

An Ethics and Social-Justice Approach to Collecting and Using Demographic Data for Psychological Researchers

Perspectives on Psychological Science
1–17

© The Author(s) 2022

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/17456916221137350

www.psychologicalscience.org/PPS



Christine C. Call¹ , **Kristen L. Eckstrand¹** , **Steven W. Kasperek²** ,
Cassandra L. Boness³ , **Lorraine Blatt⁴** , **Nabila Jamal-Orozco⁴** ,
Derek M. Novacek^{5,6} , **Dan Foti⁷** , and **Scholars for Elevating
Equity and Diversity (SEED)**

¹Department of Psychiatry, University of Pittsburgh; ²Department of Psychology, Harvard University; ³Center on Alcohol, Substance Use, and Addictions, University of New Mexico; ⁴Department of Psychology, University of Pittsburgh; ⁵Department of Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences, University of California, Los Angeles; ⁶Desert Pacific Mental Illness Research, Education, and Clinical Center, VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System, Los Angeles, California; and ⁷Department of Psychological Sciences, Purdue University

Abstract

The collection and use of demographic data in psychological sciences has the potential to aid in transforming inequities brought about by unjust social conditions toward equity. However, many current methods surrounding demographic data do not achieve this goal. Some methods function to reduce, but not eliminate, inequities, whereas others may perpetuate harmful stereotypes, invalidate minoritized identities, and exclude key groups from research participation or access to disseminated findings. In this article, we aim to (a) review key ethical and social-justice dilemmas inherent to working with demographic data in psychological research and (b) introduce a framework positioned in ethics and social justice to help psychologists and researchers in social-science fields make thoughtful decisions about the collection and use of demographic data. Although demographic data methods vary across subdisciplines and research topics, we assert that these core issues—and solutions—are relevant to all research within the psychological sciences, including basic and applied research. Our overarching aim is to support key stakeholders in psychology (e.g., researchers, funding agencies, journal editors, peer reviewers) in making ethical and socially-just decisions about the collection, analysis, reporting, interpretation, and dissemination of demographic data.

Keywords

culture/diversity, demographic data, methodology, quantitative, scientific

The study of demography and collection of demographic data are quintessential aspects of human research. “Demography” refers to the characteristics that encapsulate communities of people, such as sex, race, marital status, or socioeconomic status (Caldwell, 1996; Furler et al., 2012). “Demographic data,” on the other hand, describes the quantitative assessment of these characteristics (Vogt & Johnson, 2011). In research, demographic data are almost always used to characterize the sample at hand, which provides critical information for comparing findings across studies. Data are also commonly used to determine whether specific demographic groups are disproportionately associated with or affected by phenomena (Hughes et al., 2016). Findings from such

research are used to make data-driven economic, political, and social decisions. For example, the United States relies on demographic data from the U.S. census to directly shape policies and distribute federal funds according to the demographic composition of different areas of the country (Fernandez et al., 2016). Given these downstream societal impacts, the collection and use of demographic data require thoughtful decisions.

Specific to psychological science, demographic data are used in many ways, including but not limited to

Corresponding Author:

Christine C. Call, Department of Psychiatry, University of Pittsburgh
Email: callcc@upmc.edu




Fig. 1. Ethics and social-justice framework for demographic data. (a) Typical approach to demographic data that seeks to collect and use demographics as standard research conduct, which functions to maintain or, at best, reduce inequity. (b) Ethics and social-justice framework for demographic data highlighting the psychologist's role in ethical data use and critical points for giving people who could benefit from the research the capability to choose whether and how to engage and apply research toward transforming well-being and restoring justice.

understanding differences in psychological phenomena or outcomes among social groups, identifying population trends over time, or examining the relevance and generalizability of statistical findings from a research sample to specific populations (Fig. 1a). Although psychology tends to focus on the study of individuals, many psychological phenomena have structural causes. Therefore, consideration of demographic characteristics can help to situate the experiences of individuals within broader social and structural contexts, especially when contending with inequities (e.g., C. S. Brown, Mistry, & Yip, 2019; Roberts et al., 2020; Trent et al., 2019). However, many

demographic variables represent fundamental aspects of personhood (Fernandez et al., 2016), may be considered protected (e.g., collection of sexual orientation in health-care settings; Sanders et al., 2013), and are intricately tied to structural forces of inequity (e.g., distribution of services) that may cause harm. The harms that may arise from demographic data disproportionately affect minoritized¹ communities and may, in turn, contribute to structural inequities.

Recent efforts across fields of research (e.g., the QuantCrit framework in education; Castillo & Gillborn, 2022) are challenging long-held assumptions about data

objectivity by characterizing ways in which demographic data may cause harm. Although there is obvious benefit to the intentional use of demographic data to identify inequities and disproportionalities, the potential harms from processes of demographic-data collection, analysis, interpretation, and dissemination necessitate an ethical approach to demographic-data use. Furthermore, if one value of using demographic data is to identify disparities or disproportionalities and reduce inequities, the collection and use of demographics must be situated in contexts that aim to address the forces perpetuating inequities (e.g., social injustice). A framework that addresses the ethical and social-justice imperatives of demographic-data collection in psychology research is particularly critical at a time when large-scale data-collection efforts are increasingly called on for reproducible science (Taylor, 2017). An ethical, social-justice framework for demographic-data collection and use could lead to more accurate scientific conclusions, reduce “deficit-driven” research that positions minoritized groups as disadvantaged compared with majoritized groups, and support the development of evidence- and equity-based solutions (e.g., Cogua et al., 2019).

Not all researchers who examine psychological processes do so with human participants, which for some may call into question the role of demographic-data collection in such studies. Still, this research is often performed with an ultimate goal of providing a lens into human experiences. Thus, it is important for psychological researchers to understand the implications of their research in translation to humans. Experimental and basic research, whether conducted in humans or nonhuman animals, is often intended to create an empirical basis to test theories. In these cases, research likely prioritizes internal validity without goals of achieving ecological validity, and thus generalizability to all populations may not be a priority (Mook, 1983). However, regulatory bodies do recommend collection of some variables that are relevant to human demographics. For example, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) recommends the inclusion of sex into research design, including in nonhuman research (NIH, 2015a), because the inclusion of sex can support equity in preclinical to clinical translation (Waltz et al., 2021). Consistent with these guidelines, preclinical researchers should also be able to discuss what demographic variables, such as sex, are relevant to their research and consider how such variables can support preclinical to clinical translation. It is true that there is not a “one-size-fits-all” approach to demographic-data collection; the appropriate scope and depth of demographic characteristics measured in a study may vary across subdisciplines and projects depending on the research question (Fig. 1).

However, as a field, psychological researchers of all kinds should be willing to examine assumptions about what identity information is or is not important to avoid furthering or creating new inequities in the research-translation process (Snell-Rood et al., 2021). Indeed, for researchers to build on existing research with *eventual* goals of generalizability, it is critical that they have access to a suitable demographic characterization of the initial research—even if that research did not have goals of generalizability—to inform their approach. By collecting and reporting on demographic data (or animal data that are related to human demographic data), experimental and basic researchers can facilitate the translation of their findings more efficiently, which is likely to increase the impact of their work and the field of psychology as a whole.

Through an ethics and social-justice lens that includes acknowledgment of the inequities in research, in this article, we (a) provide a review of the ethical and social-justice challenges that arise when using demographic data in psychological research and (b) propose a framework to aid psychologists and allied social-science fields in responsibly collecting and using demographic data. The overarching goal of this article is to support key stakeholders in psychology (e.g., researchers, funding agencies, journal editors, peer reviewers) in making ethical and socially just decisions related to demographic data. The discussion largely focuses on U.S.-based research, although aspects may be relevant to research globally. We acknowledge that there are likely important considerations for other geographical regions that warrant discussion that are outside the scope of this article.

Review of Ethical and Social-Justice Challenges Related to the Use of Demographic Data

Researchers regularly face dilemmas in navigating the collection, analysis, reporting, and dissemination of demographic data. Additional challenges arise during the peer-review process given that reviewers consider demographic data in grant applications or submitted articles. Before deciding how to navigate these challenges, it is first critical that researchers become aware of these dilemmas, which may not be obvious at the outset, particularly if a researcher, lab, or institution is accustomed to handling demographic data in certain ways. Below, we highlight key challenges or dilemmas that arise when working with demographic data at each step of the research process (data collection, analysis, reporting, dissemination, and peer review) and review scholarship related to these issues.

