Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 00, No. 0, 2019, pp. 1–22
doi: 10.1111/josi.12356

This article is part of the Special Issue "Research on Race and Racism;" Andrea L. Miller, Chadly Stern and Helen Neville (Special Issue Editors). For a full listing of Special Issue papers, see: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/josi.2019.75.issue-4/issuetoc.

Forging Diversity-Science-Informed Guidelines for Research on Race and Racism in Psychological Science

Andrea L. Miller*, Chadly Stern, and Helen Neville
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (E-mail: amiller0@illinois.edu)

As race and racism continue to be important subjects of research in psychology, guidelines for scholarship in this domain of inquiry are strongly needed. Drawing from the foundations of previous discussions of diversity science, we propose five principles that can help scholars conduct generative research on race and racism. Specifically, research on race and racism is strengthened when scholars: (1) are mindful of historical patterns of oppression and inequality, (2) adopt a racially diverse team science approach, (3) utilize diverse samples, (4) consider the influence of multiple identity groups on human experience, and (5) promote the translation of knowledge from the laboratory to the field. In outlining our proposed guidelines, we elaborate on why this discussion for research about race and racism is needed at this particular point of the field's history.

Despite long-standing and emergent civil rights and social movements, societies and organizations throughout the world continue to struggle in effectively promoting spaces that are inclusive of racial and ethnic diversity. Although the United States is becoming more diverse, racial and ethnic segregation in public schools continues to grow (Foley & Lattimer, 2016), social policies that promote racial diversity are under attack (e.g., affirmative action; Horwitz & Costa, 2017), and governmental policies are being implemented that explicitly prevent the growth of racial and ethnic diversity (e.g., immigration restrictions; Pierce & Selee, 2017). Even in psychology graduate programs and organizations, the growth of racial diversity has remained relatively stagnant (Green, 2016; Lin,

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Andrea L. Miller, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 603 East Daniel Street, Champaign, IL, USA 61820, 217-300-4703 [e-mail: amiller0@illinois.edu].

© 2019 The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues

Stamm, & Christidis, 2018). Thus, new insights are needed on how to effectively address extant issues surrounding race and racism in society.

There is a long history of research in psychology that has examined the factors that produce and maintain racism in the United States (Allport, 1954; Clark, 1989; Dovidio, Newheiser, & Leyens, 2012; Jones, 1997). Various subfields and research areas in psychology (e.g., social, developmental, community, counseling, African American psychology) have a rich tradition of investigating racial and ethnic differences as reflected in systems of power and privilege. While specific methodologies and levels of analysis that are examined change over time, the goal of using psychological science to understand and address racial inequality has remained constant. Importantly, however, scholars continue to openly grapple with how psychology research examining race and racism can be most effectively conducted and used to inform social policy (Richeson, 2018; Stewart & Sweetman, 2018). Employing psychology to address current issues related to racism has gained ever-increasing attention, as exemplified by the publication of recent special issues in *Current Directions in Psychological Science* (Engle, 2018), *American Psychologist* (Comas-Díaz, Hall, Neville, & Kazak, 2019), and *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* (Lee, 2019), as well as the Race and Ethnicity Guidelines in Psychology, which were recently passed by the American Psychological Association Council of Representatives in August 2019. However, there is yet to be a fully articulated set of recommendations for future research on race and racism. A set of guidelines for research on race and racism is sorely needed, as it would provide scholars with a shared approach to conducting and evaluating scientific contributions.

Building on the extant literature, we contribute to this discussion by outlining recommended principles. Our proposed guidelines draw from emerging ideas within *diversity science* to develop a general approach and recommendations for how scholars can effectively conduct scientific research on race and racism.

Drawing from a Diversity Science Framework

Several scholars have noted individual ways in which researchers contribute to the generation of knowledge on issues surrounding race and racism, including the use of racially diverse samples (e.g., Richeson, 2018; Stewart & Sweetman, 2018) and examining the effects of racial diversity on individual and collective outcomes (e.g., Bell, Leopold, Berry, & Hall, 2018; Craig, Rucker, & Richeson, 2018; Plaut, Thomas, Hurd, & Romano, 2018; Richeson & Sommers, 2016). Each of these elements is important. However, an approach to conducting research on race and racism that is broader than any one of these particular elements is needed. Building on the legacies of multicultural psychology and scholars of racism and sexism, researchers in recent years have proposed a systematic approach of diversity science to capture the psychological processes related to the

persistence of inequality in the face of changing demographics (e.g., Jones, 2010; Mendoza-Denton & España, 2010; Plaut, 2010a; see also the proposal for a Critical Race Psychology by Salter & Adams, 2013). Diversity science is not a topic of study or analysis of any particular social group. Rather, diversity science is a practice and a way of *doing* science that cuts across traditional boundaries among subfields within psychology. For example, Plaut (2010b) defined diversity science as "the study of the interpretation and construction of human difference—of why and how difference makes a difference" (p. 168). Diversity science thus incorporates a broad agenda to exploring human differences. We argue that focusing on a specific domain of difference can help add depth to the methodological approach, especially considering that categories of difference vary in terms of their meaning and role in society. In this article, we are specifically interested in understanding the influence of diversity science as it relates to research on race and racism.

There are a number of advantages to developing an agenda for research on race and racism that is squarely situated within the diversity science tradition. First, public recognition of a diversity science approach to research on race and racism as legitimate provides space to further develop the area as a normative practice and as an effective approach in all psychological science, regardless of topic or field. Establishing diversity science as an explicit approach to research on race and racism also provides opportunities to further develop theory-informed research that can lead to evidence-based practice. Currently, scholars often work in silos with a focus on their own topic areas. A diversity science approach provides a framework in which scholars across psychology and related fields can find points of engagement. This engagement can, in turn, help deepen our thinking on race and racism, as well as move us toward the goal of informing policy to promote health, education, and other forms of racial equality.

Second, ensuring a diversity science approach is represented in psychology also allows undergraduate and graduate programs to train the next generation of psychologists to conduct research on race and racism from a rigorous and inclusive paradigm. A number of psychology programs have created diversity science initiatives or cognate areas (e.g., University of California at Los Angeles and University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign) that recognize the value of explicitly organizing graduate and undergraduate training and research around the diversity science theme and cutting across traditional subdivisions of psychology. Similarly, some universities now offer graduate minors in diversity science (e.g., University of Illinois at Chicago). By recognizing the power of diversity science as a cross-cutting discipline and point of scholarly engagement, psychology programs can provide the institutional framework and resources for training and research that addresses some of the most pressing societal concerns, especially those related to race and racism.

In our attempt to articulate an agenda for research on race and racism, it is important that we outline definitions of these key terms. To do so, we draw

from previous discussions and conceptualizations in psychology. Consistent with the interdisciplinary literature on race (see proposed APA Race and Ethnicity Guidelines in Psychology 2019), we define *race* as the socially constructed racial categories within a given geopolitical space (e.g., White, Black, Asian, Latinx, or American Indian within the United States in 2019). Importantly, our definition is not static, as it allows for definitions of racial groups to change over time and place. For example, the societal definition of who is "White" or "Black" in the United States has shifted dramatically over the past century and varies across cultures (Horowitz, 2012).

