair of President Clinton’s Initiative on Race.

Now OEMA wanted to know: What advances have been made in scientific and applied psychology related to issues of racism since then? And do any of those advances help us better understand why a noose was placed on a psychology professor’s door? And so we thought of doing this Special Section on Psychology and Racism: Ten years after the Miniconvention. We asked two leaders in the field, Derald W. Sue, PhD and James M. Jones, PhD to help us by drafting overview articles that broadly assess both the state of psychology and racism 10 years ago, and its current state. We also reviewed abstracts from the 1997 Miniconvention. In order to identify some cutting edge advances in psychology related to racism that might be highlighted in the Special Section, we reviewed APA Convention programs during the past 10 years as well as some of the most recent psychological
research literature. What our review revealed was that during the past 10 years, the advances in the area of psychology and racism have been significant and astounding, resulting in an area that is abloom with innovative ideas and methodologies, and applications.

And so we decided the Special Section would replicate the Miniconvention’s focus on two of the three critical topics of Psychology of Racism, and Psychology of Anti-Racism. We also decided to replicate one of the resources developed for the 1997 Miniconvention—its annotated bibliography on Psychology and Racism. A Revised Annotated Bibliography on Psychology and Racism: 1997 – 2007, soon will be available on OEMA’s website (www.apa.org/pi/oema Click on “publications”). Two extremely talented and diligent interns engaged in the extensive literature search and editing for the Revised Annotated Bibliography. My appreciation is extended to Shin Ock of University of Maryland-College Park and Jennifer Perry of George Washington University.

Appreciation is also extended to the authors of the Special Section articles and essays. I continue to be amazed at the readiness of so many to share so much. And of course, my continuing respect and appreciation is extended to the OEMA staff who worked on this Special Section — especially, Alberto Figueroa-Garcia, MBA, Dennis Bourne, and Sherry T. Wynn.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this Special Section to my mother, who literally abandoned her death bed to attend the 1997 Miniconvention (“The doctor says I am to rest and NOT travel to Chicago – as though I’m suppose to just go to bed and wait to die!”). The Special Section is also dedicated to my father – and to the millions of other mothers and fathers who, through their example, taught their children not to be silent in the face of intimidation and humiliation, threat to life and livelihood, and injustice. Many of the authors of the Special Section articles and many of the research and applied psychologists who during the past 10 years have ensured the blooming of the area of psychology and racism are just a few of the progeny of such parents.
Warm greetings to all those gathered in Chicago for the American Psychological Association’s Miniconvention on Psychology and Racism.

As Americans, we can be proud of our diversity. Striving together, people of different ethnicities, backgrounds, races, and beliefs have contributed to the success of our nation, reflecting the profound truth that this rich diversity is one of our greatest strengths. But we must face the reality that sometimes our differences divide us, and too often the voices of hatred and prejudice drown out the harmony in our national life.

Despite these real differences in the life experience and backgrounds of the American people, there is also a rich fabric of shared experience -- of common problems, common hopes and fears, common ground. It is of great importance for the future of our nation that we expand that common ground, focusing more on what unites us than on what divides us. And in pursuing this path we must engage in a public dialogue that is respectful, tolerant, and open.

My race initiative, "One America in the 21st Century," is about helping to build a stronger, more just, and more united American community that offers opportunity and fairness for all Americans. I commend the APA for promoting this dialogue and for striving together to end racism. Events like this conference help us to recognize anew that working in a spirit of community is not a hope but a necessity, and that our individual dreams can only be realized by our shared efforts.

Best wishes for a productive conference.

Bill Clinton
PSYCHOLOGY OF RACISM
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Hate Crimes Are Illegal But Racial Microaggressions Are Not!
Derald Wing Sue, PhD

Ten years ago, I took part in the OEMA Miniconvention on "Psychology and Racism" in which a number of us shared our work on race, racism and psychology. It was a period of time when many in our nation took pride in pointing out how overt expressions of racial hatred, direct and conscious discrimination, and beliefs in White supremacy were being effectively addressed and that racism was on the decline. Indeed, hate crimes throughout the United States seemed to confirm this conclusion, although there continued to be occasional outbreaks that were loudly condemned by the majority of citizens. During the miniconvention, some of us presented statistics indicating that racism had not disappeared but was morphing into contemporary forms labeled "modern racism", "symbolic racism" and "aversive racism". These expressions of bias and bigotry are often outside the level of conscious awareness of well-intentioned individuals, but they continue to reflect a troubling worldview of White supremacy.

Ten years later, as I write this article, one of my African American colleagues has been the victim of a noose incident that in the year 2007 has become a frequent occurrence. As my Black brothers and sisters are aware, the noose is a terrifying racist symbol meant to intimidate Persons of Color. From the 1880s to the 1960s approximately 4,700 men and women of color (including Chinese and Native Americans) were lynched, but 70% were Black (Potok, Visconti, Frankel & Holmes, 2007). While noose incidents averaged about a dozen/year over the last decade, approximately 50-60 occurred in 2007; seemingly correlated with the prosecution of the "Jena 6", six Black youths in Louisiana. According to the Southern Poverty Law
Center, hate groups have increased 40% from the years 2000-2006 and hate crimes during that period averaged 190,000 incidents per year.

By historical standards, however, overt expression of hate crimes are still much lower than in the past. But their resurgence is very troubling and directly contradicts the belief that racism is declining, that it is being effectively addressed, and that it no longer represents a major problem. Indeed, a great fear I have is that it may become increasingly acceptable to make public racist statements and/or to act on conscious racial bias and bigotry with increasing impunity. Even when racist expressions are condemned, as in the cases of Don Imus, Rosie O'Donnell, Michael Richards and Mel Gibson, the consequences are transitory and these individuals appear to continue with "business as usual." Yes, it is clear to me that overt expressions of racism and hate crimes may be increasing as the demographics of the United States changes toward a majority of Persons of Color. Many Whites are beginning to realize that in several short decades, they will become a "numerical" minority and that demands for change in our economic, political, social and educational systems may result in a revamped society that alters the power structures of this nation.

Despite overt displays of racism and the negative impact of hate crimes, however, our research at Teachers College suggest that it is not "old fashioned" racism, manifested in hate crimes, that do the most damage to People of Color, but the unconscious, invisible and insidious forms that we call racial microaggressions (Constantine & Sue, 2007; Sue, Bucerri, et al 2007; Sue, Capodilupo & Holder, in press; Sue, Nadal et al, in press).

"Racial microaggressions are brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults to the target person or group (Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al 2007, p 273)." Because they are often perceived as banal and trivial assaults, insults and invalidations ("small things"), many believe they possess only minimal harmful or negative impact on target persons or groups. It may surprise readers that our research suggest that racial microaggressions are far more harmful than hate crimes. We certainly do
not mean to minimize the devastating nature of hate crimes, for no Person of Color would ever like to meet a member of the Klan or a Skinhead while alone. But a White supremacist has far less impact upon the standard of living of People of Color than well-intentioned individuals whose decisions and actions produce systemic detrimental conditions (Sue, 2003). Our research and those of others indicate that racial microaggressions not only have negative psychological consequences for People of Color (assails their mental health and self-esteem), but they are directly responsible for creating disparities in education, employment and health care. In a previous publication, I outlined some possible pitfalls about using hate crimes as the sole indicator of racism (Sue, 2005).

