URBAN INSTITUTE

Lessons Learned from Studying Structural Racism in National Policies

Reflections from Three Experts in the Field

Luisa Godinez-Puig, Claire Cusella, and Rekha Balu

July 2024

This brief presents lessons learned from projects that aimed to analyze three different national policies related to families in the US—the treatment of marriage in the tax system, child foster care placement, and the uptake of Social Security benefits—and the role of structural racism in the design and implementation of these policies. Urban Institute's Office of Race and Equity Research asked three experts and scholars in their respective fields, Dorothy Brown (tax law and policy), Darcey H. Merritt (child welfare policy), and Mikki D. Waid (retirement policy and Social Security), about the kinds of analytical and research challenges researchers should address when studying each of these policies with a structural racism lens. Their feedback provided a common set of dimensions to consider, focusing on improving the framing and analysis of the historical and current structures that led to and maintain the ongoing disparities in national policies in the United States.

Background

Systemic, institutional, and structural racism have long been a feature of American policy and governance. Some policies and practices implemented throughout America's history intended directly to exclude or discriminate, while other policies that may have intended to promote equality still resulted in major differences in the opportunities and outcomes between different racial groups. These racial disparities show up in multiple social, economic, and cultural realms (Brown et al. 2019) and persist and have compounded across generations. Historical, institutional, cultural, and interpersonal dynamics can

facilitate and maintain advantages for white people—the dominant group of the last centuries—while creating and maintaining disadvantage and barriers to opportunity and well-being for people of color.

Over the last century, social policies and programs and national support systems intended to help families and children improve their well-being were not necessarily designed to reduce burden or narrow gaps in the access and outcomes for communities of color, whereas white communities benefit from these supports. These national systems were also not designed to narrow the gaps of access and outcomes between communities of color and predominantly white ones (Brown 2021; Merritt 2021; Waid 2016). Family support programs focus on a wide range of needs, including early childhood care, job training, food and nutrition support, health care, and more. The rules and conditions for participating in these types of programs intersect with each other, meaning that participation in one social program can affect eligibility for another program, or it can increase or decrease the burden of proving eligibility. Given these intersecting rules, it's not immediately obvious to potential applicants whether participation is a greater benefit or burden. Therefore, it is necessary to continue to research these burdens and benefits and assess community and individual experiences of these systems.

While researchers and the broader learning community are increasingly moving toward analyzing and understanding the deep legacy of racism in social programs, many are facing knowledge, experiential, analytical and methodological challenges. Because structural racism permeates across systems, spans across generations and is woven into various national-level laws and programs, it raises measurement and causal identification challenges that researchers need to name to estimate or discuss its effects.

To explore how structural racism drives outcomes across policy areas, in late 2021, Urban Institute experts launched the project "Interrupting Structural Racism's Impact on Health and Well-Being," which included five demonstration studies of varied scope and approach to examine how structural racism plays out in different systems and how systemic changes could produce more equitable outcomes. The studies spanned the fields of transportation, behavioral health, child welfare, tax policy, and retirement policy. To support the participating researchers, we assembled a primarily Black, and people of color (BIPOC) leadership and advisory team that brought extensive experience studying racial inequality in policy and practice across issue areas. This advisory group included founders and leads of Urban's Office of Race and Equity Research (ORER), which launched in 2022, several experts who came to Urban through the equity scholars program and external experts with relevant subject matter expertise whose reflections appear in the next section.

During the phases of each specific project's development and research, the Office of Race and Equity Research managed the research portfolio, and these external subject matter experts provided the research teams with literature, conceptual and technical reviews, resource materials, coaching, and extensive feedback. The goal was to equip researchers with the materials and knowledge to move away from just quantifying disparities and focus more on how structural racism produced those differences, and what it would take to close gaps between groups. Through the development of this project, the advisory group identified inherent tensions in the research cycle, as well as areas of opportunity for new work on structural racism. These insights informed a preliminary framework for researchers, policymakers, communities, and funders to use when studying structural racism in social policy (Balu et al. 2023).

