



AMERICAN  
PSYCHOLOGICAL  
ASSOCIATION

## ESSENTIAL SCIENCE CONVERSATIONS

### DISMANTLING RACISM IN THE FIELD OF PSYCHOLOGY AND BEYOND: CONVERSATION WITH THE EDITORS OF THE SPECIAL ISSUE OF THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGIST (OCTOBER 29, 2024)

---

#### TRANSCRIPT

**Shandol Hoover:** Hello, everyone, and welcome. Thank you for joining us today. I am Shandol Hoover, Senior Director of APA Science Special Projects and Implementation. This program is part of an APA series called Essential Science Conversations. Where panelists and audience members can engage in an open dialogue about emerging topics in psychological science. Before we get started with today's session, I want to share a few quick announcements.

First, we hope you'll visit [apa.org/science](https://apa.org/science) to learn how APA is elevating psychological science, and that you'll subscribe to *Science Spotlight*, a free newsletter delivered to your inbox every two weeks that has the latest news, funding opportunities, upcoming events, and more. We also hope you'll subscribe to *Editor's Choice*, a free weekly newsletter that delivers articles to your inbox for free. Second, thanks to those of you who submitted questions for today's program when you registered. You can also ask a question as the program is taking place in real time. There's a Q&A feature on the dashboard. Please enter your questions there. We'll be monitoring those questions throughout the program.

Finally, this program is being recorded. Everyone who registers will receive an email with the link to the recording, a transcript, and related resources in about two to three weeks. I'll now turn things over to Dr. Mitch Prinstein, Chief of Science.

**Dr. Mitch Prinstein:** Hi, everybody. So glad to be here, and so glad that you are here. I am excited to kick off this panel by telling everybody a little bit about some of the work that APA has been doing in this space. In 2021, the American Psychological Association passed resolutions initiating a process of atonement for its participation in promoting, perpetuating, and failing to challenge racism and discrimination towards communities of color. The May/June 2024 special issue of the *American Psychologist* examines the ways psychology perpetuated racism and offers strategies and mechanisms to aid in dismantling racism.

Today, we are excited to host a conversation with the guest editors for a discussion about the research and methods highlighted in this special issue. I am very pleased to introduce our intimidatingly awesome all-star panel for today's discussion. First, I'd like to welcome Dr. Germinie Awad, who's the University Diversity and Social Transformation Professor of Psychology at the University of Michigan. Next is Dr. Kevin Cokley, the Associate Chair of Diversity Initiatives and Space Management, University Diversity and Social Transformation Professor of Psychology, also at the University of Michigan.

I'd like to introduce Dr. Lillian Comas-Díaz, a Clinical Professor at George Washington University in the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences. Dr. Gordon Nagayama Hall is a Professor Emerit at University of Oregon. Dr. Joseph Gone is a Professor of Anthropology and of Global Health and Social Medicine at Harvard University, and the Faculty Director of the Harvard

University Native American Program. Dr. Maysa Akbar is APA's Chief Diversity Officer and Chief of Psychology in the Public Interest.

Welcome, to all of you. Thanks so much for joining. What a great panel. Maysa, why don't we start with you. Can you tell us a little bit about the process that led to the apology and some of the plans that came out of the apology to make sure that we actually did things to address the harm that was caused?

**Dr. Maysa Akbar:** Sure. Thank you, Mitch. It's such a pleasure and an honor, as you mentioned, to be here with the guest editors for this edition. As you mentioned, and just for awareness of the audience, the APA issued a formal apology to people of color in October of 2021. Then in June of 2022, issued a specific apology to the native and Indigenous community at the Society of Indian Psychology Convention. Where a report was submitted as an apology to Council. Now, both of these were done vis-à-vis our policymaking body at APA through the council representatives.

While it's important for the body, the membership, to be actively engaged in the process of an apology, particularly a historic apology like this. We're 130 year-plus organization. Many harms have happened, depending on what the societal issues were at the time. We certainly had a lot to understand, in terms of our role in human hierarchy, in eugenics, in terms of our participation around the Indian boarding schools and et cetera. We had to dig back and create a chronology for that. For us to really understand what we were apologizing for.

