

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

**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NOTE: This is an unpublished preprint currently under review (September 2022).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 its progress

¹ We acknowledge there are complex reasons why these papers were retracted, one being methodological flaws. However, such methodological concerns intersect with objectivity norms that maintain racial inequality, which we describe in greater detail below.

1 toward meeting anti-racist goals set in 2020, finding that they were, as the CEO put it, “still an
2 institutionally racist organization”, having “fall[en] short of our commitment to anti-racism, both
3 as a funder and an employer” (Farrar, 2022). In this article, we provide a guide for social
4 psychologists who wish to help move our field toward racial equity, ensuring that our science is
5 representative of the world around us, inclusive of historically-marginalized scholars, and aiding
6 progress toward an equitable society. These concrete, data-driven recommendations are aimed at
7 scholars across levels—from graduate student to full professor, from the individual to the field.
8 We discuss the importance of methodological practice, empirical transparency, and resource-
9 driven institutional support (particularly from gatekeepers such as journal editors, principal
10 investigators, or senior faculty on hiring and promotion committees). We begin by reviewing
11 critical socio-historical context surrounding racial inequality in social psychology.

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

13 For decades, social psychologists have studied the antecedents and consequences of
14 racism. However, when we look inward, the evidence is clear: social psychology is by no means
15 immune from perpetuating racial inequality. Anecdotally, the field is rife with stories of scholars
16 of color being tokenized, enduring micro-aggressions to explicit bigotry, and ultimately, leaving
17 the field due to chronic racial injustices (see the Twitter hashtag #BlackInTheAcademy for
18 examples). Empirically, recent scholarship illustrates the pervasiveness of racial inequality in our
19 field. Roberts and colleagues (2020) queried more than 11,500 empirical articles published in
20 two of social psychology’s higher-ranked journals (*Journal of Personality and Social*
21 *Psychology* and *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin*), finding that the vast majority did
22 not reference participant race (95%), were edited by White editors (92%), and were written by
23 White scholars (72%). Those edited by White editors were significantly less likely to highlight

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

7 *Historical Foundations*

8 Any scholar who seeks to eradicate racial inequality in psychological science must
9 understand the field’s historic role in building and maintaining racial inequality. We do not find
10 ourselves here by accident. Historically, psychological science has long buttressed systems of
11 racial inequality. Psychology played a crucial role in the creation and maintenance of stereotypes
12 depicting people of color as cognitively, biologically, and socially inferior to White people
13 (Jones, 2010; Saini, 2019). Since the 1800s, psychologists have played a crucial role in
14 biological or genetic determinism—the notion that different genetic material corresponds to
15 different levels of intelligence (Saini, 2019). According to this theory, people of color are
16 cognitively inferior due to their genetic inferiority (Jones, 2010). Such theories persisted for
17 decades, justifying a global slave trade, a eugenics movement that gave rise to World War II, and
18 Jim Crow laws that persisted until the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s. Genetic determinism
19 was taught widely in psychology courses throughout the 1900s, and it is only relatively recently
20 that scholars have begun to debunk the essentialist notion that sex and race-based differences are
21 evolutionary facts (Fine, 2017; Jones, 2010; Saini, 2019).

22 Even after notions of biological racial inferiority became less acceptable, psychology
23 furthered more implicit notions of people of color’s cultural inferiority. For instance, Walter

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

12 *Psychological Foundations*

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

17 **Racial Ignorance.** A wealth of psychological research has established that race plays a
18 crucial role in how people perceive and move through the world (Roberts & Rizzo, 2021).
19 Despite pervasive evidence of these racialized experiences, many White scholars remain racially
20 ignorant, in large part due to overwhelmingly White social and professional networks (Mills,
21 2014; Mueller, 2020). People of color, in contrast, are often forced to navigate mostly White
22 workspaces as the token person of color, leaving them subject to subtle and deliberate
23 manifestations of bias that only reduce their belonging (Anderson, 2015). Racial segregation,

1 which has long been the norm in the United States (Massey & Denton, 1993; Rothstein, 2017)
2 means that White psychologists are less likely to have lived experiences that give them a
3 nuanced understanding of racism. Such personal experiences are critical for recognizing and
4 rejecting dominant worldviews that maintain racial inequality (e.g., Dubois, 1903; Hill Collins,
5 1991). As such, White editors and other gatekeepers are less likely to recognize the validity and
6 importance of research questions related to race.

7 **The Denial of Racism.** Psychology is rife with examples of the denial of racism, both
8 empirical and anecdotal. Anecdotally, the regular “GRE debate” on social media—in which
9 scholars debate the importance and harm of using GRE scores in the graduate student admissions
10 process—brings forth several examples of (usually White) scholars denying that the use of the
11 GRE is harmful to anti-racist goals (see Gifty, 2021). Empirically, social psychological research
12 reveals that White people, who benefit from hiding the uncomfortable existence of racial
13 privilege (from which they benefit), tend to deny that such privilege exists (Lowery et al., 2007);
14 they are especially likely to deny White privilege if they see the world as a meritocracy. It is,
15 however, possible to override this tendency by affirming other positive personal characteristics,
16 such as social skill or adaptability (Knowles & Lowery, 2012; Phillips & Lowery, 2018). Thus,
17 white Americans who see the world as meritocratic are motivated to deny their racial privilege,
18 and this is closely tied to their self-concept. This dovetails with recent research revealing that
19 individuals have a motivated tendency to underestimate racial inequality in society and their
20 institutions (Boykin et al., 2020; Kraus et al., 2017; Ray, 2019). Indeed, those who do
21 underestimate racial inequality are less likely to hire Black job applicants seeking a high-status
22 job or support policies that reduce inequality (Dupree et al., 2021).

