

UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

Title

Racial equity in social psychological science: A guide for scholars, institutions, and the field

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/59n1k38t>

Journal

Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 17(1)

ISSN

1751-9004

Authors

Torrez, Brittany
Hudson, Sa-kiera Tiarra Jolynn
Dupree, Cydney H

Publication Date

2023

DOI

10.1111/spc3.12720

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

Racial Equity in Social Psychological Science: A Guide for Scholars, Institutions, and the Field

Brittany Torrez^{1*}, Sa-kiera Tiarra Jolynn Hudson^{2,3*}, & Cydney H. Dupree^{1,4}

*Denotes shared first authorship

¹School of Management, Yale University

²Department of Psychology, Yale University

³Haas School of Business, University of California, Berkeley

⁴School of Management, University College London

NOTE: This is an unpublished preprint currently forthcoming at SPPC (as of November 2022). This preprint is a working paper shared to facilitate timely dissemination of science, and thus is subject to change.

Abstract

1
2 How can social psychologists ensure their scholarship does not maintain racial inequality—or
3 better, is anti-racist? This article serves as a reference for scholars by briefly reviewing the state
4 of racial inequality in psychological science before providing concise yet comprehensive
5 recommendations. Challenges include a) the field’s historic role in inequality-maintenance
6 (especially by reinforcing harmful stereotypes), b) pervasive objectivity norms that reify
7 Whiteness as the status quo, and c) the inequitable allocation of resources to White scholars and
8 White-centered scholarship. Recommendations center on a) methodological practices during the
9 research process (from idea generation to manuscript preparation), b) empirical transparency
10 from scholars during the publication process, and c) institutional, resource-focused support from
11 gatekeepers (e.g., editors, senior faculty) to incentivize the diversification of our science.

12 *Keywords:* race and ethnicity, inequality, academia, meta-science, objectivity, stereotypes

Racial Equity in Social Psychological Science: A Guide for Scholars, Institutions, and the Field

In 2020, much of the world was rocked by the brutal killing of Mr. George Floyd. Millions around the world took to the streets in protest. Organizations rushed to release statements affirming their commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion (e.g., American Psychological Association, 2020; British Psychological Society, 2020). Institutions changed the names of buildings, awards, and even schools to avoid associations with racist history (Jones, 2020). The field of psychology was not untouched by this social movement. In the months that followed, multiple papers were retracted from highly-ranked scientific journals for perpetuating harmful stereotypes (Bauer, 2020; Johnson et al., 2020)¹. Recent empirical findings (e.g., Roberts et al., 2020) reinforced what is easily revealed by examining the field’s major conferences or journals’ editorial boards: social psychology is overwhelmingly White, across levels and sub-disciplines. This has implications for the quality and impact of our science—the research questions that are asked, the participants whose views are represented, and the scholarship that is funded, published, and disseminated.

The field has shown some self-awareness (Dupree & Kraus, 2022; Ledgerwood et al., 2022). Task forces have been created, reports produced, calls to action written, and awards funded. But progress, along many metrics, has been frustratingly slow. Furthermore, in some cases, the progress has been illusory, a virtue-signal (Kristofferson et al., 2014) by institutions that are uncomfortable with the efforts necessary for true change (Onyeador et al., 2021). For instance, one international funding agency recently conducted an external evaluation of its

¹ We acknowledge there are complex reasons why these papers were retracted, including methodological issues and concerns about misleading interpretations (e.g., providing support for a lack of racial bias in police violence).

1 progress toward meeting anti-racist goals set in 2020, finding that they were, as the CEO put it,
2 “still an institutionally racist organization”, having “fall[en] short of [their] commitment to anti-
3 racism, both as a funder and an employer” (Farrar, 2022). In this article, we provide a guide for
4 social psychologists who wish to help move our field toward racial equity, ensuring that our
5 science is representative of the world around us, inclusive of historically-marginalized scholars,
6 and aiding progress toward an equitable society. These concrete, data-driven recommendations
7 are aimed at scholars across levels and rank—from the individual to the field, from graduate
8 student to full professor.

9 We discuss the importance of methodological practice, empirical transparency, and
10 resource-driven institutional support (particularly from gatekeepers such as journal editors,
11 principal investigators, or senior faculty on hiring and promotion committees). We begin by
12 reviewing critical socio-historical context surrounding racial inequality in social psychology.

13 **Foundations of Racial Inequality in Psychological Science**

14 For decades, social psychologists have studied the antecedents and consequences of
15 racism. However, when we look inward, the evidence is clear: social psychology is by no means
16 immune from perpetuating racial inequality. Anecdotally, the field is rife with stories of scholars
17 of color being tokenized, enduring micro-aggressions to explicit bigotry, and ultimately, leaving
18 the field due to chronic racial injustices (see the Twitter hashtags #BlackInTheAcademy and
19 #BlackInPsych for examples). Empirically, recent scholarship illustrates the pervasiveness of
20 racial inequality in our field. Roberts and colleagues (2020) queried more than 11,500 empirical
21 articles published in two of social psychology’s higher-ranked journals (i.e., *Journal of*
22 *Personality and Social Psychology* and *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin*), finding
23 that the vast majority did not reference participant race (95%), were edited by White editors

1 (92%), and were written by White scholars (72%). Those edited by White editors were
2 significantly less likely to highlight race, and among those that did highlight race, those authored
3 by White scholars were significantly less likely to report participant race. These stories and
4 findings reinforce the notion that psychological science—a field that was created by and for
5 wealthy, White men—has maintained its exclusivity nearly 150 years after its inception (Jones,
6 2010). As such, the field that purports to reveal how humans think, feel, and behave is only
7 representative and inclusive of a select few.

8 *Historical Foundations*

9 Any scholar who seeks to eradicate racial inequality in psychological science must
10 understand the field’s historic role in building and maintaining racial inequality. We do not find
11 ourselves here by accident. Historically, psychological science has long buttressed systems of
12 racial inequality. Since the 1800s, psychology played a crucial role in the creation and
13 maintenance of stereotypes depicting people of color as cognitively, biologically, and socially
14 inferior to White people (Jones, 2010; Saini, 2019). These stereotypes are encapsulated by
15 theories around biological or genetic determinism: the notion that different genetic material
16 corresponds to different levels of intelligence (Saini, 2019). According to this theory, people of
17 color are cognitively inferior due to their genetic inferiority (Jones, 2010). Such theories
18 persisted for centuries, justifying a global slave trade, a eugenics movement that gave rise to
19 World War II, and Jim Crow laws that persisted until the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s.
20 Genetic determinism was taught widely in psychology courses throughout the 1900s, and
21 although Black psychologists have been arguing against these harmful theories for decades (e.g.,
22 Boykin, 1983; Guthrie, 2004; Thomas, 1982; Thomas & Sillen, 1972), it is only relatively
23 recently that White scholars and mainstream publications have begun to debunk the essentialist

1 notion that sex- and race-based differences are evolutionary facts (Fine, 2017; Jones, 2010; Saini,
2 2019).

3 Even after notions of biological racial inferiority became less acceptable, psychology
4 furthered more implicit notions of people of color’s cultural inferiority. For instance, Walter
5 Mischel used evidence from his famous delayed gratification findings—wherein children resist
6 their impulse for one marshmallow to later receive two marshmallows—to argue that Black
7 children lack impulse control compared to White children (Grusec & Mischel, 1966; Pettigrew,
8 1964; Renner, 1964). These studies contributed to harmful stereotypes depicting Black
9 Americans as lazy and lacking self-regulation. These studies were cited in government reports
10 and proceedings, many of which suggested that it is Black Americans’ own “culture of poverty”
11 —rather than slavery, Jim Crow, and persistent racism—that leaves Black Americans
12 disadvantaged (Moynihan, 1965). Decades later, Banks and colleagues (1983) conducted a
13 review of the literature debunking Mischel’s interpretation of the findings—when asked whether
14 they wanted to delay gratification, half of Black children waited and the other half did not; their
15 choice depended on whether they valued the reward in the first place—but the damage was done.

