

Title: APA Apology to Communities of Color: Implications for the Future of Psychological Science

Date & Time: THUR, DEC 09, 2021 12:00 PM - 01:00 PM EST

Speaker 1: I really appreciate you waiting with us backstage, but we can begin. Thank you so much for joining us today. Really appreciate it. You're joining us for an APA series that is called Essential Science Conversations. This is where panelists and audience members can engage in an open dialogue about emerging topics in psychological science. Today's conversation will focus on APA's recent apology to communities of color and what the implications are for the future of psychological science.

As most of you know, APA recently issued a formal apology to communities of color for its role in promoting, perpetuating, and failing to challenge racism, and thereby falling short on its mission to benefit society and improve lives. In today's conversation, our panelists will discuss ways in which psychological scientists can promote diversity and equity in the work that they do. Before I get started, I need to go over a few housekeeping details. Many thanks to those of you who submitted wonderful questions by the way for today's program when you first registered.

We're going to try to get to as many of those questions as possible, but you can also ask questions as the program is taking place in real-time. There's a panel labeled question in your webinar dashboard, just click on that panel and type your question into the box. We'll be monitoring those questions throughout the program. This program's being recorded much earlier than anticipated but once it ends, everyone who registered will receive an e-mail with a link to the recording. You should receive that e-mail a few hours after the webinar ends.

That e-mail will also contain a link to a certificate of participation in case you need that. Let me go on to the next slide. We also have an Essential Science Conversations webpage, where you can find recordings, slides, and written transcript for all our programs. Be sure to bookmark the link and check in often. We will also share that URL in the chatbox. Without further ado, we can begin. You guys already met Prinstein Prinstein, but let me give him a proper introduction. He's going to be leading today's conversation. Prinstein is APA's Chief Science Officer.

Welcome, Mitch. You can turn on your camera and we can introduce our panelists.

Dr. Prinstein: Hello everybody. Thank you so much for joining. So excited that you're here and so excited for this panel made up of so many of my favorite people. Thank you to all of them for participating and thank you to Peggy and Wes and everyone who's working hard to make this webinar up and functioning. I am very excited to introduce these panelists for today's discussion. First, we have Dr. Maysa Akbar, who is APA's Chief Diversity Officer. She is charged with infusing equity, diversity, and inclusion into the fabric of the Association's work.

Serving as a spokesperson and advocate for EDI in the field of psychology, both within and outside the association. Next, we have Dr. Mia Smith Bynum, Mia is APA's brand new Senior Director in Science, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. Also is a professor of Family Science and the Director of the Black Families Research Group in the School of Public Health at the University of Maryland-College Park. She is an expert in African-American mental health, adolescent mental health, parenting, and family communication about racial issues.

Also, we have Dr. Idia Thurston, who is a licensed clinical psychologist and an Associate Professor of Psychology and Public Health at Texas A&M University. Idia is a core member of the Diversity Science Research Cluster at Texas A&M. She also is serving as one of the members of APA's Presidential Task Force on Psychology and Health Equity. Thank you all for being here. Welcome to this webinar, and I'm excited for us to have an essential science conversation. How are you all doing?

Dr. Maysa Akbar: Good.

Dr. Idia Thurston: Awesome.

Dr. Prinstein: I'm so excited, for us to get started, we have been talking about this even before APA's apology, but of course the APA apology has been a landmark moment in the field of psychology. Perhaps a good place for us to start is to get a little bit of information about why this apology was necessary and why now. Can you give us a little bit of information Dr. Akbar on the apology and how we got to this point?

Dr. Akbar: Thank you, Dr. Prinstein. One of the most important parts for us to realize is that while the significance of the apology and the passing of an apology resolution happened this year, just a month ago in October, the association itself has been considering the development of an apology for years. Part of the process was to identify who are we apologizing to? What are we apologizing for? Are we prepared to take action based on the apology that we've issued. One of the most important pieces that we learned from Division 45 was a report that was issued called the Warrior's Path.

In that document, it clearly identified the three most essential steps to issuing an authentic apology at the organizational level. Those steps are that it's not just important to issue an apology and to say that you are apologizing, but to detail what you are apologizing for. To go through the process of having [inaudible 00:06:19] responsibility over that apology and to clearly detail what are the actionable steps. This is the most important part, the actionable steps that will be put forward in order for harms that were historically perpetuated against marginalized communities will not continue to happen.