Urban Institute Researcher Positionality

There are bounds on what we can claim to know or see in this reflection process. Urban is a white-led, half-century old research organization. We are not experts on anti-racism. Even BIPOC researchers at Urban have benefited from the privileges of relatively elite education systems, living in relatively well-resourced neighborhoods and more. We have much to learn from the individuals who have lived within broken systems and who have spent lifetimes working to reform them through organizing, advocacy, research, practice, and policymaking. Our positionality also may limit our ability to see *all* the ways in which existing research structures could be changed to set up structural racism research for success.

In this brief, we present the suggestions and lessons learned from three of the five demonstration studies that involve family well-being:

1. the tax system and its treatment of marriage,
2. Social Security benefits and access to benefits, and
3. child foster care placement.

External reviewers' comments on these reports focused on ways to frame and improve the analysis of the historical and current structures that led to and maintain disparities in US national policies. Urban reviewers' comments focused on specifying policy levers and mechanisms.

This brief summarizes that feedback on a common set of dimensions that encourage researchers to move away from narratives and decisions about individual characteristics and toward identification and understanding of system-level decisions.

Common Considerations Across Analyses

Identify System-Level Design Choices and Drivers

Structural racism, a system-level phenomenon, currently is not fully measured in large datasets that tend to collect individual-level characteristics or responses. The mechanisms of racism cannot be well-measured in survey instruments either because it is difficult for people to respond about a combination of multiple forces. And surveys may not provide valid and reliable responses that are useful for comparison between topics or over time. So where should researchers look for data about structural racism to identify its role as a likely causal driver of persistently unfair outcomes? The expert advisers and leaders of this project have the following suggestions:

- **As a first step, look at system design choices and policy levers.** Creating datasets and models of those mechanisms may require different data collection and analysis. Several definitions of structural racism acknowledge that racism operates via multiple levels (school, community, and more) and channels (programs, policies, practices, and more) (see definition from Brennan et al. 2022). By extension, it is inaccurate to capture racism, a collection of policies and behaviors at a systemic level, with just one factor or variable (race) that characterizes an individual actor at an interpersonal level.
- **As a second step, consider how to describe and estimate the relationship between systemic and individual actions.** In quantitative research, often researchers estimate of the association between an individual's race and the outcome to infer the extent of racial disparities in that outcome and suggest that the error term in such models captures the residual effect of "structural" racism. However, the project's external experts advised that it would be more accurate to have separate regressions by race, gender, and other characteristics when attempting to measure the effects of racism in policy design or implementation. If regression models are not separated by race, gender, and other characteristics, researchers are assuming that the underlying model, including the intercept and error terms, are the same for all races. But evidence shows that people identified with different races are racialized to different degrees and experience prejudice in different ways.

"...attempting to parse the effects of racism and reduced economic opportunities is a tall order and requires an imaginative approach that can be applied to a dataset with imperfect information (again, for most survey data, there are no variables that directly attempt to measure racism)."
—Mikki D. Waid

Include Contextual Analysis

Research projects may also need to consider how structural racism may shape the context of an intervention or policy and how that context interacts with other policy levers, particularly when considering how it operates as a cause of inequities. Tabulating data on racial disparities is not sufficient to show the effects of structural racism unless it is accompanied with current and previous context explaining why these disparities exist. For example, researchers can use descriptive statistics on historical trends for more context and to hypothesize about potential drivers of disparities. Using a historical approach that accounts for key events that could have reduced or increased racial disparities can help researchers explain how overlapping structural barriers disproportionately affect people of color.

Design and Conduct Interviews for Trust and Nuance

Building a good relationship between researchers and participants is fundamental to qualitative research. It is critical for researchers to build trust and rapport with participants; it helps generate rich conversations, maintain respect, and minimize the often-transactional nature of researchers asking participants for information. This is especially true when researchers are inquiring about sensitive topics such as how people perceive and experience race and racism and when participants do not identify with the social identity or backgrounds of the research team.

The framing and wording of questions in interviews, especially questions that address issues of race and ethnicity, need to be carefully designed to convey openness to and elicit genuine responses. As part of announcing a study has begun, researchers could publish interview questions regarding demographic differences and other characteristics, to elicit feedback for the current study and/or to encourage other researchers to use similar wording to measure reliability and consistency of understanding of the questions. For example, it is important to be clear about how questions were presented to participants and what themes were addressed (e.g., does the interview protocol address power dynamics and hierarchy in the systems governing or administering the program in which they participate, factors that result in child removal, questions on barriers faced by people from different racial and ethnicity groups?). An interview ideally would elicit nuances related to the experience of race and racism that a survey cannot capture. Readers can better interpret the nature of participants' views on racial/ethnic differences if protocols are published, so that readers can see the way the questions were posed, the positionality of the researchers. and the characteristics of the participants. Additionally, researchers may want to use alternative modes of solicitating information from interviewees, such as vignettes, rather than direct questions to understand and describe racial/ethnic differences in experiences and outcomes.