Through the support of Division 45 and some of the work that was being done there, a Warrior's Path document was completed. Which challenged APA that if we were actually going to engage in a true and authentic apology, there were three important elements that needed to be at play. We needed to apologize for what we did and do that authentically. We needed to make sure that our apology was issued publicly, and to the people for which it harmed, and identified what those harms are explicitly. Then we needed to make sure that we engaged in a process of repair and reconciliation with the things that we apologized for, we wouldn't continue to perpetuate in the future.

That's not always easy to engage in that level of apology. The editors that are here were also the leaders in driving how the mechanism of this apology was going to go through at APA. They not only have firsthand knowledge of the authoring of the special issue, but they also authored the way that the apology was going to be completed for APA. What led us to this point is that we can't add an apology without replacing it with something that is going to track what the path forward is going to be.

There was a lot of work done in terms of, how do we then, if we're dismantling systemic racism, and one of the things that we have done in order to tackle that is an apology, then how do we then formally engage in creating and advancing racial equity in our field? A mechanism that was really important in terms of doing that is memorializing that process. Doing that both from an academic standpoint, so that there's scholarship that the researchers and our academic institutions and psychologists can lean on, and doing it in a multimodal way, because we know that there are different mechanisms for knowing and learning.

This was one that was particularly important. As you mentioned, in July of this year, the special edition came out. I hope that that gives a very 30,000-foot glimpse on the process that got us here. I'm very proud of the work that the guest editor did, and all the contributing psychologists and scholars that submitted for this. It was a very competitive process. I'm sure the editors will talk a

little bit about that. We are here now memorializing this and talking about history in the making. Not 20, 30, 40 years from now, but today, we were able to do that in a very remarkable way.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Thank you so much. I have a question for all of our guest editors. There's so much that needs to be done, and obviously, we can't solve this problem as quickly as we might like. What were your goals for this special issue? What were you wanting to make sure was communicated in this first but important critical step in really getting this information out to our community of psychologists? Does anyone have a thought about your primary goals for the special issue?

**Dr. Joseph Gone:** Well, let me respond first, and then I'm sure others will have things to add. Thanks for the question, Mitch. Thanks to all of you for joining. It's really great to be part of this group again, because we worked together for quite a while. It's been fantastic. The apology resolutions were an important milestone for the American Psychological Association to come to terms with this legacy of racism, discrimination, and hate. It's one of the great honors of my career to have served alongside Gigi and these other task force members to take up the call to figure out how we might make amends for those issues.

One of the dangers of this kind of apology is that nothing really results from it. APA is a longstanding, very complex, lots of people involved. Those are especially trying circumstances to get things to happen. Psychology is many things, but of course, one thing it is, is a science. One of the things that we need to take stock of is how racism has colored what counts as scientific knowledge throughout our history to recognize, as the apology resolutions did, that racism and bias and discrimination and hate did in fact percolate through psychological science in ways that disadvantaged folk of color, and to find ways, now going forward, to remedy that legacy.

Science is a key foundation for what we do as psychologists. Trying to find a way to allow for reflections on and recommendations for grappling with this legacy effectively is an important thing to do. What better venue than the *American Psychologist*, the major publication organ of the American Psychological Association with very high impact factor, which goes to all of our a hundred some thousand members, to try to solicit the very best ideas, understandings, insights, and recommendations for repudiating this long legacy of racism.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Thank you. Other comments about your goals, your hopes for the special issue before you even began.

**Dr. Germinie Awad:** I just want to know. This is such a huge issue in a monumental area, right? We knew that we weren't going to have a comprehensive special issue. That really everything that was submitted in terms of abstract and then accepted are just a sampling of the issues. The four themes that the special issue ended up covering really related to bias in scientific racism and research, intergroup collaboration, organizational and clinical implications, as well as changing the culture of psychology.

In some ways, we really wanted to have a general call put out there and have the psychological scientific community really submit ideas to try to make it as, A, as inclusive and wide-reaching as possible, but we didn't know exactly what we were missing as a group of editors. We wanted to have anything innovative to be submitted, and we wanted to really go into this with not so many preconceived notions about what there is to offer. I just want to make that comment, because it's going to, like you said, Mitch, this is a start. This is just really, a sampling of the scholarship and research out there on this topic. I want to say I didn't know exactly what we were expecting when we sent out the call.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Thank you. We live in a time when discussions about racism and the acknowledgment of harms that have been caused has been critiqued as being a politicized discussion. Let's talk about that directly. Can you discuss a politically agnostic reason why the discipline of psychology requires us to talk about and acknowledge the ways that racism and harms have impacted our field? Whether that be our science, our education, our practice, and why it's critical for this to be discussed in a way that is not intended to promote a political agenda, but to improve our field?