I think it has been a momentum to get to this place. I think society at this point is at a tipping point, and so is our association. That many people are ready not just to engage in the process of examining our historical role in psychology and harming communities of color, but also to establish what are going to be the ways in which we

will move forward to develop equity, diversity, and inclusion throughout the association and throughout the field.

Dr. Prinstein: Thank you so much. One of the things that I personally am so excited about with the apology is that it includes a resolution with action, action, action. Things that we could be doing to not just apologize and provide the words, but to really change the way in which we as a discipline are able to change the fields. In essence, change the world with our science and with our work as psychologists. I imagine that there might be some folks who are doing terrific science and are really, really supportive of equity, diversity, and inclusion, and justice issues.

Then they are very, very much thinking about ways that they can contribute to hiring more faculty from diverse backgrounds, really increasing pathways for students from underrepresented or minoritized groups into the field, but that's not all that scientists can do. There are ways that scientists every day could be making a contribution in the way that they're doing their research or reporting their research. Dr. Thurston, can you say a little bit about some of the things that a scientist can do today right now to really change the white default that we have been perpetuating within science?

Dr. Thurston: Thanks, Dr. Prinstein. That's such an important question, because I think each of us can do something. The idea that equity work is relegated to certain individuals in our community is I think an old way of thinking. That each one of us in our science can make one change one, two, three, four, five specific changes that pushes the needle. One of the first things is the language that we use. Really thinking about changing our language from putting the onus on individuals, not recognizing the role of systems in perpetuating the experiences people are having.

Switching to system-centered language where we describe people's experiences based on the context in which they live and the systems within which they function. To show that this is not an individual change I can just do this one thing, but that really redlining and other similar structural things have maintained people living in the neighborhoods that they live. Having the limited access to the resources that they need, having the experiences that they have when they interact with individuals.

In our writing, if we change the way we describe people's experiences, it centers the systemic issues and not put those issues on the individual. I think the other thing is to realize that racial groups are not a monolith. Within each identities, there's so much variability. While we're progressing towards labeling the groups that we study because years ago you could just report articles without even saying the racial, ethnic demographics of the sample. That's a good step to move towards reporting these numbers, but an even deeper step is to report the variability within these numbers.

For example, when you say Asian, we know Asian is a large population of diverse groups of people to really specify who have a range of experiences. The downside is within those groups, certain groups are experiencing marginalization and because we lump everyone to this category called Asian, we miss the groups who are not doing well and we have blanket strategies. Even adding a table that provides more

specificity or depth into the groups of people that was studying would go a really long way.

Then I think one third point is really rewarding community-engaged work. We tend to center the idea that doing work in certain settings is privilege over others. Not really accounting for the work and the time and energy that goes into engaging with communities and really reinforcing that. That allows the community to have a voice in the research we're doing, in the issues that we're centering. Really reinforcing that, having special issues that look for papers that engage communities in the work and in each part of the process.

From starting off the study thinking of the idea all the way to disseminating. Not just leaving our articles in our journals that circulates within academics, but really pushing to get that information into the community so that communities can actually use that information. Those are just a few of the things I would say that we can do as researchers, as individuals to move the needle.

Dr. Prinstein: Thank you so much. It's so incredibly helpful. I want to dig into this a little bit further because I believe in my heart that the vast majority of scientists really, really want to do the best they can in this space and want to learn. I had some publications with scholars who are coming from minoritized backgrounds, sometimes on topics that were relating to populations of underrepresented communities. I noticed for the first time that in the reviews that I got, there were comments that seemed to undermine the value of the research or question the importance of discussing the history that was the foundation of the research.

I realized that it was incredibly hurtful to my students. It was in itself a microaggression. Dr. Mia Smith-Bynum, can you talk a little bit about for other white researchers like me, who might be listening the extent to which this is a unique experience. Or there might be many investigators who white people might not realize are experiencing this more frequently than might be understood.

Dr. Smith-Bynum: That's a really excellent point and Dr. Thurston's points were also just fantastic in terms of setting this up. What you're referring to Dr. Prinstein is the deficit model so that a research design is not worthy if there is not a white subpopulation to which people of color are compared. What gets missed in focusing on race and ethnicity is the heterogeneity within both of those subgroups. We know that race and ethnicity are strongly correlated with socioeconomic status, for example.

