

ESSENTIAL SCIENCE CONVERSATIONS

What is Public Psychology and Why is it Important?

April 6, 2022

Transcript

Operator: Hello, everybody, and welcome. Thank you for joining us today. This program is part of an APA series called Essential Science Conversations where panelists and audience members can engage in an open conversation about emerging topics in Psychological Science. Today's conversation will focus on public psychology. What exactly is public psychology and why is it important, especially for any discipline like ours, which is concerned with advocacy, community representation, and inclusive service to the public?

Our panelists will discuss why it's necessary for our field to shift its focus from the individual researcher to a more publicly engaged science. Before we get started, I just need to go over a few housekeeping details. First, many thanks to all of you who submitted questions for today's program when you registered. Our panelists have received those questions, and they will try to answer as many of those as possible. You will also have an opportunity to ask a question in real-time.

If you notice in your Zoom dashboard, there's a little button there called Q&A and all you have to do is just click on that button and type your question into the box. If you have a question for the panelists, be sure to use that Q&A box rather than the chat box. We'll be monitoring that Q&A box throughout the program, and we'll be taking questions from the live audience during the tail end of the webinar. Secondly, this program is being live-streamed to APA's YouTube channel.

Once the webinar ends, the recording will be available on that channel. For those of you who may not know, APA indeed does have its own YouTube channel, where you can watch many different webinar recordings, including this one today. You should also receive an email with a link to the webinar recording about a day after the webinar ends, and that one's going to be coming from Zoom. Then finally, we have an Essential Science Conversations webpage where you can find recordings, slides, and written transcripts of all our programs.

Just be sure to bookmark the link and check in often. I will also share that URL in the chat box in just a moment. Without further ado, let's begin. I am so pleased to introduce our hosts who will be leading today's conversation. Let's welcome Dr. Mia Smith Bynum, who is APA's Senior Director for Science, equity, diversity, and inclusion. Welcome, Mia. At this point, she is going to take over and introduce today's panelists.

Mia: Hi, good afternoon or good day. There's many people logging in from overseas which I think is just fantastic. Welcome. I'm pleased to be hosting this session today and because there's a lot of good content, I'm going to get right into the introductions. I'm pleased to introduce our panelists. First, we have Dr. Asia Eaton. Asia is a feminist social psychologist and associate professor of psychology at Florida International University, where she directs the power women and reach relationships lab.

Her lab explores how gender intersects with identities, such as race, sexual orientation, and class to affect individual's access to an experience with power. Since 2016, Asia has served as head of research for Cyber Civil Rights Initiative, which is working to end image-based

sexual abuse. I'll say briefly that, Dr. Asia, this special issue and her colleagues here who edited this, I heard about it when I was a member of the Leadership Institute for Women in Psychology during 2020.

I knew that this special issue in public psychology was coming. I am so happy that I get to host this session and speak with the authors today. We are fortunate to have with us also on the soon-to-be Dr. Anthony Flynn. Anthony is a fourth-year PhD student in Counseling Psychology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. His research teaching and consulting and clinical work emphasize foundational clinical communication skills and health disparities.

He works in solidarity with local social movements in Madison Wisconsin and is a union steward and mutual aid organizer with the University of Wisconsin Teaching Assistance Association. Walking the walk as we like to say, and finally but not least, we have a Dr. Neil Lewis Jr. Neil is an assistant professor of communication and social behavior at Cornell University. He co-directs Cornell's action research collaborative, which brings together researchers, practitioners, community members, and policymakers to address pressing issues in society and improve lives.

Outside of Academia, he is a publicly engaged scholar and science communicator. Welcome and thank you all for being here. Now let's begin our Essential Science Conversation. As I was saying, I learned that this special issue was coming in 2020 when Asia and I were both in participant leaders in one of the marquee APA programs. This notion of public psychology is very exciting, timely, and I would argue groundbreaking. What I want to do is present these questions to each panelist as I have them on my script here, but there may be comments that each of you want to weigh in on as we get underway.

First, I'll begin with Asia. What exactly is public psychology? When you Google it, we can't find a whole lot of information. That's how groundbreaking it is. If you could share with us a little bit about what public psychology is.

Asia: Absolutely. Thank you so much, Mia. It's great to see you again. First, I want to give credit to all the authors in the special issue, and to my co-editors, Dr. Patrick Zanka, Michelle Schleifer, and Belinda Silca, for developing this special issue with me and the present conceptualization of public psychology. Public psychology simply is science and practice for and with the public. Psychological science and practice for and with the public.