1 **The Interrogation of Racially Minoritized Scholars.** These psychological foundations
2 manifest in behaviors that contribute to the interrogation and isolation of racially minoritized
3 scholars (for specific instances of interrogation, see Torrez et al., 2022). Due to their racial
4 identities, racially minoritized scholars who seek to bring their lived experiences to their research
5 may be perceived as unable to shed personal biases—leaving them subject to empirical
6 interrogation. In contrast, due to historical power dynamics, White scholars’ personal biases and
7 lived experiences are perceived as default, neutral, more easily adhering to traditional notions of
8 objective science—excusing them from such interrogation.

9 Such dynamics are made clear when we examine our field’s own literature on bias
10 confrontation. Minority groups who confront bias are often met with skepticism (Czopp &
11 Monteith, 2003; Drury & Kaiser, 2014; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). Indeed, Black people who
12 confront racial bias face more backlash compared to White confronters (Schultz & Maddox,
13 2013). This is especially concerning considering the tendency for marginalized scholars to study
14 topics related to inequalities relative to other research topics (Hoppe et al., 2019). Scholarship
15 focused on racial justice violates the status quo of psychological science, wherein racial
16 scholarship is severely underrepresented (Roberts et al., 2020). When people of color do confront
17 bias or challenge the status quo, they are more likely to be discredited by others (Ashburn-Nardo
18 et al., 2008; Kaiser & Miller, 2001).

19 Racially minoritized scholars may take notice of these backlash effects, stifling their
20 innovative and radical racial scholarship by attempting to objectify their work. This process
21 fundamentally shapes racial discourse and racial scholarship in the academy in ways that are
22 anything but objective (Anderson, 2015). For example, deterred by frequent and unconstructive
23 interrogations of their work, underrepresented racial minorities may present their work in ways

1 that align with the status quo—ultimately stalling efforts to encourage radical and novel racial
2 scholarship and instead advancing a psychology of race filtered through the perspective of
3 Whiteness (Andersen, 2003; Jones, 2010). Applying these findings to publication and science
4 communication, strong negative reactions to researchers who challenge the status quo can
5 contribute to racially minoritized scholars’ feelings of alienation in academia. Ultimately,
6 increased interrogation and alienation may prompt scholars of color to leave academia, leaving
7 the field bereft of academics with valuable personal and academic experience to lend to research,
8 teaching, and service.

9 *Institutional Foundations*

10 **Objectivity Norms.** Another factor driving racial inequality in psychological science
11 may be the implicit norms enforced by institutions and stakeholders in our field. One such norm
12 is objectivity. Objectivity, defined as the “extent to which a researcher’s methods are free from
13 prejudice”, is a norm typically upheld across the sciences that enforces scientific rigor, personal
14 detachment, and a lack of bias (Armstrong, 1979, p. 423; Zuberi & Bonilla-Silva, 2008).
15 However, applying traditional standards of objectivity to the study of a topic so often cast as
16 subjective (such as racial scholarship) may hold implications for the reproduction of racial
17 inequality in psychological science. For example, as previously mentioned, racially minoritized
18 scholars who conduct research on racialized topics may be seen as too invested in the
19 conclusions of their research, inviting interrogation over whether they are truly objective. In
20 addition, the approaches and methodologies that are most likely to center the perspectives of
21 racially marginalized people and provide a more critical lens to psychological studies of race are
22 likely to be run counter to predominant norms of objectivity (e.g., Critical Race Psychology; see
23 Salter & Adams, 2013; Salter & Haugen, 2017). Similarly, the difficulties associated with

1 sampling racially minoritized groups members (Okazaki & Sue, 1995) and the use of qualitative
2 methodologies to elevate the marginalized perspectives of these groups (e.g., Bowleg, 2013;
3 Settles, 2006) are likely to invite scrutiny in a field devoted to rigorous, quantitative science in its
4 pursuit of objectivity.

5 **The Prioritization of Individualistic Approaches.** Approaching racism as a systemic
6 issue existing not only within the minds of individuals but also, largely, in the fabric of our
7 society runs counter to the predominant individualistic approach of psychological science.
8 Critical race psychology is an area of scholarship that imposes a critical lens upon hegemonic
9 perspectives in psychology—in large part to transform the psychological study of race from an
10 approach that views racism as embedded within the psychology of individuals to one that views
11 racism as systemic (Salter & Adams, 2013). However, as this approach challenges the status quo,
12 it may prompt a more skeptical review process, whereby ordinary claims require extraordinary
13 evidence (e.g., evidence that racism is systemic). These higher standards increase the barriers to
14 publication, particularly in higher-ranked journals, potentially stalling programs of research,
15 promotions, and careers.