When we engage in these comparisons, we miss the impacts of the racial wealth gap when we are comparing people on different outcome metrics. Your experience is very common that when a white American faculty begin to supervise or collaborate with students and scholars of color on topics such as racism, discrimination, or just merely focusing on the psychological experiences of people of color, then they run into those very real gatekeeping dynamics in the peer-review process.

This is a really important conversation around raising awareness about that because often people of color who are in our field will complain about it. If you're not studying

people of color, you won't experience it. You're like, "Well, what are they talking about?" This is a very important acknowledgment. What I've done in preparation for today's webinar is I've pulled together just a selected list of my favorite hits when it comes to references on this. Some older references. One of the questions that we got in preparation for this webinar is, why is the APA apologizing?

I've got some citations here dating back as far as the '90s, but this has been going on for longer period of time in which the emphasis on whiteness and white American and particularly white middle-class Americans college students that is the corpus of our body of research. One of the things that we know is that in under 20 years that our country is no longer going to have a single racial, ethnic majority group. That it really is going to be a very heterogeneous population. We need white scientists who can train students of color effectively because they're just not enough scientists of color in our field to train us.

I would encourage all of our listeners and viewers to go and read some of these older pieces because they are foundational. I still cite them when I'm engaged in my own publishing, as well as some of the newer papers that I've included. So you have a sense of the arc where we've come in the last 20 to 30 years since I've been in the profession. Then also your understanding, you can meet your students where you are. I guess I'll touch a little bit on the issue of white privilege. White American scientists are going to be in spaces that I and Dr. Akbar and Dr. Thurston are not.

When you see these kinds of issues, one of the ways that you can be an ally and help move our science forward, is to speak up and continue to share these particular issues, mentor our junior scholars on how to push against these biases, because that's a set of strategies on how you challenge that. Then thinking very carefully that if you're in a position to select folks who are associate editors and so on and so forth. That you really vet them to make sure that they understand what excellent science looks like when it comes to race and ethnicity and understanding people of color.

Dr. Prinstein: Thank you so much for saying that. For those who are watching this as a recorded webinar, do know that on the Essential Science Conversation page, we will put all of the references that Dr. Smith-Bynum is talking about up on that page so you can access it. What you're saying is reminding me that there are lots of articles out there that in the title will say the study of these constructs within a Black sample or within a predominantly African American sample but I don't see that where it says within a predominantly white sample.

What's up with that? What message is that sending to our scholars coming from communities of color about their role and their know support for their research in the field? Are those kinds of title decisions being made by the authors? Dr. Thurston, can you speak to that?

Dr. Thurston: Yes. A recent JAMA article that showed what the editorial staff looked like of medical journals, it's not that varied in psychology either. The editorial staff matters a lot, and we have woeful underrepresentation of diverse faculty and editorial board members. Most journals don't have community advisory boards for their journals. When people are publishing information about communities in ways

that only showcase the negative side of those communities, and don't provide a balanced example of those communities.

Of how people are thriving in those communities that it's only the negative aspects, we're mirroring what's done in the media. That there aren't people to check those. Journals, I think, need to be very intentional as Dr. Smith-Bynum talked about with who is on the editorial board? Who are the reviewers, and really finding a way to provide feedback to reviewers because part of, one of the struggles is that when reviewers provide information about articles that are submitted, there's no check and balance.

They might in their review engage in microaggression towards the writer, and it just feeds right back to that author. When we're talking about retaining folks in our field, if you get that kind of feedback that devalues the science that you put in, sometimes maybe someone's dissertation. They spend a long time working on that and we're devaluing that contribution, it drives people away from our field. It tells people that you're not welcome here and these ideas are not welcome. I think really thinking about a check and balance system so that journals have someone to answer to which may be many times is themselves.

They make that really transparent as to what strategies they're doing to diversify the editorial board to provide feedback to reviewers so that people don't put this kind of language out there and there's no check and balance for it. Then, to be in some ways reinforced for having diverse editorial boards. Some divisions like Division 45 like Dr. Akbar mentioned are doing incredible work in this area. Other divisions are not, even thinking within APA and there's no public acknowledgment. There's no reinforcements but the journals are doing a really good job.