Pitfall # 1: Defining Racism as Pathology or a Mental Disorder

A common myth that many hold is that racism is the result of extreme pathology, that it is a "sickness", "unhealthy" and a function of disturbed minds. Some have even argued that racism should be classified in DSM-IV-TR as a mental disorder and "racists" should be considered mentally disturbed. Indeed, it is possible to argue that White Supremacists are filled with such hatred and bigotry that they see the world in delusional terms. While I entertain the notion that those who perpetrate hate crimes may suffer from some form of mental disorder, they represent a very small fraction of the racism problem. Studies suggest that racism is very pervasive, that it is present in nearly everyone, and that it is the more subtle and unintentional expressions, racial microaggressions, that truly do the greatest harm to persons of color. To equate racism with pathology, unfortunately, diminishes the widespread nature of racism and allows us to escape entertaining the notion that we all harbor racist attitudes and engage in discriminatory behaviors, not just the mentally disturbed.

Pitfall # 2 - Belief that Racism is Not Normative or Widespread

The near unanimous public outcry against hate groups and the condemnation of these acts may seduce us into the belief that we are not bigoted because we are not hate mongers. We now understand that racism is, in many ways, very normative, an everyday occurrence, and generally invisible in our lives. They occur almost constantly in the form of racial microaggressions; invisible and outside of conscious awareness. Their
frequency in everyday interactions suggests that racism functions as a default standard. By making racism invisible, we unintentionally enable and empower its manifestation. The result is that we preserve our self-image as a good, moral and descent person, and allow us to deny its existence in ourselves, our family, and our friends.

**Pitfall # 3 - Belief that White Supremacists Are the Ones Who Perpetrate the Greatest Harm to People of Color**

Hate crimes represent only the tip of the racism iceberg. The more insidious, damaging and harmful forms of racism are expressed through the everyday, unintentional, and unconscious racial microaggressions perpetrated by ordinary citizens who believe they are doing right. It isn't the White Supremacist who controls the tools which result in educational, economic and political disparities that work to the detriment of Persons of Color. In fact, these overtly racist individuals affect only a small part of my life. It is people we elect to office, teachers who educate our children, business leaders who carry out the policies and practices of their corporations, government leaders, law enforcement officers, physicians, dentists, construction workers, our family, friends, and neighbors. It is ordinary citizens who experience themselves as good, moral and descent individuals, who consciously believe in democracy, and who would never consciously discriminate.

**Pitfall # 4 - Racism Only Harms People of Color**

Many White Americans are unaware of how racism also harms them. They live a false racial reality and operate within a "matrix" that allows them to see the world through "rose colored glasses" and prevents them from seeing the ugliness and reality of racism. In some respects, our White people are also victims of racism. Their victimization however is different from People of Color. Whites have been fed a racial curriculum based upon falsehoods, unwarranted fears and in the belief in their own group's superiority. As a result, they have unwittingly conspired with a part of the system that advantages them, while disadvantaged people of color. Most Whites were socialized into oppressor roles, yet taught concepts of social democracy, fairness, justice and equality. Recognizing the polarities of the
democratic principles of equality and the unequal treatment of persons of color is not pleasant for White Americans.

Being an oppressor (even unknowingly) means the dimming of perceptual awareness and accuracy. Allowing the degradation, harm and cruelty to Persons of Color mean the diminution of one's humanity, and lessening compassion toward others. At some level, oppressors become callous, cold, hard and unfeeling toward the plight of the oppressed. It means separating yourself from others, seeing them as lesser beings, and in many cases subhuman aliens. From this perspective, racism serves as a clamp on one's mind, allowing for the systematic mistreatment of others by perpetuating a false illusion of one's racial superiority. To continue allowing systems of injustice to exist and to deny complicity in the oppression of others means denying reality.

In closing, I again reiterate the major theme of this article. Hate crimes are abhorrent and we should all condemn them. They are, however, only a fraction of the racism problem. We must increasingly realize that racial microaggressions do the most damage to the quality and standard of living of Persons of Color. Ironically, hate crimes are illegal, but racial microaggressions are not!
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**Nooses**

Kecia M. Thomas, PhD

My graduate students and I have been tracking the proliferation of workplace nooses for at least the last three years, but for some reason the noose hung outside Dr. Madonna Constantine's office took me off guard. There have been nooses found at the University of Maryland and of course in Jena, Louisiana. Yet the noose, which was directed at Dr. Constantine, someone eerily similar to myself, (a Black female psychologist at Columbia University who addresses issues of social justice in her research and teaching),
brought to light the vulnerability and isolation so many professionals of color experience in their workplaces.

Nooses have appeared in at least fifteen states and in various types of workplace settings. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) has tracked the meteoric rise of workplace nooses over the last decade and even formed a special taskforce to better understand and address the increase in the reporting of racial harassment in the workplace. In spite of the various locations and workplaces in which nooses are found, the intention is always the same: The harassment and intimidation of African Americans. And the motivation is always the same: Race. The modern noose reminds us all of the legacy of lynchings and signify to Blacks that they are not wanted nor valued, and that they should "stay in their place". Certainly many of the nooses found over the last year, such as the one directed toward a recently promoted African-American woman who worked in an Indiana wireless retailer and another found by a recently promoted Black male police officer in NY, were in response to Black workers who demonstrated the qualifications, experience and desire to move to the next level in their careers.

These modern workplace nooses like the lynchings of the past are not just directed toward a single individual. I believe they are directed to an entire community, who for some, may be perceived as gaining too much attention, education, influence, and power. My fear is that the intimidating messages of nooses may in fact derail some ethnic minority individuals' career aspirations and dreams, especially those who find themselves as solos and tokens in their workplaces. This fear is not totally unfounded given those of us who work in environments in which our demographic group is most underrepresented are also the most likely to experience discrimination and harassment.

The mere experience of tracking workplace nooses is in itself unsettling. In fact, during the fall of 2007 I became so overwhelmed with receiving forwarded emails of new noose incidents around the country that I simply stopped opening them and began to save them in an electronic folder for a later date. Learning of the incidents is depressing. However, the
institutional and individual responses to these incidents by those organizations in which nooses have been found, and the responses by the judicial system itself has been frightening and tragic. Nooses themselves are manifestations of overt and hostile forms of prejudice, however responses to these nooses is even more disturbing given they are frequently representative of aversive prejudice.