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

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

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

4 These barriers contradict every intention set forth by psychological scholars who wish to
5 improve the rigor of our field. For instance, scholars' attempts to objectify their research in order
6 to align themselves with the status quo and seek approval from institutional gatekeepers (e.g.,
7 editors and reviewers) fundamentally shapes the landscape of racial scholarship in the academy.
8 Thus, rather than creating a psychology of race that is free from bias—which might instead be
9 envisioned as inclusive of all perspectives, while particularly elevating the voices of those who
10 have been historically marginalized and allowing for complexity in its understanding of race and
11 racism—objectivity norms create a psychology of race wherein racial scholarship is
12 simultaneously too biased toward dominant (i.e., White) perspectives and lacking necessary
13 nuance to capture the full range of mechanisms involved in experiences of racism.

14 The centering of White perspectives has consequences for the quality and impact of our
15 science, and the cost our field to society is also great. For scientists wishing to elevate
16 psychological science's rigor and standing amongst policymakers, organizational stakeholders,
17 and colleagues in mathematical and physical sciences, decontextualized research proliferating
18 ineffective approaches to diversity across society is antithetical to these goals. For example,
19 colorblind or instrumental approaches to diversity (Apfelbaum, et al., 2008; Apfelbaum et al.,
20 2012) remain a significant part of our field's past and present connection with diversity
21 management strategies in organizations. And yet, our field provides very little evidence of such
22 approaches' utility in attenuating hierarchy and, in fact, such strategies may contribute to
23 inequality reproduction (Georgeac & Rattan, 2022; Starck et al., 2021).

1 Ultimately, a psychology of race that does not fully incorporate and value the
2 perspectives of racially minoritized people is limited in its imagination and potentially harmful in
3 its policy-building capacity. Adjacent fields like sociology have not been influenced by the
4 constraint of finding universal truths to the extent psychology has (Cauce, 2011; Cole, 2009),
5 allowing for greater centering of the complexities of race and identities without relegating these
6 dynamics to the periphery of science. It is thus no surprise that insights related to identity often
7 first originate in other social sciences (Cole, 2009) and are subsequently integrated into social
8 psychology. As an example, political scientists Sen and Wasow (2016) argue that “race is a
9 bundle of sticks”, better understood as a bundle of related categories (e.g., skin color, social
10 norms, religion, class) that co-occur with the latent factor we call “race.” This contrasts with
11 psychology's current understanding of race as an essentialist, single stick, that aggregates across
12 these related but separate dimensions. Similarly, sociologist Ellis Monk (2022) argues against
13 race as a category in the first place, arguing that scientists are placing rigid categories (e.g., race)
14 onto inherently fluid concepts. Finally, sociologists Barbara and Karen Fields (2022) take these
15 ideas even further and posit that race is neither essentialist nor constructivist but illusory. While
16 social psychologists often operate under the assumption that race produces racism, these
17 sociologists argue that it is the very act of racism that produces the illusion of race.

18 We do not mean to imply that our field uniquely suffers from oversimplified
19 understandings of race. However, as mentioned above, social psychology is uniquely inhibited
20 from incorporating paradigm-changing insights into theories, methodologies, and analyses.
21 Social psychology must resist the impulse of universality and lean into more radical and
22 innovative approaches to race. How would psychology change if the above ideas, and more,
23 were incorporated into our science? How much closer could we come to a set of truths that

1 applied to more of humanity by forgoing our insistence on universal truths colored by Whiteness
2 (Guthrie, 1976)? While there is some evidence of change (see Martinez, 2022 for an extension of
3 racecraft in the realm of face perception), this work remains undervalued and deprioritized.

4 **Recommendations**

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

9 *Understand the Scope of the Problem*

10 First and foremost, it is imperative that we know the scope of the problem. While
11 anecdotes can be powerful illustrators of racism's impact, our field is primarily influenced by
12 empirical evidence. Thus, individuals and organizations must audit themselves to see and
13 quantify the extent to which they are perpetuating racism. For instance, as noted on many
14 psychology departments' Diversity and Anti-Racism statements, several departments fielded
15 surveys in 2020 and 2021 to assess the racial climate felt by graduate students, postdoctoral
16 fellows, and faculty and to gather suggestions on how to improve the climate in the future (see
17 University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign for one example; Psychology Department Anti-Racism
18 Action Plan, 2020). Anecdotally, scholars have audited the race (and other identities) of those
19 they cite in their manuscripts as an academic "racial Bechdel Test" (Selisker, 2015), revealing
20 just how White-centered is the scholarship in which they engage (Zurn et al., 2020). Moreover,
21 in 2020, several departments hosted implicit bias workshops and anti-racist book clubs to
22 improve understanding of interpersonal and structural racism, which can lead to deep reflection
23 and awareness of White privilege, as also noted on many departments' Diversity and Anti-

1 Racism websites (see St. Olaf College for one such example; Psychology Department
2 Commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, 2021). Such data-driven steps—involving both
3 empirical audits and conversations—are crucial; we must fully understand the nature of the
4 problem before we can effectively intervene upon it.