Really changing that so that the expectation is one of improvements and knowing that each journal will start from where they are but that there are some 10%, 20%, some way to show that you're working on this strategy and you're improving year to year. That there's accountability.

Dr. Prinstein: Thank you. Dr. Akbar, we are working so hard to increase representation among scientists and to really change the way we're thinking about admissions. To have more scholars from communities of color come into our fields but then, it sounds like these scholars are entering a climate where there might be microaggressions within their reviews. Messages that are being sent within the scientific community. Also, other ways in which within their programs, there might be hardships and stressors and ways that really are undoing all of the good work that we're trying to do and scaring people away from our field.

What are some more of those ways that people need to be thinking about the climate in which we are raising scientists from communities of color and are there things we could be doing at APA about those? You're on mute Maysa.

Dr. Akbar: Thank you. Sorry about that. I think it's such an essential question for this essential science conversation. What we do know in terms of the demographics of psychologists overall is that 86% of psychologists identify as White. That leaves a

very low percentage for all other persons of color who are looking at becoming a psychologist. The trajectory in terms of the process of completing your degree, first of all, entering into a psychology program, successfully finishing a psychology program.

We know that the largest percentage of students that do not successfully finish or are ABD are graduate students of color. Then after that process, assuring that they secure the right internship. That they have the right funding mechanisms for all of the levels of licensure and credentials that are necessary in order to enter into the field successfully. All of those are existing barriers into the pathways to psychology. Honestly, one of the very first steps, Dr. Prinstein is the acknowledgment that there is a different set of standards for scholars of color when they're coming into the field.

That they are contending with a host of different barriers even within the field. We have to be extremely aware that if we are all actively, whether you are a psychology department. Whether you are a medical center, whether you are an established internship or post-doctoral program. That if part of the strategic plan related to your EDI work is pathway programs for scholars and practitioners of color, that it is not just about developing the pathway programs, but understanding that the barriers are derailers to successful completion in your ecosystem.

We must consider all of those components first as opposed to just looking at the peak of the mountain which is simply we need to get more scholars into psychology. I think the other piece of this is owning and we try to model this by example at APA. Owning the process of what it means to be in an establishment that perhaps also engaged in historical harms against historically minoritized populations. We don't realize the impact that that has in terms of repair, healing, and reconciliation, how can I be successful in a space that feels oppressive to me?

A lot of students of color are contending with those issues. The default is that in spite, sometimes of success and I know that Dr. Smith Bynum and Dr. Thurston can relate to this. In spite sometimes of achieving the related outcomes are that you have scholars and practitioners of color that struggle with imposter syndrome. You have many that are struggling in terms of belongingness and psychological safety. You have many that are wondering whether they are the only person of color that then is responsible for every student and every agenda around people of color.

We have to have a shared and collective responsibility around this. It's not just the goal of establishing pathways. It's not just the aspiration of building a psychology that is more diverse. It is also what are we going to do to change systemically and institutionally the way that we hold and nurture psychologists of color to be successful. I hope that that encapsulate a very large picture of this process but it also stimulates thinking when we're talking about pathway programs.

Dr. Prinstein: Amen Dr. Akbar. I want to continue the conversation with Dr. Smith Bynum and then Dr. Thurston. If you're comfortable, can you talk more about what does that climate feels like and what are the ways in which we can be more sensitive to the climate as every researcher can be thinking about that? I say if you're

comfortable because I recognize that it might be triggering to talk about, so please don't go any further than you feel comfortable.

Dr. Smith-Bynum: Oh, I'm happy to testify as we say in the Black church. The reason why I'm on this path of why I came to the APA is that I want to do what I can at this stage in my career, I finished in '99, to make it better for the young scholars who are coming behind me. It's hard to quickly summarize what that is like but I would point out a concept of wearing the mask. A lot of time, what students of color and people from other minoritized populations will do is that in order to fit into these mainstream settings is that we'll wear a mask.

We'll be smiling as we move through the hallways. We will be professional. We'll come to class prepared and that takes psychological energy. I'll tell the story of two white male mentors that I've had in my career that have been instrumental. They've given me wonderful support in career advice. What they did was they were one excellent scholars but they were empathic and compassionate. I'm the kind of person I plant a little seed about as a Black woman and then both of them would pick it up and they wouldn't treat me a bug under a microscope.