The word racism was introduced into the US lexicon with Carmichael and Hamilton's (1967/1992) publication of *Black power.* They described racism as

> the predication of decisions and polices on considerations of race for the purpose of *subordinating* a racial group and maintaining control over that group . . . Racism is both overt and covert . . . We call these individual racism and institutional racism. The first consists of overt acts by individuals, which cause death, injury or violent destruction of property . . . The second type originates in the operation of established and respected forces in the society, and thus receives far less public condemnation than the first type (pp. 3–4).

Building on this and other works, racism in psychology commonly refers to social and economic oppression from individuals and society that is based on a person's racial or ethnic group membership (see also Sidanius & Pratto, 2001). This includes individual (e.g., negative emotion toward racial minorities), cultural (e.g., stereotypes about racial groups), and institutional factors (e.g., racial segregation laws). Psychologists highlight the ways in which racism concerns both the actions of a perpetrator (e.g., discrimination in job hiring) and the experiences of the target of racism (e.g., stress) (Jones, 1997).

Diversity-Science-Informed Guidelines for Research on Race and Racism

Taking together the insights we have drawn from previous discussions of diversity science, past research on race and racism, and the APA Race and Ethnicity Guidelines in Psychology, we propose five principles that can assist scholars in conducting generative research on race and racism; specifically, research on race and racism is strengthened when it: (*1) is mindful of historical patterns of oppression and inequality, (2) adopts a racially diverse team science approach, (3) utilizes diverse samples, (4) considers the influence of multiple identity groups on human experience, and (5) promotes the translation of knowledge from the laboratory to the field*.

We argue that these principles help to promote rigorous psychological science concerning race and racism, although we also note that the suggested guidelines outlined here may be useful for psychological research on any topic (not only race and racism). These principles emphasize that conducting meaningful research on race and racism is not something that can be accomplished in a single study,

with a single scientific theory, or by a single individual. Additionally, when these principles are enacted in psychological science as a whole, rather than in an isolated manner, they produce the strongest and most comprehensive version of research on race and racism. Throughout the rest of this section, we elaborate on each of the five principles in turn. To be clear, the goal is for both individual psychology research teams and the field as a whole to strive to implement as many of the five principles as possible as they design studies and chart out a research agenda. There is no arbitrary number of how many principles should be implemented for the research to be considered meaningful. Instead, researchers should reflect on the degree to which they incorporate these principles and strive to more fully address the core ideas.

(1) Research on race and racism benefits when scholars are mindful of historical patterns of oppression and inequality. When conducting research on race and racism, historical patterns of stigma and oppression can seep into research. We argue that this issue can be addressed in two key ways. First, being mindful of how scientific knowledge has historically been used to benefit some racial groups and harm others is essential for conducting unbiased research and ensuring that psychology does not reinforce extant inequality. Everyday people who lack knowledge of the history of racial oppression in the United States often fail to understand how history shapes modern forms of inequality (Nelson, Adams, & Salter, 2013). Psychologists, as humans, are no different. Psychology has an unpleasant history in which research practices were used to paint a picture of racial minorities as being psychologically inferior to Whites (Jones, 2010). Although some psychologists possess a deep knowledge of this history, many do not. In turn, the same arguments that were used to reinforce racial inequality decades ago can become continually raised in modern scientific discourse (see Jost, 2019, for an elaboration on this point). The impact of historical and institutional inequality on research can also be more subtle. Some researchers have pointed out, for example, that "well-meaning scientists and practitioners whose genuine intentions are to promote human welfare" may unintentionally "draw on conceptual tools that reinforce systems of domination," such as the conceptualization of development as progress or individualistic treatments of well-being (Adams, Kurtiş, Salter, & Anderson, 2012, p. 50). When psychologists are aware of long-term patterns of racial oppression and inequality, including patterns of scientific racism, they can become more attentive to how this historical reality can influence present and future research and actively guard against this problem.

Second, researchers interested in studying race and racism have both the benefit and the drawback of living in societies in which race and racism play a large role in everyday life. Because of historical patterns of privilege, oppression, and inequality that exist throughout the world, there always exists the possibility that researchers' own life experiences will both inform and bias the research itself. Addressing this issue can be challenging in part because many people, including

those who endorse egalitarian values, are inclined to adopt a racial "color blind" ideology in which they believe that race does not play a meaningful role in everyday life (Karmali, Kawakami, & Vaccarino, in press). Nevertheless, psychologists conducting research on race and racism, and in particular those who have benefitted from White privilege, can work toward overcoming this issue through purposefully evaluating how *their own* life experiences may impact their perspectives of the world, the research questions they ask, and their interpretations of findings. One approach to doing so is through considering multiple hypotheses and interpretations of findings for any research question (McGuire, 2004; Washburn & Skitka, 2018). This process allows researchers to critically probe why one hypothesis or interpretation of a finding might seem most correct to them. In turn, scientists can reduce the possibility that research conclusions are being derived from one's own privileged experiences or racial biases. It is an effortful task, but by engaging in continual reflection about how their own lived experiences influence research, scientists can reduce the risk of contaminating research questions with cultural biases, missing out on large stores of knowledge about human behavior, and reproducing old patterns of inequality in society.

Consider, for example, the emergence in the 1990s of cross-cultural research that showed that many psychological principles researchers assumed to be universal were actually highly context-dependent (e.g., Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Shweder, 1990). Similarly, consider the argument that the extensive reliance on convenience samples that were Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic (WEIRD) led to a large body of research findings that were probably not generalizable to other populations (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010). These examples illustrate that psychological science is *enhanced* when researchers proceed critically and thoughtfully with the theories and methods of the past and attend to historical patterns of oppression, inequality, and culture. Thus, we agree with Plaut's (2010b) assertion that diversity science "recognizes the power structures and relations that currently exist in society and the perception thereof," (p. 168) and we argue that this practice is particularly important for research on race and racism. It requires active effort to conduct psychological research that adequately takes into account how variation in culture, demographics, geography, and life experiences might affect the psychological processes that one studies.

(2) Research on race and racism is strengthened when scholars adopt a racially diverse team science approach. We propose that research on race and racism is greatly improved when scholars employ a team science approach. Team science is an approach to science involving teams of researchers from different disciplines, with distinct substantive expertise, or with distinct methodological orientations. Team science, particularly across disciplines, has produced increasing knowledge in psychology and the social sciences over the past few decades; it has numerous benefits, including the possibility of addressing complex problems unable to be addressed by individual investigators or disciplines, and the

acceleration of the translation of knowledge from laboratory to clinic and community (Bisbey, Reyes, Traylor, & Salas, 2019; Tebes & Thai, 2018).