**Dr. Awad:** I just want to say I feel like this is like a got you question [laughs] in a way, just because I think that a way to delegitimize our science is to unilaterally refer to it as political. If we want to delegitimize an area of study, we say there's no scientific merit to it. It's a political issue. I feel like that's the rhetoric that's used to delegitimize these really very real issues that deal with the study of human behavior and the core of what psychology is.

We know that culture and race and ethnicity are a core part of psychological science. Whether or not you choose to acknowledge that just really speaks to the rigor of your own work as a scientist. Because it's part of human behavior, you need to address all aspects of human behavior. For folks who talk about this as being politicized, I just feel like it's a mechanism to try to delegitimize something that is, to me, really much a part of a core of what psychology and the study of human behavior is.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Perhaps for psychology, of all disciplines, it is critical that we are talking about this topic in a way that does not marginalize it to being a political discussion, but in a way that is essential to our understanding and our commitment to understand all humans behavior, and to treat all humans behavior in all ways that affects our society.

**Dr. Akbar:** Mitch, can I jump in just because I-

**Dr. Prinstein:** Please.

**Dr. Akbar:** -think I'm equally as passionate about this like Gigi and all of the editors here? I think also when people say there's not enough science in this area, that is actually not factual. While this special issue is incredibly special, hence why we called it a special issue, there are decades and decades of bodies of work and the complexity of race, racism, equity, diversity, inclusion before it was even called that that exists within psychology, within our science.

There has been a gradual evolution in the language, in the conceptualization of it, in better understanding the diversity even within groups, because I think very often when these conversations were happening, either there was an exclusion of entire groups of people, or groups were treated as a monolith. The complexity of this issue has always been there. The body of work has always been there. The research has always been there. I think, to Gigi's point, the process of, oh gosh, there's where my ESL is going to kick in, delegitimizing, there it is, this process is by calling it political, and then putting it to the side, and then ignoring it and not giving it the respect and the credibility that it deserves.

**Dr. Gone:** I'd like to briefly add, Mitch, that I think that we recognize that all knowledge production is political. Some is marked as political, some is framed as political. The irony of the dismissing of maybe some of this research as political in this study is that actually what it's doing is unmasking the politics that have dogged our discipline since its inception. What the apology resolution does, and what many of these articles speak to is the long legacy of eugenics,

commitments, and so on that parlayed through into very racist kinds of scholarship that is not actually scientific.

In fact, there's a great article in here by Kevin Bird and colleagues that are all about the racist pseudoscience that even persist to this day. Although, albeit not in APA journals by and large.

**Dr. Gordon Nagayama Hall:** I just want to add that-

**Dr. Lillian Comas-Díaz:** I would also-- I'm sorry.

**Dr. Hall:** Go ahead. Go ahead.

**Dr. Comas-Díaz:** I would also like to add that what this special issue is doing, among other things, is to engaging psychology in a more paradigmatic shift, because these are voices that have not been heard, or if they have been heard, they have been masked in a different way. This is a situation that benefits everyone, because psychology is situated in a very specific discipline, in a very specific area. This special issue is expanding and bringing into its fold the wisdom and the knowledge of the Global South, and the wisdom and the knowledge of the people of color that had been not only silenced, but also misrepresented in psychology. We're opening a big door here, and it's just benefiting all of us. Thank you.

**Dr. Hall:** I just want to add that racism doesn't occur in a political vacuum. This past weekend, I was in the desert of Southwest Arizona at the Poston Camp, where my mother was incarcerated in World War II, not because of criminal activity, but because she and her family and 120,000 Japanese Americans were Japanese Americans. It was a racist act. These Japanese Americans were removed from the West Coast because of competition with farmers and racism. These folks didn't-- It wasn't for political reasons that this happened. Well, there were political reasons that this happened to them, but it wasn't because my ancestors espoused a particular political perspective.

Racism is a political act. In this special issue, we're discussing the effects of racism, and how to dismantle it. Sure, there's political components to it. That's not just necessarily our focus, but as my colleagues have said, all science is political. As has been said, we're unmasking some politics and trying to address these issues in a way that we think is as objective as possible.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Thank you so much for addressing those issues head on. Kevin, I want to make space for you, if you're looking for opportunity to make some comments, too.