The typical response to these incidents has been initially one of denial, more specifically that nooses are *not necessarily* representative of racial hatred and harassment. Frequently, they are explained away as jokes. One notable legal decision in which nooses where at the center of a racial discrimination suit in which the plaintiffs were seeking class action status, involved a judge who commented that it is simply *an interpretation* to infer that nooses are forms of racial harassment. The request for class action status was denied. It almost seems as though we have created a national climate for diversity in which racial harassment can be easily explained away and that making accusations of racism is perceived as more harmful and damaging than the racism itself!

It would appear that as a nation we have acquired some collective form of amnesia that allows us to discount the obvious-especially when it relates to race. In some cases we have allowed the perpetrators of these hate crimes and their institutions to explain away the historical significance of nooses through their own presumed ignorance of American history. To name these incidents as racist seems beyond our comfort level. In our silence our society cultivates racism and perpetuates prejudice by looking the other way. The explaining away of nooses as harmless jokes, mere knot, or historically insignificant isolates the targets of this harassment and frequently exposes them to secondary systems of harassment and discrimination. Targets who choose to confront nooses and seek justice to their harassment must often subsequently confront the institutions and communities that refuse to take these crimes seriously.

I am proud to be a part of a professional community that has spoken up in response to Dr. Constantine's attack and that has put initiatives in place to lead public policy in curtailing future noose attacks. We have to remember
that these nooses are not mere slogans or symbols of hate—they are instruments of hate.

Kecia M. Thomas is a professor of Industrial/Organizational Psychology at the University of Georgia where she also serves as the Sr. Advisor to the Dean of the Franklin College of Arts and Science on Inclusion and Diversity Leadership. Dr. Thomas also serves as the founding director of the Center for Research and Engagement in Diversity (RED) within her college. She is the editor of Diversity Resistance in Organizations (2007).

APA (Past) President Speaks Out Against Hate Crimes
APA Opinion-Editorial
October 2007

This week, another college campus was the scene of a noose carefully placed to threaten, intimidate and shock. On Tuesday, a faculty member found the meticulously tied rope on the office door of Dr. Madonna Constantine, a well-respected African-American psychologist at Columbia University’s Teachers College.

This incident comes on the heels of nooses found outside the African-American cultural center at the University of Maryland, in the personal belongings of a Black cadet and a White faculty member at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy and, perhaps most notoriously in recent months, on the so-called “white tree” at a high school in Jena, Louisiana.

The people who employ these symbols are certainly aware of their power. For Black
Americans, the noose is a potent reminder of the nearly 5,000 African-American men and women who were hanged by Whites from 1890 through the 1960s.

This spate of noose placements serves as confirmation of the findings of a significant body of psychological studies showing that discrimination and prejudice persist in significant and demonstrable ways in our country. Research has indicated that while most people believe themselves to be free of prejudice, many also harbor attitudes that may lead to subtle discriminatory beliefs or behaviors. This contradiction between self-perception and actual behavior indicates that everyone needs to be vigilant about their own attitudes -- and what we might be inadvertently teaching others around us, particularly children and students.

There is also widespread agreement among social scientists that the social categorization process—making assumptions about people based on their race or ethnic group, including racial stereotyping—is a virtually automatic and often unconscious process.

The strategic placement of a noose, however, involves forethought, planning and outright hostility. Indeed, these campus incidents are being investigated as hate crimes, and the perpetrators most certainly deserve strong sanctions that clearly condemn such despicable acts.

What does psychology tell us about the backgrounds and motivations of people who commit hate crimes? For one thing, they are not mentally ill in the traditional sense; according to psychological scientists, they're not diagnosably schizophrenic or manic depressive, for example. What those who engage in hate crimes do share, however, is a high level of aggression and antisocial behavior.

More than just a prank

People who commit hate crimes "are not psychotic, but they're consistently very troubled, very disturbed, very problematic members of our community who pose a huge risk for future violence," according to Dr. Edward Dunbar,
a psychologist at UCLA who has studied hate crime perpetrators from a clinical and forensic perspective. Dunbar also notes that childhood histories of such offenders show high levels of parental or caretaker abuse and use of violence to solve family problems.

Alcohol and drugs sometimes help fuel these crimes, but the main determinant seems to be personal prejudice, which distorts people’s judgment, blinding them to the immorality of what they are doing.

People who commit bias crimes are more likely to deliberate and plan their attacks than those who commit other types of crimes, Dunbar adds. In addition, those who commit hate crimes show a history of such actions, beginning with smaller incidents and moving up to more serious ones.

As for those who bear the brunt of these vicious acts, they tend to suffer emotional damage, often with the hallmarks of post-traumatic stress disorder. Hate crimes can create intense feelings of vulnerability, anger and depression.

On a more positive note, research has demonstrated that stereotypical thinking may be reduced as a consequence of contact between people of different races. For example, research results indicate that interactions among students of different races can diminish racial stereotyping, contribute to building cross-cultural respect, and enhance social and communication skills. What’s especially encouraging about these findings is that they are particularly strong among children in K-12 learning environments. Thus, early positive experiences of diversity prepare children for the diverse world they will inhabit.

The impact of diversity is indeed complex – but for most of us, it is not double-edged. Once we can overcome any initial discomfort with new experiences, we are prepared to derive many long-term personal, occupational and social benefits.

Violence and hate crimes can have serious consequences for the mental health and well-being of victims and communities. My colleague Dr.
Constantine is particularly knowledgeable about the various experiences that produce an individual who engages in hate crimes. I hope that her many years of research, teaching and advocating for cultural competence can help her to withstand this unconscionable attack. But mostly, I hope these repugnant incidents will be a catalyst for us all to become more committed to eliminating racism and hate.

Sharon Stephens Brehm, PhD
President, American Psychological Association

Implicit Prejudice and Self-Stereotyping: Recent Experimental Research Advances
Stacey Sinclair, PhD

In the early to mid 1990s experimental social psychologists specializing in prejudice and stereotyping began to embrace the notion of implicit prejudice. In contrast to explicit self-reports of prejudice, implicit prejudice, which is measured indirectly, was lauded for being less vulnerable to strategic manipulation and more indicative of the bias people were unwilling or unable admit. This form of prejudice has been shown to be highly prevalent. For example, data collected from several thousand people via the internet showed that 68% of respondents had more negative implicit associations toward Black than White people (Nosek et al, 2007). Despite the subtlety with which it is measured, implicit prejudice is also related to important outcomes. Whites Americans higher in pro-White/anti-Black prejudice appear to be more nervous in the presence of an African American, report having fewer African American friends, and have been shown to evaluate an African American target more negatively

-Stacey Sinclair, PhD-
than a similar White target (for a review see Fazio & Olson, 2003). Most distressing for individuals interested in reducing bias, because implicit prejudice was assumed to be etched in the mind via long term socialization, this form of prejudice was thought to be virtually immutable.