"It is critical to build rapport with respondents, especially when inquiring about sensitive topics, particularly if there are some identity mismatches between the respondents and research team."
—Darcey H. Merritt

The Tensions in Studying Specific Policies

Tax

Expert: Dorothy Brown, JD, LLM, Martin D. Ginsburg Chair in Taxation, Georgetown University Law Center

Review of "Racial Disparities in the Tax Treatment of Marriage" by Janet Holtzblatt, Swati Joshi, Nora Cahill, and William G. Gale

SUMMARY OF PROJECT

This project explores how several major tax and nontax factors affect the tax treatment of marriage (total income, each spouse's share of certain income types, and family composition), and how changes in tax law since 2000 have affected marriage bonuses and penalties, by racial and ethnic groups.

The project finds that in 2018, Black couples were more likely to pay higher federal income taxes, and a larger share of their income in taxes, in a marriage than was the case for white couples. That finding is driven by the observation that dual-earner couples earning similar amounts are more common in Black families than in white families. This working paper provides new evidence on these racial differences, using data from the Survey of Consumer Finances, supporting Brown's (2021) hypothesis.

Although there is progressivity in the tax system, meaning that people with higher incomes and wealth are meant to bear more tax burden, it can obfuscate some of the underlying historical and structural forces that drive disparities between racial and ethnic groups. The progressivity may lead to some hesitancy among policymakers to suggest interventions that "add to the complexity" of an already complex system. However, the tax system currently creates and perpetuates disparities between white and Black taxpayers, as shown by previous work, which needs to be resolved in concert with reducing complexity. This hesitancy can be reflective of a culture that is "implicitly satisfied to act int he preservation of racism and injustice" (Shahram 2023). Researchers' choices about theory, analysis and solutions should place greater weight on the issues that harm a specific racial group of taxpayers.

Contextual analysis can shed light on the ways in which communities and families are organized, and how that may interact with tax policy. Specifically, there are different marriage rates for Black and white Americans and therefore we need to account for marriage rates in the design of policies and

taxation. Similarly, when comparing one earner and two earner couples, exploring differences between Black and white women's historical labor participation can pinpoint how marriage penalties and subsidies were historically designed to favor white (one-earner) couples exclusively. When policies design benefits that can be claimed only for certain types of family structures (e.g., one spouse earning more than another), then policy design misses the opportunity to deliver benefits for the different family structures (Horowitz et al. 2022).

Additionally, researchers and policymakers cannot assume that Black married couples perceive marriage and/or benefit from marriage in the same way as white couples do in the tax system (see research suggesting otherwise: Kornhauser 1993; Brown 2021). Nor can they assume that marriage results in higher educational attainment and earnings for children across races or greater wealth for all types of married couples (see research suggesting otherwise: Shapiro. Meschede, and Osoro 2013.[1] In these two cases, these nuances result in disparities in outcomes of marriage penalties and subsidies. Using historical (e.g., accounting for events that changed racial disparities and inequities), social (e.g., applying an intersectional approach to capture the overlap between race and other social characteristics) and cultural frameworks (e.g., implementing a culturally responsive analysis) can allow researchers to learn more about potential reasons for disparities, how they overlap within structures over time, and generate more relevant hypotheses.

"There may be lots of problems in the tax system, but they are not all of the same weight. Race discrimination carries a greater weight than most (problems); given that, the government should not discriminate against Black taxpayers."
—Dorothy Brown

Social Security

Expert: Mikki D. Waid, PhD, Senior Research Fellow, Harvey L. Neiman Health Policy Institute

Review of "Limitations on Social Security Benefits for Black Retirees: Exploring Structural Racism's Impact" by Richard W. Johnson and Karen E. Smith

SUMMARY OF PROJECT

This project uses Urban Institute's dynamic microsimulation model, DYNASIM4, to analyze how reducing or eliminating racial disparities in key life outcomes would narrow the racial gap in Social Security payouts. The team simulates Social Security benefits for Black and white workers nearing retirement, based on observed racial differentials, then forecasts how much benefits for Black retirees would increase if those racial disparities did not exist.