It's a framework and a set of principles that ask us to reimagine and reorient psychology to center social problems, to engage diverse publics and knowledge creation, to democratize and communicate scientific knowledge, and to rethink what constitutes psychology and psychological expertise. That said, public psychology is not an entirely new idea. It has a lot in common with liberation psychology, some things in common with community psychology, open science, a lot in common with slow science for those of you who are familiar with Isabel Stinker's book.

In fact, when we first started to develop the concept, we thought we were going to call it citizen psychology, consistent with 2018 APA President Jessica Henderson Daniels work, and also with Kevin Nadal's work on becoming a psychologist activist. We realized we wanted to be even broader than citizen psychologist, which is really individual focused. The word citizen obviously problematic in some ways.

We broadened it out to look at structures and institutions, and policies and practices, as well as what the individual practitioner or scientist is responsible for, and who they're responsible to.

Mia: Wonderful. To build on that, one of the reasons I was very excited about this special issue, and all of its contents has to do with just my own observations that with the ascendance of social media, that many younger scientists, particularly early career professionals, millennials and Gen Z, that they really want a publicly engaged psychology. You see a lot of conversations on social media with people are tweeting about their research.

I found some of the most interesting papers, hanging out on Twitter. If you could talk a little bit about that dynamic, and how public psychology interfaces with the ways that we think about impact for promotion and tenure.

Asia: Oh, I could go off on this one, but I'm going to hand it over first to Neil and Anthony. I'm sure you have thoughts.

Neil: Yes, sure. I'll jump in here. One of the things that I really appreciated about the special issue, so first of all, thanks again, for creating the issue. I thought it was really helpful to see how many people are thinking about this topic. In addition to diving into the content of what is public psychology, and how we think about that, what I really appreciated with all the articles is recognizing the sociology of the discipline that we're in, and how do we think about different kinds of knowledge?

I thought the article is all in their own way, really talked about how if we want this work to be done, and done well, then we as a discipline need to change the way we think about what is good science or good work, and make sure that our promotion guidelines are aligned with that. Otherwise, it's not going to happen. That's another thing I really appreciated by the special issue.

Mia: Awesome. Anthony, would you like to weigh in please?

Anthony: Yes. I couldn't agree more with what Dr. Eaton and Dr. Lewis has shared already. I think that when we look at the current systems as they exist, and take a hard look at them and look at, do they actually incentivize this work? I think at present, the resounding answer is largely no. I think about the distinction between the impact on a tenure application for a single research publication versus a community-based project that leads to materially benefiting hundreds of people.

This idea that somehow that's going to count less for tenure, or it might even count less for progression and a graduate degree than a paper that, frankly, I don't know how many people will read. I think we really have to think about within this structure how are we incentivizing this work, and take a critical look at it too.

Mia: Awesome. Any other comments on that? This a big one, so any other comments, please do add.

Asia: I'll add to that, as far as a bigger picture goes and a critical look. I would even argue that we need to re-conceptualize what we consider academic work. We have this tripartite model of teaching, research, and service, where is public benefit in that, especially for those who work at public institutions? It's presumed to be a part of each of those, but we need to

center it, public benefit. Even if you look at the national surveys of college and university faculty, they probe teaching, research, and service.

You can fulfill those criteria without doing anything that directly or indirectly benefits the public, and that's really problematic. I think we should position public benefit as a central process, product of academic work that determines the nature and scope of every other activity.

Neil: If I can quickly add to that? One of the papers, I think it was the Cole paper, asked the question that I think it's useful for us to reflect on. In this space, there's been a lot of conversation about giving psychology away. We will produce the work and give it away to the public. The question that the paper asked that I really love was, if we went and ask the public, if they want what we have to give, would we be satisfied with the answer they'd give us?

That's something that I think we really need to think about. Exactly, building on Asia's point, the way things are set up, we can go about our day-to-day work without ever really thinking about what the public really wants, or would benefit from, and pat ourselves in the back for. If we really want to do this work well, we have to be more reflective and incorporate that in our practice.

Mia: Awesome. I see a couple of questions in the chat. I'm going to try to weave a couple of points in here with the next question. One of the questions that was submitted prior to the webinar states, is there a difference between applied community and public psychology? Then we have a number of guests from around the world. There may be some differences in terminology here that I want to acknowledge.

We have also a query about brow psychology, which is a new one for me, and then there's some questions about population psychology, which again, I'm stretching my brain here. Are there any overlaps between this notion of public psych and sociology?