They'd say, "Tell me more." Without judgment, without presupposition which gave me permission to tell my story of what it's actually like. In doing that, I'm taking off the mask. It doesn't require that you know all the theories about, in my case, the Black American experience, but that you show up as a human being who happens to also be a professional and a researcher, and a scholar. By allowing me to share my story and then what happened over time is to teach about that, we actually share power in that relationship that rarely happens in graduate programs where the students are always subordinate.

Which makes it hard to speak up and talk about what it's like. It's very isolating, it can be very dehumanizing and when you're trying to get your work out there. What scholars of color do and I say all minoritized scholars in that area because we're often attracted to psychology. We want to study human behavior,¹ is we do what they say in hip hop music. We flip scripts. We're coming to the same phenomenon and we're bringing that intersectional perspective. We're saying, huh, what about if we zoomed in on this part.

Or there's a construct in this whole framework that is not accounted for that I think from my technical expertise and my lived experience that is not accounted for. Then you put four of those ideas in a class, you put it in a thesis or you're citing journals that from an establishment standpoint are not "well respected" because of impact scores, and things that citation impacts. These are mainstream metrics. Then someone says, "Well, I've never heard of that journal. Why are you citing it?"

Meanwhile, you're the burgeoning expert in the topic but this faculty instructor is not. In the way of institutionalized racism, they have not heard of said journal because they are not an expert, but they presume as expertise because they've been in the field longer. When students present these new ideas, you pause and you get curious. Say like a scientist, "I haven't heard that, tell me more." When you're secure yourself, you don't mind not knowing something.

Always know that even as people are wearing the mask, that they are often because I don't want to speak for everyone, struggling or suffering with the isolation in some manner. I've heard this story from my most accomplished students that I've trained, as well as my ones who are what I like to call my diamonds in the rough. They're often first-generation, but they got that spark, that curiosity that we as scientists love to groom. They're going to take a little bit more time and effort and TLC, but the payoff is hard to put into words.

Dr. Prinstein: Thank you. Dr. Thurston, anything you'd like to add?

Dr. Thurston: So much, I feel I'm in church too. I'm like amen to everything. [laughs] I think that I had a couple of things which is, first the value of being seen and just how often students of the global majority have not seen in these spaces. I think I, in some ways, want to speak to those students. I think that many times as faculty, even as hard as it is for us, we still have tools and things to access to help us function and I think as students both developmentally as an adolescent psychologist.

There's not a lot of awareness about what you have available to you. One of the biggest things and I'm still very early in my career, that helped me was realizing that psychology is not at all. Trying to figure out my village, my squad, outside of psychology because I found people in sociology who were talking about the same things I was thinking about but just using different language. I found people again, in other departments who were doing that same work or who looked like me, who I could get a drink with, after work to share about my experience.

That really mattered. That's what helped me stay because most of the settings, I was often the only. I walk into the room, and I'm the only. I look in the room and it's just me and I think what that allowed me to think of my village being outside of psychology. One, it made me have different kinds of ideas. It made me a better scientist because I thought about issues in different ways, but also helped me understand that I wasn't truly alone. I think that's one of the sad things about these systems is that as it isolates you, you start to internalize that and really think you're alone and really think these ideas are just to you.

That's not true. Having other people shared community who can see you who can be part of your village or squad, who maybe don't understand psychology but they get the concepts that you're talking about is really big. The other thing that I think to the mentors who are on the call is that you can create an oasis within your labs and that's hugely powerful. Even if you're in a system that is incredibly not reinforcing of or not seeing students of color, students of the global majority, you can create a space that allows that to flourish.

My lab is the change lab, I adore my students so much. I'll have conversations with other people about things we do in our lab where we celebrate each other's birthdays, we spend time to see each other. We do a lot of engaging in things, and most people will say, oh, that's not really research. How is that relevant? Well, it's relevant because you can't really flourish if you're not seen. Maybe you're not seeing in your classroom, maybe when you raise your hand and you're not called on. Maybe

when you're doing your research, people are doubting it but in this space, in that lab, in that center, we see you.