5 Scholars must also increase their awareness of White-centric practices and norms at all
6 stages of research: from hypothesis generation, operationalization, and analysis, to interpretation
7 of findings, the review process, and ultimately, publishing. One useful tool to assist in this
8 awareness is Elizabeth Cole’s model for increasing awareness in psychology of intersectionality,
9 or the interconnected hegemonic nature of social identities (Cole, 2009). She encourages scholars
10 to ask three central questions at each stage of the research process, namely, “who is included
11 within this category” and “what role does inequality play” (as well as “where are the sites of
12 commonalities across differences”). Centering these questions can help underscore when
13 assumptions are being made regarding prototypicality and norms that are rooted within
14 Whiteness as well as offer follow-up questions that will help mitigate it. Scholars should also ask
15 “who is included in my sample?”, ideally leading them to increase sample diversity for
16 generalizability and clarify to whom their samples refer (e.g., including racial qualifiers before
17 generic words like “women”, “men” and “people” in titles, abstracts, and results).

18 We note that, while addressing racial ignorance is a critical first step (Livingston, 2021),
19 it is just the tip of the iceberg. Many well-meaning interventions aimed at improving racial
20 equity focus solely on awareness without a strategy for implementation, allowing people to feel
21 good for doing something that ultimately changes nothing (e.g., implicit bias workshops;
22 Onyeador et al., 2021). In fact, only engaging in shallow forms of addressing racial disparities

1 can further entrench hierarchy by promoting an illusory sense of progress and fairness (Kaiser et
2 al., 2013; Kraus et al., 2022).

3 *Address White-Centered Practices*

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

7 **Decentering Whiteness in research representativeness.** First, we encourage the field to
8 decenter Whiteness by reconsidering a) whom we invest in as research assistants, graduate
9 students, and faculty members, b) whom we request for invited talks and special issue
10 submissions, and c) whom we research, cite, and elevate. The problem of racial diversity within
11 our field is obvious. At the most senior level, the number of full tenured Black professors within
12 social psychology is scarce, with full tenured Latinx and Native American professors at even
13 more dismal numbers. In 2019, Black professors made up 3 percent of full tenured professors
14 registered with the *Society of Personality and Social Psychology* (SPSP, Latinx faculty made up
15 2% of full professors, and at the time of the survey, no full tenured professors identified as
16 Native American (SPSP, 2019). To remedy this issue, academic institutions must invest in the
17 successful recruitment and retention of faculty of color (see Dupree and Boykin, 2020).

18 Many programs exist to address pipeline issues, from summer research opportunity
19 programs to community spaces like the *Black Social and Personality Psychologists Retreat*
20 (NSF, 2018; SPSP, 2018) and *Flourish* (SPSP, 2020) which take place after SPSP's annual
21 conference. However, very few of these programs focus on community-building and the ones
22 that do are rarely institutionalized, with financial, temporal, and cognitive burden of maintaining
23 them falling on the shoulders of racially minoritized scholars. We propose an increase in

1 institutionalized support for programs that increase inclusion and networking opportunities.
2 Examples include the *Emerging Scholars Talk Series* in NYU’s psychology department (NYU,
3 2022), which explicitly brings in diverse scholars to present their work. Rather than passively
4 waiting for scholars to reach out and request to give a talk—requests that require a level of
5 cultural knowledge that not all academics possess—organizers can reach out on social media and
6 organizational listservs to request speakers, providing them with professional growth and
7 increasing the exposure of their work. If at all possible, organizers should also consider
8 providing an honorarium to speakers and covering travel costs, which can further incentivize a
9 diverse array of scholars to present. Moreover, organizers should endeavor to invite a diverse
10 array of racially minoritized scholars from a range of institutions, not only the most high-profile
11 scholars from the highest-ranked institutions. Investing in scholars of color can go a long way
12 toward diversifying the field, but it will require effort and financial capital.

13 Similarly, we encourage scholars to think deeply about the representativeness of their
14 research samples, materials, and methods. Many scholars use convenience samples such as
15 psychology students and online databases, which are notoriously non-representative, in part due
16 to the overwhelming pressure to “publish or perish” (Anderson et al., 2019). Research stimuli for
17 race-neutral work often feature White-only faces, names, and relevant scenarios, in an effort to
18 “control for extraneous variance” (Cook & Over, 2021). However, titles, abstracts, and general
19 findings are often described as if the research was done on representative samples using
20 representative materials (Henrich et al., 2010; Rad et al., 2018). To decenter Whiteness in
21 research design, we encourage scholars to be clearly and accurately describe who their research
22 is about and to whom it can generalize—and to increase sample and stimuli diversity to be more

1 inclusive. Scholars must also urge institutions to create better avenues to support finding and
2 adequately compensating samples of racial minorities.

3 Increasing sample and stimuli diversity is easier said than done, and the field must invest
4 in diversifying both. Online databases charge a premium for access to racially diverse samples;
5 for example, Cloud Research, a popular participant database software, charges a per-participant
6 fee of 0.24 cents to recruit White participants but 0.59 cents to recruit Black participants (Litman
7 et al., 2017). Furthermore, many stimuli databases treat race as an afterthought, often not
8 consistently labeling stimuli with accurate racial information (Scheuerman et al., 2020). A
9 special issue on diversifying standard paradigms in psychology—such as the “mind in the eyes”
10 task, currently assessed using only White faces (Baron-Cohen et al., 2001)—may encourage
11 researchers to create these materials. We also urge departments and institutions to develop
12 innovative ways of increasing access. There are some mechanisms for running representative or
13 community samples at low cost, notably the Time-sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences
14 (TESS; <http://tessexperiments.org/>) initiative and Harvard Digital Laboratory for the Social
15 Sciences (DLABSS; <https://dlabss.harvard.edu/>). However, these mechanisms are idiosyncratic,
16 and access often depends on institutional prestige or luck. Other mechanisms such as the
17 University of Chicago Survey Lab (<https://voices.uchicago.edu/surveylab/>) and Project Implicit
18 (<https://www.projectimplicit.net/>) increase access to hard-to-recruit populations but are
19 prohibitively expensive. These examples suggest that pooling resources can be an effective way
20 to increase access to minoritized populations without drastically increasing costs.