**Dr. Kevin Cokley:** My colleagues have really said it all very well. I think I would probably add that there's a politics of neutrality that goes unrecognized. Scholars and scientists and researchers who operate under the assumption that we should be these unbiased, objective, neutral arbitrators of science, that is a politics of neutrality that is no different than any other sort of politics that one may read into the work that has been published here.

That's something that people aren't comfortable acknowledging, or perhaps even refuse to acknowledge. As Dr. Gone said, our science is not free from politics. It's just a matter of what politics are being acknowledged and recognized and what is not.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Really interesting. Yes, thank you. Thank you all for addressing this. With that now clearly articulated, let's talk about some of the content in the special issue. I think there are a lot of folks who are very much trying to do their best, and opening their minds, and really understand

what errors either our fields or they have inadvertently or not caused. How our field has caused harm.

What are some of the things you can share? Either from experiences that are reflected in the special issue, or otherwise, that's really important for people to know and might miss if they don't read every word as much as they want to and intend to, of this special issue. [silence] Oh, and if Joe, can you start us off on that?

**Dr. Gone:** Thanks. It's really a fantastic range of papers that address all kinds of different elements. I was already mentioning one about racial hereditary in research, and the way in which racist pseudoscience still persists in psychological research laboratories, that, again, as I'm saying, are not typically published in APA journals, but there's a whole cottage industry that's still happening. It's very subtle and nuanced in terms of how this work is represented. This is a really great article that's really about biological and genetics research standards and practices that most psychologists don't know tons about.

Yet this research persists because we don't maybe know as much as we should, and the authors are great at recommending some ways in which tightening up some of the standards would prevent this stuff from even being published, because it's so problematic methodologically not just politically or what have you. Then there's stuff around some colleagues of mine, Jill Fish and Victoria O'Keefe and Jeffrey Ansloos, looked at what needs to happen to transform psychology to be more favorable to Indigenous peoples. Something I obviously care about as an Indigenous person myself.

It's a great article that focuses on the second apology that Maysa mentioned, which has to do with the apology to Indigenous peoples from APA, and that unpack some of that. From Isis Settles and colleagues, we've got a great analysis of the ways in which everyday interactions in departments of psychology for faculty members who are trying to get tenure and promotion are subject to biased sorts of evaluations and biased perceptions by colleagues, that mitigate against some of their knowledge production being fully recognized.

I think these are really great things to have illuminating. There's lots of other articles. Each of us has greater facility with some of them, because we edited different bodies of them. I think at least looking at the abstracts across every single one of them is illuminating in itself, much less focusing in on the ones that have particular attention.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Wonderful. I invite any other editor's shout-outs for articles or points within articles that you think are so important for people to understand and recognize, and perhaps create as essential reading for themselves, for their students, for their colleagues.

**Dr. Cokley:** I think certainly a case can be made for every article that was published. I think that, for the editors, we were assigned specific manuscripts that we are perhaps maybe a bit more familiar with than maybe some of the others. Certainly, one of the manuscripts that I would, again, I think they're all must-reads, but one that I would certainly particularly advocate for would be the manuscript by Rogers et al, *Research as Resistance: Naming and Dismantling the Master Narrative of "Good" Science*.

There is the idea-- I think there's an assumption that there's an agreed upon understanding of what constitutes good science that has a lot of epistemological assumptions that oftentimes go unchallenged. What Rogers et al do is they break down those epistemological assumptions in ways that I think are quite thought-provoking. In my estimation, this should be required reading.

I don't know if *History and Systems of Psychology* is still required, or Philosophy of Science is required at the doctoral level at many programs, but it's one of those articles that really causes or really requires individuals to rethink their prior understandings of what constitutes good science, good research, in ways that I think will help advance the field to better address some of the historic harms that have fallen upon, particularly minoritized scholars attempting to do work that has not oftentimes been reflective of the predominant types of work that has been published.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Many people don't know that scholars who publish particularly on a group that has been minoritized might be asked to indicate the population of their sample in the title. Whereas research that has been done on predominantly majority populations, there is no such request, or perhaps there's a requirement if you're studying predominantly a Native, or African-American, or a Latinx population, to include a White comparison sample. Whereas no such requirement is made in a research study that's done with predominantly European Americans.