We recognize you, we know that you're more than just a researcher contributing that you're a whole person. You're someone who has parents, you're someone whose family may have COVID. You're someone whose parents may have died, all of those things matter because that allows you to bring your full self. Even if in this institution, you can't bring your full self, maybe you can do it in this lab. We have a Diversity Science Research Cluster at Texas and maybe you can come to the cluster and be seen.

Really thinking about pockets within these systems that allow you to really be yourself. You can take off that mask periodically, to just have some relief. I would say those are two big things that I think we can each do even when you're in the systems that feel really unmovable and it feels really discouraging. That you can make little things and it doesn't matter if you're a faculty of color or you're. As a white faculty, you can do that too. You can allow your students to help you create that space that reinforces their full identities.

Dr. Akbar: Prinstein, [crosstalk] really quickly. Thank you so much for positioning that, that when we're talking about climate and culture, we are all responsible for how we want to transform the spaces that we occupy. In that process, whether you are just focused on how your lab will create climate and culture, how your class will create climate and culture, how your department. There are many numerous opportunities to have an inclusive space and there are layers of systems within systems.

I want the audience to think about this if we can go 30,000 feet up in terms of how do we change an entire culture in a university or we can go as focal as how do you change the culture and climate in your classroom? Believe it or not, those interactions for students of color could be the determining factor of whether they continue in this process and become the three people that you see in the screen today. I am sure that we can all give since we're talking about [laughs] church testimony around an incredible professor or supervisor or researcher who placed us in sight and changed the trajectory of our career because of a conversation that they had.

Because they allowed us to feel we belonged. I've shared this with you, Prinstein in the past that my graduate school program was really difficult for me. I actually had a graduate school professor that said to me that I did not have the pedigree to be a psychologist and that that moment for me could have been a complete derail. I would not be sitting here today, as the CTO of the American Psychological Association had I believed what was told to me as a budding psychologist in my graduate program. We need everyone to create the culture that we want to see and the time is now to do that. There is no longer an opportunity to wait for it.

Dr. Prinstein: Thank you for sharing that. Dr. Akbar. I think there's more that I have learned from you and from others too. Let's stop putting pictures up in our classes of people who look like me. Let's start putting up pictures of people who look y'all when

we talk about people's research in our classrooms. Also, let's use inclusive language when we're talking in our classrooms, on our exams. Dr. Akbar, can you talk about the efforts that the EDI office at APA haven't been engaging in and the recent guide towards inclusive language that we just posted in the chat for everybody here.

I encourage people to look up on the APA website if they're watching this recording.

Dr. Akbar: I really want to encourage that the workaround equity, diversity, and inclusion is not additive, but it is instrumental. It should guide on all of the training that we do, all of the research that we do, all of the ways in which we share a psychological science with the world. The EDI office has been extremely busy trying to create frameworks for training programs to consider and for other programs in which psychologists sit and other scholars sit to make sure that they are able to utilize that and then individualize it to their ecosystem.

The first product that came out in May or April of this year was the EDI framework. How do you even begin to think about the implementation of EDI into your space? That allows you to think about the different components of psychology and to consider what are the most relevant areas that will support into your previous question before, the right climate and culture of inclusivity? Then, the most recent tool that I am so extremely proud of is Inclusive Language Guidelines.

Throughout the last year, we had been receiving tons of feedback around, I'm not sure what are the right words to use within what context, depending on the audience that I'm speaking to. Sometimes it was around written communication, sometimes it was around scholarly work, sometimes it was around presentation modalities. At that point, we made an assert decision within the office that we needed to spend quite a bit of time developing a guideline that would support decision-making around the type of inclusive language that's scholars and researchers wanted to use.

The guideline that you'll see as Dr. Prinstein mentioned in the chat, is it's an iterative document. It is meant to be a guideline, so we want to make sure that it guides your thoughts and the way that you're going to move forward. It certainly provides you with ways in which historically words have been used to harm those that identify from communities that have been historically marginalized and new ways in which you can use language that would improve that communication and remove the element of harm. Sometimes the harm that happens in language is unintentional.

I want to make sure that I bring that up but that unintentionally does have an impact. We have to educate ourselves in the way that we're going to use communication so that we not just demonstrate our intent, but that we actually are being clear about the way that we want to be inclusive in our communication with others.