Racial disparities in earnings and lower life expectancy significantly reduce lifetime Social Security benefits for Black retirees. While Social Security is designed to be progressive and scales contributions and benefits to earnings levels, the program is not designed to address other ways in which Black and working-class households are disadvantaged. For example, the program fails to adjust for higher and earlier rates of mortality among certain groups and penalizes single heads of household—policy choices that could be revised to reflect current health and family composition trends.

The quantitative difficulties in measuring racism itself were apparent in the analysis of Social Security. The model aimed to measure the effects of racism on economic opportunity in Social Security payments to Black beneficiaries by "forcing" or setting the underlying model characteristics of Black people to look like those of white people. This is common in some economic analysis to set certain differences to equal zero as a thought exercise. But in doing so, the model is equating Black and white experiences, assuming that white and Black people would experience racism or the lack of racism, and its effects in the same way. The variables analyzed in a survey or in a large dataset can reflect the outcomes of racism but often don't measure how racism has contributed to or changed each variable.

To be sure, it is difficult to measure "racial counterfactuals." Researchers need to be creative when constructing counterfactuals that rely on large administrative datasets and/or survey data. For example, we know from previous work that Black people tend to have lower labor force participation and earnings compared to white people. This can lead to lower Social Security benefits, lower retirement income, lower savings, lower wealth and a reduced likelihood of living in a nicer neighborhood (Bridges and Choudhury 2009; Rhee 2013; Wilson and Darity 2022). Contextual analysis can point to which of these overlapping variables should be accounted for as potential moderators of the impact of a policy change. For example, the fact that Black individuals have shorter life expectancy compared to white individuals means they collect Social Security benefit for less time than others. This health disparity is increasingly shown to be a result of structural racism (GBD US Health Disparities Collaborators 2022). Moreover, structural racism not only impacts proximal outcomes directly, but it also impacts the downstream effects of those outcomes indirectly.

Using the DYNASIM microsimulation model offers a novel approach to understand how one factor can dynamically affect other factors such as mortality, education or marriage. But if the factor being modeled is a characteristic rather than a behavioral outcome, then we are not capturing the dynamic effect of racism, only the moderating effect of race as a demographic characteristic. And if we want to understand the differential experience between racial groups, we instead need to run regression models separately for each group.

""...one of the most important aspects of modeling racial differences is missing in pretty much all datasets…a variable measuring racism itself! The effect of racism (institutional and otherwise) will affect the independent coefficients (thus racism will affect education, health, marital status…), but the effect of racism not reflected in the coefficients will be included in the error term. If a researcher believes that different races experience racism/prejudice in different ways, then there needs to be an error term that is different for each race, which implies having unique regressions by race. Thus, to measure racial differences more accurately, I would suggest having separate regressions for whites and Blacks (at the least)… To be the most accurate, one would also need different regressions for the different genders also (such as one for Black women, one for white women, one for white men, and one for Black men). [...] In this example, you would then use Blinder-Oaxaca Decomposition to measure the alternative model (so, use the Black characteristics with the white regression coefficients to see how Black labor force participation might improve)."
—Mikki D. Waid

Child Welfare

Expert: Darcey H. Merritt, PhD, Professor, Crown Family School of Social Work, Policy, and Practice, University of Chicago

Review of "Prevention Services Availability and Black-White Placement Disparity: Contextualizing Structural Racism in Child Welfare" by Katrina Brewsaugh, Bridgette Lery, Shannon Gedo, Soumita Bose, Emily Ross, Xiaomeng Zhou, Scott Huhr, Jamie McClanahan, and Fred Wulczyn

SUMMARY OF PROJECT

This project aims to identify whether the child welfare system functions differently in areas where Black children are placed in foster care at a similar or lower rate than white children, compared with areas with the opposite pattern. The team conducted semistructured interviews with child welfare agency administrators and managers who oversee maltreatment investigations. The team also interviewed administrators of prevention services providers to explore the hypothesis that unequal allocation of prevention resources is a driver of structural disparity in child welfare placements.