16 *Psychological Foundations*

17 Racism is a systemic phenomenon, baked into the fabric of our society (see Saini, 2019,
18 for a longer review). As social psychologists, we have studied the contextual and psychological
19 factors that contribute to the maintenance of racial inequality. These same mechanisms
20 contribute to racial bias and inequality within our field.

21 **Racial Ignorance.** A wealth of psychological research has established that race plays a
22 crucial role in how people perceive and move through the world (Roberts & Rizzo, 2021).
23 Despite pervasive evidence of these racialized experiences, many White scholars remain racially

1 ignorant, in large part due to overwhelmingly White social and professional networks (Mills,
2 2014; Mueller, 2020). People of color, by contrast, are often forced to navigate mostly White
3 workspaces as the token person of color, leaving them subject to subtle and deliberate
4 manifestations of bias that can reduce their sense of belonging (Anderson, 2015). Racial
5 segregation, which has long been the norm in the United States (Massey & Denton, 1993;
6 Rothstein, 2017) means that White psychologists are less likely to have lived experiences that
7 give them a nuanced understanding of racism. Such personal experiences are critical for
8 recognizing and rejecting dominant worldviews that maintain racial inequality (e.g., Dubois,
9 1903; Hill Collins, 1991). As such, White editors and other gatekeepers are less likely to
10 recognize the validity and importance of research questions related to race and racism.

11 **The Denial of Racism.** Psychology is rife with examples of the denial of racism, both
12 anecdotal and empirical. Anecdotally, the regular “GRE debate” on social media—in which
13 scholars debate the importance and harm of using GRE scores in the graduate student admissions
14 process—brings forth several examples of (usually White) scholars denying that the use of the
15 GRE is harmful to anti-racist goals (see Gifty, 2021). Empirically, social psychological research
16 reveals that White people, who benefit from hiding the uncomfortable existence of racial
17 privilege (from which they benefit), tend to deny that such privilege exists (Lowery et al., 2007);
18 they are especially likely to deny White privilege if they see the world as a meritocracy.

19 It is, however, possible to override the tendency to deny White privilege by affirming
20 other positive personal characteristics, such as social skill or adaptability (Knowles & Lowery,
21 2012; Phillips & Lowery, 2018). Self-affirmation, “a well-established procedure for protecting
22 individuals from threats to the self” (Phillips & Lowery, 2018, p. 13), reduces White Americans’
23 tendency to claim that they have had hardship (and therefore haven’t benefited from White

1 privilege) by reducing their sense of threat. Thus, White Americans, particularly those who see
2 the world as meritocratic, are motivated to deny racial privilege, and this is closely tied to their
3 self-concept. This dovetails with recent research revealing that individuals have a motivated
4 tendency to underestimate racial inequality in society and their institutions (Boykin et al., 2020;
5 Kraus et al., 2017; Ray, 2019). Indeed, those who do underestimate racial inequality are less
6 likely to hire Black job applicants seeking a high-status job or support policies that reduce
7 inequality (Dupree et al., 2021). This denial of racial inequality—and the hierarchy-enhancing
8 implications of this motivated belief—also influence White scholars’ valuation of research on
9 race and racism and motivation to mitigate such inequality in our field.

10 **Backlash Against Confronting Bias.** These psychological foundations of ignorance and
11 denial are likely to manifest in behaviors that contribute to the interrogation and isolation of
12 racially minoritized scholars (for specific instances of interrogation, see Torrez et al., 2022). Due
13 to their racial identities, racially minoritized scholars who seek to bring their lived experiences to
14 their research may be perceived as unable to shed personal biases—leaving them subject to
15 empirical interrogation. In contrast, due to historical power dynamics, White scholars’ personal
16 biases and lived experiences are perceived as default, neutral, and more easily adhering to
17 traditional notions of objective science—excusing them from such interrogation. Such dynamics
18 are made clear when we examine our field’s own literature on bias confrontation. Minority
19 groups who confront bias are often met with skepticism (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Drury &
20 Kaiser, 2014; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). Indeed, Black people who confront racial bias face more
21 backlash compared to White confronters (Schultz & Maddox, 2013). This is especially
22 concerning considering the tendency for marginalized scholars to study topics related to
23 inequalities relative to other research topics (Hoppe et al., 2019). Scholarship focused on racial

1 justice violates the status quo of psychological science, wherein racial scholarship is severely
2 underrepresented (Roberts et al., 2020). When people of color do confront bias or challenge the
3 status quo, they are more likely to be discredited by others (Ashburn-Nardo et al., 2008; Kaiser
4 & Miller, 2001).

5 *Institutional Foundations*

6 **Objectivity Norms.** Another factor driving racial inequality in psychological science
7 may be the implicit norms enforced by institutions and stakeholders in our field. One such norm
8 is objectivity. Objectivity, defined as the “extent to which a researcher’s methods are free from
9 prejudice”, is a norm typically upheld across the sciences that enforces scientific rigor, personal
10 detachment, and a lack of bias (Armstrong, 1979, p. 423; Zuberi & Bonilla-Silva, 2008).

11 However, applying traditional standards of objectivity to the study of a topic so often cast as
12 subjective (such as racial scholarship) may hold implications for the reproduction of racial
13 inequality in psychological science. For example, as previously mentioned, racially minoritized
14 scholars who conduct research on racialized topics may be seen as too invested in the
15 conclusions of their research, inviting interrogation over whether they are truly objective. In
16 addition, the approaches and methodologies that are most likely to center the perspectives of
17 racially marginalized people and provide a more critical lens to psychological studies of race are
18 likely to be run counter to predominant norms of objectivity (e.g., Critical Race Psychology; see
19 Salter & Adams, 2013; Salter & Haugen, 2017). Similarly, the difficulties associated with
20 sampling racially minoritized groups members (Okazaki & Sue, 1995) and the use of qualitative
21 methodologies to elevate the marginalized perspectives of these groups (e.g., Bowleg, 2013;
22 Settles, 2006) are likely to invite scrutiny in a field devoted to rigorous, quantitative science in its
23 pursuit of objectivity.

1 Racially minoritized scholars may take notice of this scrutiny, stifling their innovative
2 and radical racial scholarship by attempting to objectify their work. This process fundamentally
3 shapes racial discourse and racial scholarship in the academy in ways that are anything but
4 objective (Anderson, 2015). For example, deterred by frequent and unconstructive interrogations
5 of their work, underrepresented racial minorities may present their work in ways that align with
6 the status quo—ultimately stalling efforts to encourage radical and novel racial scholarship and
7 instead advancing a psychology of race filtered through the perspective of Whiteness (Andersen,
8 2003; Jones, 2010). Applying these findings to publication and science communication, strong
9 negative reactions to researchers who challenge the status quo can contribute to racially
10 minoritized scholars' feelings of alienation in academia. Ultimately, increased interrogation and
11 alienation may prompt scholars of color to leave academia, leaving the field bereft of academics
12 with valuable personal and academic experience to lend to research, teaching, and service.

13 **The Prioritization of Individualistic Approaches.** Approaching racism as a systemic
14 issue existing not only within the minds of individuals but also, largely, in the fabric of our
15 society runs counter to the predominant individualistic approach of psychological science.
16 Critical race psychology is an area of scholarship that imposes a critical lens upon hegemonic
17 perspectives in psychology—in large part to transform the psychological study of race from an
18 approach that views racism as embedded within the psychology of individuals to one that views
19 racism as systemic (Salter & Adams, 2013). However, as this approach challenges the status quo,
20 it may prompt a more skeptical review process, whereby ordinary claims require extraordinary
21 evidence (e.g., evidence that racism is systemic). Arguing that individual approaches to racism
22 will not suffice is an upward battle, given the prevailing individualistic approach of our science.