These are the kinds of things that people might not recognize, blind spots that they might not have before had the opportunity to recognize, "Oh, that's happening." That's a bias built right in to the way in which we peer review and cite our research.

**Dr. Akbar:** Mitch, it's interesting that as we evolved the conversation around this, and I remember, I don't know if you all remember this, but when we were having conversations about the apology, that the area around research and scholarship, and who is allowed entry into publishing the type of work that could be impactful is definitely a systemic issue that excludes researchers who have decided to engage more fully in qualitative research, or in participatory research, in community-based research, because of the criteria or the guidelines in terms of entry.

That that has a ripple effect on the careers, and the trajectory, and the capacity for tenure on scholars who choose to focus the scientific body of work that they're focused on in this area. It's not just the inability to get published. It impacts the scholar's entire career, if they don't have entry into the world of publishing because of these issues. What are the criteria that would need to change in order to make space for this type of work to reach others? Then I think the other thing that was discussed during the process of the apology is who actually then gets access to the science, and gets to benefit from the science.

There's such an incredible gap about the audience who reads the scholarly work versus the people who would be directly affected and better informed were the science to get out to communities that need it the most. There are so many barriers that are implicit, that we don't talk about, that cause harm in a multitude of ways when we don't think more expansively about the robust nature of scientific work.

**Dr. Prinstein:** That's absolutely right. I wanted to just quickly make note of APA's recent task force report on promotion, tenure, and retention of faculty of color in psychology. For those of you watching this live, you'll find a link to that in the chat. For those of you watching it on streaming, you can Google that report, which has now been disseminated to all deans across the United States, to understand how it is that the systems that you're hearing from the panelists today are impacting the academic workforce and the ability to recruit and retain folks who will be able to better address all human behavior rather than continue some of the biases that have really perpetuated a more narrow focus on a subset of the world's population.

Let me turn it back to our panelists. I know that there are deserving shout-outs of all of the papers in the special issue, and want to give you a chance to comment on what's been said and/or to shout-out other terrific papers in the special issue.

**Dr. Hall:** I want to follow up on this issue of what is good science and who are good scientists. There's an excellent article by Benuto and Bridges on what they call health equity tourism. There's different resources, funding, grants for health equity research, which sounds, on the face of it, wonderful. It's like, "Great. This is an opportunity for scientists in underrepresented or marginalized communities to get their work funded and do their work." Well, what happens with these resources is that health equity tourists step in.

Health equity tourists are opportunistic scientists who have a reputation in some other field. Because they have a preexisting reputation, they can come into the field of health equity as experts. They're not members of the community, they're tourists in the sense in that they do the work and then they have no commitment to the community and may leave this kind of research when something else interests them, because they're opportunists.

What happens as a result of these health equity tourists is that scientists of color, scientists who have commitments to these communities are further marginalized. Those with the most expertise are not respected for their expertise. I just think this is a great article for anyone to read who's had the frustrating experience of trying to get their expertise recognized, and then finding that resources and funds go to someone else that is not part of the community, that may have less expertise, but has a reputation in so-called mainstream science.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Thank you. Great points. Thank you for putting the links to those papers in the chat, for those of you that are watching live. Fantastic. Anyone else want to bring up some of the other excellent points in the special issue, or some of the other papers? Lillian, I see you're about to contribute, but you're on mute.

**Dr. Comas-Díaz:** Okay, I got my speech now. There's a interesting, provocative, and fascinating article on racial capitalism, by Daniel Gaztambide and his colleagues. It's an eye-opening of how, in a way, we can be unaware of a systemic issue that influences all of us. In other words, following a decolonial orientation it was designating people of color as the other, but it was just to gain more riches, imperialistic approaches, power over, and that's another thing. The issue of power is very important, that we haven't discussed, in regular psychology.

Going back to the racial capitalism, that article really outlines, how is it that the system of economic, the capitalism is made to have people of color be the other in order to benefit as perhaps white supremacy and capitalism? I really urge you all to read that article because it really discloses step by step, how is it that we are all affected by this earlier colonial designation of people of color as the other and inferior in order to benefit capitalism?

**Dr. Prinstein:** Excellent. Thank you so much for highlighting that article. As you say, yes, a must-read for all. Germine, you had a thought as well.

