Diversity Accountability Index for Journals (DAI-J):

Increasing awareness and establishing accountability across psychology journals

NiCole T. Buchanan¹, Marisol Perez², Mitchell J. Prinstein³, and Idia B. Thurston⁴

Recommended Citation:

Buchanan, N. T., Perez, M., Prinstein, M. J., & Thurston, I. (2021). Diversity Accountability Index for Journals (DAI-J): Increasing awareness and establishing accountability across psychology journals [unpublished manuscript]. PsyArXiv. <https://psyarxiv.com/zp9em>

Author Note

NiCole T. Buchanan (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9288-5245>), Marisol Perez (<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0915-2145>), Mitchell J. Prinstein (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7587-8665>), and Idia B. Thurston (<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2484-2985>).

We have no known conflicts of interest to disclose. Authorship is listed in alphabetical order by last name because all authors contributed equally and merit first author status. Traditional hierarchical authorship structures may not reflect collaborative and interdisciplinary contributions to manuscripts. Authors self-identify as a U.S. born biracial Black woman, Hispanic woman, white male, and Nigerian American Immigrant Black woman. Correspondence regarding this table may be directed to Dr. Idia Thurston, Texas A&M University, 256 Psychology Building, College Station, TX 77843, idiathurston@tamu.edu, 979-845-3794

See related manuscript:

Buchanan, N. T., Perez, M., Prinstein, M. J., & Thurston, I. (invited resubmission). Upending Racism in Psychological Science: Strategies to Change How Our Science is Conducted, Reported, Reviewed, and Disseminated. *American Psychologist*. (PsyArXiv Public Access: <https://psyarxiv.com/6nk4x>)

Abstract

To increase awareness and establish accountability, we propose that journals rate themselves using this table with an emerging list of accountability benchmarks. Recommendations are derived from Buchanan, Perez, Prinstein, & Thurston's 2021 paper, *Upending Racism in Psychological Science: Strategies to Change How Our Science is Conducted, Reported, Reviewed, and Disseminated*. Benchmarks were based on Centola et al., 2018, which showed 25% as the tipping point for shifting majority opinion on social norms. In order to over-correct for racism that has permeated our science, we suggest partial credit (score of 1) for journals that meet the 25% threshold and full credit (score of 2) for journals that go well above this threshold (i.e., 33% or one third of their publications). In the present table, "Most" refers to 70-100% of published articles, "Some" refers to 30-50% of published articles, and "Few" refers to 0-10% of published articles.

A Proposed Diversity Accountability Index for Journals (DAI-J) in Psychological Science

Index Topic	2 = Yes	1 = Partial	0 = No
1. Publications focused on race, ethnicity, racism, and diversity science	>33% of publications address any of these topics, >33% explore the underlying factors driving these relationships and examine nuanced differences within BIPOC groups.	≥25% of publications address any of these topics, but 0-24% address the underlying factors driving these relationships or examine nuanced differences within BIPOC groups	0-24% of publications address any of these topics
2. Diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) principles	Mission statement reflects DEI principles; showcases work relevant to BIPOC populations; >33% of publications include author positionality statements	Mission statement reflects DEI principles, but positionality statements of social identity are not included	Mission statement does not reflect any DEI principles or positionality statements
3. Inclusive research methods	>33% of publications use inclusive research methods and examine within BIPOC group heterogeneity	≥25% of publications use inclusive research methods and examine within BIPOC group heterogeneity	0-24% of publications use inclusive research methods
4. Recruitment of diverse samples	Journal requires authors to provide explicit statements regarding sample diversity and justification of use of WEIRD and all white samples, and reviewers are required to assess for sample inclusion concerns	Journal requires 1 or 2, but not all of the following: explicit statements regarding sample diversity; justification of WEIRD or all white samples; reviewers to assess for sample inclusion concerns	Journal does not require any of the following: explicit statements regarding sample diversity, justification of WEIRD and all white samples; reviewers to assess for sample inclusion
5. Use of Diversity Science Approaches	Diversity science approaches are encouraged and used in >33% of published papers	Diversity science approaches are encouraged and used in ≥25% of published papers	Diversity science approaches are not encouraged and are used in 0-24% of published papers
6. Systems Centered Language (SCL)	Author instructions encourage SCL and >33% of published papers use SCL	Author instructions encourage SCL and ≥25% of published papers use SCL	SCL is not explicitly encouraged and 0-24% of papers use SCL
7. Inclusive journal keywords¹	>33% of journal keywords are inclusive and the percentage of articles using these inclusive keywords are published each year along with benchmarks to increase use	≥25% of journal keywords are inclusive but the percentage of articles using these inclusive keywords and benchmarks to increase use are not published yearly	0-24% of journal keywords are inclusive; percentage of articles using such keywords is not published
8. Definitions of race	Most articles discussing race define the construct and explain how it was measured and used	Some articles discussing race define the construct and explain how it was measured and used	Few articles discussing race define the construct or explain how it was measured and used
9. Ethnicity reporting for participants of all races	Most articles reported ethnicity for participants of all racial groups	Some articles reported ethnicity for participants of all racial groups	Few articles reported ethnicity for participants of all racial groups
10. Within group heterogeneity	Most articles report ≥3 sociodemographic identities and >33% of articles examine findings by intersecting identities	Some articles report ≥3 sociodemographic identities and ≥25% of articles examine findings by intersecting identities	Few articles report ≥3 sociodemographic identities and 0-24% of articles examine findings by intersecting identities
11. Systems to identify and respond to bias in reviews	Established a system to recognize bias in the review process <i>and</i> protocols to respond to bias in reviews	Has established either a system to recognize bias in the review process <i>or</i> protocols to respond to bias in reviews	No system for recognizing bias in review process and no protocols to respond to bias in reviews
12. Initiatives to dismantle white supremacy	Journal has publicly disseminated initiatives to dismantle white supremacy in psychological science	Journal has initiatives to dismantle white supremacy in psychological science but initiatives are not publicly disseminated	Journal has no initiatives to dismantle white supremacy in psychological science