The implicit prejudice research conducted by my colleagues and me is one of a number of lines of research that have blossomed since the 1997 OEMA Miniconvention on Psychology and Racism contradicting the presumed immutability of implicit prejudice (for a review of others’ work see Blair, 2001). We show that implicit prejudice can be shaped by fleeting interpersonal interactions. Rather than being inflexible, implicit prejudice fluidly and spontaneously converges toward the perceived opinions of people with whom one wants to get along, a process we refer to as affiliative social tuning. We began by showing that implicit prejudice could indeed be shifted by one element of the interpersonal context - the ethnicity of the person with whom one is interacting. This initial strategy had the virtue of pitting our expectations against the existing assumption that exposure to a member of a stereotyped group would automatically elicit stereotype-consistent associations toward that person. In other words, prevailing thought at the time suggested interaction with an African American person would increase implicit prejudice but we expected the opposite. Consistent with our expectations, White individuals who interacted with an African American experimenter had lower implicit prejudice than White individuals who interacted with a White experimenter (Lowery, Hardin & Sinclair, 2001). Of course this could have occurred for many reasons having nothing to do with the presumed beliefs of the experimenters. So we then conducted a series of experiments in which people interacted with an experimenter who conveyed egalitarian beliefs by wearing an anti-racism shirt. Uniquely consistent with our prediction, implicit prejudice was lower among individuals who interacted with a liked, as opposed to disliked, experimenter presumed to have egalitarian views - irrespective of that experimenter's ethnicity (Sinclair, Lowery & Hardin, 2005). Also consistent with our understanding of affiliative social tuning, these reductions were not a function of efforts to control prejudice. Following written instructions to control prejudice do not yield similar effects and affiliative social tuning of implicit prejudice does not consume
previous cognitive resources (Huntsinger & Sinclair, 2008). Finally, these effects are unique to the interpersonal context. While views of liked social interaction partners initiate social tuning of implicit prejudice, less social sources of information, such as a poster, do not do so (Lun, Sinclair, Whitchurch & Glenn, 2007).

Self-Stereotyping

Although social psychologists have long assumed that members of stereotyped groups come to see themselves in a stereotype-consistent manner, research examining the circumstances under which such self-stereotyping occurs is just emerging. Our findings demonstrating that self-stereotyping also can be understood as a product of affiliative social tuning contributes to this effort. In this work stereotype targets who wanted to get along with a new social interaction partner incorporated that person's apparent stereotypic (or counter-stereotypic) views of their group into their own self-views. This occurred even when doing so was detrimental to participants' own interests, i.e., the chance of winning a prize (Sinclair, Huntsinger, Skorinko, & Hardin, 2005). Not only can interactions with strangers yield self-stereotyping, but, for some groups, close others can also form the foundation of stereotypic self-views. When subtly reminded of close others presumed to have stereotypic beliefs about them, White women, White men and Asian American women were more apt to describe themselves in a corresponding manner (Sinclair, Hardin, & Lowery, 2006; Sinclair & Lun, 2005). Interestingly, though one can create interpersonal circumstances that elicit self-stereotyping from African Americans (Sinclair et al, 2005), we found evidence suggesting that members of this group are less apt to spontaneously think of close others who hold stereotypic views and therefore are somewhat protected from self-stereotyping (Sinclair, et al, 2006).

Taken together this research has potent theoretical and practical implications for future study of prejudice. It forces re-thinking about the ontology of implicit prejudice, lending weight to recent models of implicit cognition that emphasize flexibility. It also illuminates unique means of mitigating this form of prejudice. Rather than advocating that people
struggle to control their prejudiced impulses or targets of prejudice behave in a way that deflects bias, our work suggests that interpersonal environments can be structured to inspire greater egalitarianism. By creating and maintaining interpersonal spaces that inspire their friends, acquaintances and colleagues to adopt egalitarian views, individuals can utilize the basic human desire for affiliation to reduce prejudice.

Stacey Sinclair received her PhD in Social Psychology from the University of California at Los Angeles and was an undergraduate double-major in psychology and economics at Stanford University. She is currently an Associate Professor in the Psychology Department at the University of Virginia and will be joining the Psychology Department and Center for African Americans Studies at Princeton this Fall.

### Update on Stereotype Threat: Out-group Presence May Be A Necessary Mediator In Stereotype Threat

Lloyd Ren Sloan, Daniel Martin, Grady Wilburn and Debbie Van Camp.

In their original formulation, Steele and Aronson (1995) hypothesized that Stereotype Threat may be activated by taking a challenging, self-diagnostic test related to negative own-group ability stereotypes but that this wouldn't happen in a non-diagnostic context. Potentially qualifying the original Steele and Aronson (1995) proposal, diagnostic testing with challenging stereotype-related materials in exclusively in-group settings doesn't produce performance decrements (Sloan, et. al., 1999; 2000; Marx, 2005). However, Stereotype Threat performance decrements do occur in out-group context testing, suggesting that stereotype threat decrements additionally may require out-group presence, perhaps acting as reminders.
of the stereotype or cues or primes for expected negative stereotyping or unfair evaluation. Challenging intellectual tests described as "fair" eliminate performance decrements (Sloan, Wilburn, Martin, Fenton, Starr, Craig, Gilbert, & Glenn; 2003). Therefore could anticipation of immediate, explicit comparison-evaluation by potentially stereotyping out-group members produce stereotype threat decrements within in-group contexts where it is usually absent? Could it be produced by a reminder of historically lower own-group SAT performance or by just the expectation that White researchers would use the data or would soon arrive to score the test in students' presence (a more credible evaluation threat or a prime for unfair evaluative) or even by mere, non-evaluative, out-group presence during the test (a simple but continuous reminder/prime of the out-group)?

Methodology: 318 African American students at a historically African American university took a difficult, 28-item, SAT-type verbal test (similar to Steele and Aronson's (1995) described as "diagnostic" versus "nondiagnostic" of their personal ability with a White or Black experimenter. To examine the impact of perceived potentially unfair evaluation in two other conditions, the Black experimenter also told the African American students that; (1) the ethnically biased test data was being collected for use by a White professor, or (2) that the White professor would arrive before the end of the session and score their tests before they left (to examine the impacts of expected live out-group involvement in evaluation), or (3) in a modified version of Aronson, Lustina, Good, Keough, Steele & Brown's (1999), "when white men can't do math," manipulation, the Black experimenter reminded the Black participants of poor historical own-group performance compared to Whites on SAT type tasks, or finally (4) the Black Experimenter presented only the standard instructions to groups that also included a White woman participant in
order to examine the impact of the mere presence of an out-group member for the possible stereotype reminder or anticipated unfair comparison that the situation might imply.