In research on race and racism, this team science approach operates at its best when the voices and perspectives of racial and ethnic minorities who have been historically underrepresented in the field are not only included in the research team, but are *elevated*. This practice is active, not passive. It takes deliberate field-wide effort to ensure that there is true and meaningful diversity in the teams conducting psychological science. Furthermore, teams of scientists work best together when promoting diversity in the field does not fall disproportionately on racial and ethnic minorities, but instead is a collaborative effort where all psychologists take responsibility for achieving these goals.

We believe that the goal of elevating the voices of racial and ethnic minorities can be achieved in two key ways. First, scientists should ensure that their research teams are diverse and/or led by psychologists of color. As discussed above, historical patterns of privilege, oppression, and inequality in society create the possibility that researchers' own life experiences can bias research. Racially diverse groups more readily share information, consider multiple perspectives, and eschew problematic practices of conformity and groupthink (Gaither, Apfelbaum, Birnbaum, Babbitt, & Sommers, 2018; Galinsky et al., 2015; Sommers, 2006). Through collaboration within racially diverse science teams, individual researchers may reduce the risk of their own life experiences or perspectives limiting the research questions they ask and their interpretations of findings. Second, scientists can ground their thinking in, and cite the work of, racial and ethnic minority scholars. Actively including racial minorities in research teams and positions of leadership may help to reduce current disparities in the career advancement of scholars of color and increase the credit that scholars of color are often denied for their work (Ray, 2018).

It is important to make note of a clarification in our argument. Our conceptualization of racial and ethnic diversity in team science does *not* mean that we assume there is a one-to-one match between researchers' social identities and the way that they think about their research topics. In a 1972 Supreme Court opinion on the issue of racial diversity among jurors, Justice Marshall stated:

> We are unwilling to make the assumption that the exclusion of [African Americans] has relevance only for issues involving race. When any large and identifiable segment of the community is excluded from jury service, the effect is to remove from the jury room qualities of human nature and varieties of human experience the range of which is unknown, and perhaps unknowable. It is not necessary to assume that the excluded group will consistently vote as a class in order to conclude, as we do, that its exclusion deprives the jury of a perspective on human events that may have unsuspected importance in any case that may be presented.

(Peters v. Kiff). Justice Marshall's words are as relevant today to the issue of racial diversity in psychological science as they were to the issue of jury

diversity decades ago. Racial diversity among psychological scientists and the various experiences that they bring with them is crucial for research on race and racism and, indeed, research on any topic.

One of the major benefits of a team science approach to research on race and racism is that it fosters important methodological diversity. Working with researchers in other disciplines such as sociology, public health, geography, computer science, media studies, racial and ethnic studies, and history can broaden the types of questions psychologists ask and the methodological tools used to answer the questions. Jones (2010) argued that “diversity science must develop increasingly complex theories and multilevel, multidimensional analytical frameworks to deal with added complexity that considering diverse groups’ interactions necessarily entails” (p. 705). Applying this suggestion to research on race and racism, psychologists can use theoretical and methodologically sophisticated designs to investigate individual-level expressions of racism, while at the same time extending this work to investigate institutional, structural, and cultural racism (Neblett, in press). By doing so, racism research in psychological science could have broader implications for public policy. Employing multiple methods can allow researchers to investigate questions involving the role of both individual and more distal systems on human experiences. For example, researchers could examine the transgenerational transmission of resilience or the influence of police killings of unarmed Black and Brown women and men on people’s physical and mental health (e.g., Bor, Venkataramani, Williams, & Tsai, 2018).

Neblett (2019) reminds racism researchers to attend to developmental and life course questions using increasingly more sophisticated designs. As such, in addition to population studies investigating, for example, the link between police killings and health, researchers could explore the cumulative effect of this exposure on children over time or the influence of the exposure on critical life transitions (e.g., high school to work or college). To investigate these questions, researchers can rely on a range of methods drawing from qualitative, quantitative, interpretative and community-based participatory research traditions. Overall, a racially diverse team science approach promotes these goals by allowing researchers to center the voices of those traditionally marginalized in psychological research, to give long overdue credit to the past work of scholars of color, and to benefit from methodological diversity.

(3) Research on race and racism benefits from using diverse participant samples. We argue that research on race and racism is greatly improved when scholars incorporate more racially diverse samples into their scientific investigations. However, a diversity science approach to understanding race and racism suggests that research is not benefited simply from utilizing samples that include people from various racial groups. Rather, we emphasize that research becomes more generative and inclusive when scholars theorize and discuss findings in a manner such that majority group members are not treated as “default” people

while racial and ethnic minority group members are viewed as "moderators" that qualify an effect (Apfelbaum, Phillips, & Richeson, 2014; Awad & Cokley, 2010; Helms, Jernigan, & Mascher, 2005). Early psychology studies used samples of only White men and boys (Asch, 1951; Kohlberg, 1958; Milgram, 1963; Sherif, 1956). Clearly, there has been significant improvement in this regard. However, there is still a discipline-wide tendency to begin examining a particular topic of study using mostly White, educated, Judeo-Christian samples and only later ask whether the findings differ across race, nationality, and other meaningful forms of group membership. This practice has the potential to perpetuate the notion that patterns of thought and behavior among Whites are "normal" and neutral, and that deviations from these patterns among racial and ethnic minority groups are what necessitates scientific explanation (Bailey, LaFrance, & Dovidio, in press; Hegarty, 2017; Hegarty, Pratto, & Lemieux, 2004; Markus, 2008).

Consider, for example, recent developments in research on the moral foundations that people prioritize in their judgments. Moral foundations theory argues that political liberals and conservatives construct moral systems based on distinct subsets of dimensions (Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009). The theory has been highly generative, but early evidence supporting this hypothesis was based on samples that were predominantly White (Graham et al., 2009; Graham et al., 2011; Koleva, Graham, Iyer, Ditto, & Haidt, 2012). Although the original authors of the moral foundations hypothesis have, laudably, been involved in efforts to test its generalizability across different ideological systems (e.g., Iyer, Koleva, Graham, Ditto, & Haidt, 2012) and in different countries (Graham et al., 2011), a recent study demonstrated that patterns predicted from moral foundations theory differed among African Americans and White Americans (Davis et al., 2016). These recent findings illustrate how moral foundations research is enhanced when researchers consider historical and cultural differences between White and Black Americans (e.g., the differential role of religion in political and social movements), and when findings from both majority and minority groups are given equal footing in theory construction and application.

Ultimately, we argue that good psychological science adheres to the diversity science principles we have outlined. Most research incorporates dimensions of race and ethnicity, even if unacknowledged. The research discussed here highlights the fact that studies on predominantly White and western populations is "racial" and "ethnic" research in the sense that it is grounded in a set of unexplored assumptions. Taking a diversity science approach to research on race and racism allows psychologists to critically examine the assumptions they make about the universality of psychological processes that, by and large, have only been observed in contemporary North America and Western Europe (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Shweder, 1990).