1 These higher standards increase the barriers to publication, particularly in higher-ranked
2 journals, potentially stalling programs of research, promotions, and careers.

3 **Implications of Racial Inequality in Social Psychological Science**

4 Before turning to recommendations, we briefly note the implications of racial inequality
5 in social psychological science, for they are grave. In short, the field of social psychology is a
6 microcosm of a society that has a long legacy of upholding racial inequality. Individually, racial
7 ignorance derived from segregation, the motivated tendency to deny racial privilege, and the
8 interrogation of racially marginalized scholars who challenge the status quo are keeping White
9 editors and grant reviewers from seeing the importance of race-centered research questions and
10 keeping scholars of color marginalized (Knowles et al., 2014; Roberts & Rizzo, 2021).

11 Structurally, objectivity norms and an emphasis on individuality maintain the Whiteness of our
12 field, keeping White and racially minoritized psychological scientists from firmly and explicitly
13 centering race in their scholarship.

14 These barriers contradict every intention set forth by psychological scholars who wish to
15 improve the rigor of our field. For instance, scholars' attempts to objectify their research in order
16 to align themselves with the status quo and seek approval from institutional gatekeepers (e.g.,
17 editors and reviewers) fundamentally shape the landscape of racial scholarship in the academy. A
18 bias-free psychology of race might be envisioned as inclusive of all perspectives, elevating those
19 who have been historically marginalized, and allowing for complexity in its understanding of
20 race and racism. However, objectivity norms create a psychology of race wherein racial
21 scholarship is simultaneously too biased toward dominant (i.e., White) perspectives and lacking
22 necessary nuance to capture the range of mechanisms that drive racism.

1 The centering of White perspectives has consequences for the quality and impact of our
2 science, and the cost to society is also great. For scientists wishing to elevate psychological
3 science’s rigor and stand amongst policymakers, organizational stakeholders, and colleagues in
4 mathematical and physical sciences, decontextualized research proliferating ineffective
5 approaches to diversity across society is antithetical to these goals. For example, colorblind or
6 instrumental approaches to diversity (Apfelbaum, et al., 2008; Apfelbaum et al., 2012; Georgeac
7 & Rattan, 2022) remain a significant part of our field’s past and present connection with
8 diversity management strategies in organizations. And yet, our field provides very little evidence
9 of such approaches’ utility in attenuating hierarchy and, in fact, such strategies may contribute to
10 inequality reproduction (Georgeac & Rattan, 2022; Starck et al., 2021).

11 Ultimately, a psychology of race that does not fully incorporate and value the
12 perspectives of racially minoritized people is limited in its imagination and constrained in its
13 implications. Adjacent fields like sociology have not been influenced by the constraint of finding
14 universal truths to the extent psychology has (Cauce, 2011; Cole, 2009), allowing for greater
15 centering of the complexities of race and identities without relegating these dynamics to the
16 periphery of science. It is thus no surprise that insights related to identity often first originate in
17 other social sciences (Cole, 2009) and are subsequently integrated into social psychology. As an
18 example, political scientists Sen and Wasow (2016) argue that “race is a bundle of sticks”, better
19 understood as a bundle of related categories (e.g., skin color, social norms, religion, class) that
20 co-occur with the latent factor we call “race.” This contrasts with psychology’s current
21 understanding of race as an essentialist, single stick, that aggregates across these related but
22 separate dimensions. Similarly, sociologist Ellis Monk (2022) argues against race as a category
23 in the first place, arguing that scientists are placing rigid categories (e.g., race) onto inherently

1 fluid concepts. Finally, sociologists Barbara and Karen Fields (2022) take these ideas even
2 further and posit that race is neither essentialist nor constructivist but illusory. While social
3 psychologists often operate under the assumption that race produces racism, these sociologists
4 argue that it is the very act of racism that produces the illusion of race.

5 We do not mean to imply that our field uniquely suffers from oversimplified
6 understandings of race. However, as mentioned above, social psychology is uniquely inhibited
7 from incorporating paradigm-changing insights into theories, methodologies, and analyses.
8 Social psychology must resist the impulse of universality and individuality and lean into more
9 radical and innovative approaches to race. How would psychology change if the above ideas, and
10 more, were incorporated into our science? How much closer could we come to a set of truths that
11 applied to more of humanity by forgoing our insistence on universal truths colored by Whiteness
12 (Guthrie, 1976)? While there is some evidence of change (see Martinez, 2022 for an extension of
13 racecraft in the realm of face perception), this work remains undervalued and deprioritized.

14 **Recommendations**

15 By now, we hope it is clear that social psychology has a problem with race and it is
16 imperative we address it. We now outline ways that individuals, departments, and institutions
17 can take concrete steps to mitigate their contribution to the field's centering of Whiteness and
18 ultimately incorporate explicitly anti-racist methods and practices to their scholarship.

19 ***Understand the Scope of the Problem***

20 First and foremost, it is imperative that we know the scope of the problem. While
21 anecdotes can be powerful illustrators of racism's impact, our field is primarily influenced by
22 empirical evidence. Thus, individuals and organizations must audit themselves to see and
23 quantify the extent to which they are perpetuating racism. For instance, as noted on many

1 psychology departments' Diversity and Anti-Racism statements, several departments fielded
2 surveys in 2020 and 2021 to assess the racial climate felt by graduate students, postdoctoral
3 fellows, and faculty and to gather suggestions on how to improve the climate in the future (see
4 University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign for one example; Psychology Department Anti-Racism
5 Action Plan, 2020). Anecdotally, scholars have audited the race (and other identities) of those
6 they cite in their manuscripts as an academic "racial Bechdel Test" (Selisker, 2015), revealing
7 just how White-centered is the scholarship in which they engage (Zurn et al., 2020). Moreover,
8 in 2020, several departments hosted implicit bias workshops and anti-racist book clubs to
9 improve understanding of interpersonal and structural racism, which can lead to deep reflection
10 and awareness of White privilege, as also noted on many departments' Diversity and Anti-
11 Racism websites (see St. Olaf College for one such example; Psychology Department
12 Commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, 2021). Such data-driven steps—involving both
13 empirical audits and conversations—are crucial; we must fully understand the nature of the
14 problem before we can effectively intervene upon it.

15 Scholars must also increase their awareness of White-centric practices and norms at all
16 stages of research: from hypothesis generation, operationalization, and analysis, to interpretation
17 of findings, the review process, and ultimately, publishing. One useful tool to assist in this
18 awareness is Elizabeth Cole's model for increasing awareness in psychology of intersectionality,
19 or the interconnected hegemonic nature of social identities (Cole, 2009). She encourages scholars
20 to ask three central questions at each stage of the research process, namely, "who is included
21 within this category" and "what role does inequality play" (as well as "where are the sites of
22 commonalities across differences"). Centering these questions can help underscore when
23 assumptions are being made regarding prototypicality and norms that are rooted within

1 Whiteness as well as offer follow-up questions that will help mitigate it. Scholars should also ask
2 “who is/is not included in my sample?”, ideally leading them to increase sample diversity for
3 generalizability, clarify to whom their samples refer (e.g., including racial qualifiers before
4 generic words like “women”, “men” and “people” in titles, abstracts, and results), and provide
5 constraints on universal claims (Kraus & Torrez, 2020).

6 We note that, while addressing racial ignorance is a critical first step (Livingston, 2021),
7 it is just the tip of the iceberg. Many well-meaning interventions aimed at improving racial
8 equity focus solely on awareness without a strategy for implementation, allowing people to feel
9 good for doing something that ultimately changes nothing (e.g., implicit bias workshops;
10 Onyeador et al., 2021). In fact, only engaging in shallow forms of addressing racial disparities
11 can further entrench hierarchy by promoting an illusory sense of progress and fairness (Kaiser et
12 al., 2013; Kraus et al., 2022).