Asia: I could start with a couple of those. There's definitely overlap between community psychology and public psychology. My understanding of community psychology, and I'm not a community psychologist, is that the community is the unit of study. That's not necessarily the case for public psychology, although they both have interest in social issues and institutions, and the relationship between people and contexts. You can be a public psychologist and have the amygdala be your unit of study.

As far as what was the other one applied goes, well, public psychology is intended to be for the public good. Now, I don't want to get into defining what that is, but applied psychology is not by definition. It could, in fact, be investigating how to get more effort out of workers and increase a company's bottom line. It could be finding how to make solitary confinement more aversive. You could be doing applied psychology on these things. That's not consistent with public psychology.

Mia: Related to this. One of the questions is framed this way and I'm thinking I'm going to tweak it a little bit. There's a query about how can public psychology make an impact on our field? How will it benefit the public? Let me reframe that a little bit to say, how would you like to see this special issue used by our field? The first thing I think about is like, "Wow, someone finally, in a cohesive way, named a construct for the moment." It put it all under one

umbrella. I'd love to hear everyone's thoughts about how you'd like to see this special issue used.

Anthony: [silence] I think, personally, for me, in response to the call for papers for this issue, originally, I was really struck by this being a call for action in our field ultimately. I think, this moment that we are in historically, following the pandemic, multiple years of really active social strife out in the streets I think it calls for us to rise the occasion to heed the calls that minoritized folks in our field and outside of it have been making for decades, sometimes even centuries, and really get engaged in meaningful partnerships of solidarity with social movements, with organizations that are actively engaged in change.

I think we see so many examples of this today, whether it'd be getting behind drug decriminalization and supervised consumption sites, or I have a colleague, Rachel Dyer, who's a reproductive justice scholar talks about eliminating fetal assault laws that are mandate reporting, when treating pregnant people who are using drugs like those laws are a threat to bodily autonomy, and safety of pregnant people. Think about the anti-queer and trans bills that have come up in Florida and Texas.

I think, really, a salient example, here in Madison is the development of alternatives to police involvement in mental health crisis intervention, development of our cares team here in Madison, based off the codes program. Time and time again, there are spaces that we have opportunities to leverage our collective power as a field and our individual power as well, to move these institutions in a direction towards liberation. I think it behooves us to answer that call.

Neil: Adding to that, there are two other pieces that I think a specialist you can help with. For a bit more background, I was trained in social psychology, and then entered the field in the midst of two crises. One, we can call the crisis of evidence around the replication crisis of the 2010s, and another one happening at the same time was what's been termed the crisis of relevance, the way that many of our stays are reproduced, we're so far removed from the realities of everyday life that it was hard to use them.

I think what the special issue does really well is really walk through multiple elements to address both of these things. Thinking about the different ways that we can construct knowledge, engaging more people than the college sophomores in the laboratory, that has become the default sample and population of study. There's so many elements that are walkthrough within the special issue that I think can help the field really think through new ways of producing knowledge that addresses the methodological angst that's been in the field over the past decade or so.

As well as make our work more relevant for addressing those very issues that Anthony just talked about, and more issues that we know are coming. We haven't yet talked to this conversation about the climate crisis, but that's something else that will shake the field for decades to come. The papers is really walk through many elements that we can think about to do all of as well.

Mia: Thank you for that. Let me see the next question here. How are we to fix systems of power, really, that have encouraged these individual researcher-based silos?

Anthony: I think I may have signed up for this one. I think, to really begin by recognizing that the interest who disproportionately benefit from these systems are motivated by those

systems continued replication. For the system that you're talking about these individual silos-- I might even call it the neoliberal academia broadly. It's industry and politicians, in some cases, administration who are deeply invested in that system continuing to exist the way it is.

I think after we recognize that I believe it's a matter of organizing collectively to present an alternative notion of what's possible, and to build our own base of power that's committed to liberation, and presents a credible threat to that continued existence as it exists today. Our systems in academia, they really function to atomize us. To diffuse our collective power, the collective power of students, workers, faculty researchers.

To maintain a status quo that benefits so few at the expense of so many, particularly folks with minoritized backgrounds and from minoritized contexts. To change those systems, we have to organize collectively and distill our power to present an alternative, and bring that out at that atomized power together. We can leverage that power to say that we're not going to go on this way. We refuse to replicate these oppressive systems.

My colleague, Sergio Dominguez, in our paper emphasized that we are contesting injustice and presenting an alternative. Those are the conditions that we can shift these systems executive session. Just a better world is possible when we organize in solidarity together to build it.