We propose that accounting for racial and ethnic diversity within the context of the particular theory being examined can enhance the quality, rigor, and

completeness of the knowledge our field produces. It is also normatively beneficial to ensure that we do not create a body of knowledge simply based on samples of dominant racial group members. We fully recognize that researchers need to start a research project somewhere, often with one type of sample, before expanding their inquiries outward. A diversity science approach allows for theories to grow and evolve as they are tested in increasingly complex ways. However, we encourage researchers to consider the thoughts and experiences of racial and ethnic minority groups as integral to their theories, rather than construing these research studies as an attempt to determine whether findings simply "replicate" from majority racial groups.

(4) Research on race and racism benefits when scholars consider the influence of multiple identity groups on human experiences, with attention to the relative power and oppression associated with the group identities and their intersections. Currently, most research on race and racism in psychology tends to examine one aspect of diversity at a time and frequently does not account for the fact that racial and other identities might be inseparable. Considering a single identity dimension (e.g., race, gender) in isolation inhibits scientists' ability to gain accurate knowledge of human psychology and experience (Ghavami & Peplau, 2013; Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008) and can lead to the development of interventions that are theoretically informed and well-intentioned but that inadvertently backfire (e.g., Pietri, Johnson, & Ozgumus, 2018).

We argue that research on race and racism is greatly improved when scholars work to recognize the importance of intersectionality in their theories, methods, and populations of study (Cole, 2009; Galliher, McLean, & Syed, 2017; Grzanka, Santos, & Moradi, 2017; Nicolas, de la Fuente, & Fiske, 2017). Intersectionality concerns how people's multiple identities simultaneously influence their lived experiences in an interactive and inseparable manner (Cole, 2009; Grzanka et al., 2017). Black feminist legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw is credited with coining the term intersectionality over two decades ago. Her seminal works (Crenshaw, 1989, 1991), along with her academic foremothers (e.g., Beal, 1970) and contemporaries (e.g., Collins, 1986, 2000), serve as the catalyst for what is now the field of intersectionality studies (Cho, Crenshaw, & McCall, 2013). Originally, intersectionality theory was introduced to capture the experiences of Black women whose lived realities remained invisible through the single-axis approach to studying inequalities from feminist (gender-only analysis) and antiracist (race-only analysis) paradigms. Intersectionality theory has since expanded to incorporate other dimensions of diversity (e.g., sexual orientation, class, disability) through varied conceptual and analytic lenses. For example, intersectionality provides a framework in which to investigate a broad range of topics using multiple methodologies including constructing a scale to assess gendered-racial microaggressions among Black women (Lewis & Neville, 2015), examining intersections between ambiguous and obvious social categories (Remedios, Chasteen, Rule, & Plaks, 2011),

exploring Asian American women's body image (Brady et al., 2017), comparing experiences of racism and sexism among Asian women (Remedios, Chasteen, & Paek, 2012), and evaluating an intervention designed to increase condom use among Latino gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men (Rhodes et al., 2017).

It is important to highlight that intersectional research is not new to psychology. Before the introduction of the term intersectionality, Smith and Stewart (1983) edited a special issue in *Journal of Social Issues* on investigating racism and sexism in Black women's lives. In fact, they were among the first to propose a contextual interactive model in psychology. Other social psychologists including Purdie-Vaughns and Eibach (2008) and Cole (2009) introduced and expanded intersectionality theory to a broader psychology audience. Psychology researchers more recently have elaborated on the epistemological and methodological manifestations of intersectionality, especially in the quantitative literature (e.g., Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016). On the basis of the interdisciplinary literature, Lewis and Grzanka (2016) developed a checklist for intersectional research on racism in psychology. They outlined specific criteria across the research process including developing research questions (e.g., incorporating context-specific factors related to the topic), methodology (e.g., selecting appropriate measures and sampling procedures to assess intersectional questions), data analysis (e.g., explicitly exploring ways to uncover the role of power related to the topic of the research study), and implications of the findings (e.g., identifying the ways in which findings may contribute to the communities or groups most affected by the results).

Intersectional research is more than a buzzword or academic trend. Application of intersectionality can add complexity to a diversity science approach in the area of race and racism research. Intersectionality prompts researchers to see the limits of a single-axis approach to a topic and thus encourages exploration of the simultaneous influence of gender, sexual orientation, class, and other identities on one's racial views and experiences with racism, as well as the ways in which multiple marginalized identities concurrently play out in cognition and daily actions. By doing so, researchers can explicitly investigate topics and experiences that are invisible or underexplored in psychological research and in society at large (e.g., sex trafficking of missing Indigenous girls and women, mascots depicting racist images of Indigenous men). Additionally, when researchers adopt an intersectional approach, they move away from comparing racial groups and move toward exploring within-group differences. Intersectionality also opens the door for researchers to theorize and investigate the influence of multiple group identities in general on psychological phenomena, such as racial beliefs of White gay and heterosexual men. This type of opening allows researchers to further explore the ways in which relative power and privilege of one's multiple identities shapes attitudes and behaviors.

(5) Research on race and racism is improved when scholars promote the translation of knowledge from the laboratory to the field for interventions and policy change that address racial inequality. Finally, we argue that research examining race and racism can prioritize *both* the creation of scientific knowledge and the translation of this knowledge outside of the laboratory. Psychological science as a field has sometimes drawn sharp distinctions between so-called "basic" and "applied" research, and has in some ways placed greater value on what is viewed as basic research activities. Our definition of a diversity science approach to research on race and racism challenges this binary. We propose that subjecting psychological theories to tests outside of highly controlled laboratory environments is a necessary step in the basic scientific method of psychology, and that researchers who do so often learn a great deal about complex factors that impact both their original theories and the translations of theories from the lab to the field (e.g., Paluck, 2016; Paluck & Green, 2009). In other words, external validity is essential (see Sue, 1999). Jones (2010) captured the argument well when he asserted: "we privilege internal validity over external validity in our methods and interpretations of results. But it is external validity that helps us to know how people differ, how environment matters, and even how our variables operate across contexts" (p. 705). An approach to research on race and racism that encourages the examination of psychological theories outside of the lab and the development of societal interventions through policy is also in broad alignment with Lewin's (1946) famous argument that "research that produces nothing but books will not suffice." Even research that has not reached the interventions stage can benefit from researchers' awareness and discussion of potential interventions that may stem from it (e.g., Perry, Skinner, & Abaied, in press).

Psychological science has a responsibility to provide evidence that informs policies to help ameliorate racial inequalities and racist practices. Part of this responsibility stems from acknowledging and undoing the role of psychology in reinforcing racism in society at large and within science more specifically. Psychology played an active role in the eugenics movement and in creating and producing biased research to reinforce practices of racial superiority and inferiority (Winston, 2004). More recently, psychologists were involved in the torture of terrorism suspects, who were disproportionately men of color (Hoffman, 2015). Given this history, it is simply not sufficient for the field to stop promoting racial hierarchies. The field has a responsibility to actively participate in the dismantling of those hierarchies.