Results: Diagnosticity was successfully manipulated in subjects' perceptions ($X^2=6.6$ (1), $p<.001$). As expected, African American participants tested in exclusively minority contexts (Black experimenter) showed no performance decrement in the standard "diagnostic" compared to "non-diagnostic" testing ($F<1$), but participants did show significant performance decrements when tested by a White experimenter ($F(1,79)=5.98$, $p<.02$). None of the Black experimenter's descriptions of "collecting the data for a White researcher" or that the White professor would score their data in their presence, nor the Black experimenter's direct reminder of historically lower test performance had any decremental effect on performance ($F<1$ in all three conditions). Rather dramatically however when a White woman participant was included as another test-taker with minority students and the Black Experimenter (employing only standard instructions), minority students' performance was lower in the Diagnostic Condition ($F(1, 43)=4.30$, $p<.05$).

Conclusions: Perceiving tests to be ethnically fair eliminates performance decrements in out-group contexts, but immediate or future potentially unfair comparisons by out-group researchers does not lead to performance decrements within in-group settings. Stereotype threat also is minimized in exclusively in-group settings. While direct reminders of real historic in-group performance disparities had no impact, the presence of a co-acting White participant in the test taking group does lead to stereotyped minority members' performance decrements. These findings suggest that perceived or expected bias in evaluation may be a significant part of the concerns that drive the Stereotype Threat Effect but that these factors may require the multiplying impact of the presence of potentially stereotyping out-group members to create Stereotype Threat's negative consequences on the performance of those stereotyped, perhaps through increased White presence priming greater levels of cultural mistrust (Terrell & Terrell, 1981; 1983; Whaley, 2001).
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Racism on the Down Low: Subtle, Implicit and Real
James M. Jones, PhD
University of Delaware

The second edition of *Prejudice and Racism* was published in 1997 (Jones, 1997). It updated the 1972 edition (Jones, 1972) by making three critical points: one, racism was more subtle and implicit, often reflecting racial attitudes that functioned below an individual's awareness; two, targets of racism were reacting with a growing range of adaptive mechanisms, complexes of racial identities, and a growing ability to protect themselves from the damaged psyches often thought to be an inevitable consequence of racism; and three, that race itself was a scientifically meaningless classification of human beings, but nevertheless, represented a social construction that served the purpose of perpetuating racism.

In this short essay, I will reconsider what we thought we knew about racism a decade ago, what we have learned since then, whether and how we have used this information, and what challenges does anti-racist work face in the years ahead.

What We Knew Ten Years Ago

We began to understand the subtleties of racism with new terms like aversive, symbolic and modern racism. Although they differed from each other in certain ways, these theories alike demonstrated that although "traditional" racism as overtly manifested racial animus had subsided, it was replaced with an "underground" form that found expression when "people aren't looking." That is, when their negative behaviors toward
racial groups could be explained in non-racial terms. Racial integration is not bad, bussing is. I don't want to keep Blacks out of my neighborhood; I just don't want property values to go down.

The most conceptually and empirically advanced of these theories was aversive racism (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986) "a particular type of ambivalence in which there is conflict between feelings and beliefs associated with a sincerely egalitarian value system and unacknowledged negative feelings and behaviors about Blacks" (p. 62). Aversive racists are motivated by both egalitarian values and anti-Black feelings. When the significance and appropriateness of egalitarian norms are clear, then neutral or even pro-Black behaviors may occur. However, when the normative basis of egalitarian values is weak, or ambiguous, anti-Black feelings influence behavior.

To illustrate, an experimental participant was asked to help a Black or White partner in a scrabble game in which the need for help was external (it was a really hard task) or internal (the partner had not tried very hard). When the need was external, they actually helped the Black partner slightly more than the White partner. But when the need was internal, they helped the Black partner far less. As I summarized this finding (Jones, 1997), "…when conditions are favorable for positive interaction and "obvious" choices, people will "do the right thing". But when there is "wiggle room", the possibility of negative attitudes giving rise to racially biased behavior becomes more likely" (p. 128). So, the bottom line is — reports of our racial progress were greatly exaggerated.

But perhaps even more significant was the continuing evidence of institutional racism. The Federalist Papers (#54) made the case that slaves were "of mixed character of person and of property". They proposed the compromising expedient to the U.S. Constitution that slaves were "…debased by servitude below the equal level of free inhabitants; [and thus are] divested of two fifths of the man." By law or by fact, with or without explicit racist intention, institutions continue to produce racial inequality. Crack cocaine offenses were criminalized at 100 times the severity of powder cocaine offenses. The resulting racial disparity is
staggering as Blacks and Latinos constituted 75 percent of those with crack convictions, while Whites were 75 percent of powder offenses. In another realm, banking, we find that home mortgages were granted in direct inverse proportion to the percentage of the population of Blacks in the neighborhood. Blacks and Latinos continue to have higher unemployment, lower wages, and less skilled occupations. Prosecutors are LESS likely to seek the death sentence for Black than White victims of murder. Institutional practices are linked to racial disparities across the board.

President Lyndon Johnson proposed affirmative action as the remedy for institutional discrimination. Affirmative action came under direct assault in the 1980s and has only expanded in the past decade. We learned over 10 years ago that Whites (50%) relative to Blacks (77%) are much less likely to believe that Blacks face discrimination in hiring. And even if they have experienced discrimination in the past, Whites (83%) more than Blacks (56%) said that Blacks should NOT be given preferential treatment to make up for past discrimination. These racial disparities in perceptions of discrimination and their remedies continue to mark the landscape of social policy and affirmative action.

We also found that cultural racism was enjoined in what became known as the "culture wars." That is, traditional values and beliefs (like those that gave rise to the 3/5ths of a man argument) were heralded as the cultural foundation of America. Objections to anti-racist activities grew from a notion that American culture was one in which rights belong to individuals not groups. We discriminate against groups, but rights only belong to individuals—a catch-22. It was, thus, immoral to make policy decisions on the basis of group membership. This harkening back to traditional values and "our way of life" became known as the "new racism," in which the subtle biases and discriminatory practices at individual, institutional and cultural levels, were ignored.

And finally, the argument that race has no scientific meaning led to an increasingly loud voice that the concept should be eliminated. Instead, it was argued, race is a social construction, a project of society that gave meanings to race that were self-serving and in fact perpetuated racism (for
example, the Willie Horton ad in the political campaign of G.H.W. Bush in 1988). However, if we get rid of the concept of race, will racism go away? Belief in a "colorblind" society moves in the direction of eliminating the significance of race, but research shows that it is directly connected to increased stereotyping and discrimination.

New knowledge and methods

In the last decade, we have continued our research to identify the subtleties of racism. The implicit measures of racial attitudes have proven to be powerful detectors of racial biases. Moreover, we have utilized social neuroscience to show that racial biases are often "hard-wired." For example, we have learned that the amygdala region of the brain, commonly associated with fear responses, is activated when the faces of outgroup members are detected. Difference, it seems is not neutral but threatening! Implicit measures of racial attitudes such as the Implicit Association Test (IAT) have demonstrated strong connections between positive concepts (heaven, ice cream) and Whites and negative concepts (devil, death) and Blacks (cf. Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003). A growing body of research shows that IAT bias (the tendency to respond more quickly when favorable qualities are associated with Whites and unfavorable qualities are associated with Blacks) predicts subtle discrimination, other negative racial beliefs, and basic brain activities that distance Whites from other groups. In other words, we know with ever growing precision and clarity that race matters and usually not in a good way.