Collection of Demographic Data

Recruitment: the implicit exclusion of minoritized groups from research samples

Before demographic data can be collected, researchers must recruit participants, a critical step in the research process that affects the examination of demographic data. Historically, “basic science” methods that prioritize internal validity at the expense of heterogeneous samples have been conferred disproportionate legitimacy compared with “applied science” methods in which context is inherent (Lewis, 2021). This is harmful when findings from basic science are assumed to generalize to populations and contexts that were not considered in the research, including in the absence of data demonstrating generalizability (Lewis, 2021). Bias in research sampling is an increasingly recognized problem and is sometimes formally referred to as the “WEIRD,” or White, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic, problem. Although WEIRD samples are common, including in psychological science, only about 12% of the world’s population are actually WEIRD, which suggests a major gap in generalizability to non-WEIRD communities for whom such research could benefit (for a discussion, see Arnett, 2008). For example, White samples are overrepresented in therapeutic research proportional to their representation in the population, whereas racially and ethnically minoritized samples are underrepresented in therapeutic research (George et al., 2014; Miranda et al., 2003; Scharff et al., 2010; Walsh & Ross, 2003). The lack of inclusion of minoritized groups from research samples limits the confidence by which research can be applied to minoritized communities, raising ethical and social-justice issues and affecting scientific integrity.

Underrepresentation of minoritized groups in research samples may be due to recruitment challenges and a consequence of historical maltreatment of minoritized groups in clinical and psychological research (e.g., Auguste et al., 2022). Mistrust of psychological research and lack of access to information are commonly reported barriers to research participation by minoritized communities (George et al., 2014; Rowley & Camacho, 2015; Scharff et al., 2010). These barriers can be exacerbated by recruitment methods that rely on research participants to seek out studies as opposed to methods that build trust with minoritized communities that researchers can then recruit from. The latter approach is necessary to right historical wrongs and conduct research with respect and care for minoritized communities to ensure a positive experience and maximize the benefits of research in these communities.

Underrepresentation in psychological research may also contribute to growing health inequities if findings are selectively validated among homogeneous, majoritized groups. White, heterosexual norms are often equated with objectivity and impartiality, an assumption that can harm minoritized communities (Lewis, 2021). For example, neuropsychology relies on normed tests to aid in diagnosis. These norms are influenced by sociocultural factors (e.g., acculturation), for which demographic variables often serve as proxies. When research is conducted in relatively homogeneous samples and without adequate assessment of sociocultural factors known to affect test performance, norms fail to account for diverse sociocultural experiences, which in turn has downstream consequences for diagnosis and treatment (Byrd & Rivera-Mindt, 2022).

Assessment: balancing respect for participants with generalizability

When considering how to assess demographic data, researchers face decisions about using inclusive approaches sensitive to participants’ identities versus methods that allow for aggregating data. The former emphasizes respect for participants, whereas the latter can facilitate the comparison across studies and scientific growth. The spectra of demographic-collection methods can range from most inclusive and least prescriptive (e.g., open-text responses for all demographic questions; Hughes et al., 2016; Moody et al., 2013; Strunk & Hoover, 2019) to least inclusive and most prescriptive (e.g., forced, single-answer choice to a limited list of demographic categories). Choosing an approach presents ethical and social-justice dilemmas.

There are numerous reasons to take a more inclusive approach, which typically means less prescriptive or constrained assessment of identity. Forcing participants to incorrectly select an identity from a list of identities that do not apply to them is an act of oppression (Strunk & Hoover, 2019) and can reinforce the sense that psychological research does not recognize or accept their identity. It can also lead to uncertainty about how to respond or frustration with the research, which may contribute to participants from minoritized groups opting out of research, thus exacerbating existing inequities (Hughes et al., 2016) or potentially causing emotional harm. On the other hand, giving participants more freedom to report their identities can validate their lived experiences, convey respect, and build trust in the research process.

Despite the clear drawbacks to less inclusive approaches, there are certain ethical and social-justice reasons for being more prescriptive in the assessment of demographic data. To promote the well-being of

minoritized groups, it is crucial that researchers can identify, aggregate, and compare data from these groups. It is clear that minoritized groups are underrepresented in research, limiting the ability to draw inferences from existing studies, create policies, and develop interventions that serve minoritized groups. Less prescriptive approaches can make it challenging to aggregate or compare data about minoritized groups across studies (e.g., for a meta-analysis or review). These challenges also arise if the categories reported on are not actually representative of the participants' identities, either because the questions were not sufficiently inclusive to adequately capture identity or because data were collapsed into categories that are not representative of participants' identities. Still, there may be benefits to collecting demographic data in ways that are more confined and therefore more easily and accurately compared across studies.

Researchers have proposed practices that may provide balance between less versus more prescriptive approaches in the interest of furthering science while supporting inclusivity. For example, Moody and colleagues (2013) proposed a two-step process involving asking participants for free-text responses to demographic questions and then applying a standardized coding scheme for those responses. Hughes and colleagues (2016) built on and modified the questionnaire and coding scheme provided by Moody and colleagues. Strunk and Hoover (2019) proposed a similar concept in the field of education research. Still, there is not a one-size-fits-all answer to how best to handle this tension.

In secondary data analyses, researchers may be faced with using demographic data that they did not initially collect. In these cases, the challenge becomes how to responsibly analyze and report on the data. This challenge is particularly pronounced when the researcher conducting the secondary analysis believes that demographic data were assessed in a way that compromises ethics or perpetuates injustices in the field. Given the dramatic rise in data sharing and open science, this dilemma is likely to be of increasing relevance.

Analysis of Demographic Data

Both ethical and social-justice dilemmas arise during statistical analysis. Perhaps because there is ambiguity in if, when, and how to examine demographic data, researchers may not prespecify a plan for analyzing such data in the same way that they would for a primary outcome variable. Ad hoc statistical approaches (e.g., multiple analyses) may increase the risk of false positives, particularly when analyzing associations between demographic characteristics and phenomena (Simmons

et al., 2011). False positives related to demographic data have implications for research integrity and reproducibility as well as equity and social justice in that they may reinforce inaccurate biases or divert attention away from true inequities.

Before conducting statistical analyses, aggregating or collapsing subsets of socially defined communities (e.g., gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, queer) into larger, less descriptive categories (e.g., LGBTQ+) for analyses conceals variation between groups that may be important (Strunk & Hoover, 2019). Such practices also falsely imply that the collapsed categories share key similarities when their differences may be clinically important to acknowledge. The practice of collapsing across categories is often done when the number of individuals in a given category is too small to conduct valid inferential statistical analyses. Collapsing within minoritized identities even though majoritized groups (e.g., straight or heterosexual participants) are rarely collapsed conveys that psychological science perceives identities to be variables that can be arranged at the discretion of the researchers or that altering identity data may be acceptable under circumstances deemed "appropriate" by researchers but without permission of people whose identities are being permuted. Keeping categories more descriptive and nuanced rather than collapsing categories may provide a more accurate representation of who was included in the research and, thus, to which populations the research can be generalized (Hughes et al., 2016).

During statistical analyses, attempts to account for confounding variables can be problematic when significant effects related to minoritized communities are obscured through statistical correction or aggregation (Kauh et al., 2021). For example, race, ethnicity, and other demographic variables that are not outcomes of interest but are related to dependent variables are often seen as adjustable (Kaufman & Cooper, 2001). If a demographic variable is not an outcome of interest but is related to outcomes, it is common to statistically control for the demographic variable (Kaufman & Cooper, 2001). However, as is discussed in more detail later, this adjustment is done at the expense of other social determinants (e.g., systemic racism) and often without thoughtful explanation of where demographics and social determinants intersect and why (Noroña-Zhou & Bush, 2021; Ross et al., 2020). Finally, when analyzing demographic variables, it is common practice to set the most privileged group as the comparison (e.g., including White vs. "other" racial identities), which can reinforce societal hierarchies of how social groups are compared and erase heterogeneity in reference or "other" categories (Noroña-Zhou & Bush, 2021).