Based on the limited number of interviews conducted, team members were unable to confirm or disprove their hypothesis. But, they found elements of administrative and interpersonal structural racism that may contribute to racial disparities in child welfare. People who work in child welfare may

not always be aware of how the availability of quality prevention services may influence racial disparities in foster care placement. Building trust and rapport with those who work in child welfare systems will be required to have discussions to allow them to ask questions and speak openly about systemic drivers of racial disparities.

The child welfare field has benefited from research that examines the interconnectedness of poverty and child welfare (see Detlaff et al. 2021), neighborhood racial and ethnic diversity correlations with maltreatment referrals (see Klein and Merritt 2014), or pursues qualitative and mixed-methods accounts of the impact of race and poverty on families of color's experience with child protective services. Variation in social contexts and the relationship to behaviors and outcomes (see (Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn 2000; Sampson, Morenoff, and Raudenbush 2005) sheds light on structural racism and racialized poverty as it manifests in child protective services' exposure and involvement.

It is important to identify the factors that explain between racial group variation in outcomes and behavior in placement of children in foster homes. Previous literature has shown that Black-white gaps in child maltreatment rates in rural counties are often lower than those of urban counties, which can impact case workers' decisions (see Maguire-Jack et al. 2015). Teasing out these geographic differences provides more information on how it may relate to racial variation as well. Similarly, individual case workers' extent of decision making may vary across regions based on available resources. Explaining how these factors relate to or influence variation in outcomes and under what circumstances provide necessary context for the racial disparities present in the child welfare system.

Additionally, researchers should be careful about generalizing conclusions from nonrepresentative sample case studies, given the myriad of interconnected factors and levels of decisionmaking at play. There are a variety of sampling techniques and criteria that qualitative researchers can use to improve the strength of inferences and conclusions a study can reach, including defining the sample universe, size and outreach to participants in ways that align with the research questions of interest (Robinson 2014).

Clear information should be provided on how participants are recruited, what types of recruiting materials are used and the number of participants that respond and/or accept/decline participation. Researchers need to highlight the level at which they hypothesize the racism takes place: interpersonal, institutional, or other. For instance, it is helpful to identify what decision point in the process of child protective services is related to foster care placement rates. In the case of the counties in the paper reviewed here, removal decisions are made in consultation with upper management and legal stakeholders, supervisors and legal departments, and frontline workers. Target participants should include the entire service array of individuals involved in the process of decisionmaking: frontline workers, administrators, and legal teams.

"Who was on the team and what are their positionalities? It's important to have this information about the researchers, especially given the nature of the inquiries regarding race."
—Darcey H. Merritt

Lessons Experts Identified Across Three Projects

Lesson 1: Studying racial disparities is not the same as studying racism, and studies aiming to assess the causal effect of structural racism are not the same as studies of the moderating effect of race or other demographic characteristics. Study designs should articulate and reflect this distinction of causal vs correlational and structural vs individual analysis.

The research plan development, data collection, and analysis must be developed within a structural racism framework, to move beyond documenting disparities and instead research the drivers of those disparities. As mentioned in the Social Security context but attributable more broadly, the variables included in large datasets often reflect the outcomes of racism, but not racism itself or its direct and downstream effects (Balu et al. 2023). This is why researchers should exercise caution or avoid using individual-level variables to reflect system variables in models claiming to assess structural racism, and note that the limitations of what individual-level variables can illustrate.

Incorporating a structural racism framework implies incorporating a structural racism lens at all stages of research, which can be done with a within-systems or an outside- system approach and often requires the inclusion of community members and different team members at different decisions making points of the research life-cycle (Balu et al. 2023). For example, in qualitative research interview protocols and outreach plans should be developed in collaboration with community partners to ensure that communities are not harmed but rather benefited by the project and adequate rapport can be built with participants. In quantitative research, the modeling of alternative policies should focus on policy options (whether they are within the current system or within a new alternative system) that mitigate or eliminate racial disparities; research should thoroughly explain how (and the degree to which) these changes can impact racial disparities. Finally, researchers may want to incorporate mixed-methods approaches to explain the dynamic and complex nature of the processes that drive inequities.