21 Finally, we encourage scholars to acknowledge and celebrate the value of non-
22 quantitative methods in decentering Whiteness. Qualitative methods—including storytelling and
23 participatory action research—are at the forefront of the research paradigms of critical race

1 theory and liberation psychology (Comas-Díaz & Torres Rivera, 2020). In contrast to
2 quantitative methods (e.g., experiment and survey research), qualitative methods give voice to
3 the lived experiences of marginalized groups. Analyses that use or are informed by these
4 methods have a greater capacity to place racial issues in a broader historical and societal
5 context—bringing issues of race and power into the spaces where they are likely to be best
6 understood (Kraus & Torrez, 2020). People of color are one of the most important sources of
7 information on race and racism (Adams et al., 2018) and yet, qualitative methodologies centering
8 their perspectives are often devalued and deemed less empirically rigorous in psychological
9 science (Kidd, 2002)—thanks, in no small part, to objectivity norms.

10 **Decentering Whiteness in social psychological norms.** Second, we propose decentering
11 Whiteness in social psychological norms. Norms are powerful tools for changing behaviors and
12 altering outcomes; the social psychological research supporting this claim is vast (Cialdini &
13 Goldstein, 2004; Tankard & Paluck, 2016). And yet, our field hasn't fully grappled with the
14 impact of these norms on perpetuating racial inequality.

15 *The role of institutional gatekeepers.* The norms of social psychological gatekeepers—
16 those who are tenured, associate editors at major journals, heads of funding agencies, etc.—can
17 have an outsized effect on increased equity. We can look to the f movement as a great example
18 of gatekeeper norms reverberating throughout the discipline, as the Transparency and Openness
19 Promotion (TOP) guidelines put forth by the Center for Open Science (Nosek et al., 2015) are
20 now being used by several journals in the field such as the *Journal of Personality and Social*
21 *Psychology* (JPSP: <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/psp/index?tab=4>) and *Cortex* (Chambers,
22 2018). Requiring adherence to such guidelines in a higher-ranked journal such as *JPSP* will
23 likely increase scholars' familiarity with open science, making it much more likely that they will

1 follow those guidelines for journals that do not require it. Scholars will become more
2 comfortable with doing anti-racist work if they have the chance to practice, and discipline
3 gatekeepers have a fundamental role in creating systems and spaces that make anti-racist
4 behaviors valued and easy to implement.

5 Increasing the diversity and lived experience of gatekeepers is another way of changing
6 the norms. For instance, returning to the notion of colorblindness, individuals who grew up in
7 more racially-diverse spaces are less likely to endorse colorblindness and more likely to be race-
8 conscious in how they view and react to racial dynamics (Meyers et al., 2021). Having people
9 with more diverse cultural experiences at the helm of important social psychological
10 organizations is critical for altering disciplinary norms. A diverse set of gatekeepers will be more
11 cognizant of inequity and in a lack of inclusivity—and have the institutional power to implement
12 solutions to those problems. For example, people who are more race-conscious may be more
13 likely to notice White-washing within the publishing process, including racial research receiving
14 greater scrutiny, samples being predominantly-White (but referenced using in race-neutral
15 language), and research focusing exclusively on racial minorities being forced to include White
16 control samples for publication. Having a diverse set of gatekeepers with the power to address
17 these problems—for instance, by changing reviewer guidelines, empowering associate editors to
18 explicitly disregard reviewer advice for White control samples, and requiring precise language in
19 the use of convenience samples—would go a long way to changing norms within the field.

20 *The role of open science.* Although the open science movement has imparted important
21 lessons around setting and proliferating norms to improve the quality of our science, the
22 particular norms it seeks to advance may inadvertently contribute to racial inequality in the field
23 (Bennett, 2021). In many ways, the open science movement was sparked by the highly

1 publicized replication crisis in psychology—an increasingly occurring phenomenon whereby
2 attempted replications of past study findings frequently do not reveal the same result (Maxwell,
3 Lau, & Howard, 2015). A key aim of the open science movement in our field is to increase the
4 quality of psychological science by making scientific research (e.g., methodological decisions,
5 pre-registered hypotheses, analysis syntax) more accessible and transparent in order to increase
6 replicability (Crüwell et al., 2018). In an effort to increase the legitimacy of psychological
7 science, open science advocates pushed forth more rigorous methodological and analytical
8 standards for hypothesis testing. While these efforts are well-intentioned, without careful
9 attention to the way in which these standards are applied, they may inadvertently contribute to
10 objectivity norms in our field (Bennett, 2021). For example, scholars of color conducting work
11 on race, who are already more likely to receive interrogations to their objectivity in the form of
12 methodological critique (Torrez et al., 2022), may see increased intensity of these interrogations
13 with the elevation of open science. Further, these interrogations, which disproportionately affect
14 scholars of color, may be lauded as part of our field’s natural scientific practice of increasing
15 open science, rather than critiqued for their unique burden on scholars of color. Additionally,
16 calls for increased power within the Open Science movement (e.g., increased sample sizes) may
17 be particularly burdensome for scholars who study racially marginalized groups. We encourage
18 open science advocates to consider how this movement can be reimagined to support the
19 perspectives and career success of marginalized scholars, including, but not limited to, the
20 guidance provided to support early career feminists by Pownall and colleagues (2021).