Yet, the prevailing idea that a colorblind approach to decision making in America is the only fair and balanced way to create social justice has the net effect of leaving in tact, racism on the down low. Moreover, research shows that people who adopt a colorblind ideology, are more likely to stereotype members of outgroups, and to show discrimination in their behavior toward them.

We have also come to better understand that targets of racism play an active role in protecting themselves from its harmful effects. We know that when negative treatment can be attributed to racism, its negative
psychological effects are diminished. In fact, a meta-analysis of self-esteem studies shows that Blacks have higher self esteem than Whites and that this gap has grown even larger over time (Twenge & Crocker, 2002) So the concept of "resilience" has offered a salient perspective on the coping and adaptation skills of targets of racism. But it is still the case that facing the threat of racism continues to compromise the status of targets of racism in American society. One of these concepts, stereotype threat (Steele and Aronson, 1995) has shown how targets of racism may undermine their own performance in their efforts to disprove the negative expectations held about their group. This tremendously subtle effect suggests that the cultural context of racism can produce it, even if individuals are not knowingly engaged in discriminatory behavior. Again, racism operates on the down low.

Effective use of this knowledge

Given what we know, what can we do about it? Well this is a complex issue because it is not simply a matter of an institution, community, organization, state or federal government to intervening to reduce prejudice and enhance social justice. For example, a residence life program that sought specifically to employ this knowledge to educate college students in its residence halls had to shut it down because of complaints about "brainwashing" and "mind control." Everyone does not believe the data, or further, believe that individuals have any obligation to change. So change is the problem.

People feel threatened by change, particularly when the change sought implicates their cultural identity—reprise the culture wars! Zárate, Garcia, Garza, and Hitlan (2004) showed that when it came to cultural identity markers, contrasting one's group to immigrant groups led to more anti-immigrant prejudice—differences can be threatening to cultural identity. We know that reducing perceived threat is crucial to fostering anti-racist attitudes.
We also know that intergroup contact (See Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) has proven over the years to be the most robust strategy for reducing anti-racist attitudes and behaviors. This is done in a couple of ways. One way is through cooperative learning programs where members of different cultural groups work together on a common problem. This procedure forces people to work together, and in the process, they benefit from the contributions of others, perform tasks better, and develop more positive intergroup attitudes.

Another way contact works is through direct discussion of conflicted areas of intergroup relations with members of the conflict group. Gurin and colleagues (2004) instituted an intergroup relations program consisting of "intergroup dialogues" (ID) between members of two groups with histories of disagreements. Twelve to fourteen students participated in weekly two-hour discussions over seven weeks. Public conversations examined commonalities as well as differences between groups. ID participants compared to control group students, had more interracial interactions, greater desire to learn more about other groups, and were more involved in civic activities in their communities.

The bottom line here is that any effort to reduce prejudice and improve intergroup relations requires that we take account of race, we confront it. As Justice Brennan observed in his opinion on Bakke v. Board of Regents of California, "...if we want to get beyond race, we must first take race into account." The one thing we know is that reducing racism will not and cannot occur without acknowledging that race matters, and that it influences judgments, emotions and behaviors in ways that perpetuate inter-racial bias.

Challenges for the future

That is our challenge for the future: To acknowledge that race matters and benefit from the science that shows us how; to promote inter-racial contact which is demonstrated to improve race relations; to illustrate the subtle ways in which race-judgments infiltrate our emotional responses, our cognitive judgments and our basic brain mechanisms. We have to
acknowledge that not only are we generally ignorant of other groups, we are threatened by them. The threats are at times realistic (job competition) but more often, they are symbolic of cultural identity preferences and the resistance to change. It is a daunting task, and we are making progress. If Barack Obama can be elected President of the United States of America, then symbolically and realistically, we may become the change we fear. If not, la luta continua.
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Coping with Racism in African American Children and Adolescents
Enrique W. Neblett, Jr., PhD
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

In the aftermath of racially derogatory comments by radio-personality Don Imus about the Rutgers Women's Basketball Team, the racially-charged Jena Six case, and recent verbal attacks on a group of Black students campaigning for presidential hopeful Barack Obama, signs remain that racism is a persistent and vexing problem for African American children and adolescents. African American youth report a higher frequency of racial discrimination experiences than their ethnic minority counterparts (Fisher, Wallace, & Fenton, 2000). Scholars estimate that 46 to over 90 percent of African American adolescents and young adults report personal experiences with racism (Cooper, McLoyd, Wood, & Hardaway, 2008). These experiences are associated with deleterious mental health outcomes (e.g., Prelow, Danoff-Burg, Swenson, & Puglialo, 2004; Sellers, Copeland-Linder, Martin, & Lewis, 2006; Wong, Eccles, & Sameroff, 2003) and can jeopardize the wellness of African American youth.
Researchers have highlighted the role of coping resources, styles and strategies in understanding responses to racism and racism's impact on physical and psychological health (Scott, 2004; Williams, Neighbors, & Jackson, 2003). One of the most commonly identified coping resources is racial identity - the significance and meaning of race to an individual. Parental communications about race and racism, through a process commonly referred to as racial socialization, serve as another coping resource for African American youth. Racial identity and racial socialization are important resilience factors against racism as they help buffer the negative effects of racism on psychological health (Neblett, White, Ford, Philip, Nguyen, & Sellers, in press; Sellers et al., 2006).

Though less explored in African American youth, examples of coping styles include spiritual-centered coping, collective coping, and ritual-centered coping (Utsey, Adams, & Bolden, 2000). Spiritual-Centered coping reflects a connection with spiritual elements, while collective coping refers to behaviors that emphasize the group over the individual. Ritual-centered coping is characterized by rituals that acknowledge ancestors, celebrate events, and pay homage to various deities. Utsey and colleagues suggest that African American coping behaviors are influenced by age-old spiritual beliefs and rituals of Western and Central Africa. In the TRIOS model, Jones (2003) suggests that coping is influenced by a present-past time orientation, a rhythmic link with the environment, improvisation or creativity, orality - the use of spoken word or singing, and spirituality, an emphasis on spiritual forces that act in the human world.

Examples of coping strategies include disidentification, devaluing and discounting (Crocker & Major, 1989), racelessness (Fordham, 1988), and cool pose (Majors & Billson, 1992). In response to possible judgment on the basis of race, African Americans youth may disidentify with the setting in which the judging may occur, devalue the domain in which their group is stereotyped, or discount the extent to which outcomes in that domain are valid indicators of one's true ability. These strategies have been implicated in discussions of African American underachievement. Racelessness refers to losing one's race in order to succeed. Finally, cool pose is a pattern of response used by African American males for negotiating racism.
characterized by unique patterns of speech, walk, and demeanor. Such a style communicates pride, strength, and control and helps to deflect conflict and anxiety.