13 *Address White-Centered Practices*

14 While there are many areas in which social psychology can decenter Whiteness, we focus
15 on three here: explicitly decentering Whiteness in research representativeness, decentering
16 Whiteness as a field-level norm, and decentering Whiteness in institutional incentive structures.

17 **Decentering Whiteness in research representativeness.** First, we encourage the field to
18 decenter Whiteness by reconsidering a) whom we invest in as research assistants, graduate
19 students, and faculty members, b) whom we request for invited talks and special issue
20 submissions, and c) whom we research, cite, and elevate. The problem of racial diversity within
21 our field is obvious. At the most senior level, the number of full tenured Black professors within
22 social psychology is scarce, with full tenured Latinx and Native American professors at even
23 more dismal numbers. In 2019, Black professors made up 3 percent of full tenured professors

1 registered with the *Society of Personality and Social Psychology* (SPSP), Latinx faculty made up
2 2% of full professors, and at the time of the survey, no full tenured professors identified as
3 Native American (SPSP, 2019). To remedy this issue, academic institutions must invest in the
4 successful recruitment and retention of faculty of color (see Dupree and Boykin, 2020).

5 Many programs exist to address pipeline issues, from summer research opportunity
6 programs to community spaces like the *Black Social and Personality Psychologists Retreat*
7 (BLASPR; NSF, 2018; SPSP, 2018) and *Flourish* (SPSP, 2020) which take place after SPSP's
8 annual conference. However, very few programs focus on community-building (BLASPR and
9 Flourish are two exceptions) and the ones that do are rarely institutionalized, with financial,
10 temporal, and cognitive burden of maintaining them falling on the shoulders of racially
11 minoritized scholars. We propose an increase in institutionalized support for programs that
12 increase inclusion and networking opportunities. Examples include the *Emerging Scholars Talk*
13 *Series* in NYU's psychology department (NYU, 2022), which explicitly brings in diverse
14 scholars to present their work. Rather than passively waiting for scholars to reach out and request
15 to give a talk—requests that require a level of cultural knowledge that not all academics
16 possess—organizers can reach out on social media and organizational listservs to request
17 speakers, providing them with consistent, professional growth and increasing the exposure of
18 their work. If at all possible, organizers should also consider providing an honorarium to
19 speakers and covering travel costs, which can further incentivize a diverse array of scholars to
20 present. Moreover, organizers should endeavor to invite a diverse array of racially minoritized
21 scholars from a range of institutions, not only the most high-profile scholars from the highest-
22 ranked institutions. Investing in scholars of color can go a long way toward diversifying the
23 field, but it will require effort and financial capital.

1 Similarly, we encourage scholars to think deeply about the representativeness of their
2 research samples, materials, and methods. Many scholars use convenience samples such as
3 psychology students and online databases, which are notoriously non-representative, in part due
4 to the overwhelming pressure to “publish or perish” (Anderson et al., 2019). Research stimuli for
5 race-neutral work often feature White-only faces, names, and relevant scenarios, in an effort to
6 “control for extraneous variance” (Cook & Over, 2021). However, titles, abstracts, and general
7 findings are often described as if the research was done on representative samples using
8 representative materials (Henrich et al., 2010; Rad et al., 2018). To decenter Whiteness in
9 research design, we encourage scholars to be clearly and accurately describe who their research
10 is about and to whom it can generalize—and to increase sample and stimuli diversity to be more
11 inclusive. Scholars must also urge institutions to create better avenues to support finding and
12 adequately compensating samples of racial minorities.

13 Increasing sample and stimuli diversity is easier said than done, and the field must invest
14 in diversifying both. Online databases charge a premium for access to racially diverse samples;
15 for example, Cloud Research, a popular participant database software, charges a per-participant
16 fee of 0.24 cents to recruit White participants but 0.59 cents to recruit Black participants (Litman
17 et al., 2017). Furthermore, many stimuli databases treat race as an afterthought, often not
18 consistently labeling stimuli with accurate racial information (Scheuerman et al., 2020). A
19 special issue on diversifying standard paradigms in psychology—such as the “mind in the eyes”
20 task, currently assessed using only White faces (Baron-Cohen et al., 2001)—may encourage
21 researchers to create these materials. We also urge departments and institutions to develop
22 innovative ways of increasing access. There are some mechanisms for running representative or
23 community samples at low cost, notably the Time-sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences

1 (TESS; <http://tessexperiments.org/>) initiative and Harvard Digital Laboratory for the Social
2 Sciences (DLABSS; <https://dlabss.harvard.edu/>). However, these mechanisms are idiosyncratic,
3 and access often depends on institutional prestige or luck. Other mechanisms such as the
4 University of Chicago Survey Lab (<https://voices.uchicago.edu/surveylab/>) and Project Implicit
5 (<https://www.projectimplicit.net/>) increase access to hard-to-recruit populations but are
6 prohibitively expensive. These examples suggest that pooling resources can be an effective way
7 to increase access to minoritized populations without drastically increasing costs.

8 Finally, we encourage scholars to acknowledge and celebrate the value of non-
9 quantitative methods in decentering Whiteness. Qualitative methods—including storytelling and
10 participatory action research—are at the forefront of the research paradigms of critical race
11 theory and liberation psychology (Comas-Díaz & Torres Rivera, 2020). In contrast to
12 quantitative methods (e.g., experiment and survey research), qualitative methods literally give
13 voice to the lived experiences of marginalized groups. Analyses that use or are informed by these
14 methods have a greater capacity to place racial issues in a broader historical and societal
15 context—bringing issues of race and power into the spaces where they are likely to be best
16 understood (Kraus & Torrez, 2020). People of color are one of the most important sources of
17 information on race and racism (Adams et al., 2018) and yet, qualitative methodologies centering
18 their perspectives are often devalued and deemed less empirically rigorous in psychological
19 science (Kidd, 2002) and therefore, are underrepresented in psychological research.

20 **Decentering Whiteness in social psychological norms.** Second, we propose decentering
21 Whiteness in social psychological norms. Norms are powerful tools for changing behaviors and
22 altering outcomes; the social psychological research supporting this claim is vast (Cialdini &

1 Goldstein, 2004; Tankard & Paluck, 2016). And yet, our field hasn't fully grappled with the
2 impact of these norms on perpetuating racial inequality.

3 *The role of institutional gatekeepers.* The norms proliferated by social psychological
4 gatekeepers—those who are tenured, associate editors at major journals, heads of funding
5 agencies, etc.—can have an outsized effect on increased equity. We can look to the open science
6 movement as a great example of gatekeeper norms reverberating throughout the discipline, as the
7 Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP) guidelines put forth by the Center for Open
8 Science (Nosek et al., 2015) are now being used by several journals in the field such as the
9 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (JPSP:
10 <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/psp/index?tab=4>) and *Cortex* (Chambers, 2018). These norms
11 can go beyond open science, such as the norms at the Journal of Experimental Social Psychology
12 where they espouse not only cutting-edge open science practices but also inclusive language
13 ([https://www.elsevier.com/journals/journal-of-experimental-social-psychology/0022-1031/guide-](https://www.elsevier.com/journals/journal-of-experimental-social-psychology/0022-1031/guide-for-authors)
14 [for-authors](https://www.elsevier.com/journals/journal-of-experimental-social-psychology/0022-1031/guide-for-authors)). Requiring adherence to such guidelines in a higher-ranked journal such as *JPSP*
15 will likely increase scholars' familiarity with open science, making it much more likely that they
16 will follow those guidelines for journals that do not require it. Scholars will become more
17 comfortable with doing anti-racist work if they have the chance to practice, and disciplinary
18 gatekeepers have a fundamental role in creating systems and spaces that make anti-racist
19 behaviors valued and easy to implement.