21 *The role of objectivity norms.* Subjectivity is inevitable in scholarship. Rather than
22 attempting to quantify and standardize psychology’s path into scientific legitimacy through
23 objectivity and scientific rigor, we must embrace bias and subjectivity, deepening our

1 understanding of how our identities shape our science—including the research topics we choose,
2 the people we study, and the outcomes we care about. Unlike the hierarchy-enhancing
3 assumptions of psychological research that currently dominate our field, this stance considers the
4 subjectivity of multiple parties, including White scholars conducting racial scholarship, scholars
5 whose research is not explicitly racialized (but that undoubtedly has racial consequences), and
6 scholars conducting quantitative research. From ideation and research design to analysis, all
7 quantitative researchers, regardless of their racial identity, are inundated with subjective choices
8 influenced by their backgrounds and identities, particularly around the interpretation of data
9 (D’Ignazio & Klein, 2020). One solution aimed at raising awareness of subjectivity in
10 scholarship is the implementation of reflexivity statements, which we discuss below.

11 *The role of scholars.* Non-gatekeepers can also alter field norms. One solution aimed at
12 raising awareness of scholarship subjectivity is the implementation of reflexivity statements, also
13 known as positionality statements. Typical academic norms would prescribe that scholars keep
14 emotion and personal investment as separate from the research process as possible (Nzinga et al.,
15 2018). However, White and racially minoritized scholars who study racial issues can and should
16 make readers aware of their perspective, position, and (for some) privilege. Additionally,
17 researchers who study topics they perceive to be race-neutral might reflect on how their
18 positionality may nonetheless manifest in their work (Dupree & Kraus, 2022). Reflexivity
19 statements require all scholars to reflect on the experiences and perspectives that they
20 intentionally or unintentionally infuse into the research process, from ideation to interpretation.
21 Several examples of such reflexivity statements exist. For example, Roberts and colleagues
22 (2020) provide a note in the Acknowledgement section of their recent manuscript: “When the
23 manuscript for this article was drafted, one author self-identified as U.S. Black-White American,

1 and four authors self-identified as U.S. White American” (p. 12). Similarly, the current authors
2 provide a reflexivity statement in the Acknowledgement of this article. For guidance on how to
3 reflect upon one’s positionality as well as craft reflexivity statements, see Jamieson et al. (2022)
4 as well as Homes (2020).

5 Returning to institutional gatekeepers, journals could require a reflexivity statement prior
6 to submission in all social scientific papers—a practice typically more common in qualitative
7 research. Editors could reflect on their own positionality and require reviewers to provide a
8 reflexivity statement when reviewing racial scholarship. In this way, scholars can reflect on their
9 positionality in a way that invites structural changes by raising awareness of all scholars’
10 subjectivity, rather than interrogating the objectivity of the few scholars of color in our field.
11 These reflexivity statements fit well in the field’s focus on increasing the transparency and
12 openness of our science. In the same way that journals require individuals to disclose their
13 financial conflicts with their research, we should also disclose how our experiences and positions
14 within society impacts our science.

15 **Decentering Whiteness in incentive structures.** Last, but not least, current incentivizes
16 in the field do not match purported values. If we state that antiracism is a core value, those values
17 should align with what gets rewarded within the field. As an example, publishing as many
18 articles as possible is desired and highly rewarded, with no caveats given for racial dynamics
19 (e.g., sample recruitment) that impact the capacity to publish quickly. Racially minoritized
20 populations can be harder to recruit than White populations for a variety of reasons, ranging from
21 deep distrust of academics due to historical racism (e.g., the Tuskegee experiments; Scharff et
22 al., 2010) to a lack of institutional compensation that aids recruitment. If we want to make social

1 psychology less White, we must also change the expectations that are built on White-centered
2 norms.

3 Importantly, we would like to see our field incentivize scholarship that not only
4 investigates racial topics but does so from a critical lens that challenges the status quo. This can
5 include, but is not limited to, a series of articles in every issue of higher-ranked social
6 psychological journals (e.g., *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Psychological*
7 *Science*) focused on critical race psychology or critical qualitative and quantitative
8 methodologies (e.g., Clarke & Braun, 2019; Garcia et al., 2018) that are authored by scholars of
9 color. As the status quo currently marginalizes these perspectives and approaches (Hoppe et al.,
10 2019), the relegation of this work to lower-ranked specialty journals or special issues exacerbates
11 racial inequality by contributing to racial disparities in publishing, citations, hiring, and
12 promotions (Hofstra et al., 2020; Roberts et al., 2020) A proactive approach that prioritizes this
13 work across issues in higher-ranked journals would bring those perspectives from the periphery
14 (e.g., special issues and specialty journals) into high-status, mainstream spaces, helping to
15 alleviate racial disparities. Editors and reviewers in these mainstream journals must also be
16 required to become more acquainted with alternative perspectives and approaches in order to
17 better evaluate and promote critical work on racial inequality. Short-term changes might involve
18 adding more expertise in qualitative methods and critical scholarship to editorial boards; long-
19 term changes would involve more methodological training in psychology doctoral programs.