Lesson 2: The framing of a study of structural racism requires citing previous work that uses a structural racism lens, clearly indicating whether racism is being treated as a contextual or causal factor.

A structural lens needs to be incorporated in the earliest parts of the project life cycle; in the ideation phase and as researchers are working through project conception and team formation and orientation. This includes defining the dimensions of structural racism at the onset of a project and mapping potential contexts or causal drivers to outcomes of interest. The decision about whether to model structural racism as a contextual or causal factor likely requires building on research from other disciplines or topical areas to identify the overlapping and distinct structures, policies, social and economic conditions that (can) influence each program's outcomes. This type of work may be "messier" and demands that we look beyond more traditional research that is bounded and linear and lean on the work of scholars outside of the dominant frames (Shahram 2023) It will require more input and time to map out potential influences than a typical study that selects a single policy or research question.

Lesson 3: Project teams should include scholars and practitioners of color with expertise on and lived experience of structural racism.

Involving experts on structural racism and team members with lived experience is crucial to correctly apply a structural racism framework. Because researchers are often trained within a narrow discipline, method and a specific program or field specialization, they may lack the subject matter expertise on structural racism, may not be fully versed in the literature on structural racism and/or have the lived experience to frame research questions from this perspective.

Researchers' positionality, which includes their world view, beliefs, values and lived experience, shape the way research is conducted, its outcomes and results, and who has power to conduct and disseminate research. This is particularly important when a study is centered around race and racism. By acknowledging positionality, researchers identify complex power dynamics and provide more information on the continuum of positions researchers assume throughout a project. By doing so, research on structural racism should reflect on structural biases in all aspects of the research process, and prioritize engaging and uplifting the work of scholars of color whose work may be relevant but less frequently cited.

"Part of applying an anti-oppressive approach with a social justice lens to such research inquiries requires mindfulness of the literature typically propped up as the gold standard of empirical evidence. It's important to remain cognizant of the race and ethnicity, and social positions, of the scholars typically cited for reporting on marginalized people of color, whilst other scholarship from members of those communities gets short shrift. To dismantle

structural biases at all steps of our scholarly processes, we need to be reflective of inherent hierarchies regarding who is privileged to conduct and disseminate the research."
— Darcey H. Merritt

Resources

- Research Within versus Outside Existing Systems: Framing and Studying the Effects of Structural Racism
  Rekha Balu, Karishma Furtado, Chitra Balakrishnan, Claire Cusella, Brian Smedley
  https://urbn.is/46CAVBj

- A Conceptual Map of Structural Racism in Health Care
  Karishma Furtado, Alaisha Verdeflor, Timothy A. Waidmann https://urbn.is/3KVqks4

- Measuring Structural Racism: Approaches from the Health Literature
  Karishma Furtado, Nikhil Rao, Mayo Payton, Kristen Brown, Rekha Balu, Lisa Dubay
  https://urbn.is/3KXz68Z

- Structural Racism Explainer Collection: A series on how structural racism operates in systems such as community colleges, K-12 schools, neighborhood planning, and more.
  https://urbn.is/4cunV3l

- Do No Harm Guides: A series of work, including ones showing how data visualizations can perpetuate structural harm unintentionally. https://urbn.is/3XwbyPR

- Increasing the Rigor of Quantitative Research with Participatory and Community-Engaged Methods. Toolkit with resources to use participatory methods into all phases of quantitative research. https://urbn.is/4ct9M6o

Papers in the Interrupting Structural Racism Series

- How Structural Racism and Limits on Economic Opportunity Restrict Social Security Benefits for Black Retirees
  Richard W. Johnson, Karen E. Smith https://urbn.is/3XF8dON

- Racial Disparities in the Income Tax Treatment of Marriage
  Janet Holtzblatt, Swati Joshi, Nora Cahill, William G. Gale https://urbn.is/3VU75We

- Prevention Services Availability and Black-White Placement Disparity: Contextualizing Structural Racism in Child Welfare
  Katrina Brewsaugh, Bridgette Lery, Shannon Gedo, Soumita Bose, Emily Ross, Xiaomeng Zhou, Scott Huhr, Jamie McClanahan, Fred Wulczyn https://urbn.is/3VU75We