Mia: I will just observe even just the language that Anthony is using is so culturally different from what we think about when we're in typical departments of psychology, or psychological sciences around the country that it really is from the ground up psychology as talking about the organizing piece, which is radical, but in all the good ways, I think. I'll just disclose my bias there. There's a number of good questions that are coming up into chat. I'm going to try to blend them together. If there wasn't.

Asia, I'm just going to give you a heads up. I'm going to come to you to talk about the article in the special issue that deals with clinical practice as one of the lead editors for this special issue. One of the questions that has come up is, what can a budding psychology student do right now to assist the community and outreach goals of public psychology? That is for you, Anthony.

Anthony: Certainly, I think ultimately, one of the single most impactful steps that we can take as students and I use the, we pronoun there very intentionally, is to join grassroots organizations who are engaged in these efforts for systemic change. I think a focus on one's local communities is where some of that effort can be most impactful. Reflecting on where our interests and expertise are and where the need is, and get in touch with these organizations to offer our support. This is something that a lot of folks in my department here in Madison, a lot of students ultimately do.

I think as far as which organization as a union organizer, I'd be remiss to not encourage you to join your graduate worker union if there is one. Local Black Lives Matter organizations, allies for black lives, if that feels more your speed. Local tenants or homeless unions working on housing issues. There's DSA and IWW chapters in most major cities who are engaged in credible work. Ultimately, you pick your issue and there's probably a grassroots organization working on it.

The Migrant Justice prison reform or abolition, reproductive justice, disability justice, you name it. I think that when we engage and join them in solidarity, we have an opportunity to

learn from them. Sure, but more importantly, we engage in what Diana Trujillo refers to as the circulation of capitals. This idea that by we extend these organizations and these movements, social and relational investment of legitimacy, knowledge, power, protection, credibility, status that we might require through education.

I think something that my colleague, Rhea Jordan, emphasized in our paper is that these partnerships, they're going to demand vulnerability from us and humility, as well. We have to have that courage to contest injustice, even when it feels like we have limited control. To acknowledge that we're going to make mistakes, to proceed with grace and humility to learn the lesson, and try again.

Mia: Awesome, thank you so much for that. Next question. I'm going to go to the one about clinical practice and then I'll come back to the pre-submitted questions. Asia, if you could talk about the role of clinical practice in really engagement of outside of higher Ed, I think, where you can.

Asia: Well, I am a psychological scientist, to be clear, but we did have practitioners and clinicians contribute to this special issue, Anthony being among them. A lot of the articles that touched on clinical practice touched on training, like the articles by Neville and Miles on becoming a researcher, practitioner, activist or advocate. I think it goes back to how we incentivize practice and science, which goes back to what we train people to be good at, and what we train people to excel in and understand and engage.

Public psychology is going to require really overhauling our teaching and training. Teaching is actually one article type that we didn't get in the special issue, that we would love to have. I almost feel like we need a whole other special issue to cover everything. Neville talks about training students in a liberation psychology framework and it's a really stunning article. Liberation psychology, like public psychology, focuses on science for the public good.

Science whose end goal is action and working with and for communities. The focus of liberation psychology, in particular, is a little more narrow than public psychology, focusing on oppressed communities and social justice. Whereas public psychology is a little broader than that. Yes, I would encourage you to read those articles to get more information on the training and the clinical work.

Mia: There's a comment in the chat that says, From Lionel, "I participated in some of these grassroots organizations. I feel I didn't fit in because of how these groups act, behave and engage with others. I think it's important to point out that researching and understanding how these groups act before joining." What the question or comment is really pointing out is really a clash in cultures.

This is for the panel. What you all are proposing and what your co-authors and fellow editors are proposing is really thinking beyond the individual and really that higher Ed, in the production of scholarship in general, is very regimented, and top-down and there are evaluation systems that as you all have noted, incentivize the production of a certain type of scholarship. Engaging with community research, it requires relationship building.

It may take you a good two years to court a community organization before they say, "Okay, I'll let you come to my community board meeting and present your ideas." A lot of that goes to the historic mistreatment by researchers of marginalized communities. I know sometimes even if I show up as a black woman in my life as an academic that that is not enough, "Street

cred," to get me in the door. It really depends on the organization and the region of the country.

If there has been historic mistreatment by the local university towards that community organization. A public psychology really, as you all said, it centers these kinds of engagements. We're moving away from the very cool and useful one-on-one psyche pool model, but we're trying to really understand people where they are with the best psychological science. I've made a couple of comments. If any of you could weigh in on the challenge of meshing that with university, and college evaluation structures, when it comes to as one of the articles says, What is good science versus, "Bad psychology."?