20 **Conclusions**

21 Social psychology is not immune from racism; racism lives here, too. It is no longer
22 enough for our discipline to be aware of racism—social psychological scholars, gatekeepers, and
23 institutions must be actively anti-racist in the practice of our science. In this article, we aimed to

1 provide social psychologists with the sociohistorical context, psychological foundations, and
2 practical recommendations necessary to accomplish this task. We firmly believe that social
3 psychology is well-positioned to fight against one of society's most troubling ills: racial
4 inequality. However, before we profess our intent to save the world's ills, we must save
5 ourselves. We hope that this article encourages social psychological scholars, gatekeepers, and
6 institutions to take concrete steps toward racial equity, for the world needs us healthy and whole
7 to effectively inform and assist a troubled 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, C.M., Brown, N.D., Carter, J.T., Dukes, K., Green, D.J., Harrison, T., Hebl, M.,
21 McCleary-Gaddy, A., Membere, A., McJunkins, C.A., Simmons, C., Singletary Walker,
22 S., Smith, A.N. & Williams, A.D. (2020). Anti-racist actions and accountability: not
23 more empty promises. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, 39(7), 775-786.

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

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

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

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

12 Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist, 64*(3),
13 170–180. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014564>

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

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

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

21 Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to
22 confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,*
23 *29*(4), 532-544. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202250923>

- 1 D'ignazio, C., & Klein, L. F. (2020). *Data feminism*. MIT press.
- 2 Dubois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of Black folk*. Chicago, IL: A. C. McClurg and Company.
- 3 Dupree, C. H. & Boykin, C. M. (2021). Racial inequality in academia: Systemic origins, modern
4 challenges, and policy recommendations. *Policy Insights from Behavioral and Brain*
5 *Sciences*, 8(1), 11-18.
- 6 Dupree, C. H., & Kraus, M. W. (2022). Psychological science is not race neutral. *Perspectives on*
7 *Psychological Science*, 17(1), 270-275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620979820>
- 8 Dupree, C. H., Torrez, B., Obioha, O., & Fiske, S. T. (2021). Race–status associations: Distinct
9 effects of three novel measures among White and Black perceivers. *Journal of*
10 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 120(3), 601-625.
11 <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000257>
- 12 Drury, B. J., & Kaiser, C. R. (2014). Allies against sexism: The role of men in confronting
13 sexism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 70(4), 637-652. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12083>
- 14 Farrar, J. (2022, August 10). *An update on Wellcome’s anti-racism programme*. Wellcome.
15 <https://wellcome.org/news/update-wellcomes-anti-racism-programme>
- 16 Fields, B. J., & Fields, K. E. (2022). *Racecraft: The soul of inequality in American life*. Verso
17 Books.
- 18 Fine, C. (2017). *Testosterone Rex: Myths of sex, science, and society*. WW Norton & Company.
- 19 Georgeac, O. A., & Rattan, A. (2022). The business case for diversity backfires: Detrimental
20 effects of organizations’ instrumental diversity rhetoric for underrepresented group
21 members’ sense of belonging. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000394>

- 1 Gifty, A. (2021, June 8). The GRE Causes More Harm than Good to Women of Color. Medium.
2 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)
3 [women-of-color-3640e620f432](https://zora.medium.com/the-gre-causes-more-harm-than-good-to-women-of-color-3640e620f432)
- 4 Grusec, J., & Mischel, W. (1966). Model's characteristics as determinants of social
5 learning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4(2), 211-215.
- 6 Guthrie, R. V. (1976). *Even the rat was white: A historical view of psychology*. New York:
7 Harper and Row.
- 8 Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). Most people are not WEIRD. *Nature*,
9 466(7302), 29-29. <https://doi.org/10.1038/466029a>
- 10 Hill Collins, P. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of*
11 *empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- 12 Hofstra, B., Kulkarni, V. V., Galvez, S. M. N., He, B., Jurafsky, D., & McFarland, D. A. (2020).
13 The Diversity–Innovation Paradox in Science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
14 *Sciences*, 117(17), 9284-9291. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1915378117>
- 15 Hoppe, T. A., Litovitz, A., Willis, K. A., Meseroll, R. A., Perkins, M. J., Hutchins, B. I., ... &
16 Santangelo, G. M. (2019). Topic choice contributes to the lower rate of NIH awards to
17 African-American/black scientists. *Science Advances*, 5(10).
18 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaw7238>
- 19 Jamieson, M. K., Pownall, M., & Govaart, G. H. (2022, February 23). Reflexivity in quantitative
20 research: a rationale and beginner's guide. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/xvrhm>
- 21 Johnson, D. J., Tress, T., Burkel, N., Taylor, C., & Cesario, J. (2020). Retraction for Johnson et
22 al., Officer characteristics and racial disparities in fatal officer-involved shootings.
23 *Proceeding of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117, 9127.