20 Increasing the diversity and lived experience of gatekeepers is another way of changing
21 the norms. For instance, individuals who grew up in more racially-diverse spaces are less likely
22 to endorse colorblindness and more likely to be race-conscious in how they view and react to
23 racial dynamics (Meyers et al., 2021). Having people with more diverse cultural experiences at

1 the helm of important social psychological organizations is critical for altering disciplinary
2 norms. A diverse set of gatekeepers will be more cognizant of inequity and marginalization—and
3 have the institutional power to implement solutions to those problems. For example, editors and
4 reviewers who are more race-conscious may be more likely to notice White-centered practices
5 within the publishing process, including racial research receiving greater scrutiny, samples being
6 predominantly-White (but referenced using in race-neutral language), and research focusing
7 exclusively on racial minorities being forced to include White control samples for publication.
8 Having a diverse set of gatekeepers with the power to address these problems—for instance, by
9 changing reviewer guidelines, empowering associate editors to explicitly disregard reviewer
10 advice for White control samples, and requiring precise language in the use of convenience
11 samples—would go a long way toward shifting norms within the field.

12 *The role of open science.* Although the open science movement has imparted important
13 lessons around setting and proliferating norms to improve the quality of our science, the
14 particular norms it seeks to advance may inadvertently contribute to racial inequality in the field
15 (Bennett, 2021). In many ways, the open science movement was sparked by the highly
16 publicized replication crisis in psychology—an increasingly occurring phenomenon whereby
17 attempted replications of past study findings frequently do not reveal the same result (Maxwell,
18 Lau, & Howard, 2015). A key aim of the open science movement in our field is to increase the
19 quality of psychological science by making scientific research (e.g., methodological decisions,
20 pre-registered hypotheses, analysis syntax) more accessible and transparent in order to increase
21 replicability (Crüwell et al., 2018). In an effort to increase the legitimacy of psychological
22 science, open science advocates pushed forth more rigorous methodological and analytical
23 standards for hypothesis testing. While these efforts are well-intentioned, without careful

1 attention to the way in which these standards are applied, they may inadvertently contribute to
2 objectivity norms in our field (Bennett, 2021). For example, scholars of color conducting work
3 on race, who are already more likely to receive interrogations to their objectivity in the form of
4 methodological critique (Torrez et al., 2022), may see increased intensity of these interrogations
5 with the elevation of open science. Further, these interrogations, which disproportionately affect
6 scholars of color, may be lauded as part of our field's natural scientific practice of increasing
7 open science, rather than critiqued for their unique burden on scholars of color. Additionally,
8 calls for increased power within the Open Science movement (e.g., increased sample sizes) may
9 be particularly burdensome for scholars who study racially marginalized groups. We encourage
10 open science advocates to consider how this movement can be reimagined to support the
11 perspectives and career success of marginalized scholars, including, but not limited to, the
12 guidance provided to support early career feminists in open science by Pownall and colleagues
13 (2021).

14 *The role of scholars.* Subjectivity is inevitable in scholarship. Rather than attempting to
15 quantify and standardize psychology's path into scientific legitimacy through objectivity and
16 scientific rigor, we must acknowledge bias and subjectivity, deepening our understanding of how
17 our identities shape our science—including the research topics we choose, the people we study,
18 and the outcomes we care about. Unlike the hierarchy-enhancing assumptions of psychological
19 research that currently dominate our field, this stance considers the subjectivity of multiple
20 parties, including White scholars conducting racial scholarship, scholars whose research is not
21 explicitly racialized (but that undoubtedly has racial consequences), and scholars conducting
22 quantitative research. From ideation and research design to analysis, all quantitative scholars,
23 regardless of their racial identity, are inundated with subjective choices influenced by their

1 backgrounds and identities, particularly around the interpretation of data (D’Ignazio & Klein,
2 2020). One solution aimed at raising awareness of subjectivity in scholarship is the
3 implementation of reflexivity statements, which we discuss below.

4 Typical academic norms would prescribe that scholars keep emotion and personal
5 investment as separate from the research process as possible (Nzinga et al., 2018). However,
6 White and racially minoritized scholars who study racial issues can and should make readers
7 aware of their perspective, position, and (for some) privilege. Additionally, researchers who
8 study topics they perceive to be race-neutral might reflect on how their positionality may
9 nonetheless manifest in their work (Dupree & Kraus, 2022). Reflexivity statements require all
10 scholars to reflect on the experiences and perspectives that they intentionally or unintentionally
11 infuse into the research process, from ideation to interpretation. Several examples of such
12 reflexivity statements exist. For example, Roberts and colleagues (2020) provide a note in the
13 Acknowledgement section of their recent manuscript: “When the manuscript for this article was
14 drafted, one author self-identified as U.S. Black-White American, and four authors self-
15 identified as U.S. White American” (p. 12). Similarly, the current authors provide a reflexivity
16 statement in the Acknowledgement of this article. For guidance on how to reflect upon one’s
17 positionality as well as craft reflexivity statements, see Jamieson et al. (2022) as well as Homes
18 (2020).

19 Returning to institutional gatekeepers, journals could require a reflexivity statement prior
20 to submission in all social scientific papers—a practice typically more common in qualitative
21 research. Editors could reflect on their own positionality and require reviewers to provide a
22 reflexivity statement when reviewing racial scholarship. In this way, scholars can reflect on their
23 positionality in a way that invites structural changes by raising awareness of all scholars’

1 subjectivity, rather than interrogating the objectivity of the few scholars of color in our field.
2 These reflexivity statements fit well in the field's focus on increasing the transparency and
3 openness of our science. In the same way that journals require individuals to disclose their
4 financial conflicts with their research, we should also disclose how our experiences and positions
5 within society impacts our science.

6 **Decentering Whiteness in incentive structures.** Last, but not least, current incentives in
7 the field do not match purported values. If we state that antiracism is a core value, those values
8 should align with what gets rewarded within the field. As an example, publishing as many
9 articles as possible is desired and highly rewarded, with no caveats given for racial dynamics
10 (e.g., sample recruitment) that impact the capacity to publish quickly. Racially minoritized
11 populations can be harder to recruit than White populations for a variety of reasons, ranging from
12 deep distrust of academics due to historical racism (e.g., the Tuskegee experiments; Scharff et
13 al., 2010) to a lack of institutional compensation that aids recruitment. If we want to make social
14 psychology less White, we must also change the expectations that are built on White-centered
15 norms.

16 Importantly, we would like to see our field incentivize scholarship that not only
17 investigates racial topics but does so from a critical lens that challenges the status quo. This can
18 include, but is not limited to, a series of articles in every issue of higher-ranked social
19 psychological journals (e.g., *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Psychological*
20 *Science*) focused on critical race psychology or critical qualitative and quantitative
21 methodologies (e.g., Clarke & Braun, 2019; Garcia et al., 2018) that are authored by scholars of
22 color. As the status quo currently marginalizes these perspectives and approaches (Hoppe et al.,
23 2019), the relegation of this work to lower-ranked specialty journals or special issues exacerbates

1 racial inequality by contributing to racial disparities in publishing, citations, hiring, and
2 promotions (Hofstra et al., 2020; Roberts et al., 2020) A proactive approach that prioritizes this
3 work across issues in higher-ranked journals would bring those perspectives from the periphery
4 (e.g., special issues and specialty journals) into high-status, mainstream spaces, helping to
5 alleviate racial disparities. Editors and reviewers in these mainstream journals must also be
6 required to become more acquainted with alternative perspectives and approaches in order to
7 better evaluate and promote critical work on racial inequality. Short-term changes might involve
8 adding more expertise in qualitative methods and critical scholarship to editorial boards; long-
9 term changes would involve more methodological training in psychology doctoral programs.