Neil: Maybe I can jump in. Yes. All of those things are incredibly important to deal with. You have to deal with those tough issues to do this work well. That's why I think so many of the articles emphasize that universities have to take a step back and think about what does that mean, right? If doing this research means you're not going to sit in your office and come up with a question on your own, design that the study stimuli on your own in the way that your disciplinary journal would like it to be done, then you might have to think about different kinds of products.

I think Anthony alluded earlier that maybe the end product isn't a article in an APA journal. Maybe it's something else that's more valuable to the community organizations. Why can't those things also count? What would it mean in a university to say that--?

Mia: Can you speak a little more about that, Dr. Neil, just about what are those other things? I think that that is the secret sauce. We all know universities will never not value a publication. I will say, as a fan of this work, I tell my students no one's ever going to say, "Why did you waste time publishing that scientific article?" You're never going to hear that throughout your career, right?

Neil: Yes.

Mia: That is just one output of the wonderful training, if we're fortunate to be able to receive. What other kinds of things should universities be looking at to value? We've got people here from all over the world, this is your moment to really shape and influence the impact of this work. I want to do what I can to facilitate that. What other kinds of products might a public psychologist produce that university should absolutely value. I'll present it to Dr. Neil first, but please, any of you feel free to weigh in.

Neil: I'd love to hear a range of answers. We can think about it. One of my colleagues, for instance, writes a lot of shorter blog posts with his community partners. That is much more accessible than the 20-page academic article. Maybe it's producing videos with-- We're doing a lot of COVID work lately, and short videos about the vaccines is actually more useful than long technical descriptions of how it's made. Those are some ideas. Earlier you mentioned engaging in conversation on social media. There are folks that I know that regularly participate, whether it's like Reddit, ask me anything conversations.

That's directly engaging with people with the questions they have. There are all of these things. They take time, they take effort, they require building trust, and are meeting people where they are and communicating in the ways that matter to them. Universities can count that if they want to. There are other academic entities that have done this. I know the Mayo

Clinic almost 10 years ago now, for instance, started counting social media engagement as part of their evaluation criteria.

They realize that's actually an effective way to communicate with people about their health, which is at the end of the day their mission. If our mission is to serve the public, then we need to broaden our view of what that actually means, and value the different ways of doing that.

Mia: Awesome. Would the other two panelists, would you be interested in weighing in?

Asia: I'll jump in quickly, some other products, evidence of impact beyond journal articles and their impact factor, and what that means would be policy change, or evidence at trying to make a policy change. We did collaborate with this legislator who introduced this change to this bill, and it didn't go through, but we spent the time doing this, or it did go through, but not exactly as we wanted. I've had that experience. TV and radio segments for public education, and curriculum change in schools that you can demonstrate that you've accomplished.

White papers that are written in everyday language, that aren't full of jargon that are accessible to people. I worry a little bit about the social media engagement because that can be a popularity contest too, but these are challenges that we need to take on and there's no metric, there's no one metric that's perfect. We need a diversity of metrics. We always have needed a diversity of metrics.

Mia: Very exciting, Anthony.

Anthony: I appreciate Asia's emphasis on policy change, obviously. I think that, in addition, the only other thing that came up from me as you were talking was Amicus briefs in court cases can be really impactful. I know that that's been a big part of what one of my co-authors worked on as we young, who does work with trans communities has an opportunity to be really impactful on local state, and national stages in the legal system.

Mia: Awesome. Thank you for that. Let's see. We have, let me check my list here. We've got one comment, that I'll ask you to chew on a little bit. I'll probably form in a formal question here in a moment. We have one question that was briefly touched on about public psychology and its application in COVID-19. I believe Neil talked about vaccine education, which is critical right now. Then there's a query about using public psychology to address the mental health crisis on campus.

Speaking of COVID-19 is likely to be expanded because of the impacts that the isolation of virtual school have had on young people who are now headed into college Ed. I don't know if anyone needs a little time to think about that, or not if you want to weigh in, but we have some other questions about here. What does the evidence say about science communication methods for demystifying psychology for the public? Any comments about the knowledge base on that?

Asia: Well, I will say that, I don't think it's about persuading the public or defending science. The public doesn't need persuasion, it needs access, and exposure, and opportunity, and engagement. We don't need to defend science, we need to open it up, to collaborate, to lift the veil. There's nothing for us to defend. We've been in a defensive posture trying to communicate how useful we are, especially as social science, psychology is in social science.