Another part of psychology's responsibility to society stems from our awareness of the importance of evidence-based policy. Well-meaning policies that are informed by policymakers' lay theories of human behavior can be ineffective, wasting precious social and financial resources, or can even backfire. Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, for example, it was a matter of both

law and common sense that policies segregating White Americans from African Americans and other people of color in public accommodations were harmless, as long as the amenities provided to each group were roughly equivalent (Plessy v. Ferguson). Psychologists Kenneth and Mamie Clark presented their research (e.g., Clark & Clark, 1947; Clark & Clark, 1939) to the Supreme Court, which showed the psychological harm that segregation caused to African American children, prompting the 1954 ruling that school segregation was unconstitutional (Brown v. Board of Education).

More recent examples of the importance of evidence-based policy abound, including the discovery that many common-sense police practices increase the risk of false confessions and disproportionately affect criminal suspects of color (e.g., American Psychological Association, 2014; Kassin et al., 2010; Kassin, Redlich, Alceste, & Luke, 2018); the awareness of the prevalence and consequences of implicit racial biases in individual and institutional discrimination, in direct contradiction to the ruling in Washington v. Davis (1976; e.g., Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Jost et al., 2009; Kovera, in press); and the discovery that police department policies promoting the use of *Terry* stops (i.e., stop-and-frisks; Terry v. Ohio) both fail to identify more crime and disproportionately harm communities of color (e.g., Hester & Gray, 2018; Jones-Brown, Stoudt, Johnston, & Moran, 2013; Saunders, Kelly, Cohen, & Guarino, 2016; Sewell, Jefferson, & Lee, 2016).

New research suggests that Ban-the-Box policies, which have been lauded as a useful and creative solution to the problem of employment discrimination against people with criminal records, may inadvertently increase employers' use of racial cues in hiring (Agan & Starr, 2018; Doleac & Hansen, 2017). Taking together these examples and the many more that are not mentioned here, it is clear that psychologists have the tools to produce the much-needed information that can shape policies to effectively ameliorate racial inequalities and racist practices. The field has a responsibility to produce this information.

Implementing the Proposed Guidelines

In this article, we have outlined core principles and guidelines that researchers can implement to construct a more generative body of research on race and racism. However, we are fully cognizant that implementing new guidelines in scientific research is rarely a simple and straightforward task. Even the most dedicated researchers are likely to hit roadblocks and stumble in their progress, especially if they are new to conducting research on race and racism. Lewin (1946) argued that scholars must develop procedures that they can use to translate scientific findings into meaningful social change. Without doing so, ideas and proposed guidelines operate in abstraction and fail to result in coordinated action. Change to the scientific status quo operates in a similar manner. Here, we highlight several

possible ways in which scholars can work to implement our proposed guidelines when conducting research on race and racism.

First, researchers can consult journals that either focus on or commonly cover research about race, ethnicity, and racism, such as *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology,* the *Journal of Black Psychology*, and the *Journal of Social Issues*. General journals in psychology tend to receive the highest impact factor and in turn the most attention from scholars interested in learning about advances in the field (https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/resources/impact-factors). Journals that are interdisciplinary and that focus on more specific areas of inquiry can be viewed as overly "specialized" and receive less attention from readers. However, these journals are fonts of knowledge and can be a catalyst for implementing our proposed guidelines. Specifically, publications in these journals commonly include samples from racial and ethnic minorities, which can assist researchers in developing theoretically informed hypotheses that do not simply anchor on research findings from racial majority populations. For example, this issue of the *Journal of Social Issues* includes articles with racially and ethnically diverse participant samples (Albuja, Gaither, Sanchez, Straka, & Cipollina, in press; Castillo-Lavergne & Destin, in press; Jaxon, Lei, Vraneski-Shachnai, Chestnut, & Cimpian, in press) or articles that review research examining mostly racial and ethnic minority individuals (David, Schroeder, & Fernandez, in press; Ozier, Taylor, & Murphy, in press). The authors of these papers also reflect racially and ethnically diverse research teams. Relatedly, racial minority researchers might also face bias (often nonconscious) that can prevent them from being published in journals in their field that view themselves as more general or basic-science-oriented (Garcia-Moreno, 2019). In turn, journals that heavily focus on topics related to race and racism can become a haven for scholars of color seeking to publish their research. Researchers might use these outlets to find scholars with particular expertise whom they could contact to develop a research team.

Second, researchers can (and often do) make use of electronic discussion boards and listservs that operate under academic societies. For example, the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Society for the Psychological Study of Culture, Ethnicity and Race, and many divisions of APA maintain listservs and shared interest groups where scholars can post requests for relevant literature and for collaborators on research projects. Not all scholars might be able to attend conferences that academic societies hold, and these listservs stand as excellent ways for researchers to build collaborative connections and diverse research teams. Scholars also disseminate their findings to other academics and to community members through webinars and blogs. For example, as part of the third author's APA Division 45 presidential initiative, she compiled a task force to explore the promotion of healing in communities of color through social justice. As part of these activities, the racially and ethnically diverse task force sponsored a webinar series. One webinar in particular

focused on cutting-edge diversity science research related to the topic. Four scholars shared their research findings; through the process they provided real examples of the five core principles outlined in this article. Operating on a more local level, researchers could look to departments within their own university that commonly focus on issues of race and racism (e.g., psychology looking to political science and sociology) to build their pool of collaborators and develop interdisciplinary and diverse research teams.

Third, researchers can collect data outside of the laboratory. Undergraduate participant populations (including those from psychology) are notorious for lacking racial and ethnic diversity (Henrich et al., 2010). However, researchers could collect data from their undergraduate community as a whole or their local community as a way of increasing the racial diversity of their samples. If researchers live in a racially homogenous community, they could develop collaborations with scholars who live in more racially diverse spaces. When they possess monetary resources for research, scholars could also use online survey platforms that allow researchers to request specific compositions of racial diversity in their samples (e.g., TurkPrime, Qualtrics; Litman, Robinson, & Abberbock, 2017). Importantly, researchers have begun to identify barriers, and also effective practices, in recruiting racially and ethnically diverse samples in mental health research. For example, based on their systematic review of the literature, Waheed, Hughes-Morley, Woodham, Allen, and Bower (2015) outlined concrete strategies researchers could implement to address recruitment barriers such as providing free childcare during the time of data collection, avoiding the use of stigmatizing terms, and creating an advisory board.

Fourth, researchers, editors, department leaders, and administrators can work to create policies and practices that incentivize the application of the five principles outlined in this article. Implementing the proposed principles can be time- and resource-intensive (e.g., recruiting a racially diverse participant sample is typically more challenging than is recruiting a predominantly White homogenous convenience sample). In turn, researchers might experience concern that implementing the principles we propose could harm evaluations of their productivity. Changing policies could alleviate this concern and ensure that scholars who seek to conduct high quality research on race and racism are not inadvertently penalized while entering the job market or during annual review and promotion evaluations. For example, racial diversity in participant samples could be used as an evaluative factor in determining the quality of a research paper. This practice is slowly making its way into some journals. The *Attitudes and Social Cognition* section of the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* now requires authors of all submitted papers to include a “thoughtful discussion on their samples with an emphasis on their *diversity and inclusiveness*” (emphasis in original; Kitayama, 2017, p. 359). Relatedly, universities, departments, and grant agencies could include the racial

diversity of a sample as an evaluative factor when determining the allocation of research funds.