10 **Conclusions**

11 Social psychology is not immune from racism; racism lives here, too. It is no longer
12 enough for our discipline to be aware of racism—social psychological scholars, gatekeepers, and
13 institutions must be actively anti-racist in the practice of our science. In this article, we aimed to
14 provide social psychologists with the sociohistorical context, psychological foundations, and
15 practical recommendations necessary to accomplish this task. We firmly believe that social
16 psychology is well-positioned to fight against one of society’s most troubling ills: racial
17 inequality. However, before we profess our intent to save the world’s ills, we must save
18 ourselves. We hope that this article encourages social psychological scholars, gatekeepers, and
19 institutions to take concrete steps toward an anti-racist field and society.

References

- 1
2 Adams, G., Salter, P. S., Kurtiş, T., Naemi, P., & Estrada, Villalta, S. (2018). Subordinated
3 knowledge as a tool for creative maladjustment and resistance to racial oppression.
4 *Journal of Social Issues*, 74(2), 337-354. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12272>
- 5 American Psychological Association. (2020, May 29). 'We are living in a racism pandemic,'
6 says APA President. Retrieved from
7 <https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2020/05/racism-pandemic>
- 8 Andersen, M. (2003). Whitewashing Race: A Critical Review Essay on 'Whiteness. In A. Doane
9 and E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.) pp. 21–34. *Whiteout: The Continuing Significance of Racism*.
10 New York: Routledge.
- 11 Anderson, C. A., Allen, J. J., Plante, C., Quigley-McBride, A., Lovett, A., & Rokkum, J. N.
12 (2019). The MTurkification of social and personality psychology. *Personality and Social*
13 *Psychology Bulletin*, 45(6), 842-850. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218798821>
- 14 Anderson, E. (2015). The white space. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 1(1), 10-21.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649214561306>
- 16 Armstrong, J. S. (1979). Advocacy and objectivity in science. *Management Science*, 25(5), 423-
17 428. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.25.5.423>
- 18 Apfelbaum, E. P., Norton, M. I., & Sommers, S. R. (2012). Racial color blindness: Emergence,
19 practice, and implications. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21(3), 205-209.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214111434980>
- 21 Apfelbaum, E. P., Sommers, S. R., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Seeing race and seeming racist?
22 Evaluating strategic colorblindness in social interaction. *Journal of Personality and*
23 *Social Psychology*, 95(4), 918. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0011990>

- 1 Ashburn-Nardo, L., Morris, K. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2008). The confronting prejudiced
2 responses (CPR) model: Applying CPR in organizations. *Academy of Management*
3 *Learning & Education*, 7(3), 332-342. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2008.34251671>
- 4 Banks, W. C., McQuater, G. V., Ross, J. A., & Ward, W. E. (1983). Delayed gratification in
5 blacks: A critical review. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 9(2), 43–56.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1177/009579848300900203>
- 7 Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Hill, J., Raste, Y., and Plumb, I. (2001). The “Reading the
8 Mind in the Eyes” test revised version: a study with normal adults, and adults with
9 Asperger syndrome or high-functioning autism. *Journal of Child Psychology and*
10 *Psychiatry*, 42, 241–251.
- 11 Bauer, P. J. (2020). Retraction of “Declines in religiosity predict increases in violent crime—but
12 not among countries with relatively high average IQ.” *Psychological Science*, 31(7), 905–
13 905. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797620941437>
- 14 Bennett, E. A. (2021). Open Science From a Qualitative, Feminist Perspective: Epistemological
15 Dogmas and a Call for Critical Examination. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 45(4),
16 448–456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03616843211036460>
- 17 Bowleg, L. (2013). “Once you’ve blended the cake, you can’t take the parts back to the main
18 ingredients”: Black gay and bisexual men’s descriptions and experiences of
19 intersectionality. *Sex Roles*, 68(11), 754-767. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-012-0152-4>
- 20 Boykin, A. W. (1983). The academic performance of Afro-American children. In J. Spence
21 (Ed.), *Achievement and achievement motives: Psychological and sociological*
22 *perspectives* (pp. 321-371). W.H. Freeman and Company.

1 Boykin, C.M., Brown, N.D., Carter, J.T., Dukes, K., Green, D.J., Harrison, T., Hebl, M.,
2 McCleary-Gaddy, A., Membere, A., McJunkins, C.A., Simmons, C., Singletary Walker,
3 S., Smith, A.N. & Williams, A.D. (2020). Anti-racist actions and accountability: not
4 more empty promises. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, 39(7), 775-786.

5 British Psychological Society (2020, June 4). Standing Against Racism. Retrieved from
6 <https://www.bps.org.uk/psychologist/standing-against-racism>

7 Cauce, A. M. (2011). Is multicultural psychology a-scientific?: Diverse methods for diversity
8 research. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 17, 228–233.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023880>.

10 Chambers, C. D. (2018). Introducing the transparency and openness promotion (TOP) guidelines
11 and badges for open practices at Cortex. *Cortex*, 106, 316-318.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2018.08.001>

13 Cialdini, R. B. and Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity.
14 *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 591–622.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.142015>

16 Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 64(3),
17 170–180. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014564>

18 Comas-Díaz, L., & Torres Rivera, E. (Eds.). (2020). *Liberation psychology: Theory, method,*
19 *practice, and social justice*. American Psychological Association.

20 Cook, R., & Over, H. (2021). Why is the literature on first impressions so focused on White
21 faces?. *Royal Society open science*, 8(9), 211146. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.211146>

1 Crüwell, S., van Doorn, J., Etz, A., Makel, M. C., Niebaum, J. C., Orben, A., . . . Schulte-
2 Mecklenbeck, M. (2018). 8 easy steps to open science : An annotated reading list.
3 PsyArXiv, 1-32. <https://doi.org/10.31234/OSF.IO/CFZYX>

4 Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to
5 confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*,
6 29(4), 532-544. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202250923>

7 D'ignazio, C., & Klein, L. F. (2020). *Data feminism*. MIT press.

8 Dubois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of Black folk*. Chicago, IL: A. C. McClurg and Company.

9 Dupree, C. H. & Boykin, C. M. (2021). Racial inequality in academia: Systemic origins, modern
10 challenges, and policy recommendations. *Policy Insights from Behavioral and Brain*
11 *Sciences*, 8(1), 11-18.

12 Dupree, C. H., & Kraus, M. W. (2022). Psychological science is not race neutral. *Perspectives on*
13 *Psychological Science*, 17(1), 270-275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620979820>

14 Dupree, C. H., Torrez, B., Obioha, O., & Fiske, S. T. (2021). Race–status associations: Distinct
15 effects of three novel measures among White and Black perceivers. *Journal of*
16 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 120(3), 601-625.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000257>

18 Drury, B. J., & Kaiser, C. R. (2014). Allies against sexism: The role of men in confronting
19 sexism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 70(4), 637-652. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12083>

20 Farrar, J. (2022, August 10). *An update on Wellcome’s anti-racism programme*. Wellcome.
21 <https://wellcome.org/news/update-welcomes-anti-racism-programme>

22 Fields, B. J., & Fields, K. E. (2022). *Racecraft: The soul of inequality in American life*. Verso
23 Books.

- 1 Fine, C. (2017). *Testosterone Rex: Myths of sex, science, and society*. WW Norton & Company.
- 2 Georgeac, O. A., & Rattan, A. (2022). The business case for diversity backfires: Detrimental
3 effects of organizations' instrumental diversity rhetoric for underrepresented group
4 members' sense of belonging. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000394>
- 6 Gifty, A. (2021, June 8). The GRE Causes More Harm than Good to Women of Color. Medium.
7 Retrieved from [https://zora.medium.com/the-gre-causes-more-harm-than-good-to-](https://zora.medium.com/the-gre-causes-more-harm-than-good-to-women-of-color-3640e620f432)
8 [women-of-color-3640e620f432](https://zora.medium.com/the-gre-causes-more-harm-than-good-to-women-of-color-3640e620f432)
- 9 Grusec, J., & Mischel, W. (1966). Model's characteristics as determinants of social
10 learning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4(2), 211-215.
- 11 Guthrie, R. V. (1976). *Even the rat was white: A historical view of psychology*. New York:
12 Harper and Row.
- 13 Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). Most people are not WEIRD. *Nature*,
14 466(7302), 29-29. <https://doi.org/10.1038/466029a>
- 15 Hill Collins, P. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of*
16 *empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- 17 Hofstra, B., Kulkarni, V. V., Galvez, S. M. N., He, B., Jurafsky, D., & McFarland, D. A. (2020).
18 The Diversity–Innovation Paradox in Science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
19 *Sciences*, 117(17), 9284-9291. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1915378117>
- 20 Hoppe, T. A., Litovitz, A., Willis, K. A., Meseroll, R. A., Perkins, M. J., Hutchins, B. I., ... &
21 Santangelo, G. M. (2019). Topic choice contributes to the lower rate of NIH awards to
22 African-American/black scientists. *Science Advances*, 5(10).
23 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaw7238>