We've been in a defensive posture for a long time. We think we have a bad public image. We don't have a bad public image. We have practice that has problems, from paywalls to jargon, to concepts that just circle the ivory tower. That's how we get to public distrust of science. I think it's more-- The evidence shows self-persuasion. That's the most effective form of persuasion. Let people persuade themselves through experience with our science

Mia: Go ahead. I'm sorry.

Neil: Well, yes, just quickly building on that. I think one issue we do have, is this, and I don't know where it necessarily comes from, but this idea that we have all of the knowledge, and it's for us to go and give it away, and that's the way to engage with the public. People know lots of things about their lives. [chuckles] We can have, we can engage in conversations about that. Thinking about, and having conversations about different kinds of evidence, what is there, what's missing?

Some of the really productive discussions I have which cuts both ways is about not only what is in the literature, but what's missing from the literature, because of who has been excluded from the production of the knowledge in the first place. There we're learning something about the science as we're having these discussions, but then opening up those conversations builds some of that trust, and allows for broadening, and access broadening participation. All of those things that Asia just noted are super important.

Mia: Awesome. I have an undergraduate curriculum question for you. If you were to, and take a minute to think about this, this is a big question. It wasn't on your list. [chuckles] If you were to roughly outline the contents of an undergraduate course that focused on public psychology, what would it look like? Take a minute to think about that. We know undergrads that's the early part of shaping what the future of the profession will look like. What are some of the things that you would want to see in a course like that?

Anthony: I think coming from the clinical realm here, if it was a course in public psychology that had a clinical lens to it, I'd really want to emphasize a systems lens to recognize that mental health problems do not exist between the ears of our clients. They exist in this and manifest from the systems that they inhabit, and that their socialization within systems of oppression oftentimes is what like manifests the maladies that we see, the challenges that we see in therapy.

I think really emphasizing that systems lens in parallel with an emphasis on critical self-reflection. Understanding the ways in which we are socialized as clinicians and systems of oppressions of oppression and how that impacts the ways that we experience our clients. We intervene with them. The directions we get. The biases that we have. The things we miss clinically with folks, and really taking that critical lens of applying it both outwardly and inwardly.

Mia: That's good stuff. Would others like to weigh in? Go ahead, go for it. Sorry. I cut you off.

Neil: One of the undergraduate courses I teach, is a course on persuasion and social influence, and the way that I often begin that class, especially in our research methods section, is asking students to think for the entire class about how do we know what is and isn't so. What that does is, it encourages them to really critically analyze everything else that I'm going to say for the rest of the semester. We're going to talk about a bunch of studies, you're

going to read studies in this class, as you're reading them, pay Vic careful attention to details like who was in these studies, who was not in these studies, where were these studies run and what's missing?

I think thinking about all those details helps engage with the processes we're talking about here from a public psychology perspective. They're often bringing up issues about who needs to be included in the work and the future, and how if we change the way that we go about conducting these studies we might reach very different conclusions about the world.

I think that process is really helpful for students to go through and also then encourages them to push us, faculty members and other researchers to do better in the future. Going back to one of the other questions that you asked Anthony, like it's not just graduate students changing the way that we do things, but also undergraduates demanding more of the professors I think does a lot for pushing the work forward.

Mia: Awesome. Asia, did you want to add anything?

Asia: I have one tiny thing to add, because I've been thinking about a lot lately is I would want to talk a lot about APA ethics in the class. For a long time, we didn't really have very good ethical policies, and then we developed some, and it seemed like we focused to the present day, mainly on non-maleficence, doing no harm. I'd like to see us shift to focusing on beneficence and how to actually bring us participants and community members' welfare to the fore.

I can tell you in my own research with my own IRB, I can say in my consent form, there are no direct benefits from participating in this study. Is that really okay for a public psychology? We need to consider the welfare of all of our clients and our participants and our community collaborators first and foremost.

Mia: Very good point. One of our questions I believe this was one of our guests from Brazil, I think I have the country right. They put in the Q&A are the basic ideas of public psychology tied to Marxist vision of humans and events? Big question there, take a minute to think about that one.

Anthony: As a labor organizer who has some affinity for those sorts of perspectives, I don't think it inherently does, and I do think that there is a materialist analysis to public psychology, inherently endemic to public psychology that demands a look at how, for example, material conditions produce the dynamics that we see in our work broadly speaking.

Mia: I have another question related to themes that we have covered today. There's a huge demographic shift coming with respect to race and ethnicity in the United States it's actually already underway. Census data tell us that for people under the age of 18, that it is already a majority black and brown population and young people who are entering college. This is the demographic of young people who are now entering college, who are entering our profession.