¹ Examples of inclusive BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color)-related keywords include racial justice, racism, intersectionality theory, oppression, minority stress, sexism, structural inequality, cultural humility, implicit bias, discrimination, ethnic identity, racial identity, health equity, diversity, and inclusion.

13.	System to rate reviews and reviewers	There is a formal system for authors to provide feedback on reviews; feedback is used to identify bias toward BIPOC scholarship in the review process	There is a formal system for authors to provide feedback on reviews but feedback is not used to identify areas of bias in the review process	There is no formal system for authors to provide feedback on reviews
14.	System to address discriminatory and biased feedback	The frequency of discriminatory and biased feedback in reviews is published each year <i>and</i> benchmarks are set to reduce their occurrence	The frequency of discriminatory and biased feedback in reviews is published <i>but</i> there are no listed benchmarks to reduce their occurrence	The frequency of discriminatory and biased feedback in reviews is not published and there are no benchmarks set to reduce their occurrence
15.	BIPOC reviewers, editors, and authors	Number of BIPOC reviewers and editors are assessed and reported annually; >33% of reviewers and editors self-identify as BIPOC; and >33% of publications include BIPOC authors	Number of BIPOC reviewers and editors are not assessed and reported; ≥25% of reviewers, editors, and authors self-identify as BIPOC	Number of BIPOC reviewers and editors are not assessed and reported <i>and</i> 0-24% of reviewers, editors, and authors are BIPOC
16.	Community experts	Community experts are included on the editorial advisory board	Community experts are consulted for feedback on certain papers <i>but</i> not included on editorial advisory board	Community experts are not consulted and not included as members on the editorial advisory board
17.	Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) training	Editorial board members are required to complete DEI and implicit bias trainings	Editorial board members are encouraged, but not required, to complete DEI and implicit bias trainings	There is no statement or expectation that editorial board members complete DEI and implicit bias trainings
18.	BIPOC scholar mentorship	Has programs to mentor BIPOC scholars in both the review <i>and</i> editorial processes	Has programs to mentor BIPOC scholars in either the review <i>or</i> the editorial process (but not both)	No programs to mentor BIPOC scholars in the review or editorial process
19.	Recognize BIPOC editorial members	Contributions of BIPOC editorial members are formally recognized in & outside the journal	Contributions of BIPOC editorial board members are acknowledged in the journal only	Contributions of BIPOC editorial board members are not formally recognized
20.	Invite commentaries to counter racism	Commentaries are solicited for every publication that has the potential to reinforce white supremacy	Commentaries are solicited for some publications that have the potential to reinforce white supremacy	Commentaries are not solicited for publications that have the potential to reinforce white supremacy
21.	Assess for bias in rejection rates	Manuscript rejection rates are reported across keywords to assess inequities toward BIPOC scholarship; benchmarks set for improvement	Manuscript rejection rates are reported across keywords to assess inequities toward BIPOC scholarship; no benchmarks set for improvement	Manuscript rejection rates across keywords are not examined or reported
22.	Educate about race, racism and bias	Supports and leads educational and training efforts that raise awareness about the value of BIPOC scholarship, bias in prior work, and the need to upend racism in psychological science	Supports but not leads educational and training efforts that raise awareness about the value of BIPOC scholarship, bias in prior work, and the need to upend racism in psychological science	Does not support educational efforts or training programs that raise awareness about the value of BIPOC scholarship, bias in prior work, and the need to upend racism in psychological science
23.	Community dissemination plan	Public and community dissemination is actively encouraged and >33% of articles include public dissemination plans for BIPOC communities	Public and community dissemination is actively encouraged, but few articles include a public dissemination plan targeting BIPOC communities	Public and community dissemination is not encouraged (or is penalized); no articles have public dissemination plans
24.	Public and BIPOC-focused dissemination tracking	The proportion of papers whose findings were directly disseminated to the public and BIPOC communities is tracked & reported annually	The proportion of papers whose findings were directly disseminated to the public and BIPOC communities is tracked but not publicly reported	The proportion of papers whose findings were directly disseminated to the public and BIPOC communities is not tracked
25.	Dissemination with community partners	>33% of papers have community partners as co-authors	≥25% of papers have community partners as co-authors	0-24% of papers have community partners as co-authors

Note: To increase awareness and establish accountability, we propose that journals rate themselves using this emerging list of accountability benchmarks. Benchmarks were based on Centola et al., 2018, which showed 25% as the tipping point for shifting majority opinion on social norms. In order to over-correct for racism that has permeated our science, we suggest partial credit (score of 1) for journals that meet the 25% threshold and full credit (score of 2) for journals that go well above this threshold (i.e., 33% or one third of their publications). In the present table, “Most” refers to 70-100% of published articles, “Some” refers to 30-50% of published articles, and “Few” refers to 0-10% of published articles.