The systematic study of coping with racism in African American youth is yet in its infancy. Much of what we assume to be true about African American youth is based on adult-centered models of coping that are rarely specific to racism. Researchers should continue to examine unique coping resources, strategies and styles that African American youth employ to cope with racism. Have youths' reactions to racism evolved as racism has shifted from more extreme events to more covert and unconscious attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors (Devine, Plant, & Blair, 2001)? Similarly, what unique responses do African American youth employ to cope with structural or institutional racism? A second area of interest is how African American parents teach their children to respond to racism. Furthermore, how do specific coping styles and strategies pass from one generation to the next? Finally, the link between coping and both short- and long-term health outcomes will be important to consider. We know little about how coping with racism influences health outcomes over time. Coping strategies such as cool pose, for example, might be adaptive in the short-term, but less so in the long run (Noh, Beiser, Kaspar, Hou & Rumens, 1999), or alternatively, such strategies may convey a protective effect on youth development over time. Taken together, these research directives can promote intervention and policy efforts that advance the mental health of African American and other ethnic minority adolescents who experience racism.
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Expressive Arts Languages and Anti-Racism: Making the Invisible Visible
Mukti Khanna, PhD

Community dialogues on race can commonly evoke race-related defense mechanisms including colorblindness, color consciousness, cultural transference, cultural ambivalence, avoidance of race and identification with the oppressor. (Ridley, 2005). Cultural identity development research suggests there are different stages of identity development for majority and minority cultures. (Ponterotto,
et al, 2006). Community leaders are often challenged to find ways to facilitate anti-racism dialogues to move from indifference to Gandhi's Heart – Unity stage of cultural identity development. Heart – Unity expands traditional stages of awareness and allyship to an understanding of the profound interconnectedness of life. As stated by Butigan (2005):

All life is one. Yet this oneness is dramatically distorted by systems of structural violence based on physical, economic, cultural and psychological threat, fear and separation. Heart -Unity is a process that 1). affirms the radical interconnectedness of all life and 2). embodies this by relentlessly challenging, resisting and dismantling any form of structural violence and oppression that distorts or undermines this oneness. Heart-Unity goes beyond being an ally, which often can be reduced to a form of "helping" and privilege. It is a profound awareness of difference, but also difference without division that can transform one's own self- understanding, assumptions and choices (Butigan cited in Slattery, Butigan, Pelicaric and Preston- Pile, 2005, pg. 122- 124).

Talking about traumatic situations too soon can have an unintentional re-traumatizing effect and create more pain, which can happen to people of color in anti-racism work. A paradigm shift in trauma treatment is revealing how imagery based work has been effective in transforming the neurological feedback loop between parasympathetic and sympathetic nervous system activation (Naparstak, 2004). Integrating expressive arts languages into conversations about race issues can help make invisible dimensions of power, privilege and difference more visible through the use of nonverbal imagery based languages.

An integrative expressive arts dialogue on race may include somatic experiencing, image theatre and touch drawing to understand the link between internalized oppression and the structural and institutional forces that perpetuate exclusivity. Somatic experiencing can be foundational in establishing grounding and centering when dialoguing about race to help regulate the nervous system from being triggered into fight, flight or freeze.
Embodying perceptions and reactions to perceptions of race and racism can deepen understanding of both internalized oppression and the structural forces that perpetuate racism. Community dialogues from image theatre can include Rainbow of Desire and Cops in the Head formats to address internal oppression in the personal and collective psyche. Community dialogues on race also can be expanded into Forum Theatre to invite audience participation in developing options, alternatives and experimenting with solutions to racial challenges (Diamond, 2007).

The awareness that emerges in expressive arts dialogues on race can be deepened through Touch Drawing, a simple yet profound process that allows many images to be drawn through the touch of the fingertips on paper (www.touchdrawing.com). Communities in racial conflict can draw inner portraits of the perceived "Other". Being witnessed and witnessing the Other through this visual record of one's inner process can be a doorway for reconciliation, mediation and transformation. Through an integrative expressive arts process, community members are able to see that they have agency in the ability to create transformation in the areas where they have privilege. When engaged in movement, touch drawing and interactive theatre, people at many different levels of identity development are able to simultaneously process and deepen their understanding of race in a way that is not possible in a verbal dialogue when only one speaker is talking at a time. Expressive arts dialogue on anti-racism can expand the capacity for respectful and empathic witnessing of life experience's that may be very different from one's own experience. Witnessing inner images in regards to racism allows community members to experience each other at a Heart-Unity level, catalyzing profound insight and transformation.

When individuals don't express themselves they get sick. When communities are not allowed to express their collective experience, they can also become sick. The cumulative effects of microaggressions and structural violence can lead to intergenerational cycles of violence and frustration. It is essential to create more forums for the collective voice and experiences of members on all sides of a community in regards to race to be expressed, witnessed and heard. The skillful integration of expressive arts languages into community dialogues can prevent retraumatization when
working with issues of race by engaging our imagination, intuition and spiritual capacities in restoring culture and community.
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Resources on Expressive Arts Dialogue
Provided by Mukti Khanna, PhD

**Mandala Center For Change**
This is a multidisciplinary education organization dedicated to community dialogue, social justice and societal transformation. It is also an international hub for the training and grassroots practice of Augusto Boal’s Theatre of the Oppressed.
[www.mandalaforchange.com](http://www.mandalaforchange.com)

**International Expressive Arts Therapy Association (IEATA)**
This is an international professional organization dedicated to ensuring the integrative arts combining dance, drama, music, visual arts, writing and architecture play a vital role in both individual and community development. Thus IEATA encourages an evolving multimodal approach within psychology, community arts and education.
[www.ieata.org](http://www.ieata.org)

**Headlines Theatre for the Living**
Derived from Augusto Boal’s Theatre of the Oppressed, this ‘healing art’ theatre seeks to help living communities tell their stories. It conducts projects with First Nations and multicultural communities through theatre workshops focusing on such issues as violence and suicide prevention, anti-racism, youth empowerment, bullying, and community development.
[www.headlinestheatre.com](http://www.headlinestheatre.com)

*Theatre for Living: The art and science of community-based dialogue* by David Diamond
This book is a resource for those interested in the power of theatre to evoke community healing. It includes case studies as well as detailed instructions for numerous theatre games and exercises.
Grassroots Strategies in Addressing Diversity Issues in a Psychology Department
Nabil Hassan El-Ghoroury, PhD
MetroHealth Medical Center, Department of Pediatrics
Case Western Reserve University

My interest in diversity issues did not fully develop until I arrived in graduate school. At the first case conference I attended in graduate school, when almost all of the clinical faculty and students gather, I found myself to be the only Latino graduate student. While a large majority of the students were white, there were a number of African Americans and a couple Asian Americans. My department lost its only ethnic minority faculty during my first year of graduate school. There were no courses offered in diversity issues, so those of us interested in this area drove over one hour away to attend a course at another university. The students who attended this course tended to be the ethnic minority students and the white students with strong interests in diversity.