1 Jamieson, M. K., Pownall, M., & Govaart, G. H. (2022, February 23). Reflexivity in quantitative
2 research: a rationale and beginner's guide. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/xvrhm>

3 Johnson, D. J., Tress, T., Burkel, N., Taylor, C., & Cesario, J. (2020). Retraction for Johnson et
4 al., Officer characteristics and racial disparities in fatal officer-involved shootings.
5 *Proceeding of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117, 9127.

6 Jones, J. M. (2010). I'm white and you're not: The value of unraveling ethnocentric science.
7 *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(6), 700-707.

8 Jones, Carolyn. "California Districts Look to Rename Schools Linked to Racist History."
9 *EdSource*, 30 June 2020, [https://edsource.org/2020/california-districts-look-to-rename-](https://edsource.org/2020/california-districts-look-to-rename-schools-linked-to-racist-past/634080)
10 [schools-linked-to-racist-past/634080](https://edsource.org/2020/california-districts-look-to-rename-schools-linked-to-racist-past/634080).

11 Kaiser, C. R., Major, B., Jurcevic, I., Dover, T. L., Brady, L. M., & Shapiro, J. R. (2013).
12 Presumed fair: Ironic effects of organizational diversity structures. *Journal of Personality*
13 *and Social Psychology*, 104(3), 504–519. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030838>

14 Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2001). Stop complaining! The social costs of making attributions
15 to discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(2), 254-263.

16 Kidd, S. A. (2002). The role of qualitative research in psychological journals. *Psychological*
17 *Methods*, 7(1), 126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.7.1.126>

18 Knowles, E. D., & Lowery, B. S. (2012). Meritocracy, self- concerns, and Whites' denial of
19 racial inequity. *Self and Identity*, 11, 202–222.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2010.542015>

21 Knowles, E. D., Lowery, B. S., Chow, R. M., & Unzueta, M. M. (2014). Deny, distance, or
22 dismantle? How white Americans manage a privileged identity. *Perspectives on*
23 *Psychological Science*, 9(6), 594-609. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614554658>

- 1 Kraus, M. W., & Torrez, B. (2020). A psychology of power that is embedded in societal
2 structures. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 33, 86-90.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.07.018>
- 4 Kraus, M. W., Rucker, J. M., & Richeson, J. A. (2017). Americans misperceive racial economic
5 equality. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(39), 10324–10331.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1707719114>
- 7 Kraus, M. W., Torrez, B., & Hollie, L. (2022). How narratives of racial progress create barriers
8 to diversity, equity, and inclusion in organizations. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 43,
9 108-113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.06.022>
- 10 Kristofferson, K., White, K., & Peloza, J. (2014). The nature of slacktivism: How the social
11 observability of an initial act of token support affects subsequent prosocial action.
12 *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40(6), 1149-1166. <https://doi.org/10.1086/674137>
- 13 Ledgerwood, A., Hudson, S. T. J., Lewis, N. A., Maddox, K. B., Pickett, C. L., Remedios, J. D.,
14 Cheryan, S., Diekmann, A. B., Dutra, N. B., Goh, J. X., Goodwin, S. A., Munakata, Y.,
15 Navarro, D. J., Onyeador, I. N., Srivastava, S., & Wilkins, C. L. (2022). The Pandemic as
16 a Portal: Reimagining Psychological Science as Truly Open and Inclusive. *Perspectives*
17 *on Psychological Science*, 174569162110366.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916211036654>
- 19 Litman, L., Robinson, J., & Abberbock, T. (2017). TurkPrime.com: A versatile crowdsourcing
20 data acquisition platform for the behavioral sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 49(2),
21 433-442. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-016-0727-z>
- 22 Livingston, R. W. (2021). *The conversation: How seeking and speaking the truth about racism*
23 *can radically transform individuals and organizations* (First edition). Currency.

- 1 Lowery, B. S., Knowles, E. D., & Unzueta, M. M. (2007). Framing inequity safely: Whites'
2 motivated perceptions of racial privilege. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*,
3 33(9), 1237–1250. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207303016>
- 4 Martinez, J. E. (2022, May 24). Facecraft: race reification in psychological research with faces.
5 <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/wqkd6>
- 6 Massey, D., & Denton, N. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the*
7 *underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- 8 Maxwell, S. E., Lau, M. Y., & Howard, G. S. (2015). Is psychology suffering from a replication
9 crisis? What does “failure to replicate” really mean?. *American Psychologist*, 70(6), 487.
- 10 Meyers, C., Williams, A., Pauker, K., & Apfelbaum, E. P. (2021). The impact of social norms on
11 navigating race in a racially diverse context. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*,
12 136843022098422. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430220984228>
- 13 Mills, C. W. (2014). *The racial contract*. Cornell University Press.
- 14 Mueller, J. C. (2020). Racial Ideology or Racial Ignorance? An Alternative Theory of Racial
15 Cognition. *Sociological Theory*, 073527512092619.
- 16 Monk, E. P. (2022). Inequality without Groups: Contemporary Theories of Categories,
17 Intersectional Typicality, and the Disaggregation of Difference. *Sociological Theory*,
18 40(1), 3–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07352751221076863>
- 19 Moynihan, D. P. (1965). Employment, income, and the ordeal of the Negro family. *Daedalus*,
20 745-770.
- 21 Nosek, Alter, G., Banks, G. C., Borsboom, D., Bowman, S. D., Breckler, S. J., Buck, S.,
22 Chambers, C. D., Chin, G., Christensen, G., Contestabile, M., Dafoe, A., Eich, E., Freese,
23 J., Glennerster, R., Goroff, D., Green, D. P., Hesse, B., Humphreys, M., ... Yarkoni, T.

1 (2015). Promoting an open research culture: Author guidelines for journals could help to
2 promote transparency, openness, and reproducibility. *Science* (American Association for
3 the Advancement of Science), 348(6242), 1422–1425.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab2374>

5 NSF (2018). Workshop: An Annual Retreat to Broaden Participation of Black Social and
6 Personality Psychologists. Retrieved August 15, 2022, from
7 https://www.nsf.gov/awardsearch/showAward?AWD_ID=1847721&HistoricalAwards=f
8 [else](#)

9 NYU (2022). Emerging Scholars Program. Retrieved August 15, 2022, from
10 <https://as.nyu.edu/departments/facultydiversity/recruitment/emerging-scholars->
11 [program.html](#)

12 Nzinga, K., Rapp, D. N., Leatherwood, C., Easterday, M., Rogers, L. O., Gallagher, N., &
13 Medin, D. L. (2018). Should social scientists be distanced from or engaged with the
14 people they study?. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(45), 11435-
15 11441. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1721167115>

16 Okazaki, S., & Sue, S. (1995). Cultural considerations in psychological assessment of Asian
17 Americans. In *Clinical personality assessment: Practical approaches* (pp. 107-119).
18 Oxford University Press.