- Recommendations for Programs and Funders Who Serve People Who Use Substances: Disrupting Structural Racism's Impact on Health and Well-Being

Lisa Clemans-Cope, Kimá Joy Taylor, Nikhil Rao, Monique Tula, Maya Payton https://urbn.is/3XS8rIN

- Disrupting Structural Racism: Increasing Transportation Equity in South Dallas
  Christina Plerhoples Stacy, Karolina Ramos, Donovan Harvey, Sonia Torres Rodríguez, Jorge Morales-Burnett, Sabina Morris https://urbn.is/4cbjVov

Notes

[1] Edward Rodrigue and Richard V. Reeves, "Five Bleak Facts on Black Opportunity," Commentary, Brookings, January 15, 2015, https://www.brookings.edu/articles/five-bleak-facts-on-black-opportunity/.

References

Balu, Rekha, Karishma Furtado, Chitra Balakrishnan, Claire Cusella, and Brian Smedley. 2023. "Research Within versus Outside Existing Systems: Framing and Studying the Effects of Structural Racism." Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Brennan, Paula A., Elaine Arkin, Dwayne Proctor, Tina Kauh, and Nicole Holm, 2022. "Systemic and Structural Racism: Definitions, Examples, Health Damages, and Approaches to Dismantling." *Health Affairs* 41 (2): 171–78.

Bridges, Benjamin, and Sharmila Choudhury. 2009. "Examining Social Security Benefits as a Retirement Resource for Near-Retirees, by Race and Ethnicity, Nativity, and Disability Status." *Social Security Bulletin* 69:1.

Brown, Dorothy A. 2021.*The Whiteness of Wealth*. New York: Crown.

Brown, Steven K., Kilolo Kijakazi, Charmaine Runes, and Margery Austin Turner. 2019. "Confronting Structural Racism in Research and Policy Analysis." Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Detlaff, A., Reiko Boyd., Darcey Merritt, Jason Anthony Plummer, and Jams D. Simon. 2021. "Racial Bias, Poverty, and the Notion of Evidence." *Child Welfare* 99:3.

GBD US Health Disparities Collaborators. 2022. "Life Expectancy by County, Race, and Ethnicity in the USA, 2000-19: A Systematic Analysis of Health Disparities." *Lancet* 400 (10345): 25–38.

Horowitz, Juliana M., Nikki Graf, and Gretchen Livingston. 2022. *Marriage and Cohabitation in the U.S.* Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.

Klein, Sacha, and Darcey H. Merritt. 2014. "Neighborhood Racial & Ethnic Diversity as a Predictor of Child Welfare System Involvement." *Children and Youth Services Review* 41:95–105.

Kornhauser, Marjorie E. 1993. "Love, Money, and the IRS: Family, Income-Sharing, and the Joint Income Tax Return." *Hastings Law Journal* 45:63–110 .

Leventhal, Tama, and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2000. "The Neighborhoods They Live In: The Effects of Neighborhood Residence on Child and Adolescent Outcomes." *Psychological Bulletin* 126:309–37.

Maguire-Jack, Kathryn, Paul Lanier, Michelle Johnson-Motoyama, Hannah Welch, and Michael Dineen. 2015. "Geographic Variation in Racial Disparities in Child Maltreatment: The Influence of County Poverty and Population Density." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 47 (September): 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2015.05.020 .

Merritt, Darcey H. 2021. "How Do Families Experience and Interact with CPS?" *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 692 (1): 203–26.

Rhee, Nari. 2013. *Race and Retirement Insecurity in the United States*. Washington, DC: National Institute on Retirement Security.

Robinson, Oliver C. 2014. "Sampling in Interview-Based Qualitative Research: A Theoretical and Practical Guide." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 11 (11): 25–41.

Sampson, Robert J., Jeffrey D. Morenoff, and Stephen Raudenbush. 2005. "Social Anatomy of Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Violence." *American Journal of Public Health* 95: 224–32.

Shapiro, Thomas, Tatjana Meschede, and Sam Osoro. 2013. "The Roots of the Widening Racial Wealth Gap: Explaining the Back-White Economic Divide." Waltham, MA: Institute on Assets and Social Policy.

Shahram, Sana Z. "Five Ways 'Health Scholars' Are Complicit in Upholding Health Inequities, and How to Stop." 2023. *International Journal for Equity in Health* 22:15.