Reporting and Interpreting Demographic Data

After demographic data have been collected and analyzed, researchers are faced with decisions about how to report and interpret these data in publications and elsewhere. It is common for publications in psychology and related fields to omit demographic data during reporting (Buchanan & Wiklund, 2020). For example, in a review of all studies published in the *American Journal of Psychiatry* between 2019 and 2020 ($N = 125$), Pedersen and colleagues (2022) found that data on age were omitted in 10% of studies, gender/sex data were omitted in 16% of studies, race and ethnicity data were omitted in 57% of studies, and sexual-orientation identity data were omitted in 99% of studies. Although there have been many calls for psychological researchers to shift from conceptualizing identity as one-dimensional to intersectional, reporting intersectional identities in published psychology articles remains rare (Cole, 2009; McCormick-Huhn et al., 2019; Sabik et al., 2021).

The presentation of analyses involving demographic data is also important to consider. When research has focused on experiences of minoritized individuals, the conclusions drawn have focused largely on negative consequences and deleterious effects of being a minoritized person (i.e., “deficit” models). This can include, for example, increased symptoms of psychopathology and experiences of stereotype threat in minoritized communities (Barnett et al., 2019). Both the framing of “negative” demographic-related effects and saturation of research articles reporting deficit-model understandings of being a minoritized person contribute to perceptions of minoritized groups as inherently flawed or struggling psychologically. This practice risks perpetuating trauma through stigmatization and stereotypes and affects communities’ trust in research participation.

Reporting of demographic data in publications, when presented without certain context or appropriate elaboration, can facilitate spurious misinterpretations of key findings (Helms et al., 2005; Okazaki & Sue, 1995). Misattributions of effects that arise from systemic or contextual influences related to demographics can lead to the furtherance of biases and stereotypes in science and wider society, harming minoritized populations and creating deterministic pathways for populations (Lett et al., 2022). For example, much research in the history of psychological science attempted to elucidate biological predispositions for violence among male youths with minoritized racial and ethnic identities (Washington, 2006, Chapter 11). These studies often use overly broad demographic criteria for inclusion in their studies and leave many other collinear variables, such as low

socioeconomic status, lack of access to resources, and other systemic variables, unmeasured, facilitating the erroneous conclusion that violence among males is primarily related to minoritized racial and ethnic identities. Presenting associations between violence and minoritized racial and ethnic identities without the context of broader systemic considerations limits the ability to target addressable sociopolitical and environmental factors that may improve outcomes among these populations. Beyond erroneous conclusions, these studies reify stereotypes about minoritized groups that lead to serious consequences for members of these groups. For example, misperceptions of Black men as larger and more intimidating are informed by racial stereotypes and contribute to justifications for the use of physical force in police altercations (Wilson et al., 2017). Using methodological and statistical approaches that position demographic variables as proxies for social conditions, rather than biological differences, shifts the focus from disparities to inequities, thus allowing for system-level change to occur (Lett et al., 2022).

Misinterpretations are also facilitated when psychological research conflates distinct demographic variables. For example, sex and gender are often used interchangeably, sometimes even in the same publication. The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NASEM; 2022) defined sex as a multidimensional construct of anatomical and physical traits including internal and external reproductive organs, secondary sex characteristics, chromosomes and hormones, whereas gender is a construct that unites gender identity, gender expression, and sociocultural expectations associated with sex traits (Rubin et al., 2020), for which variations exist across cultures, societies, and eras. Research that does not parse sex/gender in meaningful ways limits interpretations of effects and generalizability to populations, perhaps among communities who may benefit from specificity in research (Lindqvist et al., 2021). Omission of gender/sex during research often occurs because of limited consensus on how and when to assess sex and gender in research. The absence of tools for assessing gender and sex has led to research in which gender/sex was collected with binary categorical labels (e.g., “male/female” or “boy/girl”), which precludes gender- and sex-diverse individuals being able to identify themselves in categories that reflect their experiences (Cameron & Stinson, 2019). NASEM specifically recommended that researchers use terminology that is specific to the construct of interest, report which components of sex and/or gender are collected, and collect sex and gender when there is a clear, well-defined goal for collection.

Dissemination of Findings Related to Demographic Data

Research that is inclusive of minoritized groups or seeks to examine psychological phenomena related to experiences of minoritized identities is beneficial only insofar as it is effectively and widely disseminated to communities that participated in the research, the larger scientific community, and society at large. Researchers and institutions rarely create methods for disseminating findings to minoritized communities that have participated in research and people who are supporting these communities, which further exploits minoritized communities (K. S. Brown, Kijakazi, et al., 2019; Lewis & Wai, 2021). The exclusion of studies on these topics from higher-impact journals that reach broader audiences implicitly dismisses the validity of these topics of study. Recent evidence shows that a disproportionate majority of psychological-science articles are authored by White individuals and that most (83%) editors-in-chief of psychology journals are White (Roberts et al., 2020). Having disproportionately White authors and editors results in majoritized communities determining which topics are worth studying, how findings are interpreted, and which findings should be published and disseminated (Lewis & Wai, 2021). This is consequential because White scientists and editors are less likely to study and publish research centering experiences of racially diverse populations (Roberts et al., 2020). In a study by Roberts and colleagues (2020) in which they examined more than 26,000 publications in cognitive, developmental, and social psychology over the last 5 decades, only 5% of publications highlighted race explicitly. White editors published significantly fewer articles highlighting race (4%) compared with editors who are people of color (11%) and selected significantly fewer editorial board members who are people of color (6%) than editors-in-chief who are people of color (17%). Finally, White participants were more common in articles authored by White scientists, whereas participants of color were more common in articles authored by scientists of color.

The Peer-Review Process: A Note for Funding Agencies, Journal Editors, and Peer Reviewers

The use of demographic data also presents challenges during peer review. Important data can be dismissed because of reviewers' critiques of how demographic data were handled; alternatively, research in which demographic data are handled in unethical ways may make its way through the review process. Investigators of trials funded by the NIH are currently required to

report on certain demographic characteristics of their samples (e.g., race and ethnicity) using language that is predetermined by the funding agency and mirrors U.S. census categories (NIH, 2015b). This is meant to provide a "common language" that allows for comparison across or aggregation of research from various studies to facilitate scientific growth, promote generalizability of findings to the broader population, and ensure that certain groups are not excluded from research. Although this may increase equity and facilitate science, the execution can introduce new dilemmas. The language of identity is constantly evolving, often at a faster pace than funding agencies or the U.S. census are updated, creating a mismatch between demographic data and individuals' identities. For example, before 2000, Americans could select only one racial identity on the U.S. census, leaving people identifying as multiracial without the option of selecting multiple racial identities, a practice that both yielded inaccurate data and undermined multiracial identities (A. Brown, 2020). Furthermore, individuals who identify as Middle Eastern or North African (MENA) are categorized as White in the U.S. census despite most MENA individuals self-identifying and being perceived by others as MENA rather than White (Maghbouleh et al., 2022).

These challenges have led to calls for NIH and other funding agencies to modify demographic-reporting requirements in ways that promote equity, fund research focused on minoritized groups and structural inequities, and fund research conducted by minoritized researchers. Journal editors can similarly help grow the amount of research on minoritized groups and topics related to marginalization (e.g., racism) by establishing which demographic information is required of all published articles, explicitly encouraging submissions on topics related to these issues, and providing guidance for editors and reviewers to check the cited literature for adequate representation of topics and authors (Galán et al., 2021; Schwabish & Feng, 2021).

An Ethical and Social-Justice Framework for Thinking Critically About Demographic-Data Collection and Use

The discussed challenges and harms with demographic data in psychology and their consequent impact on individuals and communities who could benefit from psychological research highlight the ethical and social-justice conflicts arising from the current dominant practices of demographic-data collection and use in psychological science. Given the importance of demographic data for the recognition of inequities and redistribution of resources, it is imperative that researchers in psychology have a framework through which to

consider responsible demographic-data collection and use. To build such a framework, we call on three foundational models for ethics and social justice. We describe each model and its application to demographic data in psychological science separately and then integrate the three into a proposed framework.