Prinstein: Dr. Akbar, thank you so much for that. I believe that that guideline of inclusive language would be useful to every department, to every university, to every workplace. To any setting that APA has created something that people can use to begin conversations and to establish a baseline for how it is that any community, any group of scholars can be talking. Thank you so much for all the amazing work on

that. The other ways of really thinking about inclusion, I was shocked to learn and excuse my naivete on this.

I'd love to learn more about the idea that when there are page limits on publications, scientists will first cut citations to references from scholars who are from communities of color before cutting the references authored by white scholars. Which to me just creates the systemic issues of lowering the h-index of our colleagues from communities of color. Of changing the way that we're talking about science from communities of color. Dr. Thurston, can you say more about that and any reflections that you have on that? Please correct me if I'm misunderstanding.

Dr. Thurston: No, you're right and I was trying to get into the chat which I can add in a little bit our paper, *Upending Racism in Psychological Science* that is forthcoming American psychologists that gives 25 specific steps to address these issues. This is one of the issues we talk about in that paper. When you have these limits, part of the issue is you're cutting things that may be peripheral. If you're studying a topic that maybe is not directly on race-related issues, and you have 15 references and you need to cut it down to 30, you then by process of elimination cut out often the things that maybe you at one point had and thought was important.

When you have to make decisions and those are the ones that get cut first. The impact of that then trickles down into the citation of folks who are studying this work which trickles down to tenure decisions, promotion decisions, pay increases. All of that is tied to this one type of metric of how many times is your article cited. The more you're cited, the more you're cited. It's like the curse of riches or what? [chuckles] The more you get, the more you get and the less you have, the less you have. The way our structure of writing papers exist, reinforces this system.

Some of the things to think about is why do we keep using h-index as a marker of people's success. That there are multiple other ways we are incredible scientists. I'm sure we can figure out other ways to consider impact, which is what we really care about. To make the argument that if more academics are citing a certain paper versus more communities are changed by certain work by certain thinking is one that centers a certain type of science. We really as a field thinking more deeply about how we recognize again community impact that when a community is changed fundamentally.

Or people are feeling better or feeling more seen or respected or valued or accessing services better because they were reached out to by a community health worker and that really made the difference. Finding spaces in our publication enterprise to value those things. To value scholarship and contributions from community members. Oftentimes you have to have these PhD letters. You have to write your science in a certain way that excludes a whole group of people who are doing incredible work but are not trained in that model to write in that way.

As psychologists who are open to diverse of experiences and diverse people, we have to change the way we think about contributions to science. That we think about contribution to science with a wider lens. That we recognize and don't penalize people for doing community talks and count that as being published already, as

being a part of science has already been published. These articles are penalized because they've already publicized some of their science when it was really done as a way to educate the community, to give back to the community.

It really requires a rethinking of the way we've thought about science and dissemination of science. It really requires us to be innovative in how we consider impact. I think Dr. Akbar's points about thinking really about the impact of content and not so much about how much work are we putting out there is a really important one. Have clearly lots of thoughts about this and just as someone who's early in their career, thinking about not replicating the things that have been done before.

Really for us to put on our hats to think about what are different ways that we can value scientific contributions from a range of individuals and not just the ones who fits a certain mold.

Dr. Prinstein: Thank you so much. We have time for just a couple of quick more questions, if we could just squeeze them in. Dr. Smith-Bynum, among our registrants, a lot of folks want to know what can students do today to really help this process. They can't get faculty hired as much as their voice is important and has really moved many psychology departments. There are ways that students want to feel efficacious today, how can they use their power to change things?

Dr. Smith-Bynum: I think I'm unmuted. There's a few different ways to do it. Usually, in most departments, there is a student organization or there's a representative from the graduate student body to the graduate committee in the department. Whatever those formal departmental mechanisms are, I would make sure that I am leveraging those channels and making clear what our expectation are in terms of what the curriculum looks like. If it's too homogenous. If it is not up to date and current in addressing the issues in our field in a 2021 sense, that using those formal mechanisms.

One of the things that I think students don't always realize, students are the lifeblood of any institution of higher ed. They pay tuition, they teach courses so on and so forth. When they're not happy, departments have to listen, or at least ones that are forward-thinking and understanding what the stakes are due. Putting your concerns in writing. That's part of the reason I put some of these things in the chat is so that you can go out right away and make a case for what you think the concerns are.