19 Onyeador, I. N., Hudson, S. T. J., & Lewis, N. A. (2021). Moving Beyond Implicit Bias
20 Training: Policy Insights for Increasing Organizational Diversity. *Policy Insights from*
21 *the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 8(1), 19–26.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732220983840>

23 Pettigrew, T. F. (1964). *A profile of the Negro American*.

1 Phillips, L. T., & Lowery, B. S. (2018). Herd invisibility: The psychology of racial privilege.
2 *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27, 156–162.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721417753600>

4 Plomin, R. (2018). *Blueprint: How DNA makes us who we are*. MIT Press.

5 Pownall, M., Talbot, C. V., Henschel, A., Lautarescu, A., Lloyd, K. E., Hartmann, H., ... &
6 Siegel, J. A. (2021). Navigating open science as early career feminist researchers.
7 *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 45(4), 526-539.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1177/03616843211029255>

9 *Psychology Department Anti-Racism Action Plan*. Psychology at Illinois. (2020, June). Retrieved
10 August 28, 2022, from [https://psychology.illinois.edu/diversity/psychology-department-](https://psychology.illinois.edu/diversity/psychology-department-anti-racism-action-plan)
11 [anti-racism-action-plan](https://psychology.illinois.edu/diversity/psychology-department-anti-racism-action-plan)

12 *Psychology Department Commitment to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion*. Commitment to
13 Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. (2021, November 3). Retrieved August 28, 2022, from
14 <https://wp.stolaf.edu/psych/diversity-equity-and-inclusion/>

15 Rad, M. S., Martingano, A. J., & Ginges, J. (2018). Toward a psychology of Homo sapiens:
16 Making psychological science more representative of the human population. *Proceedings*
17 *of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(45), 11401-11405.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1721165115>

19 Rasinski, H. M., & Czopp, A. M. (2010). The effect of target status on witnesses' reactions to
20 confrontations of bias. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 32(1), 8-16.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973530903539754>

22 Ray, V. (2019). A theory of racialized organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 84(1), 26-
23 53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122418822335>

- 1 Renner, K. E. (1964). Delay of reinforcement: A historical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 61(5),
2 341-361.
- 3 Roback, A. A. (1923). *Behaviorism and psychology*. University Bookstore, Incorporated.
- 4 Roberts, S. O., Bareket-Shavit, C., Dollins, F. A., Goldie, P. D., & Mortenson, E. (2020). Racial
5 Inequality in Psychological Research: Trends of the Past and Recommendations for the
6 Future. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 15(6), 1295–1309.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620927709>
- 8 Roberts, S. O., & Rizzo, M. T. (2021). The psychology of American racism. *American*
9 *Psychologist*, 76(3), 475–487. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000642>
- 10 Rothstein, R. (2017). *The color of law: A forgotten history of how our government segregated*
11 *America*. Liveright Publishing Corporation: New York, NY.
- 12 Rosenthal, R. (1990). How are we doing in soft psychology?. *American Psychologist*, 45(6), 775.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.45.6.775>
- 14 Saini, A. (2019). *Superior: The Return of Race Science*, Beacon Press, Boston, MA.
- 15 Salter, P., & Adams, G. (2013). Toward a critical race psychology. *Social and Personality*
16 *Psychology Compass*, 7(11), 781-793. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12068>
- 17 Salter, P. S., & Haugen, A. D. (2017). Critical race studies in psychology. In *The Palgrave*
18 *handbook of critical social psychology* (pp. 123-145). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- 19 Scharff, D. P., Mathews, K. J., Jackson, P., Hoffsuemmer, J., Martin, E., & Edwards, D. (2010).
20 More than Tuskegee: understanding mistrust about research participation. *Journal of*
21 *Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, 21(3), 879-897.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.0.0323>

1 Schultz, J. R., & Maddox, K. B. (2013). Shooting the messenger to spite the message? Exploring
2 reactions to claims of racial bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(3), 346-
3 358. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212475223>

4 Selisker, S. (2015). The bechdel test and the social form of character networks. *New Literary*
5 *History*, 46(3), 505-523. <https://doi.org/10.1353/nlh.2015.0024>

6 Sen, M., & Wasow, O. (2016). Race as a Bundle of Sticks: Designs that Estimate Effects of
7 Seemingly Immutable Characteristics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 19(1), 499-
8 522. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-032015-010015>

9 Settles, I. H. (2006). Use of an intersectional framework to understand Black women's racial and
10 gender identities. *Sex Roles*, 54(9), 589-601. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9029-8>

11 Scheuerman, M. K., Wade, K., Lustig, C., & Brubaker, J. R. (2020). How we've taught
12 algorithms to see identity: Constructing race and gender in image databases for facial
13 analysis. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-computer Interaction*, 4(CSCW1), 1-35.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1145/3392866>

15 Shedd, C. (2015). *Unequal city: Race, schools, and perceptions of injustice* (Russell Sage
16 Foundation, New York).

17 Simonton, D. K. (2004). Psychology's status as a scientific discipline: Its empirical placement
18 within an implicit hierarchy of the sciences. *Review of General Psychology*, 8(1), 59-67.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.8.1.59>

20 SPSP (2018). Building Community Among SPSP's Black Membership. Retrieved August 15,
21 2022, from <https://spsp.org/building-community-among-spsps-black-membership>

22 SPSP (2019). Member diversity statistics. Retrieved August 15, 2022, from
23 <https://spsp.org/sites/default/files/Member-Diversity-Statistics-December-2019.pdf>

1 SPSP (2020). Flourish: A Retreat for Pre-tenure Faculty of Color. Retrieved August 15, 2022,
2 from <https://spsp.org/news-center/news/flourish-retreat-pre-tenure-faculty-color>

3 SPSP (2022). Flourish—Providing a Network for Pre-Tenure Faculty of Color at #SPSP2022.
4 Retrieved August 15, 2022, from [https://spsp.org/news-center/news/flourish-providing-](https://spsp.org/news-center/news/flourish-providing-network-pre-tenure-faculty-color-spsp2022)
5 [network-pre-tenure-faculty-color-spsp2022](https://spsp.org/news-center/news/flourish-providing-network-pre-tenure-faculty-color-spsp2022)

6 Starck, J. G., Sinclair, S., & Shelton, J. N. (2021). How university diversity rationales inform
7 student preferences and outcomes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
8 118(16). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2013833118>

9 Tankard, M. E., & Paluck, E. L. (2016). Norm Perception as a Vehicle for Social Change. *Social*
10 *Issues and Policy Review*, 10(1), 181–211. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12022>

11 Thomas, W. B. (1982). Black intellectuals' critique of early mental testing: A little-known saga
12 of the 1920s. *American Journal of Education*, 90(3), 258-292.

13 Thomas, A. & Sillen, S. (1972). *Racism and psychiatry*. New York, NY: Brunner/Mazel.

14 Torrez, B., Dupree, C. H., & Kraus, M. W. (2022). Examining the racialized function of objectivity
15 in management scholarship. In E. B. King, Q. Roberson, & M. Hebl (Eds.), *Research on*
16 *Social Issues in Management*.

17 Viglione, G., & Subberaman, N. (2020). Universities scrub names of racist leaders — students
18 say it’s a first step. *Nature*, 584, 331-332. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-02393-3>

19 Wilton, L. S., Apfelbaum, E. P., & Good, J. J. (2019). Valuing Differences and Reinforcing
20 Them: Multiculturalism Increases Race Essentialism. *Social Psychological and*
21 *Personality Science*, 10(5), 681–689. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550618780728>

22 Zuberi, T., & Bonilla-Silva, E. (2008). *White logic, White methods*. New York: Rowman &
23 Littlefield.

- 1 Zurn, P., Bassett, D. S., & Rust, N. C. (2020). The citation diversity statement: a practice of
- 2 transparency, a way of life. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 24(9), 669-672.
- 3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.06.009>