Applying the American Psychological Association Code of Ethics to Demographic Data

First, we recognize the American Psychological Association's (APA) Code of Ethics (APA, 2016) that applies broadly across the profession of psychology, including research. The APA Code of Ethics provides "a common set of principles and standards upon which psychologists build their professional and scientific work," underscoring the commitment of psychology in "[improving] the condition of individuals, organizations, and society" while also supporting freedom of inquiry. The APA Code of Ethics comprises five ethical principles: (a) beneficence and nonmaleficence, seeking to do work that has benefit, without harm; (b) fidelity and responsibility to professional standards of conduct in psychology; (c) integrity to the accuracy, honesty, and truthfulness of scientific conduct; (d) justice in ensuring that all persons can access and benefit from psychological contributions; and (5) respect for people's rights and dignity, including self-determination and respect for cultural, individual, and role differences across individuals. Ethical decisions about data use are inherent to research (e.g., confidentiality, storage); however, the application of ethical decision-making in research is context dependent (Birnbacher, 1999) and may evolve as understanding regarding the challenges of demographic data emerges. Specifically, demographic methods that met a prior ethical standard may not meet the same standard in the future if such methodology in a new context violates one or more ethical principles. For example, because language around identity evolves, ethical assessment of demographic characteristics requires researchers to use the most current, bias-free, and affirming language (see the APA's guide to bias-free language; APA, 2019). This may mean changing the word choice on a demographic questionnaire if a term is now considered pejorative or adding additional response options given that the omission of a response option can invalidate and "other" participants' identities.

Consider a questionnaire that asks for a participant's "sex" and provides the possible responses of "male" and "female." Consistent with NASEM recommendations, we would recommend (a) changing "sex" to "sex assigned at birth" or "sex listed on birth certificate" to reduce bias and (b) include a second question on current gender because this allows participants to have

their identity respected during data collection and to be counted in research with the identities they hold, which supports translation of research in their communities.² When researchers proactively adapt their demographic questionnaires to use affirming, bias-free language, they exemplify the APA Code of Ethics in the following ways: (a) beneficence and nonmaleficence by conducting research that aims to benefit all individuals and groups (whereas using biased, stigmatized, or oppressive language may do harm to participants, consumers of the research, and society as a whole); (b) fidelity and responsibility by striving to remain up to date on research and guidelines surrounding affirming language for identity; (c) integrity by ensuring their research accurately captures the identities of participants; (d) justice by building trust with minoritized communities, thus encouraging research participation by people who are often underrepresented in research; and (e) respect for people's rights and dignity by affirming individuals' identity or culture. This is just one example of how the APA Code of Ethics can be applied by researchers when working with demographic data; below, we suggest additional points in the research process that necessitate consideration of the APA Code of Ethics regarding demographic data.

Applying Sen's Capability Approach to Demographic Data

Second, and consistent with the commitment of psychology to improving the health condition of individuals, organizations, and society, we recognize Sen's capability approach (Sen, 1985) and its relationship to human health (Nussbaum, 2011; Sen, 1989). Briefly, the capability approach focuses on the moral importance of individual abilities to realize the life they value. In contrast to objective metrics of a successful or valued life, this approach focuses on subjective well-being and the "capability sets" one has to achieve it. In this context, capability sets are combinations of real "functionings" (e.g., wealth or health) to which people have access to and use to realize their valued life. Societal deficiencies arise when individuals or collectives of people lack necessary capability sets or can achieve only capabilities that are incompatible with human dignity (Nussbaum, 2011). Social, institutional, and environmental conditions can function as conversion factors, supporting an individual in converting resources into capability sets, suggesting that such systems have a moral obligation to reduce capability shortfalls (Drydyk, 2012). In the context of psychology research, notably few in society have the capability to enact and produce research that influences their own well-being. However, as an institution, psychology's use of demographic data could serve as a conversion factor that supports individuals or collectives

to guide research that facilitates the achievement of a valuable life (Taylor, 2016, 2017).

Researchers can draw on Sen's (1985) capability approach to identify the inequities related to their research that arise from social deficiencies and affect capability sets. These inequities might be evident in representation in research (i.e., the exclusion of certain demographic groups from research), inaccuracies or misrepresentations in characterizing demographic groups in research, or the outcome the researcher is studying (e.g., health inequities faced by certain demographic groups). Each of these inequities hinders the capability sets needed to achieve a valued life. Once these inequities are identified, researchers can rework their approach to demographic data to serve as a conversion factor, for example, by including underrepresented groups in their research, ensuring that those groups are accurately described, and analyzing demographic data in such a way that helps elucidate inequities.

Applying Fraser's Theory of Social Justice to Demographic Data

Finally, because the capability approach focuses on the means to individual outcomes of value, we recognize Fraser's (2009) theory of social justice to describe an outcome of justice. Fraser's model includes three dimensions critical for justice: (a) recognition versus misrecognition, which highlights status inequality between groups of people, leading to unfair biases and attributions; (b) redistribution versus maldistribution, which acknowledges the unequal distribution of resources that limits equal participation in society; and (c) representation versus misrepresentation, which considers who is included in a system, thus influencing who has the right to frame discourse and policies in a system. This model considers these dimensions from two perspectives. The affirmative perspective considers these dimensions from within a defined state, in which addressing injustice does not change the state itself and instead produces reforms meant to ameliorate injustice. From this perspective, injustice may be reduced, but the structures producing the injustice are affirmed, thus maintaining a state in which future injustice may arise. In contrast, the transformative perspective seeks to restructure the boundaries of a defined state, rather than redistribute resources within the state, to address the root causes of injustice to promote multiculturalism and parity. As detailed above, demographic-data collection and use have historically limited accurate recognition in research, which consequently affects resource distribution and societal representation and affirms existing structures that perpetuate inequities. Researchers can draw from Fraser's model to work toward a transformative approach to demographic data.

Proposed Ethical and Social-Justice Framework for Working With Demographic Data

With these models in mind, we propose an ethical and social-justice framework for demographic-data collection and use (Fig. 1b). Table 1 provides questions that researchers can ask themselves and procedures they might use at each stage of the research process as they apply this framework. Our framework acknowledges, per the APA Code of Ethics, that researchers have the ability to maintain freedom of inquiry in their research question and process; however, this framework highlights pivotal points at which ethical and socially just demographic-data practices could be applied throughout the research process. After selection of the research question, researchers should seek input on—rather than assume—who may benefit from the research in building a valued life and how the research should be conducted to enhance that value. The capability set to make such decisions places functional value in the knowledge and perspectives of communities the research is meant to support in determining both whether the research question is one that is valued by the community and, if so, how to best collect demographic data to ensure accurate representation.

Ethical and socially just choices may vary considerably depending on the research project and other contextual factors, so we emphasize the importance of justifying and clearly reporting on each choice using our framework and Table 1 as guides. To this end, before collecting data, researchers should consider using preregistration options to share how they plan to analyze certain variables, including how they will define and use demographic data and how decisions were made regarding the use of demographic data in their analyses. This step would greatly improve the extent of forethought and consideration given to possible roles and repercussions of demographic-data use in psychological research.

Once demographic data are collected, researchers should articulate the ethical use or nonuse of demographic data in analyses in the write-up of their findings, with a focus on APA principles of benefit without harm, research integrity and fidelity, and justice and respect for persons. Specifically, it is imperative that researchers describe the methods used to gather demographic data from participants and report how said data are operationalized to formulate the demographic variables used in their statistical analyses. Researchers should also develop competency in explaining the limits of their demographic data. Scientific journals should update publication guidelines to include recommendations such as these for the methods and results sections of empirical articles.

Table 1. Suggested Questions to Consider and Corresponding Examples for Navigating Demographic Data Use Through an Ethics and Social-Justice Lens