Roughly by the early 2040s, the university, the country will be a majority people of color country in terms of composition. It doesn't seem to be a bit of an accident to me that we are having this conversation with this huge demographic shift underway. What are the implications of that for how we think about the relevance of our field for the very real social issues that the country is struggling through right now, and that question is to anyone who would wish to ask it?

Neil: I think I can start. I think that change is part of what we're seeing some of it in the things that current graduate students and other early career people are pushing for in the field. I don't think it's an accident that we're having this conversation now, that when you look at the literature and you see what has been studied, what hasn't been studied, who has been included, who's been excluded. I think there are a number of students now who are looking at it and like, "I don't know that actually reflects the reality that I grew up with, or have experienced."

That makes sense, given all the meta scientific studies we've seen on psychology. Historically, it's been a science of wealthy white American undergraduates. Now that the country is changing and the demographics in our classroom are changing and students are like, "What?" I think that's why we're having this reckoning in the field right now is that it's a recognition that the field in some ways has failed in generating a good understanding of the diversity of experiences that exist in the world. That's why we're having these conversations now, and are having to rethink what the field is and what we do.

Asia: That's so insightful Neil, and I think you're exactly right. When I look at my own graduate students and I have eight right now, and a lot of them are from underrepresented backgrounds in psychology. They are by and large interested in pursuing research topics that affect and improve conditions for communities they care about and belong to. If you want a diverse science, you have to appreciate the interests and angles and expertise of diverse contributors.

Anthony: I think with that as somebody who embodies more, or I don't embody many minoritized identities outside of my sexual identity. I think that's something that stands out to me in terms of how to stand in solidarity with my minoritized colleagues too, is a recognition that my liberation as a sex minority person, or is inherently tied to the liberation of my colleagues who are oppressed on other axes.

I think that it's with that that we have to be committed to action to support material and otherwise to these efforts to shift these systems, if we want to put our ethical responsibility as a field, into practice, whether we are members of those groups or not.

Mia: Awesome. Thank you for that. I have each of your papers here. We have about 12 minutes left. I may take us right up to the hour, and we'll see how it goes. I'm going to go in order of the way you appear on my screen. Neil, I'm going to start with you. Can you provide for the audience because there are many folks who are just hearing about this special issue for the first time. The title of your article is, what counts as good science, how the battle for methodological legitimacy affects public psychology.

If you could give us the headline, and then when the issue dropped, as we like to say in hip hop culture, I saw your Twitter thread and you had a lot of personal reflections that I thought were just wonderful for the moment. If you could share a little bit of that with your audience, to your personal comfort of course.

Neil: My paper really focused on this tension in the field and again for background I'm trained in social psych so that guided a lot of what I wrote about, but a lot of it does generalize beyond that, about this debate between basic and applied research as if those are completely separate things and one is legitimate, the other is not in the discourse. How does each side come up with different methods of generating knowledge?

How do they evaluate knowledge claims, and how do they view the other side? It's really that debate that I walk through with the paper, but also it's implications for who is represented at different levels, participants as researchers, as journal editors, as funders and so forth, and how all of these things are intertwined, and what are the implications for not only the knowledge that we produce, but how that knowledge gets used in the world, to develop interventions, to develop the policies that govern our society.

That's really what the paper walked through. This broader epistemic analysis, but also has some personal relevance. I'm someone who, again, came up in a traditionally basic part of the discipline that faced a lot of pushback for my work being to applied, as I was coming up. At the end of the day, I took a job outside of psychology department to be able to do this work in an environment, in a discipline that does value it in a more holistic way. There's also this personal element to it too.

Mia: I thank you for the comment about being in an academic unit that is not a psych department, because I think that that also reflects a subtle thread that happens that when we ask these questions with a real world, and I would say social justice component to them, that there's not always a home. Which says a lot because social psychology is usually one of the sub-parts of our profession, that there absolutely in a department of psychology or psychological sciences, but your intellectual home as a fully credentialed professional, you need kindred spirits, and you're not finding them in our department.

That's a thread that I'm familiar with, in that I wish I had very insightful comments, but I'm just going to put a pin in that as something that I'm noticing here. Anthony, so the title of your paper is "When the Political is Professional Civil Disobedience in Psychology", which man I can't wait to cite this, I'm like holding it right here. Please talk to me about the inspiration for this work and the headline for this piece in particular.

Anthony: Yes, I really appreciate the glowing feedback. It's been an incredible opportunity to be a part of this panel, and to be welcome to the special issue as well. What my co-authors and I focused on was, we each come to psychology or come to the work that we do, from different backgrounds, from different orientations towards work, but one of the threads and the ties that binds us is in some degree of civil disobedience of refusing complicity in harmful practices in support of liberation in some form or another.