Given this situation, a number of us graduate students met with the director of clinical training to address our concerns about diversity issues. This student-led discussion eventually developed into the Multiculturalism and Diversity Committee. The DCT served as a member and advisor of this committee as well. We would regularly meet to discuss how we could increase opportunities for learning about diversity. As a result of our discussions, we agreed to hold a Diversity Speaker Series, in which we invited speakers to come to our department and discuss relevant issues. I had the opportunity to be the chair of the Diversity Speaker Series for one year.
The Diversity Speaker Series turned out very well. The DCT was able to procure a small amount of funding from the university to pay for some speakers. We invited several individuals from our university, including the Office for Students with Disabilities and the University Counseling Center, to speak about local community concerns. At least one alumna discussed her research on health issues of lesbian women of color. Included in these speakers was Dr. Norman Anderson, who was then the Director of Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research for the National Institute of Health. These presentations introduced my colleagues to the important challenges of addressing the needs of diverse populations.

My student colleagues and I were very concerned about the lack of representation of people of color among the clinical faculty. Discussions in the Multiculturalism and Diversity Committee included how we could recruit more faculty of color. We used the recommendations from CEMRRAT on how to write faculty advertisements that would attract minority applicants. While during our time we were not successful in recruiting an ethnic minority candidate, we saw that several people of color were interviewed.

A third area of concern was recruiting more students of color. The committee developed various strategies, including personally inviting APA Minority Undergraduate Students of Excellence (MUSE) to apply to our program, and matching ethnic minority students who interviewed at our program with members of the committee.

Reflecting on these activities ten years later, I see several important lessons learned that can help students and professionals who may find themselves in somewhat isolating situations.

- Cultivate allies among your colleagues. Having a group of allies makes it easier to accomplish larger tasks. I found allies among White students who were committed to diversity topics, as well as cultivating an alliance with the DCT. Student colleagues were valuable so when we discussed our concerns we had a larger voice. Having a faculty ally
was critical for getting funding from the university and getting other faculty to buy into our goals.

- **Advocate for what you believe is important.** It is important to speak up when you find less support for diversity issues. The Diversity Speaker Series was a direct result of a group of students organizing to advocate for multiculturalism and diversity issues. The inclusion of allies makes advocacy much easier, compared to speaking on one's own.

- **Utilize your community's resources.** The first speakers invited for the speaker series were colleagues in other departments of the university. There are numerous resources in one's community, whether it is a university or a city, where one can find speakers to discuss local diversity issues. This is a low cost but useful method to learning more about multiculturalism and diversity.

Graduate students can make a meaningful difference in addressing diversity issues. This is certainly not an easy process, but can contribute to a program's commitment to multicultural issues.

**Nabil Hassan El-Ghoroury, PhD,** is a bilingual pediatric psychologist at MetroHealth Medical Center, the public county hospital in Cleveland, OH. He is on the faculty of the Department of Pediatrics at Case Western Reserve University. He is currently on the APA Board of Professional Affairs, and previously served as Chair of the Committee on Early Career Psychologists. As a graduate student, he was on the APAGS board as Member at Large, Diversity Focus, and Chair of the Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Concerns.
Indigenous Perspectives on Healing
Beth Boyd, PhD and Gene Thin Elk, BA
University of South Dakota

The Native American perspective of mental health and healing differs from the Western scientific perspective in a number of important ways. Understanding and explaining thoughts, emotions and behaviors requires a holistic view which includes concepts such as balance, life forces, interconnectedness and generativity. These concepts must be considered in order to understand indigenous wellness, illness and healing.

First, and most importantly for Native people, a relationship with the creative life force is at the core of all things seen and unseen. All life forms have a purpose, place and time in Creation and everything in the natural world shares the same spiritual essence or "spark of the Creator". Wellness is the recognition of a critical balance both within a person and with all the life forces around her/him (e.g., other people, animals, plants, the Spirit World, "inanimate" things, etc.). Achieving wellness involves seeing and sensing these life forces to establish one's relationship with the Creator, creating harmony within the self, with others, with nature and the cosmos.

Illness, adversity, and difficult times reflect a disconnection of the self from the creative life forces. An imbalance between the physical, emotional, mental and spiritual aspects of the self may result in mental or physical illness. Healing involves re-establishing the balance with the Creator and creating harmony within the self, with others and in the cosmos and nature. To achieve a level of healthful balance, one must relate to the physical world as a relative, discover how to relate to these life forms, understand one's relationship with them (how each affects the other), and recognize that the life essence within them is the same essence as within the self.
Healing comes about through restoration of the critical balance and is most often accomplished within spiritual ceremonies. Healing is typically practiced by a spiritual person recognized by the community. The person in need of healing participates in the preparation of the ceremony, the ceremony itself, and any follow-up which may include herbal medicines, life changes, and/or other ceremonies. All of the senses of the body, mind, emotions and spirit are evoked in the healing process through the use of drums, songs, and earth elements which have a spiritual essence of their own to address the restoration of balance. The healer ensures that the person to be healed is fully informed, at whatever level she or he can understand, about the reason for her/his difficulty, the form healing will take, and most importantly, the responsibility the individual must assume for his/her own healing. Healing is seen as an ongoing series of choices which are the total responsibility of the individual and their family. The "patient" and family are not only empowered, but required, to be full participants in the healing process (Todd-Bazemore, 1999).

Relationship is of central importance to Native people. One is interconnected with their ancestors, living relatives, and those in the future. Relationship transcends physical death, as Native people view the relatives who have gone before them as part of their lives and ongoing relationships with ancestors help to guide present-day actions. Relationship also means a responsibility to promote the next generation's well-being.

Indigenous concepts of wellness integrate many Western concepts of mental and physical health. However, for Native people, wellness includes the existence of a spiritual essence which has a direct influence on the individual. The Western value of empiricism makes it difficult to merge these concepts because they cannot be evaluated or measured by Western instruments. Perhaps the best way of terming the intersection between these two perspectives is "thinking from the heart and hearing with the mind."

Indigenous healing practices such as traditional spiritual and ceremonial ways of healing were outlawed in the United States until 1978. Combined with federal policies of extermination, removal, relocation and assimilation, and the estimated loss of 95% of the population (Stiffarm & Lane, 1992),
Native people have suffered generations of traumatic losses for which traditional ways of healing were not recognized. Currently, there are 562 federally recognized American Indian tribes and Alaska Native villages in the United States (Department of the Interior, 2002), each with their own distinct language, culture and beliefs. Although Native people participate in the Western health and mental health care system, many still hold to their traditional Native healing ceremonies. Some do not fully understand but they resonate to the teachings as if they are genetic memories. It is critical for health care providers who treat Native people to provide services that support the integration of the indigenous health perspectives and practices with Western medicine.
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