Waid, Mikki. 2016. "Social Security: A Key Retirement Income Source for Older Minorities." AARP Public Policy Institute. Washington, DC: AARP Public Policy Institute.

Wilson, Valerie, and William Darity, Jr. 2022. U*nderstanding Black-White Disparities in Labor Market Outcomes Requires Models that Account for Persistent Discrimination and Unequal Bargaining Power*. Washington DC: Economic Policy Institute.

About the Authors

Luisa Godinez-Puig is a senior research associate in the Office of Race and Equity Research and a former equity scholar at the Urban Institute. Godinez-Puig's work focuses on two interconnected areas of research, both centered on racial and ethnic justice. The first is on how state and local policies affect racial equity. The second centers on financial well-being for immigrant communities, particularly the role that tax benefits and financial inclusion play in underserved communities. Her work has been published in Urban *Affairs Review*, *Public Health Reports*, *Ethnopolitics*, and the *Monkey Cage* blog of the *Washington Post*, and by the Brookings Institution and the Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University. Godinez-Puig holds a doctorate and a master's degree in political science from Boston University, a Master of Laws degree from the University of Chicago, and a law degree (juris doctor equivalent) from Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Claire Cusella is a senior policy program manager in the Office of Race and Equity Research, where she contributes to the overall strategy and management of the Office while managing a portfolio of projects focused on racial equity. She contributes to research and policy projects exploring the root causes of structural racism and working to determine solutions to disrupt the underlying sources of disparities and mechanisms that hamper racial equity. Prior to Urban, Cusella spent seven years at Equal Justice Works, supporting a community of lawyers dedicated to public service to address unmet legal needs and ensure equal access to justice. She has a BA in political science and sociology from the State University of New York at Geneseo and a master's degree in public administration from the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University.

Rekha Balu is co-vice president of the Office of Race and Equity Research, leading research and technical assistance work on structural racism in social policy domains, measurement, and modeling of structural racism and social inequity, assessment of federal equity initiatives, and strategies for building wealth equitably. She spent more than a decade as a program evaluator and intervention designer for various federal, state, and local education and human services agencies, including while director of the Center for Applied Behavioral Science at MDRC. Balu served as a fellow with the US Office of

Evaluation Sciences, on the board of the Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness, and as an adviser on several technical working groups and policy advisory committees for national nonprofits. She earned her bachelor's degree from Northwestern University, a master's degree from the Harvard Graduate School of Education, and a master's degree and doctoral degree from Stanford University.

Acknowledgments

This brief was funded by the Ballmer Group and by the Salesforce Foundation. The initial "Interrupting Structural Racism's Impact on Health and Well-Being" project, which included the five demonstration studies and the scholars' review, was funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. We are grateful to them and to all our funders, who make it possible for Urban to advance its mission.

The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Funders do not determine research findings or the insights and recommendations of Urban experts. Further information on the Urban Institute's funding principles is available at urban.org/fundingprinciples.

This brief would have not been possible without the thoughtful reviews and insights by Dorothy Brown, Darcey H. Merritt, and Mikki D. Waid. The authors would like to extend a special thanks to the authors of the reviewed papers—Katrina Brewsaugh, Soumita Bose, Nora Cahill, Jamie McClanahan. William G. Gale, Shannon Gedo, Janet Holtzblatt, Scott Huhr, Richard W. Johnson, Swati Joshi, Bridgette Lery, Emily Ross, Karen E. Smith, Fred Wulczyn, and Xiaomeng Zhou—and to those who supported the initial "Interrupting Structural Racism's Impact on Health and Well-Being "project including Chitra Balakrishnan, Karishma Furtado, Brian Smedley, and Justyce Watson.



500 L'Enfant Plaza SW
Washington, DC 20024
www.urban.org

ABOUT THE URBAN INSTITUTE

The Urban Institute is a nonprofit research organization that provides data and evidence to help advance upward mobility and equity. We are a trusted source for changemakers who seek to strengthen decisionmaking, create inclusive economic growth, and improve the well-being of families and communities. For more than 50 years, Urban has delivered facts that inspire solutions—and this remains our charge today.

Copyright © July 2024. Urban Institute. Permission is granted for reproduction of this file, with attribution to the Urban Institute.