Ultimately, this paper arose out of my foundational ethics class, for my graduate degree at along with my colleagues, and we're looking at what does the field have to say about civil disobedience? As it turns out, that there was tons of insights towards civil disobedience with regard-- From minoritized scholars, from feminists, from black scholars, from native scholars, from folks engaged in immigration struggles. However, in terms of what's formally ingrained in our ethics code, and what's formally ingrained in APA guidance around civil disobedience was relatively minimal.

What we looked to do is to synthesize existing perspectives both within and outside the field, to inform psychologists' navigation of civil disobedience and implementation of civil disobedience as a practice for transformative change. I think with that we did a systemic analysis of the ethics code, looked at the ways it can inform civil disobedience, looked at the places where it continues to have shortcomings, and proposed a number of directions. Both for individual psychologists, and students and for the field at large to go to really embolden civil disobedience, the refusal to capitulate to harmful practices into our field, and as a practice for transformative change.

Mia: Awesome, thank you for sharing that. I'm going to save my last question for the lead editor, Asia. My question is a little bit different for you, and I think this is for all of my students and early career folks who are out there who will cite this work. Can you talk to me a little bit about what it was like to put this together and put this out into the world? I'm going to say, I think this is a groundbreaking issue, and so that'll be our final question for the day.

Talk a little bit about that process, because the cool thing about our work is that there was nothing, and then we get to create something. Pool all of these cool ideas together that are threads in these areas and that and pooling it together into a cohesive vision, and getting it accepted in our flagship journal for our association. Let's talk a little bit about that. For our early career folks who are trying to figure out how they can have their public psych impact.

Asia: Absolutely. The issue started as a panel at SPSSI division nine of APA, the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, SPSSI, which is a division I'm truly devoted to. There was a small grant that SPSSI gives out to allow people to do, essentially public psychology, to work with local communities to change local and state policy. Myself and Patrick Grzanka, and Michelle Schlehofer were on that. That's how it got started, as we were talking about psychology activism consistent with Kevin Nadal's Conceptualization and Citizen Psychologist Conceptualization.

Then we realized there was a potential for something bigger there. We really developed the idea, as we were reading the articles and the articles that were being revised, it was fluid up until the end, it remains fluid. One thing that I want to leave people with is the knowledge that you can participate in public psychology incrementally in small ways, you don't have to do it all at once. Let me give an example of a program of research of mine that participates in public psychology in multiple ways.

You can do some and many and all of these as is appropriate to your ability, and scope, and time. I have partnered with Lotus House, which is the largest homeless shelter serving women and girls in the United States. They had questions, and they wanted someone who could help them answer their questions. One of the things they really wanted was evidence of their effectiveness. They're a very effective organization, something like 80% plus of their graduates go on to independent living, this is phenomenal.

They have ideas as to why they provide an incredible support system. They have very unique culture, and they wanted someone to help them establish an evidence base to show the world we have our arms around this problem. I was like, "Okay, I'll help you, I have skills to do this." We developed a memorandum of understanding, so that's like a public psychology principle, where they own everything, they own all the data, I can't do anything without them, which is fully appropriate.

I can't publish, I can't do a poster, I can't do a talk without engaging with them. We did-- We used qualitative methods, which were the most appropriate to their participants. They came from multicultural orientations, we have a paper on multicultural orientation. In the special issue, we practice things like cultural humility and taking advantage of cultural opportunities. In these focus groups that we conducted Lotus House ended up co-writing the paper with us, they are an author on the paper, the last author is Lotus House.

Ultimately, I communicated this to the public recently through an NPR segment with the academic minute, so communicating this. They're also using this paper, they have it on their website, and they are using it to advocate for their culture and their policies and their

practices to be adopted more widely. There's many opportunities for you to participate in this. Even one thing I was thinking about when Anthony was talking was how--

Even in a faculty meeting, you can change the conversation. Even what you say in a faculty meeting can change the conversation from focusing on this person's grant dollars, or the number of publications to what people are doing in the community, for students, for social structures. Just by asking questions and being curious, so what is this supposed to demonstrate? Can this demonstrate that as well? That alone will help us move things forward.

Mia: You timed that perfectly Asia, this has been a great conversation. You're getting a lot of love in the chat. I don't know if you've been able to digest that while preparing your responses. I want to thank all of our guests from around the world, and from my dear colleague Peggy for providing the tech assistance for this meeting. This has been an essential science conversation by the Americans Psychological Association. Please join us for the next one, and thank you so much to our panelists.