Psychology departments could also implement practices and procedures to ensure they are recruiting and retaining racially diverse undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty. A diverse body of student and faculty researchers is essential to creating diverse research teams and perspectives when approaching scientific topics. There are a number of excellent resources to guide these efforts (Castenel, Grantham, & Hawkins, 2018; Han & Onchwari, 2018; Minefee, Rabelo, Stewart, & Young, 2018; Snyder, Frogner, & Skillman, 2018).

Altogether, these suggestions open possibilities for scholars conducting research on race and racism to begin to implement the proposed principles that we have outlined here. The list of suggestions that we have outlined here is by no means exhaustive. Rather, we view these suggestions as a starting point, and we believe that they are part of a broader constellation of actions that scholars can continually take to conduct high quality and inclusive research on race and racism.

Conclusion

Racial inequality stands as a persistent issue for social scientists and policy makers, yet scholars frequently disagree on how research concerning race and racism can (and should) be conducted. In this piece, we have outlined diversity-science-informed guidelines for research on race and racism within psychological science. We have specified a broad approach with several recommendations that, when considered in their totality, can be used to effectively conduct insightful scholarship. We hope that as scholars continue in their scientific pursuits, our proposed guidelines assist them in conducting cutting-edge research that sheds new light on issues surrounding race and racism.

References

Adams, G., Kurtiş, T., Salter, P., & Anderson, S. (2012). A cultural psychology of relationship: Decolonizing science and practice. In O. Gillath, G. Adams, & A. D. Kunkel (Eds.), *Relationship science: Integrating evolutionary, neuroscience, and sociocultural approaches* (pp. 49–70). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Albuja, A. F., Gaither, S. E., Sanchez, D. T., Straka, B., & Cipollina, R. (in press). Psychophysiological stress responses to bicultural and biracial identity denial. *Journal of Social Issues*.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Agan, A., & Starr, S. (2018). Ban the box, criminal records, and racial discrimination: A field experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *133*(1) 191–235. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjx028

American Psychological Association. (2014). *Resolution on interrogations of criminal suspects*. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/about/policy/interrogations.aspx

Apfelbaum, E. P., Phillips, K. W., & Richeson, J. A. (2014). Rethinking the baseline in diversity research: Should we be explaining the effects of homogeneity? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *9*, 235–244. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614527466

Asch, S. (1951). Effects of group pressure on the modification and distortion of judgments. In H. Guetzkow (Ed.), *Groups, leadership and men* (pp. 177–190). Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Press.

Awad, G. H., & Cokley, K. O. (2010). Designing and interpreting quantitative research in multicultural counseling. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 385–396). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bailey, A., LaFrance, M., & Dovidio, J. (in press). Is man the measure of all things? A social cognitive account of androcentrism. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868318782848

Beal, F. (1970). Double jeopardy: To be Black and female. In T. Cade (Ed.), *The Black woman: An anthology* (pp. 90–100). New York, NY: Signet.

Bell, M., Leopold, J., Berry, D., & Hall, A. (2018). Diversity, discrimination, and persistent inequality: Hope for the future through the solidarity economy movement. *Journal of Social Issues*, *74*, 224–243. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12266

Bisbey, T. M., Reyes, D. L., Traylor, A. M., & Salas, E. (2019). Teams of psychologists helping teams: The evolution of the science of team training. *American Psychologist*, *74*, 278–289. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000419

Bor, J., Venkataramani, A. S., Williams, D. R., & Tsai, A. C. (2018). Police killings and their spillover effects on the mental health of Black Americans: A population-based, quasi-experimental study. *The Lancet*, *392*, 302–310. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31130-9

Brady, J. L., Kaya, A., Iwamoto, D., Park, A., Fox, L., & Moorhead, M. (2017). Asian American women's body image experiences: A qualitative intersectionality study. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *41*, 479–496. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684317725311

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

Carmichael, S., & Hamilton, C. V. (1992). *Black power: The politics of liberation in America*. New York, NY: Vintage.

Castenel, L. A., Grantham, T. C., & Hawkins, B. J. (Eds.). (2018). *Recruiting, retaining, and engaging African-American males at selective public research universities: Challenges and opportunities in academics and sports*. Charlotte, NC: IAP.

Castillo-Lavergne, C. M., & Destin, M. (in press). How the intersections of ethnic and socioeconomic identities are associated with well-being during college. *Journal of Social Issues*.

Cho, S., Crenshaw, K. W., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a field of intersectionality studies: Theory, applications, and praxis. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *38*, 785–810. https://doi.org/10.1086/669608

Clark, K. B. (1989). *Dark ghetto: Dilemmas of social power*. Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press.

Clark, K. B., & Clark, M. (1947). Racial identification and preference in Negro children. In T. M. Newcomb & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in Social Psychology* (pp. 169–178). New York, NY: Henry Holt.

Clark, K. B., & Clark, M. (1939). Segregation as a factor in racial identification of Negro school children. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *11*, 159–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.1939.11010160

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

Collins, P. H. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of Black feminist thought. *Social Problems*, *33*, s14–s32. https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.1986.33.6.03a00020

Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Comas-Díaz, L., Hall, G., Neville, H., & Kazak, A. (Eds.). (2019). Racial trauma: Theory, research, and healing [Special issue]. *American Psychologist*, *74*(1), 1–5.

Craig, M., Rucker, J., & Richeson, J. (2018). The pitfalls and promise of increasing racial diversity: Threat, contact, and race relations in the 21st century. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *27*, 188–193. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721417727860

Crenshaw, K. W. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, *140*, 139–167.

Crenshaw, K. W. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*, 1241–1299.

David, E. J. R., Schroeder, T. M., & Fernandez, J. (in press). Internalized racism: A systematic review of the psychological literature on racism's most insidious consequence. *Journal of Social Issues*.

Davis, D., Rice, K., Van Tongeren, D., Hook, J., DeBlaere, C., Worthington, E., & Choe, E. (2016). The moral foundations hypothesis does not replicate well in Black samples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *110*, e23–e30. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000056

Doleac, J., & Hansen, B. (2017). The unintended consequences of "Ban the Box": Statistical discrimination and employment outcomes when criminal histories are hidden. Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved from https://ssrn.com/abstract=2812811

Dovidio, J., Newheiser, A., & Leyens, J. (2012). A history of intergroup relations research. In A. W. Kruglanski & W. Stroebe (Eds.), *Handbook of the history of social psychology* (pp. 407–430). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Else-Quest, N. M., & Hyde, J. S. (2016). Intersectionality in quantitative psychological research: II. Methods and techniques. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *40*, 319–336. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684316647953

Engle, R. (Ed.). (2018). Racism [Special issue]. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *27*(3), 147–206.