Research stage (see Fig. 1)	Questions to contemplate	Examples of practices to consider and resources to leverage
Research question	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the theoretical and empirical justification for asking this question related to demographic data? Or, what is the justification for not asking this question? 2. Whom is this research question intended to benefit? Whom does it have the potential to harm? 3. What are the possible implications (benefits and harms) of my research question for various communities? How can I attempt to increase benefits and decrease harms? 	<p>Use a diverse, team-science approach to ensure no one expectation is dominant and no single expertise is prioritized and to improve the comprehensiveness of the motivating prior research and theory (Ledgerwood et al., 2022; Noroña-Zhou & Bush, 2021).</p> <p>Be intentional about the sample (e.g., avoid defaulting to “easy-to-access populations”; Roberts et al., 2020).</p> <p>Use a data-ethics checklist to keep your team accountable throughout the research process (e.g., Lou & Yang, 2020).</p>
Capability set (community): How and should these data be collected?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has there been community input on this research question? 2. Has there been community input on the methods I am considering? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. For existing measures: Has prior research used community-engaged methods (e.g., focus groups)? Which communities were the measure created and tested in? b. For new measures: Have I considered community-engaged focus groups, partnering with an institutional community advisory board, or other community-engaged practices? 3. Have I taken steps to recruit a representative sample from the community? How will my sample composition affect generalizability? 	<p>Review the literature to determine whether prior studies have collected community input on this or related questions (Pedersen et al., 2022).</p> <p>Consult with community-engaged researchers at your institution or elsewhere (Pedersen et al., 2022).</p> <p>Establish a community advisory board and/or partner with community members and advocacy organizations (K. S. Brown, Kijakazi, et al., 2019; Collins et al., 2018; Rowley & Camacho, 2015).</p> <p>Hire research staff from the target community to provide input and help develop rapport with community partners and participants (Rowley & Camacho, 2015).</p> <p>Compensate participants, staff, and community partners appropriately and generously, including forms of compensation in addition to traditional financial payments, such as transportation, food, and child care (K. S. Brown, Kijakazi, et al., 2019).</p> <p>Use snowball sampling and community partners to help establish trust with participants (Rowley & Camacho, 2015).</p> <p>Regularly review demographic characteristics of the sample to ensure ongoing representation of groups (Pedersen et al., 2022).</p> <p>Clearly document the rationale for including and excluding certain demographic variables (e.g., in a protocol).</p> <p>Consider including demographic variables that might be relevant for future research even if not directly relevant to the current study aims (e.g., demographic characteristics that may be relevant for future meta-analyses).</p> <p>Recognize the sensitivity of demographic data and be explicit and clear with participants about why you need them and how you will use them (Rowley & Camacho, 2015).</p> <p>Consider using evidence-based demographic questionnaires (e.g., PhenX Toolkit; Hamilton et al., 2011).</p> <p>Do not use the label “other” when listing options for demographic categories because it carries a negative connotation of being abnormal (Ford et al., 2021; consider instead “not listed” or “prefer to self-describe”).</p>
Demographic methods	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Which demographic variables am I considering including? Which am I considering excluding? What is my justification? 2. What am I trying to ask with these demographic variables? What are the limitations of these variables? 3. How do my choices surrounding demographic methods affect generalizability and interpretability in the context of other research, including future meta-analyses? 4. Whom am I helping by including or excluding these variables? Whom am I harming? How can I reduce the harm? If harm is possible, what is my justification for proceeding? 	<p>Use snowball sampling and community partners to help establish trust with participants (Rowley & Camacho, 2015).</p> <p>Regularly review demographic characteristics of the sample to ensure ongoing representation of groups (Pedersen et al., 2022).</p> <p>Clearly document the rationale for including and excluding certain demographic variables (e.g., in a protocol).</p> <p>Consider including demographic variables that might be relevant for future research even if not directly relevant to the current study aims (e.g., demographic characteristics that may be relevant for future meta-analyses).</p> <p>Recognize the sensitivity of demographic data and be explicit and clear with participants about why you need them and how you will use them (Rowley & Camacho, 2015).</p> <p>Consider using evidence-based demographic questionnaires (e.g., PhenX Toolkit; Hamilton et al., 2011).</p> <p>Do not use the label “other” when listing options for demographic categories because it carries a negative connotation of being abnormal (Ford et al., 2021; consider instead “not listed” or “prefer to self-describe”).</p>

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Research stage (see Fig. 1)	Questions to contemplate	Examples of practices to consider and resources to leverage
Ethical use of demographic data	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the potential benefits and harms of how I plan to statistically examine demographic data? How can I maximize benefits and minimize harms? 2. Have I preregistered my analytic plan and methods related to demographic data? If not, what is my justification? 	<p>When asking questions about gender/sex, avoid including only binary male/female options (e.g., include genderqueer as an option; Hyde et al., 2019). When using a checklist of demographic items, allow participants to check as many as they want; do not force a single selection (Moody et al., 2013; Viano & Baker, 2020).</p> <p>Use open-ended demographic questions so participants are not forced to check a box that may not accurately describe their identity (Roberts et al., 2020). For surveys, include demographic questions at the end so participants can choose whether and what demographic information to disclose in the informed context of the other information they have already shared (Moody et al., 2013). Provide an easy/accessible way for participants to express any concerns or questions about the methods (Moody et al., 2013). Include questions about cultural assets and strengths; do not focus only on cultural deficits or weaknesses (Castillo & Gillborn, 2022; Sablan, 2019). Establish an a priori conceptual framework to support why each demographic factor you include in analysis is relevant to your research question (Chandran et al., 2021; Noroña-Zhou & Bush, 2021).</p>
Capability set (community): How and should these data be applied?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who will these findings and corresponding interpretations benefit or harm? Has there been community input from individuals that these findings might affect? 2. Are there communities that are noticeably absent from my research sample? If so, have I reviewed and enacted suggestions for increasing representation (see Capability Set [Community]: How and should these data be collected?) 3. How can I disseminate results back to the community? How does the community want these results to be used moving forward? 4. Am I planning to share the demographic data publicly? What is my justification? Have I considered the benefits and harms of sharing demographic data? Have I received community input about this? 	<p>When analyzing race/ethnicity, avoid defaulting to White as the reference group. This reinforces White as the standard that all other racial/ethnic groups should be normed to (Ioannidis et al., 2021; Noroña-Zhou & Bush, 2021). Examine within-groups variability before collapsing groups using a shared demographic feature for between-groups comparisons (Buchanan et al., 2021; Noroña-Zhou & Bush, 2021; Rowley & Camacho, 2015). Try not to collapse different demographic groups with small sample sizes into an “other” or “minority” variable that lacks conceptual meaning (Castillo & Gillborn, 2022; Flanagan et al., 2021; Noroña-Zhou & Bush, 2021). If it is necessary to collapse some groups, justify this decision and describe its limitations. Rereview the literature to understand how community input has or has not been applied to similar research before (Pedersen et al., 2022). Discuss findings, their implications, and whether/how to disseminate both the original data (i.e., through public data sharing) and the findings with community partners and/or community-engaged consultants (Collins et al., 2018). Be intentional about which “broader audiences” you are trying to engage. “The audience outside of academia” is not a monolith, so strive to understand the intended audience and craft dissemination materials specifically for them (Lewis & Wai, 2021). Host community data walks (K. S. Brown, Kijakazi, et al., 2019).</p>

(continued)

Table 1. *(continued)*

Research stage (see Fig. 1)	Questions to contemplate	Examples of practices to consider and resources to leverage
Transformative functioning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> How am I choosing to report demographic data? Which intersectional identities have I reported? What is my justification given my research question, community input, and the position of my research in the broader context of my field (e.g., facilitating comparisons with other work)? How am I interpreting findings from demographic data? What theoretical or empirical justification do I have for this interpretation? Could my interpretation reinforce harmful or inaccurate biases? Have I carefully described the limitations of the data and what they cannot be used to describe? How can I partner with the community to use these findings to address root causes of inequity and restore well-being? 	<p>Consider reporting the full sample demographics even for demographic factors not included in analyses either in text or as a supplement (Roberts et al., 2020). Report intersectional identities in text and/or as a supplement. Although it may be impossible to report all intersectional identities, consider reporting those that are particularly relevant to your research question or that the community has asked you to center.</p> <p>Consider including a positionality statement in articles to enhance transparency and to better contextualize the work (Castillo & Gillborn, 2022; Roberts et al., 2020). Be clear about generalizability and limitations (e.g., include a constraints-on-generalizability statement in articles; Castillo & Gillborn, 2022; Pedersen et al., 2022; Simons et al., 2017).</p> <p>Situate socially constructed demographic characteristics properly in historical and sociopolitical contexts (e.g., do not ascribe racial/ethnic differences to biological differences; Cole, 2009; Noroña-Zhou & Bush, 2021). Disseminate the research process and methods along with the findings (e.g., be explicit about who was/was not included; Lewis & Wai, 2021). Exercise scientific humility when contributing to public discourse (Lewis & Wai, 2021).</p>

Note: Our suggestions related to demographic data draw from theories of social justice (Fraser, 2009; Sen, 1985) and the American Psychological Association's General Principles of Ethics (American Psychological Association, 2016): (1) beneficence/maieficence: maximizing benefits and minimizing harms to research participants and the broader community; (2) fidelity and responsibility: justifying decisions related to demographic data by remaining up-to-date on empirical and theoretical knowledge; (3) integrity: ensuring that demographic data accurately capture identities and clearly communicating the limits of the data; (4) justice: attending to who is included and excluded from the research, who is affected by research findings, and how research findings can be used to address root causes of inequity and restore well-being; (5) respect for people's rights and dignity: partnering with individuals from the community to center their voices in the research process to affirm identities, communicate respect, and promote well-being.