**Dr. Awad:** Yes. I want to highlight the article about intergroup collaboration, by Demanarig and colleagues. I think this is especially important given especially current issues related to anti-Arab racism, anti-Palestinian racism, and Islamophobia. We see a lot of intergroup coalition building happening around these issues that highlight specifically what these communities are going through right now. I think this particular article does a good job of talking about the theoretical framework that would help explain some of those actions that are happening right now.

Also, just to think about certain groups that tend to be more invisible even in ethnic minority spaces, such as Arab and Middle Easterners. Oftentimes, when this community has gained entrance in these spaces, it's because of coalition building with other communities of color that note their



absence and speak up for them. I think it's really a great article. There's a model that helps explain how coalition building works, and collaboration within communities work. I think it would be a great resource for folks who are really wanting to do something and figure out, how do you go about building these collaborations?

**Dr. Prinstein:** Fantastic. Thank you so much for highlighting that piece. We are getting lots of questions from people who are watching now, or folks who posted questions in advance. I wanted to pass some of those along, because we have many, many good thoughts here. One is that folks are very interested in sharing this special issue with their research methods class at the undergraduate level, at the graduate level, doing that in a way that starts a dialogue that will really see the development of new scientists.

Some people are asking, what is the best way that you might recommend them doing that, particularly in a school and states where there might be different discussions going on right now about equity, diversity, and inclusion, and whether there are ways to create activities or experiential learning to really help people heed the lessons from this work? Any comments about that at all and using your special issue as a teaching tool?

**Dr. Cokley:** That's a really good question, Mitch. I had not thought about that as much as perhaps we should have. One of the things that occurs to me is inspired by actually what we're doing now. It seems to me that with our advancing technology, that it's much easier now to have webinars that would allow authors to talk about their work in ways that makes it more accessible than certainly was able to happen in the past.

I think that one suggestion I would give the students and to faculty is to reach out to the authors of these manuscripts and create opportunities for them to talk about their work in ways that would expose them to classes where you don't have to fly people out, pay them honorarium. You might want to, I don't know. I won't get into those specifics, but certainly, there's an opportunity now to be able to reach out, and to take advantage of technology, and to have authors talk about their work in ways that are much easier and more accessible than previously.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Terrific suggestions. Thank you.

**Dr. Comas-Díaz:** I may add that one of the things that the special issue highlights is the power of power, and how in psychology we don't talk about power. In terms of power over what? Over whom? Having those conversations about power, and when people feel powerless, and what to do about it would be very, very healing in a way. From that perspective, taking action about being more clinically aware, consciousness about how power influences all of our lives can make us be more awakened into why we are dealing with the kind of situation, perhaps, we're dealing in this country right now. In this political climate. Thank you.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Maysa, we're getting a number of questions in the chat about the direction that APA is taking in addressing diversity, equity, and inclusion more broadly. Now, this particular apology was focused on a racial and ethnic minoritized populations. Some people are asking questions about whether there's also a recognition that there has been oppression or hardships that have been endured by folks with disabilities, folks with diversity in religious spaces, including antisemitism. I'm wondering if you want to talk a little bit about where this particular apology and special issue fits within APA's broader initiatives that are addressing diversity, equity, and inclusion in a wider and inclusive way.

**Dr. Akbar:** Yes, I think it's important to make the distinction about this conversation in particular, because there is a lot of merit to the discussion that equity, diversity, and inclusion really is a pretty broad umbrella term for many different types of communities that can fit under that term. At the same time, the goal for the apology, in particular during the leadership of the presidency of Dr. Jennifer Kelly, was to issue an apology for people of color.

The purpose of this special issue of the AP was an extension of not only documenting the history of that apology, which you see in the commentary, but then also to look at as the editors, the special guest editors have identified the complexity of this issue. That it's not as easy as just an apology, but all of the other areas that they have brought up. I think it's important to center and anchor that as a result of this conversation for the scientific community. Along with that, my job as the Chief Diversity Officer is to look at the umbrella of all of the populations that are covered under EDI.

The next, and in a lot of ways has been a simultaneous continuation of work that has been anchored for the association for decades, but in the next coming years, and specifically for the next area of diversity work at APA, we have been looking at an Accessibility Inclusion Maturity Model as the methodology, the mental model, the framework that APA and the broader field of psychology will be using in terms of better understanding the needs of the disability community, the areas of accessibility that are necessary, also the intersectional lens that interacts with those that have multiple identities.