Foley, A., & Latimer, B. (2016). Public schools becoming more racially segregated: Report. Retrieved from https://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/public-schools-becoming-more-racially-segregated-report-n576121

Gaither, S. E., Apfelbaum, E. P., Birnbaum, H. J., Babbitt, L. G., & Sommers, S. R. (2018). Mere membership in racially diverse groups reduces conformity. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *9*, 402–410. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617708013

Galinsky, A. D., Todd, A. R., Homan, A. C., Phillips, K. W., Apfelbaum, E. P., Sasaki, S. J., Richeson, J. A., Olayon, J. B., Maddux, W. W. (2015). Maximizing the gains and minimizing the pains of diversity: A policy perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *10*, 742–748. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691615598513

Galliher, R., McLean, K., & Syed, M. (2017). An integrated developmental model for studying identity content in context. *Developmental Psychology*, *53*, 2011–2022. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000299

Garcia-Moreno, B. (2019). *Unconscious bias in academic publishing*. Retrieved from https://www.wiley.com/network/journaleditors/editors/unconscious-bias-in-academic-_publishing

Ghavami, N., & Peplau, L. (2013). An intersectional analysis of gender and ethnic stereotypes: Testing three hypotheses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *37*, 113–127. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684312464203

Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *96*, 1029–1046. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015141

Graham, J., Nosek, B., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*, 366–385. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021847

Green, A. (2016). *Psychology's diversity problem*. Retrieved from https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/psy-curious/201601/psychologys-diversity-problem

Greenwald, A., & Banaji, M. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, *102*, 4–27. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.102.1.4

Grzanka, P., Santos, C., & Moradi, B. (2017). Intersectionality research in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *64*, 453–457. https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000237

Han, I., & Onchwari, A. J. (2018). Development and implementation of a culturally responsive mentoring program for faculty and staff of color. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Partnership Studies*, *5*(2), 3, Article 3. https://doi.org/10.24926/ijps.v5i2.1006

Hegarty, P. (2017). On the failure to notice that White people are White: Generating and testing hypotheses in the celebrity guessing game. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *146*, 41–62. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000243

Hegarty, P., Pratto, F., & Lemieux, A. (2004). Heterosexist ambivalence and heterocentric norms: Drinking in intergroup discomfort. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *7*, 119–130. Retrieved from https://doi:_10.1177/1368430204041399

Helms, J. E., Jernigan, M., & Mascher, J. (2005). The meaning of race in psychology and how to change it: A methodological perspective. *The American Psychologist*, *60*, 27–36. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.60.1.27

Henrich, J., Heine, S., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *33*, 61–135. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X

Hester, N., & Gray, K. (2018). For Black men, being tall increases threat stereotyping and police stops. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *115*, 2711–2715. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1714454115

Hoffman, D. (2015). *Report to the special committee of the board of directors of the American Psychological Association: Independent review relating to APA ethics guidelines, national security interrogations, and torture*. Retrieved from https://www.apa.org/independent-review/revised-report.pdf

Horowitz, A. L. (2012). Ethnic identity. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Horwitz, S., & Costa, R. (2017). Sessions's move to take on affirmative action energizes Trump's base. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/sessionss-move-to-take-on-affirmative-action-energizes-trumps-base/2017/08/02/771285b4-779f-11e7-8839-ec-48ec4cae25_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.003382a4e10c

Iyer, R., Koleva, S., Graham, J., Ditto, P., & Haidt, J. (2012). Understanding libertarian morality: The psychological dispositions of self-identified libertarians. *PLoS ONE*, *7*, e42366. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0042366

Jaxon, J., Lei, R. F., Shachnai, R., Chestnut, E. K., & Cimpian, A. (in press). The acquisition of gender stereotypes about intellectual ability: Intersections with race. *Journal of Social Issues*.

Jones, J. M. (1997). *Prejudice and racism* (2 ed). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Jones, J. (2010). I'm white and you're not: The value of unraveling ethnocentric science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *5*, 700–707. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610388771

Jones-Brown, D., Stoudt, B., Johnston, B., & Moran, K. (2013). *Stop, question and frisk policing practices in New York City: A primer (Revised)*. Retrieved from https://www.atlanticphilanthropies.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/SQF_Primer_July_2013.pdf

Jost, J. T. (2019). *Social psychology and human values*. Retrieved from http://spsp.org/news-_center/member-newsletters/11-29-18/social-psychology-and-human-values

Jost, J., Rudman, L., Blair, I., Carney, D., Dasgupta, N., Glaser, J., & Hardin, C. (2009). The existence of implicit bias is beyond reasonable doubt: A refutation of ideological and methodological objections and executive summary of ten studies that no manager should ignore. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *29*, 39–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2009.10.001

Karmali, F., Kawakami, K., Vaccarino, E., Williams, A., Phills, C., & Friesen, P. (in press). I don't see race (or conflict): Strategic descriptions of ambiguous negative intergroup contexts. *Journal of Social Issues*.

Kassin, S., Drizin, S., Grisso, T., Gudjonsson, G., Leo, R., & Redlich, A. (2010). Police-induced confessions, risk factors, and recommendations: Looking ahead. *Law and Human Behavior*, *34*, 49–52. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-010-9217-5

Kassin, S., Redlich, A., Alceste, F., & Luke, T. (2018). On the general acceptance of confessions research: Opinions of the scientific community. *American Psychologist*, *73*, 63–80. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000141

Kitayama, S. (2017). Journal of Personality and Social Psychology: Attitudes and social cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *112*, 357–360. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000077

Kohlberg, L. (1958). The development of modes of thinking and choices in years 10 to 16 (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.

Koleva, S., Graham, J., Iyer, R., Ditto, P., & Haidt, J. (2012). Tracing the threads: How five moral concerns (especially purity) help explain culture war attitudes. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *46*, 184–194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2012.01.006

Kovera, M. B. (in press). Racial disparities in the criminal justice system: Prevalence, causes, and a search for solutions. *Journal of Social Issues*.

Lee, R. (2019). Understanding, unpacking, and eliminating health disparities: A prescription for health equity promotion through behavioral and psychological research [Special issue]. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *25*(1), 1–5.

Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems. *Journal of Social Issues*, *2*, 34–46. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1946.tb02295.x

Lewis, J. A., & Grzanka, P. R. (2016). Applying intersectionality theory to research on perceived racism. In A. N. Alvarez, C. T. H. Liang, & H. A. Neville (Eds.), *Cultural, racial, and ethnic psychology book series. The cost of racism for people of color: Contextualizing experiences of discrimination* (pp. 31–54). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Lewis, J. A., & Neville, H. A. (2015). Construction and initial validation of the Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale for Black women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *62*, 289–302. https://doi.org/10.1037/_cou0000062

Lin, L., Stamm, K., & Christidis, P. (2018, February). How diverse is the psychology workforce: News from APA's Center for Workforce Studies. *Monitor on Psychology*, *49*(2), 19.