In addition, researchers should be attuned to how analyses benefit communities and support justice while also minimizing inadvertent harms. This is consistent with emerging recommendations for research conduct from psychology organizations, peer-reviewed journals, and select funding agencies (APA Task Force on Race and Ethnicity Guidelines in Psychology, 2019; Buchanan et al., 2021; Flanagin et al., 2021). Following completion of ethical analyses that address the research question, researchers should consider whether sharing the data publicly is an appropriate step. Sharing demographic data openly provides the maximum level of transparency and informs the generalizability of the findings, consistent with APA Ethics Principles of research integrity and fidelity. However, it is also an ethical imperative (e.g., beneficence and nonmaleficence) to protect the identities of minoritized groups or groups that have been historically oppressed via research (i.e., indigenous communities), especially in cases in which research findings may easily be traced back to individuals or used to further denigrate minoritized groups (e.g., Lui et al., 2022). Thus, the decision to share data openly and the decision to use open data should be considered within our ethical framework.

As yet another step toward an ethical and social-justice approach for using demographic data in research, researchers should seek input on the functional value of the results of their research rather than assuming their application. Without such input, researchers run the risk of implicitly supporting defined states (i.e., affirmative functioning) that may not have value to affected communities or only reduces or redirects the impact of injustice rather than addressing root causes. In contrast, supporting communities in defining the research value using their capabilities may lead to a transformative outcome that leads to a just restructuring, social equity, and parity.

As previously discussed, numerous barriers exist to the seeking of input from, recruiting, and retaining diverse perspectives in research. In this framework, we acknowledge the role of social, institutional, and environmental conversion factors that would support community-driven capabilities in the research process. One simple way to do this would be for researchers and departments to promote the use of evidence-based demographic tools that have already been developed (e.g., PhenX Toolkit; Hamilton et al., 2011). Some researchers may have access to clinical and translational science institutes that can serve to enhance the capabilities of individuals from diverse backgrounds in research or support researchers in making ethical analytic choices. We also encourage research collaborations that include expertise in community-based participatory methods and for research institutions and departments to consider equitable strategies that allow for stronger

community engagement (e.g., funding a research advisory board). Community engagement needs to be built on equitable, participatory principles that aim to increase trust and engagement without placing additional or unnecessary burdens on communities themselves (Collins et al., 2018; Israel et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2015). However, given the importance of transformative outcomes in research, ongoing commitments to establishing and enabling social, institutional, and environmental conversion factors is critical to the implementation of this ethical and social-justice framework for demographic data.

Conclusion

Researchers in psychological science are regularly faced with critical decision points related to the incorporation of demographic data into their studies. These decisions can either reinforce practices that perpetuate inequities and bias or move the field toward greater diversity, inclusivity, and equity. Thus, we implore researchers to proceed thoughtfully when collecting, analyzing, reporting, interpreting, and disseminating the results of demographic data and to regularly review and update their practices given the rapid pace at which society's understanding of identity and demography shift.

Although we have provided a framework to help researchers think critically about decisions related to demographic data and critical opportunities for stakeholder input, additional research in this area is needed to provide guidelines. Qualitative and quantitative research should examine the preferences of individuals with minoritized identities regarding how demographic data are collected, analyzed, and reported. In addition, community-based participatory research involving individuals with minoritized identities who can advise researchers on their handling of demographic data may be appropriate in many cases.³

Training in the ethical and socially just use of demographic data is also needed. To decrease inequities in the psychological sciences, recent calls have focused on revamping graduate curricula to ensure that it does not continue to reinforce oppressive systems (Galán et al., 2021). Graduate programs could benefit from substantively incorporating issues regarding demographic-data use into various classes. For example, research-methods courses could explicitly discuss ethical and socially just methods for engaging underrepresented participants in research, obtaining their input about the value and methods of a research question, accurately assessing demographic data, and disseminating findings related to demographic data. Statistical-analysis courses could engage students in dialogue about how to appropriately decide how to use demographic data in analyses (e.g., as a covariate, predictor, or not at all). Departments

could require that thesis or dissertation proposals include a section that specifically discusses decision-making around demographic data, and committee members could weigh in on this section.

We emphasize the need for continued conversations among researchers, journal editors, grant and peer reviewers, and other key stakeholders regarding the use of demographic data. To facilitate such conversations, we have created an open reader-commentary page (https://osf.io/gmbpf/?view_only=c4f51c3f72fb4f49b6add6d5fd935215), at which stakeholders can provide feedback on our article and offer ideas for additional recommendations that can be considered in future efforts to create a valuable framework for addressing the issues identified in this publication.

Transparency

Action Editor: Leonel Garcia-Marques

Editor: Klaus Fiedler

Author Contributions

C. C. Call and K. L. Eckstrand share equal first authorship; S. W. Kasperek, C. L. Boness, and L. Blatt share equal second authorship; N. Jamal-Orozco and D. M. Novacek share equal third authorship.

Christine C. Call: Conceptualization, Project administration, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; Kristen L. Eckstrand: Conceptualization, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; Steven W. Kasperek: Conceptualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; Cassandra L. Boness: Conceptualization, Project Administration, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; Lorraine Blatt: Conceptualization, Project administration, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; Nabila Jamal-Orozco: Conceptualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; Derek M. Novacek: Conceptualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; Dan Foti: Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing.



Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared that there were no conflicts of interest with respect to the authorship or the publication of this article.

Funding

C. C. Call and K. L. Eckstrand receive funding from the National Institute of Mental Health (T32 MH018269). C. L. Boness receives funding from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (K08 AA030301). D. M. Novacek receives funding from the VA Advanced Fellowship in Mental Illness Research and Treatment. S. W. Kasperek receives funding from the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship (DGE1745303).

ORCID iDs

Christine C. Call  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3500-3001>
 Kristen L. Eckstrand  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6506-3649>

Steven W. Kasperek  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6078-9328>

Cassandra L. Boness  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8734-193X>

Lorraine Blatt  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9010-2884>

Nabila Jamal-Orozco  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4670-7293>

Derek M. Novacek  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5943-5215>

Dan Foti  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0544-7659>

Acknowledgments

One author identifies as a non-Hispanic White cisgender woman from a low-income background; one identifies as a White, cisgender woman; one identifies as a Black cis gay man; one identifies as a multiracial (Black and White), queer, gender-nonconforming, first-generation college person from a low-income background; one identifies as a White, queer person; one identifies as a non-Hispanic White cisgender queer woman from a low-income background; one identifies as a non-Hispanic White cisgender man; and one identifies as a multiethnic Middle-Eastern Latina, first-generation American and college person from a low-income background. Together, the authors represent a group of United States-based early-career and midcareer scholars across several subdisciplines within and outside of psychology who are invested in moving academia toward equity and social justice. We acknowledge that our identities—as well as our position as academics—influence our biases when it comes to decentering dominant or majoritized identities in research and thinking about demographic data.

Notes

1. We use the term “minoritized” throughout to refer to groups, communities, or individuals who experience historic and ongoing oppression because of social and structural inequities that create and systematically privilege “majoritized” groups. We acknowledge that other terms, such as “marginalized,” also capture this sentiment and may be preferred by some readers.
2. A recent experience by one of our authors offers another example of a failure to validate an individual’s identity with demographic items. When collecting ethnic identity data, the author unintentionally omitted “Arab” from a prescriptive list of options and in a text-entry field, a participant responded, “Arab for the love of god why is there never Araaaaaaaaaab.”
3. For a recent review of the many benefits of community-based participatory research and an overview of several studies that have successfully used this approach, see Kia-Keating and Juang (2022).