- 1 Jones, J. M. (2010). I'm white and you're not: The value of unraveling ethnocentric science.
2 *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(6), 700-707.
- 3 Jones, Carolyn. "California Districts Look to Rename Schools Linked to Racist History."
4 *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)
5 [schools-linked-to-racist-past/634080](https://edsource.org/2020/california-districts-look-to-rename-schools-linked-to-racist-past/634080).
- 6 Kaiser, C. R., Major, B., Jurcevic, I., Dover, T. L., Brady, L. M., & Shapiro, J. R. (2013).
7 Presumed fair: Ironic effects of organizational diversity structures. *Journal of Personality*
8 *and Social Psychology*, 104(3), 504–519. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030838>
- 9 Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2001). Stop complaining! The social costs of making attributions
10 to discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(2), 254-263.
- 11 Kidd, S. A. (2002). The role of qualitative research in psychological journals. *Psychological*
12 *Methods*, 7(1), 126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.7.1.126>
- 13 Knowles, E. D., & Lowery, B. S. (2012). Meritocracy, self- concerns, and Whites' denial of
14 racial inequity. *Self and Identity*, 11, 202–222.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2010.542015>
- 16 Knowles, E. D., Lowery, B. S., Chow, R. M., & Unzueta, M. M. (2014). Deny, distance, or
17 dismantle? How white Americans manage a privileged identity. *Perspectives on*
18 *Psychological Science*, 9(6), 594-609. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614554658>
- 19 Kraus, M. W., & Torrez, B. (2020). A psychology of power that is embedded in societal
20 structures. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 33, 86-90.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.07.018>

- 1 Kraus, M. W., Rucker, J. M., & Richeson, J. A. (2017). Americans misperceive racial economic
2 equality. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *114*(39), 10324–10331.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1707719114>
- 4 Kraus, M. W., Torrez, B., & Hollie, L. (2022). How narratives of racial progress create barriers
5 to diversity, equity, and inclusion in organizations. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *43*,
6 108-113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.06.022>
- 7 Kristofferson, K., White, K., & Peloza, J. (2014). The nature of slacktivism: How the social
8 observability of an initial act of token support affects subsequent prosocial action.
9 *Journal of Consumer Research*, *40*(6), 1149-1166. <https://doi.org/10.1086/674137>
- 10 Ledgerwood, A., Hudson, S. T. J., Lewis, N. A., Maddox, K. B., Pickett, C. L., Remedios, J. D.,
11 Cheryan, S., Diekman, A. B., Dutra, N. B., Goh, J. X., Goodwin, S. A., Munakata, Y.,
12 Navarro, D. J., Onyeador, I. N., Srivastava, S., & Wilkins, C. L. (2022). The Pandemic as
13 a Portal: Reimagining Psychological Science as Truly Open and Inclusive. *Perspectives*
14 *on Psychological Science*, 174569162110366.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916211036654>
- 16 Litman, L., Robinson, J., & Abberbock, T. (2017). TurkPrime.com: A versatile crowdsourcing
17 data acquisition platform for the behavioral sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, *49*(2),
18 433-442. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-016-0727-z>
- 19 Livingston, R. W. (2021). *The conversation: How seeking and speaking the truth about racism*
20 *can radically transform individuals and organizations* (First edition). Currency.
- 21 Lowery, B. S., Knowles, E. D., & Unzueta, M. M. (2007). Framing inequity safely: Whites'
22 motivated perceptions of racial privilege. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*,
23 *33*(9), 1237–1250. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207303016>

1 Martinez, J. E. (2022, May 24). Facecraft: race reification in psychological research with faces.
2 <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/wqkd6>

3 Massey, D., & Denton, N. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the*
4 *underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

5 Maxwell, S. E., Lau, M. Y., & Howard, G. S. (2015). Is psychology suffering from a replication
6 crisis? What does “failure to replicate” really mean?. *American Psychologist*, 70(6), 487.

7 Meyers, C., Williams, A., Pauker, K., & Apfelbaum, E. P. (2021). The impact of social norms on
8 navigating race in a racially diverse context. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*,
9 136843022098422. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430220984228>

10 Mills, C. W. (2014). *The racial contract*. Cornell University Press.

11 Mueller, J. C. (2020). Racial Ideology or Racial Ignorance? An Alternative Theory of Racial
12 Cognition. *Sociological Theory*, 073527512092619.

13 Monk, E. P. (2022). Inequality without Groups: Contemporary Theories of Categories,
14 Intersectional Typicality, and the Disaggregation of Difference. *Sociological Theory*,
15 40(1), 3–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07352751221076863>

16 Moynihan, D. P. (1965). Employment, income, and the ordeal of the Negro family. *Daedalus*,
17 745-770.

18 Nosek, Alter, G., Banks, G. C., Borsboom, D., Bowman, S. D., Breckler, S. J., Buck, S.,
19 Chambers, C. D., Chin, G., Christensen, G., Contestabile, M., Dafoe, A., Eich, E., Freese,
20 J., Glennerster, R., Goroff, D., Green, D. P., Hesse, B., Humphreys, M., ... Yarkoni, T.
21 (2015). Promoting an open research culture: Author guidelines for journals could help to
22 promote transparency, openness, and reproducibility. *Science* (American Association for

1 the Advancement of Science), 348(6242), 1422–1425.
2 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab2374>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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