Then the other piece I would use is to pull the census data. Census data, there's some wonderful graphs that I've used in my lectures that show what the demographics of the country are going to be and you just map that onto the curriculum. Research scientists, it's evidence-based. This is not my opinion or my agenda. This is about the relevance of our field for the next 50 to 100 years. When you look at the weekly content in that syllabus, and you look at what readings actually focus on issues of race and ethnicity, and you map that on to the demographic changes, the proof is in the pudding right there.

One of the things that I'm working on as we speak, is a tool that was underway before I got to APA called the micro trainings. These micro trainings are going to be

a little short, five to seven-minute selective deep dives on these topics that we're talking about today. If you did not get some of that formal training in your course, you're in an environment where frankly, the leadership of the faculty is hostile to what you're trying to do that. In my new role, I will be helping to personally develop some of those micro trainings.

Right now I have one that I'm having a good time developing called best practices on race and ethnicity in psychological sciences. It's going to be one five minutes tool. I think I'm now going to have to do it in three parts. I'm probably going to be reaching out to Dr. Thurston to be my peer reviewer on that. We've got another one on defining race and ethnicity, and there's some others. We've got a list of maybe 25 topics, as I learned APA infrastructure that we'll be putting those out in some practical ways.

They're going to come with reference lists. Those are going to start to appear likely within January after the first of the year. This is part of our work to be responsive to the resolutions and transferring the apologies and what we know that we have to fix with our field into actionable items. I would say to our audience members, with the team that we have, look for some changes underfoot. It's going to be a slow trickle, but then it'll hopefully grow into a nice stream of things that young professionals can use.

Then hopefully, those can also be used in lectures, and then instructors will pick those up as well and we can start to break into some of these systems that have played this for so long.

Dr. Prinstein: Thank you so much. We do have one final question that I would like to answer with a very exciting announcement if that's okay. I will say that to get updates on all the things that you're hearing about, be sure you're subscribing to the *APA Science Spotlight*. That link will be coming through in the chat right now as well. We are reporting all of these micro trainings, and the inclusive language document, and all of these things that we're doing, you can hear it first from *APA Science Spotlight*, just a little one e-mail every two weeks.

You don't want to miss what's happening in there. The link to sign up for those will be coming soon in the chat. The last question was APA has taken a bold and necessary stance but what about other psychological societies? What can we do to encourage other psychological societies to take a similar stance? I am so excited to announce that APA is taking the lead on creating journal reporting guidelines to take into account these issues related to equity, diversity, and inclusion. APA formally invites every Psychological Society to send a liaison and join us to be a part of this initiative, because we want to do it together for the entire field.

I am thrilled that so many psychological societies have now committed to sending a liaison to this writing group. I'm not going to get them all, forgive me but they include SRCD, and ABCT, and the Society for Neuroscience and SPSP and-- Mia, what am I forgetting? There's so many--

Dr. Smith-Bynum: Society for Neuroscience, Society for Research in adolescence. Those are the ones that I know off the top of my head.

Dr. Prinstein: There are several more that I know we're forgetting.

Dr. Smith-Bynum: They keep coming every day.

Dr. Prinstein: They keep coming. If you are listening and you want your psychological society to be represented too, you're more than welcome. Also, CAAPS the Coalition for the Advancement and Application of Psychological Science. Lots and lots of groups. We are welcoming anyone and everyone to be part of this very important discussion about journal reporting guidelines. I want to thank three of my favorite people and awesome, awesome, colleagues, Dr. Akhbar, Dr. Smith-Bynum, and Dr. Thurston, for joining us on this panel.

I want to thank so many people who joined us today. Please forward along this link so other people can watch and learn about how we could all be doing something today to reduce eliminate systemic oppression and systemic racism in our own work as scientists every single day. Thank you so much to Peggy Christidis and Wes Baker, for all the work they do to make these seminars, webinars go so smoothly. Thank you all for participating in this essential science conversation. These conversations work when you continue the conversation.

Go on Twitter, talk with people down the hall, or over your zooms today. Keep the conversation going. Thank you all so much.

[00:55:53] [END OF AUDIO]