References

- American Psychological Association. (2016). Revision of ethical standard 3.04 of the “Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct” (2002, as amended 2010). *American Psychologist*, 71, 900. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000102>
- American Psychological Association. (2019, August). *Bias-free language*. <https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guide/lines/bias-free-language>

- APA Task Force on Race and Ethnicity Guidelines in Psychology. (2019). *Race and ethnicity guidelines in psychology: Promoting responsiveness and equity*. American Psychological Association. <https://www.apa.org/about/policy/guidelines-race-ethnicity.pdf>
- Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95%: Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist*, *63*(7), 602–614. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.7.602>
- Auguste, E., Bowdring, M. A., Kasperek, S. W., McPhee, J., Tabachnick, A., Tung, I., & Galán, C. (2022). *Psychology's contributions to anti-Blackness in the United States within psychological research, criminal justice, and mental health*. PsyArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/f5yk6>
- Barnett, A. P., del Río-González, A. M., Parchem, B., Pinho, V., Aguayo-Romero, R., Nakamura, N., Calabrese, S. K., Poppen, P. J., & Zea, M. C. (2019). Content analysis of psychological research with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people of color in the United States: 1969 – 2018. *American Psychologist*, *74*(8), 898–911. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000562>
- Birnbacher, D. (1999). Ethics and social science: Which kind of co-operation? *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, *2*(4), 319–336. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27504102>
- Brown, A. (2020, February 25). *The changing categories the US census has used to measure race*. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/02/25/the-changing-categories-the-u-s-has-used-to-measure-race/>
- Brown, C. S., Mistry, R. S., & Yip, T. (2019). Moving from the margins to the mainstream: Equity and justice as key considerations for developmental science. *Child Development Perspectives*, *13*(4), 235–240. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12340>
- Brown, K. S., Kijakazi, K., Runes, C., & Turner, M. A. (2019, February 19). *Confronting structural racism in research and policy analysis*. Urban Institute. <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/confronting-structural-racism-research-and-policy-analysis>
- Buchanan, N. T., Perez, M., Prinstein, M. J., & Thurston, I. B. (2021). Upending racism in psychological science: Strategies to change how science is conducted, reported, reviewed, and disseminated. *American Psychologist*, *76*(7), 1097–1112. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000905>
- Buchanan, N. T., & Wiklund, L. O. (2020). Why clinical science must change or die: Integrating intersectionality and social justice. *Women & Therapy*, *43*(3–4), 309–329. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02703149.2020.1729470>
- Byrd, D. A., & Rivera-Mindt, M. G. (2022). Neuropsychology's race problem does not begin or end with demographically adjusted norms. *Nature Reviews Neurology*, *18*, 125–126. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41582-021-00607-4>
- Caldwell, J. C. (1996). Demography and social science. *Population Studies*, *50*(3), 305–333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0032472031000149516>
- Cameron, J. J., & Stinson, D. A. (2019). Gender (mis)measurement: Guidelines for respecting gender diversity in psychological research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *13*(11), Article e12506. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12506>
- Castillo, W., & Gillborn, D. (2022). *How to “QuantCrit”: Practices and questions for education data researchers and users* (EdWorkingPaper: 22-546). Annenberg Institute at Brown University. <https://doi.org/10.26300/v5kh-dd65>
- Chandran, A., Knapp, E., Liu, T., & Dean, L. T. (2021). A new era: Improving use of sociodemographic constructs in the analysis of pediatric cohort study data. *Pediatric Research*, *90*(6), 1132–1138. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41390-021-01386-w>
- Cogua, J., Ho, K. Y., & Mason, W. A. (2019). The peril and promise of racial and ethnic subgroup analysis in health disparities research. *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work*, *16*(3), 311–321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26408066.2019.1591317>
- Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist*, *64*(3), 170–180. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014564>
- Collins, S. E., Clifasefi, S. L., Stanton, J., Straits, K. J., Gil-Kashiwabara, E., Rodrigue Espinosa, P., Andrasik, M. P., Miller, K. A., Orfaly, V. E., The LEAP Advisory Board, Gil-Kashiwabara, E., Nicasio, A. V., Hawes, S. M., Nelson, L. A., Duran, B. M., & Wallerstein, N. (2018). Community-based participatory research (CBPR): Towards equitable involvement of community in psychology research. *American Psychologist*, *73*(7), 884–889. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000167>
- Drydyk, J. (2012). A capability approach to justice as a virtue. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, *15*, 23–38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-011-9327-2>
- Fernandez, T., Godwin, A., Doyle, J., Verdin, D., Boone, H., Kirn, A., Benson, L., & Potvin, G. (2016). *More comprehensive and inclusive approaches to demographic data collection* (School of Engineering Education Graduate Student Series). Purdue e-Pubs. <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/enegs/60/>
- Flanagin, A., Frey, T., Christiansen, S. L., & AMA Manual of Style Committee. (2021). Updated guidance on the reporting of race and ethnicity in medical and science journals. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *326*(7), 621–627. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.13304>
- Ford, K. S., Rosinger, K. O., Choi, J., & Pulido, G. (2021). Toward gender-inclusive postsecondary data collection. *Educational Researcher*, *50*(2), 127–131. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20966589>
- Fraser, N. (2009). *Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world*. Columbia University Press.
- Furler, J., Magin, P., Pirota, M., & van Driel, M. (2012). Participant demographics reported in “Table 1” of randomised controlled trials: A case of “inverse evidence”? *International Journal for Equity in Health*, *11*(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-9276-11-14>
- Galán, C. A., Bekele, B., Boness, C. L., Bowdring, M., Call, C. C., Hails, K., McPhee, J., Mendes, S. H., Moses, J., Northrup, J., Rupert, P., Savell, S., Sequeira, S., Tervo-Clemmens, B., Tung, I., Vanwoerden, S., Womack, S., & Yilmaz, B. (2021). A call to action for an antiracist clinical science. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, *50*(1), 12–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2020.1860066>

- George, S., Duran, N., & Norris, K. (2014). A systematic review of barriers and facilitators to minority research participation among African Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, and Pacific Islanders. *American Journal of Public Health, 104*(2), e16–e31. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2013.301706>
- Hamilton, C. M., Strader, L. C., Pratt, J. G., Maiese, D., Hendershot, T., Kwok, R. K., Hammond, J. A., Huggins, W., Jackman, D., Pan, H., Nettles, D. S., Beaty, T. H., Farrer, L. A., Kraft, P., Marazita, M. L., Ordovas, J. M., Pato, C. N., Spitz, M. R., Wagener, D., . . . Haines, J. (2011). The PhenX Toolkit: Get the most from your measures. *American Journal of Epidemiology, 174*(3), 253–260. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwr193>
- Helms, J. E., Jernigan, M., & Mascher, J. (2005). The meaning of race in psychology and how to change it: A methodological perspective. *American Psychologist, 60*(1), 27–36. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.60.1.27>
- Hughes, J. L., Camden, A. A., & Yangchen, T. (2016). Rethinking and updating demographic questions: Guidance to improve descriptions of research samples [Editorial]. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research, 21*(3), 138–151. <https://www.rwu.edu/sites/default/files/demographic%20recs.pdf>
- Hyde, J. S., Bigler, R. S., Joel, D., Tate, C. C., & van Anders, S. M. (2019). The future of sex and gender in psychology: Five challenges to the gender binary. *American Psychologist, 74*(2), 171–193. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000307>
- Ioannidis, J. P., Powe, N. R., & Yancy, C. (2021). Recalibrating the use of race in medical research. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 325*(7), 623–624. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.0003>
- Israel, B. A., Eng, E., Schulz, A. J., & Parker, E. A. (2005). Introduction to methods in community-based participatory research for health. In B. A. Israel, E. Eng, A. J. Schulz, & E. A. Parker (Eds.), *Methods in community-based participatory research for health* (Vol. 3, pp. 3–26). Jossey-Bass.
- Kaufman, J. S., & Cooper, R. S. (2001). Commentary: Considerations for use of racial/ethnic classification in etiologic research. *American Journal of Epidemiology, 154*(4), 291–298. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/154.4.291>
- Kauh, T. J., Read, J. N. G., & Scheitler, A. J. (2021). The critical role of racial/ethnic data disaggregation for health equity. *Population Research and Policy Review, 40*(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11113-020-09631-6>
- Kia-Keating, M., & Juang, L. P. (2022). Participatory science as a decolonizing methodology: Leveraging collective knowledge from partnerships with refugee and immigrant communities. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 28*(3), 299–305. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000514>
- Ledgerwood, A., Pickett, C., Navarro, D., Remedios, J. D., & Lewis, N. A. (2022). The unbearable limitations of solo science: Team science as a path for more rigorous and relevant research. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 45*, Article e81. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X21000844>
- Lett, E., Asabor, E., Beltrán, S., Cannon, M., & Arah, O. A. (2022). Conceptualizing, contextualizing, and operationalizing race in quantitative health sciences research. *Annals of Family Medicine, 20*, 157–163. <https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.2792>
- Lewis, N. A., Jr. (2021). What counts as good science? How the battle for methodological legitimacy affects public psychology. *American Psychologist, 76*(8), 1323–1333. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000870>
- Lewis, N. A., Jr., & Wai, J. (2021). Communicating what we know and what isn't so: Science communication in psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 16*(6), 1242–1254. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620964062>
- Lindqvist, A., Sendén, M. G., & Renström, E. A. (2021). What is gender, anyway: A review of the options for operationalising gender. *Psychology & Sexuality, 12*(4), 332–344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2020.1729844>
- Lou, S., & Yang, M. (2020). *A beginner's guide to data ethics*. <https://medium.com/big-data-at-berkeley/things-you-need-to-know-before-you-become-a-data-scientist-a-beginners-guide-to-data-ethics-8f9aa21af742>
- Lui, P. P., Gobrial, S., Pham, S., Giadolor, W., Adams, N., & Rollock, D. (2022). Open science and multicultural research: Some data, considerations, and recommendations. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 28*(4), 567–586. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000541>
- Maghbouleh, N., Schachter, A., & Flores, R. D. (2022). Middle Eastern and North Africans may not be perceived, nor perceive themselves, to be White. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA, 119*(7), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2117940119>
- McCormick-Huhn, K., Warner, L. R., Settles, I. H., & Shields, S. A. (2019). What if psychology took intersectionality seriously? Changing how psychologists think about participants. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 43*(4), 445–456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684319866430>
- Miranda, J., Nakamura, R., & Bernal, G. (2003). Including ethnic minorities in mental health intervention research: A practical approach to a long-standing problem. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry, 27*(4), 467–486. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:MEDI.0000005484.26741.79>
- Moody, C., Obear, K., Gasser, H., Cheah, S., & Fechter, T. (2013, December 5). *ACPA standards for demographic questions*. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1kRi8S_TxCJMvXghGgd7eKlexEAlYb3jL/view
- Mook, D. G. (1983). In defense of external invalidity. *American Psychologist, 38*(4), 379–387. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.38.4.379>
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2022). *Measuring sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation*. National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/26424>
- National Institutes of Health. (2015a). *NOT-OD-15-102: Consideration of sex as a biological variable in NIH-funded research*. <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-15-102.html>
- National Institutes of Health. (2015b). *NOT-OD-15-089: Racial and ethnic categories and definitions for NIH diversity programs and for other reporting purposes*. <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/not-od-15-089.html>
- Noroña-Zhou, A., & Bush, N. R. (2021). *Considerations regarding the responsible use of categorical race/ethnicity within*