The need not to be so focused on making people prioritize which identity has to come first, but instead, to see people holistically for all of the identities that they carry. There's been an evolution of that work this last year. The council representatives that we provided the information to council, related to the framework of the AIMM, which went through a significant process of scientific rigor. We wanted to make sure that it was based on psychological science in its creation and dissemination.

That is the model that we will be using strategically for the next three to five years, in terms of developing organizationally how we're going to handle issues related to disability inclusion, and how we're going to progress this work at APA. We are also hoping that with the scholars that have been part of this, those that come from rehabilitation science, those that come from the disability community, that we look at it from various different perspectives. That this conversation will continue beyond the development of this model and its applicability.

I think the other piece that we also have been looking at very closely with work that has happened really over the last 40 to 50 years at APA, is those that affect the LGBTQ plus community, because when we look at the broader conversation around anti-EDI legislation, we see very specific attacks that fall under the umbrella of those that identify with gender diversity issues, that identify with sexual orientation issues.

We're working hand in hand to make sure that we advance the science in that area, that we advocate for those people who are in specific positions of power, around lawmaking and in Congress, so that they are armed with the science that's necessary, and the decisions that are being made state by state, but also federally. Then I think you mentioned also antisemitism. I think that there is a complexity around the science in this space. There are many colleagues that have championed the continuation of this conversation, being very specific and surgical, and elevating this conversation at APA.

Also, a process by which the areas of Jewish identity, both culturally and religiously, and also the areas of antisemitism do come out in scholarly work in a much more robust way that we've seen

historically. I think what I really appreciate about not only our members but our scholars, is that they're very passionate about the areas that are a focus for them. They're very passionate about assuring that this information is disseminated to the scientific community and the communities that are affected the most.

We will continue to do this work, and we'll continue to do this partnering with those that have a specialty in terms of concentration and professional commitment to the dissemination and the continuation of research in specific areas.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Thank you, Maysa. I fear that you and all of the guest editors here today have been dealing with questions like this for your entire careers. There are ways in which people might say-- We've moved from a period in which people didn't talk about diversity. In fact, there was an encouragement for blindness, which in itself is perhaps not the best term, but a way of, "Let's not even see that we have different backgrounds, lenses, experiences." To now a culture where we are acknowledging and valuing and really wanting to learn from the different experiences and cultures and backgrounds that we have.

In doing so, I fear that all of you have heard the kinds of comments that if we talk about this, it might hurt someone from a different group, or it might make white people feel bad about being white, or if we talk about the oppression experience by one group, might it make another group feel that they are not being heard, understood, and their experience is similarly being validated simultaneously?

I'm just curious, this is a topic that is so relevant to the acceptance of, and use of your special issue, but it's frankly one that's relevant to our whole society right now. I'd love to learn from all of you on the panel, how do you address this? How do you deal with it? How can we promote the idea that empathy is not a zero-sum game?

**Dr. Comas-Díaz:** As a clinician, I hear this in my practice. What I convey is that when people feel empathetic towards another group, they're connecting with their humanity, and that that's what is the common ground here, our humanity. In the middle of the differences, and that makes us who we are. What I do therapeutically, is to use that pain that the person brings about. How come my group is not being, fill the blank, as a way of connecting with the other group that they're using as a mirror, and making that mirroring be positive, and concentrating on the commonalities, but also honoring the differences.

Within liberation psychology, we have the position that it's important to be healed, to also engage in some kind of active dealing with the state that is creating this social justice action. Whatever you define your healing social justice action, that's what you need to do. What we need to do is to support how people engage in what they need to become more humane. Thank you.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Thank you. Other thoughts?

**Dr. Hall:** That's well put, Lillian, about empathy. Mitch, you've said that all of the guest editors have probably been dealing with these issues for a long time. Well, our communities and ancestors have been dealing with these issues for centuries. When I hear someone who says, "Well, I'm uncomfortable talking about this," again, I'm thinking of this pilgrimage I went to in Arizona. Those were just sparse facilities. They were basically incarcerated out in the desert. There were no fences because there's no place to escape to.

That was pretty uncomfortable, I think, from my ancestors. All of these marginal groups have experienced racism for centuries. To feel a little bit uncomfortable, I think, is a good thing, because to feel that discomfort is a step toward empathy, as Lillian was pointing out.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Thank you. [silence] Well, we're just about out of time, so I wanted to ask you all for final thoughts. Including, what are some things that people listening to this today, or in the coming weeks, as it's posted online, what's something that you, today, can do as a scientist, as an educator, as a practitioner in psychology to heed the lessons from the special issue that you've put together? Joe, do you want to start us off?