Litman, L., Robinson, J., & Abberbock, T. (2017). TurkPrime.com: A versatile crowdsourcing data acquisition platform for the behavioral sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, *49*, 443–442. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-016-0727-z

Markus, H. R. (2008). Pride, prejudice, and ambivalence: Toward a unified theory of race and ethnicity. *American Psychologist*, *63*, 651–670. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.8.651

Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, *98*, 224–253. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224

McGuire, W. J. (2004). A perspectivist approach to theory construction. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *8*, 173–182. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0802_11

Mendoza-Denton, R., & España, C. (2010). Diversity science: What is it? *Psychological Inquiry*, *21*, 140–145. https://doi.org/10.1080/10478401003800945

Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *67*, 371–378. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040525

Minefee, I., Rabelo, V. C., Stewart, IV, O. J. C., & Young, N. C. J. (2018). Repairing leaks in the pipeline: A social closure perspective on underrepresented racial/ethnic minority recruitment and retention in business schools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *17*, 79–95. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2015.0215

Neblett, E. W. (in press). Diversity (psychological) science training: Challenges, tensions, and a call to action. *Journal of Social Issues*.

Neblett, E. W. (2019). Racism and health: Challenges and future directions in behavioral and psychological research. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *25*, 12–20. https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000253

Nelson, J., Adams, G., & Salter, P. (2013). The Marley hypothesis: Denial of racism reflects ignorance of history. *Psychological Science*, *24*, 213–218. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612451466

Nicolas, G., de la Fuente, M., & Fiske, S. (2017). Mind the overlap in multiple categorization: A review of crossed categorization, intersectionality, and multiracial perception. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *20*, 621–631. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217708862

Ozier, E. M., Taylor, V. J., & Murphy, M. C. (in press). The cognitive effects of experiencing and observing subtle racial discrimination. *Journal of Social Issues*.

Paluck, E. L. (2016). How to overcome prejudice. *Science*, *352*, 147. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf5207

Paluck, E., & Green, D. (2009). Prejudice reduction: What works? A review and assessment of research and practice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*, 339–367. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163607

Perry, S. P., Skinner, A. L., & Abaied, J. L. (in press). Bias awareness predicts color conscious racial socialization methods among White parents. *Journal of Social Issues*.

Peters v. Kiff, 407 U.S. 493 (1972).

Pierce, S., & Selee, A. (2017). *Immigration under Trump: A review of policy shifts in the year since the election*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Pietri, E., Johnson, I., & Ozgumus, E. (2018). One size may not fit all: Exploring how the intersection of race and gender and stigma consciousness predict effective identity-safe cues for Black women. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *74*, 291–306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.06.021

Plaut, V. (2010a). Diversity science: Why and how difference makes a difference. *Psychological Inquiry*, *21*, 77–99. https://doi.org/10.1080/10478401003676501

Plaut, V. (2010b). Reply: Diversity science: Who needs it? *Psychological Inquiry*, *21*, 168–174. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2010.492753

Plaut, V., Thomas, K., Hurd, K., & Romano, C. (2018). Do color blindness and multiculturalism remedy or foster discrimination and racism? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *27*, 200–206. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721418766068

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).

Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Eibach, R. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles*, *59*, 377–391. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9424-4

Ray, V. (2018, April). The racial politics of citation *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2018/04/27/racial-exclusions-scholarly-citations-opinion

Remedios, J., Chasteen, A., & Paek, J. (2012). Not all prejudices are experienced equally: Comparing experiences of racism and sexism in female minorities. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *15*, 273–287. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430211411594

Remedios, J., Chasteen, A., Rule, N., & Plaks, J. (2011). Impressions at the intersection of ambiguous and obvious social categories: Does gay + Black = likable? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *47*, 1312–1315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.05.015

Rhodes, S. D., Alonzo, J., Mann, L., Song, E. Y., Tanner, A. E., Arellano, J. E., Rodriguez-Celedon, R., Garcia, M., Freeman, A., Reboussin, B. A., & Painter, T. M. (2017). Small-group randomized controlled trial to increase condom use and HIV testing among Hispanic/Latino gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men. *American Journal of Public Health*, *107*, 969–976. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2017.303814

Richeson, J. (2018). The psychology of racism: An introduction to the special issue. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *27*, 148–149. https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214187813

Richeson, J., & Sommers, S. (2016). Toward a social psychology of race and race relations for the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *67*, 439–463. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115115

Salter, P., & Adams, G. (2013). Toward a critical race psychology. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *7*, 781–793. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12068

Saunders, B., Kelly, E., Cohen, N., & Guarino, C. (2016). Right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation indirectly predict support for New York City's Stop-&-Frisk policy through prejudice. *Current Psychology*, *35*, 92–98. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-015-9364-4

Sewell, A., Jefferson, K., & Lee, H. (2016). Living under surveillance: Gender, psychological distress, and stop question-and-frisk policing in New York City. *Social Science & Medicine*, *159*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.04.024

Sherif, M. (1956). Experiments on group conflict. *Scientific American*, *195*, 54–58.

Shweder, R. (1990). Cultural psychology—What is it? In J. W. Stigler, R. A. Shweder, & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development* (pp. 1–43). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (2001). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, A., & Stewart A. (Eds.). (1983). Approaches to studying racism and sexism in Black women's lives [Special issue]. *Journal of Social Issues*, *39*(3), 1–158.

Snyder, C. R., Frogner, B. K., & Skillman, S. M. (2018). Facilitating racial and ethnic diversity in the health workforce. *Journal of Allied Health*, *47*(1), 58–69.

Sommers, S. (2006). On racial diversity and group decision making: Identifying multiple effects of racial composition on jury deliberations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*, 597–612. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.4.597

Stewart, A., & Sweetman, J. (2018). Scholarship and activism diverge: Responding to MLK's call with theory and research on diversity, political action, and resistance to oppression. *Journal of Social Issues*, *74*, 204–213. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12264

Sue, S. (1999). Science, ethnicity, and bias: Where have we gone wrong? *American Psychologist*, *54*, 1070–1077. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.12.1070

Tebes, J., & Thai, N. (2018). Interdisciplinary team science and the public: Steps toward a participatory team science. *American Psychologist*, *73*, 549–562. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000281

Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968).

Waheed, W., Hughes-Morley, A., Woodham, A., Allen, G., & Bower, P. (2015). Overcoming barriers to recruiting ethnic minorities to mental health research: A typology of recruitment strategies. *BMC psychiatry*, *15*(1), 101. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-015-0484-z

Washburn, A. N., & Skitka, L. J. (2018). Strategies for promoting strong inferences in political psychology research. In B. T. Rutjens & M. J. Brandt (Eds.), *Belief systems and the perception of reality* (pp. 125–137). London, UK: Routledge.

Washington v. Davis, 426 U.S. 229 (1976).

Winston, A. S. (Ed.). (2004). *Defining difference: Race and racism in the history of psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

ANDREA L. MILLER is a visiting assistant professor of Psychology at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign. Her research examines the social-psychological foundations of prejudice, discrimination, and inequality, particularly as they interact with the law.

CHADLY STERN is an assistant professor of Psychology at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign. He studies belief systems and intergroup relations.

HELEN NEVILLE is a professor of Educational Psychology and African American Studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Her research focuses on two interrelated areas of racial ideology: Black racial identity and color-blind racial ideology.