- health research. PsyArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/kfa57>
- Nussbaum, M. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Harvard University Press.
- Okazaki, S., & Sue, S. (1995). Methodological issues in assessment research with ethnic minorities. *Psychological Assessment, 7*(3), 367–375. <https://doi.org/10.1037/14805-015>
- Pedersen, S. L., Lindstrom, R., Powe, P. M., Louie, K., & Escobar-Viera, C. (2022). Lack of representation in psychiatric research: A data-driven example from scientific articles published in 2019 and 2020 in the American Journal of Psychiatry. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 179*(5), 388–392. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.21070758>
- Rowley, S. J., & Camacho, T. C. (2015). Increasing diversity in cognitive developmental research: Issues and solutions. *Journal of Cognition and Development, 16*(5), 683–692. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15248372.2014.976224>
- Roberts, S. O., Bareket-Shavit, C., Dollins, F. A., Goldie, P. D., & Mortenson, E. (2020). Racial inequality in psychological research: Trends of the past and recommendations for the future. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 15*(6), 1295–1309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620927709>
- Ross, P. T., Hart-Johnson, T., Santen, S. A., & Zaidi, N. L. B. (2020). Considerations for using race and ethnicity as quantitative variables in medical education research. *Perspectives on Medical Education, 9*(5), 318–323. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-020-00602-3>
- Rubin, J. D., Atwood, S., & Olson, K. R. (2020). Studying gender diversity. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 24*(3), 163–165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2019.12.011>
- Sabik, N. J., Matsick, J. L., McCormick-Huhn, K., & Cole, E. R. (2021). Bringing an intersectional lens to “open” science: An analysis of representation in the reproducibility project. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 45*(4), 475–492. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03616843211035678>
- Sablan, J. R. (2019). Can you really measure that? Combining critical race theory and quantitative methods. *American Educational Research Journal, 56*(1), 178–203. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831218798325>
- Sanders, J. Q., Feit, M. N., & Alper, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Collecting sexual orientation and gender identity data in electronic health records: Workshop summary*. National Academies Press.
- Scharff, D. P., Mathews, K. J., Jackson, P., Hoffsuemmer, J., Martin, E., & Edwards, D. (2010). More than Tuskegee: Understanding mistrust about research participation. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved, 21*(3), 879–897. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.0.0323>
- Schwabish, J., & Feng, A. (2021, June 9). *Do no harm guide: Applying equity awareness in data visualization*. Urban Institute. <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/do-no-harm-guide-applying-equity-awareness-data-visualization>
- Sen, A. (1985). *Commodities and capabilities*. North-Holland.
- Sen, A. (1989). Development as capability expansion. *Journal of Development Planning, 19*, 41–58.
- Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2011). False-positive psychology: Undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant. *Psychological Science, 22*(11), 1359–1366. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611417632>
- Simons, D. J., Shoda, Y., & Lindsay, D. S. (2017). Constraints on generality (COG): A proposed addition to all empirical papers. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12*(6), 1123–1128. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617708630>
- Smith, S. A., Whitehead, M. S., Sheats, J. Q., Ansa, B. E., Coughlin, S. S., & Blumenthal, D. S. (2015). Community-based participatory research principles for the African American community. *Journal of the Georgia Public Health Association, 5*(1), 52–56. <http://hdl.handle.net/10675.2/618545>
- Snell-Rood, C., Jaramillo, E. T., Hamilton, A. B., Raskin, S. E., Nicosia, F. M., & Willging, C. (2021). Advancing health equity through a theoretically critical implementation science. *Translational Behavioral Medicine, 11*(8), 1617–1625. <https://doi.org/10.1093/tbm/ibab008>
- Strunk, K. K., & Hoover, P. D. (2019). Quantitative methods for social justice and equity: Theoretical and practical considerations. In K. K. Strunk & L. A. Locke (Eds.), *Research methods for social justice and equity in education* (pp. 191–201). Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05900-2>
- Taylor, L. (2016). The ethics of big data as a public good: Which public? Whose good? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 374*(2083). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2016.0126>
- Taylor, L. (2017). What is data justice? The case for connecting digital rights and freedoms globally. *Big Data & Society, 4*(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951717736335>
- Trent, M., Dooley, D. G., Dougé, J. SECTION ON ADOLESCENT HEALTH; COUNCIL ON COMMUNITY PEDIATRICS; COMMITTEE ON ADOLESCENCE; Cavanaugh, R. M., Jr., Lacroix, A. E., Fanburg, J., Rahmandar, M. H., Hornberger, L. L., Schneider, M. B., Yen, S., Chilton, L. A., Green, A. E., Dille, K. J., Gutierrez, J. R., Duffee, J. H., Keane, V. A., . . . Wallace, S. B. (2019). The impact of racism on child and adolescent health. *Pediatrics, 144*(2), Article e20191765. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2019-1765>
- Viano, S., & Baker, D. J. (2020). How administrative data collection and analysis can better reflect racial and ethnic identities. *Review of Research in Education, 44*(1), 301–331.
- Vogt, W. P., & Johnson, B. (2011). *Dictionary of statistics & methodology: A nontechnical guide for the social sciences*. Sage.
- Walsh, C., & Ross, L. F. (2003). Are minority children under- or overrepresented in pediatric research? *Pediatrics, 112*(4), 890–895. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.112.4.890>
- Waltz, M., Fisher, J. A., Lyerly, A. D., & Walker, R. L. (2021). Evaluating the National Institutes of Health’s sex as a biological variable policy: Conflicting accounts from the front lines of animal research. *Journal of Women’s Health, 30*(3), 348–354. <https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2020.8674>
- Washington, H. A. (2006). *Medical apartheid: The dark history of medical experimentation on Black Americans from colonial times to the present*. Doubleday.
- Wilson, J. P., Hugenberg, K., & Rule, N. O. (2017). Racial bias in judgments of physical size and formidability: From size to threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 113*(1), 59–80. <https://doi.org/10.1037/psp0000092>