**Dr. Gone:** Sure. Thanks. I'm a researcher, and so I make knowledge, and my entire career has been organized around trying to elevate Indigenous knowledges, perspectives, worldviews, understandings, in psychology as it pertains to psychological matters. That work has led me to embrace methodologies that I was not necessarily all that deeply trained in in my graduate training in the 1990s. Which are interpretive methods, thematic analysis, interviews and focus groups and trying to really capture the meanings that people make.

We're fortunate, in this day and age, to have an entire Society for Qualitative Inquiry in Psychology, and Division 5 has expanded to incorporate and fold in those kinds of alternative methodologies. Hopefully, we don't have to continue to describe them in that way anymore, they just get folded in as tools in our toolkit. I think that's one thing that's really important to appreciate as we think about how to write the scientific record, which has slandered and misrepresented the psychologies and the well-being, the perspectives of our peoples throughout history.

I think making sure that a broader swath of psychology trainees are exposed to qualitative inquiry, and to the methodological aspects of interpretive meaning, making kinds of analysis is really important. That's one thing I would advocate.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Thank you. Other final thoughts on what listeners can do today to take a positive step?

**Dr. Akbar:** Mitch, I'll-- Oh, Gigi, do you want to go first?

**Dr. Awad:** I would just say, read the special issue, and keep your minds open, and be willing to engage in difficult conversations, be willing to really reflect on how we all carry privilege in certain ways, even if we are also simultaneously part of oppressed groups. That even when we are talking about privileged groups, that there are some ways that there's not privilege.

I just think that we need to be a little bit more open to the complexities of identity and how also context comes into play, but to also be able to acknowledge when there's real power issues at play, and where people have real privilege and the power to be able to talk about their own or their particular histories in a way that maybe other groups are not able to articulate. I just think being open to the complexities and the discomfort that comes with really delving into these issues.

**Dr. Akbar:** Lillian, go ahead, please.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Fantastic. Thank you.

**Dr. Comas-Díaz:** Yes. Well said. Well said. I would just add that it's important that we look our positionalities, because who we are, not only gender, age, whatever, informs how we see ourselves, how we see the other, how we see the world. We believe that we're not political, but we are

political, in terms of, this is how we are grounded in who we are. Learning who you are, and then being able to differentiate yourself on others, but connect with the common ground, is a way of effecting change. If you want to change any social issues, you just ground yourself in who you are, and make a decision of how you're going to share that, and how you're going to effect the system. Thank you.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Thank you.

**Dr. Akbar:** I would just say, Mitch, as a person that was hand in hand with this group, as we were going through the apology process, and writing up all of the resolutions, and the documents, and issuing the apology, and even through the year plus long process of this special issue, the centerpiece of the conversation among the folks that you see here is, are we apologizing to ourselves? Are we moving this work forward without the allyship that is necessary? To consider the power issue that is at play when we're dealing with oppression and systemic racism and et cetera.

I think what this group can demonstrate as role models to everyone that's in this audience is that they took on the call to action. The conflict about apologizing to self lowered in the priority of assuring that an apology went out, and that scientifically, they brought to the surface the issues that impact and affect their community. That leadership is essential, and it's an essential, I think, beacon or North Star that others who are willing and wanting to advocate for their communities can follow as an example. We have gotten this far due to the courage that this group and many others have engaged in to be able to speak up about these issues within our discipline.

**Dr. Prinstein:** Thank you. I want to thank all of you for your leadership. I want to thank you for participation on this panel, and for the work that you did on this special issue. I want to thank you for working through the pain and the adversity that these projects required you to confront yet again, in order to find an opportunity to teach others who need to listen and learn from your experiences and from your guidance. Thank you. It is hard to simultaneously be a teacher and someone who is experiencing trauma at the same time.

I really appreciate, and dare I say, I think that the entire scientific community, within our discipline, owes you a tremendous debt of gratitude for the work that you're doing to help us listen and learn. Thank you so much. Thank you everyone who participated on this panel as an attendee. Thank you so much for the staff who helped to make this possible. Also, for those who are listening, there will be a quick survey for you to type in your thoughts and suggest future topics for our seminar series. Thank you, again, all so much, and have a wonderful rest of your day.